

1 GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
2 Zoning Commission  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8

9 Public Hearing

10 Case No. 15-05 [P.N. Hoffman and Associates, Inc. &  
11 Riverside Baptist Church: Consolidated PUD and  
12 Related Map Amendment for Square 472, Lot 127  
13 ("Property")]  
14  
15  
16

17 6:34 p.m. to 10:11 p.m.

18 Monday, November 30, 2015  
19

20 Jerrily R. Kress Memorial Hearing Room  
21 441 4th Street, N.W., Suite 220 South  
22 Washington, D.C. 20001  
23  
24  
25

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.  
1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington, DC 20036  
Washington: 202-898-1108 • Baltimore: 410-752-3376  
Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1 Board Members:

2 ANTHONY HOOD, Chairperson

3 MARCIE COHEN, VICE CHAIR

4 PETER MAY, Commissioner

5 ROBERT MILLER, Commissioner

6 MICHAEL TURNBULL, Commissioner

7

8 Office of Zoning:

9 SHARON SCHELLIN, Secretary

10 DONNA HANOUSEK

11

12 Office of Planning:

13 JENNIFER STEINGASSER

14 STEVE COCHRAN

15

16 DDOT

17 RYAN WESTROM

18

19 Other

20 DAVID AVITABILE

21 BAO VUONG

22 MICHAEL BLEDSOE

23

24

25

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

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. We're ready to get  
3 started. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, this is  
4 the public hearing of the Zoning Commission for the  
5 District of Columbia. Today's date is November the  
6 30th, 2015. We're located in the Jerrily R. Kress  
7 Memorial Hearing Room.

8 My name is Anthony Hood. Joining me are Vice  
9 Chair Cohen, Commissioner Miller, Commissioner May,  
10 and Commissioner Turnbull. We're also joined by the  
11 Office of Zoning staff, Ms. Schellin and Ms.  
12 Hanousek, as well as the Office of Planning staff,  
13 Ms. Steingasser, Mr. Cochran, and the District  
14 Department of Transportation, Mr. Westrom.

15 This proceeding is being recorded by a court  
16 reporter. It's also webcast live. Accordingly we  
17 must ask you to refrain from any disruptive noises or  
18 actions in the hearing room, including the display of  
19 any signs or objects.

20 Notice of today's hearing was published in  
21 the D.C. Register and copies of that announcement are  
22 available to my left on the wall near the door.

23 The hearing will be conducted in accordance  
24 with provisions of 11 DCMR 3022 as follows:  
25 preliminary matters, the applicant's case, report of

1 the Office of Planning, report of other government  
2 agencies, report of the ANC, organizations and  
3 persons in support, organizations and persons in  
4 opposition. And then we'll have rebuttal and closing  
5 by the applicant.

6 The following time constraints will be  
7 maintained in this meeting. The applicant has up to  
8 60 minutes, organizations five minutes, and  
9 individuals three minutes.

10 The Commission intends to adhere to the time  
11 limits as strictly as possible in order to hear the  
12 case in a reasonable period of time. Excuse me. The  
13 Commission reserves the right to change the time  
14 limits for presentations if necessary, and at no time  
15 shall be seated.

16 All persons appearing before the Commission  
17 are to fill out two witness cards. These cards are  
18 located on the table near the door.

19 Upon coming forward to speak to the  
20 Commission please give both cards to the reporter  
21 sitting to my right before taking a seat at the  
22 table. When presenting information to the Commission  
23 please turn on and speak into the microphone, first  
24 stating your name and home address. When you are  
25 finished speaking please turn your microphone off so

1 that your microphone is no longer picking up sound or  
2 background noise.

3 The decision of the Commission in this case  
4 must be based exclusively on the public record to.  
5 To avoid any appearance to the contrary the  
6 Commission requests that persons present not engage  
7 the members of the Commission in conversation during  
8 any recess or at any time. In addition there should  
9 be no direct contact whatsoever with any commissioner  
10 concerning this matter.

11 The staff will be available throughout the  
12 hearing to discuss procedural questions. Please turn  
13 off all cell phones -- well, I'm going to still say  
14 beepers. Please turn off all beepers and cell phones  
15 at this time so not to disrupt these proceedings.  
16 Would all individuals wishing to testify please rise  
17 to take the oath?

18 Who's going to -- Ms. Schellin, would you  
19 please administer the oath?

20 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Please raise your right  
21 hand.

22 [Oath administered to the participants.]

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. At this time the  
24 Commission will consider any preliminary matters.  
25 Ms. Schellin, do we have any preliminary matters?

1 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. The first thing we  
2 have is a party status application that was filed by  
3 Mr. Hurwitz, the President of Townhouse Management 1,  
4 Incorporated. That application was filed at Exhibit  
5 27, and today at Exhibit 37 he filed a waiver for the  
6 late filing to amend the application and ask the  
7 Commission to consider that. And that is in  
8 opposition.

9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Commissioners, Mr.  
10 Avitabile, if you could come to the table?  
11 Commissioners, we have an amended request from 27.  
12 It was from our Exhibit 27, which is now 37, which  
13 has been first a request for a waiver to submit the  
14 furtherance of the party status request to us. Any  
15 objections to -- first of all, any objections to  
16 waiving this in?

17 MS. COHEN: No.

18 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. All right. We're  
19 going to consider the request, and I think they fine-  
20 tuned it, which gave us a little more information  
21 than what we normally would ask for. Specifically,  
22 they are -- their submission, they are the closest  
23 townhome development to this particular project, is  
24 what I read out of most of it, even though they get  
25 into some of the merits of the argument.

1           What is your pleasure, Commissioners?

2           MS. COHEN: Mr. Chairman?

3           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.

4           MS. COHEN: I would recommend that we permit  
5 them to be party in opposition.

6           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. We have a  
7 recommendation on the table. Is there any objection  
8 to that? Before I call for a vote I want to talk to  
9 Mr. Avitabile. Mr. Avitabile, do you have any  
10 objections?

11           MR. AVITABILE: I am just reviewing the  
12 amended thing for the first time now, but we don't  
13 have any objection.

14           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: No objections. Any  
15 objections up here?

16           MS. COHEN: No.

17           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. No objections. We  
18 will call them the -- hold on a second. The 26th is  
19 -- is the 26th -- no, we'll call them the Townhouse  
20 Management 1-8. Townhouse Management is what I'll  
21 call them.

22           Okay. Ms. Schellin, anything else?

23           MS. SCHELLIN: The applicant has proffered a  
24 couple experts that have not been before the  
25 Commission before. Those resumes are at Exhibit 26C.

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Mr. Avitabile, I  
2 don't believe we need to do Mr. Fitch or Mr. VanPelt,  
3 and I think everyone else we need to do. Am I  
4 correct? And you have two who are here who are not  
5 going to be experts but they're just going to be here  
6 to answer any questions.

7 MR. AVITABILE: That's correct. And the  
8 people who will be testifying on direct presentation  
9 will be Brian Pilot from Studios, will be John  
10 Wittman from Geier Brown Renfrow, and then Dan  
11 VanPelt who has been previously confirmed as an  
12 expert.

13 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So Mr. Fitch is not  
14 -- we don't need to worry about Mr. Fitch.

15 MR. AVITABILE: We do not.

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

17 MR. TURNBULL: The reason you're having two  
18 architects, one is going to talk about the church,  
19 one is going to talk about the other building?

20 MR. AVITABILE: That's correct.

21 MR. TURNBULL: All right.

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Colleagues, so  
23 basically we have Mr. Pilot and Mr. Wittman being  
24 proffered as experts in architecture. And their  
25 resumes are in Exhibit 26. Any objections?

1 MS. COHEN: No.

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So Commissioner  
3 Turnbull, any objections?

4 MR. TURNBULL: No, I'm okay.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So, so noted. We  
6 will now proceed as those two who were given in  
7 proffer as being experts. Anything else, Ms.  
8 Schellin?

9 MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir.

10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Mr. Avitabile, you  
11 can bring your team up and we can go ahead and get  
12 started.

13 MR. AVITABILE: Great. Thank you. All  
14 right. We'll get started.

15 Good evening, Chairman Hood and Members of  
16 the Commission. We're here tonight to present a  
17 consolidated plan unit development and related zoning  
18 map amendment for the redevelopment of the Riverside  
19 Baptist Church site. The site is located at the  
20 intersection of 7th and I Street Southwest, and it is  
21 bounded by I Street on the north, 7th Street on the  
22 Northwest, and Main Avenue on the Southwest. It is  
23 located adjacent to the Wharf Development, which is  
24 currently under construction, and it is located  
25 within walking distance of the waterfront and

1 L'enfant Plaza Metro rail stations.

2 The application before you this evening will  
3 allow the church and its development partner, P.N.  
4 Hoffman, to redevelop the church and surface parking  
5 lot into a mixed use development with approximately  
6 170 residential units, ground floor community serving  
7 retail, and a new home for Riverside Baptist Church.  
8 The site will be rezoned from the R-5-B to the C-3-A  
9 zone district.

10 The D.C. Council recently designated the site  
11 as appropriate for use as a mixed use medium density  
12 residential, low density commercial development as a  
13 part of the Southwest Small Area Plan. The height  
14 and density of the proposed development as well as  
15 the proposed C-3-A zoning is not inconsistent with  
16 this new designation.

17 With that I would like to turn you -- turn  
18 the presentation over to Bao Vuong, who is the Vice  
19 President at P.N. Hoffman. You'll then hear from  
20 Pastor Michael Bledsoe of Riverside Baptist Church,  
21 and then John Wittman and Brian Pilot, our  
22 architects. Dan VanPelt will then provide testimony  
23 on the very limited transportation impacts of this  
24 project.

25 MR VUONG: Good evening, Commissioners. My

1 name is Bao Vuong and I'm here to represent P.N.  
2 Hoffman, one of the two PUD applicants. I wanted to  
3 first thank you for your consideration of our  
4 application. We're very excited about this project  
5 and we believe that this development fits well within  
6 the overall context of the Southwest neighborhood.

7 Just briefly, our agenda for tonight is first  
8 we're going to focus in on the church, the church  
9 history and design, and then we'll move into the  
10 residential design and finally wrap up with landscape  
11 and the traffic overview.

12 As you may know, P.N. Hoffman is a long-time  
13 D.C. based developer with numerous award winning  
14 projects across the city. We're known not only for  
15 our quality and design, but also the quality of our  
16 community engagement process. And this project  
17 attempts to follow in those footsteps.

18 Over the last decade P.N. Hoffman has been  
19 particularly invested in the Southwest community with  
20 the development of our Wharf Project, a 3.2 million  
21 square foot, \$2 billion redevelopment of D.C.'s  
22 Southwest waterfront. We have built strong  
23 relationships with the Southwest community members  
24 and our engagement with Riverside Baptist dates back  
25 to the early days of that process.

1           As a part of our investment in the Southwest,  
2 P.N. Hoffman began working with Pastor Michael  
3 Bledsoe and the Riverside Baptist congregation over  
4 seven years ago. Over these many years the church  
5 has spent much time discussing and deliberating about  
6 its potential redevelopment as it's watched the Wharf  
7 designs unfold. The congregation came to the  
8 conclusion that any rebirth must accomplish two main  
9 goals. The first, the church wanted to remain true  
10 to its Southwest -- to its roots in the Southwest  
11 neighborhood which dates back to its inception over  
12 157 years ago. This means staying in the Southwest.

13           The second main goal is to secure the  
14 church's future for the next 150 years. Our plan  
15 accomplishes these two critical goals for the church  
16 while taking an underutilized transit oriented  
17 property to its fullest potential. Both P.N. Hoffman  
18 and Riverside Baptist have worked closely with  
19 various D.C. government agencies. This includes  
20 participating in the Southwest Small Area Plan  
21 meetings to better understand the desires of the  
22 community in general.

23           Dating back to 2011 we have had numerous  
24 meetings with the Office of Planning and various  
25 agencies within the District's Department of

1 Transportation to discuss curb cuts and propose  
2 changes to the public realm. This includes securing  
3 conceptual design approval from the Public Space  
4 Committee in October of this year. We have also met  
5 with MWATA about the Green Line that cuts through the  
6 Southwest corner of the property.

7 In addition to the D.C. government agencies  
8 we've met with multiple Southwest neighborhood  
9 associations. This includes presentations to the  
10 Southwest neighborhood assembly, over 15 formal and  
11 informal meetings with various ANC commissioners.  
12 This culminated with ANC formally supporting our  
13 application as part of their November meeting. We've  
14 also presented to the Waterfront Gateway Neighborhood  
15 Association which is affiliation of eight homeowner  
16 associations representing nearly 900 households and  
17 over 1,900 residents in the Southwest community.

18 And finally we had met with each of our  
19 property's immediate neighbors. This includes, not  
20 pictured here, Jefferson Middle School to the  
21 Northwest, Disabled American Veterans immediately to  
22 the west of our property, the Wharf to the south,  
23 Water Side Towers which is owned by UDR to our east,  
24 Townhome Management 1, which is located to the  
25 northeast of our property, and Town Square Towers

1 which is located directly north.

2           The team has used these meetings to inform  
3 our design and programming to ensure a project  
4 compliments the overall feel and development of the  
5 development pattern of the Southwest neighborhood.  
6 We're very excited and proud of our building design,  
7 which is a modern interpretation on the midcentury  
8 modern architecture in Southwest D.C., and our  
9 architects will expand on the design later in the  
10 presentation.

11           Before that I'd like to spend a few minutes  
12 focusing in on our revised public benefits package.  
13 This includes increased affordable housing, our  
14 revised application exceeds the minimum requirement  
15 of including -- of the inclusionary zoning ordinance,  
16 including deeper level affordability with units at 50  
17 percent AMI. We've also increased the sustainable  
18 design, committing to LEED Gold for the residential  
19 portion of the building. We're providing a minimum  
20 of 6,900 square foot of community serving retail and  
21 services space, which includes a \$25,000 subsidy to  
22 help attract a daycare facility to the site.

23           We also have proffered various transportation  
24 demands management measures that we'll go into later  
25 in the presentation. And working closely with DDOT

1 we will reconstruct a dysfunctional intersection at  
2 the corner of 7th and I Street Southwest. This  
3 reconstruction not only makes it safer for  
4 neighborhood residents and future Wharf visitors, but  
5 perhaps more importantly safer for the students of  
6 Jefferson Middle School, the students at Apple Tree  
7 Charter School, and the disabled American veterans  
8 who use the crossing on a daily basis.

9 Just to quickly orient the Commission to the  
10 site. So we have 7th Street that runs north here,  
11 and I Street that runs east/west. And some of the  
12 few major issues of this intersection includes a slip  
13 lane that allows cars to make a quick right turn  
14 right through here. There's an unprotected  
15 pedestrian island in the middle of the intersection  
16 that forces those traveling north across I Street to  
17 make a two-step process to actually get across. In  
18 addition the intersection is missing a crosswalk on  
19 the south side of I Street, and the one crosswalk  
20 that does currently exist currently has a private  
21 driveway that currently dumps both cars and traffic  
22 into where pedestrians are supposed to be landing at  
23 the intersection.

24 Our redesigned intersection improvements  
25 include a bunch of different aspects. First, as you

1 can see in the upper left-hand corner, this is the  
2 existing intersection, just to give you a perspective  
3 of what we're doing. We're eliminating the slip lane  
4 and pushing out the curb for pedestrian and  
5 neighborhood use while eliminating an awkward and  
6 potentially dangerous two-step crossing across I  
7 Street.

8 By eliminating the slip lane we're able to  
9 create public seating that allows neighborhood  
10 residents to sit and gather safely while enjoying the  
11 landscaping and the water wall feature of our  
12 project. This improves both visibility between  
13 pedestrians, bikes, and cars and utilizes a tightened  
14 curb radius to slow down traffic making a right-hand  
15 turn.

16 By eliminating the two-step crossing our  
17 design shortens the distance required to cross I  
18 Street. A new crosswalk will be added to the south  
19 side of I Street allowing pedestrians to cross  
20 directly. We'll be also adding meeting extensions  
21 for pedestrian safety. And then we'll also be  
22 realigning Jefferson, the private drive for Jefferson  
23 Middle School. So this is the existing situation  
24 today, and we'll be pushing their driveway south so  
25 that the cars actually exit into the middle of the

1 intersection.

2           We'll also be upgrading the existing sidewalk  
3 to ensure that it meets all DDOT and ADA standards.  
4 In addition there's a pedestrian refuge that  
5 currently exists. It's a six foot refuge today so  
6 it's blitz, what is Riverside Baptist curb cut today  
7 and UDR's curb cut to the east. And so it will be  
8 releveraging that existing curb cut for our future  
9 project and increasing the refuge to 16 feet.

10           In addition, on the southern portion of the  
11 slip lane we'll be adding new street parking and  
12 we'll be pushing the curb out to increase the size of  
13 the sidewalk along 7th Street. In addition that  
14 allows us to increase the amount of plantings that we  
15 have, and we'll be adding a new seating area at the  
16 southern end of the site, right along Main Avenue  
17 also.

18           In addition to the physical benefits and  
19 perhaps more importantly, we're securing the future  
20 of Riverside Baptist Church as a Southwest  
21 neighborhood institution. With that I'd like to turn  
22 over the presentation to Pastor Bledsoe to talk about  
23 the church's history and its ministry within the  
24 Southwest community.

25           MR. BLEDSOE: Good evening. My name is

1 Michael Bledsoe. For 23 years I have pastored  
2 Riverside Baptist Church in Southwest Washington,  
3 D.C. For 18 years I have been recurring adjunct  
4 professor currently teaching church history at Howard  
5 University School of Divinity. It's a privilege to  
6 be here speaking on behalf of my congregation.

7           You should know our church's congregation on  
8 polity. We don't receive money from a diocesis but we  
9 depend upon the generosity of our members. As well,  
10 decisions are made by our membership. The  
11 congregation decided in the affirmative to engage a  
12 process whereby we could secure both our past and our  
13 future by creating an endowment fund that will  
14 safeguard our church for the next and hopefully many  
15 decades. That vote, by the way, was 81 percent in  
16 favor.

17           So we came to this decision after several  
18 years of discussion and study, mindful that our aging  
19 facility and its maintenance threatened to overwhelm  
20 our budget and indeed our institutional existence.  
21 With those prefatory remarks I would like to speak  
22 briefly to our history, our communion, and our  
23 engagement with our community.

24           I would ask you to ponder the remarkable fact  
25 that an institution has remained vibrant and present

1 in Southwest Washington, D.C. for nearly 160 years.  
2 We've had an uninterrupted continuous history of  
3 worship in Southwest since its founding pastor,  
4 Reverend Chastain Meador, began the congregation in  
5 1957 as the Island Baptist Church. It changed its  
6 name after the Civil War to the Fifth Baptist Church,  
7 and then after urban renewal when its building was  
8 razed, it purchased the present corner, renaming  
9 itself, Riverside Baptist Church.

10 So we've been first responders through the  
11 Civil War, the Great War, World War II, Korea,  
12 Vietnam, Iraq, 9-11. We have been a voice for the  
13 perplexed, the marginal, the hungry. We've been an  
14 advocate for justice and peace. Through 16 decades  
15 of time, a sanctuary of timeless message of the  
16 gospel, and then the humanization of our society and  
17 world. We're committed to not merely preserving our  
18 past but acting now in the present for future  
19 generations who will take their place in the refuge  
20 of our sanctuary. That's something of our history.

21 Our communion, our religious heritage is  
22 Baptist, and particularly we are connected to the  
23 Baptist heritage of sole freedom, separation of  
24 church and state, and the dignity of every person's  
25 conscience. And because that's the case we're

1 ecumenical, which is to say we cooperate not only  
2 with other Christian denominations, but in an inter-  
3 faith context as well, and our effort to humanize or  
4 create a more humane society.

5           In that regard we have been outspokenly an  
6 advocate of racial justice. We have advocated for  
7 gender equality. We ordained women to the -- into  
8 ministry. We have been outspoken in our advocacy of  
9 marriage equality and the inclusion of those of  
10 minority sexual orientation. We are a religious  
11 organization with a vision of reconciliation and  
12 justice, working to better one another, so we in turn  
13 might improve and heal our world.

14           That religious vision is carried out in our  
15 engagement with the community, and indeed the world  
16 at large. I've already noted that we've been engaged  
17 in this community for nearly 160 years. We have fed  
18 the hungry through the Crop Walk, Martha's Table,  
19 SOME, and the meeting of individual needs of persons  
20 who come to our door for assistance, including our  
21 own congregants. We have responded to tsunami,  
22 earthquake, and pestilence by sending funds for  
23 relief efforts. We've opened our doors to support  
24 groups like AA, SIA, which is Survivors if Incest  
25 Anonymous, NA, and support groups for gay men and

1 women. From community concerts to poetry nights and  
2 black history celebrations, to youth mentoring and  
3 outreach, partnerships with Apple Tree Early Learning  
4 Preschool, pastoral counselors and residents, the  
5 Evangelical Environmental Network, Howard Divinity  
6 student field work, interfaith dialog with Temple  
7 Micah, our church has radiated hope, faith, and love  
8 through an unflagging service.

9 Our efforts with this partnership with P.N.  
10 Hoffman are aimed at securing our future, our voice,  
11 and our service for years to come. And we believe we  
12 are acting wisely by conserving our past and  
13 proactively by planning for the future.

14 Now John Wittman of Geier Brown Renfrow  
15 Architects will speak to our church design.

16 MR. WITTMAN: Good evening, Commissioners. I  
17 am John Wittman with Geier Brown Renfrow and  
18 architect for the church. And I'll start to talk to  
19 our design goals and how they informed our design.

20 And essentially, you know, the importance of  
21 maintaining a strong presence for the church on 7th  
22 and Maine, and that is to create a recognizable and  
23 articulated building form, one that is clearly read  
24 as a freestanding building with the apartments as a  
25 backdrop.

1           The other piece is to talk to an expression  
2 of faith, and really, the Riverside congregation.  
3 And one thing that's very important is going from  
4 what is now a very opaque building to one that is  
5 very transparent, one that is connected to the  
6 community, and one that talks to a welcoming church.

7           Another piece that is important expression of  
8 faith is the importance of water as a symbol in  
9 Baptist theology and how the idea of water movement  
10 was incorporated in our design. Of course the  
11 Southwest context and the strong modernist heritage  
12 of the neighborhood informs what is done, as well as  
13 the history of Riverside itself, and carrying forward  
14 pieces of the existing building and through the idea  
15 of materials, be it stone, wood, and stained glass  
16 that we're looking to incorporate into the new  
17 design.

18           Just quickly to kind of review the existing  
19 site and to kind of touch on the location of the  
20 church on the site, it was a very early decision that  
21 the church should be at the corner of 7th and Main.  
22 Ultimately to maximize its presents and visibility of  
23 the institutional abuse and to define the -- use it  
24 to define the gateway in the corner and have that as  
25 a main entrance. And really to kind of make the

1 church the overall piece of the Main Avenue  
2 streetscape.

3           Some very early concept sketches of what led  
4 to the design that we'll see tonight. And that  
5 really is in part to pull the church away from the  
6 apartment building and to create a zone in between  
7 them (due to equipment malfunction approximately 30  
8 seconds of audio could not be transcribed.)

9           Okay. So the battery went dead on that mic.  
10 But okay. So to maintain the functional connection  
11 and to both the parking and the neighborhood serving  
12 retail that is going to be in the apartment building,  
13 and also another piece which is very important and to  
14 really have the connection to the waterfront at the  
15 corner, and that is something both to define the  
16 corner on an urban level, but also how it plays in  
17 part of the church and basically how the church works  
18 on every Sunday, and the connection that we're trying  
19 to have with the view from that corner to the  
20 waterfront. Also having the green landscape edge  
21 along Main Avenue and also the -- we see here on the  
22 right is the second floor plan and that the worship  
23 space is what's lifted up and occupies the second  
24 floor and creates the formal expression.

25           So looking at the floorplans and the first

1 floor here, and this is where we have the connection  
2 that runs through. This is a shared vestibule that  
3 ties into the parking and the neighborhood retail.  
4 This is the vestibule and then having the multi-  
5 function space and offices on the main level. So it  
6 would be more activated during the week and on a  
7 regular basis. But also how the church works on a  
8 Sunday and really thinking about the idea of  
9 thresholds is something that pastor talks about a lot  
10 and how one moves from, you know, the outside and  
11 into the worship space, coming in through this side  
12 or this side, you come into central area, and then up  
13 this staircase, which is very open to below but also  
14 has this corner window that allows a view out to the  
15 waterfront, and then turning away from that view and  
16 making your way further up the stairs into the  
17 narthex past the baptistery, and then into the seats,  
18 and then orienting the congregation to the exterior.  
19 So the view would be one of filtered light behind the  
20 chancellor area through a metal screen.

21           So looking at the 3-D view of the church and  
22 just kind of getting a sense of the kind of the three  
23 key elements of the church, we have the iconic tower,  
24 we have a very prominent entry piece, and then we  
25 have the formal shape of the worship space that's

1 lifted up and defined with the, kind of the wave-like  
2 form to the roof, as well as the wave-like form to  
3 the perforated metal panels that form the screen  
4 behind the worship, chancellor area. Also have,  
5 carrying the elements forward, of the stone from the  
6 existing church that is reused to create this solid  
7 foundation of the building along 7th Avenue, 7th  
8 Street. And then those stone pieces then carry  
9 through to the landscape and it wraps around the  
10 corner with stone and the landscape as well.

11           Go to the next slide. And really this just  
12 kind of gives us a view of how that volume works and  
13 how that works on the streetscape along Main, again  
14 seeing the church as the object piece, the iconic  
15 piece that sits in front of the apartment building.  
16 This gives us maybe a bit of a better idea of how  
17 that stone wall works, and then how we're reusing  
18 stained glass from the existing church, and having it  
19 inserted in there as well to carry that forward to  
20 connect to the existing building that occupies the  
21 site.

22           These are the primary materials and we have  
23 samples of most of these. This is a -- these two are  
24 precast panels. This lighter colored one is used  
25 extensively on the church. It essentially matches

1 the apartment building and ties the two buildings  
2 together. This more textured panel is unique to the  
3 church and we'll see in the elevations whereas that  
4 used the idea of wood, which is a major component of  
5 the current church. Some painted metal. This would  
6 be for the curtain wall systems. This is a painted  
7 metal for the roof.

8           Along Main Avenue we've got a perforated  
9 metal screen and ribbons of that. This is a little  
10 bit different from the sample, what you see here on  
11 this screen is more accurate to the pattern we're  
12 going to be doing. It will be a custom pattern and  
13 done in such a way with different size perforations  
14 to both functionally for letting light in, but also  
15 to create maybe perhaps a sense of wave and motion.  
16 That's going to be mixed in with these Geolam slats,  
17 which are going to be the wood slats, which also form  
18 part of the screen along Main Avenue. And then the  
19 existing stone and the existing stain glass that are  
20 going be brought forward.

21           So the elevations for the building, you can  
22 see here this would all be the precast that matches  
23 the apartment building. We do have a band of the  
24 more textured precast that runs to kind of separate  
25 and lift up the worship space. We've got the

1 perforated metal screen that forms the backdrop. You  
2 can see how we've integrated some aspects of the  
3 stained glass that would be visible through the  
4 screen, the stone there, and then next, Hiroshi.

5           And then here we see the side of the building  
6 that would be facing, I guess that is the south  
7 elevation. And then essentially this is more of the  
8 textured panels that go across here to create more of  
9 a shadow effect and give some interest to that.  
10 We've got the volume of the church set back to allow  
11 some windows and light into that space, and this  
12 elevation back here is towards the apartment building  
13 and kind of indicates that gap between the two  
14 buildings, allows the church to be its own entity and  
15 have this little green space up on the upper level.

16           So that has quickly taken us through the  
17 church portion of the project, and I will turn it  
18 over now to Brian Pilot to talk about the apartment  
19 building.

20           MR. PILOT: Good evening, Commissioners. My  
21 name is Brian Pilot. I'm a Principal at Studios  
22 Architecture's office in Washington, D.C. There are  
23 four primary goals for the residential design.

24           The first and most important is that the  
25 church is the iconic element. It's the primary focus

1 for the overall development, and the residential  
2 building is meant to be intentionally deferential to  
3 the church, which occupies the corner of 7th and  
4 Maine.

5           We have a very important vista along 7th  
6 Street, looking south, which becomes a gateway to  
7 Main Avenue, and that's a very important  
8 consideration as we develop the massing. The team  
9 worked very closely with Public Space and DDOT to  
10 create a new gracious streetscape which we'll review  
11 in detail on the landscape plans. And it was very  
12 important that the architecture has a scale and  
13 contextual relationship to the neighborhood.

14           Go to the next slide. So this is a series of  
15 three diagrams that illustrates how we developed our  
16 massing approach for the residential building. The  
17 first diagram on the left shows the conventional  
18 approach that would place the mass along the curved  
19 property line along 7th and I, with the application  
20 of vertical elements to enhance that 7th Street  
21 vista.

22           What we felt, as a design team, was a much  
23 more powerful approach was what we're calling this  
24 geometric approach which breaks the massing into two  
25 distinct forms, intersecting at the access of 6th --

1 of 7th Street. This creates a strong geometric  
2 corner at 7th, and additional relief and green space  
3 at the streetscape which is shown in those green  
4 volumes at either side of the mass.

5 Then taking it one step further we've lowered  
6 the mass at I Street to help reduce shadows and view  
7 impacts for the neighboring development, but also to  
8 bring back that unique mix of scales that we see in  
9 the southwest neighborhood. We've also looked at  
10 bolder corner and edge conditions while still  
11 maintaining the church as the iconic element on Main  
12 Avenue.

13 As we explored the neighborhood context there  
14 were two primary ideas that we embraced as we  
15 developed the architecture. The first being the  
16 unique mix of scales that I mentioned before that  
17 happens from block to block. And the second is the  
18 strong use of a geometric modularity and screening  
19 elements within a unified façade articulation.

20 And simultaneously with developing the  
21 architecture we also developed a material pallet  
22 consistent with the neighborhood but also fresh and  
23 modern. In addition to a high quality glass the  
24 primary material is a light buff precast with varying  
25 texture. Samples which are both with us today. A

1 light gray contrasting precast is introduced in  
2 limited amounts at the ground and second floor in  
3 order to separate the upper floor geometry before it  
4 meets the ground and to deal with the various changes  
5 in elevation grade. And then finally a warm  
6 champagne bronze metal was introduced in the moyen  
7 color and the vertical inset balconies to create a  
8 warmer sense of modernism.

9           So this is a perspective looking at the north  
10 elevation, a view looking south down 7th Street,  
11 where the two masses have been fractured apart,  
12 creating a strong corner in the middle of the site  
13 and on axis with 7th Street. This is further  
14 enhanced by two story water walls that have been  
15 introduced at each side of the residential entry. A  
16 white buff precast concrete is the dominant solid  
17 material with the use of slightly acid edge panels  
18 and a much deeper textured panel working at a very  
19 interesting geometric pattern that you can see in the  
20 elevations.

21           An additional percentage of glazing is  
22 introduced in the upper two levels to lighten these  
23 levels from the primary massing and break up the  
24 overall massing of the building. The architecture of  
25 levels 3 and 7 unify the entire building so that the

1 articulation of the façade does not deter from the  
2 more powerful geometric form of the massing.  
3 However, the strong corners and vertical balconies  
4 gestures break up the massing at meaningful exposures  
5 and at the edges.

6           Next one. So this is the same north  
7 elevation in an architectural elevation where one can  
8 easily read those vertical insets of balconies that  
9 are placed periodic through then north façade, as  
10 well as at the edges, as well as that lighter effect  
11 of the increase fenestration at the upper levels.

12           Go to the next one. This is an image of the  
13 south elevation. There is a strong corner condition  
14 at Main Avenue, which is shown here, as well as an  
15 intentional gap left between the church and the  
16 residential building to give the church adequate  
17 breathing room from the larger mass of the  
18 residential building. In this elevation one can also  
19 view how the parking entry is discretely entered at  
20 the back of the site here down beneath the courtyard.

21           This next image shows the east elevation on  
22 the left and the west elevation on the right. These  
23 are both the narrow ends of the thin site. The east  
24 elevation drops in scale on I Street to minimize  
25 those view impact and shadows which you see here.

1           In the west elevation with its strong corners  
2 at either edge, but then it's intentional simplicity  
3 here is the backdrop and you see an image of the  
4 church, this is a cross-section through that gap  
5 between the two buildings. But once again, the  
6 church along Main being the main focus of this  
7 elevation.

8           And this slide illustrates the height  
9 adjacencies to the neighboring developments as well  
10 as its scale to the approved Wharf development. At  
11 the lower mass, closest to the I Street intersection  
12 the lower roof is at 68 feet, which is shown right  
13 here, and the steps up to the higher roof at 90 feet  
14 with the penthouse and addition. The Waterside  
15 Towers and the Town Square Towers that are directly  
16 adjacent either at 7th and I or at 7th Street are  
17 both 100 feet to their roofline, plus the additional  
18 penthouse, and then the approved Wharf development is  
19 at 130 feet, not including the penthouse.

20           This is a slide of our ground level plan.  
21 The peach color is the church space. The pink is the  
22 neighborhood serving retail. The blue is  
23 residential. And the yellow hatched area is  
24 potential expansion area that may be required for the  
25 neighborhood serving retail. But if that is not

1 utilized for that it would become residential.

2           The entry of the church, as John mentioned,  
3 is here at the Northwest corner, and the primary  
4 entry of the residential building is here, right at  
5 that 7th Street axis. The curb cut for service is  
6 located in the same general location as was mentioned  
7 before at the existing curb cut here. The parking  
8 entry, as I mentioned before, is discretely located  
9 to the south elevation, away from the public space  
10 and the sidewalk.

11           And the loading area is not directly on the  
12 sidewalk, and the adjacent open space allows for  
13 turning maneuvers for trash pickup and 30 foot trucks  
14 within private property requiring no back-in  
15 maneuvers in public space.

16           This is our typical floor level which is all  
17 residential at levels three through seven, with --  
18 you can see the inset balconies here at the corners  
19 and at various points in the north façade. At level  
20 8 the massing begins to set back to minimize view  
21 impacts and shadows on adjacent properties.

22           And the next slide. And then at the  
23 penthouse, the residential penthouse level 1, the  
24 massing steps back again at a one to one ratio,  
25 including any guardrails. And then final our

1 mechanical penthouse here, stepping back once again,  
2 which is just mechanical equipment and elevator  
3 overrun.

4           And this is a section of the two last several  
5 floors that I just spoke of. The one at the left is  
6 at level 8, where the massing steps back down at I  
7 Street and the one at the left is at the roof and the  
8 penthouse level. The section to the left will  
9 provide green roof planting and terrace space for  
10 residents and the diagram to the right shows how all  
11 elements at the roof and penthouse are set back at a  
12 one to one ratio, which will also contain green roof  
13 plantings and terrace space for residents.

14           This is a quick perspective of those  
15 elements.

16           This is our typical parking level plan. The  
17 current parking design illustrates 169 spaces of  
18 below grade parking. Five of these will be dedicated  
19 to the church, as well as 35 additional spaces on  
20 Sunday. In addition there are 64 internal long-term  
21 bicycle parking spaces included on the G1 level,  
22 which are at this location and here.

23           And as I mentioned before, the footprint of  
24 the building has created a unique opportunity for  
25 wonderful public landscape experiences along Main

1 Avenue and 7th and I Street, and we've worked closely  
2 with the Office of Planning and Public Space to  
3 curate this experience, including new benches, lush  
4 plantings, and additional trees. These areas include  
5 the zone in front of the church here, which is on  
6 DDOT owned land. This is the line of the property  
7 line here. This additional space in front of the  
8 residential building at this location, and then the  
9 additional space that's captured by capturing the  
10 slip lane.

11 We are also making extraordinary efforts to  
12 save four of the existing very large oak trees, and  
13 the sidewalk will now have the recommended eight foot  
14 clear path and this jogs into private property in  
15 certain areas where the existing trees in an effort  
16 to maintain their root health, we've stepped that  
17 back and then jogged the eight foot clear path onto  
18 private property.

19 Go to the next slide. This is a variety of  
20 precedent images that try to capture the spirit of  
21 the landscape. As noted before, we were saving four  
22 of the existing trees and we were filling in the gaps  
23 with oak species in accordance with UFA's Forestry  
24 Vision for the City. These oaks will grow up to join  
25 and eventually replace the large canopy feel in the

1 neighborhood.

2           Additional planting on site will be lush,  
3 creating a soft buffer from the street and building.  
4 We are using city standards for paving, lighting,  
5 bike racks, and trash cans. This will knit our site  
6 into the community's existing and future urban  
7 design. Stone materials will be used for the public  
8 garden in front of the church creating a welcoming  
9 and special seating area on Main Avenue. And special  
10 wood benches define a public plaza at the corner of  
11 7th and I Street.

12           One of the other important elements of our  
13 landscape design is the introduction of two water  
14 walls. And the goal for the water wall is to create  
15 a powerful effect with two stories of cascading water  
16 on a well-detailed beautiful material that is  
17 dramatically lit. The current material strategy  
18 calls for a sturdy architectural mesh material as  
19 illustrated on the images on the right with various  
20 precedent images below indicating the water flow and  
21 lighting potential. This metal mesh material has a  
22 quality and texture that is also compelling without  
23 the water flow when it may be shut off during winter  
24 months.

25           And finally, this street scape view really

1 captures and illustrates the dramatic change from the  
2 current experience which is dominated by cars with  
3 its narrow sidewalk condition and slip lane into a  
4 gracious pedestrian friendly zone with areas for  
5 seating, lush plantings, and the dramatic water wall  
6 experience.

7           So to further explain the traffic demands let  
8 me introduce Dan VanPelt.

9           MR. VANPELT: Good evening, Commissioners.  
10 For the record, I'm Dan VanPelt with Gorove Slade  
11 Associations. Gorove Slade performed the  
12 transportation study for the project and assisted the  
13 team with the design of the transportation related  
14 elements of the PUD.

15           As Bao and Brian have both conveyed in their  
16 testimony there has been significant interaction with  
17 DDOT as the plans have evolved to where they are  
18 today. This included meeting with DDOT early on in  
19 the process, even before the PUD had been submitted  
20 to discuss the site's access scheme, the proposed  
21 changes to the 7th and I Street intersection and the  
22 treatments in public space.

23           You know, a conversation with the agency  
24 continued through the design process and the  
25 coordination with DDOT resulted in the plans that you

1 have before you now. Our exploration did include  
2 looking at access from the other adjacent streets and  
3 trying to determine where was the most appropriate  
4 location for that access point and ultimately it  
5 culminated on the access point at I Street, generally  
6 in the same location where the curb cut is today.  
7 And that's really for multiple reasons.

8 DDOT's preference, and just from a  
9 transportation principle standpoint we always look at  
10 the lesser of the streets as kind of a place where we  
11 really want to have the access. I Street has the  
12 lowest volume of vehicular traffic and really in the  
13 functional classifications of the streets, adjacent  
14 streets, I Street is really the -- is that street.

15 And then looking at both the other adjacent  
16 streets, both Main and 7th Street have medians in the  
17 middle of them, making left turns and turns in and  
18 out a little bit more difficult. And I think one of  
19 the last things in our conversation with DDOT is just  
20 preserving the future for a potential streetcar  
21 through the area. It's more likely that that would  
22 be on 7th and Main, and so trying to minimize  
23 driveway conflicts with streetcars. It's certainly  
24 something that was on DDOT's mind as we reviewed  
25 access scheme with them.

1           And so a conceptual approval from the Public  
2 Space Committee was also received in October, as Bao  
3 said earlier, endorsing the curb cut location as  
4 proposed, and then the other public space  
5 improvements for the intersection and public -- and  
6 the public realm.

7           A comprehensive transportation review was  
8 scoped with DDOT and performed. The CTR concluded  
9 that the project will not have a detrimental impact  
10 to the surrounding transportation network provided  
11 that all the site design elements and transportation  
12 demand management TDM measures are implemented.

13           The study also conclude that the proposed  
14 changes in 7th and I Street section would have a  
15 positive impact for all the reasons that Bao outlined  
16 in detail earlier. From an operation standpoint the  
17 removal of the right turn lane improves the way for  
18 vehicles because there's an exclusive pedestrian  
19 phase that is no longer required in the signal timing  
20 plan with this geometric redesign.

21           Next slide. So in order to encourage the  
22 alternate modes of transportation a robust TDM plan,  
23 transportation management plan, is part of the PUD.  
24 The key elements are listed here. I'm not going to  
25 go into all of them but will point out that it does

1 include incentives for all new residents for  
2 BikeShare and CarShare to help encourage those modes.

3 DDOT did request the addition of two  
4 additional items to the transportation management  
5 plan that weren't already included in our package, a  
6 bike maintenance facility has been added and at least  
7 one electric vehicle charging station will be  
8 incorporated. We're agreeing to all of DDOT's  
9 conditions and we're pleased to have the agency's  
10 support and their active participation.

11 So with that, appreciate you listening to my  
12 testimony. I'd be happy to answer any questions but  
13 for now I'll turn it over to Dave Avitabile.

14 MR. AVITABILE: Thank you, Dan. The record  
15 contains detailed supports from the Office of  
16 Planning and the District Department of  
17 Transportation in support of the application, and we  
18 appreciate their support. And we are also pleased to  
19 have the support of ANC 6D, which is also in the  
20 record.

21 To conclude I wanted to reiterate the  
22 consistency of this project with the PUD standards,  
23 and to some degree I'm anticipating, I think, some of  
24 the commentary that you're going to hear from some of  
25 the other people here tonight. The PUD is not

1 inconsistent with the use, height, and density  
2 detailed on the Comprehensive Plan as it's been  
3 amended by the Southwest Small Area Plan. I know our  
4 prehearing submission included some -- an initial  
5 explanation of how the PUD Is not inconsistent with  
6 the Comprehensive Plan and how small area plans work  
7 in concert with the Comprehensive Plan. But I wanted  
8 to go into a little more detail.

9           The amended plan calls for this site to be a  
10 mixed use, medium density residential, and low  
11 density commercial land use site. As explained in  
12 the framework element of the plan this means a medium  
13 density development with a preference for residential  
14 use as the dominant use, since that's expressed as  
15 the medium density use, and then the commercial use  
16 should be deferential. That's why that's expressed  
17 as low density.

18           The project is largely residential with  
19 limited additional church and ground floor  
20 nonresidential uses. So we're consistent with this  
21 designation of mixed use, medium density residential,  
22 and low density commercial. In order to accommodate  
23 the commercial use, also called for in that plan, we  
24 have to seek a rezoning to a commercial zone. That's  
25 why we've sought the C-3-A zone district. And the C-

1 3-A zone district is listed in the framework element  
2 as a medium density commercial zone district. So  
3 again, we are consistent with the call for a medium  
4 density zone designation category for the site.

5 Both the medium density residential and  
6 commercial land use categories as described in the  
7 Comprehensive Plan call for typical heights of seven  
8 to eight stories. However, the plan also explicitly  
9 states that PUDs may result in greater heights than  
10 that typical range. And the varying heights of this  
11 project from two to seven stories, to nine stories,  
12 is consistent with the plan's guidance when taken as  
13 a whole. We're going through the PUD process and  
14 that permits greater heights than the seven to eight  
15 story range that's typically cited. And again, at  
16 nine stories we're only talking about one story  
17 higher than what the Comprehensive Plan defines as  
18 typical.

19 The density of four and a half FAR is also  
20 consistent with that medium density designation. And  
21 finally, the project has a lot occupancy of 73  
22 percent, which is consistent not only with the medium  
23 density designation, but all of the zone -- many of  
24 the zone categories that are listed as medium density  
25 permit a lot occupancy of 75 percent. And we're also

1 consistent with the lot occupancy for the C-3-A zone  
2 district, which is 75 percent.

3           The project will deliver significant benefits  
4 and amenities that have been discussed tonight, and  
5 they include affordable housing, including a  
6 significant component at deeper than 80 percent AMI  
7 that will be provided at 50 percent AMI. It includes  
8 LEED Gold design for the residential component of the  
9 project. It includes the redesign of the  
10 intersection, as well as other streetscape  
11 improvements that go beyond the typical, replace the  
12 existing sidewalk, we're increasing the width of the  
13 sidewalk, we're totally reconfiguring an  
14 intersection. We're creating additional public space  
15 along Main Avenue. And finally of course, the  
16 retention and the support of the Riverside Baptist  
17 Church and all that it does for this community and  
18 the District as a whole.

19           The project will not have unacceptable  
20 impacts on surrounding property. OP, DDOT, and the  
21 Public Space Committee have all approved the location  
22 of the curb cut for parking and vehicular access for  
23 the reasons that Mr. VanPelt just went through. And  
24 the Public Space Committee and OP and DDOT have also  
25 supported the other positive changes that will come

1 from this project to the surrounding infrastructure,  
2 through the intersection and streetscape  
3 reconfiguration.

4           Of particular note, one of the things that's  
5 described in the package is the public space plan,  
6 what we're doing allows us to retain a number of the  
7 existing mature trees around the site. Not only  
8 because we're just retaining them, but by widening  
9 the sidewalk we're able to widen the tree boxes will  
10 help ensure the continued viability of those trees  
11 going forward.

12           And then finally, because I think it's in our  
13 written submission but I wanted to note it, through  
14 Hoffman's discussions with Townhouse Management 1, we  
15 have offered to provide a parking control arm,  
16 lighting, and new fencing or landscaping to mitigate  
17 the potential impacts on their parking lot and open  
18 spaces.

19           As is permitted under the PUD regulations we  
20 have requested zoning flexibility to accommodate the  
21 design of the project. As was detailed in our  
22 application we're seeking flexibility first for a  
23 minor FAR increase of .07 FAR to go from a 4.5 to a  
24 4.57, and this is really to accommodate setting back  
25 the ground floor of the building to widen the public

1 experience at that ground floor. As we explained,  
2 setting that area back effectively creates, you know,  
3 2,000 square feet or so of gross floor area that we  
4 have to count towards our FAR but it's not really  
5 usable for us because it's not enclosed. And that  
6 corresponds the .07 increase that we've asked for.

7           We've also asked for flexibility from the  
8 rear yard requirements. And as we explain in the  
9 written submission, the site effectively fronts on  
10 three streets but for that 20 foot strip of property  
11 that is owned and controlled by DDOT. So normally we  
12 would be able to measure our rear yard to the center  
13 line of the street at the rear of the project. But  
14 we technically can't because of that 20 foot strip.  
15 So that's why we think the flexibility is appropriate  
16 here.

17           We've asked for flexibility from the court  
18 width requirements. We do have two irregularly  
19 shaped courts, one at the rear of the project and one  
20 in between the church component and the residential  
21 component. These courts generally comply with the  
22 width requirements as irregular courts using the  
23 circle test that's described in the definitions of  
24 the Zoning Regulations. But because they neck down  
25 to accommodate the design of the project to widths

1 that are slightly narrower than the Zoning  
2 Regulations require, we've requested relief out of an  
3 abundance of caution.

4           We've asked for flexibility from the parking  
5 regulations. And I know we detailed it here but just  
6 to make sure everyone understands what we've asked  
7 for, first we've asked for a slightly larger  
8 proportion of compact parking spaces. The  
9 regulations permit 40 percent. We'd like 44 percent  
10 compact parking spaces, and we'd also like to be able  
11 to group them in groupings of less than five  
12 contiguous spaces. We just feel that that's  
13 appropriate for the design and the uses of the  
14 project. And we've also asked for flexibility for  
15 the dimensions of the ADA parking spaces that we're  
16 providing, the handicapped accessible parking spaces.  
17 They comply with the ADA requirements for an eight  
18 foot parking space width, so they meet the ADA  
19 requirements, but eight foot width doesn't meet the  
20 normal nine foot zoning requirement, width zoning  
21 requirement. So we're only talking about those ADA  
22 spaces.

23           And then finally we've asked for flexibility  
24 from the loading requirements, from the requirement  
25 to provide a 55-foot-deep loading berth. I think

1 there have been quite a few PUDs requesting that  
2 flexibility. Many variances over the last few years  
3 that you all have heard and the Commission itself, as  
4 you all know, has actually taken proposed action to  
5 approve the elimination of the 55 foot deep loading  
6 berth requirement as a part of the Zoning Regulations  
7 rewrite. So I don't think we're -- I think we're  
8 following the trend, not setting a trend here.

9           And finally, as we have shown you this  
10 evening, we're proposing a penthouse that complies  
11 with the use and the dimensional requirements of the  
12 new penthouse regulations that have just been  
13 approved by the Zoning Commission. We presented this  
14 design to you tonight in the interest of efficiency,  
15 even though the new regulations have not been  
16 published yet. We think given the record of that  
17 case it's very clear what those regulations require  
18 and we've been able to understand and design our  
19 project accordingly.

20           We do understand that the Commission cannot  
21 take final action on this PUD until those regulations  
22 have taken effect, and we think that the timing works  
23 out given where we understand those regulations to be  
24 and potentially being published in the next few  
25 weeks. But we thought it was appropriate to take

1 advantage of the opportunity to present and discuss  
2 our penthouse design with you at the hearing tonight,  
3 rather than in a subsequent proceeding.

4           So in conclusion, taken as a whole, the  
5 proposed project including the above areas of zoning  
6 flexibility, is fully justified given the lack of  
7 adverse impacts and the amenities and benefits that  
8 have been proffered. The project is not inconsistent  
9 with the Comprehensive Plan as amended by the  
10 Southwest Small Area Plan. The project meets all of  
11 the requirements for approval under the Zoning  
12 Regulations and it's supported by OP, DDOT, and ANC  
13 6D. The proposed new development will provide new  
14 housing and affordable housing, a significantly  
15 improved public streetscape environment, community  
16 serving ground floor retail use, exemplary and  
17 sustainable design, and a new home for the Riverside  
18 Baptist Church congregation in its long-time  
19 Southwest neighborhood home.

20           We thank you for your time and we welcome  
21 your questions.

22           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I want to thank you  
23 for the presentation to us. Two quick things. Ms.  
24 Schellin, does the Office of Planning have -- I was  
25 looking here from the party, Townhouse Management 1,

1 Inc. I'm looking here at some of their questions  
2 that they were having, some of the concerns. Some of  
3 them directly go to the Office of Planning and DDOT.  
4 So could you share that front page with them on the  
5 submission, or maybe they may already have it?

6 MS. SCHELLIN: We'll get it.

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. If we can get that,  
8 that may save us some time. So that will help  
9 expedite some of the questions that they may have.  
10 And, Mr. Avitabile, did you all meet -- and I think  
11 you mentioned this in your comments, or somebody  
12 mentioned this. Did you all meet with Townhouse  
13 Management 1?

14 MR. AVITABILE: Yeah, I'll ask Bao to speak  
15 to that.

16 MR VUONG: Yes. We've had some, you know,  
17 over five meetings with them, meeting with both their  
18 president, meeting them onsite to walk their property  
19 multiple times, have done presentations to their  
20 association. And I know that they had some certain  
21 issues, larger issues, that they had with our site.  
22 In particular the orientation of where the church is  
23 located versus the residential building. And in  
24 particular our curb cut. And those were two areas  
25 after working with DDOT and working through with

1 Office of Planning and the church, thought  
2 appropriate to leave as is.

3 We were able to work closely with them on  
4 mitigation factors for other areas that they were  
5 concerned about. Specifically with respect to  
6 potential residents parking in their parking lot,  
7 which they have issues today. In addition they were  
8 also worried about pedestrians, I think working  
9 through what is currently private open space area and  
10 people potentially walking their dogs into their open  
11 area in the back. And so that's part of the  
12 mitigation factors that we have with the parking  
13 control arm and the fencing along I Street.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: What do we do to remedy  
15 it? I think it was 22 spaces. What did we do to  
16 remedy that? What did we do? How did you resolve  
17 that with them about the spaces that were being used  
18 and you said that exists today? What did you do?

19 MR VUONG: What we have offered to do is add  
20 in a parking control arm to help mitigate outside  
21 users from coming into their parking lot. I  
22 understand that UDR, who owns the apartment building  
23 adjacent to Townhouse Management 1 also has parkers  
24 back there. So as you can see in our PUD application  
25 that we're requiring both the approval of UDR and

1 Townhome Management One before we'll install that  
2 because both are users of that parking lot.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Typically I just  
4 ask those few questions to give my colleagues a  
5 chance to figure out who is going to go first. I  
6 typically don't go first. So I have plenty of more  
7 questions after that, so I wanted to get that. So  
8 I'm sure we've made up our mind who's going to go  
9 first. Or we may not have any questions.

10 MR. AVITABILE: We're comprehensive but not  
11 that comprehensive. Oh, okay. Okay. Who would like  
12 to start us off? Commissioner May?

13 MR. MAY: Okay. So given that you're  
14 proposing the occupied penthouse scheme at this  
15 point, and a little hard for me to tell, but is there  
16 -- I mean, can you tell me what the -- how much  
17 actual additional affordable housing came about as a  
18 result of having that -- the occupied space on the  
19 roof?

20 MR. AVITABILE: Sure. So the penthouse has  
21 approximately -- and I don't have the exact number,  
22 but it's about 3,000 square feet of space that's  
23 devoted to residential units. And so that means that  
24 eight percent of that space, which is about 256  
25 square feet, would be then set aside for affordable

1 housing at 50 percent AMI. So what we did is we took  
2 that number and added it in to the number that we  
3 were already proposing to set aside at 50 percent  
4 AMI.

5 MR. MAY: Two hundred and forty-six. Yeah, I  
6 remember seeing that number and I was like -- seemed  
7 like an odd number. But anyway, so but that's  
8 essentially made one of the units larger in essence,  
9 or two of the units larger or something like that?  
10 Is that what the net effect was?

11 MR. AVITABILE: I'm not sure exactly how it  
12 worked out. I don't know if you can speak to that  
13 but essentially that's what it would be.

14 MR. MAY: Okay. I know that right now you're  
15 proposing the 20 foot penthouse, but the earlier  
16 submissions showed a 15 foot penthouse, right? And  
17 that included the elevator overrun? Yes?

18 MR. PILOT: That's correct.

19 MR. MAY: And did you have any difficulty  
20 trying to find an elevator that would work in a 100  
21 foot building with a 15 foot penthouse? With 15 feet  
22 for the elevator overrun and access to the roof?

23 I know this is not what you're proposing but  
24 this goes to a different issue.

25 MR. PILOT: I think the goal would be to have

1 the least amount of mechanical penthouse, I think is  
2 where your question is going. But I think it's --

3 MR. MAY: Just, yeah, I'm just looking for an  
4 answer directly to my question. Did you have  
5 difficulty finding an elevator that would work with a  
6 15 foot --

7 MR. PILOT: With a five foot overrun, yes.

8 MR. MAY: Yeah. You had difficulty?

9 MR. PILOT: Correct.

10 MR. MAY: So it was not going to work at 15  
11 feet? I'm sorry. I'm asking you if you had a  
12 problem. Previous design showed only a 15 foot  
13 townhouse. I mean 15 foot penthouse. That was not a  
14 problem.

15 MR. PILOT: I believe that that was prior to  
16 having the penthouse level of residential.

17 MR. MAY: Yes, I know that. All right. I'm  
18 not making myself clear, I don't think. So I mean,  
19 the original -- the design where you had a 15 foot  
20 penthouse, you found a way to make that work with an  
21 elevator that gave you access to the roof and only  
22 essentially like a five foot overrun, correct?

23 MR. PILOT: I don't know if at that point we  
24 had studied the technical aspects to that level of  
25 detail.

1           MR. MAY: Because I'm just curious because we  
2 had a big debate about whether you needed to have 15  
3 feet or whether you needed to have 16-6 as a minimum  
4 penthouse height, and this is the second project that  
5 I've seen that showed a fairly tall building with a  
6 15 foot penthouse and nobody seemed to breaking a  
7 sweat over having, you know -- finding the elevator  
8 technology that worked there.

9           I know that's not relevant here because  
10 that's not what you're asking for. It just goes to  
11 this other case and what we're likely to see in the  
12 future. So anyway, I appreciate your bearing with me  
13 on those confusing questions.

14           I want to talk just a little bit about the  
15 reconfigured intersection. So maybe you want to  
16 bring up a graphic of that. Okay. Wow, that's  
17 really washed out, but all right. So it's not really  
18 clear in seeing it up there on the screen, it was  
19 clear on my screen here, or maybe in the dark. But  
20 what seems to be missing in the reconfiguration, you  
21 know, the narrowing of the lane and getting the  
22 parking, losing that weird little island, putting in  
23 the crosswalks and everything else, is the  
24 accommodation of bicycles as they travel through the  
25 intersection. Did you give that some consideration?

1           MR. AVITABILE: Yeah. We had extensive  
2 discussions with DDOT about that leading up to the  
3 Public Space Committee hearing.

4           MR. MAY: Yeah.

5           MR. AVITABILE: And the issue -- Dan, I don't  
6 know if you want to speak to that. You should speak  
7 to that point.

8           MR. VANPELT: Yeah, that was one  
9 consideration, was how do we accommodate bikes  
10 through here, bicyclists through here, because there  
11 were certainly other bike lanes on I Street.

12           We were I think in some ways a bit challenged  
13 with how we wanted to make that -- did we want to put  
14 a bike lane on 7th Street. That was one of the  
15 things that we had talked about. This project is not  
16 going to move the median of the -- the median along  
17 the street. And so the really width -- the changes  
18 that we're talking about there, we would have had to  
19 choose a parking lane and increase the public realm  
20 and/or, you know, essentially choose to put the bike  
21 lane in. so it was ultimately decided --

22           MR. MAY: You could have a bike lane and more  
23 sidewalk, right? Instead of adding car parking?

24           MR. VANPELT: That was one possibility. That  
25 was something we had talked about at one point, but I

1 think that we felt that from overall objectives and  
2 trying to improve the public realm, try to provide  
3 parking for potential retail for the site, that it  
4 seemed like providing the parking was the thing that  
5 made the most sense. So we did have that  
6 conversation with DDOT.

7 MR. MAY: Okay.

8 MR. SEAMAN: If I can just add one thing? I  
9 apologize. Shawn Seaman with P.N. Hoffman. It's a  
10 relatively short stretch of 7th Street that would  
11 have share rows in lieu of a dedicated bike lane.  
12 You have a dedicated bike lane on I Street, and then  
13 you have a 10 foot cycle track in front of the Wharf.  
14 So transporting from the cycle track on the Wharf you  
15 would share the right-hand travel lane, make the  
16 right-hand turn at the 7th and I intersection, then  
17 you'd be back on a dedicated bicycle lane. So it is  
18 something that we looked at in some detail. We were  
19 concerned that a dedicated bike facility would create  
20 the same interruption of pedestrians crossing I  
21 Street that exists with the cars in the slip lane if  
22 we dedicated right-turn bike lane. So it was  
23 something that we didn't take lightly, the bicycle  
24 connection from I to the Wharf cycle track.

25 MR. MAY: Okay. Well, I'll now share with

1 you that this is my route to work every morning, and  
2 so I'm very, very familiar with that transition. And  
3 I mean, I don't actually -- I won't make the  
4 transition go all the way across Main Avenue to the  
5 bike lane, I don't think, whenever that's built  
6 because I'm eventually making my way to Banneker and  
7 going up and over rather than trying to connect  
8 through on Main Ave. But it just seemed to me that  
9 you have an opportunity, at least for the cyclists  
10 who are coming off the cycle track on Main Avenue  
11 along the Wharf, to make the transition to I Street a  
12 little bit more smoothly rather than sort of pinching  
13 down the way you do. I mean, it's -- maybe it's just  
14 a matter of allowing that right-hand lane to be a  
15 little bit wider or something like that. It just  
16 feels like it is quite pinched. So I think you  
17 should look at that carefully.

18 Now, I don't usually make that transition  
19 myself, but you know, since I travel I Street every  
20 day I see cyclists going both ways on I Street and  
21 it's a fairly popular route and it's going to become  
22 a lot more popular once the cycle track is in and you  
23 don't have to go through, you know, hell to get  
24 around your construction, frankly. Or even the  
25 difficulty of getting through the intersections, you

1 know, further down. I mean, all that is going to  
2 become easier travel through there on bicycles, it's  
3 going to come easier with your project at the Wharf,  
4 and I just think you ought to be careful not to  
5 create another, you know, difficult transition there.

6 I agree, it's a relatively short run. I  
7 mean, of course I'm doing it at 7:00 in the morning  
8 so I'm not seeing the heaviest bicycle traffic. I  
9 mean, the biggest problem I have is, you know,  
10 construction vehicles at the moment.

11 So I have just, I have a question about this  
12 DDOT property that's along the right of way but it's  
13 not the right of way. I mean, what is that? Why  
14 isn't that just right of way?

15 MR. AVITABILE: What we've gathered from the  
16 research is it was created as a part of urban renewal  
17 when all of the various streets were reconfigured and  
18 the lots were recreated. And so when Main Avenue was  
19 located where it currently is, it left over this 20  
20 foot remainder that just runs between 7th Street  
21 downtown to M Street and 6th Street, and the way it's  
22 been treated -- it's owned by the District. It's  
23 been treated as if it's part of public space.

24 When Arena Stage was built the parts of Arena  
25 Stage that projected into that area were treated as

1 if they were building projections, and so we're just  
2 proposing to do the same thing and that's where OP  
3 and DDOT are as well. So essentially what we have is  
4 the limited amount of sidewalk area that's part of  
5 Main Avenue, and then another 20 foot strip that  
6 we're using and treating as public space as well,  
7 essentially as a large public parking area in front  
8 of the church.

9 MR. MAY: Okay. I'm sure there's some sort  
10 of tale behind the ownership there, but I assume that  
11 probably what it is, relates back to the federal  
12 ownership of most of the streets in the old city.  
13 Anyway, and so this is just extra space that was  
14 created and rather than you know --

15 MR. AVITABILE: That's right.

16 MR. MAY: -- seat it to the federal  
17 government it just became part of the District's  
18 property.

19 MR. AVITABILE: It's convoluted but that's  
20 the best we can figure and --

21 MR. MAY: Yeah.

22 MR. AVITABILE: -- that seems to be how the  
23 District is now treating it.

24 MR. MAY: Yeah. Okay. And I don't have a  
25 lot of questions about the design of the building. I

1 don't have any great concerns about it. I don't  
2 think you're -- you know, the notion of trying to  
3 show the taller mass of the building as being just  
4 somewhat distinct from the main mass of the building,  
5 I don't think it's very effective. I just think that  
6 the colors are so similar that it all just becomes a  
7 blur. It just kind of all looks the same, but I  
8 don't think that's necessarily a problem either. You  
9 know, I think it would be much more jarring if you  
10 did a more typical solution that you might see, you  
11 know, in other parts of the city or out in the  
12 suburbs where you have, you know, the concrete frame  
13 mass being intersected with the glass box or  
14 something like that. I don't think you want to go  
15 that route and it just seems out of place with the  
16 rest of the architecture of Southwest. So I think  
17 that's, you know -- like I said, I don't think you're  
18 doing what you want to do but I don't think it's a  
19 real problem either.

20           You know, my only suggestion is that the --  
21 and it's kind of hard to tell from the samples that I  
22 have and from the, you know, what you've shown in  
23 your renderings, but I'm a big fan of darker  
24 penthouses. And here, where we're talking about the,  
25 you know, the tallest penthouse that we've permitted

1 in history, basically, you just happen to be the  
2 first.

3           It's, I think it's even more important for it  
4 to be that darker color, and I would treat both the  
5 first level of it and the second level of it the same  
6 so that it still both reads as penthouse. But I  
7 would just look at darker colors there if you -- and  
8 maybe you decide it's not worth doing, but I think  
9 it's worth a look.

10           So we have a small sample of metal that's  
11 going to be used as the balcony guardrails in the  
12 main building, right? And that's going to be a perf  
13 metal. But we don't actually have a sample of that  
14 perf metal, or we just have a picture of what the  
15 pattern might look like? Or is that definitely the  
16 pattern?

17           MR. PILOT: That precedent image captures the  
18 spirit of what we're trying to achieve, and that  
19 material finish is just the top coat material. Yes.

20           MR. MAY: Okay. I mean, how is it supported?  
21 I mean, it looks like it's just a scrim of that  
22 material. Is it backed by something to make it  
23 rigid, or is it going to be banded at the top or  
24 bottom, or is it -- you know, I'm just trying to  
25 understand what we're going to see.

1           MR. PILOT: Yeah. The idea is that any of  
2 the vertical supports providing the lateral support  
3 would be hidden from the outside that you're really -  
4 - the perforated metal is the primary expression that  
5 you see. And once again, that finish sample is just  
6 the top finish. We would be looking at a gauge that  
7 can withstand impact, except --

8           MR. MAY: This is not going to give a lot of  
9 support.

10          MR. PILOT: Correct. And any of the  
11 mechanical fasteners would be from the inside to try  
12 to minimize any other expressions to that balcony.  
13 So we're really just capturing that sort of every  
14 even perforated metal on the outside.

15          MR. MAY: Okay. All right. Yeah, because  
16 it's -- I mean, it is a little bit hard to tell. The  
17 concept behind it certainly makes sense, but it is one  
18 of those areas where the execution is really where it  
19 will succeed or fail and I'd hate to sort of see  
20 something up there where you're trying to have this  
21 kind of lacey scrim of a balcony guardrail and then  
22 it's sort of betrayed by, you know, the structure  
23 behind it telegraphing through, either because it's,  
24 you know, you can see through the perf metal to see  
25 it, or it's, you know, it's got structure that makes

1 it heavier that's at the top or the bottom or  
2 something like that. So that would just -- since we  
3 don't see it in great detail, and I don't imagine  
4 you're going to have it developed to the point where  
5 we would see it in great detail. So we'll just have  
6 to trust that you're going to do it right.

7 I think if you do have thoughts on what the  
8 pattern might really be I'd be interested in seeing  
9 it. But if you're not at that point I don't want to  
10 rush that; wouldn't want to rush that decision.

11 I have just a couple of questions about the  
12 church design. And one is that the -- I was really  
13 interested in this Geolam slats. Where is this being  
14 used, actually? I was trying to figure that out in  
15 the drawing and I was having trouble finding it.

16 MR. WITTMAN: It's going to be used across  
17 the Main Avenue elevation. It's basically interwoven  
18 with the perf metal so they're going to be horizontal  
19 elements projecting out from the curtain wall there.

20 MR. MAY: Right. And so I mean, is this  
21 actually -- this is wood bonded the aluminum behind  
22 it?

23 MR. WITTMAN: It's a wood product. It's a  
24 synthetic product.

25 MR. MAY: Oh, okay. Because I mean, it's a

1 remarkably thin wood product bonded to the metal. Do  
2 you know anything about the durability of it? I  
3 mean, you're sure that it's not going to start  
4 breaking down?

5 MR. WITTMAN: It's a new product for us as  
6 well, so we can certainly explore that.

7 MR. MAY: Yeah. I think you want to make  
8 sure it's going to stand the test of time. I mean,  
9 it looks fascinating and I think it, you know, it  
10 could be a great thing but it's certain different.

11 And then the only thing I had -- and do we  
12 have a rendering of the front of the church, the sort  
13 of tower piece? Do you have that? I know it was in  
14 -- there we go.

15 So do I understand correctly that the tower  
16 itself is a mass that's covered in essentially a  
17 precast and it's sort of, you know, the width of it  
18 at the base is, I don't know, eight feet or something  
19 like that. And then when you get up above the glass  
20 it spans out over the glass and it's more like 16  
21 feet wide, something like that?

22 MR. WITTMAN: Yeah. The continuity of the  
23 volume, yes. I mean, on the lower level there's a  
24 glass portion and a precast portion. It's something  
25 that, you know, we want to accentuate the

1 transparency and the connection from that corner  
2 stair going up the stairs to the exterior. So that's  
3 what led to that design.

4 MR. MAY: Okay. Mostly I want to understand  
5 what you're doing there. I mean, I do find it rather  
6 strange that you have a fairly large precast mass  
7 that's sitting on glass. You know, when you get  
8 above that, I mean, maybe it's just my architectural  
9 training where, you know, you don't want to visually  
10 see this sense of something that's stone kind of  
11 resting on something that's glass without support.  
12 And it just -- there are ways that you can do it that  
13 it doesn't give you that queasiness. But it does  
14 make me a little uneasy. But again it's, I mean,  
15 it's a minor point.

16 MR. WITTMAN: Yeah. I mean, to a certain  
17 extent we are trying to incorporate into the idea the  
18 cantilever over the entryway so that, you know, that  
19 whole connection between the interior and the  
20 exterior is intended to be articulated through that  
21 as well.

22 MR. MAY: Yeah. Well, and it might be worth  
23 taking another look to make sure that that's really  
24 what's coming across and that it's not just -- I  
25 mean, you know, what it feels like to me is that

1 you've taken this very solid mass that is the tower  
2 and carved out a portion of it and stuck glass in  
3 there instead. And it just, it's not exactly  
4 clicking.

5 One last question is, on the perf metal that  
6 you are proposing to use, which I think we have a  
7 sample that's actually perforated, right? That was  
8 your sample?

9 MR. WITTMAN: Yeah. I mean, the sample we  
10 have is perforated. It does show the finish and the  
11 idea of having different size perforations. The  
12 image is better on the -- kind of better conveys the  
13 design strategy in the sense that as we get perhaps  
14 more order to the perforations so that we can create  
15 a kind of a layer of a pattern and sort of a wave  
16 like motion with that as well.

17 MR. MAY: Right. So it's more like this  
18 image than --

19 MR. WITTMAN: That's the design intent, but  
20 being as that's a custom piece we really couldn't get  
21 a sample of it.

22 MR. MAY: Okay. Well, that's reassuring  
23 because this is another one of those things that was  
24 kind of making me uneasy.

25 MR. WITTMAN: Understood.

1           MR. MAY: Yeah. All right. Thank you.  
2 That's it for me.

3           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Vice Chair Cohen.

4           MS. COHEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and I am  
5 actually a convert to the darker color for the  
6 penthouse. I wasn't until I met Commissioner May and  
7 he forced me to look up and look at penthouses. So I  
8 just want to echo what he's just said.

9           Reverend Bledsoe. It is Reverend, right?  
10 Bledsoe?

11          MR. BLEDSOE: Reverend with a PhD.

12          MS. COHEN: Is that okay? Doctor? Doctor  
13 is --

14          MR. BLEDSOE: Go by Pastor, that's fine.

15          MS. COHEN: Okay, sir. I know that your  
16 congregation is not too far from Greenleaf Public  
17 Housing. Is that correct?

18          MR. BLEDSOE: Right.

19          MS. COHEN: And I presume some of your  
20 parishioners live there?

21          MR. BLEDSOE: Well, you know, this ebb and  
22 flow in terms of demographics, and I would say from  
23 across Southwest, the entire Southwest, we draw  
24 occasionally parishioners from all those quadrants.  
25 But right now I don't know that I have someone who is

1 living at Greenleaf.

2 MS. COHEN: All right. Because I was going  
3 to first of all -- and I do commend your congregation  
4 for their mission and their social conscience. But I  
5 was going to remind you that based on any mass that  
6 one does, most of those families will not be able to  
7 afford to live in this property and I didn't know if  
8 that was a great concern to you. I would think it  
9 might be, but I'm not making any assumptions.

10 But what I do want to state is that I think  
11 this project is asking for quite a bit of  
12 flexibility, and I think you're just meeting -- even  
13 though you're going one unit at 50 percent, that's  
14 not required, unless I misunderstood, you know,  
15 reading your application, you're just really not  
16 meeting the needs of the community and I really think  
17 you need to take a look at the possibility of adding  
18 or even going deeper in subsidies, because again you  
19 are asking for quite a bit of flexibility.

20 MR. AVITABILE: Just to clarify, what we're  
21 proposing is -- we actually have five units at 50  
22 percent AMI.

23 MS. COHEN: Then --

24 MR. AVITABILE: If you go to the table, it's  
25 on page 5 of our November 10th prehearing submission.

1 I'll kind of run through the affordable housing half.

2 MS. COHEN: Do, please.

3 MR. AVITABILE: Okay.

4 MS. COHEN: Why don't you do that?

5 MR. AVITABILE: How we got it. So --

6 MS. COHEN: Because I don't have the pre --  
7 well, let me go -- 26? Okay. We have it. Okay.

8 MR. AVITABILE: Okay. So ordinarily we'd  
9 have to set aside eight percent of the project --

10 MS. COHEN: Correct.

11 MR. AVITABILE: -- at 80 percent AMI. And  
12 what we're proposing to do is take 25 percent of that  
13 set-aside and set it aside at 50 percent AMI instead  
14 of 80 percent AMI, because that ends up at about  
15 2,879 square feet that we're going to set aside at 50  
16 percent instead of 80 percent AMI. And then in  
17 addition to that we're going to take the 246 square  
18 feet resulting from the penthouse and add that in as  
19 well. So what you end up with is about 3,125 square  
20 feet of the project that will be set aside for 50  
21 percent AMI, so that's about five units.

22 MS. COHEN: And those are studios and one bed  
23 -- I still think you should take a look at it --

24 MR. AVITABILE: Okay.

25 MS. COHEN: -- based on the flexibility that

1 you're asking for. I don't know if the other  
2 Commissioners feel the same way.

3 I'd like to get back to the church because I  
4 don't -- how many parking spaces does the church use  
5 now on a daily basis, and then how many do you need  
6 for Sundays, and then for weddings and funerals, an  
7 estimate.

8 MR. BLEDSOE: We have a parking lot now and  
9 have had since, you know, that church was built on  
10 that corner of about 33 spaces. During the week it's  
11 not used very much. We use a few spaces and so you  
12 see in the presentation they're guaranteeing us five  
13 through the week. It is used more on the weekends  
14 and particularly on Sunday of course, and we'll fill  
15 that parking lot. So but --

16 MS. COHEN: You'll fill the 35 spaces, or 75?

17 MR. BLEDSOE: Sure, on a Sunday. You know,  
18 we'll have -- most of those will be filled, if not  
19 all. We have about 33 spaces. And that's guaranteed  
20 in perpetuity with this project that we'll have that  
21 on Sundays.

22 MS. COHEN: And what about weddings and  
23 funerals? What do they do about parking?

24 MR. BLEDSOE: Well, yeah, that's a great  
25 question and it's one that's going to demand our

1 innovation and flexibility. But we believe with the  
2 parking that's going to be offered through what's  
3 happening right across the street with the parking  
4 spaces available, that we can make use of that for  
5 weddings and funerals.

6 MS. COHEN: And how is that going to be  
7 managed, now that you're going to be shared parking  
8 with the apartments. So how will you manage it, just  
9 by signage?

10 MR. BLEDSOE: How will we manage our spaces?

11 MS. COHEN: Yeah, so that you know that on  
12 Sunday you'll have those 35.

13 MR. BLEDSOE: Bao probably can speak to that  
14 better than I.

15 MR VUONG: Yeah. That's something that the  
16 apartment building will manage, so the church spaces  
17 are in the first level of the garage, and then the  
18 apartment spaces will be buried deeper on the lower  
19 levels. And so --

20 MS. COHEN: And we hope people -- we all  
21 respect that of course.

22 MR VUONG: Absolutely. We will be enforcing  
23 that.

24 MS. COHEN: Okay.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I have to say that that

1 should be, Mr. Avitabile, memorialized, depending  
2 upon how far we go in this. Exactly what he just  
3 said. I don't know if it's written anywhere, but  
4 that needs to be memorialized somewhere for the  
5 future.

6 MR. AVITABILE: In a condition of approval.  
7 Understood.

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

9 MS. COHEN: No, no, no, no, that's quite fine  
10 because I'm trying to read my handwriting. I used to  
11 have good handwriting.

12 On the transportation the Public Space  
13 Committee has met and given you verbal approval or --

14 MR. AVITABILE: They have given us, yeah,  
15 concept approval.

16 MS. COHEN: Concept approval. Okay.

17 MR. AVITABILE: They now operate similar to  
18 HPRB and CFA, where they review a project at this  
19 stage and give a concept approval.

20 MS. COHEN: Now can you walk me through the  
21 access to the garage? I did not -- either missed it  
22 or did not really focus on it.

23 MR VUONG: So this is the ground floor plan.

24 MS. COHEN: Right, and it --

25 MR VUONG: 7th Street and I Street here. So

1 at the same curb cut location the vehicle will travel  
2 in, one lane in, one lane out, and then come down,  
3 down this -- the grade begins to drop from the street  
4 in a steady pace here, and then begins to drop more  
5 dramatically. And then the parking garage entry is  
6 then below grade and takes one underneath the  
7 courtyard and down into the parking garage.

8 MS. COHEN: So it's along the route of the  
9 retail, but the retail won't be using it? The retail  
10 spaces won't be using the garage?

11 MR VUONG: So actually, that's the back side  
12 of the retail so the retail --

13 MS. COHEN: Okay.

14 MR VUONG: -- street frontage is actually on  
15 the top portion of the building.

16 MS. COHEN: Okay. All right. All right. I  
17 think the, you know, Townhouse Management, the  
18 opponent, had some site access issues. Can you  
19 elaborate a bit on their concerns? Can you discuss  
20 that?

21 MR VUONG: Yeah. So I believe -- I mentioned  
22 earlier, I believe their two major concerns were the  
23 location of the church versus the apartment building.  
24 And so they had request that we flip-flop the site  
25 and essentially put the apartment building on Main

1 Avenue and put the church up closer to the 7th and I  
2 intersection.

3 For a myriad of reasons, but one, the  
4 prominence of the church, and this is all why we're  
5 here today, is to ensure that the church continues  
6 going forward. And we want to -- and along with  
7 Pastor Bledsoe, spent a lot of time discussing what's  
8 the most appropriate location for the church. And so  
9 we felt that -- came to the conclusion that the 7th  
10 and Main Avenue intersection was the appropriate  
11 place.

12 In addition to that there's some practical  
13 difficulties about locating the apartment building on  
14 that side, and that's the WAMAT tunnels. And so  
15 that's something that we'd have to build over with  
16 the apartment building and there would be some  
17 difficulties in putting the parking garage underneath  
18 our building.

19 The second aspect of it that they asked was  
20 with respect to moving the curb cut for our garage  
21 entrance, and spending a lot of time working with  
22 DDOT, we felt that that was the right location for  
23 it. Main Avenue and 7th Street both did not feel  
24 like appropriate places.

25 We were able to work with -- on, like I said,

1 a couple of other items, mitigation options, and  
2 that's something that we can actually pull up in a  
3 slide. Can you pull it up?

4 MR. AVITABILE: And while Hiroshi is pulling  
5 that up, I think with regard to the location of  
6 parking access, Dan spoke to that in our  
7 presentation. But both 7th Street and Main Avenue  
8 have medians which make it difficult to have parking  
9 access from those streets. You have to go right in,  
10 right out only. And in addition, given that those  
11 are planned future street car routes you wouldn't  
12 want them there. And finally DDOT's general  
13 preference is that you put your parking, your curb  
14 cut access, on the least busy street, and that's I  
15 Street.

16 So I Street becomes the logical place and  
17 that's what DDOT concluded with us and what the  
18 Public Space Committee approved.

19 MS. COHEN: Thank you. I actually, I really  
20 do like the design of the church and the apartment  
21 building. I think they do go well. I think they  
22 also, the apartment updated the vocabulary of the  
23 modernist and made it, you know, a little but more  
24 current. And I think my favorite thing on the church  
25 is the wave like features. I just think it enhances

1 the church. And in some ways, even though it's made  
2 out of metal, I think it does soften the façade.

3 Mr. Chairman, those are my questions, but I  
4 may have to come back after I translate my  
5 hieroglyphics because I can't read my own writing,  
6 unfortunately.

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Mr.  
8 Turnbull, you like to go next?

9 MR. TURNBULL: Sure. Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
10 And I want to thank you for your presentation  
11 tonight. I think this is a unique site and I  
12 think -- and I was glad to hear the church is staying  
13 and staying in the neighborhood, working. And I  
14 think the design, we can argue about whether we like  
15 or not but I think for the most part it does fit in  
16 with the character of the neighborhood.

17 I guess what I am -- my concerns are, I'm  
18 still struggling with the density. The medium  
19 density term. I think it's 167 units on something  
20 like .82 acres. If I translated that it would be  
21 about 200 units per acre. To me that's dense. And  
22 although OP has said that's at the high end of medium  
23 density, for me it's almost the low end of high  
24 density. It's dense.

25 So I'm struggling with that. I'm struggling

1 with how interpret that.

2 But I guess I would agree with the Vice  
3 Chair, that given this density that you want, what  
4 you're trying to put on this site, and given the  
5 mission of the church, and I appreciate the  
6 affordability level that you've put in so far, I  
7 think you can go a little step further. I think they  
8 could look for a two bedroom that could be -- I think  
9 there needs to be a little bit generous offer. I  
10 mean, I don't want to gentrify -- people who are  
11 going to be coming here are going to be rich. Well  
12 to do people. But I think we need to make room for  
13 people who can't afford that to make room for them in  
14 the area to allow for life at its fullest. So I  
15 would like to see a little bit generous, more  
16 generous affordability level proffered.

17 I guess going back, and looking at -- there  
18 was mention of a possible daycare. Is that still in  
19 the offering?

20 MR VUONG: Yeah. So that is our preferred  
21 use for the retail site and we have reached out to  
22 several daycare providers for the retail space. We  
23 have not formalized any agreement yet. But that is  
24 our preferred use.

25 MR. TURNBULL: So it's a fairly large retail

1 space. So that would all be for the -- which I  
2 supposed you need. Is there a play area, then, in  
3 the back of that, or --

4 MR VUONG: Yes. There's green space that we  
5 have set aside in the back and we have actually  
6 preprogrammed a playground are. In addition, if  
7 daycare space wanted to expand into the additional  
8 2,200 square feet, we would be giving them access to  
9 actually have the entire back space.

10 MR. TURNBULL: Oh, into the back space of the  
11 blue area there? Or what am I looking at?

12 MR VUONG: Do we have a pointer that I can --  
13 so, it's this green area.

14 MR. TURNBULL: Oh, I see.

15 MR VUONG: That we set aside.

16 MR. TURNBULL: Now, would they be dropping  
17 off then, on 7th Street?

18 MR VUONG: Yes. That would --

19 MR. TURNBULL: So it would be a no-parking  
20 area, or how would you do that? Or a designated  
21 drop-off?

22 MR. AVITABILE: I think we'd explore that  
23 with DDOT through the public space process. But I  
24 think you could take the parking lane and perhaps  
25 have it as a drop-off lane only during the morning or

1 afternoon or during certain hours. Dan, are there  
2 other measures we could use, or --

3 MR. VANPELT: I think that that was kind of -  
4 - that was one of the conversations we had with DDOT  
5 early on because daycare was contemplated for the  
6 site, is being able to use this curb, this new curb  
7 parking that would be created as here, and then we'd  
8 just need to work through the details with DDOT for  
9 the curbside management.

10 MR. TURNBULL: Okay. I guess that being said  
11 I'd be interested to know a little bit more plans on  
12 that back area and how that is going to be dealt  
13 with, with the neighborhood, with the neighbors  
14 behind at the Tower. The Tower is behind there. Is  
15 there a fence? Is there a green cover? Noise  
16 levels? Hours of operation? How are you going to  
17 handle that with the building being next door? I  
18 think from an operational standpoint it would be good  
19 to know.

20 MR. VANPELT: I think a lot of that is going  
21 to depend upon ultimately who the operator is and how  
22 they program their daycare facility. I don't know  
23 the requirements for a daycare, but I would expect  
24 for security purposes that there would be a fence  
25 that would be -- I'll put up on the back side for

1   securing the children.

2                   MR. TURNBULL:   Okay.   Well, I guess, here is  
3   my concern about this whole thing about a retail.  
4   I'm hearing neighborhood serving retail.   I think the  
5   ANC people want neighborhood serving retail.   A  
6   daycare is obviously definitely neighborhood serving  
7   retail.   And I'd just like to know a little bit more  
8   about how you wanted to -- how you're going.   I mean,  
9   if you don't do a daycare, what are you looking for  
10   for neighborhood serving retail?   What would be the  
11   options?

12                  MR VUONG:   So that's something that we have  
13   committed to consulting with the ANC on, and working  
14   through with them.   But some of the other items that  
15   were brought up as potential tenants were, you know,  
16   a potential specialized pharmacy, medical office or  
17   clinic, so like an urgent care facility, something  
18   that -- you know, it will be a balance of, you know,  
19   what makes sense there from an economic perspective  
20   for a potential retailer in addition to working with  
21   the ANC.

22                  MR. TURNBULL:   Okay.   Here is then, the  
23   follow-up question.   Knowing then with the backspace,  
24   what you're going to do with it, laying levels,  
25   what's the impact going to be on the neighbors

1 directly adjacent to it. I need to know, are you  
2 going to keep light levels low, noise level low. I  
3 think we need to have a commitment from you that  
4 whatever goes in that back open space will have a  
5 minimal effect upon the neighbors. I think that is  
6 my concern.

7           There's a picture showing about the bike  
8 racks, and the three areas that I've seen were  
9 stacked bike racks. And I just want to know how easy  
10 -- I know a lot of peoples in their 50s and 60s that  
11 ride bikes and how easy it going to be to get a bike  
12 off a second tier bike rack? I mean, I have one in  
13 my garage. I have a double tier and it's easy for  
14 me, but if my wife wants the bike she says, get my  
15 bike. You know, I mean, so I mean, I'm just looking  
16 that certain people are not going to be able to get a  
17 bike rack off this second rack. So I'm just  
18 wondering how that gets handled.

19           MR. SEAMAN: I'll take this. We're using a  
20 product at the Wharf called the double-decker by  
21 Dero. It's a specialty manufacturer of bike racks.  
22 And I believe it's a hydraulic action that pulls the  
23 bike down from the upper level.

24           MR. TURNBULL: Oh, it is?

25           MR. SEAMAN: So we can look at that and

1 confirm.

2 MR. TURNBULL: Okay.

3 MR. SEAMAN: But there are things that make  
4 that easier so that it's not a manual --

5 MR. TURNBULL: Well, I was hoping you would  
6 have something like that.

7 MR. SEAMAN: Yeah. Yeah.

8 MR. TURNBULL: But, okay. Great. Parking,  
9 getting back to parking. Is this building going to  
10 have no RPM --

11 MR. AVITABILE: No RPP, that's correct.

12 MR. TURNBULL: No, I mean RPP. Yeah.

13 MR. AVITABILE: That's correct.

14 MR. TURNBULL: So you'll write that in to  
15 your order and whoever the --

16 MR. AVITABILE: Yeah, we can write it in,  
17 though I don't think we actually have to because it's  
18 commercially zoned. They won't give us the RPP, but  
19 we'll write it in anyway.

20 MR. TURNBULL: But that was going to be my  
21 next question, up here to the Department of  
22 Transportation. I thought since Main Avenue is -- I  
23 mean, I didn't think that they were going to be able  
24 to get it anyways, but okay.

25 On the roof, I also saw on one of your plans

1 you didn't talk about it tonight, a pergola. I saw  
2 something sketched in for a pergola on the roof. And  
3 it didn't look like it complied with setbacks or --  
4 you didn't show it tonight but in your set of  
5 drawings previously there was a pergola showing,  
6 sketched on the roof.

7 MR. PILOT: So if you go back to the plan you  
8 can show the location. Yes, in these plans there is  
9 a small pergola showing here.

10 MR. TURNBULL: Yeah, but there's also a  
11 dotted line just to the north of that and on a sketch  
12 that you have it sort of shows that that would be a  
13 part of the pergola also. You had an elevation up on  
14 the roof that sort of showed that it went over the  
15 door, coming out.

16 MR. PILOT: Okay. Our intent would be to  
17 hold that back at the one to one ratio.

18 MR. TURNBULL: Could you provide a drawing  
19 that shows that the pergola would be -- meet the  
20 setback requirements then?

21 MR. PILOT: Absolutely.

22 MR. TURNBULL: Okay. While we're on the roof  
23 that one corner is the one area that's going to be  
24 used for, it looks like there's an area out there for  
25 residents to come up and congregate and use that

1 corner. That's also the one area that's probably  
2 closest to the tower next to you. I would like to be  
3 sure the hours of operation, lighting up there, and  
4 the impacts of that corner on the building adjacent.  
5 I think we want to make sure that the hours of  
6 operation that we've covered everything, and that the  
7 impact is going to be minimal.

8 MR. PILOT: We can provide that in our  
9 supplemental filing.

10 MR. TURNBULL: Okay. Okay. And I'm assuming  
11 you're going to -- although I don't know if you've  
12 covered it. Maybe you did. I'm assuming you'll work  
13 out a construction management plan with the ANC and  
14 the neighbors. It's, we can't enforce it but it's  
15 often referenced in our orders that you've agreed to  
16 have a construction management -- I think we did it  
17 on the Wharf and everything else, construction  
18 management plan that there's a point of contact for  
19 the neighbors, that if there are issues there is  
20 someone to go to.

21 MR VUONG: Yeah, that was part of the ANC  
22 recommendation. We submitted a draft construction  
23 management plan. That's something that we'll  
24 ultimately get finalized.

25 MR. TURNBULL: To the ANC.

1 MR VUONG: To the ANC.

2 MR. TURNBULL: Okay.

3 MR VUONG: Yes, we did.

4 MR. TURNBULL: All right. As long as it's  
5 covered.

6 Other than those I think that this point it's  
7 a well development of the site, I think. It's going  
8 to be an added benefit to the area. I just think  
9 there's a few areas that I'd like to see tweaked a  
10 bit. But thank you.

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Turnbull, I didn't  
12 know you were a bike rider. You learn something new  
13 every time we have a hearing.

14 MR. TURNBULL: I have a stationary bike.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Oh, okay.

16 MR. MAY: He's more of a bike fetcher than a  
17 bike rider.

18 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Maybe we can get  
19 Commissioner May a stationary --

20 MR. TURNBULL: I have an elliptical but --

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Oh, okay. All right.  
22 Commissioner Miller.

23 MR. MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And  
24 thank you to the applicant, P.N. Hoffman, and the  
25 church for your presentation.

1           I think you have -- I want to commend you on  
2 making a lot of changes and refinements since the  
3 time of setdown, both design changes to both the  
4 church and to the apartment building. And to you  
5 increase the sustainability, the LEED sort of -- the  
6 LEED proffer to Gold, for the apartment building.  
7 And even on the church I see if you get the maybe  
8 points you'll get the Gold.

9           And I appreciate that you have offered deeper  
10 affordability levels than were provided at setdown,  
11 and deeper than what's required under the  
12 inclusionary zoning and current regulations. But I  
13 would share Commissioner Cohen and Commissioner  
14 Turnbull's suggestions that you try, see if you can  
15 do a little bit more there. I realize that you are  
16 providing 3,100 square feet at 50 percent AMI and  
17 8,600 at -- over 8,600 at 80 percent AMI. And then I  
18 think this was at the ANC's request, over 2,800  
19 square feet of what's called workforce housing at 100  
20 percent AMI, although I'm not sure I would agree that  
21 100 percent AMI is workforce housing in the District  
22 of Columbia. But because of the need that is great  
23 and because of the tie-in with the church for this  
24 particular project, I think if you could provide one  
25 of the -- at least one of the units at the deeper

1 affordability level, which we appreciate as a two-  
2 bedroom unit, I think that would be an important  
3 gesture to consider.

4 I also appreciate the balconies that you've  
5 added to the apartment buildings. I always like,  
6 when I see a big residential building, to see for me,  
7 this is maybe just my own taste, if I was wanting to  
8 live in a dense area, I'd want to have my balcony to  
9 go out. So the more balconies the better. If you  
10 want to add even more I think that would be great.  
11 Particularly because it also adds a residential feel  
12 to the building. You didn't go -- you didn't want to  
13 go with the brick that -- and I realize there are a  
14 range of materials that are in the context of the  
15 neighborhood, both brick and precast concrete, and  
16 you wanted something that would go -- could be  
17 compatible with the church. But I think the  
18 balconies do provide a residential -- anything you  
19 can do to make that large building read as  
20 residential, I think is a good thing.

21 I appreciate also that you've worked very  
22 closely with the Advisory Neighborhood Commission on  
23 developing a public benefits and community -- public  
24 benefits and mitigation package, and also a  
25 construction management plan. And I commend you for

1 that effort. I think that's excellent. And this ANC  
2 has always been very strong on getting those public  
3 benefits and construction management and if other  
4 ANCs are watching I would direct you to ANC 6D's  
5 agreements that they got in some of these zoning  
6 cases because they really are a model of the type of  
7 mitigation and benefits that all neighborhoods need  
8 for their projects.

9           So I'm not sure if I have -- oh, well, I'm  
10 not sure I have any questions. But I do share -- I  
11 usually don't have a concern about density, which  
12 Commissioner Turnbull expressed. And I appreciate  
13 all the information that was provided by the  
14 applicant about planning and maybe we'll get into  
15 some dialog with them about how this project's  
16 density meets the, what's called for in the,  
17 particularly the Small Area Plan, the Southwest Small  
18 Area Plan that was approved by the counsel. I still  
19 do have some hesitancy about the fact that just at  
20 the timing of it that the comprehensive plan land use  
21 map itself has -- still shows that future land use  
22 for this site is moderate density residential, even  
23 though the supplemental guidance from Southwest Small  
24 Area Plan says it should be changed to medium density  
25 residential.

1           But it's just somewhat disconcerting that the  
2 existing Comprehensive Plan map shows moderate  
3 density residential and that hasn't yet been changed  
4 prior to the -- it won't be changed prior to our  
5 taking zoning action. So it's just somewhat -- but  
6 there's a lot of language there and a lot of  
7 supplemental guidance. I realize that. I'm just  
8 concerned a little bit about the precedent here. But  
9 maybe I'll get more comfort level as we go along.  
10 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

11           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. And on that point I  
12 would associate myself with your comments,  
13 Commissioner Miller, and Commissioner Turnbull on  
14 that medium density. You know, we've been around the  
15 barn a few times with that. I do have some things I  
16 want to direct to Office of Planning, not necessarily  
17 germane to this case, but I would like to use this as  
18 a pilot case along with another case that we had in  
19 front of us, which became an issue. So I don't know  
20 if that's -- it's not appropriate for me to deal with  
21 here but I'm just putting that out there now because  
22 that's something that I'm going to try to go down  
23 discovery lane and try to figure out.

24           Reverend Dr. Bledsoe, isn't that how I'm  
25 supposed to say it?

1 MS. COHEN: Dr. Reverend.

2 MR. BLEDSOE: The more pretentious of us use  
3 those titles. Pastor is sufficient.

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I know a lot of ministers  
5 with their doctor's degree and they've always  
6 informed me, Reverend Doctor.

7 MR. BLEDSOE: Those are demons.

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Is that what it is? I  
9 don't think my pastor is a demon, but anyway,  
10 hopefully he's not watching.

11 But anyway, I will tell you that I was  
12 curious of the connection between the Howard  
13 University letter of support and here and now. I  
14 know you were a professor in theology up at Howard.  
15 So I guess that's the connection. I was just trying  
16 to figure out the connection where there was a --

17 MR. BLEDSOE: There is a strong connection  
18 and I've been there 18 years and continue there.  
19 They recently gave me a title a few years ago called,  
20 Recurring Adjunct, which sounds more like a medical  
21 diagnosis, recurring. But they wanted to honor the  
22 fact that I've been there that long. So -- but over  
23 those 18 years we've had approximately 15 students  
24 who come and do their field education in our church.  
25 So they are mentored there. They get to carry out

1 programs and do an array of things, and then they  
2 take that back to the divinity school of course.

3 And the other thing not to be missed there is  
4 that the church, in a sense, loans me to the divinity  
5 school, then the church gives that time back to the  
6 community. So it's a wonderful community connection.

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

8 MR. BLEDSOE: Currently I have a young lady  
9 who is a student at Wesley Seminary, who is doing her  
10 field education and work with us at Riverside. I  
11 couldn't get her to go to Howard. So it's an  
12 important connection for us and has been.

13 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. All right. I  
14 appreciate that. I will call you Pastor since you --

15 MR. BLEDSOE: That's fine. Thanks.

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: The other thing I usually  
17 ask ministers is, can they preach. But I'm not going  
18 to do that tonight. I'm not going to ask you that.

19 MR. BLEDSOE: I can preach but I can't sing.

20 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Oh, okay. So you answered  
21 my question. Thanks.

22 Okay. Let me ask, during the presentation,  
23 and if you could pull that slide up, there was  
24 something going on between the church and the  
25 building, the big building in the back. And it was

1 in the back and you said it was -- I think it was a  
2 space left open. It has the metal grates or whatever  
3 that is, in the middle. But what's going on back in  
4 there behind those grates? What is that, just a  
5 separation? I think you talked about the separation.  
6 And what's happening back in there?

7 I mean, you can just show me from the street  
8 view. It was -- you showed how it separated from the  
9 church and the building. And I think in your -- I  
10 forgot who it was who said it's been so long ago.

11 MR. WITTMAN: I mean, basically that area,  
12 there's a small garden area that's accessed off of  
13 the worship space. Okay. There we go. So yeah. So  
14 essentially at the lower level there's a lobby space  
15 that connects to the parking garage. But at the  
16 church level there is a small area there and there's,  
17 in terms of what goes on in that space.

18 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So it's just a  
19 little garden. We're not --

20 MR. WITTMAN: Yeah, there's going to be some  
21 greenery and some benches. It's intended as a place  
22 for reflection. The church won't use it for any kind  
23 of activities or anything, but it really is sort of a  
24 small garden area for quiet reflection.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Mr. Avitabile, you

1 talked about the RPP. I didn't catch the discussion  
2 back and forth with you and Mr. Turnbull. Now you  
3 said you all would write it in but it's a commercial  
4 area. So here's the thing. I don't like to raise  
5 false promises. And I'm not really sure because it's  
6 commercial, whether DDOT would even keep a record.  
7 So what was your comment? You said you would write  
8 it in. What did that mean?

9 MR. AVITABILE: So what I meant was we'd be  
10 happy to include as a condition of the PUD that there  
11 would be no RPP, parking for the residents.

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: But you and I both know,  
13 there's no way to track that, right?

14 MR. AVITABILE: Well, right. But the other  
15 way that that gets enforced, which is the first piece  
16 of this is that if you're a commercially zoned  
17 property, whether directly or through a PUD, you are  
18 not eligible to get an RPP permit. You can't get  
19 one. You go in with the address 680 I Street, DDOT  
20 in its database says, that's commercially zoned, you  
21 can't get an RPP sticker. So that actually is the  
22 stronger way to enforce that commitment and that  
23 commitment to not have RPP.

24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I may have missed it. Was  
25 there a loud outcry from the ANC and the community

1 about that to begin with? I'm not saying go either  
2 way, but if it was, I don't want to -- definitely  
3 don't want to deter that.

4 MR VUONG: No, that's just something that we  
5 offer that as a matter of course as part of ours. So  
6 we didn't spend a lot of time discussing that.  
7 That's just something that we said we would do.

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Because I just want  
9 to make sure because I have evidence that sometimes -  
10 - and I know that DDOT is still working on some of  
11 this. At least they were some time back, is that we  
12 make these decisions here and actually those things  
13 are actually not being able to be accomplished. So  
14 I'm hoping if we're going to -- if we're going to put  
15 the residents on promised land that it actually is  
16 something that's viable, that works.

17 And I would associate my comment -- myself  
18 also with the comments about the deeper  
19 affordability. I think three of my colleagues at  
20 least have asked, said look at that. I will tell you  
21 the design, as far as I'm concerned, I won't spend  
22 much time, but I do like the design of the church. So  
23 I really like the front of that church. To me it's  
24 fascinating. I do like the design of the church.  
25 And I know that there are some density issues and

1 concerns from the party in opposition about some of  
2 the things. Obviously those conversations have been  
3 had. I'm going to also ask the Office of Planning  
4 and DDOT at the appropriate time, to comment again as  
5 stated in some of the -- the submission we received  
6 this evening.

7 The stained glass windows are going to be  
8 preserved, the way I read it. Correct, Pastor?

9 MR. BLEDSOE: We're going to try and take as  
10 many as we can. But there's no guarantee that we can  
11 take all of them. We're doing our best to bring what  
12 we can with us.

13 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I think the water wall, I  
14 really like that. I think you used, the architect,  
15 you used a reference, you said knit into the existing  
16 community. Now that took me -- when you said that,  
17 that took me to these exhibits. They don't have page  
18 numbers on them. It kind of shows on down 7th  
19 Street. And I don't know if you have this up here.  
20 I didn't see that tonight, but this is something that  
21 we had that we were able to look at in our  
22 submissions given to us.

23 I would like to see how that building sits,  
24 more than just from 7th Street. And the way this  
25 shows me here is, the trees -- unless it's in here

1 and I missed it, because I may have missed it. The  
2 trees, this time of the year, how is that building  
3 going to look for me looking down 7th Street without  
4 all that greenery, which is actually hiding it. But  
5 how is it going to look when all that greenery is  
6 gone. I just want to see how it knits, and I don't  
7 want to use your words, knits into the existing  
8 community. Okay? So you may have gotten yourself  
9 some additional work because I do like that, knit  
10 into the existing community.

11 I want to see how it fits, not just from 7th  
12 Street but maybe one or two other areas and coming  
13 down Main Street. How am I going to see that when  
14 I'm getting ready to make my right turn and  
15 Commissioner May is coming down on the right side of  
16 me on his bicycle. And I'm not going to tell you  
17 some of the words I'll probably use, but just explain  
18 to me, I mean, show me how that's going to fit. I  
19 just want to see how it's going to knit into the  
20 existing community. Okay?

21 I should have said -- excuse me, Pastor. I  
22 didn't mean to say that. Okay.

23 What else do I have? Okay. That's actually  
24 it. I think my colleagues have done an exhaustive  
25 job of covering things. They may have some

1 additional -- Vice Chair has an additional question  
2 and Mr. Turnbull has an additional question, and  
3 Commissioner May has an additional question. I mean,  
4 Commissioner Miller and Commissioner May, you have an  
5 additional question, Mr. May?

6 Okay. Vice Chair Cohen.

7 MS. COHEN: Thank you. This is a question  
8 for Mr. VanPelt, and I know that you discussed this  
9 with DDOT so maybe I should ask them as well, but why  
10 did you just include phase 1 of the Wharf in your  
11 analysis?

12 MR. VANPELT: Well, we looked at -- we always  
13 look at what's going to be kind of on the network at  
14 the time that the project that we're analyzing is  
15 going to be coming to fruition. So we look at that  
16 future build year. And then we kind of come to  
17 agreement on what we're going to include is going to  
18 be on the network at that time. I mean, some ways to  
19 think about it, too, the Wharf did a much more  
20 exhaustive longer term horizon analysis that took  
21 into account, oh geeze, I don't know, 20 some  
22 developments and a whole bunch of additional  
23 background growth. Some other ways to think about it  
24 is the Wharf study already kind of accounted for  
25 additional density on this site and other sites

1 through its analysis.

2           So to kind of redo all of that again for this  
3 project doesn't necessarily make the most sense. So  
4 we, you know -- and you can talk to DDOT about that  
5 but that's one of the assumptions that we vetted  
6 early on in the scoping process with them, was to  
7 really look at what was going to be in place,  
8 generating trips on the network at the time that this  
9 project would be open and generating traffic.

10           MS. COHEN: Thank you for referring back. I  
11 just that, you know, that was for me, months and  
12 months ago.

13           MR. VANPELT: Sure.

14           MS. COHEN: And my memory does not go back to  
15 even yesterday.

16           MR. VANPELT: Sure.

17           MS. COHEN: So, thank you.

18           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Commissioner Turnbull.

19           MR. TURNBULL: Oh, thank you, Mr. Chair.  
20 Yeah, I forgot one item and it was referenced in your  
21 exhibit 26, page 12. And Mr. Avitabile also  
22 mentioned it. It was the flexibility from the  
23 dimensional requirements of the ADA spaces. Not  
24 meeting the strict nine by 19, you say you got eight  
25 feet. But when I look on your PowerPoint, the page

1 46 which shows the garage level, where there's  
2 several parking spaces, typical ADA is eight by 18  
3 with a five foot space on either side for access, I  
4 do believe. And it looks like you're showing an  
5 extra five feet.

6 But does that mean that the depth of all of  
7 your spaces are only 18 feet, because it looks like  
8 they line up with the rest of the parking spaces.

9 MR. AVITABILE: I think, and I'll ask Brian  
10 maybe to confirm this, I think the depth of all of  
11 our spaces is 19 feet. So that's not the -- that's  
12 not where we're asking for flexibility. Where we're  
13 asking for flexibility is solely on the width of  
14 those spaces at eight feet versus nine feet. So  
15 that's why a regular dimension space seems to have  
16 the same depth as an ADA space.

17 MR. TURNBULL: So let me get -- so the spaces  
18 are 19 feet deep.

19 MR. PILOT: That is correct.

20 MR. TURNBULL: But the ADA space would only  
21 be eight feet. But are all the other spaces nine  
22 feet?

23 MR. AVITABILE: So we have -- okay, if I do  
24 the math right, 44 percent is compact, which means --

25 MR. TURNBULL: They're less. They're

1 smaller.

2 MR. AVITABILE: -- 56 percent of the spaces  
3 are full sized nine by 19 spaces.

4 MR. TURNBULL: How much?

5 MR. AVITABILE: Fifty-six percent of the  
6 parking spaces would be full sized nine by 19 spaces.

7 MR. TURNBULL: Thank you. Okay.

8 MR. AVITABILE: And then 44 percent would be  
9 compact, eight by 16 spaces.

10 MR. TURNBULL: Sixteen.

11 MR. AVITABILE: Although it actually looks  
12 like some of the compact spaces may also be --

13 MR. PILOT: A little bit deeper, correct.

14 MR. AVITABILE: They're deeper. They may  
15 also be the 19 feet because they're in the same stack  
16 as some full size spaces. So they're all going to be  
17 19 feet deep. The flexibility is simply on the  
18 width, not on the depth.

19 MR. TURNBULL: Okay. But you are saying that  
20 on the full size spaces the regular spaces are all  
21 filled, nine by 19.

22 MR. AVITABILE: That's correct.

23 MR. TURNBULL: Okay.

24 MR. AVITABILE: And then I think our initial  
25 filing just simply asks for flexibility from the

1 dimensional requirements without specifying exactly  
2 what it was. And so we tried to specify exactly what  
3 we needed here.

4 MR. TURNBULL: Okay.

5 MR. AVITABILE: So the Commission understood.

6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Commissioner  
7 Miller.

8 MR. MILLER: Yeah, just briefly. I think I  
9 may have neglected to mention that I fare with my  
10 colleagues compliments on the design of the church  
11 and the materials used there and it's just really --  
12 I think it is beautiful. Particularly I think the  
13 natural field stone that you're bringing from the  
14 existing structure, I think, and adding to it.

15 And I don't think I -- I also wanted to  
16 compliment you on the revisions to the rooftop  
17 structure and taking advantage of the new, you know,  
18 the approved but not yet effective roof top habitable  
19 space regulations. And for the other revisions you  
20 made, ensuring that there are all the appropriate  
21 setbacks there.

22 There are three residential units that are  
23 going to be on the roof, 3,000 square feet? Is that  
24 what you said? Or that's what your submission says?

25 MR. PILOT: Yes.

1 MR. MILLER: And what size units are those?  
2 Are they one bedrooms or --

3 MR. PILOT: Correct. They're one bedroom and  
4 one bedroom/den sizing.

5 MR. MILLER: Great. Okay. Thank you very  
6 much.

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Any other questions  
8 up here? Okay, do we have a representative, this is  
9 for --

10 MR. AVITABILE: I actually think there are  
11 two bedrooms up there.

12 MR. MILLER: Three. There are three --

13 MR. AVITABILE: I think there are three two  
14 bedrooms.

15 MR. MILLER: Two bedroom units.

16 MR. PILOT: It is two bedrooms. I'm sorry.

17 MR. MILLER: Okay. Thank you for that  
18 correction. All the more reason to consider going  
19 for one of those deeper affordability levels at the  
20 two bedroom. I think that would be a good connection  
21 to that too.

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Any other questions  
23 up here? Okay. Hold on a second.

24 Representing the ANC 6D. Anyone cross-  
25 examination, anyone here representing the chairperson

1 as Mr. Moffatt. Anyway, we have their letter and  
2 I'll deal with that at the appropriate time.

3 Okay. Let's go to the town. Mr. Hurwitz.  
4 Are you going to be representing -- yeah, you have  
5 any cross-examination? Of any -- cross is, you know,  
6 cross is on anything you just heard them tell us.

7 MR. HURWITZ: [Speaking off the mic.]

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Questions of anything you  
9 just heard them tell us. But come to the mic.

10 MR. TURNBULL: You have to be on the mic.

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Take a seat. Identify  
12 yourself.

13 MR. HURWITZ: Hi. I'm Josh Hurwitz,  
14 President of Townhouse Management 1. Thanks for  
15 allowing us party status. We're happy to be here and  
16 just one quick comment. We have been working --  
17 there we go. Sorry, first time.

18 We have been working with P.N. Hoffman and  
19 the Riverside Church and they've been excellent and  
20 their building is lovely. But we have some concerns.  
21 So that's not cross. That was just a comment. Sorry  
22 about that. I didn't know I got to cross first. I  
23 thought I got comments first.

24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: No, here's what's going to  
25 happen. They're going to have to work through you,

1 okay? You're representing the party in opposition,  
2 so if she has anything she can tell you and you can  
3 convey it to us.

4 MR. HURWITZ: I think this -- do I ask you,  
5 sir, or do I ask one of these people?

6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: You can ask one of them.

7 MR. HURWITZ: I'm sorry. The man that just  
8 left his microphone, did --

9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I figured that would  
10 happen. Mr. VanPelt.

11 MR. HURWITZ: I guess the first question  
12 would be about the traffic pattern and the parking  
13 pattern. You say that the lesser street is where you  
14 put the ingress and egress to your apartment  
15 building. Is that someplace codified in the city's  
16 paper to put it through residential areas rather than  
17 through busy districts? Just to get a better  
18 understanding.

19 MR. VANPELT: It makes part of the District's  
20 curb cut policy. It is -- I don't remember exactly  
21 where it is located. I'm sure we could do that up  
22 and get that for you. But it is certain policy, even  
23 beyond the District from a transportation standpoint.  
24 We always look at the lowest functioning street. I  
25 mean, the other streets are arterial streets and so

1 we're looking at trying to put -- and it carries the  
2 highest volume. 7th Street has in the order of  
3 something in the order of 10 or 12,000 ADT a day.  
4 Main Avenue is much higher than that, and so I Street  
5 is four to 5,000. So we're always -- you're going to  
6 look at and gravitate towards that lesser street for  
7 the access.

8 MR. HURWITZ: So when you do look at that are  
9 you also calculating in the other development plan  
10 for I Street that's coming forward in the next couple  
11 of years?

12 MR. VANPELT: When we meet with DDOT There is  
13 an extensive scoping process that we do and it looks  
14 at all of the assumptions that will inform our  
15 transportation review, and that includes looking at  
16 the background projects that will be added. For this  
17 study it was determined that, at the time that this  
18 project is open and generating trips. It would be  
19 really the first phase of the Wharf. There are  
20 certainly other projects that are kind of known in  
21 the pipeline in that area. And then there's -- have  
22 an additional growth that we put on top of the  
23 network to kind of -- it's like a catchall if you  
24 will, to try to capture other developments.

25 MR. HURWITZ: So only things that are

1 currently being constructed was considered in this  
2 rational, just so sort of (indiscernible)\*\*3:45.

3 MR. VANPELT: Currently approved and known to  
4 be generating traffic at this time. But this project  
5 would be up and generating traffic.

6 MR. HURWITZ: And our other understanding is  
7 that the street car has also been proposed for I  
8 Street as well as 7th Street, not Main Avenue.

9 MR. VANPELT: There are actually -- there  
10 were different alternatives that looked at possible  
11 potential alignments on I, on 7th, on Main. I think  
12 it's the thought that 7th and Main for sure, 7th is  
13 probably more likely. But there are possible  
14 alternative -- there was a concept that looked at it  
15 for I Street also.

16 MR. HURWITZ: So --

17 MR. VANPELT: But it was communicated to us  
18 from DDOT that it's more likely that it would be on  
19 7th or Main. Less likely on I. Although that was  
20 one of the -- that is still one of the alternatives  
21 that was contemplated under the initial kind of  
22 feasibility review and that certain would have to be  
23 additional study of that and I think you could  
24 probably talk to Mr. Westrom about that a little bit  
25 more.

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And let me just say this,  
2 you will also have a chance to cross-examine Office  
3 of Planning and DDOT, so if that helps you with some  
4 of the questions you're asking now.

5 MR. HURWITZ: That would be great. Thank  
6 you, sir.

7 Two more questions for you about this. I  
8 guess, you know, was Townhouse Management 1 and the -  
9 - and Townhouse Management 2, 3, and 4, there are  
10 four Townhouse Managements in Southwest, were they  
11 considered when you did this planning study?

12 MR. VANPELT: Well, we start with traffic,  
13 existing traffic counts that are on the network. So  
14 any traffic that's generated by those sites or any of  
15 the others that are in the study area will be  
16 captured and were considered.

17 MR. HURWITZ: And I'm sorry, sir, I don't  
18 know the rules of the room, but I guess can I make a  
19 comment on the cross-examination?

20 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: What you want to do is  
21 save your comment. Anything he just mentioned, and  
22 you want to rebut that when you do your presentation.  
23 You can mention it then.

24 MR. HURWITZ: Okay. Thanks.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So put it in the parking

1 lot, use one of those spaces and put that there and  
2 bring that to our attention at that time. Okay.

3 MR. HURWITZ: The last question I have then  
4 would be, when you consider the traffic patterns,  
5 you're saying it's just cars. It's not kind of the  
6 density and the use of those properties?

7 MR. VANPELT: Well, it's I guess -- if I  
8 understand your question we're looking at all modes.  
9 I mean, we're looking at vehicular traffic. We're  
10 looking at pedestrian traffic. We're looking at  
11 bicycle traffic. So we're looking at all of those  
12 modes.

13 The densities, I mean, unless there is a  
14 known development application that's going to  
15 increase the density on one of those other sites and  
16 we've included that, that is -- that's not  
17 necessarily something that was in our analysis. But  
18 I'm not sure if I understood your question correctly.

19 MR. HURWITZ: Okay. Thank you.

20 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

21 MR. AVITABILE: Chairman Hood, I just have  
22 one question for Mr. VanPelt on kind of redirect,  
23 just to clarify something that Mr. VanPelt made, if I  
24 may?

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Do we usually do that now?

1 MR. AVITABILE: Typically the process would  
2 be they cross and then I can ask a question on  
3 redirect. I don't usually do it but it would make  
4 much more sense to ask the question now than at  
5 rebuttal two hours later or one hour later.

6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I ask my questions an hour  
7 later and I forget them. Go ahead. You're right.  
8 Redirect.

9 MR. AVITABILE: Thank you. Thank you. Mr.  
10 VanPelt, did you consider background growth as a part  
11 of your traffic study?

12 MR. VANPELT: Certainly. I mean, we look at  
13 the -- we look at kind of the identified development  
14 sites and then we have -- we always do a background  
15 growth of that. It's kind of a catchall if you will,  
16 for kind of everything else that are even projects  
17 that could be miles from here. But, you know, would  
18 influence traffic patterns potentially.

19 MR. AVITABILE: Great. Thank you.

20 MR. HURWITZ: Can I ask them questions. Can  
21 I talk to OP?

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: You want to redirect --  
23 well, no. What you can do is -- here's how it --  
24 because I'm going to help you. You actually did a  
25 very good job. So here's what I would suggest.

1           Once we do the cross -- we're going to hear  
2   from Office of Planning and DDOT. Once we do the  
3   cross you can cross them, and then anything you want  
4   to bring to our attention, because we're the ones you  
5   want to convince, okay.

6           MR. HURWITZ: Right.

7           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So you want to do that in  
8   your presentation to us.

9           MR. HURWITZ: Thank you, sir.

10          CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay? All right. All  
11   right. Let's go to Office of Planning. You might  
12   want to hold your seat. So let's go to Office of  
13   Planning and DDOT, Mr. Cochran.

14          MR. COCHRAN: Oh, thank you, Mr. Chair.  
15   There has been a long presentation by the applicant,  
16   a lot of questions, so I'm going to be brief because  
17   I know you'll have a lot of questions also.

18          OP does recommend that you approve the  
19   supplied unit development after Zoning Commission  
20   Order 14-13 is actually in effect and after of course  
21   the applicant has supplied the additional information  
22   that you're requesting tonight.

23          We do find it consistent with the  
24   Comprehensive Plan, as that is somewhat altered by  
25   the guidance provided by the Small Area Plan. There

1 are a number of benefits. We agree that it would be  
2 advisable to have additional lower income housing.  
3 And the design has been refined in response to the  
4 Zoning Commission's comments at setdown. They've  
5 actually come through twice with us, and I think  
6 you're glad that they're -- you're looking at the  
7 second version of the revision.

8           With respect to the Comprehensive Plan and  
9 the Small Area Plan there's a subtle and very much  
10 interrelated relationship between them. First off,  
11 planning works on a kind of a tripartite level.  
12 You've got the Comprehensive Plan that addresses  
13 overall citywide elements and individual ward  
14 elements. And then, yeah, it gets down to some  
15 extent, with policies and recommendations and actions  
16 that are specific to the neighborhood level. But it  
17 specifically says, where you really do apply it at  
18 the neighborhood level is through the small area  
19 plans.

20           Now they're not absolutely part of the  
21 Comprehensive Plan that the City Council adopts  
22 legislatively. They are -- they provide advice that  
23 the Comprehensive Plan says that they should provide  
24 overall as small area plans. And they're also  
25 adopted by the City Council.

1           Now I was the development review specialist  
2 on the development of the Southwest Area Plan, so  
3 I've been to all of the neighborhood meetings and so  
4 on and so forth. And let me just begin to address  
5 the changes in the density and the changes in the  
6 height on this site.

7           There's something that's unusual about the  
8 overall pattern of Southwest. And something that we  
9 really tried to promote in the Small Area Plan, and  
10 the neighborhood really went along with it.  
11 Southwest consists of towers and townhouses. Many of  
12 the developments have towers, townhouses, and space  
13 that used to be open to the public but it was always  
14 private. And for many of them it's now fenced.

15           But in order to get that kind of arrangement  
16 you need the tower and the lower element. In this  
17 case the tower is the residential building. The  
18 lower element is the church. That church probably  
19 has less FAR than townhouses on a comparable site.  
20 It's a big open space. So you're basically shifting  
21 some of the height to the back in order to get the  
22 lower element along Main Avenue.

23           Now there's a history of the church as being  
24 along Main Avenue. Now of course there are a couple  
25 that are on I street also. But you had three

1 modernist churches along Main Avenue. You will still  
2 have, eventually, three modernist churches along Main  
3 Avenue. One of them is going up very soon at the  
4 P.N. Hoffman site, and the Saint Matthews is still a  
5 part of an approved PUD a little bit farther down M  
6 Street.

7           This is a very important site. I mean,  
8 you've just come underneath the freeways, you've just  
9 come under the federal part of the city and bang,  
10 you're entering the Southwest. The only really  
11 modernist part of D.C.

12           So we agreed with the applicant that it was  
13 very important to have a signature feature right  
14 there at the corner. We also were aware in the Small  
15 Area Plan that we didn't want to create a canyon  
16 effect along Main Avenue. If you move the tower over  
17 to Main Avenue we were concerned, you would then have  
18 two nine story to 13 story buildings right across  
19 from each other; exactly what we wanted to avoid.  
20 And the Small Area Plan keeps that same avoidance  
21 going all the way, Main Avenue down M Street to South  
22 Capitol.

23           So those are the things that we were looking  
24 at in looking at the massing on this, and the  
25 heights. The 4.57 FAR is well within what is

1 typically considered appropriate for a medium density  
2 site. I mean, you know, if you'd like I could go  
3 through examples of PUDs that you have approved that  
4 have more than that FAR under Medium density. And  
5 yes, eight stories is considered typically the upper  
6 limit for a by right density in medium development  
7 land use designations.

8 But this isn't by right. This is a PUD.  
9 This is where you're able to adjust things to allow  
10 for some things to be achieved in return for other  
11 things being slightly different. And that's what we  
12 think that this PUD is doing with the density, with  
13 the site planning, with the differences in the  
14 heights.

15 So that's the end of my brief remarks and I'm  
16 happy to answer any questions.

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Who would like to  
18 ask any questions of DDOT? You know what, we didn't  
19 do DDOT. I'm sorry. I want to really get on Mr.  
20 Cochran's last point, but let's go to Mr. Westrom  
21 first for DDOT. I'm sorry.

22 MR. WESTROM: Thank you, Chairman Hood and  
23 Commissioners. Good evening. It does seem like  
24 there are some transportation issues on the table and  
25 so happy to provide a synopsis of a report and then

1 ultimately take questions.

2           Hi, I'm Ryan Westrom with DDOT and I would  
3 certainly agree with the applicant's characterization  
4 that they worked closely with DDOT in performing  
5 their comprehensive transportation review. There  
6 were obviously a lot of details here, and then in  
7 addition the conceptual public space permitting that  
8 was undertaken by the applicant. Again, we would  
9 agree that they worked closely with us in those  
10 elements and covered many of the things that were  
11 brought up tonight.

12           A couple of those that I think are worth  
13 noting, just because they certainly were pertinent  
14 issues that were presented. One, in terms of the  
15 driveway location and the selection of this  
16 particular driveway location, this is something where  
17 the applicant was reactive to DDOT. And DDOT sought  
18 to see the driveway, as I think was characterized  
19 very very well by Mr. VanPelt, on the lowest  
20 hierarchy street that is present. As the applicant  
21 noted, they do face three streets and so there  
22 theoretically could be possibilities. However, Main  
23 being the highest hierarchy and the heaviest traffic  
24 street, and then 7th would be less desirable  
25 locations than I Street. And the reason for that and

1 the rationale for choosing a lower hierarchy street  
2 is safety.

3 Reducing the number of conflict points,  
4 reducing the number of opportunities for entering and  
5 exiting vehicles to have a conflict point with either  
6 pedestrians or vehicles is really the preeminent  
7 concern. And by putting it on the lowest volume  
8 street, that creates the safest situation.

9 In addition, as was noted by the applicant,  
10 there are medians on both Main and on 7th. And thus  
11 you'd be left in a situation where vehicles would  
12 have a difficult time getting in and out if they were  
13 coming from the wrong direction.

14 And then lastly as was noted, although our  
15 street car system plan is on hold pending the  
16 east/west street car development, these are streets  
17 where street car development is contemplated. Both  
18 on 7th and on Main. And if that were the case,  
19 again, those would not be a desirable location for a  
20 driveway to be located. For all those reasons we  
21 felt like it was most appropriate and most safe to  
22 put the driveway on I Street as then we developed the  
23 design with the applicant.

24 Lastly I would note just a minor  
25 clarification in regards to the issue of RPP, and we

1 can discuss it further if necessary, Mr. Avitabile  
2 was correct in that a commercial property is not  
3 intended to have RPP eligibility. However, the way  
4 the RPP database is managed, it's done on a block by  
5 block basis. And I did look up in the database and  
6 the 600 block of I Street is listed as eligible for  
7 RPP. And so if the building did take the 680 I  
8 Street address, theoretically a resident may be able  
9 to apply for RPP and have it happen. And so the  
10 block is eligible for RPP as it stands right now.  
11 That's certainly something that can come under  
12 review, but I know that there are other residential  
13 properties on that block as well, which probably want  
14 to maintain their status.

15 So I just wanted to note that and clarify  
16 that. Beyond that we did request some additional  
17 mitigations from the applicant. As Mr. VanPelt noted  
18 the applicant has concurred with those and agreed to  
19 include them in their PUD. And with that concurrence  
20 and with our overall review of the comprehensive  
21 transportation review that was submitted, DDOT does  
22 not have an objection to the PUD. And we are happy  
23 to take any questions from the Commissioners or the  
24 applicant, or the party. Thank you.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you both, Mr.

1 Cochran and Mr. Westrom, for those very thorough,  
2 thorough reports to us.

3 Let's see if we have any questions of either  
4 Office of Planning or DDOT. Vice Chair Cohen?

5 MS. COHEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr.  
6 Cochran, I really commend your review. It was very  
7 thorough on the discussion of the plans. I just  
8 wanted to state that in the future -- in a former  
9 life I actually did a review of a lot of the housing  
10 properties, on a units per acre. And I think for Mr.  
11 Turnbull's sake, the density is pretty high on the  
12 high-rise units, and what you know, keeps the balance  
13 in that entire neighborhood is the fact that we do  
14 have the combination townhomes.

15 So what I'm doing is just reiterating I think  
16 the points you made, and I appreciate them.

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Any other questions or  
18 comments? Mr. Turnbull.

19 MR. TURNBULL: Yeah. Yeah, I want to thank  
20 Mr. Cochran again for his splendid report as usual,  
21 and his great explanation tonight. But I'm still --  
22 and as Vice Chair said, I think I'm still a little  
23 bit -- I mean, when you talk about the high end of  
24 medium density and we get 167 units on a site that's  
25 not quite an acre, if it was an acre it would be

1 almost -- if I interpolate it, almost 200 units per  
2 acre. If I took off the church it would be even  
3 higher yet.

4 So I'm just concerned at what point do you  
5 start getting in -- how many units per acre does it -  
6 - when does it become high density?

7 MR. COCHRAN: Because we're in D.C., I can't  
8 answer that. In many other jurisdictions they do  
9 consider things like number of dwelling units --

10 MR. TURNBULL: Right. I know, but they --

11 MR. COCHRAN: -- per acre.

12 MR. TURNBULL: Per acre. We don't.

13 MR. COCHRAN: We've never done that.

14 MR. TURNBULL: Right.

15 MR. COCHRAN: It becomes even more  
16 complicated as dwelling units get smaller and smaller  
17 in newer apartment buildings.

18 MR. TURNBULL: That's right.

19 MR. COCHRAN: There may now be the same  
20 number of -- twice the number of dwelling units in  
21 the same amount of FAR as there was 40 years ago  
22 because we've gotten down to such smaller units.

23 But we look at FAR, and that's what OP judged  
24 it on, the FAR of the whole site.

25 MR. TURNBULL: Okay. And I understand that.

1 But here's my point, then, what I'm concerned about  
2 for the Zoning Commission. As we go down this route  
3 dealing with FAR we just instituted, are going  
4 forward with new Zoning Regulations and if units are  
5 getting smaller and the FAR -- I'm concerned. We all  
6 want more housing. We all want better quality  
7 housing, but we're also concerned about the density  
8 and the impact on the street level down below with  
9 everything else.

10 So I guess I would like OP to either do a  
11 study or come back the Zoning Commission, Mr. Chair.  
12 We had this like a couple of weeks ago on a couple of  
13 cases that we set down where we had the high end of  
14 moderate density, and we were all concerned about  
15 that. So I'm concerned about the density, the number  
16 of issues, and where we're going, and I guess I would  
17 like some feeling so that the Zoning Commission -- we  
18 don't feel like we're backing into something that  
19 we're not fully on board with.

20 MR. COCHRAN: I wanted to make just one quick  
21 clarification. It's well within what is considered  
22 moderate. Where I said it was at the high end in the  
23 report, it's at the high end of the height that would  
24 be considered appropriate in a moderate density zone.  
25 But with respect to FAR it's right in there.

1 MR. TURNBULL: Okay. Well, I guess --

2 MR. COCHRAN: I guess I'll defer to my  
3 superior for a response on what we might look at.

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Before we do that, I think  
5 you're right and I don't know whether it's  
6 appropriate for us to do this in a training session.

7 MR. COCHRAN: Right.

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Because we went through  
9 this once before in another case that's still out  
10 there hanging and I may have some of the stuff mixed  
11 up, that was handed back to us on a platter. So I  
12 think this is something that we need to, maybe in a  
13 training session --

14 MR. TURNBULL: Or something.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: -- or some kind of way and  
16 deal with it. I don't know if this is appropriate in  
17 this particular case. But there's something that we  
18 need to resolve and I'm going to let Ms. Steingasser,  
19 if she wants to piggyback on it.

20 MS. STEINGASSER: I was just going to say,  
21 the zones and the relationship to the Comp Plan  
22 designations are set out in the Comp Plan. And  
23 that's where we start. And so we look at the  
24 designation of the Comp Plan map, any guidance  
25 provided by the Small Area Plans, and then the zones

1 that are correlated to those designations. They're  
2 then -- they're also defined in the Zoning  
3 Regulations as being either a medium density or a  
4 high density.

5 And then how we assess that density is  
6 through the impacts. And a lot of that impact is  
7 based on traffic; is the one we hear about the most.  
8 But that's how it comes. And we're happy to get you  
9 those sections of the Comprehensive Plan that lay out  
10 what those zones are that correlate to those  
11 designations.

12 MR. TURNBULL: Well, and I guess I would also  
13 like to tie that into as what Mr. Cochran was saying,  
14 FAR, and how you look at density per FAR and how that  
15 -- how does that really translate so that when we  
16 look at this we have a better understanding of really  
17 units that are going in there. I think at this point  
18 it's just a little uneasy right now.

19 Mr. Chair, then I have a question for Mr.  
20 Westrom. Did I understand you then that in light of  
21 your findings on I Street the applicant should be  
22 putting in their -- should be talking about no RPP  
23 for this building?

24 MR. WESTROM: Well, that is something I would  
25 leave to the applicant and the Commissioners. I just

1 wanted to note that the block is eligible. If the  
2 applicant and/or the Commissioners want to be  
3 reactive to that, they could react as they see fit.

4 MR. TURNBULL: Okay.

5 MR. WESTROM: We would not have an issue with  
6 them not including that, or including that, as has  
7 been noted at previous times, it's not a strictly  
8 enforceable condition.

9 MR. TURNBULL: Right. Right.

10 MR. WESTROM: It's something that we're still  
11 working through.

12 MR. TURNBULL: Right. We know that, right.

13 MR. WESTROM: But it's certainly something  
14 that could be done.

15 MR. TURNBULL: Okay. Thank you.

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Any other questions  
17 up here? Commissioner May?

18 MR. MAY: All right. So I don't mean to beat  
19 a dead horse but I want to touch the question of the  
20 density a little bit myself.

21 Comprehensive Plan, or sorry, the Small Area  
22 Plan is showing this area now as mixed use between  
23 medium density residential and low density  
24 commercial, correct?

25 MR. COCHRAN: Correct.

1           MR. MAY: Medium density residential can  
2 correspond to C-3-A per the Comprehensive Plan? Is  
3 it that explicit?

4           MS. STEINGASSER: It does indeed list a range  
5 of zones.

6           MR. MAY: Right.

7           MS. STEINGASSER: And then it says -- it ends  
8 by -- it will say something, and for example, I don't  
9 have the exact words with me, but it will say, medium  
10 density zones include the following, blah, blah,  
11 blah, but may also include other zones.

12          MR. MAY: Yeah. I know there's always  
13 that --

14          MS. STEINGASSER: Right.

15          MR. MAY: -- qualifier that it may include  
16 others, or that it may go higher even though it  
17 specifies a certain number of stories and so on. But  
18 see, and you referred to medium density zones but not  
19 medium density commercial zones. You just meant --  
20 is it generic like that? Is it just zones; medium  
21 density zones?

22          MS. STEINGASSER: The Comp Plan breaks the  
23 discussion out in terms of residential and  
24 commercial. But as you know, everything below the C-  
25 3-C has a built in incentive for residential to carry

1 a predominance.

2 MR. MAY: Right.

3 MS. STEINGASSER: So those are included.

4 MR. MAY: Okay. But I'm even just asking on  
5 the more simple question of, did they refer to medium  
6 density, you know, when they talk about what  
7 constitutes a medium density zone, do they say medium  
8 density commercial zones include C-3-A, or do they  
9 say medium density zones include C-3-A?

10 MS. STEINGASSER: Off the top of my head I'd  
11 have to --

12 MR. MAY: Yeah. Okay. I was just curious  
13 about that because I mean, I was hearing it the later  
14 way which makes it connect very clearly, this you  
15 know, what's indicated in the Small Area Plan to the  
16 proposed density here. And I think the only question  
17 is, you know, the issue of height because there is  
18 this description of what constitutes medium density  
19 in terms of number of stories or height of buildings.  
20 And it's --

21 MS. STEINGASSER: Yes.

22 MR. MAY: -- at the upper end and perhaps  
23 slightly above. But I think that there's -- the  
24 language gives flexibility that allows us to go a  
25 little bit above that.

1 MS. STEINGASSER: It does. And I believe the  
2 applicant gave a good explanation of the mixed use  
3 nature of the designation on the Comp Plan and how  
4 that breaks -- and how that relates to the mixed use  
5 allocation of FAR within these zones.

6 MR. MAY: Right. Okay. So, and then I would  
7 just add that you know, I think the idea of us having  
8 a more thorough discussion of this, you know, whether  
9 it's in training or something like that, may be a  
10 useful thing. I am really reluctant to make any kind  
11 of comparison whatsoever to any prior case because I  
12 think I'm aware of the case that the Chairman was  
13 thinking about before and I think there are some  
14 distinguishing factors in that case that make it not  
15 the same.

16 So I wouldn't want to draw too many  
17 parallels.

18 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Any other comments?  
19 Commissioner Miller?

20 MR. MILLER: Just on the issue. I want to  
21 thank Office of Planning also for your very  
22 comprehensive report and the explanations you've  
23 given here about the consistency with what's called  
24 for in the Comprehensive Plan and the Small Area  
25 Plan. I think a compelling case can be made that

1 what's proposed, it is not inconsistent. I'm just  
2 concerned about the -- for me, I mean, and I see it's  
3 not inconsistent with -- it's certain not  
4 inconsistent with medium density even in terms of the  
5 FAR. And I can remember, I think there were -- the  
6 heights, it as your own report says, it's at the  
7 upper end or at the high end. And I don't really  
8 have a problem with that. It's just the timing that  
9 we have and that the City hasn't amended the  
10 Comprehensive Plan land use map, the overall land use  
11 map from the moderate density residential.

12 And I know that ever case is different. We  
13 did have a case, I think, which -- in the last year  
14 or two where there was a moderate density residential  
15 and I think the Office of Planning made the applicant  
16 come back with a C-2-B rather than a C-3-A in that  
17 particular case and shaved off the 90 foot high  
18 buildings to 65 feet. So I think a training program  
19 that, maybe that does lay out why we do it in some  
20 cases and don't do it in other cases, and shows the  
21 distinguishing factors of each, I mean, that case had  
22 over 1,500 presidential units, as I'm recalling the  
23 Brentwood Village case.

24 And I can remember the moderate density  
25 residential where we have done 90 foot buildings,

1 because the FAR is so low because it's such a big  
2 site.

3 MS. STEINGASSER: I think the  
4 distinguishing --

5 MR. MILLER: But the timing is of concern.  
6 It was a concern of you in that previous -- in one of  
7 those previous cases.

8 MS. STEINGASSER: It was. And the  
9 distinguishing characteristic here is the other sides  
10 that you mentioned did not have a Small Area Plan to  
11 provide the additional guidance of what should the  
12 future development be. In this case the City Council  
13 just in July of this year adopted that Small Area  
14 Plan that addressed this site, you know, in detail  
15 and provided that guidance to us.

16 MR. MILLER: And I have no doubt that you'll  
17 be sending an amendment, when you send your next Comp  
18 Plan amendments, that it will change the future land  
19 use map to conform with what the Small Area Plan says  
20 to make it medium density residential, I assume. But  
21 it's kind of like backwards a little bit.

22 MS. STEINGASSER: It is a continuum.

23 MR. MILLER: It's a continuum. Okay. I can  
24 appreciate that.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Vice Chair, you had

1 another follow up?

2 MS. COHEN: Yes. I have the younger child  
3 syndrome so I have to be the last to speak. I just  
4 want to be -- everybody to be aware of, and I know  
5 that planning will take this into consideration,  
6 unintended consequences. First of all, the need for  
7 a density, the reason why we have it near transit  
8 zones is an issue related to affordability. We have  
9 problems in the District for people to be able to  
10 afford any rent, even at the high end. And if we  
11 don't have density, and there are studies, dozens of  
12 studies that prove this point, then the cost of  
13 housing goes up tremendously. So that's what the  
14 younger child has to say.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Any  
16 other questions up here?

17 Give me one second, Mr. Hurwitz. I'm coming  
18 straight to you soon as I get through going through -  
19 - there's a process I've got to go through but I see  
20 you over there chomping, ready to go.

21 Any other questions, Commissioners? Does the  
22 applicant have any cross of Office of Planning or  
23 DDOT?

24 MR. AVITABILE: I do not.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay, Mr. Hurwitz, you're

1 on. Now this is cross from Office of Planning or  
2 DDOT.

3 MR. HURWITZ: Well, first I'd like to start  
4 with Office of Planning.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Sure. However you want to  
6 do it.

7 MR. HURWITZ: Can we put his testimony, page  
8 4 up? Would that be possible?

9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I don't think they have --  
10 are you talking about DDOT?

11 MR. HURWITZ: Oh, I thought Donna was in  
12 charge of it over there.

13 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: No, they don't -- no, the  
14 applicant gets it up. But just tell us what you're  
15 referencing and we will --

16 MR. HURWITZ: Well, page 4 of the document  
17 from --

18 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Office of Planning?

19 MR. HURWITZ: Office of Planning.

20 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

21 MR. HURWITZ: I guess, you know, we've been  
22 trying to do a lot of research on this on our end so  
23 I'm not trying to be difficult. We're just trying to  
24 understand, in the picture here, when it says medium  
25 density residential, it says four to seven stories.

1 And I understand that you can get a bump for -- you  
2 can get a bump for the PUD. So now we're at nine  
3 stories, plus penthouse. We're at 10 stories. So I  
4 mean, I thought that the process -- and I guess, let  
5 me just frame our issue on the cross here, just  
6 because if you look at this, site B, site C, site E  
7 and then 501 I Street is not marked here, are all  
8 designated for redevelopment to this medium density.

9 So your decision here today concerns, also in  
10 Townhouse Management 1, not just on their beautiful  
11 ideas and proposals, but on all these projects coming  
12 forward as this project has come forward and said --  
13 has not mentioned townhouses in their PUD application  
14 at all. They've mentioned all the 100 foot buildings  
15 but none of the 60 foot buildings in their PUD. But  
16 you know, I'm just trying to understand, when I read  
17 the handbook -- sorry, Steve. Let me ask a question.

18 When I read the handbook it looked like 60  
19 feet or 65 feet was the maximum for medium  
20 residential. So I'm just trying to understand how we  
21 get to 90.

22 MR. COCHRAN: Well, if you look at the  
23 pattern around Southwest, you have a number of nine  
24 story buildings, Tiber Island, and the various other  
25 developments, Alcoa Aluminum, Riverside, all of those

1 are nine stories. That's the pattern we were looking  
2 at.

3 When you look at the three sites along I  
4 Street they have one thing in common, an attempt to  
5 save churches by allowing density to be transferred  
6 onto a different part of the site. Each of those  
7 three sites is a site of an existing church. So  
8 that's one of the reasons that you see a somewhat  
9 higher land use designation than you might otherwise,  
10 in order to allow the preservation of the churches.

11 MR. HURWITZ: No, that's great. And through  
12 the public process of the Small Area Plan I thought  
13 your office did a fantastic job. But our  
14 understanding was never that nine stories was going  
15 to be the norm for these properties. So what in your  
16 definition -- am I looking at something wrong on page  
17 4 here from the Small Area Plan, that four to seven  
18 stories of the medium density residential --

19 MR. COCHRAN: It clearly says that in the  
20 Small Area Plan. Of course, that's referring to  
21 matter of right development. If you were at some of  
22 these meetings you will remember that one of the  
23 things we were very adamant about, not we, but  
24 everybody, was we're not -- one of the buildings  
25 people don't like is the building on the north side

1 of I Street in between the 300 and 400 block. That's  
2 the one that was added to, I believe it's Capitol  
3 Park.

4 MR. HURWITZ: Potomac Place.

5 MR. COCHRAN: That's six or -- oh, it's  
6 Potomac Place. Excuse me. That's six or seven  
7 stories. That was cited as the kind of building we  
8 don't want because it's neither fish nor fowl. It's  
9 neither high nor low.

10 MS. STEINGASSER: If I could go ahead and  
11 answer the question. The nine stories are permitted  
12 as a planned unit development. And the planned unit  
13 development within the zoning regs allows for that  
14 flexibility of height in exchange for a public  
15 evaluation and weighing of the project.

16 MR. HURWITZ: So I guess what I'm trying to  
17 understand, and I'm not trying to be difficult or  
18 fight with these guys, but I'm trying to understand.  
19 So are you saying that every one of these churches  
20 you're going to allow to go to nine stories, because  
21 that was not our understand during the Small Area  
22 Plan.

23 MS. STEINGASSER: No, sir. The planned unit  
24 development process allows for a maximum of 90 feet  
25 to be proposed. This Commission will evaluate the

1 projects if they choose to go forward as a planned  
2 unit development, and determine whether the benefits  
3 and amenities generated by the PUD merit having that  
4 extra height.

5 MR. HURWITZ: Thank you, Jennifer. And can  
6 you just clarify for me. So is it seven to nine --  
7 is it, I'm sorry, four to seven stories as medium  
8 residential unless you're in a PUD and then it's  
9 nine? Up to nine or nine as high?

10 MS. STEINGASSER: These are typical ranges.  
11 They're not prescriptive regulations. The  
12 regulations are in the Zoning Code. These are  
13 typical ranges that give us a sense of the  
14 overarching form, and you can read these as  
15 correctly, matter of right. Flexibility is then  
16 granted through the planned unit development process  
17 if approved by the Zoning Commission.

18 MR. HURWITZ: And what would the highest  
19 number of stories be that you would allow in a medium  
20 residential designation?

21 MS. STEINGASSER: Well, we would measure by  
22 height more than stories. Stories are a result of --

23 MR. HURWITZ: Sure. Let's go with height.

24 MS. STEINGASSER: -- of 90 feet.

25 MR. HURWITZ: So 90 feet, which is what's

1 proposed. That would be the absolute maximum that  
2 you would allow?

3 MS. STEINGASSER: Office of Planning would  
4 only make a recommendation, but I'm not going to say  
5 it's the maximum because we have seen projects that  
6 could propose a higher density. I'm sorry, a taller  
7 height in exchange for some unforeseen public benefit  
8 or other flexibility. But they would maintain the  
9 density. So a zone is defined not just as a matter  
10 of height and square footage, but it's a combination  
11 of height and bulk.

12 MR. HURWITZ: Thank you. And I think that  
13 might be it. I think that was really what I was  
14 trying to clarify with the Office of Planning. But  
15 just, wait, I guess the last question is, so if Site  
16 A, which in this diagram that I'm looking on page 4  
17 is allowed to go to 90 feet, and then Site B, which  
18 also has a church comes in and says, hey, we have a  
19 PUD, then that would be okay to go 90 feet. And then  
20 C -- I mean, collectively what our concern is, is  
21 we're 60, 45 foot, 60 foot townhomes and basically  
22 all the sky around us is being taken away. So, I  
23 mean, that's a real challenge.

24 MS. STEINGASSER: Each project would be  
25 evaluated unto itself. I mean, it's hard to guess

1 what B and C might do.

2 MR. HURWITZ: Not really.

3 MS. STEINGASSER: Then it would be evaluated.  
4 There would be a public hearing, coordination with  
5 the ANC, property owners, community groups, same  
6 basic process.

7 MR. HURWITZ: Thank you very much. I'm  
8 sorry. I'm just trying -- I mean, our townhouse  
9 association is the one that is across the street from  
10 this actual project, but there are other townhouse  
11 associations in a little niche here in Southwest and  
12 we're just trying to kind of protect our area from  
13 the high rises and the traffic because DDOT is  
14 pushing everybody on to our streets and if  
15 Commissioner May rides his bike down I Street I'm  
16 sure he's noticing that 4th and I is getting bad, 4th  
17 and G is getting bad.

18 MS. STEINGASSER: Question?

19 MR. HURWITZ: No, that's not a question. I'm  
20 sorry. Thank you, Your Honor.

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Well, I've been called  
22 worse. That's one of the better things I've been  
23 called. I kind of wanted to hear what Commissioner  
24 May was doing riding down I Street, what was he  
25 noticing. But that's why I was letting you go ahead.

1 But anyway, that was not a question.

2 Okay. Let's go to the Office of  
3 Planning's -- I mean, I'm sorry, the ANC. Do we have  
4 any other reports of any other government agencies,  
5 colleagues, helping me in the record?

6 MR. HURWITZ: Oh, I'm sorry, Your Honor.

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Even though you've already  
8 spoken.

9 MR. HURWITZ: Mr. Chairman, can I go to DDOT  
10 now?

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Oh, you hadn't finished.  
12 Okay.

13 MR. HURWITZ: I apologize.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Go right ahead.

15 MR. HURWITZ: I thought you guys got to go  
16 first. You already went. You're done.

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: We already went, yeah.

18 MR. HURWITZ: Okay. So I guess to DDOT I  
19 guess my question is, is what happened to the  
20 proposed possible I Street streetcar?

21 MR. WESTROM: The streetcar route in this  
22 particular area hasn't been determined in finality.  
23 As Mr. VanPelt noted, it was in early system planning  
24 and there were early planning processes that were  
25 contemplating these particular routes. That process

1 was not finished at this time and so while  
2 theoretically I is still on the table, at the time  
3 that we closed that part of the process it was  
4 looking like the more likely route possibilities were  
5 on 7th and Main.

6 MR. HURWITZ: And you think Main Avenue along  
7 the curb cut is a possibility for a street car?

8 MR. WESTROM: Along the curb cut?

9 MR. HURWITZ: Along the curb line. Past  
10 Arena Stage, past all those guys?

11 MR. WESTROM: Absolutely it is a possibility.

12 MR. HURWITZ: It is? That was studied,  
13 because I was told that I Street was the more likely  
14 path.

15 MR. WESTROM: I'm not sure who told you that,  
16 but the process that I was familiar with, the  
17 streetcar route that you're talking about  
18 specifically is there was southeast/southwest  
19 corridor study which would carry a potential  
20 streetcar line from the Anacostia neighborhood,  
21 across and back up into the Southwest neighborhood  
22 and it would connect to the north/south corridor  
23 which would be the one that's coming from the north  
24 and coming down 7th. And they would essentially  
25 meet, actually, at this intersection.

1           MR. HURWITZ: One comment as we're really  
2 hoping you don't put streetcars in our neighborhood.  
3 The comment number two would be, when DDOT did this  
4 analysis are they just looking at traffic, or are  
5 they looking at where the kids go to school? Because  
6 we have two schools on I Street and we have houses on  
7 I Street. Is that taken into consideration or are  
8 you only taking in to consideration the density and  
9 the number of cars?

10           MR. WESTROM: It absolutely is multimodal.  
11 So it's vehicles, it's bicycles, it's pedestrians.  
12 Obviously we know that the middle school is right  
13 Northwest of this location and there's people moving  
14 back and forth. And in fact that was one of the  
15 driving concerns with making the specific  
16 intersection safer. We pushed for adding the  
17 crosswalk along the south leg to make sure that you  
18 could get across every leg of the intersection  
19 safely, moving the driveway that was terminating in  
20 the crosswalk back out into the middle of the  
21 intersection. Again, the aim is to reduce the number  
22 of conflict points, and so that would be between any  
23 particular mode. And so reducing the number of  
24 conflict points is done by moving to the place that  
25 there is the least amount of traffic.

1           And again, I Street seems the logical  
2 location for that.

3           MR. HURWITZ: So were you involved with the  
4 4th Street traffic patterning where the new Safeway  
5 is and the government buildings and that kind of  
6 stuff is?

7           MR. WESTROM: I was not personally involved,  
8 no.

9           MR. HURWITZ: Because all of that is being  
10 pushed on to I Street as well. So I'm just trying to  
11 understand at what point do we not try and push  
12 everybody on to I Street because we have all these --  
13 we have project B, project C, there's a project  
14 that's not on here yet. Is everybody going to be  
15 able to be on I Street and have their exit there?

16           MR. WESTROM: I can't speculate as to what  
17 traffic load it could theoretically handle. The  
18 transportation review that was conducted showed that  
19 these intersections operated at very satisfactory  
20 levels of service.

21           MR. HURWITZ: So what would be necessary for  
22 the community to come out and get you to allow them  
23 to put the exit of the -- the exit entrance of this  
24 parking garage not on I Street?

25           MR. WESTROM: The process would involve

1 convincing us that this location is not the safest  
2 location. However, we --

3 MR. HURWITZ: And is there a public process  
4 for that?

5 MR. WESTROM: There is a Public Space  
6 permitting process, and they did already receive  
7 conceptual approval for this driveway curb cut  
8 location. The final approval will ultimately be done  
9 as part of the final Public Space permitting, and  
10 that is a public process. The Public Space Committee  
11 makes the final determination on curb cuts, so DDOT  
12 acts as a reviewer in that role. And so we look at  
13 what the curb cut is and we offer what our  
14 recommendation is. And then ultimately the Public  
15 Space Committee weighs in and makes a determination  
16 as to whether they're going to approve or disapprove  
17 the curb cut that is applied for.

18 MR. HURWITZ: And could the median on 7th  
19 Street or Main Avenue be broken to allow for parking  
20 ingress and egress?

21 MR. WESTROM: Of course, theoretically it  
22 could. I don't believe that that would be a safer  
23 condition.

24 MR. HURWITZ: I guess, I mean, I guess the  
25 challenges are safer for who? For my children or for

1 the random people that are coming to the Wharf to  
2 party? I mean, I guess I'm trying to understand who  
3 gets precedent, the people that are there or the  
4 people that are coming. It's just a little bit  
5 confusing because I don't really see an opportunity  
6 for us in this process.

7 MR. WESTROM: What is the question?

8 MR. HURWITZ: I guess, we requested that the  
9 Riverside Baptist development move the parking  
10 entrance from across the street from our townhomes  
11 and our parking entrance where our 26 cars park,  
12 where UDR's building parks, where 700 7th Street  
13 parking exits, and we were told that DDOT said no.

14 MR. WESTROM: That is correct.

15 MR. HURWITZ: So is there any way to get DDOT  
16 to say yes?

17 MR. WESTROM: If we feel that the safest  
18 location is somewhere other than what we've  
19 determined to date is the safest location, then we  
20 would change our mind and say that that is the case.  
21 We don't place a --

22 MR. HURWITZ: But you haven't said the  
23 safest. You've said the most modile (sic) or it's  
24 the least resistant. You haven't told me it's the  
25 safest.

1           MR. WESTROM: No, that's specifically what  
2 I've been aiming to say, that we believe that this  
3 location is the safest location on the potential  
4 three block faces where a curb cut could be located.

5           MR. HURWITZ: And has the entire Wharf  
6 development and these other future developments been  
7 put into that study that you've done?

8           MR. WESTROM: Absolutely. And we wouldn't  
9 place a hierarchy on any one pedestrian over another.  
10 The goal would be to reduce the number of conflicts.  
11 I mean, ideally there would be no curb cut at all.

12           MR. HURWITZ: Ideally there would be no curb  
13 cut at all.

14           MR. WESTROM: Curb cuts introduce conflicts  
15 and so the goal is to minimize the number of conflict  
16 points. And so if there is no curb cut there is no  
17 conflict. In order to access this building from a  
18 vehicular and a loading perspective a curb cut is  
19 required. And so then the goal is to minimize that  
20 harm.

21           MR. HURWITZ: Okay. Well, I thank you. I  
22 appreciate it. It sounds like this is a dead issue  
23 and we're not going to win on it so we'll go ahead  
24 and move on.

25           Mr. Chairman, can I make my statement because

1 I have to get some kids to bed soon.

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Is there anybody here from  
3 the ANC? Let me do this right quick. So we can go  
4 right in order so I won't say that I went out of  
5 order.

6 Exhibit 28 it says, be it moved that ANC 6B  
7 supports the consolidated PUD and the zone change  
8 requested by P.N. Hoffman, Inc., and that's a letter  
9 of support signed by Roger Moffatt from ANC 6D. And  
10 that's in there for the record.

11 Okay. Let's go to -- do we have any persons,  
12 or organizations or persons who are here who would  
13 like to testify in support?

14 Okay. Do we have any -- did I hear somebody  
15 say something?

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: You'd like to testify in  
18 support? We have one person, right? Two people.

19 Okay. So if you all could come forward.  
20 Yeah, okay. If you all could come forward. Now you  
21 all heard the gentleman with the party, he has some  
22 youngsters that he has to put to bed. So I'm asking  
23 you all to come forward, and I would like for you all  
24 to -- no, you can keep your seat. Keep your seat.

25 MR. HURWITZ: Oh, sorry.

1           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And if you don't mind  
2 if -- you still come forward. If you all don't mind  
3 yielding to the party. How much time, Mr. Hurwitz,  
4 you think you need?

5           MR. HURWITZ: Oh, I just need like five  
6 minutes, max.

7           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Okay. So if you  
8 all -- do you all mind yielding to him? He just  
9 explained that he has some young folks he needs to --  
10 and tomorrow is a school day. Okay. All right. So  
11 you can go ahead and you may begin.

12           MR. HURWITZ: Thank you, sir. Just I guess  
13 once again I'm speaking for Townhouse Management 1,  
14 and I guess our comments for the record is, you know,  
15 it just doesn't seem that the townhomes are getting  
16 the proper due in these PUD applications, or in any  
17 process that's going on here in the community. And  
18 it's a little bit disturbing because there are over  
19 150 townhomes on I, 6th, H, and G Street. You know,  
20 when we talk about height and how Southwest is high,  
21 it was all done during the, whatever it's called, and  
22 yeah, the Urban Renewal, and Waterside Tower, 700 7th  
23 Street, Tiber Island, they have amenities, they have  
24 pools, they have gyms, they have open space, they  
25 have dog parks, they have playgrounds. They have

1 everything you need to sustain a place of living.

2 I very much like this design. I think P.N.  
3 Hoffman is nice people, I think the church is great.  
4 But you know, I don't see any amenities here for  
5 their people. So their people are just going to be  
6 out in our neighborhood, which is fine. But it's  
7 just, you know, at what point -- I guess, look, I  
8 guess our bottom line is, if you approve this that's  
9 fine. But don't make it the precedent that the next  
10 -- that B, C, and D on this chart get to go to nine  
11 stories too because basically that's all the sky in  
12 Southwest is going to be nine stories, and if you're  
13 going to do that then we might as well turn our  
14 townhouses into nine story buildings too, because  
15 this is not a realistic outcome for a balanced  
16 society. So we all engage in the Small Area Plan  
17 and, you know, I guess we should have known that  
18 there was fine print that said if you go through a  
19 PUD process you can get to nine stories, plus a  
20 story.

21 You know, we're all looking at it. We're  
22 like okay, great, they're going to build a four to  
23 seven story building where the Riverside Baptist  
24 Church is and build them a new church. That will be  
25 fabulous, we can't wait. But now all of a sudden

1 we're looking at a nine story building with 174  
2 units, plus a daycare. You know, it's all fine but,  
3 you know, at what point does it end? Like, this  
4 building is fine. They're the first. So if you let  
5 them go, great. But we're going to be back for B, C,  
6 and D, and we don't want you to allow B, C, and D to  
7 do it.

8           And, you know, it was a little bit  
9 frustrating reading the PUD application and seeing  
10 them say, look at the neighbors, they're all 100 feet  
11 tall, look at the neighbors, they're all 100 feet  
12 tall. We're going to be below that. We're going to  
13 be 90 feet. But the fact is, is they didn't mention  
14 us and we're there. And, you know, it's just a  
15 little bit disingenuous to say that 90 feet is a  
16 medium density.

17           So I hope that if you write this order and  
18 you approve this property that you make sure to say  
19 that this is not going to be the precedent for all of  
20 Southwest because that is not what we want to see, is  
21 that they get 90 feet.

22           Yes the Office of Planning told us that  
23 giving them this medium density for moderate density  
24 would allow for more flexibility. So they could go  
25 up with a tower to nine stories. But we didn't know

1 that meant a whole nine story tower that was, you  
2 know, half the property.

3 So I would just like to put that on the  
4 record for you guys. And also we have 501 I Street  
5 coming up for redevelopment soon, and they want to  
6 put a nine story building. So we're going to be  
7 boxed in. So please, do not allow that to happen.

8 And you know, just every church, every  
9 building we don't want to become a huge building in  
10 the neighborhood. And we are very concerned about  
11 parking. We are very -- and we were under the  
12 impression that RPP was part of this proposal for  
13 community benefits, they would not be getting RPP.  
14 And we are very concerned that the traffic is all  
15 being pushed to I, G, 6th, and 4th Street, and that's  
16 where all the traffic is being pushed. It's being  
17 pushed away from Main Avenue. But you know what?  
18 Main Avenue, that's where the action is. They can't  
19 be pushing all the people into our townhomes where  
20 we're walking our kids and people are flying around  
21 and we have a school. It just seems inappropriate.

22 I really do appreciate your time and I thank  
23 you for allowing us to be a part of this process.  
24 And once again, this is not about P.N. Hoffman or  
25 Riverside Baptist Church, this is really about how

1 we're interpreting the Small Area Plan and how that's  
2 going to be effecting us in the future in Southwest.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Mr. Hurwitz, what  
4 I'm going to do, I'm going to ask some of your  
5 questions. I'm going to find out some things from  
6 you first. Do you attend your ANC meetings?

7 MR. HURWITZ: Usually not, sir.

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Let me just explain  
9 to you about this ANC. I've been around a long time.

10 MR. HURWITZ: I have known Marjory Lightman.

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. But this ANC is  
12 well versed. This ANC was one in the neighborhood  
13 who knew a lot of PUDs were coming to that area and  
14 they started collectively looking at -- I don't know  
15 what ever happened to it, but collectively looking at  
16 how they're going to do their amenities package. I  
17 would encourage you, some of your concerns and you  
18 need to be at the table with the Office of Planning  
19 and the developer comes out to the ANC meeting,  
20 because when it comes down here we start looking at  
21 land use. A lot of those policies have already been  
22 vetted through the community. And I will tell you,  
23 you have one of the strongest, and I think  
24 Commissioner Miller mentioned this earlier, it's  
25 noted across the city you have one of the strongest

1 ANCs who have already been on record to know that  
2 there is a lot of PUDs. And this is being recorded  
3 so they can say well, the Chairman got up there and  
4 said some stuff that was false. But I'm not.

5 This ANC is well versed. They're well known.  
6 They are very coordinated and they have taught other  
7 neighborhoods in this city on how to deal with their  
8 amenities package. Now as far as some of the  
9 concerns that you have, those are some of the  
10 concerns that come through your ANC. So while you  
11 don't attend I would encourage you now to start  
12 attending. See what's on the agenda. Bring your  
13 concerns there.

14 MR. HURWITZ: My wife called me like 10  
15 times. I have a 12 month old baby that just --

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I understand.

17 MR. HURWITZ: Sorry. I shall try and --

18 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: But you know what?

19 MR. HURWITZ: -- I'm trying to be engaged in  
20 the process.

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: But you've got to try to  
22 balance that. You know, I've been there too even  
23 though mine is now is 31. But you've got to balance  
24 that. I don't even look 31. But anyway. But I'm  
25 just saying, you've got to try to balance that, you

1 know? Sometime you all switch it up, get one of your  
2 neighbors to go. But you've got to get engaged at  
3 that level.

4 MR. HURWITZ: Well, our neighbors are here  
5 and they've been to the ANC and we're partaking, but  
6 -- and we partook in the Southwest Plan. We just  
7 didn't realize that nine stories was the new norm.

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And you all had a lot of  
9 slorettes (phonetic) over in -- I saw a little -- I  
10 didn't know what they were all about, but you all  
11 have had a lot of slorettes (phonetic). If anybody  
12 gets together it's the folks over there in Southwest.

13 MR. HURWITZ: Oh, yeah. And we're not  
14 fighting these guys. We're just saying, hey guys,  
15 you know, not support --

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: No, I'm just talking about  
17 for your future concerns. I'm not even talking about  
18 this group now.

19 MR. HURWITZ: I appreciate that.

20 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'm talking about just in  
21 general.

22 MR. HURWITZ: Yes, sir.

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So let's see. Any  
24 other questions Vice Chair Cohen?

25 MS. COHEN: Yes. I was wondering

1 townhomes -- some of the townhomes I've been to seem  
2 to have open space around them. Your development  
3 doesn't?

4 MR. HURWITZ: No, we do.

5 MS. COHEN: You do.

6 MR. HURWITZ: But we'll be the closest open  
7 space to the Riverside Baptist, which is why they are  
8 -- we have been talking about mitigation measures  
9 because --

10 MS. COHEN: Okay.

11 MR. HURWITZ: -- we do, we have a beautiful  
12 commons.

13 MS. COHEN: Yeah.

14 MR. HURWITZ: And it's lovely. But you know,  
15 we want -- we like this part of Southwest is that  
16 everybody's got commons. Everybody has beautiful  
17 open green space. And that's part of what attracted  
18 people to Southwest. And I understand there's a  
19 demand for more units and more density. But there  
20 also needs to be a demand for keeping the place open  
21 and having parks and place for children to play.

22 MS. COHEN: Another question. What about  
23 parking? Aren't there set asides for every town home  
24 for parking?

25 MR. HURWITZ: There are set asides for all

1 the townhomes. Everybody has -- there is one spot  
2 per townhome pretty much, but the answer is, is  
3 there's no parking on the street and there's no --

4 MS. COHEN: Right.

5 MR. HURWITZ: Like if you have guests over  
6 it's a challenge. You've got to work with your  
7 neighbors to do some stuff to kind of make it all  
8 work. So there really is no parking. So that's a  
9 big concern.

10 And the Wharf hasn't come online yet, and we  
11 have a lot of traffic, a lot of parking concerns  
12 already, and it's just going to get worse and we know  
13 that. And that's okay. We're excited about the  
14 Wharf. I mean, it's not a negative. It's just a  
15 fact of life.

16 MS. COHEN: Is the Arena Stage providing  
17 impact on your parking?

18 MR. HURWITZ: Absolutely. And when there's a  
19 show there's a ton of people parking on our street.

20 MS. COHEN: Yeah, because it's easy. It's  
21 been easy to find parking so, okay. Thank you.

22 MR. HURWITZ: You're welcome.

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Commissioner May.

24 MR. MAY: Yeah. So the commons at your  
25 development, is that a public open space?

1           MR. HURWITZ: It's a -- I guess. I don't  
2 know how to answer that, sir.

3           MR. MAY: Well, I mean, can anybody go there  
4 or is it restricted to the people who live there? Is  
5 it fenced?

6           MR. HURWITZ: It is supposed to be restricted  
7 with -- it's restricted with signs. It is not  
8 restricted with a fence currently.

9           MR. MAY: Yeah. Okay. Because I mean, I  
10 know there are some areas where, you know, there are  
11 fences and it's not easy to -- you certainly can't go  
12 through.

13           MR. HURWITZ: Well, unfortunately that's the  
14 next step for us because as each of these apartment  
15 buildings comes on line we get more and more people  
16 with their dogs because it's a beautiful place to  
17 come for a walk.

18           MR. MAY: Uh-huh. Okay. I don't think I  
19 have any other questions. Thanks.

20           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Any other questions  
21 up here? Okay.

22           MR. HURWITZ: Thank you very much,  
23 Commissioners.

24           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Well, hold on one second.

25           MR. HURWITZ: Oh, yes, sir.

1           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: We might have some cross-  
2 examination. Let's try to get this out of the way.  
3 Does the applicant have any cross? And again,  
4 there's no one here from the ANC.

5           Thank you very much. Okay. I thank you all  
6 for indulging him. Let's start with the young lady  
7 to my right. Yeah, just hit until it lights up.  
8 You're ready to go.

9           MS. LACEWELL: Good evening, Chairman and  
10 other members of the Committee. My name is Ida  
11 Williams Lacewell and I have lived in Waterside  
12 Towers right next door to Riverside Baptist Church  
13 for the last 20 years. I am also a member of  
14 Riverside Baptist Church and an ordained deacon  
15 there.

16           And I really welcome the changes that are  
17 coming to our community and also the rebuilding of  
18 the church. I think the new church will bring new  
19 members and visitors to the waterfront for, you know,  
20 all kinds of activities and stuff. And I think  
21 Riverside Baptist Church, we generate a lot of love  
22 and I would like to see that continue in the decades  
23 to come.

24           I know change is hard and my grandmother  
25 always told me that the most permanent thing on Earth

1 was change. So I think we have to be open minded  
2 about going for it with this. Thank you.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. Next.

4 MR. TINSLEY: Good evening, everyone. My  
5 name is Kenneth Tinsley and I've been a member at  
6 Riverside since I was about four years old. I also  
7 live in the Southwest at the Commons Apartments on  
8 6th and H since about '93, and the church in the  
9 community has been a big part of my life and a lot of  
10 people I've grown up with, since we were young, you  
11 know, they had movie nights every other Friday. They  
12 always had things for us to do, you know, to keep us  
13 busy and things like that because on that part of  
14 Southwest there's not really that much to do. And  
15 they always reached out to us, you know, providing us  
16 school supplies, getting in taking us to baseball  
17 games, taking us to camps, and just, you know, doing  
18 everything in their power to, you know, make us  
19 better people.

20 The people I met through that church had --  
21 they're phenomenal. A lot of people came and gone  
22 but you know, they had a big influence on my life.  
23 They held me up through high school, they support me  
24 while I was in college. I attend Central State  
25 University. I graduated two years ago with honors

1 and everything. You know, the church supported me  
2 emotionally, financially. They gave me laptops, you  
3 know, just they went above and beyond for me.

4 And even when I graduated they helped me, you  
5 know, with jobs. You know, my pastor, Pastor  
6 Bledsoe, he introduced me to some people at P.N.  
7 Hoffman, Madison Marquette (phonetic), and they  
8 provided me with a summer job working with some  
9 events down in Southwest on the waterfront. And  
10 those people let me work there very summer for the  
11 past five years. And they just, they really looked  
12 out for me.

13 And about a year ago I got a call to work at  
14 a college, base college as a football coach over  
15 there, and the church once again sent me well on my  
16 way. You know, they helped me with my move and  
17 everything. And it's hard to find people like that  
18 now a days. And I hope you guys just take in  
19 consideration that, you know, it's really good people  
20 there and with the new church it could attract more  
21 people, help more people out, and we really, really  
22 do need it so I hope you guys can, you know, vote in  
23 favor of us and help us get the new church because  
24 it's a definitely a good thing in the community.  
25 Thank you.

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Next.

2 MS. YATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and to  
3 the Commissioners. My name is Juanita Yates and I'm  
4 a long time resident of Southwest Washington. In  
5 fact I've lived in Southwest since the late '70s,  
6 first as a renter in the Capitol Park Community  
7 that's off of 4th and G, and later as a homeowner in  
8 the River Park Mutual Homes Community near Fort  
9 McNare.

10 There are a number of people like me who are  
11 longtime members of Riverside. I've been a member of  
12 Riverside, again since the late '70s. And I think I  
13 echo both Ida and Kenneth, who say that -- and the  
14 many other members of Riverside who live in  
15 Southwest, we are very pleased that the church  
16 decided to remain in the Southwest community for a  
17 number of reasons, including personal reasons.

18 Pastor Bledsoe spoke about the outreach that  
19 we've been a part of in terms of outreach in  
20 Southwest. And I'm going to talk a little brief --  
21 briefly about that as well.

22 While we've focused on many many communities  
23 in Southwest, one of the -- and populations. I guess  
24 our efforts in working with children and teenagers  
25 has been the most, as far as I am concerned, the most

1 impactful. And Kenneth is one example. He was part  
2 of what we've done for the last 15 years. We've  
3 sponsored what's called Friday Fill Night. And what  
4 he was speaking about were the activities that many  
5 of the children in the Southwest community were  
6 invited to. Our church was a refuge for them to come  
7 and just have fun.

8           And as Kenneth said, we did all kinds of  
9 things with them, from Films to cookouts. We took  
10 them to the circus and meals at waterfront  
11 restaurants. And when the National Baseball Stadium  
12 opened they were among the first to enjoy the game.  
13 While the Nationals lost that game, the kids still  
14 had an opportunity to enjoy rooting for their home  
15 team. They had an opportunity to enjoy the seventh  
16 inning stretch and Taking Me Out to the Ballgame,  
17 singing all of those songs, and eating.

18           Christmas we've, for a number of years, been  
19 involved with providing toys and clothing for kids in  
20 the community. You've mentioned Greenleaf. We've  
21 had all kids from all of the various communities in  
22 Southwest in our church, and we've provided those  
23 gifts for them. I guess over the years, over 1,000  
24 gifts to children especially starting with Angle  
25 Tree. But also children who may have a parent who is

1 in prison so that through those kinds of outreach, as  
2 well as working very closely with the faculty and  
3 staff at the schools in the area, Jefferson, Amidon-  
4 Bowen, and of court Apple Tree, which was housed in  
5 Riverside for so long. We provided backpacks for  
6 them, filled with school supplies through the years.  
7 Those are just examples of the kinds of outreach that  
8 we've had with kids.

9           Pastor mentioned Crop Walk, which is  
10 initiative started in churches, Southwest churches,  
11 back in 2006 where the issue of hunger for not only  
12 for United States but in developing countries, we've  
13 provided funds for them. I guess in the first three  
14 years that I was involved with -- from 2006 to 2008,  
15 over \$30,000 was raised for those kinds of  
16 organizations that feed the hungry. And Riverside  
17 contributed over a third of that, \$11,000 where we  
18 had people in our church to provide financial support  
19 and fundraising.

20           Out of that came many of the organizations  
21 that we currently work with now, Martha's Table and  
22 SOME. Some of you may be familiar with this, so  
23 others may eat. We provide financial support to  
24 them. We provide food for them in terms of canned  
25 goods. And more importantly --

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Can you give us your -- I  
2 don't want to cut you off. I let you go because you  
3 all have been here for a while. It rang a while back  
4 so if you can give us your closing thought?

5 MS. YATES: Okay. I'll give you my closing  
6 thoughts.

7 We wanted to give you a sense, and I  
8 appreciate your giving us the extra time, but we  
9 wanted to give you a sense of who we are and from I  
10 guess from the -- from Riverside we wanted to give  
11 you a sense of who we've been for the last 158 years,  
12 starting with Island Baptist and continuing through  
13 Fifth Baptist, and now to Riverside Baptist. We  
14 wanted to give you a sense of who we are and who  
15 we've been during this period of time. Thank you.

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you very  
17 much. Colleagues, any questions of this panel?

18 And how long is the church -- 157?

19 MS. YATES: A hundred fifty-eight years.  
20 This is the 158th year.

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Well, you all look very  
22 good for 158 years. Okay.

23 MS. YATES: I'll tell the others.

24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Do we have any  
25 cross-examination? I mean, yeah, any cross? Okay.

1           And coach, let me ask you a question. Are  
2 you still coaching?

3           MR. TINSLEY: Yes.

4           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: What's the record look  
5 like?

6           MR. TINSLEY: This past year it was pretty  
7 rough. We went -- it was a really rough year  
8 compared to what we did last year. So it is what it  
9 is.

10          CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Well, keep -- hang in  
11 there. You all hang in there.

12          MR. TINSLEY: I will.

13          MS. YATES: The scores have been much better  
14 since he's been there, though.

15          CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Oh, okay.

16          MR. TINSLEY: Thank you.

17          CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Maybe you can help the  
18 Giants out next time. Okay.

19          MR. TINSLEY: I ain't going there.

20          CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. All right.  
21 Let's do it. We appreciate this panel. Is there  
22 anyone else who would like to testify in support?

23          Now I do have a number of people who would  
24 like to testify in opposition. If you can come  
25 forward, I'm not going to call names. How many

1 people are here who would like to testify in  
2 opposition?

3 Okay. If you all can come forward? Those  
4 who would like to testify in opposition. But let me  
5 ask this. How many people are here in opposition?

6 Mr. Hurwitz kind of spoke for you, your  
7 concerns for the most part. Okay. So we got that.  
8 We got that. Okay. You want to go ahead? You may  
9 begin.

10 MS. LAMBERSON: Good evening.

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Good evening.

12 MS. LAMBERSON: My name is Beverly Branton  
13 Lamberson, and I live at 825 6th Street Southwest. I  
14 want to thank everyone for all the excellent reports  
15 and the really -- the questions that you've raised  
16 have been really excellent and a lot of them address  
17 some of our concerns. And I just want to follow  
18 behind Josh just a little bit just to say that I am a  
19 resident of Southwest for a very long time. My  
20 father, the late civil rights attorney, Wiley Branton  
21 bought our house in 1965, and that was after urban  
22 renewal. So he had moved his family from Atlanta,  
23 Georgia, his family of eight of us, from Atlanta,  
24 Georgia to Washington, D.C. And when we came he  
25 wasn't a part of the whole decision and discussions

1 about urban renewal, and my father is such a people  
2 person and so passionate about doing the right thing  
3 and just looking out for people that he put us in the  
4 car to drive us around to where the people who had  
5 lived where we lived, had been displaced. So we went  
6 out Kenilworth Avenue and we went all over because he  
7 needed to convince himself that where we were living  
8 had -- and he talked to his friends who were doctors  
9 who had come and treated people in that neighborhood  
10 who told him how bad the situation was for living  
11 there. And he just wanted to make sure that he knew  
12 and that we, as his children, knew that people had  
13 been moved and had a better living condition than  
14 what they had had.

15               So that's the legacy that I come from. And I  
16 just say some of this so that you know that I am a  
17 long time resident. I remember when it was Safeway  
18 and People's Drug Store and the bowling alley and the  
19 street was open. I remember the excitement when EPA  
20 was built and it became a mall, and Blimpie's opened,  
21 and we had a place to go eat. I went to Jefferson  
22 Junior High School. My sister went to Bowen and to  
23 Amidon, and another sister went to Hawthorne. And we  
24 live across the street from this project, this new  
25 development.

1           I have nothing but the utmost respect for the  
2 church. I've been there several times. My father,  
3 my family, we worship there. We worshiped at every  
4 church in Southwest back in the '60s and '70s and I  
5 just admire all the work that they've done and I've  
6 certain enjoyed worshipping there.

7           There have been -- you know, we were not  
8 included in the original discussions. I wish we had  
9 been at the table from the very beginning, but it was  
10 all the higher buildings that were considered and not  
11 us, even though we were in the 200 feet limit. And  
12 so really I just want to sort of reiterate some of  
13 the feelings of the townhouses, and not just ours but  
14 all of us in the area because one of the things that  
15 everybody talks about is how unique Southwest is with  
16 its combination of low-rise, mid-rise, and high-rise.  
17 And we're seeing so many new developments come on so  
18 quickly, and they're all becoming high-rises.  
19 They're not new townhouses coming in. They're sort  
20 of -- they're coming in with these designs that are  
21 saying here, we have this low-rise, but a lot of it  
22 is just a façade. It's not a true low-rise. I  
23 haven't really seen anything low-rise built in  
24 Southwest at all. Everything wants to be at high-  
25 rise.

1           So I just want to say that as we -- as I grew  
2 up and as we still could do up until more recent  
3 times, we could walk around the neighborhood. You  
4 could walk down the street and you could see green  
5 spaces. You didn't have to do like this to see the  
6 sky, you know? And it's like everything now is  
7 coming so high that we're not going to be able to do  
8 that anymore. We're losing that whole feeling of  
9 openness, so not just for this but for any other  
10 projects I just hope that somebody will stop and say  
11 wait a minute, where are the low-rises? Where are  
12 the open green spaces? You know, that beautiful  
13 section around Safeway, I don't even know what's  
14 going up there now but the Westminster used to have  
15 the, you know, the arts festivals. We used to have  
16 all that outside. I'm like, I don't know where we're  
17 going to have it now.

18           So I just want to say that we're really  
19 losing this combination. And with this development  
20 and all the others and with what's coming at the  
21 Wharf we're also losing our ability to walk and see  
22 the water because we could walk and see the water  
23 right now, but when all that comes we're not going to  
24 see that either.

25           So what Josh was trying to explain, we are

1 being boxed in, and there is a lot more traffic  
2 coming. I don't remember seeing in the diagram if --  
3 I don't think it really shows you where our parking  
4 lot is compared to where this one -- where our exit  
5 is and this one is going to be. And we're already  
6 starting -- there's so much increased traffic on I  
7 Street now that we're starting to already have issues  
8 trying to turn out of the parking lot. So we're just  
9 concerned about that.

10           So I just really -- you know, and we're  
11 concerned about what the retail could be if it's not  
12 a daycare, and some of the density issues that were  
13 raised, the height of the building. I know that the  
14 building -- the plan is beautiful. I mean, it looks  
15 really nice. I like it. We had wished the church  
16 could be the other way so we could walk down the  
17 street and be inspired by seeing the church. We're  
18 not going to see the church now unless we walk down  
19 and around to Main Street. But it's just not  
20 indifference to that building. It's too high. We  
21 just want to see it scaled back.

22           Anyway, I just appreciate your allowing me  
23 time to share my thoughts. Thank you.

24           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let's see if we have any  
25 questions up here. Any questions?

1 MS. COHEN: No.

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Does  
3 the applicant have any cross?

4 Okay. Thank you very much. We appreciate  
5 your testimony.

6 Okay. Not seeing anyone else who would like  
7 to testify tonight in opposition, is there? Okay,  
8 because I think I called for it. Anyway, okay, Mr.  
9 Avitabile if you can come forward? If you have any  
10 rebuttal or any closing.

11 MR. AVITABILE: If we could have just a  
12 couple of minutes to collect and offer up a rebuttal  
13 so it's more organized rather than scattered we'd  
14 appreciate that.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. All right.

16 MR. AVITABILE: Thank you.

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Uh-huh. We'll take about  
18 four minutes.

19 MR. AVITABILE: We can do that. Thank you.

20 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Five minutes.

21 MR. AVITABILE: Five would be better. Thank  
22 you.

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thanks.

24 [Recess from 9:54 p.m. until 10:00 p.m.]

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Mr. Avitabile, we

1 ready?

2 MR. AVITABILE: We are. Thank you.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Let's go back on  
4 the record everybody. Okay, Mr. Avitabile.

5 MR. AVITABILE: Thank you very much. I think  
6 we've had a full discussion of many of the issues  
7 tonight. We just wanted to touch on a couple of  
8 items on rebuttal and know that we will have some  
9 other items to do in a post hearing submission.

10 I think the key issue that's been discussed  
11 tonight is the issue of medium density and whether  
12 this project is consistent with medium density;  
13 whether the zone category is consistent with medium  
14 density. And I think we just wanted to mention a  
15 couple of items.

16 The first is, and I think Ms. Steingasser  
17 referred to this. When you look in the Zoning  
18 Regulations at the description of the C-3-A zone  
19 district, it's Section 740.4, it specifically refers  
20 to the C-3-A zone district as a medium density zone.  
21 So this zone and the FAR and the height that's  
22 associated with it, in the Zoning Regulations itself,  
23 has kind of been defined as a medium density zone.

24 And I think the second point to make is we've  
25 talked a lot about the heights of this project and

1 the density of this project. And in many ways this  
2 project does exemplify the development pattern of  
3 Southwest as I think Mr. Cochran really explained.  
4 You've got the mix of low-rise and high-rise where  
5 you've got the two story church and then the higher  
6 story residential development, which also it isn't  
7 entirely nine stories. We do have a significant  
8 portion of the project that does step down to seven  
9 stories which is squarely within medium density and  
10 the Comp Plan by right as we talked about earlier.

11           Regarding the affordable housing commitment,  
12 we hear you and I believe we're able to commit.  
13 We'll make one of the two bedroom units 50 percent  
14 AMI. We'll then adjust the other units accordingly  
15 because right now we have other units that are in the  
16 50 percent AMI category. But we would make sure that  
17 one of the 50 percent units is a two bedroom unit and  
18 we'll provide a revised allocation of mix of units  
19 for you all to review in a post hearing submission to  
20 see how the impact of that plays out.

21           On the issue of RPP, I thank Mr. Westrom for  
22 correcting that the block itself is residential, so  
23 units with this address could have an RPP. However,  
24 to be clear, we did commit to the ANC that we would  
25 not allow our residents to have RPP. We'll agree to

1 that as a condition of the zoning order, and in  
2 addition to that what we'll also do is agree through  
3 a lease provision or a similar mechanism to directly  
4 let the residents know, look, you can't get an RPP  
5 sticker. Given the amount of parking in this  
6 building there is sufficient parking to accommodate  
7 those residents who would choose to have a car.

8 And again, it is proximate to multiple Metro  
9 stations. There's ample bike parking. There will be  
10 a bike repair facility in the building. There will  
11 be plenty of ways to accommodate the different ways  
12 that people will travel.

13 And then finally two more things, regarding  
14 Commissioner Hood, your request for additional views,  
15 we can certainly look at that and prepare that and  
16 provide that in a post hearing submission now that  
17 the leaves have fallen off the trees, I think we can  
18 provide those comparison views at this time of year  
19 and show how it knits into the community.

20 And then finally, Commissioner Turnbull, your  
21 comments about the daycare and the roof, I think we  
22 can work on coming up for the roof with appropriate  
23 parameters as you've requested, and we can work with  
24 the ANC on appropriate restrictions for a daycare use  
25 should it be selected. But we'll provide some more

1 detail on that in a post hearing submission.

2           So I think with that we've gone through the  
3 issues. Many of them really were already discussed  
4 so I don't want to belabor them and I don't feel like  
5 I need to make a strong closing statement. But I  
6 will ask if it's not too forward, and since I have  
7 been told in the past that if I come into a hearing  
8 with OP support, DDOT support, and ANC support, I  
9 shouldn't be afraid to ask if the Commission is  
10 inclined, we would ask for a bench decision tonight  
11 with the understanding that we'll work on these other  
12 items that have been addressed in the hearing between  
13 proposed and final action.

14           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: You know what I was  
15 saying? I was saying, as you was going, I said no,  
16 he's not getting ready to do that. But you did.  
17 Okay. Anything else?

18           MR. AVITABILE: That's everything. Thank  
19 you.

20           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Doesn't hurt to ask.  
21 Okay. Yeah, we still have the penthouse issue.

22           MR. MAY: Yeah. I think because the  
23 regulations haven't become final I'm not totally  
24 comfortable with the idea of taking a vote before the  
25 regulations are published.

1 MR. AVITABILE: Okay.

2 MR. MAY: Not to mention the fact that, you  
3 know, we heard significant testimony in opposition  
4 and I think we actually owe it to those people to see  
5 all of the final submissions and consider that before  
6 we take any --

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Right. Right.

8 MR. AVITABILE: Certainly.

9 MR. MAY: -- vote. That's my opinion.

10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Turnbull?

11 MR. TURNBULL: I just had a question. So on  
12 the affordable units, you still are -- what I'm  
13 hearing is that there's still only going to be five  
14 affordable units, only one of them will be a two  
15 bedroom. Is that it?

16 MR. AVITABILE: No. We have -- currently I  
17 think we have 20 total affordable units with a mix of  
18 50, 80, and 100, but --

19 MR. TURNBULL: No, but I guess there was only  
20 five --

21 MR. AVITABILE: -- what we're offering --

22 MR. TURNBULL: -- at 50 percent.

23 MR. AVITABILE: Right. And what we're  
24 offering to do is to reallocate the mix so that we  
25 can have one two bedroom unit as a part of the 50

1 percent mix.

2 MS. COHEN: It's very unclear, at least for  
3 me it was, how many you were offering as affordable.  
4 So I think you do need to resubmit and really dig  
5 deep into your pro forma.

6 MR. MAY: Can I just add on this? I mean, I  
7 didn't weigh in on the question of the level of  
8 affordability on this. But one of the striking  
9 things about this project is that we are going from a  
10 relatively low current matter of right to a pretty  
11 significant increase in the FAR that you can build.  
12 I mean, we're going from, I don't know 1.8 or  
13 something, to four and a half. I forget what the  
14 numbers are exactly. But it's a pretty big increase.  
15 And you know, granted there are a number of  
16 substantial proffered benefits to the project, I do  
17 think that another look at the levels of  
18 affordability would be appropriate and I think that  
19 just, you know, changing the allocation so that you  
20 get one more -- you get a two bedroom unit within the  
21 50 percent units, that's not that substantial. I  
22 mean, I appreciate that it is -- you know, there is  
23 costs associated with that and I understand that.  
24 But I don't think that that particular measure is  
25 exactly what the rest of the Commission was kind of

1 angling for in terms of increased affordability of  
2 the project. So I would just take a really good look  
3 at that.

4 MS. COHEN: And I would just like to add that  
5 you're asking for flexibility and waivers of certain  
6 things, plus you're getting three units in the  
7 penthouse that are very valuable. So again, yes,  
8 it's 246 more square feet. But really, it's been a  
9 while since I went digging into pro formas, but I  
10 think there's room to be generous.

11 MR. TURNBULL: I guess that's what I was  
12 getting at that, with my fellow commissioners, is  
13 that I appreciate the two bedroom but I think in  
14 light of what is really happening on the property, I  
15 think you really do need to look at the affordability  
16 a little bit further.

17 And the only other thing that I had was, I  
18 would really like to see a little bit more  
19 interaction with the townhome groups to make sure you  
20 can resolve -- I mean, we have a group of people that  
21 comes from a different era with the site planning and  
22 everything, and I think I'd like to see some more  
23 interaction with the townhome group and try and solve  
24 some of their -- work with them on some of their  
25 issues.

1 I mean, they're ready to accept. And I think  
2 if you could just work that out with those two groups  
3 and come back, and hopefully you have something  
4 finalized with that.

5 MR VUONG: I would just like to note that we  
6 have spent a lot of time with the Townhouse  
7 Management 1 Group. And even as far as this morning  
8 I was communicating with Josh and he had sent me an  
9 e-mail saying that he wasn't going to come out and  
10 oppose this project. So we actually thought we had  
11 gotten to an amicable agreement on it in terms of how  
12 we were going to work this out. I was not aware that  
13 they were going to come out and actually oppose until  
14 very late this afternoon. So, that's something that  
15 we're more than willing to do and to reach back out  
16 and, you know, I was talking to him before this  
17 saying that, you know, we still had you know, a  
18 couple of items to wrap up, so.

19 MR. TURNBULL: Okay. All right. Thank you.

20 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Anything else? Ms.  
21 Schellin, do we need to go over everything or do we  
22 all have it already?

23 MS. SCHELLIN: Mr. Avitabile, do you think  
24 you have it?

25 MR. AVITABILE: I think I do.

1 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay.

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So we won't need to  
3 do that. And do we have anything else?

4 MS. SCHELLIN: Dates.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let's come up with some  
6 dates. Ms. Hanousek, are you doing the dates  
7 tonight?

8 MS. SCHELLIN: I think I'm going to do the  
9 dates.

10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Yeah, let's do the  
11 dates.

12 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. How much time, Mr.  
13 Avitabile, do you guys need? That includes the  
14 meeting with the townhome people.

15 MR. AVITABILE: We think, particularly given  
16 the extent of conversations we've already had with  
17 the townhouses and the work that we have to do, two  
18 weeks would be sufficient for us.

19 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. So that would put that  
20 to December 14th by 3:00 p.m. And then a response  
21 from the party by 3:00 p.m. on 12/21, and draft,  
22 findings, facts conclusions of law also by 12/21,  
23 3:00 p.m. And then we can put this on the January  
24 11th meeting for consideration of proposed action.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Is there anything

1 else?

2 All right. I want to thank everyone for  
3 their participation tonight and this hearing is  
4 adjourned.

5 MS. SCHELLIN: And just remind, other than  
6 that the record is closed.

7 [Hearing adjourned at 10:11 p.m.]

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25