

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
Zoning Commission

PUBLIC HEARING

Case No. 13-14A [Jair Lynch, Development of Partners
- Second Stage PUD for McMillan Reservoir Slow Sand
Filtration Site Redevelopment, Parcel 2]

6:33 p.m. to 9:22 p.m.

Thursday, December 17, 2015

Jerrily R. Kress Memorial Hearing Room
441 4th Street, N.W., Suite 220 South
Washington, D.C. 20001

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

11 Office of Planning:

12 JOEL LAWSON

13 JENNIFER STEINGASSER

14 MAXINE BROWN-ROBERTS

15

16 DDOT:

17 JONATHAN ROGERS

18

19 Others:

20 NORMAN M. GLASGOW JR.

21 ANNE CORBETT

22 JAIR LYNCH

23 JIM VOELZKE

24 BRIAN SZYMANSKI

25 SHANE DETTMAN

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 Others:

2 BIANNE BARNES

3 RASHIDA BROWN

4 ANDREW DUPUY

5 CHIRS OTTEN

6 LEROY HALL

7 AMAL MIMISH

8 ROBIN DIENER

9 PAUL CERRUTI

10 DEBBIE HANRAHAN

11 JIM SCHULMAN

12 DANIEL WOLKOFF

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

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 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Good evening, ladies and
3 gentlemen, this is the public hearing of the Zoning
4 Commission for the District of Columbia. Today's
5 dates is December 17th, 2015.

6 My name is Anthony Hood. Joining me are Vice
7 Chair Cohen, Commissioner Miller, Commissioner May,
8 and Commissioner Turnbull. We're also joined by the
9 Office of Zoning staff, Ms. Sharon Schellin, Office
10 of Planning staff, Ms. Steingasser and Ms. Brown-
11 Roberts, the District Department of Transportation,
12 Mr. Rogers.

13 This proceeding is being recorded by a court
14 reporter and is also webcast live. Again, we are
15 located here in the Jerrily R. Kress Memorial Hearing
16 room. Accordingly we must ask you to refrain from
17 any disruptive noises or actions in the hearing room,
18 including the display of any signs or any objects.

19 Notice of today's hearing was published in
20 the D.C. Register and copies of that announcement are
21 available to my left on the wall near the door. The
22 hearing will be conducted in accordance with
23 provisions of 11 DCMR 3022 as follows, preliminary
24 matters, applicant's case, report of the Office of
25 Planning, report of other government agencies if any,

1 report of the Advisory Neighborhood Commission,
2 organizations and persons in support, organizations
3 and persons in opposition, rebuttal and closing by
4 the applicant.

5 The following time constraints will be
6 maintained in this meeting. The applicant has up to
7 60 minutes. I think they have requested 30.
8 Organizations five minutes, individuals three
9 minutes.

10 All persons appearing before the Commission
11 are to fill out two witness cards. These cards are
12 located to my left on the table near the door. Upon
13 coming forward to speak to the Commission please give
14 both cards to the reporter sitting to my right before
15 taking a seat at the table. When presenting
16 information to the Commission please turn on and
17 speak into the microphone, first stating your name
18 and home address. When you are finished speaking,
19 please turn your microphone off so that your
20 microphone is no longer picking up sound or
21 background noise.

22 The decision of the Commission in this case
23 must be based exclusively on the public record. To
24 avoid any appearance to the contrary the Commission
25 requests that persons present not engage members of

1 the Commission in conversation during any recess or
2 at any time. In addition, there should be no direct
3 contact whatsoever with any Commission concerning
4 this matter, be it written, electronic, or by
5 telephone. Any materials received directly by a
6 Commissioner will be discarded without being read,
7 any calls will be ignored.

8 The staff will be available throughout the
9 hearing to discuss procedural questions. Please turn
10 off all beepers and cell phones at this time so not
11 to disrupt these proceedings. Would all individuals
12 wishing to testify please rise to take the oath?

13 MS. SCHELLIN: Please raise your right hand.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Ms. Schellin, would you
15 please administer the oath?

16 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.

17 [Oath administered to the participants.]

18 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. At this time the
19 Commission will consider any preliminary matters.
20 Does the staff have any preliminary matters?

21 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. Besides the
22 proffered experts, which the three have all
23 previously testified and been accepted by the
24 Commission as experts, there is one party status
25 application at Exhibits 24 through 26 from McMillan

1 Coalition for Sustainable Agriculture in opposition.
2 It was filed on time. They're represented by Daniel
3 Wolkoff, and we'd ask the Commission to consider this
4 request this evening.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Colleagues, as
6 stated, in this case we have one application for
7 party status. It's from McMillan Coalition for
8 Sustainable Agriculture. MCSA. What is your
9 pleasure, and any comments?

10 We did receive a letter of authorization a
11 few moments ago. This was not uploaded. I didn't
12 see it.

13 MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir, he brought it in this
14 evening.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

16 MS. SCHELLIN: It will be uploaded tomorrow.

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

18 MS. COHEN: Mr. Chairman.

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Vice Chair Cohen.

20 MS. COHEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
21 really didn't see anything in the information
22 provided that they were uniquely affected by this
23 project, and I don't see their argument as being
24 relevant to what is being proposed to us tonight. So
25 that's just my reading of their statement.

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Any other comments
2 and questions?

3 MR. MAY: So I would note the same things,
4 although the particular argument that they would make
5 in the case is actually, I don't think, relevant to
6 their eligibility for party status. I think the
7 question is whether they are uniquely affected by
8 this. And it's hard for me to understand why as
9 well, this particular group is. They seem to have a
10 broad range of issues and interest and it doesn't
11 coalesce around anything in particular relating to
12 this project. So this is where I'm having some
13 difficulty with it as well.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Any other comments,
15 Commissioner Turnbull.

16 MR. TURNBULL: I would concur with my
17 colleagues.

18 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. You want to add
19 something, Commissioner Miller?

20 MR. MILLER: I would just note, Mr. Chairman,
21 that the same party, we had -- I believe that we had
22 denied their party status request in the underlying -
23 - in the original case. Of course there were a
24 number of other citizens organizations that we did
25 give party status to in the original case, which I

1 think have not requested here tonight. But I would
2 tend to agree with my colleagues.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I would agree,
4 while for me even though whatever the status was in
5 the previous case, Commissioner Miller, I think the
6 relevancy of this particular case, I don't tie one to
7 the other. As we all know, we take each case on face
8 value and the submission. For me the submission does
9 not show where they are uniquely affected. They will
10 have opportune time to testify and I'm not sure if
11 some of the issues that were raised in their
12 submission are even germane to the case tonight.

13 So they can testify as individuals, Mr.
14 Wolkoff, Mr. Fourniea, and others who are listed
15 here, if they are here, but if not we will work it so
16 their representative will be able to testify and
17 maybe bring some of this together. But on the
18 submission I don't think this, as was said by all my
19 colleagues, grounds, and I'm just specifically
20 asking, looking at the submission for the day,
21 grounds to give them party status in this case.

22 So someone like to make a motion?

23 MS. COHEN: Mr. Chairman, I move to deny
24 party status to, gosh, I'm sorry. I lost the name of
25 the organization.

1 MR. TURNBULL: McMillan Coalition for
2 Sustainable Agriculture.

3 MS. COHEN: Thank you, sir. And ask for a
4 second.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: It's been moved and
6 properly seconded.

7 MR. TURNBULL: Second.

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Moved and properly
9 seconded. Any further discussion?

10 MR. MAY: Yes. I just want to clarify. You
11 know, I think we all have -- or a number of us have
12 questions about the particular arguments that are
13 being raised, going to their eventual testimony. And
14 I don't believe that actually -- well, at least from
15 my perspective, that's not the basis on which party
16 status is being considered. The real question about
17 party status has to do with how they are uniquely
18 affected. And what they submitted doesn't indicate
19 that this group is uniquely or unusually affected by
20 what we are considering tonight. It's you know, they
21 raise issues like traffic and parking and things like
22 that, and that's what -- those are very general
23 effects.

24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Any further
25 discussion?

1 [Vote taken.]

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Not hearing any
3 opposition, Ms. Schellin would you -- before I go,
4 Mr. Glasgow, did you have a problem with this?

5 MR. GLASGOW: No. No, sir.

6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I'm going to ask if
7 you have a question, Mr. Wolkoff that you go to -- oh
8 no, that you go to the secretary and ask her. I am
9 not going to run a hearing. I have never run a
10 hearing out of order and I'm going to have order this
11 evening. If you plan to stay here and represent your
12 colleagues, at the appropriate time, I would ask that
13 you go over there and ask her questions. But if
14 you're going to be disruptive I'm going to make sure
15 that you exit.

16 Okay. Ms. Schellin, would you record the
17 vote?

18 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. Staff records the
19 vote five to zero to zero to deny party status to
20 McMillan Coalition for Sustainable Agriculture,
21 Commissioner Cohen moving, Commissioner Turnbull
22 seconding, Commissioners May, Hood, and Miller in
23 denial.

24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Do we have any
25 other preliminary matters?

1 MS. SCHELLIN: As I said, there were three
2 proffered expert witnesses. They've all previously
3 been accepted by the Commission, and I don't know if
4 you want to review them again or accept them in this
5 case also.

6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I think we typically, and
7 it has been our practice to continue. I don't think,
8 unless something major has changed on the resume, I
9 don't think we usually unproffer them and I think we
10 will accept our previous ruling on that unless there
11 are any objections. Okay.

12 Ms. Schellin, do we have anything else?

13 MS. SCHELLIN: Staff has nothing else.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. All right. Mr.
15 Glasgow?

16 MR. GLASGOW: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good
17 evening members of the Commission. For the record my
18 name is Norman M. Glasgow Jr. at the law firm of
19 Holland and Knight on behalf of Jair Lynch
20 Development Partners, which is also appearing with
21 Vision McMillan Partners in the District of Columbia
22 Office of the Deputy Mayor as the applicant for stage
23 2 approval and parcel 2 of the very exciting and
24 unique McMillan redevelopment project.

25 We are pleased to be here this evening to

1 present this stage 2 application, which is in
2 conformity with the stage 1 approval and has reduced
3 the height of the building from 110 feet to 82 feet,
4 reduced the overall program from approximately
5 335,000 square feet to 241,000 square feet, which
6 would be a 94,000 square foot reduction in program,
7 provides the required 25 affordable housing units,
8 reduces the size of the connecting element between
9 the two main bars of the building from approximately
10 60 feet in width as approved in the stage 1, to a 35
11 foot width at its narrowest point, and 38 feet as it
12 adjoins the other two elements of the building.

13 We are pleased to note the support of ANC 5E
14 for the project. The Historic Preservation Review
15 Board has given concept approval to this design after
16 a thorough review. DDOT has no objection to the
17 project and we have committed to all of the TDM
18 measures and mitigations included in the DDOT report.
19 We are also pleased to commit to the four conditions
20 listed at the top of page 2 of the report of Office
21 of Planning, and we have received a letter of support
22 from Council member McDuffie, which I believe you
23 received earlier today and should be in the record.

24 If there are no preliminary questions I'd
25 like to introduce our witnesses for this evening, Ms.

1 Anne Corbett on behalf Vision McMillan Partners, Jair
2 Lynch of Jair Lynch Development Partners, Jim Golski
3 of MVA Architects, Rob Schiesel of Gorove/Slade and
4 Shane Dettman of Holland and Knight.

5 And if there are no preliminary questions we
6 are prepared to proceed with the first witness.
7 Okay. Thank you. Ms. Corbett, please identify
8 yourself and proceed with your testimony.

9 MS. CORBETT: Good evening. Again, my name
10 is Anne Corbett and I'm the Project Director for
11 Vision McMillan Partners, which is partnered with the
12 District of Columbia in this public/private
13 partnership to develop the 25 acre former McMillan
14 sand filtration site.

15 I'm pleased to see you all again and report
16 on the progress over the past year. The progress
17 includes approval of the vacation of the paper
18 streets that were created before the Federal
19 Government created the sand filtration site. We've
20 completed the Mayor's Agent review process for both
21 clearing both our permits for demolition and for
22 subdivision.

23 As you know, we were recent before the
24 District Council a second time, approving the
25 extension of the land disposition agreement. And as

1 there is much discussion last year about the
2 tenanting and exactly how the program would work out
3 we've made a fair amount of progress in that regard,
4 and as I believe you know, the Jair Lynch companies
5 have established a relationship with Harris Teeter
6 and we are pleased to present a full service grocery
7 store as was discussed -- as was aspired to last year
8 and now we know will be a reality.

9 The other thing I just want to remind you of
10 versus sort of going through all of the history of
11 McMillan and the master plan, just to touch on the
12 complex rationale for the master plan and the urban
13 design concept of which this parcel is a part of, we
14 were very conscientious of the redevelopment of a
15 national landmark. And as such we had identified
16 41,000 historic resources in our historic
17 preservation report.

18 As you can imagine, we then had to very
19 carefully consider how to prioritize those resources.
20 And I'll just mention two that come to the top of the
21 list. One is the Olmsted Walk, which you can see in
22 this slide, represented by the double alley of Winter
23 King Hawthorne Trees with the red leaves they would
24 have interview he autumn. Restoring that site
25 defining walk as well as restoring both service

1 courts that run east/west with the iconic silos and
2 the regulator houses in them. The continuity of
3 those two elements is one of our primary objectives.

4 And then second, we were balancing that
5 historic adaptation process with reweaving this
6 iconic landmark back into the fabric of the
7 community, and hence we had to introduce a true
8 street experience and an urban design plan that made
9 sense for the pedestrian, the residents, the workers,
10 the community members who we expect to enjoy the many
11 resources this site will provide.

12 And so again, the pedestrian experience on
13 the north service court, the retail main street we're
14 looking to create here, along with the
15 environmentally conscious design on Half Street, and
16 it being the front door for many of the buildings on
17 site. These were some of the things that we had to
18 consider.

19 Finally, I will say, I will remind you of our
20 lengthy process with the Historic Preservation Review
21 Board that resulted in a request that we really
22 preserve the sense of the tripartite. The idea that
23 this site is divided into thirds and even in its
24 adaptation should still feel like a site with three
25 distinct parts. So we have the preserved plinth in

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 the southern section of this site. And then in the
2 center section we have the evoke -- we evoke the grid
3 of the underground cells which created abnormally
4 small blocks. These abnormally small blocks worked
5 really well for row houses, and not so well for mixed
6 use buildings. So there's some liberties taken with
7 that. But again, we're really trying to balance how
8 we honor the landmark and create an urban fabric that
9 the pedestrian and residents can enjoy and experience
10 in a logical way.

11 That doesn't feel as succinct as it did when
12 I practiced it earlier today. So I apologize.
13 Hopefully my colleague, Jim, will clear that up so
14 much better than I did.

15 Again, we're happy to see you. We've made
16 lots of progress. This is a pretty phenomenal
17 building you're about to hear about, and with that
18 I'll turn it over to Jair Lynch.

19 MR. LYNCH: Thank you, Anne. And there's
20 been a lot of progress. I do commend you on all the
21 work that's been done over the last year.

22 Good evening. My name is Jair Lynch and I
23 own an urban regeneration company that aspires to
24 create extraordinary places. We've been in business
25 for over 15 years and have developed nearly 3 million

1 square feet, totaling nearly \$800 million.

2 We've developed historic structures,
3 affordable housing, and other neighborhood assets
4 with award winning architecture with a particular
5 emphasis on place making. We've brought that
6 experience to bear as we crafted this second phase
7 multi-family development at McMillan that we refer to
8 as parcel 2. This building weaves into the design
9 guidelines and the master plan seamlessly. This
10 design approach is like a fine Swiss watch where
11 multiple goals are integrated to create a handsome
12 and appropriate building. No one factor dominated
13 the design approach for this building. It comes
14 together on two different levels.

15 One, at the master plan level that Anne spoke
16 about. We put the historic preservation first,
17 preserving the continuity on the Olmsted Walk along
18 First Street and the north service court.

19 Next we looked to create a contiguous
20 pedestrian experience at the base of the building
21 interview he private streets bracketing the north
22 service court and the spaces between the silos. We
23 maintained a single parcel, building an underground
24 garage between First and Half Streets, but introduced
25 a private street to allow, one, loading and parking

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 for our building off the main hierarchal streets,
2 front doors for the townhomes to the south, and most
3 importantly the porosity between the service courts
4 that everyone was looking for.

5 We recognize that Three Quarter and Quarter
6 Streets only connect the north and south service
7 courts, and views to the north are blocked by the
8 medical office buildings. These streets do not
9 connect to the public street grid at the north at
10 Michigan Avenue, nor to the south at Channing Street.

11 At the building level we lowed the building
12 height from approved Stage 1 PUD of 110 feet, down to
13 82 and a half, to create more light and air between
14 the vertical elements which will make Three Quarter
15 Street a special place and not just an oversized
16 alley.

17 We've wrapped the sidewalks at Three Quarter
18 Street to create a zone in which pedestrians can step
19 away and look north into the north service court and
20 understand the scale and the beauty of the silos. We
21 introduced a simple syncopation of the windows on the
22 white façade that wouldn't overpower the silos. We
23 also made sure that Half Street and First Street
24 facades also had their own look and feel as they too
25 are important components of the site.

1 Finally, we created an elegant and efficient
2 building that allows us to fulfill the commitment of
3 20 percent affordability across the McMillan program.
4 We limited the number of design gestures by honing in
5 on ones that served multiple purposes. We listed.
6 We created a plan that conforms, and the result is an
7 exciting and dynamic building that quite frankly
8 honors the historic resources by the people who will
9 utilize it the most, the pedestrian at the street.

10 This building type, which was recently
11 adopted by the International Building Code would
12 ensure the four corners of the north service court
13 and the retail place making components will come
14 online in conjunction with the other McMillan Phase 1
15 buildings which were approved last year by this body.

16 ANC 5E who supported the Stage 1 PUD last
17 year, again supported this Stage 2 PUD submission and
18 is excited by the opportunity for this second
19 building to arrive earlier and complete the McMillan
20 Main Street.

21 Please keep in mind that the production and
22 the size of the building to date is significant, over
23 95,000 square feet has been removed from the program
24 to ensure this McMillan Main Street can be delivered
25 as more of the unit. The result, as seen by the

1 Historic Preservation Review Board, is a building
2 that better respects the landmark. HPRB approved the
3 conceptual plan for this building because we listened
4 and compromised by recessing the span from the
5 building north façade, consequently removing units
6 from the north façade. The rationale being that a
7 recessed span allows the north façade to read as 110
8 foot wide vertical elements with multiple north/south
9 connections between the service courts,
10 notwithstanding the removal of the units and land
11 value for the District affects the amount of revenue
12 that stays with this overall McMillan project to
13 fulfill many of the public benefits.

14 Removal of 15 additional units will not
15 create a new view to the north because the medical
16 office building on the other side of the north
17 service court. In summary, we have created an
18 elegant solution for a parcel with streets on three
19 sides and historic resources throughout. The
20 solution is specific to and is uniquely McMillan.
21 Thank you.

22 MR. GLASGOW: For the next witness, I'd like
23 to -- Jim, please identify yourself and proceed with
24 your testimony.

25 MR. VOELZSKE: Sure. Thanks Chip and thanks

1 Jair. Good evening members of the Commission. I am
2 Jim Voelzke of MV&A Architects, and with me this
3 evening is evening is Brian Szymanski, my project's
4 lead designer.

5 MV&A has been working on the McMillan project
6 for several years, both as part of a team of
7 architects and developers on the approved master
8 plan, and as the architect on Parcel 4, the grocery
9 and residential building on the east end of the north
10 service court. We have worked very hard to ensure
11 that experience informed every part of the planning
12 and designing of Parcel 2.

13 Do we want to turn the lights down in here?
14 Thank you.

15 Tonight we are looking at the planning and
16 design of Parcel 2. As you recall this parcel was
17 one of two parcels that building designs were not
18 presented for in the fall of 2013. At the 2013
19 approval the massing, the lot plan, and density were
20 presented and approved for Parcel 2 as part of the
21 stage 1 PUD. The approved 2013 master plan proposed
22 110 foot tall box with a mid-block double span,
23 double loaded span over Three Quarter Street.

24 Today we are presenting from Stage 2 PUD
25 approval, a building with the height reduced by 25

1 percent, and a thoughtfully designed span that has
2 been reduced in its depth and height, and has been
3 located to reduce its impact on the north service
4 court.

5 As a team we immersed ourselves in the
6 approved master plan, including drawing in other plan
7 authors for frequent critiques to first and foremost
8 ensure our design for Parcel 2 seamlessly fills the
9 important southwest corner of the north service
10 court.

11 This evening I want to discuss Parcel 2's
12 consistency with the spirit of McMillan, the
13 technical foundation of the building, and the public
14 experience of the building. I hope that you'll agree
15 that the planning and design is consistent with the
16 spirit of McMillan while introducing new ideas that
17 complement the approved plan and building designs.

18 I'm going to look a little bit at just some
19 of the design concepts that drove the façade designs
20 and the building massing. Building massing is
21 planned with clear cohesion to the master plan and
22 other already approved buildings. Simple geometry,
23 evocative of the refined industrial McMillan esthetic
24 is expressed in the building's massing and
25 fenestration. The simple bar forms set on a raised

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 plinth of the first multi-family building, Parcel 4,
2 are used again at Parcel 2 where we express four
3 simple identical bar volumes.

4 An overlying form of McMillan is the elegant
5 way the ground plain flows and drapes over the
6 underground cells. The grass plain rises and falls
7 as the forms underneath exert themselves. The gentle
8 draping of the grass at the plinth perimeter is a
9 significant form of McMillan.

10 The skin of Parcel 2 is meant to drape the
11 building in much the same way the grass developed
12 drapes McMillan. The white skin drapes the box forms
13 and is cut where appropriate to reveal the darker
14 masonry bones beneath. The white skin clarifies the
15 hierarchy of the facades and homage to the north and
16 south service courts. It is held back from east and
17 west facades to reveal familiar residential
18 proportions and detail in common in the area.

19 The materials and colors proposed melt
20 seamlessly into the approved designs. We're using
21 the exact pallet of the approved plan but with
22 materials and textures unique to Parcel 2. Our
23 plinth is sheathed in mottled gray stone cut and set
24 in a scale and pattern reflective of the concrete
25 forms visible in the sand bins. It is different from

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 the board form concrete proposed for the plinth at
2 the office buildings and from the mottled limestone
3 on the grocery building, but it's comfortably
4 compatible.

5 White is the primary building color expressed
6 in draped metal panels on our primary facades.
7 Charcoal is the secondary building color expressed in
8 simple yet refined masonry.

9 Finally, a wood color is used as an accent on
10 balcony railings and mullions. And we've got samples
11 this evening of all the materials if anybody cares to
12 see.

13 This diagram also shows that the size of the
14 charcoal balcony cutout at three bays wide and four
15 levels high fits within a clear progression of scale
16 of charcoal colored bays found throughout the
17 buildings in McMillan, and the proportion is similar
18 to that of the sand bins adjacent and abutting on the
19 north façade.

20 As described in the master plan and proposed
21 for approved buildings, we borrow the geometry and
22 form of the grid patterns and banding visible across
23 both the original and proposed McMillan site to
24 pattern our facades. The clear horizontal banded
25 pattern is utilized in the white metal element, the

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 dark masonry architecture and the glass span as
2 horizontal lines pass around the entirety of the
3 building. The bands on the masonry element cross the
4 strong vertical pilasters creating a gridded pattern
5 that connects to the strong grid of the groin vaults
6 at McMillan, similar to the clear gridded nature of
7 the white metal element and the glass span.

8 Plinth walls on the north service court are
9 canted away from the court but remain perpendicular
10 on the side facades, not unlike the existing walls
11 and portals of both courts.

12 Parcel 2 anchors the west end of the north
13 service court, providing an important gateway on
14 First Street and inserting a vital piece of the
15 retail program. A tremendous effort was spent in the
16 master plan to make sure the north service court was
17 both activated and respectful. To that end Parcel 2
18 meets or exceeds all of the prescriptive goals of the
19 master plan for the north service court. The upper
20 levels are set back to unify with buildings on both
21 sides of the court. The podium height aligns with
22 the other buildings on the court, and the podium
23 walls are canted, as the other buildings are in the
24 court. Materiality is closely coordinated with all
25 the buildings.

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 Looking at the proposed site plan I want to
2 focus now on the details of Parcel 2. The same
3 attention to master plan compliance informed the
4 microplanning of the site. The north service court
5 is the active hub of McMillan. We recognized
6 immediately the necessity of vibrant and viable
7 retail at our parcel. The two approved buildings on
8 the north service court propose retail with a grocery
9 store as Anne mentioned earlier, Harris Teeter, and
10 our building at Parcel 4, and retail in the plinth of
11 the medical office buildings.

12 But the onus is on Parcel 2 to achieve the
13 critical mass necessary to activate the Court. The
14 almost 18,000 square feet of retail proposed at
15 Parcel 2 is designed to be as flexible and more
16 importantly, as viable as possible. We see the
17 corner at First Street as particularly important as
18 it's the western gateway to McMillan. That corner is
19 active and visually interesting.

20 The corner of Half Street in the north
21 service court is McMillan's heart. Again, it is
22 activated and visually interesting with storefronts
23 turning the corner.

24 For the residential program we engaged in
25 studies and debate on how this building contributes

1 to the urban design strategies within the approved
2 master plan. We considered splitting the building
3 into two separate unconnected buildings. However, a
4 singular building that maintains a connection between
5 the two sides of Three Quarter Street, as we are
6 proposing tonight, results in a building outwardly
7 focused to all of McMillan. It's primary building
8 entrance is located on Half Street, contributing to
9 the Street's prominent nature as it was proposed in
10 the master plan.

11 The Quarter Street acts as more of a
12 secondary street as it was designed in the master
13 plan, servicing the building with loading, parking
14 access, and secondary residential entries.

15 First Street and the Olmsted Walk are kept
16 clear of all interruptions. Dividing the building
17 into two unconnected halves reverses most of these
18 goals. It would necessitate dual main residential
19 entrances on Three Quarter Street, forcing services
20 and curb cuts onto Half Street contrary to the master
21 plan. The building would turn inward, two
22 complimentary halves focused across a now primary
23 Three Quarter Street whose narrow dimension was not
24 designed to accommodate such pressure.

25 Shown here is the second residential

1 floorplan that caps the plinth. We carefully studied
2 courtyard placement and concluded that opposing
3 courtyards open to Half Street and First Street was
4 the best expression of the plant's hierarchy while
5 allowing the best views from and towards our
6 building. You can also see the terraces created by
7 the prescribed setback at the north service court,
8 and recesses on Three Quarter Street, highlighting
9 the bar forms noted earlier.

10 This is the upper level residential plan,
11 typical for floors three through seven. We
12 purposefully raised the span to the third floor to
13 ensure ample space beneath, and reciprocal views
14 between the courts. The span sets back from the
15 north service court by almost 43 feet, making it
16 recede from view from most locations along the court.
17 It's single loaded depth is 35 feet at the center.

18 First Street is often overlooked in the
19 McMillan dialog. We're changing that tonight. We
20 see it as a prominent street that provides vital
21 connections to the north and the south. The open
22 vistas to the west are unique in the city. We
23 designed the west elevation to address the micro
24 context of the Olmsted walk and the macro context,
25 considering view corridors of the building from

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 blocks away. We wanted the façade to express the
2 residential use.

3 The twin vertical blocks recall the triple
4 vertical blocks we designed for Parcel 4 on the North
5 Capitol Street. Here, as on North Capitol Street it
6 breaks down the overall massing and introduces a
7 familiar scale and form. It also provides an
8 appropriate transition between the townhouses to the
9 south and the medical office building to the north.

10 As mentioned earlier, retail will turn and
11 front the Olmsted Walk at this corner. We think it's
12 imperative for the viability of all the retail on the
13 north service court that this corner announce, we're
14 open for business.

15 The draping white panels reveal their ends at
16 the two northern facing corners, a strong visual clue
17 of our deference to the north service court. From
18 this view you can clearly see the four block diagram
19 of the master plan can easily be read across the
20 north service court. The Three Quarter Street span
21 setback places it out of view when looking east or
22 west across the service court.

23 Here we see the corner of Half Street and the
24 north service court, the heart of McMillan.
25 Everything comes together here, views go south,

1 north, east, and west for blocks, linking all of
2 McMillan in a multifaceted experience. All of the
3 north service court, both original and new, is
4 revealed here. The solid, yet textured plinth,
5 enhanced with projecting storefronts, solidifies and
6 anchors the place. Sand bins, the regulator houses,
7 the sand washers, all live within a carefully
8 sculpted space. Atop the plinth terraces allow for
9 further activation and more opportunities to
10 experience the historical structures.

11 The Half Street façade mirrors the simple
12 classical scale and form of the First Street façade.
13 The main residential entrance is rightly so, centered
14 under the courtyard and centered on the Half Street
15 façade. The two level bays with its strong cornice
16 line relates closely to the scale and height of the
17 adjacent row houses.

18 Here we can see the span across Three Quarter
19 Street from the north service court. The underside
20 of the span pitches up at its center, creating a
21 greater volume of space and allowing stronger
22 reciprocal views between the historic resources in
23 the north and south service courts. The span angles
24 away from the viewer at its center, further reducing
25 its depth. The north and south sides of the span are

1 all glass, giving it a light and transparent quality
2 that sets it apart from the buildings it connects.
3 Horizontal elements have been detailed to minimize
4 their thickness, allowing for the largest expanses of
5 glass possible. The thin mullion detailing of the
6 glass wall recalls the diagonal pattern of the
7 manhole covers above the underground vaults. It also
8 relates to the window pattern of the larger buildings
9 it connects, while still being its own celebrated
10 element.

11 And in addition we are excited about the
12 opportunity to use the solid surfaces of the corridor
13 walls and ceilings as an opportunity for an art
14 feature. And there's a few examples of that on the
15 left side of the slide.

16 Here we see the span from the south on Three
17 Quarter Street, looking back to the residential units
18 on the bridge's southern side. Notice, please, that
19 the top of the medical office buildings beyond can
20 still be seen above the span. This helps show that
21 the span has minimal impact when viewed from the
22 south. Without it the medical office building would
23 eventually block the sky and vista. In fact, with
24 the sky reflecting off the glass the sky seems more
25 present in the view than if we were allowed to see

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 through to the medical office building beyond.

2 We're now looking back, and raised up from
3 the south and looking north, and you can see the
4 medical office buildings in the background. At the
5 right of the image we can see the more prominent Half
6 Street continuing north to Michigan Avenue. You can
7 also see the threading of the open space of Three
8 Quarter Street to the north service court underneath
9 the span proposed.

10 And here we see an aerial of all of McMillan
11 looking southwest from the corner of North Capitol
12 and Michigan. Parcel 2 is one lot with a modestly
13 sized apartment building. This view makes it quite
14 clear that the scale of the building has been
15 substantially broken down to reveal a reading of four
16 small refined bar volumes with strong connections to
17 all aspects of McMillan. The view also highlights
18 how well the building works with the master plan,
19 which calls for a prominent north service court and a
20 primary Half Street that connects through the site.

21 We can see the secondary connections of One
22 Quarter and Three Quarter Street that service the
23 adjacent buildings and provide additional visual and
24 physical connections between the north and south
25 service courts. We can also see how the other

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 buildings interact with the braided open space grid
2 of McMillan. You can see how Parcel 4 terminates the
3 green mews between the first row of townhouses, and
4 how the medical office building bridges the Olmsted
5 Walk in the northwest corner.

6 Looking from the south north we again see
7 well Parcel 2 blends into the site and supports the
8 master plan goals.

9 I'm going to take a few minutes now to show
10 you an animation of all of McMillan with the
11 highlight of Parcel 2. This is Half Street and the
12 north service court, and focused in the middle is
13 Parcel 2. Looking between the sand bins down Three
14 Quarter Street under the span. Looking at the
15 project from First Street across the north service
16 court, looking east. You can see the Olmsted Walk in
17 front of our building. Prominent retail corner.
18 Continuous retail store fronts along the north
19 service court and turning down Three Quarter Street.
20 You can see how the underside of the bridge is canted
21 up to enhance that vista. These are the row homes
22 that were already approved on Three Quarter Street.
23 Thank you, Brian.

24 Concluding this evening I want to reiterate
25 what Parcel 2 achieves. The building frames,

1 heightens and enhances your experience of McMillan's
2 historic resources. It activates the north service
3 court, spatially, architecturally, and
4 programmatically. It establishes First Street as a
5 gateway entrance to the north service court and
6 McMillan while providing a respectful background for
7 the Olmsted Walk. The façade hierarchy provides a
8 deferential distinction between First Street and the
9 north service court, and the massing and façade
10 proportions establish a transition in scale from the
11 medical office buildings to the north and the row
12 houses to the south.

13 That concludes my presentation. Thank you.

14 MR. GLASGOW: Mr. Chairman, we do have one
15 more witness if you wanted to hear from Mr. Dettman.
16 Please proceed with your testimony.

17 MR. DETTMAN: Thank you. Good evening, Mr.
18 Chairman and members of the Commission. I'll keep my
19 comments brief here, because as you know, pursuant to
20 Order No. 13-14 the Zoning Commission approved first
21 stage PUD approval for this particular parcel at the
22 McMillan site, and also approved a map amendment that
23 applied the C-R zone to this property. And what I
24 can do this evening is very quickly take you through
25 the consistency of what's proposed before you today

1 with the aspects of the C-R zone, as well as quickly
2 describe to you why the proposal is consistent with
3 the first stage PUD development parameters as well as
4 the overall PUD process.

5 With respect to the size of Parcel 2, Parcel
6 2 is proposed with a land area of approximately
7 66,654 square feet, not including private streets
8 like Three Quarter Street that would net a land area
9 of approximately 48,178 feet. With respect to the C-
10 R zone, again it's a mixed use zone permitting high
11 density development including office, residential,
12 and retail uses. Under a PUD you can get a maximum
13 height of 110 feet, a maximum FAR of 8 with a 4
14 maximum FAR for nonresidential uses. So for this
15 site, calculating based on the area of the land, not
16 including the private street that would result in a
17 maximum gross square footage of 385,000 square feet
18 able to be placed on this site.

19 With regard to lot occupancy under the C-R
20 zone, for nonresidential use you can get to 100
21 percent lot occupancy, but for residential uses
22 you're permitted a 75 percent lot occupancy and that
23 goes to one of the areas of flexibility that we're
24 requesting this evening.

25 With regard to the project, it's consistent

1 with the first stage PUD as well as a permitted use
2 in the C-R zone. It's an apartment house of
3 approximately 236 units with approximately 18,700
4 square feet of ground floor retail.

5 With regard to lot occupancy, and again we're
6 requesting flexibility from the Commission in this
7 respect for the ground floor. The ground floor,
8 because there's a mixture of nonresidential as well
9 as residential dwelling units, we're required to meet
10 a lot occupancy of 75 percent. On the ground floor
11 we are at 84 percent. Up above, floors two through
12 seven, we are consistent with the 75 percent
13 residential lot occupancy.

14 As been mentioned, we are proposing a height
15 of 82 feet six inches and eight stories, which again
16 we're permitted 110 feet under the PUD C-R zone.

17 With regard to density and FAR, gross floor
18 area, again not including the private streets, we're
19 well below what we're permitted to construct on the
20 site under the C-R zone. With regard to overall FAR,
21 again we're permitted an 8.0 FAR, we're providing a
22 5.0 FAR with a 4.62 residential FAR.

23 Very quickly, we're asking for flexibility
24 for side yard. Under the C-R zone we're not required
25 to provide a side yard, but if you do it's a minimum

1 of eight feet. On the south we have pulled the
2 building slightly north away from the townhomes to
3 provide a little bit more breathing room to the 46
4 foot townhomes, and so there's only a side yard of
5 approximately seven foot, three inches on the south.
6 And on the north the building is slightly pulled back
7 to provide a little bit more pedestrian circulation
8 along north service court.

9 With regard to loading, the loading
10 requirement for this building has been calculated in
11 accordance with Section 2201.2, and so the loading
12 calculation is based upon as if the building was 100
13 percent residential, which requires two berths, which
14 requires one berth, I'm sorry, at 55 feet. We're
15 providing -- given the narrow width of Three Quarter
16 Street we're providing two berths, one on the east of
17 Three Quarter and one on the west of Three Quarter
18 Street.

19 The one on the west side of Three Quarter
20 Street is 40 foot deep, and the one on the east side
21 is proposed for 30 foot deep, and that particular
22 berth is going to serve a dual function of also
23 providing the service delivery space for the building
24 which will be managed through the applicant's loading
25 management plan.

1 We've also asked for flexibility with regard
2 to roof structure. You'll recall at the setdown we
3 had requested flexibility from the one to one
4 setback. However, in response to comments made by
5 the Commission the applicant is committing to meet
6 the one to one setback, particularly for the east
7 penthouse. Or I'm sorry, the west penthouse. But
8 we're requesting flexibility to allow multiple
9 penthouse heights, as well as minor adjustments to
10 the configuration of the penthouse in order to meet
11 that one to one setback.

12 With regard to the need for the second stage
13 PUD to meet the purposes of the Zoning Regulations I
14 won't read to you what the purposes of the Zoning
15 Regulations are. You can find those in Chapter 1.
16 But I'll submit to you that the application is indeed
17 consistent with the purposes and intent of the Zoning
18 Regulations.

19 It's also consistent with the Stage 1 PUD
20 development parameters which was, for this site, C-R
21 zone, 110 feet, with a mixed use building consisting
22 of residential and retail uses.

23 The proposal is also still providing the
24 requisite amount of affordable housing which is
25 described in the PUD order. Order No. 13-14 requires

1 that this particular parcel provide 25 units of
2 affordable housing marketed to households making 80
3 percent of AMI, or approximately 21,341 gross square
4 feet. The 25 units are being proposed and in fact
5 the building slightly exceeds the required amount of
6 gross floor area for affordable housing.

7 With respect to transportation we have DDOT's
8 support. The proposed building program is consistent
9 with what was contemplated at the first stage PUD,
10 and therefore the assumptions that are built into the
11 first stage transportation analysis are still valid
12 per DDOT's report. The applicant has agreed to all
13 the TDM measures included on pages 8 and 9 of the
14 DDOT report, including the additional measures
15 requested by DDOT, including the provision of a car
16 or bike sharing membership for each unit for a period
17 of three years, as well as the relocation of street
18 parking along Ewart Street to the north side of the
19 street, in order to make the in-bound and out-bound
20 loading work a little bit more efficiently.

21 And then finally, just a couple bullet points
22 about the Three Quarter Street span. As you know the
23 Office of Planning has suggested that perhaps the
24 number of units in the Three Quarter Street span
25 could be removed as a way to get a clear passageway

1 with natural light coming through there. I just
2 wanted to note that the bridge is not a result of a
3 desire for additional height or density. Clearly
4 we're well below what we can build under the first
5 stage PUD. In fact the Parcel 2 building, as the
6 master plan was first being developed and moving
7 through the HPRB process before it even reached the
8 Zoning Commission, was always intended to be a
9 singular building. And in fact as a result of the
10 HPRB process and this need to -- or this desire to
11 reintroduce the site into the prevailing urban
12 context, the street grid, bringing additional
13 north/south connections through the portion of the
14 site between north and south service court, that
15 prompted a lot of analysis by the design team, and
16 the bridge is actually a deliberate response. A
17 response following a very careful planning and design
18 analysis that took place after the introduction of
19 Three Quarter Street and during the initial HPRB
20 review.

21 That analysis looked at, as testified to by
22 Mr. Voelzke, it considered two separate buildings on
23 this site. But at the end of that analysis it was
24 determined that a singular building was the best
25 approach to achieving the needs of this building,

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 achieving some of the high prioritized principles
2 that Ms. Corbett mentioned about the importance of
3 north service court, the importance of Half Street
4 being the primary north/south spine through the site,
5 and the importance of the historic landmark and that
6 element, the Olmsted Walk.

7 And so for these reasons is why when the
8 building first reached the Zoning Commission it was a
9 singular building with a narrow three quarter street
10 span over it. And then finally following the master
11 plan when the design team set forth to advance the
12 design of the Parcel 2 building, it went through a
13 very, very careful HPRB analysis. Two times, in
14 fact. And the first time it was rejected and the
15 design team took to minimize the profile of that
16 building, eliminate 15 units from the north side of
17 that.

18 In order to minimize the profile of that so
19 that it sort of elevated the important elements of
20 McMillan and was as least intrusive on the historic
21 landmark as possible but still achieve the functions
22 and programmatic requirements of the building.

23 Because the bridge was so carefully designed
24 I would suggest that -- or submit to you that the
25 bridge actually becomes part of the McMillan

1 experience. As Mr. Voelzke mentioned, Half Street
2 approaching north service court really is that
3 intersection is the primary intersection. Coming
4 down First Street, the treatment of the northwest
5 corner of that building was treated specifically
6 because it's the gateway into the north service
7 court. And again, traveling north along Three
8 Quarter Street you can consider it as sort of a
9 portal into the main street of the McMillan -- the
10 McMillan Main Street area.

11 So with that, Mr. Chairman, I'll conclude my
12 presentation.

13 MR. GLASGOW: That concludes the applicant's
14 direct presentation.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. We want to thank
16 you all for your presentation to us. Let's see if we
17 have any comments or questions.

18 Can we put back up the, I guess the view, the
19 -- I guess the video. I don't know what you call it.
20 But the video with the moving, you know, the -- just
21 put that back up and if you can just kind of help me
22 with the -- hold on one second. I took some notes
23 here.

24 Okay. Help me with the -- show me how the
25 building was pulled back to allow more pedestrian

1 circulation. Just help me how to -- as that's
2 moving, show me how -- if you have a pointer, show me
3 how I would experience that pedestrian circulation
4 around. How all that's going to work, if we can make
5 that work.

6 You need to be on the mic. You need to be on
7 the mic.

8 MR. VOELZSKE: What Shane was referring to on
9 the north service court and why the building was
10 pulled back was so it was aligned with the other
11 buildings, and it created enough space from basically
12 the foot of our plinth to the foot of the plinth
13 across the street, leaving enough room and activity
14 around the historic relics in the middle, still allow
15 for a lane of traffic and a sidewalk width that we
16 thought was appropriate for retail street.

17 And separately, Commissioner Hood, you know,
18 once you get above the plinth all the buildings on
19 the north service court set back another 15 feet.

20 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Well, just show me
21 how, if I'm a pedestrian, show me how I'm going to
22 walk around. How is it going to be so more
23 pedestrian friendly for me to circulate around that
24 building.

25 MR. VOELZSKE: Sure. As everyone has

1 mentioned tonight, this is Half Street, which is the
2 prominent north/south spine of McMillan. You can see
3 that the park and the southern third, the resources,
4 historic resources in the south service court there.
5 First and foremost, our building's front door is Half
6 Street. We saw the north service court as our retail
7 frontage, Half Street is our kind of formal
8 residential front door.

9 The front door of the building is located
10 centered in the façade between the two vertical bars.
11 Pedestrians coming and going, visitors coming and
12 going into the building will use this entrance. We
13 didn't want to break the retail experience along the
14 north service court with additional residential
15 entrances, and so we've left that continuous edge as
16 all retail. But we wanted the building to have an
17 address and have prominence. And Half Street was
18 rightly so the right place to do that.

19 This is also the main kind of pedestrian
20 spine between the parks and the rec center in the
21 south, the medical office buildings to the north, and
22 then the north service court, retail on all sides.
23 The new Harris Teeter down here, hopefully retail on
24 the Parcel 3 which has not been presented yet, and
25 then the retail on our project and across the street

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 at the north service court.

2 If you're shopping, you know, you're
3 basically using the sidewalks on the north service
4 court. If you're walking here from the bus or from
5 other areas of McMillan you're generally using Half
6 Street.

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Where the two building,
8 where it connects again.

9 MR. VOELZSKE: Yeah. Sure.

10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I wanted to come up and go
11 up under that pattern like I'm going up under the
12 connection.

13 MR. VOELZSKE: Okay. Let's let this run for
14 a minute and then we'll see. Stop right here, right?

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Stop right there. Right.

16 MR. VOELZSKE: Essentially the continuous
17 retail experience along the north service court. The
18 actual plan for the islands, I'll call them, or the
19 zones in the middle of the north service court, the
20 kind of park in the middle, it has the sand bins and
21 the regulator houses as well as the sand washing
22 stations. There is no pedestrian connection across
23 the north service court aligned with Three Quarter
24 Street, but you can move around the sand bins to
25 either side.

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 And then in order to, you know, basically
2 activate Three Quarter Street a little bit, we're
3 turning retail store fronts down but we envision the
4 front doors for all this retail to be on the north
5 service court.

6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: How wide is the street as
7 I go up under the underpass?

8 MR. VOELZSKE: It's 48 feet from building
9 face to building face. It's a very narrow street
10 section.

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Is that street one-way?

12 MR. VOELZSKE: Three quarter Street is two-
13 way, but it has parking on one side, and narrower
14 sidewalks.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Show me which side the
16 parking is on.

17 MR. VOELZSKE: Sure. The parking, I believe,
18 is on the west side. Right, Brian?

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I think I saw it indent on
20 one of those as we went down. Can we roll it so I
21 can go down the street so I can --

22 MR. VOELZSKE: Yeah. Just something to point
23 out, Commissioner, we purposely didn't park -- we
24 didn't want any parking or jut outs, you know, sort
25 of stepping into the pedestrian experience along the

1 north service court so the parking actually doesn't
2 start until a little bit further south on Three
3 Quarter Street.

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: As we went down that
5 street --

6 MR. VOELZSKE: Uh-huh.

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: -- Three Quarter Street, I
8 think it was to the right. Am I correct?

9 MR. VOELZSKE: Yes, sir.

10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. It's like a layby
11 or whatever you want to call it?

12 MR. VOELZSKE: It's parking and then it's the
13 curb cuts for the two loading docks as well.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And how do we get to that
15 connection again? I think someone -- it wasn't
16 originally planned. How did we get to that? How did
17 we get to the connection and how do we reduce the
18 height? Those are the two questions.

19 MR. VOELZSKE: Sure. The connection actually
20 has always been there. Originally when the project
21 was designed this was one block and it remains to be
22 one block known as Parcel 2. As part of the HPRB
23 review of the initial master plan, they had asked for
24 basically more open space connections between and
25 threading and braiding across the site. And so we

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 created a hybrid grid of open space that doubles as
2 our, basically all of our street grid. But the
3 street grid is at a greatly reduced scale than what
4 you're used to in the city. This parcel together is
5 only about 250 feet from Half Street to First Street,
6 which is a very small city block. When you bifurcate
7 it with the Three Quarter Street it actually turns in
8 to 200 and I think 20 foot blocks, or 110 foot blocks
9 with the 48 feet at Three Quarter Street.

10 And so when we decided to -- especially with
11 Parcel 4, with the grocery store -- and I don't know,
12 can you picture that on North Capitol Street? Brian,
13 it might be best to bring up the overall site plan.
14 Yeah, this is a very easy way to explain.

15 When HPRB came back to us and said, you know,
16 what -- originally the plan essentially just had Half
17 Street they said, what can we do to sort of thread
18 the open space between the north and south service
19 court in ways that would allow multiple experiences
20 and multiple views between the different spaces and
21 basically allow the center part of the tripartite
22 arrangement of McMillan to weave together the
23 outpoured parcels.

24 And so in response to that a whole series of
25 open spaces was connected -- was created to connect

1 the courts. The first one, like I mentioned, is a
2 news space between townhouses. That actually stops
3 at Parcel 4. Parcel 4 needed to be a certain size in
4 order to culminate the footprint for a full size
5 grocery store, and that introduces Quarter Street.
6 We used the nomenclature Quarter Street, Half Street,
7 and Three Quarter Street, but in fact you know, that
8 doesn't actually refer to the actual proportions.
9 Half Street is actually more at about 60 percent.
10 Quarter Street is actually more at about 40 percent.

11 The remaining blocks were basically
12 dimensioned to allow the standard row house product
13 with an alley in the middle. And that's what set
14 those up. We wanted more views. We didn't want to
15 repeat what was done here. We wanted views from the
16 north to the south service court on our Three Quarter
17 Street, but our building footprint we could break at
18 the first floor but we needed to connect at the
19 second floor to get an efficient residential program.
20 And so that building, when Three Quarter Street was
21 added in response to HPRB's request for more kind of
22 threading of the courts, we pointed out at that time,
23 sure we can do that but the building needs to be one
24 building. It will be a different experience but it
25 will have a connection upstairs.

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Ms. Corbett.
2 You're Corbett? Okay. Ms. Corbett and Mr. Lynch,
3 what have you heard from the community about this? I
4 want to know what you've heard from the overall
5 community about this particular site and project.
6 And then also I want to know how do you see the
7 issues from the McMillan Coalition for Sustainable
8 Agriculture, or do you know what the issues are? I
9 just, I want to know what you're hearing from
10 everyone.

11 MR. LYNCH: Well, as you can imagine we're
12 concentrating on the two multifamily buildings for
13 the McMillan project. And the first multifamily
14 building is the grocery store and has always been a
15 top three item for this community is getting a full
16 service grocery store.

17 But quickly thereafter, though, when people
18 talk about the retail experience, it is what other
19 ancillary retail will come along with that grocery
20 store? They quickly realized that by pulling the
21 anchor of the grocery store there can be the
22 opportunity for other retail. And so when we were
23 able to present a building that we could bring on
24 earlier and could complete the McMillan Main Street,
25 we've got a significant amount of support around

1 being able to have a full retail experience from
2 First Street to North Capitol Street. And as quickly
3 as we designed a building that met the master plan
4 guidelines that were also widely accepted, we
5 definitely got the ANC support for this project.

6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: What was the reaction to
7 Harris Teeters? I mean, what -- I mean, what was
8 that reaction? I'm just curious.

9 MS. CORBETT: Can I speak to that, even
10 though it's your win?

11 Yeah, so I was really sensitive to exactly
12 what grocery store answer was right for this
13 community. It's a, you know, there's a dearth of
14 full service grocery stores and as we discussed a
15 year ago in this hearing it was something that
16 everyone was very concerned about. Would it be real?
17 Would it be, you know, would Jair deliver on that?
18 And the other thing is though, that as you know some
19 grocery stores can have really strong impacts on
20 communities, on real estate values. And so I think -
21 - I'm really proud of Jair for really trying to
22 strike a balance between giving the community a high
23 quality grocer that delivers products they deserve
24 without being so far out of the every-man reach.

25 So I feel that Harris Teeter is exactly what

1 I heard the community wanted. You know, they didn't
2 want a low-end. They didn't want Whole Foods. They
3 wanted something that was accessible but high
4 quality. And I think it's exactly the right answer
5 for this neighborhood. Just my opinion.

6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. Good. And
7 this is all I have. Thank you very much for
8 answering my questions. I don't think anybody up
9 here has any questions because I don't normally go
10 first. Does anybody have any questions?

11 MS. COHEN: Yes.

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Vice Chair Cohen.

13 MS. COHEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just
14 wanted to note that I didn't sit in on the PUD first
15 round. I had had an accident so some of my questions
16 may be somewhat redundant to what happened.

17 My first question is, how wide is the span?

18 MR. VOELZSKE: It spans Three Quarter Street,
19 which is 48 feet wide. As far as the depth of it --

20 MS. COHEN: No, yeah, the depth.

21 MR. VOELZSKE: -- north and south.

22 MS. COHEN: That's what I meant. I'm sorry.

23 MR. VOELZSKE: It's about 35 feet.

24 MS. COHEN: Thirty-five feet. And so that's
25 going to accommodate the movement between the

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 buildings?

2 MR. VOELZSKE: It allows the building to
3 function as one building with corridor access between
4 the buildings at all levels except level 2. We
5 really thought it needed to be lifted up above level
6 2 as well to create the right volume underneath. But
7 from floors three through seven it does -- it's a
8 full connection and it functions as one building.
9 And then it allows one unit on the south, so one bar
10 of units on the south side of the bridge.

11 MS. COHEN: Now as the office building is
12 designed and eventually constructed, their views into
13 the housing itself, what will they be looking at?
14 Just the rooftop, or will they have some ability to
15 look --

16 MR. VOELZSKE: They are --

17 MS. COHEN: -- into windows.

18 MR. VOELZSKE: It will be a mix of things.
19 You know, the medical office buildings are
20 substantially larger than the building we're
21 proposing tonight. So the upper floors of the
22 medical office building will be looking at the roof
23 of this building. But the midlevel floors will be
24 looking across the north service court, which is
25 quite wide. It's not like looking across a regular

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 city street. I think it's pushing, what, 150 feet or
2 more, Brian, right? And then they are set, 120.

3 MS. CORBETT: A hundred and twenty.

4 MR. VOELZSKE: Plus the setbacks at the two
5 plinths which is another 15 feet on each side. So
6 it's a little bit different than a regular city
7 street. What they'll see at the span across Three
8 Quarter Street is eventually a glass bridge with
9 people moving east and west across. And then as I
10 mentioned briefly in the presentation, we're looking
11 -- we haven't designed it yet and we haven't figured
12 out how it would happen, but we're looking at, you
13 know, enhancing the blank wall of the corridor with
14 some kind of larger scale artwork that would sort of
15 help to basically make that view and that experience
16 a little more special.

17 MS. COHEN: All right. And I would like to
18 see the materials if you have them here. Maybe you
19 can start --

20 MR. VOELZSKE: Oh, absolutely.

21 MS. COHEN: -- handing them out.

22 MS. CORBETT: Can I just add that width is
23 kind of like an avenue. So it's --

24 MS. COHEN: Okay. Yeah.

25 MS. CORBETT: -- like Massachusetts Avenue

1 where just down the street where there's a large
2 building on either side but you don't see into them
3 because it's 120 feet in between.

4 MS. COHEN: I may have misunderstood, but
5 that span is just being used by the residents of the
6 building? Correct?

7 MR. VOELZSKE: Yes, ma'am.

8 MS. COHEN: Okay. On LEED I think you're
9 committing to Silver. However, I note that you do
10 have a chance of getting 110 points, so I would
11 believe that and I would support that you commit to
12 Gold. Have you met with the District Department of
13 Energy and Environment?

14 MS. CORBETT: We have. We meet almost weekly
15 with Bill Updike participates in our team design
16 process.

17 MS. COHEN: So what would be the problem in
18 achieving gold because I think that that's very
19 important. Especially because of the overall --

20 MS. CORBETT: Sure. Sure. So first I'll say
21 that the overall project is committing to LEED
22 neighborhood development, which is additional
23 evaluation process and is very uncommon for a project
24 like this where you have multiple owners, multiple
25 building types, real diversities of program and

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 construction types. So we are collaborating as a
2 team to achieve LEED ND Gold under the new Version 4
3 of LEED ND, which is really an accomplishment and
4 takes, again, a great amount of coordination among
5 the district as a property owner and three different
6 private developer property owners.

7 So that's what the team has been focused on.
8 The PUD, the Stage 1 PUD, set the baseline for every
9 building on site to be at least LEED Silver. That's
10 also relatively uncommon in a campus plan that every
11 single building is delivered. Well, so the LEED ND
12 minimum is that you have one out of all of your
13 buildings. So we have every single building.

14 And I would love to go through that checklist
15 with you. It is onerous as, again as you know, they
16 just came out with Version 4, so we are all subject
17 to a higher standard than we were when we committed
18 to LEED Silver.

19 MS. COHEN: Just for background I did have
20 this conversation at an earlier PUD that claimed
21 that, you know, how difficult it was for residential.
22 And so I did my homework and there's quite a bit of
23 Gold in residential so please, please take a look at
24 it. I think it's very important. The minimum that
25 we're seeing now is Silver. This is an extraordinary

1 project. And just please, take another look and come
2 back before we go for proposed action with a
3 discussion about that. Just would appreciate it.

4 MS. CORBETT: Certainly. Certainly.

5 Okay. One area that you're asking for
6 flexibility I think is in the number and square
7 footage of the residential. And what would concern
8 me is -- and the number, the size of the units. What
9 concerns me is that again, and I know you're all
10 aware of this, is that we're in the dire straits in
11 the need for housing. Of course there's a terrible
12 mismatch in what's being produced and what people can
13 afford.

14 But you're proffering 10 percent of your
15 units in this particular building for affordable
16 housing. And I would hate to see you reduce the
17 bedroom sizes in comparability of two bedrooms.
18 Again, we want to retain families in the city. We
19 don't want to push them out into the suburbs. And
20 it's very difficult for the affordability issue. The
21 townhomes are probably going to come online as you
22 said, the value of this project is increasing.
23 Probably the more you do, the more value it has. And
24 I'm just concerned about the affordability level and
25 rental usually is somewhat more affordable. Not

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 always. It depends upon the amenities. But I do
2 want you to be cautious about this. I'm really
3 concerned about the two bedroom units. Especially
4 because some of them will be at 80 percent of median
5 income.

6 MS. CORBETT: Certainly. So I would start by
7 saying that again, the project is a puzzle of the
8 entire -- or all seven parcels. And the commitment
9 is to 20 percent affordable housing across the entire
10 development.

11 MS. COHEN: Of which most is senior, so
12 please, on the family --

13 MS. CORBETT: And that was in specific
14 response to community request, Commissioner.

15 MS. COHEN: I understand that. That's one
16 thing I remember hearing is the community request.
17 But there's also something called a city need. Okay?
18 And the city is experiencing an extreme problem. And
19 so I just wish you would consider, again, if you come
20 forward and want that flexibility it's going to
21 impact the number of units that are designated for
22 affordable.

23 MS. CORBETT: So we have 85 senior units, and
24 then we have nearly 50 family units.

25 MS. COHEN: Some are in the townhouse,

1 correct?

2 MS. CORBETT: Correct.

3 MS. COHEN: Yeah, I understand that.

4 MS. CORBETT: And some of those are priced at
5 50 percent of AMI.

6 MS. COHEN: Okay. Thank you.

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Commissioner May.

8 MS. COHEN: No, I'm not -- I'm sorry. I just
9 have one other thing.

10 I also would like to know more about the roof
11 and what's going on up there other than, you know,
12 your utilities and elevator override.

13 MR. VOELZSKE: Sure. We can bring up a roof
14 plan, Brian, if you have one.

15 First off, there's a fairly tall parapet
16 that's formed by the white drapes that we discussed
17 earlier, and that's what you see with the kind of
18 parallelogram pattern on the four bars. Within that
19 we have lower mechanical units that are servicing all
20 of the residential units downstairs. And then
21 because the building has two cores we've got
22 penthouses on both the east side and the west side of
23 Three Quarter Street. Nothing out of the ordinary.
24 If we can get it passed through the building code
25 issues we are asking for the flexibility to put a

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 rooftop terrace up here. But there are code
2 implications to that that we haven't solved yet. So
3 we're not sure we're going to be able to do that.

4 MS. COHEN: Okay. And you did agree to the
5 setback requirements.

6 MR. VOELZSKE: Yes.

7 MS. COHEN: Okay. Thank you.

8 MR. VOELZSKE: Sure.

9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Commissioner May?

10 MR. MAY: Okay. So the bridge is still a bit
11 of a puzzle to me and I'm not going to belabor the
12 point. I don't really quite get the rationale for
13 it. It just seems kind of extraneous. Don't really
14 understand why that makes the building work so much
15 better except maybe it saves you a couple elevators
16 or something. I don't know. Outwardly I don't think
17 it makes really any difference.

18 And it's also just feels like kind of a weird
19 feature. But then again, you know, you could have
20 just not had Three Quarter Street and had a building
21 that went across there. So I'm not losing sleep over
22 the existence of that bridge portion.

23 I am a little curious about it though. I
24 mean, how is it actually structured? It seems like
25 the structure of that is very, very thin in section.

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 And so, I mean, are there hidden tresses somewhere or
2 something, because otherwise it's a very expensive
3 way to span 48 feet.

4 MR. VOELZSKE: We're assuming that the slab
5 is going to thin at the perimeter so that we can
6 achieve a thinner profile where the mullions meet the
7 floor slab.

8 MR. MAY: Okay.

9 MR. VOELZSKE: But within there and within
10 the apartment units, and there will be obviously
11 beams that will cross over the -- you know, making
12 the 48 foot span. It's not -- 48 feet is, you know,
13 it's not that wide. You know, 35 --

14 MR. MAY: No, but it just, I mean, just look
15 at it. Look at that. Doesn't that look -- I mean,
16 it looks very, very thin in terms of the structure.
17 I mean, normally when you see a bridge that's that
18 long you see greater depth of structure. You see --
19 I mean, think about Metro bridges and think about
20 bridges between buildings that exist in other cities
21 because the other cities like to do a lot.

22 MR. VOELZSKE: Sure.

23 MR. MAY: Because they're more concerned
24 about, you know, weather than aesthetics. But it
25 just, it looks very, very thin. And I mean, it

1 doesn't really have great bearing on this project
2 except that, you know, if you found out that it's
3 structurally not possible to do it this way and all
4 of a sudden you've got to come back with a different
5 design.

6 MR. VOELZSKE: I'm confident that we can
7 structure it as we have designed it.

8 MR. MAY: So it's just reinforced concrete,
9 or it's -- there are some steel beams in there that
10 we're not seeing?

11 MR. VOELZSKE: Whether it's concrete or steel
12 it will be concealed within some of the walls and
13 some of the forms that you see there. So at the
14 lower level --

15 MR. MAY: So but it won't actually be any
16 truss to it. Not --

17 MR. VOELZSKE: The whole thing could
18 conceivably be a box truss, but the side of the truss
19 would be behind that blank wall that you see there.

20 MR. MAY: Okay.

21 MR. VOELZSKE: And the rest would be
22 cantilevered out.

23 MR. MAY: Okay. All right. So the artwork
24 on the interior wall is a big of a concern because
25 the way you're describing it, it's going to be a very

1 visible feature and we're not seeing what it is. So
2 I mean, and I can't -- do we actually have that in
3 our submission package, those images on the left at
4 that same scale? What page is that? I must have
5 glossed over it.

6 Okay. I'm looking at page 28. Is that it?

7 MR. VOELZSKE: Yes, Commissioner.

8 MR. MAY: Okay. So I mean I kind of want to
9 -- I mean, it's such a prominent thing I kind of want
10 to see it before we sign off on it. I mean, at what
11 point are you going to actually make decisions about
12 the artwork?

13 MR. LYNCH: Our thoughts around the artwork
14 were really going to be, make sure that we get to the
15 place where we're thinking about the interiors as a
16 whole. We recognize that it's an interior wall. We
17 recognize that it has to be part of the overall
18 branding of not only McMillan but of this building.
19 But we've given several examples. We don't think
20 that it needs to be overpowering. As you see in one
21 of the examples it could be just shades of a color.
22 It could be as simple as lighting.

23 MR. MAY: So the answer is, you're not going
24 to decide this until after you've gotten through the
25 zoning process.

1 MR. LYNCH: Unless requested we would prefer
2 that, yes.

3 MR. MAY: Okay. I mean, you know, I'm not
4 trying to reorder your process. I just want to know
5 when you intend to do it, because if you intended to
6 do it anywhere close to when we're making our
7 decisions then I'd want to see it. I'm not going to
8 force you to see it, but I am going to force you to
9 submit bigger pictures of those things or any other
10 examples that you think are relevant because I can't
11 tell anything from a picture that's an inch and a
12 half wide.

13 MS. CORBETT: As you know, Commissioner,
14 public art has an elaborate public participation and
15 evaluation process which we would certainly subject
16 this to.

17 MR. MAY: I understand that, and if you've
18 observed public art around the City or others,
19 sometimes the result is good and sometimes it's not.
20 So we all have our opinion about it and I just, you
21 know, if we were going to have a shot at it I wanted
22 to have a clean shot at it. But if I'm not then
23 I'm --

24 MS. CORBETT: Fair enough. We'll bring you
25 some more precedent images of --

1 MR. MAY: Yeah.

2 MS. CORBETT: -- what we have in mind.

3 MR. MAY: To get a sense of it.

4 MS. CORBETT: I presented, you know, a short
5 list of artistic concepts to the team for their
6 consideration. It's something that I have a great
7 deal of experience in.

8 MR. MAY: Okay.

9 MS. CORBETT: So --

10 MR. MAY: Yeah, just, I mean, give is some
11 bigger, better precedent images. If you have more
12 than that, you know, great. But just something
13 that's at least eight and a half by 11 so I can
14 actually see it. That would be --

15 MS. CORBETT: And criticize it. Sorry.

16 MR. MAY: I might tell you what I like or
17 don't like, but --

18 MS. CORBETT: Excellent.

19 MR. MAY: I have another concern about the
20 facades, the white metal facades. So the big problem
21 I have with white metal in large quantities is that
22 it doesn't really weather very well. It gets dirty
23 and you see the dirt and not in a good way. I mean
24 there are ways, you know, when you design -- when
25 buildings are sort of classically designed and have

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 great detail, I mean, you know, there are reasons why
2 that level of detail exists on a classical building.
3 It's that, you know, as they get dirty over time it
4 actually enhances the detail and it looks good. It
5 still looks good. At a certain point it starts to
6 look bad, you've got to wash it. But it will last a
7 really long time before that happens.

8 But if you look at some of the very white
9 metal buildings around town they don't look so good
10 after 10 years or 20 years. And I'm just really
11 concerned that this is not going to look really good.
12 And I'm not saying that it really needs to change, I
13 just think that you need to be very, very certain
14 that it's going to look really good in 20 years. Or
15 you're going to have to just know that you have to
16 spend money for guys to go out and squeegee the walls
17 as well as the windows. I don't know what you've got
18 to do but to clean it up. But I don't want you to
19 just, you know, latch on to something that's going to
20 be hard to maintain and isn't going to look very
21 good.

22 MR. VOELZSKE: Understood. And we're
23 extremely sensitive to the points that you've made
24 and --

25 MR. MAY: Okay.

1 MR. VOELZSKE: -- focus on our design on ways
2 to basically --

3 MR. MAY: Yeah.

4 MR. VOELZSKE: -- be more forgiving as the
5 building gets dirty and --

6 MR. MAY: Right. I appreciate your
7 willingness to do that.

8 The stone sample that we have here, that's
9 the stone sample for the base?

10 MR. VOELZSKE: For the plinth.

11 MR. MAY: Yeah, for the plinth.

12 MR. VOELZSKE: Yes, for the plinth. Sorry.

13 MR. MAY: So and is that really the range
14 because it's very, very light compared to what you
15 have in your imagery. What you're showing in your
16 imagery is a medium to dark gray. And of course
17 everything lightens -- everything is lighter in
18 sunshine. So you know, even a dark gray can look
19 very light in sunshine. And that looks really,
20 really white.

21 MR. VOELZSKE: It does have a fair amount of
22 irrigation.

23 MR. MAY: Yeah.

24 MR. VOELZSKE: Each stone -- well, the way
25 we're setting it is in fairly thin pieces. So

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 although the pieces across the piece don't have a ton
2 of variation in the overall, the different pieces do.

3 MR. MAY: So -- yeah. I mean, this is just
4 another thing I would look at again because even a
5 dark sort of charcoal color stone is going to look
6 light, like what you have there. I think that the
7 base that you have there, the plinth is going to look
8 really bright and white compared to your very black
9 brick. So again, I'm not telling you to change the
10 color. I'm just telling you to look at it really
11 carefully and be really, really sure about it.

12 And I think you need to look at some
13 installations of that particular stone in sunlight to
14 know that it's the right thing.

15 Oh, and on the penthouse setback why aren't
16 you just redoing the penthouse setback and telling us
17 what it's going to be instead of asking for
18 flexibility and promising you're going to fix it?
19 Why can't you just fix it and submit it? You could
20 do that?

21 MR. VOELZSKE: It ties to the final planning
22 on the inside of the building and the elevator
23 overruns and the type of elevators that we're using.
24 And it's just -- and the setbacks from Three Quarter
25 Street, from First Street, from Half Street, from the

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 north service court are all, you know, as should be.
2 I think the setback challenge that we're having is at
3 the courtyard itself.

4 MR. MAY: I understand that but you're saying
5 that you're going to meet the setback requirements,
6 right?

7 MR. VOELZSKE: Yes.

8 MR. GLASGOW: Yes. We're going to have roof
9 structures potentially of unequal height.

10 MR. MAY: I'm not worried about that.

11 MR. GLASGOW: Yeah. But we're going to meet
12 the setback requirements.

13 MR. MAY: I understand that. You've promised
14 to meet them but you're not submitting a drawing that
15 shows how you're meeting that. That's all I'm asking
16 for. Can you just submit a drawing that --

17 MR. GLASGOW: We will submit a drawing that
18 shows that.

19 MR. MAY: -- shows how you will do it? Okay.
20 That's all. Thank you.

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Commissioner
22 Turnbull.

23 MR. TURNBULL: Oh, thank you, Mr. Chair.
24 Yeah, let's not beat around the bush regarding
25 missing elements of the plan. You want this

1 approved, show us what you want approved. Don't
2 leave anything out to chance for us to guess at.
3 Show us the roof plan. Show us sections. Show us
4 sections up there. Show us a little view of what
5 this roof plan is going to look like. This is common
6 for all PUDs. We see these things. It's not a
7 guess. And don't ask for flexibility.

8 And answer the -- OP has got a lot of
9 questions that they have. I want those answered. We
10 really need those answered. It's not tough. You
11 should be at this point already.

12 I guess I'll get back to what everyone else
13 has talked about so far is this link. I really think
14 it's two separate buildings. I mean, let's say I
15 live in the east building and the mayor is coming to
16 visit me. The mayor is going to arrive on Half
17 Street, go in, and do what?

18 MR. VOELZSKE: I suspect everybody visiting
19 the building is going to arrive on Half Street.
20 We've set that up as our primary entrance. That's
21 where the lobby will be. That's where the doors that
22 will be keyed to let you in or let a visitor in will
23 be. They'll come in and they'll take the elevator to
24 whatever floor their going to and get off at that
25 floor. And if they're going to the west wing they'll

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 walk down the corridor and go over the bridge. And
2 if they go into the east wing they'll just take the
3 elevator up and go to the apartment.

4 MR. TURNBULL: That's a construct. That's a
5 construct --

6 MR. VOELZSKE: (Inaudible.)

7 MR. TURNBULL: -- of the most ridiculous --
8 you're going to have somebody wander all the way down
9 those corridors to get to the building on the other
10 side.

11 MR. VOELZSKE: It's a fairly modest building
12 and I think that what is distracting on this is that
13 the blocks were set up as townhouse sized blocks by
14 the city --

15 MR. TURNBULL: So the link, both of them,
16 mechanicals are separate for each building.

17 MR. VOELZSKE: They're separate for each
18 unit, yes, sir.

19 MR. TURNBULL: Loading is separate for each
20 building, right?

21 MR. VOELZSKE: Whereas loading will be on one
22 side, we had the second loading dock to serve the
23 retail on the other side.

24 MR. TURNBULL: Just the retail?

25 MR. VOELZSKE: Yeah. And the parking garage,

1 you know, we didn't talk about connects both
2 buildings underneath.

3 MR. TURNBULL: And you have to back in. The
4 trucks are going to back in on Three Quarter Street
5 to be able to be unloaded, right?

6 MR. VOELZSKE: Yes, sir.

7 MR. TURNBULL: And then you've got your --
8 this just looks like an operational tough zone here,
9 to do. If this -- so basically this link that's
10 crossing the street is mainly a pedestrian access
11 point to get people from going on Main Street to get
12 over to the east building. Am I correct?

13 MR. VOELZSKE: No, I don't --

14 MR. TURNBULL: No.

15 MR. VOELZSKE: It's one building. We're
16 trying to have it function as one building. It's
17 a --

18 MR. TURNBULL: You're trying to have it
19 function. But if -- but mainly you want people to
20 get to the other building, they're going to take this
21 walkway.

22 MR. VOELZSKE: Yes, sir.

23 MR. TURNBULL: And that's what makes it
24 function. That's what makes it one building?

25 MR. VOELZSKE: No, I want my building to

1 front on Half Street. I want a prominent lobby on
2 Half Street. I want my concierges on Half Street. I
3 want prospective renters to come in on Half Street.

4 MR. TURNBULL: And if I'm leaving my building
5 on E Street do I have to go all the way and go out
6 the west building then?

7 MR. VOELZSKE: You don't have to.

8 MR. TURNBULL: Okay.

9 MR. VOELZSKE: But I would think you would
10 want to go down, drop your package off at the package
11 desk. That's where the monitors will be that will
12 tell you where the buses are, what the time is on
13 that.

14 MR. TURNBULL: I think you need one in the
15 east building. I think you need a transportation in
16 that east building also because if people are going
17 to be going out and getting on Three Quarter Street,
18 they're going to want a building. They're going to
19 want to see a screen and know what's going on.

20 MS. CORBETT: It's really not -- it's really
21 not that big.

22 MR. VOELZSKE: Let Jair answer, I think.

23 MR. TURNBULL: It's big enough. You've got
24 100 odd units, there are over 100 units on each side.

25 MR. VOELZSKE: No, just talking -- I'm

1 listening. I'm trying to understand the disconnect.
2 The building footprint, if this was a single building
3 and Three Quarter Street wasn't there, would be a
4 fairly modest sized building. The fact that Three
5 Quarter Street is bifurcating it, you know, has
6 caused it to be more of a u-shaped building, but I do
7 a lot of multifamily and none of these corridor
8 lengths and none of these walks are particularly
9 onerous.

10 MR. TURNBULL: My personal feeling is that
11 it's a canard. I really don't get how this really
12 works and I think it's deceptive.

13 MR. VOELZSKE: If I can help walk you through
14 again, it's -- I'm not trying to be deceptive.

15 MR. TURNBULL: No, I heard everything you had
16 to say. Yes.

17 MS. CORBETT: Okay. I was going to jump in
18 and say to the canard, so the issue is that we don't
19 want to interrupt the Olmsted Walk on First Street.
20 So we don't want to put an entrance with a drop-off,
21 you know, like --

22 MR. TURNBULL: I understand that.

23 MS. CORBETT: Okay. We don't want to put an
24 entrance on the north service court because then we
25 have a residential lobby on the north service court

1 that takes up --

2 MR. TURNBULL: Well, you do have -- you have
3 an entrance over there.

4 MS. CORBETT: No.

5 MR. TURNBULL: I thought I saw an entrance
6 into the building.

7 MS. CORBETT: On the north service court?

8 MR. TURNBULL: No, on Three Quarter Street.

9 MS. CORBETT: There is a secondary entrance
10 that if you live in the building you can go through a
11 key card entrance on --

12 MR. TURNBULL: Okay.

13 MS. CORBETT: -- Three Quarter Street.

14 MR. TURNBULL: Okay.

15 MR. VOELZSKE: Yeah, something I want to
16 point is that, you know --

17 MS. CORBETT: So you don't have to go through
18 that lobby every single time if you don't want to.
19 But the point is that really Three Quarter Street
20 functions as the back of house to the building so
21 that you have your single entrance to the parking
22 garage back there --

23 MR. TURNBULL: I think a lot of people are
24 going to be going out that building there. If I'm
25 going out on to --

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 MS. CORBETT: They could go out.

2 MR. TURNBULL: -- the north service court --

3 MS. CORBETT: There's nothing stopping them
4 from going --

5 MR. TURNBULL: But I think it's going to be a
6 busy street. I think it will be a busy street, Three
7 Quarter Street. There's a lot of -- I think there's
8 a lot of action from townhouses coming up to the
9 north service court. There's going to be people
10 coming out of the building, and they were going to be
11 -- I think they're going to be coming out on that
12 street.

13 MS. CORBETT: Okay. Well, I don't think
14 there is a negative impact to that. My concern would
15 be if they were two separate buildings then we would
16 be turning our back on Half Street and putting our
17 residential entrances both on Three Quarters and that
18 would just, from an urban design standpoint, that
19 would be a canard. And we would --

20 MR. TURNBULL: All right. Let's -- all
21 right.

22 MS. CORBETT: -- then have a --

23 MR. TURNBULL: Let's move on. Let's move on.
24 Let's move on with some other things here.

25 Let's go back to some of the original

1 arguments that were made in this plan when we set it
2 down. And I think Mr. Glasgow mentioned that this
3 was shown, this building that the link was shown on
4 the original setdown drawings. I think that's a
5 little misleading. I think there were some drawings
6 that had ghosted in and I think we didn't really
7 catch all of the issues that were on there. I think
8 there were some things but even OP has pointed out in
9 their report that it's not very clear what was really
10 shown on the setdown, on some of the setdown
11 drawings. So I think there's a little bit of a fudge
12 on maybe what we actually saw and what we didn't see
13 on some of those drawings.

14 But a lot of the language that we used in
15 setdown report talked about vision. We talked about
16 the vision. We talked about vista. We talked about
17 North Capitol. We talked about First Street. We
18 talked about -- I mean, we talked about the Olmsted
19 preservation. We talked about views down the
20 streets. We talked about views through the street.
21 We talked about views looking through the park, into
22 the park, and can you show from the north service
23 court, the link of the buildings?

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Do you want like the
25 full north service court building link?

1 MR. TURNBULL: No, the one from the north
2 service court looking down, looking at the link.
3 Yeah, it's page 30 in our drawing. There.

4 Can you go up? Let's get a better look at
5 that link.

6 MR. VOELZSKE: Unfortunately it's not
7 interactive.

8 MR. TURNBULL: Well, there was a separate
9 drawing that showed that link. There. I'm sorry.
10 That's banal. That is very banal. That is plain.
11 That is breaking up that whole view shed that you'd
12 see for people to see. You know what would work, and
13 I think OP says it in the report, and you talked
14 about it, if that was clear glass. Clear glass all
15 the way through so that it's a link. It's your
16 pedestrian link connecting the buildings. You know,
17 you get what, five units, five extra -- you get one
18 extra unit per floor by doing this link. Don't tell
19 me it's 15 because you could have had the other five
20 on each side were already built into the side of the
21 buildings. So you're really only getting five one-
22 bedroom building rooms.

23 MR. LYNCH: So, sir, I would like to make a
24 couple comments about your statement.

25 MR. TURNBULL: Yeah.

1 MR. LYNCH: I think we need to be fair about
2 the width of this street. It's only 48 feet wide
3 between building to building. We absolutely
4 understand your comments about the vistas on First
5 Street where you actually have nothing on the west
6 side, and you have a significant setback of over 50
7 feet. On North Capitol Street you have a self-
8 imposed setback on the west side of North Capitol
9 Street that absolutely gives you those vistas and
10 absolutely gives you a sense of grand space. But
11 we're talking about 48 feet. This is less than most
12 streets in Washington, D.C. Most alleys are at 20
13 feet.

14 And so when you talk about that and the
15 length, exactly what you see, when you talk about the
16 landscaping and the length down there, and the trees
17 that are going to align on both sides of that street
18 in order to have front doors for the townhomes, you
19 fundamentally are not going to be able to have vistas
20 to the north, and no one is going to be able to stand
21 from Michigan Avenue and actually create an expansive
22 view to the south. This is as far to the east and
23 west as you're going to be able to look because you
24 only have the hundred feet to stand on the other side
25 of the north service court. Then you're in the

1 medical office buildings.

2 I would absolutely agree with you if this
3 Three Quarter Street moved all the way up to Michigan
4 Avenue, you could have a broader vista. But we
5 really are, between the north service court and the
6 south service court, about 300 or so feet.

7 MR. TURNBULL: Well, I think you ought to
8 make it clear. I think if it was clear glass all the
9 way through so that people could look up and look
10 down and look through the whole link and have a ten
11 foot link that's mainly your pedestrian access, it
12 would be a better amenity for the people living in
13 the building instead of having to walk down just
14 another -- a continuation of a residential corridor.
15 I think to have that totally open would be a much
16 better experience for the people in the buildings,
17 and it would be a much better experience for the
18 people, the pedestrians, on the street to be able to
19 have a clear vista looking straight down the street.

20 MR. VOELZSKE: Commissioner Turnbull, I just
21 want to clarify that pedestrians that are crossing
22 that bridge that are in the building are looking out
23 at the historic resources on the north service court.
24 The units are only on one side, so it is open on the
25 other side for the interaction of the residents.

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 MR. TURNBULL: Right. But I think if it was
2 totally clear on both sides looking all the way
3 through it would open this up more and act more as a
4 link. Either that, or why don't you do something
5 really generous? Why don't you make those middle
6 units 50 percent AMI? Really do something
7 worthwhile. If you want to do this and have a
8 residential unit in there why don't you really do
9 something for the community, then, and make it 50
10 percent AMI instead of having this 80 percent or 100
11 -- market rate units up there, luxury units. Do
12 something worthwhile. If you do that I might go
13 along with it. I think that would be a really
14 generous offer for everybody in this community.
15 Somebody 50 percent to have that unit and to be able
16 to look down that street. That would be worthwhile.
17 That would be a benefit. That would be something
18 extraordinary that I think people would really
19 appreciate and go back and say, you know, this guy
20 really wants to do something worthwhile.

21 Mr. Chair, those are all. I've got other
22 things but I think that will end my questions and
23 comments for now.

24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Mr. Turnbull, if it
25 will help, I kind of agree with the clear glass. I

1 would like to see that myself. I think that's a good
2 option. Even though it's only 300 feet. Whatever
3 the case is --

4 MR. TURNBULL: I know.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: -- I think that it kind of
6 gives it more of an openness. I'd like to see that.
7 I mean, you know, you can make the choice but I kind
8 of like to see that so I can visualize that. Okay.
9 Commissioner Miller.

10 MR. MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
11 think this is a very, very attractive building except
12 for that pedestrian link. And maybe it will turn out
13 better. Maybe just the views, the drawings that we
14 have of it where we can see it, I just, I do find it
15 very off-putting. So I too would like to see the
16 glass, all glass.

17 I also would like to see an alternative where
18 maybe you knocked off the third and fourth floor
19 connections. It bothers me that the view shed from
20 the north service court -- I realize what you're
21 saying about the -- that it doesn't go all the way to
22 Michigan. But it just seems out of place.

23 And I realize how the genesis of how it got
24 there. It wouldn't seem out of place if you didn't
25 have the new street that you're creating underneath

1 it, which was somewhat of a late breaking
2 development, which I think is a good development.
3 But as long as you've got that view shed now I think
4 -- and even though it doesn't go all the way, even
5 though it just goes between the north and south, I
6 think it just would look better.

7 And I agree that the people who live in the -
8 - get my directions right. The west wing building.
9 Is it the west wing building? Are not going to
10 usually enter the Half Street. It just doesn't --
11 well, they're coming to -- well, I just don't think
12 that -- so I realize what you're trying -- I realize
13 the concept that you're trying to -- in terms of
14 making Half Street the primary residential entrance,
15 and you can't do that on First Street because that
16 has its own concept that you're trying to work with
17 there. But I think that residential entrance on
18 Three Quarter Street for that west building is where
19 people naturally will go in.

20 So I would like to see a rendering, as my
21 colleagues did, of the all glass. And if there you
22 lose 15 -- you lose another 15 units. Is that what I
23 heard earlier? You lost 15 when you took them off of
24 the other side? So that will be a total of 30 units.
25 I would be -- I know this has gone through other

1 reviews and everything affects everything and
2 prolongs the process and I don't really want to be
3 contributing to that, but for the loss of those 30
4 units at that point I would be personally agreeable
5 with you going up another floor to eight floors. You
6 have lowered the flight -- lowered the height of this
7 building to get some of the units back, particularly
8 if it's set back from the current seventh floor, the
9 top floor.

10 I appreciate the number of -- so I guess I
11 would like to see a rendering that shows the link
12 without the bottom two connections, just to see what
13 the vista looks like. And you can make it as ugly as
14 you want to make it. But --

15 MS. CORBETT: Without the bottom two? Can
16 you clarify, sir?

17 MR. MILLER: Without the third and fourth
18 floor connections.

19 MS. CORBETT: Without the third and fourth
20 floor connections. Okay.

21 MR. MILLER: I feel like it's sitting on top
22 of a view shed, even though it's a limited view shed.
23 I appreciate. And I don't want to belabor it any
24 longer either because I do think in general it's a
25 very attractive building and program. I would have

1 liked to have seen more 50 percent AMI, but I realize
2 throughout the entire project there is a lot of 50
3 and 60 percent AMI. Maybe you could just refresh our
4 memory for the record --

5 MS. CORBETT: There's --

6 MR. MILLER: -- of the --

7 MS. CORBETT: -- a total of 91 units at 50
8 and 60 percent of AMI, both between the Parcel 4 and
9 the row houses in Parcel 5.

10 MR. MILLER: And I appreciate that 50 of the
11 236 of this building are two bedrooms, the larger
12 units, which is a good thing. So, I don't really
13 have any other questions, Mr. Chairman. But I do
14 share some of the concerns about the link.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Vice
16 Chair Cohen.

17 MS. COHEN: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
18 want to be on record stating that the applicant has
19 already reduce the number of units that they had
20 proposed in the original PUD. We need units and I'd
21 rather have somebody renting a unit than having a
22 clear site that they could walk a half a block and
23 see. So I am not in favor of reducing any more units
24 in any project.

25 I know some of these are market rate, but I

1 really think the importance of increasing the supply
2 goes far, far beyond a vista view. So I just wanted
3 to state that for the record. Thank you.

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. Any other
5 comments up here?

6 Okay. Commissioner Barnes, do you have any
7 cross-examination? Are you representing the ANC? I
8 saw your name on the -- do you have any cross of this
9 panel?

10 Okay. Let's go to the Office of Planning and
11 the District Department of Transportation. Ms.
12 Brown-Roberts and then we'll go to Mr. Rogers.

13 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Good evening, Mr.
14 Chairman and members of the Commission. The Office
15 of Planning is going to stand on the record. I think
16 our main concern was about the connection, and I
17 think the Commission has discussed it a good bit and
18 therefore I won't get into that anymore.

19 But just to say that we are supportive of the
20 other flexibility that the applicant has requested,
21 and we recommend approval with the conditions that
22 were outlined in our report. Thank you, Mr.
23 Chairman.

24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Mr.
25 Rogers.

1 MR. ROGERS: Good evening, Mr. Chairman,
2 members of the Commission. The District Department
3 of Transportation will rest on the record and is
4 available for questions.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, both.
6 Let's see if we have any questions of either the
7 Office of Planning or DDOT. Vice Chair Cohen.

8 MS. COHEN: Thank you. Ms. Brown-Roberts,
9 the Historic Preservation Review Board did review
10 though that span. And so if it remained I would
11 presume you do not have any objections. Is that
12 correct?

13 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: As I said in our report
14 that we -- if it remained, yes. But again, we would
15 recommend having a transparent bridge there instead.

16 MS. COHEN: Would you recommend it still if
17 it was going to reduce the number of units?

18 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Yes, I think so. I think
19 it's an important part of the project, of the overall
20 project. And while we are really concerned about the
21 units too, I think we are looking at it in a broader
22 context.

23 MS. COHEN: So you -- no, never mind. Thank
24 you.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Any other questions

1 up here? Comments?

2 Okay. Let's go to the report of the ANC.
3 Commissioner Barnes, if you want to come forward and
4 give us the ANC's report? Oh, I'm sorry. Does
5 anybody -- does the applicant have any cross-
6 examination?

7 MR. GLASGOW: No cross-examination.

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you.
9 Commissioner Barnes, do you have any cross-
10 examination of the Office of Planning or DDOT? Okay.
11 Thank you. They were waiting for a question. Okay.
12 You can come forward and give us the ANC report.

13 MS. BARNES: Good evening, members of the
14 Commission. I am Commissioner Dianne Barnes for ANC
15 5E and I represent single member district 5E09 in
16 which the project resides.

17 I have lived two blocks from the development
18 site for the past 41 years and as this McMillan
19 project continues to go through the PUD process as
20 required, ANC 5E, at a duly noted public meeting,
21 voted and approved on a resolution at its October
22 meeting with seven of 10 members present, six
23 representing a quorum, five in favor, zero opposed,
24 and two abstain to support the modification of Parcel
25 2, the mixed use multifamily building, Case No. 13-

1 14E, for the second stage PUD application for the
2 McMillan site.

3 On November the 19th, 2013 ANC previously
4 approved and voted six in favor to oppose, two
5 abstain, with 10 members present to support the
6 master plan for the McMillan Reservoir project
7 redevelopment as approved by Historic Preservation
8 Review Board and the Zoning Commission in stage 1,
9 and the consolidated PUD and related map amendment in
10 ZC Case No. 13-14 with modifications.

11 Parcel 2 is a proposed seven-story building,
12 which it may be eight as whatever you want to
13 recommend it. But mid-rise structure joined together
14 with below grade parking and above grade starting at
15 the third floor. The building main retail entry
16 would be along the north service court, while the
17 main residential entry would be the Half Street. The
18 secondary entry as well as assessing to the parking
19 and loading will be along the central Three Quarter
20 Street.

21 The first floor of both wings of the
22 building, we have our retail uses, residential
23 amenities, and units. The upper floor would have a
24 residential unit, residential amenities would include
25 a pool on the second floor of the west wing and an

1 open passive recreation space on the second floor of
2 the east wing. The Office of Planning recommends
3 approval to the second stage PUD with the following
4 conditions if the proposed changes are addressed. If
5 there is a reduction in the number of units, the
6 number of affordable units at 80 percent of AMI would
7 remain 25. The distribution pattern of the
8 affordable unit would be of similar patterns and
9 portions that are shown on Exhibit 12C4, sheet 12,
10 page 53.

11 Flexibility to change the internal parking
12 and loading area would not exceed to external changes
13 of the relocation of parking and loading entry. The
14 roof structure of the west portion of the building
15 would meet the one to one setback requirement through
16 one or the combination of the following: selection
17 of a system that has an override that is no taller
18 than the largest -- the smallest setback dimension
19 shown on the roof plan and/or making minor
20 adjustments to the configuration footprint and
21 location of the elevator's core, stairway enclosure.

22 In closing, referencing OP in its review and
23 the Commission's recommendation ANC 5E asks that the
24 applicant be allowed the flexibility to modify the
25 PUD for the betterment of the community. Thanks for

1 allowing me to testify. Any questions?

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you,
3 Commissioner Barnes.

4 MS. BARNES: Okay.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Colleagues, any questions
6 up here?

7 Commissioner Barnes, you heard some of our
8 discussion about the --

9 MS. BARNES: Yes.

10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: -- whole thing. Do you
11 have a view on any of that or are we deviating too
12 much from what the community has agreed upon or what
13 -- can you give me a comment there? If not, don't
14 worry about it.

15 MS. BARNES: I'm in agreement with the
16 spanned, since people are concerned about the
17 transparency of going -- of looking through the view,
18 I think I also can recommend that the span glass be
19 clear; clear glass for transparency. Other than that
20 I'm not an expert on the other things, so.

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Now, I think I've asked
22 this during the first stage hearings. How long has
23 this project been in existence?

24 MS. BARNES: Oh, I'll say 26 years.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Twenty-six?

1 MS. BARNES: Uh-huh.

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I think maybe more like
3 30.

4 MS. BARNES: But this I the closest we've
5 gotten to --

6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And this is probably --

7 MS. BARNES: -- a hearing room.

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: -- the fourth rendition.

9 MS. BARNES: Yes.

10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Am I correct? Yeah.

11 MS. BARNES: Uh-huh.

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I think it's a little more
13 than that. But I'm just -- now let me ask you this,
14 where do people around the neighborhood there now,
15 where do they go to shop? Do they go down to Mount
16 Rainier? Or where do they go now to do their grocery
17 shopping? Or do they go to the Giant on Rhode
18 Island? Where do they go?

19 MS. BARNES: I see a bunch of the people at
20 the Giant on Rhode Island Avenue.

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Rhode Island Avenue.

22 MS. BARNES: But of course you've got to
23 drive down there.

24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Is that convenient?

25 MS. BARNES: If you've got a car. So if

1 you --

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So a bicycle --

3 MS. BARNES: And a bicycle. I mean, the
4 bicycle --

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: A bicycle is going to let
6 you --

7 MS. BARNES: I doubt if I would take a
8 bicycle to go shopping because you've got to bring
9 the bags back. So.

10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you very much. Any
11 other questions up here?

12 MS. COHEN: Yes. Ms. Barnes, again, you
13 know, we're in a position of having to balance
14 different objectives. And the question that I have,
15 even to my colleagues, is about sacrificing the
16 number of units. So I would like your -- if you were
17 in our position, how would you balance this. More
18 important?

19 MS. BARNES: Well, I can agree with that 50
20 to 60 percent AMI to lower down from the 80 AMI. And
21 we had discussed that before. So but to -- and if we
22 need to add another level to make that work and you
23 all agree with it, and no problem with the height, I
24 would agree with that too and pass that on to the
25 community.

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 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Any other
2 questions? Okay. Does the applicant have any cross?
3 Does the applicant have any cross of -- do you have
4 any cross?

5 MR. GLASGOW: No. No cross-examination for
6 the ANC.

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you very
8 much, Commissioner Barnes.

9 MS. BARNES: You're welcome.

10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Appreciate all your work
11 that you all do. Thank you.

12 Okay. Next. Do we need to take a two minute
13 break, anybody? Okay.

14 Next let's do the -- did we have any other
15 government reports that I may have missed? Not
16 seeing any. I think they've all been discussed. Oh,
17 I was supposed to do that first.

18 Let's go to organizations and persons in
19 support. I have a list here. Let me go with my list.
20 Commissioner Rashida Brown and Andrew Dupuy. Anyone
21 else who is here who would like to testify in
22 support? Organizations or persons who are here who
23 would like to testify in support?

24 Okay. We have two. You can come forward.
25 You want to give your cards to my right, to the court

1 reporter.

2 Okay. Ms. Brown, are you a commissioner?
3 You're a commissioner in 1A? Okay. That's right.
4 Okay, Commissioner, we will start with you. You may
5 begin.

6 MS. BROWN: Good evening, Chairman Hood and
7 members of the Zoning Commission. My name is Rashida
8 Brown and I am a Park View resident and ANC
9 Commissioner for the 1A-10 single member district.

10 ANC 1A-10 sits adjacent to the McMillan
11 reservoir and is northwest of the sand filtration
12 site. I am testifying today to express my support
13 for the zoning application on behalf of the
14 proponents who live in my single member district.
15 The full ANC 1A is not weighing in on the matter.

16 The support on my side of the ward is quite
17 significant. We recognize the numerous benefits that
18 will follow this development. Parcel 2, located
19 between First and Half Streets will include mixed use
20 development with affordable housing and retail with
21 outdoor seating adjacent to the north service courts
22 in the Olmsted Walk.

23 The concept for Parcel 2 reflects the shared
24 vision of the district of Columbia, and the vision
25 McMillan partners and members of the community. The

1 design evokes the distinct features of the historic
2 nature of the McMillan site while complimenting the
3 previously approved buildings on the site. Parcel 2
4 is critical to the success of the overall McMillan
5 project and that it anchors and activates the planned
6 Main Street along the north service court which will
7 be walkable and include neighborhood serving retail.

8 Additionally, the proposed project provides
9 much needed affordable housing and jobs for residents
10 of Ward 5 and the District of Columbia as a whole.
11 Road improvements to First and North Capitol Streets
12 and Michigan Avenue are also integral parts of the
13 plan. This will be accompanied by a transit hub near
14 Michigan Avenue as a convenient place to access buses
15 and bike and car share options.

16 We also appreciate that the applicant's
17 commitment to the transportation to transportation
18 demand management plan for the Parcel 2 and look
19 forward to the release of the Department of
20 Transportation's comprehensive east to west crosstown
21 multimodal study.

22 It is my hope that the proposed measures will
23 align and complement the city's vision for mitigating
24 transit and traffic needs. Park View will be one of
25 the effected neighborhoods as traffic flows from east

1 to west of the site. The study's results are
2 critical to the overall health of our neighborhoods.
3 The study is also assessing the traffic -- the travel
4 patterns between Brooklyn to Columbia Heights,
5 including the Washington Hospital Centers and
6 McMillan Sand Filtration site and focuses on short
7 and long-term capital improvements.

8 It is our anticipation that it will help the
9 city identify and finance the appropriate coming
10 measures to assist with mitigating the imminent
11 neighborhood impacts.

12 In conclusion, the residents of Park View are
13 eager for this project to move forward and we than
14 the Commission for approving the stage 1 PUD of this
15 parcel. We urge you to continue your support for
16 stage 2. Thank you.

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Commissioner.
18 Next.

19 MR. DUPUY: Good evening, Mr. Chairman,
20 members. My name is Andrew Dupuy. I'm representing
21 myself. I live two blocks directly south of the
22 McMillan site in Bloomingdale, and I wanted to
23 express my support as a resident for the second stage
24 PUD and McMillan as a whole.

25 I'll skip the broader arguments about

1 increased overall housing, affordable housing, and
2 the retail options. Which, all of which I think are
3 valid. But overall I think the McMillan project
4 represents the kind of sustainable smart, mixed use
5 development that a growing city needs. I think the
6 overall design and form of McMillan in Parcel 2 is
7 attractive. It comports with the history of the site
8 and it reflects significant work with stakeholders in
9 the community. I like the scale and the setbacks and
10 the mix of uses that I've seen presented here today.

11 I'm particularly impressed with the plans to
12 make the First Street side of Parcel 2 part of a
13 vibrant retail and walking corridor. I live right
14 off of First and I think that this would create a
15 great network of First, spanning from Florida all the
16 way up to Michigan. You know, encompassing retail
17 and the grand houses along that street.

18 So in conclusion, I just look forward to the
19 approval and completion of this project for my
20 neighborhood. Thank you.

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. We thank you
22 both. Let's see if we have any questions up here for
23 either one of you. Okay. Does the applicant have
24 any cross-examination of either one of these
25 witnesses? Does the ANC have any cross-examination

1 of either one of these witnesses?

2 Okay. Thank you all very much. We
3 appreciate it.

4 I do have one for you, Commissioner Brown,
5 right quick. What is the overall sense of this
6 particular project? Not the whole project, but this
7 particular with the Harris Teeters and the grocers.
8 What are Park View, what is Park View's view on that?

9 MS. BROWN: Well, the nearest commercial
10 corridor to my single member district is Georgia
11 Avenue. And as you know it has very -- it has its
12 complexities and definitely access to quality grocery
13 store is one of them. We do have access to the
14 Safeway that is in Petworth. But again, you'd have
15 to drive, take the bus. It's really not as walkable
16 as I'd like.

17 And also, for our seniors who live in our
18 single member district, a Harris Teeter is definitely
19 an option that they're excited about. Folks on the
20 eastern end of our single-member district can walk
21 there, and we do appreciate that it will be a
22 walkable active site to appreciate and enjoy and
23 become a part of the greater community. We
24 appreciate that.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Great. Thank you

1 very much for your testimony.

2 MS. BROWN: Okay.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you both. We
4 appreciate.

5 Next, I'm going to go to opposition. Chris
6 Otten. Mr. Hall, Leroy Hall. I'm trying to -- Amal,
7 Amal Mimish. You can come forward. And you can
8 correct me when you come forward. And Jim Schulman.
9 Anyone else who would like to testify in opposition?
10 Oh, Mr. Wolkoff. You can come forward. I didn't do
11 that intentionally. His name is not on this list.
12 Okay.

13 And anyone else who was in the party with Mr.
14 Wolkoff, if you want to come forward to testify. The
15 party that -- this is your time to come forward. The
16 group that was applying for party status. Is there
17 anyone else in the audience who would like to testify
18 in opposition of this project? Anyone else -- okay,
19 the chairs -- I have one more chair. Is there anyone
20 else? If there's anyone, come forward. Anyone else?

21 Okay. We will start to my -- well, let me
22 start with who I called first, Mr. Otten. Unless you
23 want to yield to the lady. We'll start with you,
24 Mr. --

25 MR. OTTEN: Yes, I'll defer to the lady,

1 sure.

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: You'll give it to the
3 lady. Okay. Let's yield to the young lady to my
4 left. You may start and you all have three minutes.
5 You.

6 MS. DIENER: Me?

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.

8 MS. DIENER: Well, good evening,
9 Commissioners. My name is Robin Diener. I'm just
10 testifying on my own behalf. I don't live in the
11 neighborhood. But the one question that I have is
12 about amenities. I'm not really clear 100 percent on
13 PUDs and how they work, but I thought that there are
14 amenities that need to be provided by the applicant
15 to the community and I was wondering what they were.
16 It certainly doesn't look to me like there's very
17 much in the way of LEED and I was very glad that
18 Commissioner Cohen brought that up because we're
19 taking away, you know, grasslands, granted it's not
20 an active used park at this time, but it is a carbon
21 sink and all of that.

22 So can't we ask that all the roofs be green
23 and that the buildings be covered in vines or
24 something so that we get a little more of that green
25 sustainability stuff that we're looking for? And the

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 streets be paved with, what do they call it,
2 permeable pavers. That's the kind of thing I'm
3 looking for.

4 Also I know Jair Lynch is good work and I
5 know he's an athlete, and I should think that we
6 would have more -- not necessarily on his buildings,
7 so maybe this is out of order, but in this project as
8 a whole, where are the running paths? Where is the
9 tennis court? Where is the dog park? And not to
10 mention the actual playing fields and things and
11 playgrounds for children. So those are my issues.
12 Thank you very much for hearing me.

13 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you very much.
14 Next.

15 MR. CERRUTI: And, Chairman Hood,
16 Commissioners, thank you and good evening. My name
17 is Paul Cerruti. I am a resident of Bloomingdale.
18 I've been a resident of Bloomingdale for five years
19 of the District of Columbia for six. I'm also one of
20 the 7,000 plus signatories of a petition in
21 opposition to the VMP plan. I'm very familiar with
22 the location because I walk my dogs there. I have
23 four Jack Russel Terriers who need a lot of exercise,
24 so I am quite familiar with the site. I walk the
25 perimeter.

1 I also am a runner so I run the site, the
2 perimeter, at least three times a week. So I've seen
3 this site intimately over the last five years while
4 as a resident.

5 Shortly after moving to the neighborhood I
6 became very aware of the controversy of McMillan
7 Park. It was pretty much inescapable. And set about
8 learning about the issue myself. Not reading -- not
9 taking other's information but actually set about
10 doing research on my own.

11 I think a huge issue here and a major premise
12 for the VMP folks for developing that site is based
13 on a lie; a lie that has been promulgated also by our
14 city leaders. And that is, that it was never a park;
15 the actual site that's in question for development.
16 That is actually, it's absolutely false. I have
17 spent the last three years researching McMillan Park
18 and there is no doubt of the activities that have
19 taken place there, organized activities that have
20 occurred on the surface level of the filtration
21 plant.

22 You know, it was mentioned earlier that you
23 know, Anne Corbett had said the filtration site.
24 Well, she was specifying something that was a little
25 bit inaccurate because the filtration site actually

1 straddles both sides of First Street. It was one and
2 the same, the filtration plant as well as the park
3 that existed on the site. It's documented that the
4 park was 118 acres. There is documentation that
5 activities were taking place in all areas of the
6 park. So that's one issue that I find very
7 disturbing in this.

8 And why is it so important? It's important
9 because once people understand that it was actually a
10 park and it was used by the public, then they change
11 -- then it becomes a whole other story. The first
12 reaction is, well, why not reopen it?

13 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Give us your closing
14 thought.

15 MR. CERRUTI: My closing thoughts and
16 comments are, this plan is completely incongruous
17 with the historic character of the site. The view
18 sheds will be destroyed. You can see the Capitol
19 dome from North Capitol, from Michigan. That will be
20 lost forever. The Olmsted Walk, it's integrity will
21 be destroyed. Olmsted, as a landscape architect, was
22 all about nature and framing vistas. And the vistas
23 that were once had by the Olmsted Walk in that
24 parcel, will be lost. Obliterated by large office
25 buildings and townhomes. The whole setting will be

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 lost. The historic integrity of the setting will be
2 lost.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you.

4 MR. CERRUTI: Additionally --

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Though. Thought,
6 singular.

7 MR. CERRUTI: Sorry.

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you.

9 MR. CERRUTI: Additionally this development
10 will --

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thought. Thought. Your
12 closing thought.

13 MR. CERRUTI: -- overwhelm the
14 neighborhoods --

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

16 MR. CERRUTI: -- surrounding the area.

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. Thank you very
18 much.

19 MR. CERRUTI: Thank you.

20 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Next, Ms. Hanrahan.

21 MS. HANRAHAN: Yes.

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Turn your microphone on.
23 Once it lights up. There you go.

24 MS. HANRAHAN: Oh, okay. Excuse me. My name
25 is Debbie Hanrahan. I live in DuPont Circle. I have

1 -- I come from an athletic family. I have four
2 athletic grandchildren and I'm talking about an area
3 in the city that is way underserved with this kind of
4 facility for the young people coming up, as well as
5 adults who are in activities.

6 The only thing with framing McMillan Park, we
7 mention historic context, is 6,000 more cars every
8 morning at North Capitol and Michigan Avenue by the
9 developer's own experts. Six thousand for the
10 medical office building. That is what will frame
11 this park.

12 I also think, it's very interesting. Here I
13 am a white person, but I want to talk about the
14 racism of white people about this park. We closed
15 that park because we didn't want the black families
16 that were moving in to that neighborhood to enjoy
17 that park that the white families had enjoyed before
18 World War II. We put up the fence, we took it down,
19 and then I believe we put it up again. Why did we do
20 that? We would rather have no park than have an
21 integrated park. And this is shameful. And we are
22 bearing that and nobody is discussing it because of
23 course we don't want to talk about our nasty history
24 in this way. But it is there, and it happened, and
25 we're depriving this part of town just because it is

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 in a She-she part of town we are depriving them of
2 the amenities that they should have.

3 If you were to talk about sustainability, I
4 don't see one sustainable thing about this project,
5 frankly. But a park in this part of town would do
6 more for this city than anything you could possibly
7 put on this site. Thank you very much.

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. Mr. Schulman.

9 MR. SCHULMAN: My name is Jim Schulman. I'm
10 an architect registered in D.C. and Maryland. I
11 apologize for my lack of written testimony tonight.
12 But I and others here are here because we care about
13 our city and we want to see excellence in our built
14 environment. And I still feel that this site should
15 be our Central Park. A Central Park with a
16 metropolitan museum scale development on it. And
17 this project is really our Angkor Wat which has been
18 discovered to be a water works. And I don't know if
19 you're familiar with Angkor Wat, but it's a UNESCO
20 World Heritage Site, historic heritage site. And
21 this is, the McMillan sand filtration park is our
22 potential global heritage site and we're blowing our
23 chance.

24 We have the potential Roman Coliseum here and
25 we're going to replace it. We're going to demolish

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 those amazing underground caverns to build a parking
2 garage for a project that feels like a Metro station
3 development. But it doesn't even have a Metro
4 station. So it's really more like Reston Town
5 Center. Not that I have anything really against
6 Reston Town Center, but I know that the excellent
7 folks that are designing this thing can do better.
8 They will do better if commissions like yours ask
9 them to do better. They could do this as a more
10 historically appropriate site if you rose to the
11 occasion and said, yes, this is a gem. This is a
12 jewel, and we should honor that opportunity.

13 So through a zoning lens what do we get?
14 What are the public amenities? We get nine low
15 income townhouses and some seniors housing. We get
16 mixed use development, which I'm very much in favor
17 of and I suspect everyone here is as well. We get
18 plinths, we get white metal shrouds, we get
19 pedestrian links, we get some vistas, we get low
20 impact development which we should have on any
21 project in D.C. as far as I'm concerned.

22 So I echo what Debbie said about seeing the
23 green in this project. Don't get me started on the
24 reasons why the roof plan hasn't been delivered to
25 you. But I hope that I can convey some of my

1 frustration in that we've traveled down a road to get
2 what Mary and Barry wanted 25 years ago, which is
3 kind of the lowest common denominator for economic
4 development in this city. And this could be our
5 Central Park. Thank you.

6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. Next.

7 MR. WOLKOFF: Thank you, Chairman Hood. I
8 appreciate five minutes as the representative of
9 McMillan Coalition for Sustainable Agriculture. I do
10 have a quick personal comment and then I'll read the
11 testimony I prepared.

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Your personal comment is
13 going to get you three and a half. But let me ask --
14 let me say this. Let me ask first, does anyone at
15 the table have an issue, because they did apply, we
16 did turn them down, if we would give him four
17 minutes?

18 MR. WOLKOFF: Five.

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: No, I'm saying four. I'm
20 saying four. Does anybody have a problem with me
21 giving him four minutes?

22 MR. WOLKOFF: I have five.

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'm just asking, four
24 minutes. Does anybody have a problem with me giving
25 him four minutes?

1 MR. OTTEN: It's as arbitrary as all the
2 other decisions, so sure.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: No, I'm asking you all
4 because you all are getting three. He can have five?
5 Okay.

6 MR. OTTEN: You're representing a group.

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Good. Okay. So go
8 ahead.

9 MR. WOLKOFF: My name is Daniel Wolkoff. In
10 reference --

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Is your microphone on, Mr.
12 Wolkoff?

13 MR. WOLKOFF: -- objections previously --

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Can't hear you.

15 MR. WOLKOFF: Sorry.

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: There we go.

17 MR. WOLKOFF: My name is Daniel Wolkoff. I'm
18 a historic preservation specialist and I'm both
19 representing myself and McMillan Coalition for
20 Sustainable Agriculture.

21 In reference to Commissioner Turnbull's
22 questions about view sheds, I've prepared this
23 graphic and these are the federal protected view
24 sheds. And that's why we have historic preservation
25 laws. And any honest evaluation of this development

1 process will tell you, which HPRB did, and so did
2 Traceries, and David Maloney, the State Historic
3 Preservation Officer, it's inconsistent with historic
4 preservation of this site.

5 My personal statement quickly is, the hiring
6 of the Fountain Agency is impeding the people of the
7 District's First Amendment rights to petition their
8 government for redress of grievances. The issue is
9 for the theft from the people of the District of
10 Columbia and the Nation of a significant work of
11 landscape architecture and industrial design by its
12 own mayor and city council and submissive agencies
13 who have failed to protect the people of Washington
14 and violated our laws. These officials have
15 committed theft of the historic protected work of
16 turn of the century master designers, brought to
17 Washington by senator McMillan.

18 MS. COHEN: Sir, excuse me. Can you lower
19 your --

20 MR. WOLKOFF: Oh, sorry. Sorry, ma'am.

21 MS. COHEN: Thank you.

22 MR. WOLKOFF: An important historic site, a
23 critical public amenity, and a potential lifesaving
24 backup system for clean water.

25 Finally, our D.C. Auditor, Kathy Patterson,

1 recognizes the unethical collusive relationship
2 between major developers, VMP, and the Deputy Mayor
3 for Planning and Economic Development. We've
4 submitted Kathy Patterson's letter to Council Chair
5 Mendelson and Attorney General Racine. Thank you.

6 And I'm wondering if the management of Harris
7 Teeter, if their chairman of the board are interested
8 in what ethics and what ethical violations have made
9 this site available to them.

10 This week Ann Anderson of the Audubon Natural
11 Society spotted a young Bald Eagle over the McMillan
12 site. Has Office of Planning and Department of
13 Environment determined the status of the PUD site as
14 a wildlife refuge? You might be aware that a Bald
15 Eagle was seen there this week.

16 McMillan Coalition for Sustainable
17 Agriculture, we're working with local urban
18 agriculture, Licking Ben Farm (phonetic), farmer's
19 markets, family fish farms. We've testified to D.C.
20 Council, Mary Chase, D.C. Sustainable Agriculture
21 Bill. Our approach is to increasing area food
22 services from the applicant's approach, we ask we
23 differ from the applicant's approach. And we ask the
24 Zoning Commission to dismiss the PUD.

25 When Whole Foods came to D.C. they found a

1 dilapidated parking garage through. Through adaptive
2 reuse they contained the entire operation, including
3 parking within the footprint. Return the derelict
4 property to productive use. It's in an alley, but
5 unlike the applicant's proposed grocery store the
6 Whole Foods is adjacent to a metro. Any food service
7 provider can locate existing buildings or development
8 an empty half block alley at Lincoln and R Street,
9 awaiting repurposing. The greenest building is the
10 one already built.

11 The adaptive reuse of 20 acres of underground
12 galleries can support a community based agriculture
13 sustainable facility and numerous allied community
14 projects. Food and nutrition and exercise hub for
15 the low income to the top chefs, like Nora Pullion
16 (phonetic) whose organic farm is far away in
17 Virginia. She could be getting her delivery of
18 produce by bicycle.

19 Jair Lynch's project boasts providing jobs,
20 3,200 jobs, 3,200 more cars in and out of the site
21 every day. Cashiers, baggers, porters, stockers,
22 wagon master. This project ours -- sorry. The
23 grocery store sends our shopping dollars and D.C.
24 income --

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Hold on, hold on a second.

1 Stop the clock one second. I'm going to ask the
2 group in the back to be respectful of them. They
3 listened to you all. Now if you all want to have a
4 meeting and not listen to them, I would ask you all
5 to take it out of the room. We want to be respectful
6 of everybody, regardless of the view.

7 Add Mr. Wolkoff another minute since I took
8 his time.

9 MR. WOLKOFF: While the project sends our
10 shopping dollars and D.C. income out to Matthews,
11 North Carolina, the headquarters of Harris Teeter,
12 while McMillan Coalition vertical agriculture will be
13 workaroud training technicians in real careers.
14 They're the owners, not dead-end local low wage jobs.

15 We already own the site. It's public land.
16 McMillan can be a center for training and real
17 building trades, electrical, masonry, carpentry,
18 while restoring the park. An urban conservation
19 corps to assist low income and senior to maintain and
20 stay in their homes.

21 The preservations of the site make sense as a
22 backup system for clean water security. Our water
23 system is threatened by obviously miserable planning.
24 Look at the tunnels and your water bill. But ground
25 water contaminated by World War I chemical weapons at

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 superfund sites in Spring Valley is being monitored
2 by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and potentially
3 beginning to impact our drinking water reservoir at
4 nearby Dale Carlia (Phonetic). How reckless,
5 destroying McMillan and covering it with carbon
6 emitting concrete, an urban heat island.

7 I ask the applicants, what are the total
8 carbon emissions of this humungous construction
9 project? And how little carbon is going to be
10 absorbed when we see in these photos, concrete
11 covering everything but the McPark.

12 We do not see how in this dense section of
13 D.C. one fifth -- only with one fifth of the park
14 space is privileged upper Northwest, partitioning up
15 the last 25 acres of open public green space, and
16 over urbanizing is consistent with the Zoning Act.

17 The Zoning Act says less congestion, promote
18 health, provide adequate light. Prevent undo
19 concentration of population and overcrowding. Okay.
20 DDOT is cited by the applicant as satisfying traffic
21 impacts. But at present 20,000 more cars will be
22 coming to North Capitol, and at present ambulances
23 and fire engines, blocked by traffic regularly jump
24 the median and come straight into oncoming traffic as
25 a deathly hazard. Think about the mother driving her

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 car, distracted by a car full of children, confronted
2 by a fire engine coming the wrong way on North
3 Capitol, which happens regularly now. So therefore
4 we ask that DDOT, since their performance has been
5 such a failure, that they should not be evaluating
6 anything and must be rejected and dropped from this
7 hearing. Please.

8 So congested before Harris Teeter, three
9 massive medical office buildings, 700 condos, 3,000
10 parking spaces, Catholic University of Development,
11 Armed Forces Retirement Home, Irving Street and
12 Marriot, 1,550 units at Rhode Island Avenue, Jamal's
13 1,500 parking space in a Brookland garage, the
14 traffic impact study is invalid. Period.

15 The store will exit on to First Street. The
16 traffic's impact study says one new car going south
17 every 10 seconds at peak hour, which could be all
18 day. That is 8,640 cars a day trying to go down
19 First Street. First Street has tiny little blocks.
20 There's a stop sign, a light, turning pedestrians,
21 bicycles within a few feet of every corner.

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Wolkoff, give us your
23 closing thought.

24 MR. WOLKOFF: This has been a corrupt and
25 failed process from the beginning. You have wasted

1 millions of tax dollars. McMillan Park has been
2 wasted every single day since 1987 with your fence
3 and government malfeasance. And as Deborah Hanrahan
4 was brave enough to say, racist discrimination
5 against lower income residents, African/American
6 residents, while favoring upper income white areas of
7 the city. We intend to bring this theft of public
8 land to the Sixth District Court, Federal Court, have
9 it thrown out. You will all be considered
10 responsible. Thank you so much for listening.

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you very much.
12 Next.

13 MS. MIMISH: Hi, Good evening. I want to
14 thank you for the opportunity to speak and testify
15 today.

16 I'm a Ward 1 resident, and I'm also an
17 affordable housing advocate. I drive a couple times
18 a week from Columbia Heights to the Lee Montessori
19 School on Douglas Street Northeast. Can you not hear
20 me?

21 MS. COHEN: What is your name?

22 MS. MIMISH: My name is Amal Mimish. Sorry
23 about that.

24 And I have to go through Michigan Avenue,
25 across North Capitol. I have stood between First

1 Street and North Capitol Street, on Michigan, the
2 light changes at least four times before I can get
3 across into Northeast. The congestion already is
4 really out of control, and there's a hospital right
5 there. So while this traffic is going on and I'm
6 sitting there for three changes of the light an
7 ambulance might come. I'm constantly late or I have
8 to leave earlier and earlier each time to go pick up
9 my niece, and I can't imagine that it's not going to
10 get much worse with the resident -- with what they're
11 proposing in Parcel 2 and the whole development as a
12 whole.

13 I also want to raise up what the auditor has
14 said, regarding the lack of a fair bidding process.
15 And also, the fact that predevelopment costs of this
16 plan have been funded by the city, which have
17 included quote, -- I'm sorry. Neutralizing the
18 opposition. And I would appreciate if my tax dollars
19 didn't go to neutralizing me.

20 With regard to affordable housing, it's my
21 understanding that the senior affordable housing will
22 be gone in 20 years. Also, 50 percent of area median
23 income is \$1,100 a month for a studio. And I am
24 concerned about the ability of seniors to afford what
25 is going to be available. It's not even at 50 as you

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 guys have discussed. It's 80 percent of area median
2 income which is being proposed.

3 Yeah, so I hardly -- I don't believe that
4 this affordable housing -- like the inclusion of
5 affordable housing is going to solve any -- is going
6 to contribute at all to solving the problem that the
7 District has with affordable housing.

8 That's it. Thanks.

9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. Mr. Hall.

10 MR. HALL: I'm a resident of the city for --
11 this is not on? Oh. I'm a resident of D.C. for
12 about 75 years. Came here as a year old.

13 Yeah, my concern is green space. Oh, you
14 don't know me?

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah, Mr. Hall.

16 MR. HALL: Leroy Hall.

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Hall, I know you but
18 could you identify yourself?

19 MR. HALL: Yes. The points I want to make
20 is, it was mentioned Harris Teeter. I've been to the
21 Harris Teeter in D.C. and it doesn't match up with
22 Safeway or Giant, and the majority of residents in
23 the city, I know for a fact, the people I generally
24 know are not thinking about Harris Teeter. They
25 don't do their shopping even all at Giant or Safeway.

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 Mostly shoppers in Save-A-Lot and the new Aldi.

2 I'd like to talk about the traffic under
3 DDOT. Traffic is going to be a big issue. I live on
4 Rhode Island Avenue Northeast, up the street from the
5 new development from the Metro, Rhode Island Metro.
6 And the traffic is ridiculous all the time, every
7 time. And it's not about accidents. It's not about
8 even construction. It's just normal rush hour and I
9 can't even get out of my driveway without waiting for
10 cars speeding down about 35 -- it's a 30 mile an hour
11 street of course. And they come down there through
12 lights that are staying on so long I have to wait
13 about two minutes to get out of the driveway on Rhode
14 Island Avenue.

15 And DDOT, from my experience, being on Rhode
16 Island and watching this traffic, they are not
17 qualified to operate traffic in the District of
18 Columbia. They also had control of the trees, and
19 that's another problem. The trees between PEPCO,
20 DDOT, and the Public Service Commission, traffic and
21 the trees and all of that has been a big mess.

22 This bridge that was mentioned, we had a
23 earthquake in D.C. not too long ago. You know, the
24 east coast is subject to earthquakes just like every
25 other part of the country, so it isn't just

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 California. That bridge, if that bridge is
2 structurally weak, it will go.

3 About this affordable housing. Well, I'm in
4 my house under reverse mortgage. I guess that's the
5 only reason I'm still here. But if they keep jacking
6 up my property taxes I will have to leave. I think
7 that the Office of Planning, DDOT, and the agencies
8 of D.C. government, they need to do some real
9 thinking. Are these the same people who approved the
10 streetcar on H Street? That is the dumbest project
11 I've ever seen. I've watched that thing, it knocked
12 off people's mirrors. From what I understand a car
13 door was knocked off by a streetcar.

14 So we need to think about how the agencies in
15 this city are functioning. I think my tax dollars
16 could go for a lot better use, and I think the public
17 housing should be increased. Too many people are
18 living on the street. There's a lady living on a
19 park bench, a new steel park bench put on 12th
20 Street, right near the CVS. And she's been there for
21 weeks, and she was there today with the rain. She
22 had her stuff covered with a tarp. This doesn't make
23 any sense.

24 We need to spend money better. We need more
25 housing. We don't need more density. We need more

1 housing for people who need housing. People who
2 don't need housing are getting it up and down in
3 every block? We need more thinking about green space
4 and housing.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Hall, give us your
6 closing thought, Mr. Hall.

7 MR. HALL: Yes. The closing thought is that
8 the city needs to be concerned about preserving as
9 much green space as possible, and forget density.
10 Just consider quality of life for the people who are
11 already here. Thank you.

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. Next.

13 MR. OTTEN: Okay. My name is Chris Otten.
14 I'm here representing D.C. for Reasonable
15 Development. I'm familiar with the zoning process,
16 and we have a couple of participating members that
17 live just south of the site. They're quite concerned
18 about this project.

19 Mr. Hood, you asked how people are receiving
20 this project. Well, there's lots of surveys out
21 there. The Washington City paper did a survey, the
22 MAG Group did a survey. Look at the room tonight.
23 You know, if this was such a popular project -- they
24 only had two people here. We have a lot of people
25 here who live in the neighborhood and around the

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 neighborhood. Overwhelmingly, look at the zoning
2 record from 13-14. Five hundred letters from
3 residents opposed to the project. That's how people
4 are receiving it.

5 And then you asked how long this project has
6 been going and I heard 26 years. Well, here we are
7 26 years on and a second stage PUD, and the Office of
8 Planning has failed to conduct what they're charged
9 to do, which is conduct an impact analysis that is
10 thorough and robust so you guys can balance the
11 amenities versus the impacts, the adverse impacts.

12 The adverse impacts are huge with this case.
13 And I want to start with the letter from D.C.'s
14 auditor. This is something fundamental to land use
15 planning in the District of Columbia. And that is
16 competitive bidding for these sort of publically
17 controlled sites. The auditor has made it very clear
18 that this competitive process was not done and ought
19 to be rebid, and that's something that you all should
20 consider as land use experts because that will lead,
21 without the competitive bid, to the loss of public
22 property.

23 And the Comp Plan makes it very clear that
24 the city should be retaining publically controlled
25 sites. In this process we're losing most of it.

1 We're losing our vistas. The huge K Street sized
2 buildings are outrageous. We're losing
3 affordability. I'm sorry, 50 percent AMI for seniors
4 is not affordable. Eighty percent -- the fact that
5 we're still talking at 80 percent AMI as affordable
6 units is an absolute joke. Eighty percent AMI is
7 \$1,500 a month. Okay? So that is not affordable.

8 We're losing air quality with all the traffic
9 and the vehicles this project is going to create.
10 The waste that this is going to generate. We're
11 losing our historic national landmark, and we're
12 losing our park. This is all publically controlled
13 right now and we're going to lose that and we're
14 against that.

15 We want the auditor's letter to be responded
16 and we're asking you to delay a vote on this until it
17 is responded to meaningfully, because it does contend
18 directly with land use issues in terms of our public
19 property here in the District of Columbia.

20 And in terms of the environmental impacts,
21 where is the DDOE report on this? This is the stage
22 now when we need to build into the order any
23 mitigation needed for the environmental impacts this
24 project presents. No noise impact studies, no air
25 quality impact studies, no water impact assessments.

1 This is kind of outrageous.

2 And the displacement pressures. The two
3 participating members with D.C. for Reasonable
4 Development, they're seniors who own their homes.
5 They are quite concerned, as Mr. Hall is here, that
6 the amount of luxury we see here, I mean, this is the
7 most minimal affordability that you can get in a
8 project of this size. Minimal. Ten or 15 percent at
9 80 percent AMI, or even 50 percent AMI means that
10 most of this is luxury. Which means that the land
11 value destabilization is real. It's a real contested
12 issue in this that has not been analyzed at all.
13 What is this going to do to the surrounding neighbors
14 and their property taxes and their rents, and
15 displacement pressures? This is highlighted
16 consistently throughout the Comprehensive Plan as a
17 major issue that the Office of Planning should be
18 conducting a comprehensive review on. We've not seen
19 them do this. And we're 26 years on in Stage 2 of
20 this PUD.

21 Also, the infrastructure. Why haven't at
22 this point we've seen any understanding of what the
23 developer contributions are going to be to our
24 infrastructure needs for this humungous project?
25 That's clearly written in the Comprehensive Plan, yet

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 we don't see the Office of Planning providing you any
2 information on that at all. Really? This is 21st
3 Century planning?

4 Getting back to affordability, because that
5 is the number one issue in this city, it is clear the
6 Comprehensive Plan requires by Policy H-1.2.4, that a
7 substantial percentage of housing units, affordable
8 housing units, be built on publically owned sites. I
9 don't know how OP defines substantial, and I don't
10 know how the applicants define substantial, but 10 to
11 20 percent is not substantial. Half of this site at
12 30 to 50 percent AMI would be a substantial
13 affordability index and an amenity, a true amenity.
14 Otherwise we cannot consider any of these so-called
15 amenities truly proffered for the public needs.
16 Thank you.

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. I want
18 to thank you all. Let's see if we have any questions
19 up here. Anybody? No questions?

20 Mr. Otten, I do want to ask you one question.
21 You mentioned 26 years. How many years do you think
22 it's been?

23 MR. OTTEN: For this project it's been what,
24 four years?

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: No, no, no, I'm saying --

1 okay. The four projects that have happened on
2 McMillan over the years, how many years do you think
3 it's been?

4 MR. OTTEN: I mean, I don't know.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: No, I'm asking Mr. Otten.

6 MR. OTTEN: I mean, one bad project after
7 another is going to lead to an infinite amount of
8 times we have to come here.

9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: No, I'm just saying, I'm
10 just wondering since I think you said you did the
11 research. Or who was that that did the research?
12 Okay. Well, maybe I'm on the wrong person.

13 MR. OTTEN: Tony Nottingham would know.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: But you did say 26, 26
15 years. And I just want to know how many -- I know
16 we've had four different projects for McMillan. How
17 many years do you think it's been?

18 MR. OTTEN: All I know is what's before us
19 right now. And all I can do is examine this project
20 within the context of the zoning regs and what's
21 required by the Office of Planning to help you make a
22 decision.

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: But in your testimony --

24 MR. OTTEN: They have failed their job.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. But in your

1 testimony you said 26 years so I assumed that you
2 knew how many years that McMillan has been, as Ms.
3 Hanrahan said, has been like that. How many years?
4 Do you know?

5 MR. OTTEN: Oh, since the fence has been up?
6 Since World War II.

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

8 MR. OTTEN: The public has been prevented
9 from using this --

10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So how many years -- let
11 me ask you this. How many years has the city been
12 trying to do something on that project? On that
13 property. On that -- hold on. I'm asking Mr. Otten.

14 MR. OTTEN: Meaningfully? Meaningfully?
15 Like, well, we can go back to the 2002 report by the
16 Office of Planning where they came out to the
17 community and got significant feedback of what the
18 people wanted there. They wanted more than half of
19 this site to be a park.

20 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. All right.

21 MR. OTTEN: So that was -- that's 10 years
22 ago.

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I'm going to
24 withdraw my question.

25 MR. OTTEN: Then a library.

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Mr. Otten.
2 Thank you. Thank you.

3 Okay. Let's see if we have any -- any other
4 questions up here? Do we have any cross-examination?
5 Does the ANC have any cross?

6 Thank you all very much. We appreciate your
7 testimony.

8 Oh, I think Ms. Diener, I just wanted to -- I
9 have a note here that you asked about the amenities.
10 This is a second stage. A lot of that was covered in
11 the first stage. I just want you -- you can check
12 with the office. We have the order. Or she can go
13 online. It's online. You can check with Ms.
14 Schellin and get that number and then you can find
15 out all about the amenities. Okay. All right. All
16 right.

17 MR. WOLKOFF: What city would this have
18 occurred in?

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Wolkoff --

20 MR. WOLKOFF: (Speaking off mic.)

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Wolkoff. Mr. Wolkoff,
22 your testimony, you've ended. Thank you very much.
23 We appreciate --

24 MR. WOLKOFF: (Speaking off mic.)

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: We appreciate your

1 testimony. Mr. Wolkoff, we appreciate your
2 testimony.

3 Okay. We're going to ask the applicant to
4 come forward if you have any rebuttal. And any
5 closing. But if you have any rebuttal, Ms. Barnes
6 may have some cross on rebuttal. I don't know.

7 MR. GLASGOW: No, this won't be very lengthy.
8 I think one item that we wanted to just clarify for
9 the record if there's any issue, because there has
10 been a lot of discussion about this, or raised by
11 persons in opposition about the D.C. Auditor's
12 letter. We believe that it's not germane at all to
13 this proceeding. If there is any thought that it is
14 in any way germane we would submit to the record that
15 there was a resolution passed by the unanimously by
16 the City Council to extend by five years, the award
17 for the McMillan Reservoir site. And that's a matter
18 of public record and we'll submit that to --

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Was that before the
20 auditor came out? Even though I know that's not
21 necessarily germane to us. But was that before or
22 after the Council action?

23 MR. GLASGOW: The auditor's letter came out
24 October 19th, 2015. The Council resolution is dated
25 effective from November 3rd, 2015.

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So it was after.
2 Okay. Thank you.

3 MR. GLASGOW: And the date of the vote was
4 November 3rd, 2015, for that resolution and it was
5 unanimously approved by the Council.

6 MS. DIENER: It was not unanimous.

7 MR. WOLKOFF: Alyssa Silverman voted no,
8 friend. Get your facts straight. That's a lie, my
9 brother.

10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let me say this, let me
11 say this. We will be able to determine what's
12 correct, what's incorrect. We hear incorrect stuff
13 down here all the time. We hear stuff down here
14 that's not even before us all the time, that
15 shouldn't even be here, that we actually have no
16 jurisdiction. But then we also hear stuff that we
17 can weigh and that we can make our decisions upon.

18 So I would ask -- because we've been doing
19 pretty good. I know there's some heated passion
20 about this project. It's always been that way. I've
21 been around here 51 years and I can remember it at 10
22 years old. So it's always been there.

23 So what I'm saying is, so nobody has to leave
24 tonight. We can all end this hearing as we've all
25 come in here. Please do not yell out in the

1 audience. We're almost finished. Just bear with us.
2 We can decipher what's right and what's wrong. Okay?
3 Okay.

4 MR. GLASGOW: Then the next item with respect
5 to, it would probably want to go through with the
6 staff and the Commission what items are needed with
7 respect to the record, and what it is that we were
8 thinking about that would be submitted because we do
9 want to have the opportunity with respect to the
10 hyphen piece, the link piece, to provide probably
11 several options for solution. And of course it was
12 my responsibility not to be conducting a separate
13 meeting here in the room, but that was part of what
14 we were -- what we need to, we think, be discussing
15 to address the Commission's concern with respect to
16 that because there probably are several options to
17 put forward for consideration.

18 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And I understand that, Mr.
19 Glasgow, but when I heard the comment of shhh, shhh
20 in the audience, the wen want to make sure we're
21 respectful --

22 MR. GLASGOW: Yes.

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: -- to everyone.

24 MR. GLASGOW: And I understand perfectly. So
25 we would want to have the opportunity to do that. I

1 think we need to submit a roof plan. We need to
2 submit with sections and some other things, more
3 information with respect to the roof. If we are
4 looking at having a hyphen piece there that has an
5 art component to it, we need to get more information
6 in on that. So we wanted to make sure to cover all
7 of those things and get some dates and timing because
8 still while interest rates, we believe, will be going
9 up, we still have very favorable financing and we
10 want to -- we do need to be moving forward, however
11 long it has been that the McMillan Reservoir site has
12 been out for consideration for development, because
13 we do want to have this piece catch up to the rest of
14 the consolidated and get it all constructed at one
15 time so we can have more of the site constructed in
16 effect during the -- we'll call it the construction
17 of the consolidated piece, as possible, if we can
18 further catch up in timing.

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Basically all we want to
20 do is run down the list. Is that it?

21 MR. GLASGOW: Yes, sir.

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

23 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. Would ask that the
24 applicant provide a copy of the PowerPoint
25 presentation for the record. And then I have that

1 Commissioner Cohen would like the applicant to
2 consider increasing the LEED level, whether they do
3 or not, these things that I have, it's up to them.
4 But Commissioner May asked them to provide larger
5 pictures of what could possibly show up on the walls.
6 Although later on Commissioner Turnbull, Commissioner
7 Hood, Commissioner Miller, all three made a
8 suggestion of a pure glass walkway instead.

9 And then Commissioner May made a comment
10 about the white metal facades tending to look a
11 little dirty. Maybe they might want to reconsider
12 that. And the light gray stone seems very --

13 MR. MAY: That's optional. That was
14 completely optional.

15 MS. SCHELLIN: Right. Right.

16 MR. MAY: And same for the stone.

17 MS. SCHELLIN: Right.

18 MR. MAY: Okay.

19 MS. SCHELLIN: May asked that they submit
20 some drawings showing that they are meeting the -- I
21 believe it was the penthouse setbacks. And that
22 follows along with Commissioner Turnbull's requests
23 that they provide the roof plan that Mr. Glasgow just
24 mentioned. Commissioner Turnbull asked that they
25 provide responses to all of OP's questions that they

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 made in their report. Commissioner Turnbull had also
2 made the suggestion with regard to the walkway that,
3 you know, another option would be that they provide
4 the middle units at 50 percent AMI. Commissioner
5 Miller said he would like, in addition to the clear
6 glass alternative, he would like to see the third and
7 fourth floor connections actually being knocked off.

8 And that's all I have.

9 MR. TURNBULL: Yeah. I just want to clarify
10 on the OP, going back on the report, which I didn't
11 get to ask them. There were some issues about the
12 applicant wanting flexibility, and it was about
13 loading and they said OP would not support
14 flexibility regarding the location or other change to
15 the loading and parking entrances. And I don't know
16 if you had requested that, but OP is saying no
17 change.

18 MR. DETTMAN: Commissioner Turnbull, the
19 flexibility we asked was with regard to modifications
20 to the parking layout in the garage.

21 MR. TURNBULL: That's also in the report.
22 They're not opposed to that.

23 MR. DETTMAN: Right. We did not ask for
24 flexibility to relocate the loading docks or the
25 parking garage entrance.

1 MR. TURNBULL: All right. All right. That
2 they would not support that. Okay.

3 And then issues related -- any external
4 design changes, they talk about -- the application
5 requests flexibility to the exact design of PUD
6 elements but did not elaborate on which elements
7 would be included. Is there any idea of what that is
8 reference to?

9 MR. GLASGOW: No, because we weren't asking
10 anything other than the flexibility and design that
11 went with the consolidated piece. We were just
12 asking for the same things that were approved with
13 the consolidated PUD on the other parcels.

14 MR. TURNBULL: So no other additional
15 flexibility regarding to the design?

16 MR. GLASGOW: None. None other than what was
17 already approved.

18 MR. TURNBULL: Okay.

19 MS. COHEN: And I would add to that just that
20 you're asking for flexibility based on market demand.
21 And again, I'd like more explanation because it
22 appears there is unlimited demand right now, and in
23 the future for families. So that, you know, I would
24 hate to see the affordable units, especially be
25 reduced. The larger affordable units. So I would

1 like more explanation to be able to feel comfort in
2 allowing that.

3 MR. GLASGOW: That's with respect to the plus
4 or minus, I think it is five percent as to the number
5 of units?

6 MS. COHEN: No, it had something to -- well,
7 maybe it is. Related to market demands to have
8 flexibility. And maybe what I'm trying -- maybe I'm
9 just being super cautious or I didn't understand
10 what's normal because it sounded like to me that
11 you're asking a little bit more.

12 MR. GLASGOW: We didn't think so. This is on
13 page 11 of the Office of Planning report. And it
14 says, the applicant has requested flexibility in the
15 number of units, a range of plus or minus five
16 percent to account for changes in market conditions
17 because sometimes we --

18 MS. COHEN: So that's it. That's the flat
19 out thing because I thought you had, in your
20 application, made it sound like you're asking to
21 possibly reduce it based on more -- by more than five
22 percent. You're just limiting it?

23 MR. GLASGOW: That's correct. And that's at
24 page 17 in the application. So page 17 in the
25 application --

1 MS. COHEN: Okay.

2 MR. GLASGOW: -- and it's mirrored in the
3 Office of Planning report --

4 MS. COHEN: All right.

5 MR. GLASGOW: -- page 11.

6 MS. COHEN: Thank you. As long as it's just
7 the five percent.

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Commissioner Miller.
9 Commissioner Miller?

10 MR. MILLER: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
11 And when you're providing us several options to
12 address concerns about the bridge span, to the -- if
13 you can include in that to the extent any of those
14 options reduce the units, if you could address my
15 suggestion that I at least -- I share the Vice
16 Chair's concern about the loss of any units, whether
17 they're market rate or affordable. But if you want
18 to address it now you can.

19 But part of your response in the options if
20 you can include whether or not adding an eighth floor
21 with a setback to recoup some of the units you've
22 already lost, or units -- I realize that might be a
23 problem with HPRB, or it might create other problems.
24 But if you can just address it as part of your
25 response?

1 MR. LYNCH: Well, one, I appreciate you
2 walking through that question and actually answering
3 parts of what we're concerned about. Adding another
4 floor would not only increase time through the
5 entitlement process, but it would change our delivery
6 schedule of the overall building because it's a
7 different construction type. And so this
8 construction type using the new IBC code will allow
9 us to bring this building to bear faster. And this
10 is the tallest that you can you do it under this
11 construction type.

12 MR. MILLER: Okay. Yeah, so that kind of
13 thing can be as part of the response. Thank you. I
14 appreciate that.

15 MR. GLASGOW: Have we answered with respect
16 to the OP questions? I think we've gone through
17 those unless there's something else.

18 MR. TURNBULL: I think that may be it unless
19 OP has any others that we haven't noticed.

20 MR. GLASGOW: Okay. So then we weren't
21 planning then on submitting any further on that.

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Is everybody -- Office of
23 Planning satisfied? Colleagues, are you satisfied
24 with what was -- okay.

25 MS. COHEN: I am.

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: As we deliberate some of
2 them may come back up, depending on what submissions
3 are. Anything else?

4 MS. SCHELLIN: Dates.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Yeah, let's get
6 some dates.

7 MS. SCHELLIN: So considering the holidays,
8 do you think that -- is January 7th too early?
9 That's like three weeks. Or can you do it then?

10 MR. GLASGOW: What do you have available
11 after January 7th? The next one.

12 MS. SCHELLIN: So then we would be moving to
13 the February meeting then.

14 MR. GLASGOW: There's nothing in between? We
15 think we need about four weeks.

16 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. So four weeks then --

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Our meeting is -- oh,
18 that's right. Never mind. Never mind. We don't
19 have but one meeting in January.

20 MS. SCHELLIN: No, we have two. I was going
21 for the second meeting.

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

23 MS. SCHELLIN: So that would put you at
24 filing January 14th by 3:00 p.m., and allowing the
25 ANC if they choose to respond, and I'm assuming OP --

1 if OP needs to -- no? Okay.

2 So then the ANC, if they choose to file a
3 response by 3:00 p.m. January 21st. And draft
4 findings facts and conclusions of law also by January
5 21st, and then we can put it on for February 8th.

6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Ms. Barnes, does that
7 schedule work for the ANC, just in case you all need
8 to comment any additional. I'm not sure if you do.
9 But does that work for you?

10 Okay. Okay. Good. Thank you. All right.
11 Anything else?

12 MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir.

13 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: We all on the same page?
14 Okay. I want to thank everyone for their
15 participation tonight and this hearing is adjourned.

16 [Hearing adjourned at 9:22 p.m.]

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24