GOVERNMENT
OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

REGULAR MEETING

+ + + + +

MONDAY

JANUARY 24, 2011

+ + + + +

The Regular Meeting of the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened in Room 220 South, 441 4th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20001, pursuant to notice at 6:30 p.m., Anthony J. Hood, Chairman, presiding.

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

ANTHONY J. HOOD, Chairman
GREGORY N. SCHLATER, Vice Chairman
CURTIS L. SELFRIDGE, JR., Commissioner
MICHAEL G. TURNBULL, FAIA,
Commissioner (AOC)
PETER MAY, Commissioner (NPS)

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

SHARON S. SCHELLIN, Secretary DONNA HANOUSEK, Zoning Specialist ESTHER BUSHMAN, General Counsel

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 Board of Zoning Adjustment
District of Columbia
CASE NO.Transcript
EXHIBIT NO.null

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

JENNIFER STEINGASSER JOEL LAWSON KAREN THOMAS MAXINE BROWN-ROBERTS

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PRESENT:

JACOB RITTING, ESQ.

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Regular meeting held on January 24, 2011.

	T-A-B-L-E O-F C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S
I.	OPENING REMARKS
	Chairman Hood4
II.	HEARING ACTION
	A. Z.C. Case No 11-01 (Office of Planning)
III.	CORRESPONDENCE (MS.SCHELLIN)
	A. Z.C. Case No. 07-26
III.	PROPOSED ACTION
	A. Z.C. Case No. 08-34 (MS. SCHELLIN) 13

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

6:38 p.m.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: This meeting will please come to order. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. This is the January 24, 2011 Public Meeting of the Zoning Commission of the District of Columbia. My name is Anthony J. Hood. Joining are Vice Chairman me Schlater and Commissioners Selfridge, and Turnbull. We're also joined by the Office of Zoning Staff, Ms. Sharon Schellin, Ms. Donna Hanousek, and Ms. Esther Bushman. from the Office of the Also, Attorney General, Mr. Ritting. Also, from the Office of Planning, we have Ms. Steingasser, Lawson, Mr. Goldstein, Ms. Brown-Roberts, and Ms. Thomas. All right. Thank you.

Copies of today's meeting agenda are available to you and are located in the bin near the door. We do not take any public testimony at our meetings unless the Commission requests someone to come forward.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	Please be advised that this
2	proceeding is being recorded by a court
3	reporter and is also webcast live.
4	Accordingly, we must ask you to refrain from
5	any disruptive noises or actions in the
6	hearing room. Please turn off all beepers
7	and cell phones.
8	Does the staff have any
9	preliminary matters?
10	MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I have one.
12	I would like to move the agenda around.
13	First, we're going to take up Hearing Action;
14	second we're going to take up the
15	Correspondence; third, we're going to have
16	Proposed Actions; and, after that, we will
17	take up anything else that is outstanding.
18	Okay. First, Hearing Action on
19	Zoning Commission Case No. 11-01, Office of
20	Planning - Text Amendment to 2116 re:
21	Location of Parking Spaces. Ms. Thomas?
22	MS. THOMAS: Good evening, Mr.

Chairman and members of the Commission. Karen Thomas with the Office of Planning. Zoning Commission's the response to recommendation at a Public Hearing on parking and loading in November of 2010, ΟP proposed Text Amendments to the parking chapter, including the section regulates the location of parking spaces on a The proposed amendments would bring the current regulations in line with Comprehensive Plan's goals for urban design, generally prescribes which that parking should be set behind or underneath buildings.

The amendments would clarify that parking for commercial uses can no longer be placed in front of a building and above grade structures must be located at least 20 feet from front lines. The amendments are not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan and OP recommends set down of this submitted amendments for public hearing on the matter.

I'd just like to add that comments

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	provided by OAG this afternoon, we made some
2	slight modifications and I've passed it on to
3	Ms. Schellin. Thank you.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, very
5	much, Ms. Thomas. We do have the amendment
6	that was given to us this afternoon. Also,
7	let me acknowledge, we're also joined by Mr.
8	Lawson of the Office of Planning, also.
9	Okay. Commissioners, any
10	questions of the Office of Planning or Ms.
11	Thomas? Not hearing any. Any questions?
12	Not hearing any, I would move that we set
13	down Zoning Commission Case No. 11-01. This
14	is the Office of Planning Text Amendment to
15	2116, Location of Parking Spaces. And I ask
16	for a second.
17	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Second.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: It's been moved
19	and properly seconded. Any further
20	discussion? Are you ready for the question?
21	All those in favor?

NEAL R. GROSS

Aye.

ALL:

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing any
2	opposition, Ms. Schellin, would you please
3	record the voce?
4	MS. SCHELLIN: The staff records
5	the vote five to zero to zero to set down
6	Zoning Commission Case No. 11-01, and this is
7	being set down as a rule making case.
8	Commissioner Hood moving; Commissioner
9	Turnbull seconding; Commissioners May,
LO	Schlater, and Selfridge in support.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Next, on
12	the correspondence, we have under
13	Correspondence, we have Zoning Commission
14	Case No. 07-26; also 96-09A. And we also
15	have a letter for request a review of a BZA
16	Case 18154. Ms. Schellin, if you want to
17	respond, could you respond to all three of
18	them? Then I'll deal with all three of them
19	at the same time?
20	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. The
21	first one is a letter from the Zoning
22	Administrator pursuant to 2409.8, advising of

action that he took it that case, pursuant to that section. The second one is a request from Goulston & Storrs, asking for a delay in the issuance in the Order in that case. And the third one is a letter from Counsel member Wells, asking that the Commission Sua Sponte -- take Sua Sponte action on a BZA case.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, very much, ${\tt Ms.}$ Schellin. Let's look at Zoning Commission Case No. 07-26, out of O Street Roadside, LLC, letter from the Zoning Administrator, re: notification pursuant to 2409.8. I think what we can Any comments? basically do is say so noted, we'll accept We have it. And actually, I think it's in our regulations he provided that, and he Any further questions has done that. comments on that? Mr. Vice Chairman?

VICE-CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: I have one question, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if we can get clarification from the Zoning Administrator. The final modification to the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	roof top mechanical structures says the
2	structures will be relocated relocate
3	portion of west building penthouse from
4	northwest corner to southern edge, adjacent
5	to hotel penthouse. And I just wanted
6	clarification. Maybe I don't know how
7	the best mechanism to do it. But I just
8	wonder if they need additional relief or if
9	they already have relief with regard to the
10	mechanical penthouse locations. Because it
11	sounds like it's at the edge of the building.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you,
13	Vice-Chairman. Ms. Schellin, I would ask,
14	working along with OAG, that we can ask for
15	further clarification, as Vice-Chairman has
16	mentioned, of the relocation. Do they need
17	further relief.
18	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Anything
20	else? Okay. So noted. Next is Zoning
21	Commission Case No. 96-09A, (the Pope John

Paul II Cultural Foundation, Inc. -- Letter

1	from Goulston & Storrs, requesting Order to
2	be delayed until the end of February.)
3	Again, in Exhibit 7, the last few sentences
4	say they would like to retain the flexibility
5	to retract John Paul II's previous request
6	for extinguishment, should it be necessary.
7	Accordingly, John Paul II asks that the order
8	be delayed until the end of February. Any
9	problems, Commissioners, with delaying this
10	order until the end of February? So, Ms.
11	Schellin, let me ask this. Will we take this
12	up at our next meeting?
13	MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir. If the
14	Commission would grant that, then Staff would
15	take care of making sure that the order will
16	either be issues or, at the end of February,
17	or the Applicant will withdraw their case if
18	they find that they no longer need that
19	relief.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So we don't need a
21	motion on this?

MS. SCHELLIN: No. If you'll just

grant Staff the authority to delay the issuance of the order, that will take care of it.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioners, do you want to empower Staff to go ahead and continue to deal with the situation? I don't see anyone shaking their head. So thank you, Ms. Schellin. We will -- Staff will deal with that accordingly. Thank you, very much.

Okay. Next, we have a letter from Council member Tommy Wells requesting Sua Sponte review of BZA Case No. 18154. received the request. Our rules don't respond to requests -- our rules don't -- we don't respond to requests of someone asking us to Sua Sponte. And I'll read exactly 3128.6. Because that is -- because there is no right of appeal to the Commission from any action of the Board. The Commission need not answer any communications to the Commission requesting a Sua Sponte review be undertaken. Sua Sponte is discretionary review а

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

internal process.

I don't know if we need to respond

to the Council member. But, as this states,

well, if he reads the transcript, Sua Sponte

review is a discretionary internal process
and that can be found in 3128. So I think

8 Sua Sponte.

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Okay. Ms. Schellin, are we finished with correspondence?

that will respond to his request for us to

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

Let's go to Proposed Action. Proposed

Action tonight is Zoning Commission Case No.

08-34, Center Place Holdings - 1st Stage PUD,

Related Map Amendment and Consolidated PUD i

Squares 564, 566, And 568. Ms. Schellin?

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. At the close of the hearing, there were several items requested from the Applicant. And you also asked the Office of Planning to make a supplemental report. Those items are before

NEAL R. GROSS

1	the Commission. And Staff would ask the
2	Commission to consider this case for proposed
3	action.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
5	Commissioners, there are a number of moving
6	parts in this particular case. And so, as I
7	looked at trying to frame the discussions, I
8	don't think I did a great job. But I looked
9	at Exhibit Number 47, which talked about some
10	of the responses to what we had asked for.
11	And also, the Office of Planning's
12	supplemental report. So we might want to
13	pull all that out in front of us and we'll
14	just eventually open up oral discussions.
15	But let me also mention we have an ANC report
16	well, an ANC letter. And I think we must
17	have asked for I'm not sure why we asked
18	them
19	MS. SCHELLIN: We allowed them to
20	respond. They had an opportunity to respond.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Okay.
22	And it says the Commission has voted seven

to one to support the amendments to the plan
affecting South Block Mass. and retail
strategy in the Massachusetts Avenue Park.
The vote had two caveats, that they provide
first source employment to D.C. residents,
which that's been met, and the representative
of ANC6-C, at the January 24, 2011 hearing be
the resident chairman of our Planning and
Zoning Environmental Committee, Mr. Rob Amos.
And we typically don't we don't take
comments. So I think both of those caveats
have been met, due to the one that we don't
have really speaking or anyone coming
forward, unless we request it. So all right.
So, with that, let me open it up for
discussion. Who'd like to start us off? And
you know, I guess, for me, I would just start
off with a good way to frame this, because
there are a number of moving parts, is that
whatever gives you heartburn the most or
makes you feel good the most, let's start
there. Either way. Okay. I open it up for

discussion. That's good. We have no discussion. So we'll just move right on. So can I get a motion to approve? All right. Commissioner May?

COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. First of all, I think I'll start off with the very positive things. This project has a lot going for it. I mean, certainly the effort to reclaim this lost piece of the city's landscape and make something of it, I think, in itself is a worthy effort and, in this remarkable effort. I mean, а planning that's gone into this, trying to work out how to get in all necessary services; how the to stream freeway underneath it; all of the sort master planning of this, I think, has been very well The -- and many of the features, you know, trying to integrate into it sustainable features; trying to integrate some really novel things into the project, like the ecochimneys. I mean, these are, I think, again

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

are all positive aspects.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Now, here's the but. The but is that, overall, I'm still not sold on overall massing of the project and the configuration of the retail and the creation of the interior streets -- the pedestrian arcade space. And so I've very, uncomfortable, trying to move this forward at this moment.

First, on the subject of massing, I still don't feel like the logic of the allocation of the FAR between the three blocks of the building makes sense yet. are working through this in pieces. I understand the phasing. That certainly makes But what we wind up with is the most sense. fully developed portion of the project feeling like it is the least dense. And then, as a result, the parcels further to the south wind up feeling like they really just have to cram in the square footage, in order to make the overall project work. I'm not

NEAL R. GROSS

I feel like, when it comes time to design these other buildings, that we're going to wind up making some very significant compromises on those. I don't know whether there is room to reallocate the FAR. I just don't feel comfortable seeing what I see.

The retail space is, I think, probably the biggest problematic aspect of the design, the way it is. It does not feel like it's going to be an inviting, attractive I don't believe that the retail space, itself, if configured in such a way that you get a sufficient critical mass of retail or even reason to be there. You know, in order to make it successful. We asked for some examples of how that has worked in the past. And Washington Harbor is cited as an example where you have this sort of interior And I think that that's certainly streets. example something that's an of been successful in many ways. Although I wouldn't

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

say that all of the retail that exists on
those sort of the pedestrian way that
parallels K Street is as successful as the
one that goes perpendicular and leads to the
water. And I think that it's the water, as a
destination, that makes that project a
success. So, you know, when you have an
attraction like that, you're going to get
foot traffic and you're going to get people
walking by and visiting whatever retail you
have there. There's no real reason to be in
this retail, except to go and get whatever is
in the retail space. So if you need to pick
up your dry cleaning or if you need to go get
a cup of coffee, yes, there's a reason to be
there. But that, in itself, doesn't make for
really good attractive retail. And so I'm
just not convinced that it's laid out the way
it should. Now, is it something where you
could configure it differently and have
greater connectivity? Maybe. But I have
this feeling like it's we're missing maybe

even a whole street through there that
there should be a street that can have cars,
that could have parking or something, or have
a destination within it that is an attraction
is a reason for people to be there. And
maybe that's a public space of some sort. I
don't know what the answer is. I don't want
to try to design it. I just don't feel like
it's there. And I think that this also sort
of blends into the issue of the ultimate
development of the south blocks. Because I
think what you do in this north block, I
think, sets a precedent, in many ways, for
what happens with the rest of it. And if
you're trying to create new critical mass,
it's important for that critical mass, I
think, to be connected in some ways. So I
don't I just I don't feel comfortable
with this the way it is.

I did read through the retail report. I'm not convinced that the retail is going to be successful. And I'm concerned

NEAL R. GROSS

about some of the bad examples around town
where similar projects have not been as
successful as we would like. And now, I did
there are areas where some of the
questions that were asked, I think, have been
answered. At least, for the moment, the
notion of measuring the height of the south
and central block off of 3rd Street, if
there's a meaningful connection through to
3rd Street, for both of those blocks, I think
that that meets the law and the requirements,
not that we interpret the Height Act, but at
least from our point of view, from a Zoning
perspective, I think that the meaningful
connection satisfied is potentially going
to satisfy that. Now, we haven't seen what
that meaningful connection is. So whatever
we would do to approve or to bless this
notion of measuring off 3rd Street would have
to be confirmed in the second stage of the
PUD for the south and central blocks.

As for the north block, I'm not

NEAL R. GROSS

sure that we need to be convinced that that is a single building. So I don't know that we need to make a determination as to whether the arcade roof is a meaningful connection or Because, the way I look at this, maybe not. I misunderstand it, but the way I look at it, you can measure height off of Massachusetts Avenue for two of the buildings and off of 3rd Street for the other building. you can get sufficient height off of those Again, maybe I'm missing something But I think that's sort of a minor Ι think point. Because that the configuration of the buildings and the retail still needs to change.

Like I said, there are many things that this project has going for it, many of the features. But I think that those are specific features and, until you get to the right configuration of buildings, I don't think that they're really the important part of this. I would also say that I don't --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I'm not inspired yet by what I see
architecturally. I just see a bunch of big
glass boxes. And I think that it I'm not
sure what the character of the buildings
needs to be or what would need to be done to
improve them. But I'm just I'm not sold
on the on what I've seen in terms of the
design. Again, I would probably have more
specific comments on that if I were
comfortable with the configuration of the
massing. But I am not comfortable with that.
So it's hard to talk about the particulars
of the architecture. So that's what I have
to say.
CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you,
Commissioner May. Any other comments,
concerns? Commissioner Turnbull?
COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman. I would agree with my
colleague in his initial statements. Because

I think this is an incredible project and I

think it's one that's been waited for, for a

long time. And I think it's going to be a
great benefit and a boon to the city when
it's complete. But, like my colleague, I
also feel that there are some issues. And I
would agree that I would think that we
need to defer on the southern block for the
access until we actually do determine that
you can actually measure that the opening
the connection to 3rd Street the viability
of that. I would like to defer until we
actually see that. It's actually now, I
mean, we've heard an explanation of it. But
I'd like I mean, an explanation can couch
a lot of different things than what we think.
But I'd like to actually see some drawings,
when we get to that point, before we actually
go ahead. And I guess the Office of Planning
Mr. May is talking about the north block
with the three buildings and the height. I
would just had one question to throw OP's
way, if they would concur with Mr. May's
assessment on that

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. STEINGASSER: In terms of the three buildings being able to reach 130 feet 2 a piece? 3 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right. 4 MS. STEINGASSER: 5 Yes. COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. 6 7 MS. STEINGASSER: We do agree with that. 8 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: All right. 9 Good. I just wanted to get that on the 10 record and make sure we're all aware. 11 guess the other aspect -- and I don't want to 12 belabor this -- is the retail. 13 And, after 14 going through tab 4 in the retial 15 consultant's assessment, I quess there's this big bugaboo about Mass. Avenue. There's this 16 great -- and I think OP is still concerned 17

and

integrated. And I would agree with all of

what is frustrating is that they're concerned

how

They talk about

about

18

19

20

21

22

the

about Mass. Avenue.

retail

their comments in their report.

And I guess

being

it's

frontage. They see it rather as an entry
into the project, which is why signature
retail spaces will flank the entry to the
pedestrian way on Mass. Avenue. I'm sorry.
I've looked at the renderings and I've looked
at the floor plan. And the plan shows about
I don't know if a Starbucks is even that
big. And those look like ten little spaces
on I'm looking at under tab five, the
building 2.4. And they're like very tiny
spaces, couched by two areas dignified or
identified as office/retail. Which are two
rather large areas on those on the corners
of on those two ends. I would agree with
Commissioner May that there's there's
something missing. I'm just concerned that
this is going to be a looking at the one
drawing, if I'm looking at Plan 11 on the
other binder, I see somebody's bakery and the
Coffee Room. And I that's about what it's
going to be is the coffee room a very tiny
room. And I can't see those as signature

elements that are going to drive people in.
They're going to say oh, what's back there?
Well, we've got a little coffee shop out
there and maybe I can get a croissant or a
baguette. I there's something that I
think is lacking and I think the skirting of
the whole project with those little canopies
just seems if you're going to make
something of this place, this has to be a
building this has to have a sense of place
to it. Not necessarily as a destination that
you're definitely this is where we've got to
go, but as a point as these three towers
standing there need to be united and create
some kind of an architecture that's going to
make sense. I think it is a little minimal
right now. And I'm just afraid that this is
going to be very stark. There's I think
where you come in on Mass Avenue, you come in
under a canopy; you go down; then you come
into an open arcade area, a plaza, with these
trees. But I in looking at the drawings -

that this is -- you've got -- you're going into lobbies. You're -- you've got some sense of -- I guess, what I've seen in the drawings do not convince me that this going to be an exciting and vibrant space and be able to pick up the pace with the development along here. So I guess I'm in agreement with Commissioner May's analysis and just wanted to add on to that.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you,
Commissioner Turnbull. Anyone else? ViceChairman Schlater?

VICE-CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There's definitely a lot to get through with this submission. By doing both the consolidated and first stage all at once, it's a lot to chew on at one time, particularly given the -- you know, we're talking about 2.3 million square feet of FAR. So it's not surprising that, you know, we're still working through some of our

concerns here.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

I do want to say I asked for some clarification on a number of items, including as to whether those parking and loading, shared facilities would be sufficient both residential and for the office needs. The Applicant answered those questions to my satisfaction. Further, in reading over their information on the measurement of height, I'm comfortable that, if a meaningful connection is made between those building, that Applicant should be able to build to 130 feet And I think, when we get to the height. specific designs of those buildings, information about how that get more connection is being made. And Ι feel comfortable that that connection can be made.

18

19

20

21

22

In terms of other questions I had at the end of the hearing, I would go first to you know, big picture on the south block.

We've got the massing of the south block. I

NEAL R. GROSS

had some concerns that it was just too big
for good urban design and that these
buildings were going to be too massive. And
I don't have all of the calculations in front
of me, but the south block is going to be how
many square feet? How many square feet?
What's that 811,000 square feet. The
Applicant has agreed to reduce the massing on
the south block by 30,000 square feet, first
by pulling the building back off of E Street
by ten feet, and I think that's a I think
that was a good first step to address the
issue on the public space of E Street. But
it didn't do a lot to actually reduce the
massing of the overall buildings. And then
the Applicant put forward a few alternatives,
in terms of atrium designs. I'm concerned
that the just to fit two buildings on
800,000 plus square feet is going to create
two massive buildings. And the floor plates
are going to be too large. And it's not
going to it's not a human scale for two

buildings. And I don't know exactly how to fit that. And I understand the Applicant's arguments that they need a certain amount of FAR to build over that platform. But I don't get the sense that this is going to be built in a way that's going to -- those buildings are going to be too big, in my estimation. So I'm not sure that I'm satisfied that the 30,000 square foot reduction is sufficient to create a good place. I'm also concerned that an interior atrium is the -- would be the way break up that massing. Ι think District suffers from a lot of that massing being pushed into interior atriums. I'd rather see it as a separation between two buildings, so that the buildings actually look smaller.

The Office of Planning mentioned that they'd like to see that E Street sidewalk widened from ten to 14 feet. I think it would make a better street. Is the Office of Planning still there on the ten to 14

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

feet?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Sorry, Joel Lawson MR. LAWSON: with the Office of Planning. Actually, we've had further discussions with the Applicant and they've agreed to the 14 feet at ground level. And the Office of Planning doesn't really have а concern if there's cantilevering over that space. We think that would work fine. But it would allow for that pedestrian movement. So the Applicant's agreed to that.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Okav. So we don't have to talk about that. Great. So I guess that's it, from the standpoint of the south block massing. I think that, at the footprint of those buildings, you're 11 - 12FAR, talking about an which is Now, if you count the significant mass. footprint of the Jewish Historical Society, that brings the FAR down. But I think the way people will experience the buildings, they're just going to seem massive.

NEAL R. GROSS

Moving my way up to the center block, I
had some questions about the 30 feet between
the office and the residential building and
whether that would be a good layout in
planning for the site. I realize that the
configuration of the residential is limited,
if you're going to fit both office and
residential on there. I think that it would
be a far better project if that were a 30
foot alley if that alley was a north/south
alley so that light could get in there. I
think it is going to be very dark in there.
But I also think, ultimately, it's a
marketing issue for the developer. And I'm
not I don't think that's going to stop me,
one way or another, from supporting this
project. I think it's now I think it's
going to be dark in there. And I think if I
were renting a unit, I wouldn't want to rent
on that alley because it's too narrow and
it's going to be hard to get sun in there.
But I'm I don't have any problems with the

center block moving forward the way it is.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

So that leaves us with the design of the north block. I think this is a tough I've still got some problems with the design of the north block. You might look at it. It didn't feel like a lot had changed. It looked like the buildings were basically being treated in the same way. The retail was being treated in the same way. And I'm just not convinced that it's going to be a successful -- successful site plan for that One thing I'm concerned about north block. is on the north/south alley, it shows a lot and plantings in the alley way of trees I think it's a very narrow alley. itself. There's 130 foot building to the south of it. I'm concerned that trees will even be able And I'm not convinced. to grow there. Ι think there was shadow studies some forward as part of the original submission. And it looked like it was going to be dark in there a lot of the time. And I'm concerned

that that area is going to be dark. I'm also
concerned that the way it's designed now, the
office buildings actually cantilever over
each office building cantilevers over the
alley way ten feet. And I think that just
increases the feeling that it's going to be a
dark enclosed space and it's going to end up
feeling like a private mall. I think it's
going to whether or not it ends up being a
private a successful private mall or an
unsuccessful private mall, either way, it's
going to end up feeling like a private mall.
And the I heard the reference to
Washington Harbor as an analogy. I also feel
like L'Enfant Plaza can be an analogy. And I
also think that Techworld can be an analogy.
And so I'm just not feeling great about that
as a public space. I think it needs they
need to figure out a way to get more light
into that space.

Then the question comes to what do you do with that space and do you put retail

in it. I think the developer should commended for putting 75,000 square feet of retail on the site. It's a tough, tough retail site. And I want to see the retail be successful. So I'm not sure that the retail strategy put forward as of yet -- I'm not convinced that that's going to Intuitively, it would seem that putting more of the retail on actual public streets that people see would be a better strategy. And I think OP raised that problem with the retail I think that would be a better strategy. approach, as well.

One other thing that I'm concerned about is the eco chimney and its location in the site plan. I think it potentially blocks visual -- you can't see into the site because it's blocking it. And I just think that's a little bit of a concern. I'm also concerned about whether it gets enough light and air to actually grow anything in it. And then I think the whole idea of that -- the trellis

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

structure that surrounds the site adds to this feeling that it's a very private space.

And I'm not convinced that it's the best approach here. So I think I have a few other concerns, but that's -- that's a good start.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Do you want to go ahead and wrap up all your concerns?

 $\label{eq:VICE-CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: No. I'm all right. } % \begin{center} \begin{$

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Okay. Ι will just say that I think the Applicant -looking back at what I asked for, behind Tab 11, the Applicant actually used it as a bench mark for his CV and First Source Station mentions, in that Place. Не case, exceeded the Local Small and Disadvantaged Business goals set forth in that memorandum. So I appreciate that. It goes on to talk about 57 First Source agreements. But anyway, the -- I'm satisfied with what was submitted to me -- or to us. He also talks about, in this letter, that he mentions about

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

his work with the Cardozo Academy of Design and Construction and Cardozo High School since 2004. So I am very -- I am just thrilled that that actually was submitted and that this is what is taking place by this particular Applicant -- I mean developer.

I do share the concerns of some of my colleagues -- well, most of my colleagues. But I don't know to what extent. T think they bring up some very good points. also look at the memorandum from the Office of Planning, where there was -- you know, we haven't got all the way to the point where we still remains need to be. OP concerned regarding certain the features of retail design. And I think -- and Ms. Steingasser, you can correct me -- I read where you all still had concern about the retail on Mass Avenue?

MS. STEINGASSER: We -- yes. Our concern was that the retail address the street more -- that we did have a conference

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 call with the Applicant and the consultant where they explained a bit more 2 their marketing approach. about 3 But concern still was how it addressed 4 Avenue and pulled the public in through that. 5 6 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let me ask 7 you this, because I don't -- as looking at the diagram, I also wonder how it's going to 8 At the conference call, did you get 9 more of a comfort level on the Mass Avenue 10 approach? Did they have the strategy that 11 they had? 12 MS. They're still 13 STEINGASSER: 14 very committed to their retail strategy and they believe very strongly that it will work. 15 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. And let me 16 just say to the Applicant, I'm one of the 17 mind set that I'm not saying it won't work. 18 One thing about me, I'll try anything. 19 20 - and I'll leave that to the "experts". again, I think that the Office of Planning 21

has a very valid point, especially when they

look at Mass Avenue. I don't have a whole
lot. I think this is a good project. There
are some massing issues, especially with the
south block. I don't know how much of that
has been changed since it was mentioned
previously. I know a little has been done.
But I think that's where it is for me. I
don't have a whole lot. I think this is at
some point, this is a great project. Again,
this is the first time my colleagues and I
have looked at this. And sometimes it takes
well, I'm going to speak for myself it
takes me a little longer to get my arm
wrapped around everything that's going on.
As I stated earlier, there are a number of
moving parts. There are a number of moving
parts.

So, any other questions or comments? Not hearing any, well I guess -- I guess I will sum up what I wrote down. And I stopped taking notes, actually, Commissioners, after we got to the fourth

thing. I have allocation of FAR, I think,
Mr. May; the south block, which we a
number of us have mentioned. One I think,
Mr. Turnbull, you mentioned when do we look
at the connection. And I think we wait for
the second stage. And Commissioner Vice-
Chairman Schlater, you mentioned the parking
and loading, that you were okay with it. And
that's when I stopped taking notes. So does
anybody there were a number of things I'm
hoping that Ms. Shiker and Ms. Schellin and
all those who were doing all this writing
have taken good notes. Commissioners, I
guess that I opened it up for comment. But,
I guess, at this point, I don't think we're
sending them back to start all over. I guess
we're sending them back to fine tune some of
the issues that we that were brought up
today. I don't necessarily know if we need
to start over. But I'll open that up for
discussion. Let's start at that discussion.
Are we sending them back to start all over

or are we sending them back to fine tune?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

COMMISSIONER MAY: I would just start out by saying that I think the project needs more work before we're ready to take proposed action. Whether it is -- I mean I think that there is an opportunity for some significant reorganization of the massing of the site. And I would encourage that. also would not say that that's an absolute necessity. You know, if they want to keep working with what they've got, I think that there is -- you know, there may be some room for them to make improvements that would address some of the concerns. But I think that, in order to solve the overall issue with the distribution of the massing, the massiveness of the south block and the sort of awkwardness of the retail arcade, I think that some significant study of the massing is appropriate. I mean, I think, you know, they've got a lot of good things going for them on this project. I mean, you know,

NEAL R. GROSS

they're not far away from having what they'd need get stage one approval for а everything, if they wanted to go that route. You know, they could submit the whole thing and study the massing a little more and may not resolve all of the retail stuff and just do a stage one. But if they want to pursue the stage two for the north block, I think some significant examination is appropriate. At least that's the direction that I would head if I was in this spot at this moment. Again, if they believe they can do it with some minor refinements, that's up to them. But that's my opinion.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Anyone else like to comment on direction? Okay. Well, I guess -- let me look into -- Ms. Schellin, do we know about -- first of all, I don't like to ask a question and then wait for people to nod their heads. But I'll look at you, Ms. Schellin. You let me know. I want to make sure were we clear and does the Applicant

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	understand kind of where we are? Do they
2	understand or do they need more direction?
3	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, I think they
4	do.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Now, do
6	they how much time? Can we work out a
7	time schedule?
8	MS. SCHELLIN: I'll looked to them
9	to tell me when they'd like to come back. We
10	could the earliest, I think, that they
11	could would be for our February 28th meeting.
12	But I'm thinking they may need more time.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I don't think all
14	from what I'm hearing from the
15	Commissioners I don't think all is not
16	bad. So, you know, there's just some things
17	that need
18	COMMISSIONER MAY: No. I mean,
19	this project has a lot going for it. But
20	it's it's some big parts that still need
21	to be figured out.
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'm just looking

at you, Ms. Schellin.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MS. SCHELLIN: Right. And if they shoot for the February 28th meeting, if this helps you any, we would need your filing by 3:00 p.m. February 15th. That would give you, basically, one, two, -- let's see, one, two, three weeks. That's not enough time? Okay. Our next meeting would be March 7th. And if you shoot for then, then we would need your filing by February 22nd. That would be The next one would be March four weeks. Do you want to come March 28th? We would need it by March 15th, to allow one week for the ANC to file a response. So you'd have until March 15th. March 7th? We'll go with March 7th, and we'll Okay. need the additional filing from the Applicant by February 22nd. And then the ANC would have until March 1st to file a response thereto. And also, OP, if they choose to file a response, they'll also have until March 1st, all filings due by 3:00 p.m.

1	Commissioner Hood, with that, we're finished.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you,
3	very much, Ms. Schellin. Is there anything
4	else before us with this case?
5	MS. SCHELLIN: Unless not with
6	this case. No, sir.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Do we have
8	a status report? Okay. Do we have anything
9	else, Ms. Schellin?
10	MS. SCHELLIN: That's it.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you,
12	everyone, for your participation. And this
13	meeting is adjourned.
14	(Whereupon, the meeting was
15	adjourned at 7:26 p.m.)

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701