GOVERNMENT
OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

ZONING COMMISSION

PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

IN THE MATTER OF:	
	Case No.
Hoffman-Struever Waterfront,	□ 11-03
LLC - First-Stage PUD &	
Related Map Amendment at	
Southwest Waterfront	

Thursday, July 21, 2011

Hearing Room 220 South 441 4th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C.

The Public Hearing of Case No. 11-03 by the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened at 7:00 p.m. in the Office of Zoning Hearing Room, 441 4th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20001, Anthony J. Hood, Chairman, presiding.

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

ANTHONY J. HOOD Chairman
KONRAD W. SCHLATER Vice Chairman
MICHAEL G. TURNBULL Commissioner FAIA,
(AOC)

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 ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

SHARON S. SCHELLIN Secretary

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

JOEL LAWSON MATT JESICK

This transcript constitutes the minutes from the Public Hearing held on July 21, 2011.

T-A-B-L-E O-F C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S
<pre>WELCOME: Anthony Hood, Chairman4</pre>
ZC CASE NO. 11-03 - HOFFMAN-STRUEVER WATERFRONT, LLC (Continuation): 4
6 TH STREET HOMEOWNERS: Leslie Randolph 7/35 Susie Humphreys 29 Alice Wender 36 Board Questions: 37 Cross-Exam by Applicant: 54
REBUTTAL BY APPLICANT: Norman Glasgow, Jr., Attorney 62 Dan VanPelt, Gorove/Slade 62 Monty Hoffman, Applicant 67 Board Questions: 97
Specifically Requested Material: 127 Set to Consider September 12, 2011: 139
ADJOURN: Anthony Hood, Chairman

1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	7:00 p.m.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let's go
4	ahead and get our second case underway.
5	Good evening, ladies and
6	gentlemen. This is the second Public Hearing
7	of the Zoning Commission for the District of
8	Columbia for Thursday, July 21 st .
9	My name is Anthony Hood. Joining
10	me are Vice Chairman Schlater and
11	Commissioner Turnbull. Commissioner May will
12	be reading the record and participating in
13	this case.
14	We are also joined by the Office
15	of Zoning staff, Ms. Sharon Schellin, also
16	the Office of Planning, Mr. Lawson and Mr.
17	Jesick.
18	This proceeding is being recorded
19	by a Court Reporter and is also webcast live.
20	Accordingly, we must ask you to refrain from
21	any disruptive noises.
22	The subject of this evening's

hearing	g is	Zoni	ng (Commis	ssion	Case	No. 1	L1-03.
This	is	a :	requ	ıest	by	Hoffm	an-Stı	ruever
Waterf:	ront,	LLC	for	appr	oval	of a	First-	-Stage
PUD an	ıd Re	lated	d Ma	ap Am	endme	nt fo	or pro	perty
locate	d at	Squa	are	390,	391,	471W	, 472	, 473
and 50	3.							

Tonight is a continuation of our July 18, 2011 hearing.

Notice of today's hearing was published in the <u>DC Register</u> on June 3, 2011.

And copies of that announcement are available to my left on the wall near the door.

The hearing will be conducted in accordance with the provisions of 11 DCMR 3022 as follows: Preliminary matters; party in opposition, in this case the 6th Street Homeowners. Again, I want to thank the 6th Street Homeowners for staying around all that time and being willing to come back two days later to present their case, because we did try to finish the other night, but we weren't

2	Also, we have rebuttal and
3	closing by the applicant.
4	The following time constraints
5	will be maintained in this meeting: The
6	party in opposition, the 6 th Street
7	Homeowners, have asked for 40 minutes.
8	All persons appearing before the
9	Commission are to fill out two witness cards.
10	These cards are located to my left on the
11	table near the door.
12	The decision of the Commission in
13	this case must be based exclusively on the
14	public record.
15	The staff will be available
16	throughout the hearing to discuss procedural
17	questions.
18	And, please, turn off all beepers
19	and cell phones, at this time, so not to
20	disrupt these proceedings.
21	Would all individuals wishing to
22	testify for the party in opposition or as a

1

successful.

1	rebuttal witness for the applicant, please,
2	rise to take the oath.
3	MS. SCHELLIN: Please, raise your
4	right hand.
5	(Whereupon, witnesses were
6	sworn.)
7	MS. SCHELLIN: Thank you.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Ms.
9	Randolph, again, I want to thank you and your
10	party for coming back tonight. We appreciate
11	it.
12	MS. RANDOLPH: I want to thank
13	the Commission. I'm sorry to have sounded so
14	strenuous the other night, but I wasn't fully
15	aware of all of your procedures.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So you're saying
17	tonight we are going to be a little better.
18	We'll work it.
19	MS. RANDOLPH: Well, I hope to
20	be.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Great.
22	MS. RANDOLPH: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

RANDOLPH: Oh, MS. sorry. I don't typically use microphones. I want to thank the Commission for recognizing party status of the 6th Street Homeowners. Although we are individual party opponents, have called ourselves the 6th that you Homeowners, so may readily Tiber distinguish from the Island us Cooperative Homes that I will refer to here as the Tiber Co-Op, which is another party in this action and a separate legal entity.

We oppose partial -- Parcel 11 of PUD, which is the site of the the St. Augustine's church property. The church and the 6th Street homes are both Zoned R-3. developer is maintain that the being opportunistic by tacking on Parcel 11 as an afterthought to the Planned Unit Development.

As more thoroughly discussed in this presentation, we believe the developer and the church are seeking to gain increased

NEAL R. GROSS

value by trying to rezone Parcel 11 as R-5-B through the process of this PUD rather than use the matter-of-right development process, which would have required the developer to seek a variance for the churches current zoning status, which is R-3 residential.

We ask the Zoning Commission to

We ask the Zoning Commission to apply the balancing test under the PUD. We maintain that in comparison to other parties and witnesses that we are significantly adversely impacted because we are uniquely situated to the PUD.

I reside at 462 M Street. The 6th Street homes have M Street addresses because their front doors are access from an internal courtyard entry that is located on M Street.

For a brief moment, we will show you our picture of our property, so you may visually understand where we reside. This is Square 473.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: We need to make sure you are on a mike. Do we have a hand-

NEAL R. GROSS

1	held mike? Okay.
2	MS. RANDOLPH: If you can see,
3	Square
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Turn it on.
5	MS. WENDER: Turn it on, Susie.
6	MS. RANDOLPH: 473.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: It's not on. We
8	need to make sure you are on the mike. There
9	is the hand-held and if somebody else would
10	hold it up for you and you can use the
11	microphone, that way you can point and show
12	us. And you can use the mike in your hand.
13	MS. RANDOLPH: On this photo
14	which is a copy of the surveyor's
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let me see the
16	mike, so I can turn it on. Okay. There we
17	go.
18	MS. RANDOLPH: On this photo, you
19	will which is copied from the surveyor's
20	office and blown up to a significant size,
21	you will see Square 473. That is the St.
22	Augustine's church.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: The camera, the webcast, okay. Yes, I was just wondering about that. The camera, if you can be over there and face the camera? The camera can pick it up for those who are watching on the webcast will see it.

MS. RANDOLPH: It's 473 here. Our homes, which are part of the Tiber Island Condominium, are located here in what is known as No. 182 Structure. Though we access our homes from a courtyard on M Street, the majority of our significant living rooms, family rooms and master bedrooms all having window walls and sliding glass windows are located on 6th Street, S.W., facing directly west.

Briefly, I just want to add that the entire square for Tiber Island Complex, as the developer calls it, is 502. We are called a Super Block under the original Southwest Development Plan. And our complex comprises perimeter townhomes. These are the

Tiber Island Condominium townhomes. The internal townhomes and the apartment buildings, which are high density, belong to the Tiber Island Cooperative.

Our property does not front what is known as the Tiber Island Cooperative Great Lawn, which has a view of Square 473, which is proposed to be a park.

read my document. Our property lines are within, approximately, 40 to 50 feet of Parcel 11. We homeowners have been paying taxes to the city, beautifully maintain our property and been supportive neighbors of the church.

The proposed rezoning of Parcel 11 from R-3 to R-5-B will adversely impact the architectural integrity of our whole community, Tiber Island Complex, not just our individual homes, particularly regarding the overwhelming scale of the proposed Parcel 11 looming over what is proposed to be a

narrowed street, such that it will destroy elements of the design that specifically included a significant view corridor, open spaces, waterfront, unobstructed views, even from as low as our basement and even second floors of monuments, including Jefferson, Lee Mansion in the Cemetery of Arlington, the Air Force Memorial, the skyline of Crystal City, the airport tower of National Airport and as far south sometimes on a good day to the monument that is in Old Town.

The condominium will appear choked off by the entirety of the PUD Parcel 11. Let's also not forget that matter-of-right high density development is also scheduled to be built directly opposite other Tiber Island Condominium homes on M Street, S.W.

Moreover, the partial closure of narrowing of $6^{\rm th}$ Street, the reversal of its direction and the proposed requirement that we enter through a traffic circle will

NEAL R. GROSS

negatively impact our use and enjoyment, including dropping off elderly persons, belongings, moving furniture and critically potentially slow police and fire access.

Most notably, the fire department recently came down 6th Street looking for 5th Street in Southwest, which does not exist, drove across the Great Lawn of Tiber Island and destroyed their sprinklers all in search of a fire at a location that does not exist in southwest, because the person who called the police called from Harbour Square, which is blocked off on another block.

So we have a lot of dead-ends in southwest and that does actually give me true safety concern.

Finally, it appears that a Metro stop may also be proposed for the corner of 6th and M Street, pursuant to the discussions I heard here on Monday, potentially bringing even more noise and trash to our area. Although we do not object, we are simply

stating that we are uniquely adversely 1 2 impacted. Technically, for the purposes of 3 the Zoning Board and the Planning Office, I 4 5 want you to know where we live. We reside at 6 456 M Street, 458 M Street, 462 M Street and All are located on the west 7 468 M Street. facing side of Square 502, as I have just 8 shown, in the structure numbered 182. 9 10 Our homes are part of the Tiber Island Condominium. Square 502 encompasses 11 the whole entire Tiber Island Complex. 12 Tiber Island homes are Zoned R-3. The 6th 13 Street homes are entered, as I indicated, 14 15 from an entrance on the courtyard. 16 Let along, because move Ι me 17

think I covered that when I described our property.

Contrary to Holland & Knight's testimony, the Office of Planning documents indicate that the majority of square footage οf Parcel 11, which comprises the St.

18

19

20

21

Augustine's church land, located on Square 473, is Zoned R-3.

Pursuant to Zoning Commission Case 95-15, which relates to the Southwest Comprehensive Zoning Plan, the Zoning Commission issued Zoning Order 807, that's dated 10/1998, that addresses Lot 0083 of Square 473, 600 M Street and that it is Zoned R-3.

The computerized Zoning Map, as of July $20^{\rm th}$, reflects ZC Order 807 and identifies that the St. Augustine's property is R-3.

Comprehensive The Plan designation of this area as land use change -- as a land use change area for high -pardon me. In quotes from the Comprehensive Plan it that "The high quality states environments that include exceptional site and architectural design and rezoning should be comprehensive in neighborhoods." I think there is a quote. There is part of my quote

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 is missing.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

My point is that the Comprehensive Plan recognizes exceptional site and architectural design and that's Section 223.12.

The high resident -- the high density residential dwelling proposed for Parcel 11 is inconsistent with the objectives of 223.12. As now discuss, this we substantially increased density will the architectural significantly impact integrity of the Tiber Island Condominiums and more specifically the 6th Street homes.

The negative impact of this vastly increased density is exacerbated by a wholly unjustified proposal that the developer be permitted to exceed the maximum lot occupancy, even permitted by R-5-B.

Now, moving on to the adverse impact of the proposed development. As indicated above, we maintain the developer is attempting to bootstrap onto the church's

property rights. We maintain that proposing zoning of R-5-B will permit a scale and massing adversely impacting the design of the Tiber Island Condominium homes uniquely impacting those condominium homes that are situated on 6^{th} Street and harming our use and enjoyment.

The documents contain PUD this flawed assumption to "undo" 1960 Southwest Redevelopment. That assumption is flawed because the PUD criteria architectural design and open spaces are a significant balancing criteria, which communities throughout the southwest quadrant reflect.

As per their own testimony on Monday, they acknowledged these verdant areas on our properties in southwest. Properties located in Segment D of the PUD, notably, Tiber Island Condominium, have won significant awards and that is Exhibit A, which I produced, which is a copy of the prospectus for the Tiber Island community.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

It is described as a beautiful award-winning community.

Our community has also been recognized in the AIA Book of Important D.C.

Architecture. It can be found in Borders, but I do not have a copy tonight.

The original Tiber Island design brochure embraced and noted the significance of space, the proximity to open space, particularly the waterfront views from the 6th Street homes, and incorporated those characteristics into the Tiber Island Condo design. And so I would refer you to what would be the fourth page of that exhibit.

Moreover, the 6th Street homes were marketed for being waterfront homes and having waterfront vistas. And I would refer you to what would be the sixth, seventh, the eighth page that has a chart that says "Schedule of Terms and Estimates." And that also includes sale prices and refers to our homes as the waterfront homes.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	Parcel 11 is detrimental to the
2	6 th Street townhomes because under that Tiber
3	design, which noted open space, the proposed
4	distance to the condominium of Parcel 11 is
5	adverse to the original design concept of the
6	Tiber Island Condo homes. The Tiber Island
7	Condo will appear choked off, suffocated.
8	Notably, the developer has told
9	us that the scale of their building will not
10	adversely impact us, but their own architect
11	testified that even four story buildings can
12	pose problems with shadows and loss of light.
13	The proximity is damaging to the
14	architectural integrity of the Tiber Island
15	Condominiums because the closest structures
16	to the perimeter of the other Tiber I'm
17	sorry.
18	It's just damaging because of the
19	proximity of the architectural integrity is
20	potentially damaged.
21	The Tiber Island design criteria

also specifically addressed that the $6^{\rm th}$

1	Street homeowners or homes, rather, would
2	have waterfront views. Those views encompass
3	seeing the monuments as I previously
4	described.
5	Could you, please, bring out your
6	photos, Ms. Humphreys? We have a series of
7	photos actually showing the sunsets from our
8	homes. And even though that is not an
9	individual criteria, the concept of light and
10	space and air was a factor in the design of
11	our community.
12	I have four pictures.
13	MR. GLASGOW: Mr. Chairman? I
14	just have one question here. Do they have a
15	light and air easement recorded over at the
16	St. Augustine's property?
17	MS. RANDOLPH: He needs to wait
18	until I finish with my presentation to ask
19	questions. I want to make a note that that
20	was one minute out of my time.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let me ask you,
22	Mr. Glasgow. I think she is right. You need

1	to wait and let her finish out her
2	presentation and that's what you can either
3	do on rebuttal or when you come or in your
4	closing remarks.
5	You can't say anything off the
6	record. Make sure we're on the mike.
7	MS. RANDOLPH: Pardon me. I
8	meant to press the button.
9	These are photos of sunsets. The
10	first photo are sunsets that can be visible
11	in my bottom floor of my house. As you will
12	notice, there are Christmas lights in the
13	picture. That reflects that it was in
14	December.
15	There are also pictures from my
16	second story level. You can see the church
17	roof in the background. If you could just
18	pass those?
19	Then we have also a third photo
20	just so that you understand how the roof of
21	the structure of the church is cantilevered.
22	Even though the church has a spire, only the

spire actually ever reached to 45 feet and the roof was cantilevered. This is the cantilevered roof.

I will continue my testimony. Thank you. The Tiber Island design criteria encompassed views and noted views in its prospectus. I maintain that the property should remain as originally zoned, R-3, and the PUD should be modified to remove Parcel 11 from the PUD.

its criteria The PUD meets without Parcel 11. Parcel 11 is both geographically and qualitatively different from the remainder of the PUD properties, which are waterfront properties that do not directly abut any residentially zoned neighborhoods.

Unlike parcels with a W-1 Zoning, which permit a density, Parcel 11 is Zoned R-3 low density. The 6th Street homes are adversely impacted by the significant increase in traffic noted by the DDOT report.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

We are now being adversely impacted by being required to access our homes from a traffic circle where we can expect to stand behind buses, taxis and cars disembarking to the waterfront before accessing our homes.

Holland & Knight will -- pardon We are uniquely impacted by traffic me. aspects, particularly due to the narrowness. Additionally, we have a concern that DDOT report notes inadequacies in the developer's traffic study regarding the volume of traffic and impact of the proposed traffic circle.

We also note that the DDOT report seems deficient specifically regarding usage of the Waterfront Station, which is closer to the PUD than L'Enfant Plaza and, as indicated, may be the site of an expanded station.

Metro usage has also increased on the Green Line more than on the Orange or Blue, because the Green is used for access to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the stadium. Sometimes it is very hard for elderly persons to even board a train or to exit at Waterfront Plaza.

Regarding the developer's outreach, they may be commended, but that outreach did not extend to the Tiber Island Condominium 6th Street Homeowners. Although, we, or I myself and several others, attended three meetings, they chose to communicate directly with a woman known as our board president.

I did not find out until, approximately, a week and a half before the ANC meeting or actually the weekend before the ANC meeting that our board president had not even been communicating proposals with other-- with four other board members. That is very concerning.

And when I asked to speak to the PN Hoffman, I was told I had to go through my president or my president had to be there or that she couldn't talk with us without our

president. And I must commend Ms. Bacon and Mr. Hoffman, they have been fairly gracious and this is not personal. They are nice people.

But nevertheless, I need to distinguish how other residents -- I'm sorry, I don't mean to say residents, how other parties and witnesses have been treated as compared to the 6th Street Homeowners.

For one, Arena Stage stated the other night that they had three meetings in which, despite the fact that they do not own the land across from Arena Stage, they were offered a view corridor and their witness stated very kindly that they met and ensured that Mr. Bing Thom had a view corridor.

We actually live and reside in southwest. Our homes, which are recognized and -- by the AIA, and as award-winning, have been in existence since 1964. Moreover, Arena Stage is a theater in which the focus is a stage.

1	I love Mr. Bing Thom's
2	architecture, but to state to us when I asked
3	it on many occasions what about our view
4	corridor? And to be told that it is
5	irrelevant smacks of unfairness that we, as
6	taxpaying residents, do not deserve in
7	comparison to a theater.
8	Regarding Harbour Square, we are
9	much more directly impacted than Harbour
10	Square, although I am informed they are a
11	party. And actually tonight, I have now
12	learned that some people there still feel
13	fairly impacted.
14	Nevertheless, they were also
15	offered reduced height of the Pier 4 homes.
16	And they are my neighbors and I appreciate
17	them.
18	Regarding Tiber Co-Op, we wholly
19	support our neighbors and efforts and
20	appreciate all the existence assistance
21	they have provided. The Tiber Co-Op Great

Lawn, which I showed you on that photo, abuts

the proposed park.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Hence, they received something that benefits their part, their property. They are a separate legal entity and although I enjoy the Great Lawn and would hope to also enjoy eventual park, they actually an received an actual benefit from developer.

We ask that in order to preserve the full architectural integrity and use and enjoyment of our homes, that the Commission deny the developer the right to rezone Parcel 11 at all.

I would also like to add that in regard, just briefly diverging, to our architecture, Mr. Holman insinuated the other night that the Tiber Island residents of the condominium supported the church. We all love the church. There has been no official vote in our community one way or the other regarding this matter and -- as I'm sure one can understand why.

1	And notably, what I must indicate
2	is that our community has taken an official
3	two-third vote to support an application for
4	historic preservation that was produced in an
5	open meeting of the ANC-6D this past week and
6	a half.
7	So returning to my proposals:
8	We suggest you deny the developer
9	the right to rezone Parcel 11.
10	We ask the Commission, in the
11	alternative, to modify the PUD to rezone
12	Parcel 11 with an R-5-A Zoning.
13	Finally, as what we would
14	perceive as the worst thing that could
15	happen, if R-5-B is allowed, we request that
16	the city modify the PUD to ensure that our
17	homes are not so significantly and uniquely
18	impacted. We urge the Zoning Commission to
19	preserve architecture, best designed
20	architecture.
21	You know, ours is AIA-recognized.
22	It is lectured on throughout the country as

1	an example of post-modernism. And preserve
2	our open and green spaces. We understand we
3	don't have air rights, but the aspect of the
4	open spaces and the design and our use and
5	enjoyment are directly impacted by the
6	proposed PUD. Thank you.
7	Oh, my neighbor would like to say
8	a few words. I don't know if Ms. Wender
9	would. Oh, hold on. Ms. Humphreys is going
10	to briefly give her statement. Thank you.
11	MS. HUMPHREYS: I'm the person
12	most immediately impacted. I live at the
13	corner of 6 th and M Street, S.W., and have so
14	for two decades and own the property.
15	And as you have heard, although
16	the postman goes to my front door, so-called,
17	with an M Street address, I actually face
18	east toward 4 th Street to make it more
19	complicated.
20	Otherwise, my waking hours, my
21	focus is on my 6 th Street side where my
22	dining room, which is actually my do

everything room, where Tiber Island Condominium Group sometimes meet and my sunny patio, where I enjoy gardening, it directly faces 6th Street, a narrow street which the PUD proposes to make only 30 feet across.

Salutatory sunlight and breezes

Salutatory sunlight and breezes can flow through the west wall of glass panes and screens, yet, for all this openness, I have the privacy designed in the Tiber Island Condominium and protected by our R-3 Zoning.

And that R-3 Zoning of St. Augustine's church.

No window of mine faces another window. The massive building proposed for Parcel 11 would wall me in with windows peering into my home. The current church buffers Tiber Island Condominium from the dense development down hill on the Wharf.

The PUD would also cause increased traffic on M Street, and incredible congestion and pollution on $6^{\rm th}$ Street. Already scarce parking made all the more rare

by the D.C. employees and their new 4th Street offices would vanish.

As it is now, service people charges for an expected \$50 parking ticket because parking their trucks usually has to be done illegally. Illegal parking in a three-lane street could block emergency vehicles.

enjoy living Ι in the neighborhood. St. Augustine's church been a good neighbor. They let neighborhood groups use their facilities for meetings, as lack a neighborhood gathering place, integrate socially people of desperate disparate economic help means and those needing help.

However, now St. Augustine's has answered the siren call of a developer. As we have heard often the last few years, too big is too big. St. Augustine's church and the developers have said they are developing by-rights, but no one has the automatic right

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

to changing the zoning, especially to such a dense zoning adjacent to a community designed for open space and communal areas.

The community designed and built in the first Southwest Redevelopment Plan, they say the Wharf could be served by two Metro Stations. However, it is -- L'Enfant Station is up a steep hill, quite onerous after wining and dining.

I'm sure the Waterside Station, one block from my home, would be the choice for most people, even though it would be further away from many of the commercial attractions. It is already crowded, overcrowded much of the time, especially during ballgames and rush hour.

I have been passed up when the train was too full to cram another person aboard and, of course, the platform itself can become dangerously overcrowded.

The developers say a shadow study showed that we wouldn't be in the shadows of

NEAL R. GROSS

1	proposed monster condominium. However, the
2	study was presented without a description of
3	how the transit of the sun was calculated to
4	vary over the year.
5	Copies of the results were
6	requested in advance, but refused. What
7	assumptions were made? How could it be
8	replicated? What happens to the total light
9	intensity?
10	The developers say that a smaller
11	development would not be viable, that
12	translates they would not make as much money.
13	The developer said the St. Augustine's plot
14	would be the first phase of the construction.
15	They say it will not. Then they say it will
16	be. Who knows.
17	Likewise, the developers say that
18	the park area will have a concession stand.
19	They say well, maybe it won't. Their July
20	8 th supplement declares commercial use. It's
21	not just green space. What can we depend on?

hope the city

I

22

the

holds

developers accountable for whatever PUD it accepts, that flexibility is not just a code word for detrimental changes and we are not left as we were with the Waterside Station PUD with a tear-down completed, but without project completion. It's a blight on the neighborhood.

And I would remind you of the pictures. I'm the one most will -- affected by the -- being at the corner and, yet, even I can see the sunset on the water obliquely out my living room window and, of course, master bedroom. And that is reflected in the picture that I gave you. It makes quite a bright spot.

The second picture was taken from down low on 6th Street looking up at the church and the Notice sunset sky. the dramatic plunge of the roof of the church which lets more light pass than the maximum height of the building would indicate, a height further manipulated by the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

including the height of the cross.

It was designed in concert with Tiber Island. Its cornerstone was laid in 1965. Thank you.

MS. RANDOLPH: I just have one little minor closing statement and this relates to the underlying original Southwest Development Plan for which they indicate in their PUD should be undone and that their intent is to undo.

And I just think that the Zoning Commission should recognize that in our community. And we are not opposing the rest of the PUD, but in our community, there was a step-down of the buildings towards the waterfront and that enabled all people of all economic levels from their homes to see the waterfront.

By the mass density of Parcel 11, what they are doing is economically saying only, you know, a \$1.5 million home can have such a view and blocking people.

And so I'm just suggesting that, as we indicated, we prefer you not rezone at all Parcel 11. If you do, we would prefer R-5-A and that is actually a huge concession from us, because, as you can see, we have from our homes even sunsets from our bottom levels, unobstructed views.

I, for one, have never closed my blinds in 12 years. I bought a house. The only house I looked at because the design is so superb and the views so exceptional. Now, yes, there are no air rights, but, you know what, they gave Bing Thom a view corridor. And we live here and we have been paying taxes for all these years. Thank you.

MS. WENDER: I think this is on.

I'm Alice Wender. I live at 458 M Street.

My neighbor, Ms. Randolph, spoke for my concerns, so to be respectful of your time, I will not now reiterate them. However, I would like to present my testimony to be part of the record.

1	And I strongly urge you to again
2	keep the church at R-3 Zoning or if not that,
3	no higher than a 5-A. Thank you.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
5	MS. RANDOLPH: We have further
6	comments to make.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I want to
8	thank you three for your presentation.
9	Ms. Randolph, what I'm trying to
LO	understand, I think I understand how the
11	orientation of your homes are. The view off
L2	of 6 th Street, which views right into where
L3	the church is, is that your back?
L4	MS. RANDOLPH: It is technically
L5	called our rear. The rear of our houses,
L6	yes. And if you were to drive down 6 th
L7	Street, our homes are marked rear entrance
18	462, rear entrance 460 and so forth.
L9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
20	MS. RANDOLPH: And they are
21	situated on almost a perfect west access. I
22	can mark the equinoxes in my living room as

1	the sun moves from the south to the north.
2	And that picture I presented up there was
3	taken around Christmas time.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: And I saw the
5	pictures. So when they sold you your homes,
6	did they sell your homes they sold the
7	view? Is that what they did? They sold you
8	the view?
9	MS. RANDOLPH: I was I bought
10	a view and the homes were advertised as a
11	view and I can read from the prospectus,
12	which is in Exhibit A, and it states page 3
13	of that I'm sorry, it's page 4 of Exhibit
14	A.
15	"Unobstructed view of restored
16	waterfront, famous restaurants, shops and
17	piers, large-only spaces, large open spaces,
18	waterfront, the quiet waters of the
19	Washington Channel and the Potomac River lend
20	a peaceful charm and residential flavor to
21	unique downtown living."

Then

on -- I think, you know,

1	it's page 8, my home is called a D-type home.
2	That is the 3,000 square foot, four story
3	home with four bedrooms, three and a half
4	baths, a den and a living room. And so mine
5	is a D Unit. It was described as waterfront.
6	Back then in 1963 it was sold for \$74,550.
7	A similar D Unit sold for \$67,000. Those are
8	the D Units that are on 4 th Street, S.W.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: And
10	MS. RANDOLPH: Which is on the
11	other side of the property.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: My rationale, I
13	was trying to figure out what you bought into
14	because I know that there is case law out
15	there about views and that's why I was
16	asking.
17	MS. RANDOLPH: Oh, okay.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, ma'am?
19	MS. WENDER: Can I directly speak
20	to that? I bought my house in 1980 and there
21	were different layouts for the different
22	houses. There was a comparable house exactly

my house on N Street. There was one that was on 6th Street. I paid more money at the time because I wanted the views. And it's not just the views, it's the light. It's the cross-ventilation. It's the breezes. It's the sunsets.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.

MS. WENDER: And I just want to make one more statement, just so you understand, our primary living spaces face 6th street. Our living room, our master bedroom, our dining room, kitchen, that is where we are, you know, most of the day.

So even though -- I mean, that's how we are impacted in terms of the quality of our life more so than -- even though it has that courtyard entrance.

MS. RANDOLPH: And we understand views are not legally a category in the PUD and that's -- my written statement does not emphasize the view. It emphasizes the whole architectural integrity, which comprises of

1	open spaces and the discussion of view
2	corridors.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I think you
4	probably remember the discussion, because I
5	took it from one of the submissions about R-
6	5-B. I actually asked Mr. Sher that
7	question. And he went back to the Comp Plan.
8	I think the R-5-A is low to moderate. And
9	then as you go to R-5-B, it's like a medium.
10	I don't want to say medium to high off the
11	top of my head, but I know it's at least
12	medium and up.
13	So your request is for us not to
14	rezone this at all, leave it as it is an R-3.
15	MS. RANDOLPH: Correct. That
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: But not take it
17	up
18	MS. RANDOLPH: would be our
19	hope.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Right. But I'm
21	just trying to understand. But not take it
22	to anything other than the R-5-A?

1 MS. RANDOLPH: Correct.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Have you had a conversation with Mr. Hoffman and others?

MS. RANDOLPH: In -- I have tried to have a conversation with Ms. Elinor Bacon and she has been gracious in communicating with us. We tried to talk on the Saturday before Monday and, you know, I tried to reach out to her. She called me the Saturday before the Monday hearing and said that nothing could be done, that the lines in the building, the footprint, they were desired and would remain the same.

And that's what I was told each time I -- I even expressed, actually, at the first meeting I attended with PN Hoffman, I even specifically spoke to one of their other nice gentleman and indicated, because I had my brochure with me, that, you know, we had significant concerns about the 6th Street homes.

1 And, frankly, we have felt abandoned by our board president and that's a 2 whole other issue. I won't go there. She is 3 4 a lovely lady, but, you know, I was told I had to deal independently with the developer. 5 6 But then I was told by them that they could 7 only talk to her or she had to be there. And when I went to meetings, they 8 seemed to want to talk to her, but not me. 9 10 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Did you also work for your ANC? Did you work with the ANC? 11 I know Andy Litsky 12 MS. RANDOLPH: 13 and we see each other around the community. 14 Frankly, I don't practice property law, so I didn't understand that this was a process 15 16 where you go to the hearing office and you -and each time that I wanted to seek something 17 from my board, I was told that's your problem 18 19 over there. We are just a few homeowners. 20 Each time -- you know, I'm an attorney, yes, but each time I sought out counsel, the fees 21

were incredibly high.

1	And, you know, it has been very
2	daunting. And, unfortunately, when you are -
3	- when it is your own property, it is very,
4	very upsetting and so when I seemed so much
5	strenuous the other night, that is why
6	because it is really upsetting.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I didn't
8	really get the answer to my question. I know
9	that you know Mr. Litsky.
10	MS. RANDOLPH: I have spoken to
11	Mr. Litsky and I have expressed twice my
12	concerns about the 6 th Street, yes.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. And you
14	all are part of the Tiber you all are
15	Tiber Island, right? You all are?
16	MS. RANDOLPH: I'm going to be
17	very clear to you. Just for clarity's sake,
18	Tiber Island Cooperative is a separate legal
19	entity. When they built our property in
20	1964, we were the second with Carrollsburg
21	Condominium ever developed in the city.
22	In fact, our brochure, you will

1	see, explains the new concept of a
2	condominium in great depth, how it is based
3	upon a Roman Law and they had to explain it
4	to that degree. In fact, they wrote the
5	original D.C. Condominium Act because of
6	Carrollsburg and Tiber Island.
7	Then at some point in the '80s,
8	they built they took the Tiber Island
9	Cooperative, which was a rental, and it
10	converted into a condo. So I
11	MS. WENDER: A co-op.
12	MS. RANDOLPH: A co-op. So our
13	homes, which are the perimeter homes, are a
14	separate legal entity. And the only "water-
15	frontage" encompassed in our design is on 6 th
16	Street. And I'm informed that the Tiber
17	Island Cooperatives had an individual
18	meeting.
19	MS. WENDER: No, we no, no.
20	MS. RANDOLPH: Why don't you
21	speak?
22	MS. WENDER: I'm sorry. No, I

1 think what happened, unfortunately, is that I 2 understand that Tiber Island Co-Op is 3 board. I mean, they are a co-op, so they are 4 represented by their board. 5 Harbour Square is a co-op, 6 they are represented by their board. 7 We, as а condominium 8 individual owners. And because, I believe 6th 9 that, on Street, have we are we 10 individual party status. But Elinor Bacon and others felt that they could only go 11 through our board president 12 and 13 different from the co-op I believe and the Harbour Square. 14 I believe they should have worked 15 16 with us individually. I also just think 17 MS. RANDOLPH: that it's a fallacy on the part 18 of 19 condominium, because our limited common 20 property runs the whole perimeter of And since we recently voted to 21 property.

preservation

seek

historic

22

status,

1	should have been looking at the bigger
2	picture.
3	So I did speak to Mr. Litsky
4	twice and he is very gracious and helpful.
5	But we are here and I tried when I
6	realized that when I found out that my
7	some of my board members did not know what
8	proposals were being made to my board
9	president, they had no familiarity at all
10	with what was going on with 6 th street or the
11	proposed closure of 6 th Street.
12	Well, I was livid, first of all.
13	That's when I realized oh my, God, all
14	right, I'm going to have to file party
15	status, because no my condominium board
16	has not been doing anything vis-a-vis our
17	property, even though the limited common
18	property runs the whole perimeter.
19	MS. WENDER: And just not
20	closure, but turning 6 th Street into a one-
21	way street, which is a concern.
22	MS. RANDOLPH: It's called a

1	partial closure, I believe, under the law.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: You know what,
3	through all of that, I think I know what you
4	are asking. Okay.
5	MS. HUMPHREYS: I have talked
6	with Andy Litsky many times.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
8	MS. RANDOLPH: Oh, go ahead.
9	MS. HUMPHREYS: That's all.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Okay.
11	Good. Okay. Commissioners, any questions?
12	Commissioner Turnbull?
13	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes,
14	thank you, Mr. Chair. I just don't have a
15	zoning book in front of me, so I may look to
16	the Office of Planning for a comment. But I
17	believe even under the existing R-3, the
18	height can go to 40 feet, but I'm not sure.
19	MR. LAWSON: Sorry, Joel Lawson
20	for the Office of Planning. Yes, R-3 allows
21	a 40 foot height and that would be measured
22	to the underside of the ceiling of the top

1	floor, that's for residential development.
2	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right.
3	MR. LAWSON: Other forms of
4	development would allow a different height,
5	of course, such as a church allows a bit of
6	extra height.
7	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: But that
8	could be built-out as a matter-of-right.
9	MR. LAWSON: That's correct.
10	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Now, R-5-
11	A allows more height?
12	MR. LAWSON: I'm trying to
	1 3
13	remember. R-5-A allows 40 feet by-right.
13 14	
	remember. R-5-A allows 40 feet by-right.
14	remember. R-5-A allows 40 feet by-right. COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
14 15	remember. R-5-A allows 40 feet by-right. COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. MR. LAWSON: And it well, R-5-
14 15 16	remember. R-5-A allows 40 feet by-right. COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. MR. LAWSON: And it well, R-5- A is a bit of a complicated zone.
14 15 16 17	remember. R-5-A allows 40 feet by-right. COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. MR. LAWSON: And it well, R-5- A is a bit of a complicated zone. COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right.
14 15 16 17	remember. R-5-A allows 40 feet by-right. COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. MR. LAWSON: And it well, R-5- A is a bit of a complicated zone. COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right. MR. LAWSON: As you know, you
14 15 16 17 18 19	remember. R-5-A allows 40 feet by-right. COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. MR. LAWSON: And it well, R-5- A is a bit of a complicated zone. COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right. MR. LAWSON: As you know, you have had to deal with it many times

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I guess the other, so as a matter-of-right, you could have a building across the street that would be 40 feet high. I think, and again, since this is only a First-Stage PUD, what we really don't see is what the real shape of the building is going to be, the design.

I mean, right now, looking at it, they are looking like they are still trying to get a view toward M Street. They have rounded the corner as it comes to the park on, again, a theoretical building that they haven't got. So they are trying to make a gesture of going around the street.

Again, we don't know what it looks like, so it's hard to comment upon how much it is going to impact. And, in fact, the way the sun sets right now, just guessing myself, some of your buildings may impact some of them more so than what they may of you, but I'm not that sure. But we --

MS. RANDOLPH: May --

NEAL R. GROSS

1	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: won't
2	know that until we get to the Second-Stage
3	and have them actually bring sun studies and
4	shadings before us.
5	MS. RANDOLPH: I have seen the
6	three-dimensional drawing. They are
7	proposing to take 10 feet of my street and
8	retain their building at what is 15 feet from
9	the current property line. They are stating
10	that their building, I think, can have a
11	maximum height of 60 feet and I believe the
12	density is higher on an R-5-B.
13	I have the Office of Zoning
14	Summary of Zone Districts document here and I
15	can read it into the record if someone wants
16	me to. I have the R-5-A and the R-5-B and I
17	also think that there is a difference
18	possibly in the FAR for the R-5-A and the R-
19	5-B.
20	And so I also would like to state
21	that the architect, my neighbor, Greg Hunt,
22	who is FAI-certified, I have submitted his

declaration for the Board, but, you know, he is -- I'm not going to call him an expert, but certainly if he were here and we were to take his testimony, he could probably crossexamine to that degree.

But as a former Dean of Catholic University and the current for School of Architecture and the current Dean of for, School of Architecture it's in Pennsylvania, and then also he was 25 years as an architectural educator at V Tech, he indicates that it seems unreasonable that the developers asked to produce a design for Parcel 11 and that they should produce a design that is more in harmony with the scale and character of the neighboring residential structures and immediate surroundings.

6th Street need not be reduced. I am asking that the Zoning Commission deny the change and he -- I am suggesting an R-5-A. The Zoning Commission should truly fulfill its obligations to guide intelligent,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

insightful planning that Southwest D.C. truly needs that is sensitive and has foresight and not simply driven by profit and characterless architecture.

We -- I am suggesting an R-5-A, a serious consideration should be given to increasing the setback distances to whatever structures are built on Parcel 11, so that 6th Street may be spatially enhanced and not choked by proposed new development.

Parcel 11 is fringe parcel within the total waterfront scheme and should redesigned to appropriately be be more related to scale and character of the Tiber Island townhomes. Only then will the Hop & Madison scheme reflect true sensitivity to historically important green and character of the adjacent neighborhood, Tiber Island.

I also want to reiterate that it is proposed that directly across the street on M Street from the side perimeter of Tiber Island, there will be an apartment building

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	that I believe is proposed to be a C and
2	R-5-D. And there will also be an office
3	building additionally built at the Waterfront
4	Train Station, which is also directly across
5	from some of the other Tiber Island
6	Condominium homes.
7	So we don't want to be boxed in
8	and we're really asking I understand that
9	you have a balancing test to take, but we
10	think that there is already a lot of balance
11	in the PUD. Thank you.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other
13	questions? Okay. Let's go through cross-
14	examination. Mr. Glasgow, any cross?
15	MR. GLASGOW: Just very briefly,
16	Mr. Chairman.
17	What is your understanding of the
18	proposed height of the Parcel 11 building?
19	MS. RANDOLPH: I attended several
20	meetings and I was informed that it could be
21	as high as 55 feet, I believe. And that then
22	according to my participation sitting in the

1	audience the other night when Mr. Eckstut,
2	EEK, witness, testified, I thought he
3	indicated that it was potentially a penthouse
4	maybe on the western side of the Parcel 11,
5	so that the structure that is closer to your
6	alleyway or M Place, which is between your
7	Parcel 11 and your Parcel 10, I think, is
8	proposed to be higher or something along
9	those lines.
10	MR. GLASGOW: Then what is your
11	understanding of the separation between the
12	proposed building on Parcel 11 and your
13	building? How many feet do you understand
14	that the PUD has for that?
15	MS. RANDOLPH: Frankly, I think
16	that the numbers are in dispute. And Elinor
17	Bacon gave me a diagram, but I questioned
18	that diagram.
19	MR. GLASGOW: And lastly, I
20	wanted to ask do you have a light and air
21	easement across the church's property?
22	MS. RANDOLPH: No, I do not. And

1	I have not argued that. I have argued that
2	the design of our structure is going to be
3	adversely impacted because the discussion of
4	light and space and the concept, which is
5	throughout our neighborhood and was
6	throughout our under the original design
7	plan is threatened.
8	Additionally
9	MR. GLASGOW: I think you
10	answered the question. You said you do not
11	have a light and air easement. Thank you. I
12	have no further cross-examination.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you,
14	Mr. Glasgow. Mr. Litsky or Mr. McBee, any
15	cross-examination? Mr. DePuy or Mr. Holman,
16	any cross-examination?
17	MR. LITSKY: None, thank you.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I don't
19	see Mr. Hitchcock. Mr. Hitchcock? Okay.
20	Mr. Kopp? Okay.
21	MS. RANDOLPH: I get a rebuttal
22	statement, do I not? I have one rebuttal

1	statement to make.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'm trying to
3	think. I don't think so.
4	MS. RANDOLPH: No?
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: No.
6	MS. RANDOLPH: Okay.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: No. You
8	MS. RANDOLPH: Well, thank you
9	anyway. Most appreciated.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: We have your
11	testimony and we got it.
12	MS. RANDOLPH: Okay. We
13	appreciate it. Really, thank you so much.
14	
	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you all. Okay. Mr. Glasgow, if you have any
15	all. Okay. Mr. Glasgow, if you have any
15 16	all. Okay. Mr. Glasgow, if you have any rebuttal or closing remarks? And about how
15 16 17	all. Okay. Mr. Glasgow, if you have any rebuttal or closing remarks? And about how much time? I'm sure you may have some
15 16 17 18	all. Okay. Mr. Glasgow, if you have any rebuttal or closing remarks? And about how much time? I'm sure you may have some rebuttal.
15 16 17 18 19	all. Okay. Mr. Glasgow, if you have any rebuttal or closing remarks? And about how much time? I'm sure you may have some rebuttal. MR. GLASGOW: Yes, we do have

1	MR. GLASGOW: I think we are
2	going to take about 10 minutes or so for our
3	rebuttal, maybe 15.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
5	MR. GLASGOW: And then there will
6	be some rebuttal from Mr. Holman and Mr.
7	DePuy.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. About how
9	much time in total, do you think? I'm just
10	trying to
11	MR. GLASGOW: Oh, total? What,
12	probably 20 minutes? Yes, and they will have
13	five.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right.
15	Thank you.
16	MS. RANDOLPH: We have the right
17	with Exhibit A, I believe.
18	MR. GLASGOW: Pardon me?
19	MS. RANDOLPH: We have a right to
20	my exhibit, I believe.
21	MR. GLASGOW: Yes, thank you.
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Let

1	me also I'm glad that was mentioned.
2	Thank you, thank you.
3	Mr. DePuy and Mr. Holman, I hate
4	to do this to my former colleague, they don't
5	get rebuttal. They don't get a closing
6	remark. They don't get that. Only the
7	applicant. So they may want to tell you.
8	MR. DePUY: If I can address
9	that, Mr. Chairman? Technically, the Vestry
10	of St. Augustine's church is the applicant
11	with respect to Parcel 11. It signed the
12	application as the owner. And so it is the
13	applicant with respect to Parcel 11-only.
14	We requested and obtained party
15	status, which is unusual for an applicant, I
16	will grant that, but we did
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: You didn't
18	represent yourself as being part. At least,
19	I didn't see it as part of the applicant.
20	MR. DePUY: No, we did not come
21	forward as the applicant.
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well, you didn't-

1	- let me just say this and you have to deal
2	with it. If you didn't represent yourself up
3	front as being part of the applicant, I'm not
4	going to let you do it on the end. I may be
5	in error, but tonight, that's the way I'm
6	going to rule.
7	So any rebuttal, you can either
8	ask Mr. Glasgow to give it for you.
9	MR. DePUY: Okay. Thank you,
10	sir.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.
12	MR. GLASGOW: Okay. Our first
13	rebuttal witness, Mr. Chairman, would be
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: We are actually
15	going to have to wait a minute. We don't
16	have a quorum.
17	MR. GLASGOW: Oh, you don't have
18	a quorum. I see.
19	(Whereupon, at 7:58 p.m. a recess
20	until 8:01 p.m.)
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. We can go
22	back on the record. Mr. Glasgow, and I hate

1	to do this to my former colleague and friend,
2	why is Mr. Holman at the table? He just
3	wants to sit there?
4	MR. GLASGOW: No, he was going to
5	answer with respect to
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: He can't. He was
7	Mr. DePuy's let's not do that. Okay. He
8	was not part of the original application on
9	the front end. He did not present himself as
10	being the applicant or being a part of the
11	applicant's case.
12	They asked for party in support.
13	MR. GLASGOW: Right.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So I have made my
15	ruling.
16	MR. GLASGOW: Oh, I understand
17	what you are saying.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: You got it.
19	MR. GLASGOW: Okay. All right.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
	011111111111111111111111111111111111111
21	MR. GLASGOW: I got it. I did

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: You got that.
2	Now, Mr. Glasgow, you and I have been
3	together a long time.
4	MR. GLASGOW: Right.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: And I just knew
6	you weren't going to try to push that down
7	like that.
8	MR. GLASGOW: No.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
10	MR. GLASGOW: I didn't understand
11	what was happening.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
13	MR. GLASGOW: I apologize. I
14	didn't understand the focus of the ruling.
15	Okay. What we would like to do here with
16	respect to the rebuttal is we have we are
17	going to have three rebuttal witnesses or
18	two, depending upon how what the length
19	is.
20	Mr. Hoffman is going to be
21	testifying. Mr. VanPelt and possibly Mr.
22	Sher. And I may cover some of that in

1	closing, just depending on how we are running
2	in time.
3	And with that, I would like to
4	start with Mr. Hoffman with respect to oh,
5	I'm sorry, Mr. VanPelt.
6	MR. VANPELT: All right. Thanks,
7	Chip. Good evening, Commissioners. For the
8	record, my name is Dan VanPelt with
9	Gorove/Slade Associates, Transportation
10	Planners and Engineers.
11	I just wanted to kind of quickly
12	touch on a couple things as relates to the
13	transportation.
14	One of them is the mode splits
15	that were in our analysis and the other is
16	the parking analysis that was part of the
17	transportation study.
18	Talking the mode splits first, if
19	we go back and we look at our transportation
20	report, we really looked took a very
21	careful look when we came up with those mode
22	splits that we used to adjust the trip

generation. You know, it really took into account the distance to the Metrorail Stations and it took into account all the other non-auto mode choices.

One of the big inputs that we looked at was the WMATA Ridership Survey and we -- that which also takes into account distance to Metrorail Stations. And then we also had other data that we factored in, it's detailed in our report, that we looked at to help come up with those mode splits that were part of the trip generation analysis.

And then we go back and there is a couple other pieces of data offered that aren't necessarily in our report, but we looked at the 2000 Census data and we looked at the Census Tracks for the residential that live around the site, there is 39 percent are using transit and 61 percent are -- sorry. 39 percent travel alone and 61 percent are using transit.

In our report, we assumed 35 and

NEAL R. GROSS

65, which are pretty similar.

If we go and we also look at the 2010 Commuter Connections, the survey that was done by the Metropolitan Washington Council Government, we looked at that. We have 42 percent of employees in the District are drive-alone. We assume for the office that we would have about 50 percent, so we have actually assumed a little bit, we think, higher.

And going and thinking about the distance to the Metrorail Stations, just a couple of other things to point out that kind of went into our thinking is that the L'Enfant Plaza Metro Station is about a 10 minute walk from the center of the site. The Waterfront Station is about 8 minutes.

But in planning, we really think about a 10 minute walk as really is not a long walk for residential, which a large portion of the site is residential. The data is showing that a 15 minute walk is even

comfortable for residential, especially when you consider that the L'Enfant Plaza Metro Station offers, you know, access to four Metrorail Stations right at the center of the system, so it's one of the key stations in the system.

So hopefully that is some helpful information that would kind of relay how we got to the assumptions that we did for the trip generation.

The next thing just to touch on quickly is the parking analysis and how we got to the rates or the range that has been presented in the application.

What is up on the screen here is a shared-parking analysis. And what this does is take into account all the different uses that are -- that make up the site. Each one of those colors corresponds to a different use within the project.

The blue is residential and that's is -- composes a big portion of the

NEAL R. GROSS

site, so that's why you see so much blue on this graph or on this figure. But each one of these uses is built in on the other. So what you ultimately see at the top of that curve is what the peak demand would be.

And what this is representing is a peak weekday when there would be the capacity for potentially 4,500 people at an event. So this is that purple part that you see towards the top is really that event.

And the application has about 2,100 to 2,600 is what we are looking for. I think as we go forward and as the -- for each stage, we will be revisiting what the parking demand really is. And as the program gets fully fine-tuned, we will be looking further and fine-tuning these numbers.

But this is the analysis that went into looking at trying to right-size what we think the amount of parking will likely need to be for the full project. And thank you.

1	MR. GLASGOW: I would like to
2	call the next rebuttal witness, Mr. Hoffman.
3	MR. HOFFMAN: Thank you, Chip.
4	On the screen here we have four different
5	subjects we chose based on some of the
6	questions from the other night to try to be
7	as responsive as we could.
8	One is the Wharf, second is
9	massing, the three adjoining properties, and
10	four flexibility of uses.
11	Let's start with the Wharf.
12	There were many questions about the Wharf and
13	what it does for everyone today and one
14	particular question was why lift it up? This
15	is existing condition of the Wharf today.
16	Many people walk from one end of the site,
17	which is the Titanic Memorial, all the way to
18	the fish market and back. It's an exercise
19	routine and the like.
20	And this is where they walk.
21	They walk across here. As it really lays
22	out, the travel zone to be able to walk is

1 about 7 feet. And that's just simply because 2 of the planter boxes and the railings and the other things that are in the way. 3 4 The other aspect of this is you really are looking at a wall when you look to 5 6 the right going out and it bifurcates the 7 space. And what we want to do is pull it together. 8 This over here simply shows 9 10 you enter what is toward the fish market. in front of Capital Yacht Club 11 This is currently today. Capital Yacht Club is right 12 13 back in here. In fact, this is Capital Yacht Club's parking currently. 14 So at the -- towards the end of 15 16 the Wharf to go to the fish market, you have to weave out into the gravel parking lot and 17 weave over that way, that's the current 18 19 condition. Another area, and this is sort of 20 midway, this is near 7th Street Park that we 21

put some interim uses in.

22

You can see the

steps coming down. They are not accessible for elderly and for handicap. It's limited in its ability. And the top half of the Wharf, this is over near Phillip's and you can see, it has been privatized over the years, so it's not even being used right now currently by the public.

And so to give you a reason to give you some insight as to what we are trying to do with the current Wharf configuration.

So the proposed Wharf, we want to essentially unifying project elements. This is probably one of the most important elements of the entire project. It's about three-quarters of a mile long. It's sort of the spine of the entire waterfront. It's sort of the personality of it.

We want to make it 60 feet wide, we went through this the other day, on one level, and we want to make it as flexible as we possibly can. It's 20 feet wider than it

1 currently is, because we are imposing our own 2 setback on our buildings back 20 feet from the line as it currently is. And it will be 3 4 accessible and safe for all people. 5 do want to have access for 6 vehicles. This is not for short-circuiting Maine Avenue, kind of like what Water Street 7 is today. This is more for convenience and 8 for drop-off and the like. 9 10 We have -- this is a real living wharf and waterfront where we need access to 11 Capital Yacht Club, Gangplank Marina. 12 13 also, in the months of January and February when people aren't outside so much, they can 14 drive up to those restaurants. 15 It's real 16 important for our viability year round. And of course, the Wharf, it will 17 active programming, both passive 18 be 19 recreational and otherwise. This is an image again of what we 20 are looking to provide. The first 20 foot 21

zone is more cafe tables and sort of the

retail spilling out and sort of this integration between the outdoors and indoors to make it very interesting and -- for social gathering and the like.

The center 20 feet is the shared area where some day the trolley will come through, that vehicles can come through, of course, people will use it and, at times, festivals at times like Cherry Blossom Festival, 4th of July and other events. It can easily be closed down to vehicles. And all of the buildings can exist without having vehicle access coming out right onto the Wharf.

The last 20 feet is what we are calling the promenade. This is a shared area. This will provide a continuous flow for pedestrian traffic, but it's also important for us for our own vitality of the retail is to animate this outer area here. So we do want to have some kiosks out there, some cafe tables, some trees, planters, we

want to make that organic, so it's changing with seasons. We are adapting it for what works and the like.

But with common denominators, it will provide unobstructed areas for pedestrian flow from one end to the other.

And we really worked that out with the Harbour Square Condominiums. In fact, in their support letter, that's clearly stated our commitment to do that.

Project massing. This was biq topic. And Ι appreciate the limitations of Stage One PUD and the а certainty that we are asking for, and go back, please, from the Zoning Commission to go forward to Stage Two, so I wanted to give you a little better qualitative and more quantitative. So you have -- I'm asking for certainty and I'll provide certainty with respect to setbacks and those sort of things. And I'm hopeful that you will take that into consideration.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

This is a portion of our model. We intentionally didn't bring our model here, didn't it to be because want taken we literal. It is, obviously, ever-moving as we work with the community, as we work with tenants, as we get smarter on things. It is changing, but there are constants in it and that is the setbacks that I want to talk about.

By the way, this is City Square. This is over near 9th Street and Banneker would be up into this corner here. This would be a corner of the theater. Not to compete with Arena Stage, but this is more of a music venue, sports venue. Today we have Kastles — in fact, tonight we have a Kastles game playing. They would be indoors here inside of this and it would be laminated with retail. So there is no dead zones here, you know, when it is not being active.

And then there would be residential apartments up above. We also

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

have a big view corridor through here, which I'll go into in just a little bit.

Let's move to the next. So

starting with principles. And I think we mentioned this the other day, that we have smaller blocks, which create shorter street frontages and we have, in fact, 11 pedestrian entrances to the site.

And we think this is important, because these blocks aren't more than 245 feet in length, which is almost half the size of a normal block.

So there were comments on Maine Avenue, the other side of Maine Avenue by some residents that there would be one linear wall. And I think and what Ι hope to demonstrate it's really is threedimensional experience, because of the openings that are coming into the streets and because of the setbacks we will provide.

We are going to provide a variety of heights and setbacks, public spaces to

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

provide a unique pedestrian-oriented environment, the building base of various heights and shapes to reduce the scale of the buildings.

This is our fourth PUD and I say our, PN Hoffman's fourth PUD, over the last 15 years. We are used to working in established neighborhoods and breaking down massing. We go before HPRB. I understand that. We get that. That is what we are going to be providing here that is fitting.

building will The towers setbacks and, of course, open up for parks, views and to get significant light and air. And the nice thing about this, because it's predominantly residential, the light and air naturally fits. If this were an office park, this would be big chubby buildings. couldn't boast about the amount of light and air coming through, because we couldn't simply provide it, the floor plates would be too thick. That's not the case for us.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Next. The massing facts. This is what I'm hoping to provide with some certainty. The Comprehensive Plan provides for a high density commercial/high density residential. That is what we are dealing with.

What we are asking for in this PUD is a total of 3.19 over the overalls site or 3.87 if you deduct all the streets that we are taking out and providing back to the public. 61 percent of our site will remain open space. And unlike our friends with the surrounding neighborhoods, this is not a campus setting that is all private. This is open to everybody.

So we are compatible with them, but we are not copying. 21 percent of the total site contains roof areas at 130 feet. I think this is an important context, because there has been discussion on 130 feet. About one-fifth of the site actually reaches to 130 feet.

1	And if you just take the roof
2	areas of the structures, and this is just
3	Parcels 1 through 9, don't add the pier,
4	don't add Parcel 11 with this discussion
5	earlier, don't add even Parcel 10, just 1
6	through 9 where it's the most dense
7	development that we placed, only 55 percent
8	of those structures actually reach to 130
9	feet.
10	The balance, 45 percent, are
11	drawn up and setback, lower roofs and the
12	like.
13	Another fact is that Parcel 9 is
14	almost 600 feet from Tiber Island hi-rise.
15	There was a comment the other day from a
16	gentleman from Tiber Island mentioning about
17	our Parcel 9 structure. And so I want to
18	call attention, that's two football fields
19	away that there is concern.
20	The Parcel 7/8 is, approximately,
21	165 feet from Waterside Towers. There was

someone the other day that mentioned from

Waterside Towers it was one of the townhouses and I'll get into this in a minute, but, you know, Waterside Towers is an apartment complex that really faces 6th Street and it coexists with townhouses with hi-rises, that was the initial design for it.

And the building towers above -building towers will be about one to four
story bases throughout, will be separated
from one another by a minimum of 50 feet.
This was brought up the other day. We are
happy to abide by that, because that, we
believe, will be the minimum and we can
easily satisfy that.

The parcels will be no greater than 250 feet in length, except for the theater. There is one exception and that's this actually right over here. This is on the northwest area of the site. This block is a little longer simply because we have to get the theater in there. And there is no other way to do it.

We were able to get trucks and unloading and the like into this alley area here, so, again, that's out of the public area. It is off the road. It's off Maine Avenue and the like, but the block itself, this here, is more than 250 feet.

However, there is a crook in the road, in the Maine Avenue, if you are familiar with it. So you will really only perceive it as 250 feet.

Next. Let's look at the massing on Maine Avenue. We want to maintain an urban boulevard, not a suburb and boulevard.

And what that means is having a consistent street frontage.

Now, we are going to break up the massing, but it's a consistent street frontage. The building face south of Market Square will have setbacks of a minimum 12 feet, so that's at the base. That provides us to have some trees, cafe tables. bays, some programming awnings and the like without

coming into public space, with having a pretty generous front area. And it also moves us away from the other side of Maine Avenue.

The building frontage features will have articulation above the base with a change in material, design, vernacular or setbacks. So we will have between one and four story bases, we will be setting back. That is our commitment.

80 percent of the buildings will have these setbacks and the average setback will be 6 feet. Now, some of these buildings will be 20 or 10 or something, some might be 4 or whatever, but the average will be 6.

I'm careful not to get too formulaic, because I don't want to stunt the very creativity we want for the quality, but I also understand the need for certainty and the massing and how we are breaking it down, at least in the macro, and we are comfortable with these maximums and minimums. I think we

can do something very special with it.

Total average, minimum setback, the towers, the length of Maine Avenue is, approximately, 18 feet. 12 feet on the base, on the sidewalk area extending another 6 feet on average up above. And from the property line to the curb, we are at 36 feet. So it's 36 feet from the curb.

Next. Massing on the Wharf.

Open treatment of towers with buildings orientation. We want to maximize views, building faces to setback, in this case, 20 feet, as I mentioned earlier, so that we can open up the area of the Wharf.

This provides larger pedestrian areas, trees and planters, again, retail awnings, bays, show windows, cafe zone, enhancements for the waterside. There was a lot of discussion on the pedestrian experience.

This is going to be animated with lots of retail, as well the Maine Avenue.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	Maine Avenue will have more neighborhood-
2	serving retail, such as the banks or a
3	clearer, those sort of things which would be
4	natural for Maine Avenue.
5	The wharf side will be more
6	cafes, eateries, that sort of thing.
7	Buildings along the Wharf will feature bases,
8	again, from one to four stories and we will
9	change material, design, vernacular, setback
10	and, in this case, 90 percent of the
11	buildings will have these setbacks, in this
12	case, will average 10 feet in depth. So the
13	setbacks are further on average.
14	Again, some will be more, some
15	will be a little less. But we would average
16	10 feet.
17	So the average minimum setback
18	for the towers and the length of the wharf is
19	30 feet from the property line. And actually
20	70 feet from the water.
21	Massing of parts of open space,

have significant setbacks

the --

we

22

to

provide major views and one of the distinctions I need to is make in the Comprehensive Plan, it asks us to optimize use from public spaces, not from private dwellings. If we go down that road, there are private dwellings all around within a half-mile zone that can claim the same thing. is public spaces. We have

It is public spaces. We have done everything we possibly could to open up views for public spaces throughout.

This is showing, by the way, from Arena Stage. If you are standing on the roof of Arena Stage and looking out, this is showing 7th Street as you would be looking into the neighborhood, if you were out on the water looking back.

Next. Massing with the Mews. This is an area that Stan covered yesterday as well. And I just want to make sure that we are communicating that these spaces are intended to be intimate. We are trying to make different experiences throughout the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

entire wharf and the waterfront.

And some of the highest quality areas are intimate and they are actually sort of narrow. And this is intentional. We don't want everything to be grand and big, so these sort of areas are going to be tucked into different areas. This is what we are showing.

And, in fact, we are calling this the grove. This is in front of what will be Gangplank Marina, which the organization that is there today that facilitates the docking of the boats now, we are going to build them a new facility, put it out on the outside of the Wharf. This building we want to move back off what this wharf edge would be and create a grove of trees in there, that would be good for picnics and again, a different experience than what we have elsewhere and an opportunity to tuck in these sort of Mews areas.

This, by the way, is, I think,

NEAL R. GROSS

Parcel 7 or thereabouts. 8, okay.

Next. Okay. Massing on Banneker Overlook. There are many individuals that have said hey, push the massing to the north, push the massing to the west, push it away from us. And we try, but, it's -- you know, we have all these competing interests and this is why I say we just -- as hard as we can try, we cannot fully satisfy everybody.

Over in this area, the concern is, of course, NCPC, National Park Service and Fine Arts all rolled into that. When we first established our massing here, by the way this is Parcel 1 and Parcel 2, this is Banneker, this is where we tried to place more massing. We had apartments up on top that — think of it as a donut that came out and then the theater area is in the center.

Instead of parking up in there like the Texas donut-type, we actually had a theater inside. We kept the theater, obviously, but what we did was we opened this

up and we committed to an 80 foot view corridor through there, so that you could see it from Banneker, from up high.

You can also see through Parcel 1 and Parcel 2. And then we took this and we shrunk this building up and we shrunk these buildings up, which is over at the fish market, to open up a gracious area, so that you can see once again off Banneker into the water.

Our concern was that we didn't want to make it, again, too open that the retail would fail or the experience would fail, so we were able to work with NCPC on putting a one story pavilion in here, so that you could have, you know, some retail animation in the middle there and warm it up a little bit.

By the way, this is a little bit bigger than the Pike's Place area in Seattle.

That's how we did have it. We had it this large, that was the same size, so we have

opened it up to -- I'm not sure of the exact width, but my point is that these view corridors have also been established and I believe NCPC is supportive of this.

let's talk about the Now, adjoining properties. Waterside Towers and Townhomes, Arena Stage and Tiber Island Condos and Cooperative and then Harbour I think those are the main impacted Square. properties that we have spent a lot of time with.

And I want to also mention that we have so many different entities and so many different stakeholders for this project. We tried to deal with the representatives of each of those entities, each of those stakeholders and do our very best in exchanging of information and communicating and working with their concerns for the interest that they are representing.

And then we also have tried to work with individuals who have come to us

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

early on in the process. So we did our best with all of those.

Starting with Waterside Towers, a bit of context. I wish I had the plan view here, I don't, but Waterside Towers, again, was built years ago. It was similar to Tiber Island where it is a mix of lower-rise and hi-rise right next to each other. They coexist.

And that was the plan intentionally and it was an award-winning plan. So this is the townhouses that someone spoke about on Tuesday, I think, a hi-rise literally right next to it. These townhouses actually face -- the whole complex faces 6th Street and it's -- they face an interior courtyard, so the backs of the townhouses are actually what look out onto Maine Avenue.

And we are actually 165 feet -our closest structure is 165 feet away from
the nearest townhouse structure. We do not
cast shadows on them either.

NEAL R. GROSS

Arena Stage. Arena Stage important to us not because it's a theater, because it has such a public presence. And, you know, they have 1,600 seats total for all They are open six days a three venues here. week and this is a draw for the public. There is large public sidewalks that wrap around here. And, obviously, this is a big impact far public space is area as as concerned.

So views from public space, this, to me, was one of the special areas that we really needed to pay a lot of attention to.

We worked with Bing Thom. We worked with Arena Stage. We actually had more than three meetings. We had three meetings along just with the architect. But what we ended up doing was we ended up reducing our square footages some and we ended up narrowing the buildings.

In fact, this building at Parcel 9 is shaped like this simply to open up views

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

from over here, so that as you walked along here, it optimized the views. And what that also did was render that building only for residential, because, as you can see, it's too narrow for an office building. We felt that worked well for compatibility reasons as well for the neighborhood.

But all these, this view corridor was prescriptive and it was to optimize views from public space.

The Tiber Island Complex. This is -- these are the townhomes that are facing St. Augustine's. This is the rear end of these townhomes. They sit next to a hi-rise. They also have a wonderful area here that opens up into the garden with a tree line, which, by the way, we are preserving. This gives you an area right here as to where that is.

Again, these townhomes are a mix of a complex with hi-rise and townhomes together throughout, not all townhouses have

NEAL R. GROSS

water views or sunsets or whatever. I presume some do and some don't. But it was award-winning in 1966, in fact, with a hirise and mid-rise or low-rise adjacent to it.

What we want to put on this side of St. Augustine is low-rise. It's moderate density as called for in the Comprehensive Plan instead of commercial, which is a more intense use. We wanted to go residential, which is a less intense use.

There was other reasons that enabled us to solve the problem that was traffic and that was brought to our attention by the Tiber Island Condo president and others. Most were concerned with the buses and the traffic that our development would cost.

So what this allows us to do, this is the current road right now, and this is over-designed. This -- buses can come through here, cars come through here, obviously, it is two-way. We felt what we

were doing was adding an amenity by reducing it and putting grass and other trees there and reducing it to one-way, so that the only utility purpose this would even had would be to serve the residents here and the residents that we would be putting there.

But in any event, this is the current condition today. And you can see in the site plan where this is. This is the direct access to come into where the buses -- this is all parking lot right now.

So this was part of a plan to transition to the existing neighborhood and, in our view, act as a buffer from the more intense development that we had to the northwest to the community.

This shows you in the front. This is now on Maine Avenue or M Street, at this point, looking back where we have narrowed this to one-way and traffic parking on either side for residents only.

If opening that street back up

NEAL R. GROSS

were something that the neighborhood would want, we would do that. It costs us money to close this. This isn't something that we are doing for any commercial benefit. We thought we were doing something that would be more attractive to the neighborhood.

It also narrows the pedestrian walk going back and forth into the front.

This gives you an idea -- well, not an idea. This gives you the specific distance that our building is from the existing townhomes. There -- it's 100 feet away. We are actually less than 45 feet when we come over here.

I'll show you on the next view, I'll show you very quickly on the next view, this is -- let me get my bearings here. The area this -- on this side, which is the northwest side of St. Augustine's we are developing, I just showed you a view looking this way, which was 100 feet from this point over.

We are taking our elevation from this side, which is lower. And can you back up one screen? You can see these are English basements here. We pushed it down as far as we could. I have not represented the exact height. I know that it is less than 45 feet, but it is less and that was the intention, so that we could mitigate the height, because I get that, that that is a concern.

Now, go forward. If you look at a section view through this, you can see the street. We were just looking at this view right here. This is what we are looking to build. This is what is existing. This is the hi-rise, it's right next to it. We believe that we are compatible.

We do have a penthouse on top, as every building -- not every building, every building that isn't a townhouse does. We did not misrepresent that. We are limiting that penthouse to 12 feet and we do want to have rooftop access for gardens. We are going to

have green roofs, as we are throughout the development.

believe that both the But we massing and the use is compatible with what is there right now. It creates an intimate setting and I think it is a buffer and it protects it from some of the -- a little bit more intense use that is to the north and it west. And also repositions St. Augustine's church for future generations.

This is Harbour Square. This is another group that we worked with successfully. We took this picture today. This is from this morning looking out. This picture right here is actually from this existing building right here, which is historic.

So we look back this way and this is just important for context. You can see the distances that this is. This is 400 feet from here over. Harbour Square is the other side of the trees. We do have Harbour Square

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

support. I just wanted to give some context as to what we are looking at.

And finally, flexibility of uses.

40 percent of this project is going in Phase

1. It's a large block of this. The

flexibility that we need really is for these

areas right in here. And this was touched

upon the other day and I felt it important

enough to come back on this and talk about

it.

This is predominantly residential. Even if we put the maximum of what we are proposing of office, the office space would only be comprised of 42 percent of this area. The rest is residential and retail. Retail is going to be there whether it is office or residential. It is pretty much a constant.

But the residential at its lowest point would be 530,000 square feet. And the office at its highest point would be 450 and that's what we are asking for.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	And it is really market-driven.
2	And as was pointed out, that really is two
3	buildings. You know, it's probably these
4	two, but it could be this one and this one.
5	I'm not sure right now. But what we will do
6	is we will commit to all the setbacks, the
7	heights, the massing, all the other things
8	that we are proffering.
9	So in any event, I wanted to add
10	clarity to this, hopefully, on the
11	flexibility. And that's it. Thank you.
12	MR. GLASGOW: And that concludes
13	our rebuttal testimony. We did want to make
14	sure that if the Commission had any other
15	questions for Mr. Hoffman before closing,
16	that those were addressed, so that we can
17	have as complete a record, at this point in
18	time.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you
20	all for your rebuttal comments.
21	Commissioners, any questions? Any questions
22	or comments? Vice Chairman Schlater?

1	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: A
2	question. One of the issues addressed in the
3	rebuttal was these view corridors from public
4	spaces and, specifically, the view corridor
5	from M Street.
6	And I didn't notice that the one
7	graphic we have of looking down M Street is
8	pretty far back, you know, towards the Metro.
9	And you can't see it very well, but it looks
10	like, from the drawings, that the church
11	actually the church now is setback off of
12	M Street and Maine Avenue where that
13	intersection comes up.
14	And now, it is very prominent and
15	protrudes actually. If you look down the
16	center of the M Street axis, it pretty much
17	meets it right there at the center of that
18	right-of-way as you are looking down to the
19	west.
20	So I'm wondering what the
21	thinking was there, in terms of preserving
22	view corridors? It would appear to block

1	half the view corridor down M Street.
2	MR. HOFFMAN: Well, I thank you
3	for bringing that up, because we did have
4	graphics actually, the where it is off
5	that view corridor more, it still comes in a
6	little bit, but not to the degree that you
7	are mentioning. That is actually, the
8	later drawing, it is off that. Our imagery
9	was inaccurate before and this became some of
LO	the confusion with working with the ANC and
11	the like, because they brought up the very
12	point.
13	We studied that because we
L4	thought why is that working like this, that
15	wasn't what our intention was.
L6	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Yes.
17	MD HOREMAN: And we wont had

MR. HOFFMAN: And we went back and realized we made some mistakes in the imagery. So the latest imagery actually shows it back. Well, I don't know if that gives -- I wish we had one that showed a longer view corridor. It does stick out

NEAL R. GROSS

18

19

20

21

1	some.
2	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Yes.
3	MR. HOFFMAN: I'm not going to
4	say it doesn't stick out at all, but it does
5	stick in a little bit, but it is much less
6	than what was originally portrayed in the
7	imagery. I'm not sure if you were referring
8	to this drawing image or something else.
9	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Yes. I
10	mean, I just put a paper up against the I
11	couldn't I don't know what the M Street
12	right-of-way is overlaid on there. And maybe
13	you can provide that.
14	MR. HOFFMAN: We are
15	MR. GLASGOW: Yes, we can provide
16	that, Commissioner Schlater, but also we are-
17	- there is no protrusion or asking for any
18	projection into the M Street right-of-way.
19	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Is the -
20	_
21	MR. GLASGOW: The M Street right-
22	of-way curves.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: It
2	curves.
3	MR. GLASGOW: It curves.
4	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: I
5	gotcha. But we are talking about view
6	corridors.
7	MR. GLASGOW: I understand.
8	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Okay.
9	What the Comprehensive Plan talks about in
LO	terms of preserving them.
11	MR. HOFFMAN: Commissioner, we
12	actually attached the latest image to the ANC
13	response about a week and a half ago, as we
L4	were working with them on this and that would
15	be, I think, the latest drawing or image on
16	there.
L7	MR. GLASGOW: We can submit that
18	for the record.
19	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Yes,
20	okay. I mean, I have it somewhere.
21	MR. HOFFMAN: You are right.
22	There is some confusion on that. Some of the

1	older ones show it way out into the
2	intersection.
3	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Does
4	that create any pinch on the public space at
5	all?
6	MR. HOFFMAN: No.
7	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: I mean,
8	in terms of the sidewalk widths and what you
9	are able to do there?
10	MR. HOFFMAN: No, no. The
11	sidewalk width is actually very generous. As
12	Chip pointed out, we are not going into the
13	public right-of-way at all. It is really the
14	view corridor that we are trying to respect
15	and to optimize that.
16	So again, a small portion of the
17	church does stick out into there, but the
18	majority of that view corridor we are
19	preserving.
20	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Okay.
21	One thing was noted in the OP report that I
22	didn't address in my questions the first time

1	around was this below market retail
2	commitment and getting some further
3	information on what that commitment is.
4	MR. HOFFMAN: Well, the
5	commitment is a result. It's a result that
6	requires us to have 20 percent unique or
7	local retail. And, in fact, we will probably
8	exceed that, but that is our commitment is to
9	have 20 percent unique retail. We think that
10	is good all around, because
11	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Is that
12	six or fewer locations or what how are you
13	defining it?
14	MR. HOFFMAN: It's mixed. I
15	don't have it memorized, but it is prescribed
16	in the LDA, so that it is not all
17	concentrated, for instance, at the fish
18	market, you know. So there it's mixed
19	throughout the entire development. It is
20	laid into a merchandising plan that was
21	reviewed by the Deputy Mayor last fall. But
22	that is our commitment to those 20 percent

1	throughout. And as I said, we will probably
2	exceed that.
3	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Okay.
4	One of the things I was sensitive to in the
5	testimony that was given was the need for
6	benefits for southwest residents. And I saw
7	that there was a specific commitment for
8	reserving affordable housing for Arena Stage,
9	for instance. And I saw there was a specific
10	commitment for jobs for or contracting for
11	Ward 8 residents.
12	And I was wondering if maybe you
13	could expand upon what are the specific
14	commitments being made for Ward 6 residents,
15	specifically?
16	MR. HOFFMAN: We are in fact,
17	we met with David Sobelsohn, an activist
18	within the community. I met with him
19	personally two days ago and we are working
20	through that. My concerns are with the
21	affordable housing or fair housing

requirements. And I have said this --

1	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: So you
2	made the commitment to Arena Stage, did you
3	not?
4	MR. HOFFMAN: What we committed
5	to was to try. It was an effort to do that,
6	that is not at closure yet. I do have
7	experience at the Mather building downtown
8	where it was limited to artists. We used Ann
9	Corbit with CDC as a clearinghouse for that,
10	because I did not want to define an artist.
11	And but there seemed to be a
12	category there that we were able to do that
13	and it was mandated by the city. So we
14	thought that may be a possibility here. So
15	we claimed and will stand by our best efforts
16	to do that with them, but we recognize that
17	that's not settled just yet. But that was an
18	artist division.
19	With respect to where someone
20	lives, currently, and getting a preference
21	over someone else where they live, that's a

little different matter. And we are giving

1	best efforts to that. We would certainly
2	like to give preference to local citizens
3	within the area.
4	We did say, and I said this
5	publicly, that we could provide information
6	potentially sooner. I mean, there is things
7	practical, legal ways of maybe accomplishing
8	this without doing anything inappropriate.
9	So as you can tell by my answer,
10	it
11	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: I
12	understand. I understand the limitation.
13	MR. HOFFMAN: I just can't
14	assure that just yet.
15	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: But
16	there is other issues on contracting.
17	MR. HOFFMAN: Oh, yes.
18	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Job
19	training.
20	MR. HOFFMAN: Oh, yes.
21	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: And a
22	focus on the maybe the benefits of the

project inuring to local residents of Ward 6. 1 We definitely are 2 MR. HOFFMAN: looking to do that. We have an intermediary 3 4 program or requirement as well and that 5 should be part of this. We want to get this 6 started. I have already given the city 7 \$250,000 towards that. And to be honest, I'm not sure that that has been utilized just 8 9 yet. 10 Ι have three-quarters of

I have three-quarters of a million left on our commitment that we will honor and we look forward to putting that into a program, so that we can do this very item.

We looked at one infrastructure that is in place. I am on the board of the Cardozo-Shaw Trades Academy. Those young adults don't necessarily come from Cardozo. They could come from Ward 6. I'm trying to find an infrastructure that would actually make this happen, as opposed to, to be honest, a lot of people meeting and talking

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	and task forces and some day something
2	happening.
3	So, you know, that is a
4	commitment that we have and we do want to
5	concentrate it in Ward 6. I think there are
6	a lot of apprenticeship opportunities. We
7	have actually already hired somebody from the
8	neighborhood as our first employee actually,
9	I think, that helps us. He is working
10	tonight, because we have a Farmer's Market
11	going on.
12	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Great.
13	I raised other issues during the hearing, but
14	I think for now, I don't have any further
15	questions. Thank you.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you.
17	Commissioner Turnbull?
18	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I just
19	have a couple. Getting back to the church on
20	the corner of the building, is that I'm
21	looking on 5.25, which is the overall aerial
22	view of the development, which again it's

1	hard to get a feel. I mean, it's generic.
2	We are looking at a cartoon right now.
3	MR. HOFFMAN: Yes.
4	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: But it
5	looks like the church would be about still,
6	without the penthouses going around, about
7	three to four stories. So I'm wondering, is
8	this not only a worship space, but some
9	administrative office space above it or I
10	don't know what the program is and maybe that
11	hasn't been roughed out yet.
12	MR. HOFFMAN: I'm not qualified
13	on the specifics with the church. I do
14	believe that the church not only has a very
15	active, obviously, religious purpose, but
16	also serves the community today and wants to
17	position itself to serve the community
18	tomorrow. And there are discussion on food
19	programs, on meetings, inexpensive spaces for
20	nonprofits.
21	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Sure.
22	MR. HOFFMAN: That's common to

1	gather and meet. So I know that is part of
2	their programming. I'm not intimate with the
3	specifics on it though.
4	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
5	Now, all of the discussions we have had
6	architecturally and planning have been with
7	Mr. Eckstut, who is the master planner. Now,
8	as you get into the different parcels, are
9	you going to be is Stand the overall? Are
10	you going to have separate architects
11	involved in the different parcels?
12	MR. HOFFMAN: We will have
13	separate architects. I think the worst
14	mistake we could make is have this building
15	one homogeneous style looking contrived and
16	in some cases we have spent so much time on
17	the designs, we are actually almost de-
18	engineering some of that, because we don't
19	want it to look so perfect.
20	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
21	MR. HOFFMAN: There will be
22	multiple architects involved.

1	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I think
2	that will be yes. I think that's smart.
3	I guess the other thing is I haven't heard,
4	now, again, maybe I didn't go back through
5	the list, but, is the ANC asking for any
6	space in the project? I mean, maybe that was
7	in there and I didn't catch it.
8	MR. HOFFMAN: Yes, they are. And
9	we are happy to provide it for them. We did
10	this very thing in Tenley Hill in Northwest
11	with the ANC there and that has been going on
12	11 years now.
13	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes.
14	MR. HOFFMAN: They are using the
15	space. They have an office. And so we are
16	very experienced with that.
17	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: It's
18	quite typical.
19	MR. HOFFMAN: Yes.
20	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: We have
21	had a lot of PUDs.

1	do it.
2	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
3	Thank you.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Mr.
5	Hoffman, let's talk about Pier 4. What's
6	happening there? What's going on with Pier
7	4? I think Harbour Square folks represented
8	they would rather not see any buildings or
9	they had an issue. What's going on with Pier
10	4?
11	MR. HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair, I think
12	that actually came from the ANC verbiage. I
13	think we have the support from Harbour Square
14	and that in fairness to the ANC, that
15	occurred after that was written in the ANC
16	memo.
17	With respect to Harbour Square,
18	we did work with them. We one of the
19	macro changes we want to make is we want to
20	make that into a park.
21	Currently Shawn, can you go to
22	a slide somewhere in there that shows the

parking lot?

Currently, the parking lot there is an annoyance to the neighborhood and buses park in there, cars park in there. So the dinner boats are coming off Pier 4 right now. You have the Spirit of Washington, the -- and there is two smaller boats, I think Spirit of Mt. Vernon goes into there as well and the -- it's a smaller one, but the dinner boats that go in and out of there.

What we want to do is move those dinner boats further to the north and west and we want to take the parking lot that is there right now, you can see upper left hand corner, remove that and put into -- a park right in there.

And to do that, we really need to move that commercial activity out of there. And what we want to do there is, since there is already structure on that pier, put residential. Again, we think that is the most compatible use, the least intense use.

It will be homeownership, not rental. People will have a vesting in that community that are looking at that park as well. So it's not, you know, empty at hours in the morning.

And we are only talking about 28 residences in there. In fact, there might be a little less now because we reduced the height of the buildings as a concession to Harbour Square to gain their support.

So anyway, we think residential is a very good compatible use. There is already structure on the pier. We are not making the pier any longer or anything for that residential use. And we are moving the commercial activity to the north and west where it is more compatible with some of the others. It's M Street Landing where there is more people and chaos, if you will.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Also, I think the, I'm trying to remember from Monday night, CBCC asked to be named. I don't know whether it was -- I forget whether it was a

1	work group or whatever it was, they asked to
2	be named. And did we have a problem with
3	that?
4	MR. HOFFMAN: I don't have a
5	problem. I mean, I don't know what their
6	vesting is in relationship to the ANC. My
7	only concern is having counter-purposes with
8	the ANC and some of the groups that are
9	vesting that we are working with.
10	To the extent that there is no
11	counter-purpose, I have no problem, you know,
12	talking with them and trying to work with the
13	group. I'm not as familiar with them.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I think this was
15	because they expressed to us, at least the
16	Commission, that they had the knowledge of
17	how to get jobs and I think necessities for
18	those folks who live in Ward 6. I believe
19	that's what they represented. I would have
20	to go back and check.
21	MR. HOFFMAN: And they could be
22	of some help, I would love to work with them.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. The last
2	question. You heard tonight from the 6 th
3	Street Homeowners on Parcel 11. What's going
4	on with that? Have you had discussions with
5	them?
6	MR. HOFFMAN: We did meet. We
7	met three times. I'm not sure. We met much
8	more with the Tiber Island Condo Co-Op Board
9	and President, that's you know, we did
10	the result today was not from working in a
11	vacuum and just throwing it on people.
12	This was a result of working with
13	the board and president on accomplishing what
14	we have, that's the narrowing of the street,
15	the height of the buildings, the facades, the
16	things that where we moved the and I
17	didn't go over this, but we moved the parking
18	entrance in and out is on the opposite side
19	of M, so that there is no car activity in
20	front of them.
21	And it was only recently that we
22	heard of the individual homeowner there that

expressed their concern to us. And, you know, to that end, we have actually modified our approach about, you know, as far as we could go on it and we did look at the height on that. As I mentioned, we are taking the height from the lower side of the street. We are not playing a game of going to the high part and, you know, saying 45 and it's really 50 or whatever, that it is probably closer to 41 feet as it -- across the street from those neighbors.

And that's where we left it, to be honest.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Glasgow, I know this is the First-Stage and you are still trying to massage and really narrow down what you are going to do with Parcel 11 and everything. I still would like to see, because we are basically giving rights to say, okay, this is the height or this is how we are going to change the zoning, if I'm part of the 6th Street -- standing in the 6th

1	Street homes, I would like to see something.
2	What kind of view would I be
3	looking at? What will I see if I'm on the
4	6 th Street side? And actually, while I know
5	you will say well, we will do more of that in
6	the Second-Stage, I want to see this now,
7	because we are approving quite a bit of what
8	actually may happen on that particular
9	parcel.
10	MR. GLASGOW: Yes. We can give a
11	depiction. Mr. Chairman, you want sort of
12	like a front-on elevation or a perspective?
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: A perspective.
14	MR. GLASGOW: Okay.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: If I'm looking
16	just if I'm standing on the side of where the
17	6 th Street Homeowners are, if I'm in their
18	yard, per se, I won't say go as far as their
19	living room, because you might have to go in
20	there, but if I'm in their backyard or
21	whatever, side yard or whatever that is, if
22	I'm in their area looking that way, what

1	would I see?
2	MR. GLASGOW: All right. I don't
3	we don't have a perspective straight-on.
4	We do have a view down the street, because
5	what we wanted to show the Commission Members
6	is the height that we were proposing is,
7	essentially, the height of their buildings,
8	that's that view.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, that doesn't
10	do it for me.
11	MR. GLASGOW: I hear you.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
13	MR. GLASGOW: I hear you.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: That doesn't help
15	me.
16	MR. GLASGOW: We will get
17	something in for the record on that, so you
18	can see that. But you can see that our
19	intent is that on one side of 6 th Street and
20	on the other side of 6 th Street, the
21	buildings are, essentially, the same height.
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

1	MR. GLASGOW: All right. Which
2	is similar when we were hearing the testimony
3	about the R-3 Zone, which is we took that
4	into account, too, when we were hearing the
5	questions and so we sort of kept it. You've
6	got R-3-type of height. If you had R-3 row
7	dwellings go down the street, this would be
8	your height. It's 40 feet.
9	Mr. Hoffman was saying they
10	measured on the low side of the height side
11	and, in fact, in R-3, you measure to the
12	the 40 feet goes to the underside of the
13	ceiling of the top story. If you had a
14	pitched roof or something, it would be
15	taller.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So am I looking
17	from the 6 th Street homes in this view?
18	MR. GLASGOW: No. You are
19	looking down 6 th Street.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
21	MR. GLASGOW: Okay. Their homes
22	are on the left hand side and the proposed is

1	on the right hand side.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Right side.
3	MR. GLASGOW: And because of the
4	number of trees that are being retained,
5	because we were told that retaining the trees
6	there is very important, you can see there is
7	a lot of buffering and there is a lot of
8	right then and there because of the trees.
9	And then also we made sure that we had 100
10	foot setback, that there is a 100 foot
11	separation building line to building line.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I really just
13	would like to see just one photo if I'm
14	standing in the 400 Block, like I think the
15	address is 462, 458.
16	MR. GLASGOW: Right. But just
17	right across the street looking at
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Right. Looking
19	at the
20	MR. GLASGOW: the pattern.
21	MR. HOFFMAN: Mr. Chairman, we
22	can provide that. I think we have got enough

1	information in the computer. We will just
2	move it around. I think we can show that.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: That will be very
4	helpful. And I'll tell you, I didn't want to
5	ask you that, because I will tell you this,
б	it was very well-done. I was able to see
7	just about everything I wanted to see, except
8	for that. So as far as I'm concerned, this
9	book is very well-done.
10	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr.
11	Chair? Mr. Chair, just to clarify what you
12	want. I wonder if the applicant could put up
13	page 5.8, which shows Parcel 10 and 11
14	adjacent to the property?
15	MR. HOFFMAN: Yes. Shawn, can
16	you get that on there?
17	MR. SEAMAN: Yes.
18	MR. HOFFMAN: Okay.
19	MR. SEAMAN: There you go.
20	MR. HOFFMAN: There.
21	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: M Street
22	is at the bottom of the picture and you have

1	got 6 th Street going up next to the building.
2	Are you looking for a view from that end
3	unit down M Street by the church or are you
4	looking or do you want a view looking 6 th
5	Street up to the Waterfront Park? Are you
6	looking down? I think you are talking about
7	M Street looking at the church and the
8	building, but I'm not sure or do you want
9	both?
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'm going to
11	phrase it like this. Whatever the 6 th Street
12	Homeowners, because they are on M Street and
13	they are on $4^{\rm th}$ Street, I'm confused, but I
14	just want the back of the 6 th Street
15	Homeowners who are a party
16	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: They can
17	do it they can do a couple. I mean
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Now, if you
19	well, I just want to see what the 6 th Street
20	Homeowners
21	MR. GLASGOW: Mr. Chair? Maybe
22	you can just point it to me and then we will

1	do it.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Now, here
3	is my only issue.
4	MR. GLASGOW: Okay.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: 6 th Street
6	Homeowners have explained that they are on M
7	Street. Their address is on M Street, but I
8	think the back of their homes is on 6 th
9	Street. Okay. So I
10	MR. GLASGOW: That would be
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: want to be in
12	the back of their home on 6 th Street looking
13	towards Parcel 11.
14	MR. GLASGOW: Right. Okay.
15	MR. HOFFMAN: Do you want a pen?
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Right. So
17	whatever gets me there, that's where I need
18	to be.
19	MR. HOFFMAN: Okay.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Sure, sure.
21	MR. HOFFMAN: Okay. Thank you.
22	MR. GLASGOW: Okay. From what I

1	understand I need a mike.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: You need to be on
3	a mike. Now, Mr. Turnbull, if you want to
4	ask him something else?
5	MR. GLASGOW: Mr. Chairman, what
6	I understand is that you are asking us, here
7	is the 6 th Street homes and that we would
8	take a view like this, so we are looking down
9	like from here across and down.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: That's exactly
11	what I'm asking for.
12	MR. GLASGOW: That approach.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: But if we want
14	both, let's ask for it. That's the only one
15	I want.
16	MR. GLASGOW: Right.
17	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: I don't
18	know if you have the information in the
19	computer or how hard it is to provide, but I
20	think it would also be interesting to see
21	what an R-3 building built matter-of-right
22	across the street would look like.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: That's good, Vice
2	Chair. I would agree. Let's do that.
3	MR. GLASGOW: All right.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let's see what
5	the R-3 and all what you are proposing.
6	MR. GLASGOW: Right.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: See what it looks
8	like.
9	MR. GLASGOW: We're happy to do
10	that.
11	MR. HOFFMAN: Right.
12	MR. GLASGOW: Do you want it in
13	plan and in perspective?
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: What do we you
15	all are the experts.
16	MR. GLASGOW: Just perspective?
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Just
18	MR. GLASGOW: Just the massing?
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.
20	MR. GLASGOW: All right.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So we asked for
22	what is matter-of-right and also the 5-B. I

1	won't ask for A, because that's not what they
2	proposed. Okay. Anything else?
3	All right. Do we have some
4	closing dates? Oh, cross-examination. Okay.
5	Mr. Litsky or Mr. McBee, do you have any
6	cross on rebuttal?
7	MR. LITSKY: No.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Mr. DePuy,
9	do you have any cross on rebuttal? Again,
10	Mr. Hitchcock is not here. Mr. Kopp is not
11	here. Ms. Randolph, do you have any cross on
12	rebuttal?
13	MS. RANDOLPH: No, thank you. I
14	have appreciated being here. Thank you.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.
16	Okay. Do we need some dates? Ms. Schellin?
17	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Do we want
18	to go over the list just to make sure? I
19	know that they did some rebuttal, but just to
20	make sure that I know I was out and they
21	may have covered some of the things, but just
22	to make sure that we are clear on exactly

1	what we are looking for and what the record
2	is actually open for.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Yes.
4	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner
5	Schlater had mentioned and they may have
б	covered this, the breakdown of the mode
7	splits, how many people they think will take
8	the Metro and the comparison of the modes,
9	that they actually cover that.
10	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: I think
11	it was addressed.
12	MS. SCHELLIN: It was addressed?
13	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: But
14	MS. SCHELLIN: Okay.
15	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: No.
16	MS. SCHELLIN: No?
17	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: But not
18	sufficiently. So to the extent that you can
19	look at other projects and compare those mode
20	splits against that.
21	MS. SCHELLIN: Okay.
22	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: I think

NEAL R. GROSS

1	that would be helpful
2	MS. SCHELLIN: Okay.
3	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: to
4	just understanding it in context of other
5	projects.
6	MS. SCHELLIN: All right. And
7	are you still looking for the timing to be
8	tied down a little more instead of open-
9	ended?
10	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Yes. I
11	think that can be yes, I would like more
12	information on that.
13	MS. SCHELLIN: And Commissioner
14	Hood asked the applicant to respond to
15	Exhibit 40, which was the letter submitted by
16	Stacy, I believe it was, Braverman, it's
17	Exhibit 40. And then there were several
18	items that Commissioner Hood read into the
19	record that Commissioner May had asked for.
20	I'm not going to reread those, because that
21	list was quite long.
22	The ANC asked that they be

1	allowed to submit a supplemental report
2	because they had some, I believe, most
3	meetings with the applicant after they had
4	taken an official position, so they may want
5	to have another meeting and revisit, may or
6	may not reconsider some outstanding issues.
7	So if we could leave the record
8	open for them to
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Is that who
10	they asked for the record to be left open,
11	right?
12	MS. SCHELLIN: They did.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: When will we
14	possibly take this up?
15	MS. SCHELLIN: September 12 th .
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: And I think that
17	falls in line with Mr. Litsky. I'm looking
18	at you, Mr. Litsky, does that fall in line
19	with your meeting, your regular monthly
20	meeting? You will be able to
21	MS. SCHELLIN: They will meet I
22	think

1	MR. LITSKY: We meet on the $12^{ ext{th}}$.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Meet on the 12 th .
3	MS. SCHELLIN: at special
4	meeting.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, you're going
6	to have a special meeting.
7	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Because I
9	know ANCs and civic associations usually take
10	July and August.
11	MS. SCHELLIN: Right. They said
12	they would hold a special meeting.
13	Then tonight Commissioner
14	Schlater asked that the M Street right-of-way
15	be overlaid showing the view corridor. Okay.
16	And then the last thing that Mr. Hood asked
17	for was the perspective view from 6 th Street
18	Homeowners' backyard and what an R-3 matter-
19	of-right building would look like, also.
20	Those are the last or the only items that I
21	have. I don't know if Mr
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Is there anything

1	else?
2	MS. SCHELLIN: Glasgow wants
3	to add to the list.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Do you have
5	anything else, Mr. Glasgow, that we missed?
6	MR. GLASGOW: I'm checking with
7	Ms. Brown, also, if I can for a second.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
9	MR. GLASGOW: With respect to Mr.
LO	May's comments, we tried to answer a number
11	of those and I guess what we will do is we
12	will in summary fashion, because there were a
L3	number of them that were asked at the
L4	hearing.
L5	MS. SCHELLIN: I can go down the
L6	list, if you would like.
L7	MR. GLASGOW: No. We've got the
18	list.
L9	MS. SCHELLIN: It's not that
20	long.
21	MR. GLASGOW: I think we have got
22	the list.

1	MS. SCHELLIN: Okay.
2	MR. GLASGOW: We can coordinate
3	that part with you.
4	MS. SCHELLIN: Okay.
5	MR. GLASGOW: But we thought we
6	answered a number of those at the hearing.
7	We can we will coordinate with you on
8	that.
9	MS. SCHELLIN: Okay.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well, I think
11	when he reads the transcript over the summer,
12	he will know whether or not they have been
13	if you answered some. I don't know if we
14	want to do it that way and then let him say -
15	- let Ms. Schellin know that they are not
16	answered.
17	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: I think
18	you are better off just specifically
19	addressing them.
20	MR. GLASGOW: Each
21	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: In
22	writing.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	MR. GLASGOW: Yes, each one or
2	say that this is where it was in the
3	transcript, right, at the hearing.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
5	MR. GLASGOW: That's fine. We
6	will list them all and then provide a
7	response.
8	MS. SCHELLIN: Okay.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
LO	MS. SCHELLIN: Again, I can email
11	them to you, too, if you would prefer. Just
12	let me know. You'll remind me on Monday,
13	because I'll forget.
L4	MR. GLASGOW: Yes, to email them
15	there, that would be good in case
L6	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.
L7	MR. GLASGOW: we didn't write
L8	them down the same way that
L9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
20	MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. All right.
21	You will have to remind me, because I'm not
22	here on Fridays. All right.

1 MR. GLASGOW: Okay. 2 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Anything else? That would be it. 3 MS. SCHELLIN: 4 VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: One 5 There is a couple of things. Just in thing. 6 general on the overall site plan and massing, 7 this issue of sort of how the Maine Avenue facade is viewed, I mean, has been brought up 8 a couple of times. And I think Mr. Hoffman 9 10 addressed it well today. 11 thing that might be But one helpful is just to get an elevation for the 12 13 length Maine of Avenue, that understand, you know, the relationships of --14 you know, if we are looking at from Maine 15 16 Avenue and we are looking at the street wall to see -- you know, based on the number and 17 width of the alleys and Mews going through 18 19 them, what is that going to look like from a massing standpoint? 20 I think that would be helpful in 21 evaluating whether these setbacks and Mews 22

1	and alleys have, you know, appropriately
2	addressed that issue, because there are some
3	lingering concerns on my part, at least, as
4	you have got, you know, a row of 130 foot
5	buildings right there on Maine Avenue and it
6	could I don't know, you know, it's one
7	building after another.
8	And I'm not sure what you can do
9	to break that down, if it's just small, even
10	if it you know, 50 foot openings with 130
11	foot buildings can be pretty imposing. So I
12	would just like to see it from an elevation
13	standpoint, and I think that would help
14	understand how it works a little bit better.
15	MR. GLASGOW: That would be part
16	of the
17	MR. HOFFMAN: That will be part
18	of our package to submit.
19	MR. GLASGOW: Right, yes.
20	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Okay.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right.
22	Anything else?

1	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well,
2	just I haven't gone through it. We had, in
3	our package tonight, a response to I think
4	it dealt with the gentleman who had his boat
5	and came up the channel. And I haven't gone
6	through that, but I think it addresses
7	everything regarding a visiting ship that
8	comes up the channel.
9	And I didn't take enough notes on
10	what he was really getting at with his I
11	think he had a 40 foot, but I think in the
12	literature we got tonight that what we are
13	looking at is accommodating 60, is that
14	MR. GLASGOW: That's correct.
15	Boats up to 60 feet.
16	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Up to 60
17	feet. And I don't know what the number is
18	that come up per year. Do we know how many
19	visiting ships come up? I mean, you usually
20	got to call in advance anyway and you just
21	don't bring the Black Pearl up and say I need

to dock here.

1	MR. GLASGOW: Also, Commissioner,
2	there was a 500 foot turning radius that was
3	provided toward the northwest part in the
4	channel.
5	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
6	MR. GLASGOW: And then we had the
7	mooring piece
8	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Piece.
9	MR. GLASGOW: on the south
10	side and then you had all the docks that were
11	on the side toward the development.
12	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right.
13	Like I said, we just I just saw it tonight
14	for the first time, so just scanning it
15	briefly, it looked like it satisfied all of
16	those questions, but we may want to come back
17	and just make sure that it is covered.
18	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: My
19	memory is now being jogged from the hearing
20	the other night, because I remember some of
21	the other issues.
22	One of them was the greening of

1	the site. So we have a lot of hardscape out
2	there. I think it was Mr. Seaman who said
3	that there were maybe some better images
4	available to talk about the landscape plan
5	for the site and get a better understanding
6	for, you know, the greening of that area.
7	And I don't need it tonight, but
8	if you can just submit that, too, in to the
9	record?
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Anything
11	else? Okay. Ms. Schellin, is everything in
12	order? Are we all on the same page?
13	MS. SCHELLIN: I need to give
14	some dates.
15	MR. GLASGOW: No closing
16	statement.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh.
18	MS. SCHELLIN: Okay.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: You have no
20	closing statement. Okay. I thought you
21	might have asked for a Bench decision. Okay.
22	

1	MR. GLASGOW: That would be bold.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Okay.
3	I want to thank everyone for
4	MS. SCHELLIN: I would like to
5	give some dates, please.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Sure.
7	MS. SCHELLIN: If we could have
8	the additional filings, the specific requests
9	only, and the record would be closed to
10	everyone else and everything else, other than
11	the specific requested documents only, they
12	would be due by 3:00 p.m. August 26 th and
13	responses from the parties only would be due
14	by 3:00 p.m. September 2 nd . And we can place
15	this on the Commission's September 12 th
16	agenda for consideration.
17	Draft findings of fact and
18	conclusions of law from the parties would be
19	due also by $3:00$ p.m. September 2^{nd} . We
20	would ask if you do provide those, that you
21	provide them in hard copy and you also email

me a courtesy Word copy, MS Word. Thank you.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Is
2	that it? All right.
3	I want to thank everyone for
4	their participation in this hearing. And we
5	will take this up some time, I believe, in
6	September.
7	So with that, this hearing is
8	adjourned.
9	(Whereupon, the Public Hearing
10	was concluded at 9:10 p.m.)
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

NEAL R. GROSS