

GOVERNMENT OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

REGULAR PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

MONDAY

NOVEMBER 9, 2020

+ + + + +

The Regular Public Hearing of the District of Columbia Board of Zoning Commission convened via Videoconference, pursuant to notice at 4:00 p.m. EDT, Anthony J. Hood, Chairperson, presiding.

BOARD OF ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

- ANTHONY J. HOOD, Chairman
- ROBERT MILLER, Vice-Chair
- PETER SHAPIRO, Commissioner
- PETER G. MAY, Commissioner
- MICHAEL TURNBULL, Commissioner

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

- SHARON SCHELLIN, Director, Office of Zoning
- PAUL YOUNG, Zoning Data Specialist, Office of Zoning

COUNSEL ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT PRESENT:

- CARY R. KADLECEK, ESQUIRE, Goulston & Storrs, PC

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Regular Public Hearing held on November 9, 2020.

HUNT REPORTING COMPANY
 Court Reporting and Litigation Support
 Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia
 410-766-HUNT (4868)
 1-800-950-DEPO (3376)

T-A-B-L-E O-F C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

Case No. 66-68A Application of Enterprise Community
 Development, Inc. - 10

HUNT REPORTING COMPANY
 Court Reporting and Litigation Support
 Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia
 410-766-HUNT (4868)
 1-800-950-DEPO (3376)

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

2 (9:41 a.m.)

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: This hearing will please
4 come to order.

5 Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. We are
6 convening and broadcasting this public hearing by
7 videoconferencing.

8 My name is Anthony Hood. Joining me are Vice-Chair
9 Miller, Commissioner Shapiro, Commissioner May, and
10 Commissioner Turnbull. We are also joined by the Office of
11 Zoning staff Ms. Sharon Schellin, as well as Mr. Paul Young,
12 who will be handling all of our virtual operations.

13 Tonight's hearing is zoning commission case number
14 66-68A; it's the Enterprise Community Development, Inc.,
15 modification of significance for a large-scale plan development
16 for Edgewood Commons at Square 3630, Lots 2, 5, 803, 805, 807,
17 810 through 813.

18 Today's date is November 9th, 2020.

19 The virtual public hearing notice is on the Office of
20 Zoning's website. This proceeding is being recorded by a court
21 reporter and the platforms used are webcast live, Webex, and
22 YouTube Live. The video will be available on the Office of
23 Zoning's website after the hearing.

24 All persons planning to testify must sign up in
25 advance and will be called by name at the appropriate time. At

HUNT REPORTING COMPANY
Court Reporting and Litigation Support
Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia
410-766-HUNT (4868)
1-800-950-DEPO (3376)

1 the time of sign-up, all participants will complete the oath or
2 affirmation required by Subtitle Z 408.7.

3 Accordingly, all those listening by Webex or by phone
4 will be muted during the hearing and only those who have signed
5 up to participate or testify will be unmuted at the appropriate
6 time. When called, please state your name and home address
7 before providing your testimony. When you are finished
8 speaking, please mute your audio.

9 If you experience difficulty accessing Webex or if
10 you're a telephone call-in or have not signed up, then please
11 call our OZ hotline number at 202-727-5471.

12 If you wish to file written testimony or additional
13 supporting documents during this hearing, then be prepared to
14 describe and discuss it at the time of your testimony. The
15 hearing will be conducted in accordance with provisions of 11Z,
16 DCMR Chapter 4, as follows: preliminary matters, applicant's
17 case, report of the Office of Planning and District Department
18 of Transportation, report of other government agencies, report
19 of the ANC, testimony of organizations which will be five
20 minutes and individuals, which will be three minutes. And we
21 will hear in the following order for those in support,
22 opposition, and undeclared. Then, we will hear rebuttal and
23 closing by the Applicant.

24 Again, the Office of Zoning number, hotline number is
25 202-727-5471, for any concerns during this proceeding.

1 At this time, the Commission will consider any
2 preliminary matters. Does the staff have any preliminary
3 matters?

4 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir.

5 The first one is that there is a motion to waive the
6 rules to allow for an affirmation instead of an attestation on
7 the post-petition and maintenance due to COVID. That's at
8 Exhibit 19. I'd ask the Commission to first consider that.

9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Schellin.

10 Commissioners, we have a motion to waive the rules to
11 allow an affirmation, instead of an attestation or a post-
12 petition and maintenance due to COVID-19.

13 I'm looking -- let me readjust my screen so I can see
14 everybody. I don't see -- do I see -- do we have any
15 objections?

16 (No verbal response)

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I don't see anyone with no
18 objections. So, no objections will be had by general
19 consensus.

20 What's the next motion, Ms. Schellin?

21 MS. SCHELLIN: At Exhibit 24, there's a motion to
22 waive the rules to accept a motion to file revised plans past
23 the 20 days before the hearing without reaching out for consent
24 from the ANC, filed by the Applicant.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Any objections, Commissioners, to

1 the motion?

2 I am sure they have worked with the ANC, but any
3 objections to this motion?

4 (No verbal response)

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: No objections. So, that will be
6 general consensus, as well.

7 Do we have anything else, Ms. Schellin?

8 MS. SCHELLIN: Proffered expert witnesses.

9 We have two. The first one is Daniel Solomon. He
10 is, I believe, new with Gorove Slade. He's the transportation
11 expert.

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

13 Mr. Solomon is new with Gorove Slade, so his --

14 MS. SCHELLIN: At Exhibit 23(b).

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: 23(b). An expert in
16 transportation.

17 Do we need time or are we good?

18 COMMISSIONER MAY: So, I would just note that in
19 terms of his experience -- there's some sort of echo going on
20 that I'm hearing. Okay. Thank you.

21 I would note that his experience, I think six years
22 with Gorove Slade and eight years total, is a little less than
23 I would normally expect. I mean, I don't know whether -- what
24 the recollection is of the other commissioners, but for some
25 reason, I'm thinking that we would, you know, we would, you

1 know, in cases where it's not an absolute -- well, I don't
2 know. I just, I have this recollection that 10 years might
3 have been a threshold for us, but I could be wrong about that.

4 Anybody else have an opinion?

5 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: I don't. I'm looking at the
6 history of the projects and his education and it seems
7 adequate. I'm not familiar with any set period of time, so I'd
8 be curious, Ms. Schellin, if there -- if you have any
9 recollection of that.

10 MS. SCHELLIN: I do not.

11 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: So then, I don't have any
12 objection, Mr. Chair.

13 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I don't recall. I don't
14 know. It's a toss-up. I could go either way on this.

15 COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. I don't feel strongly about
16 it. I just had this recollection that we had --

17 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yeah.

18 COMMISSIONER MAY: -- had, you know, some sort of
19 minimum requirement. I don't know.

20 When I was eight years out of or eight years into the
21 working world, I'm not sure how expert I was on anything, but
22 I'm going to trust that Mr. Solomon is more expert than I was
23 when I was of that vintage.

24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So, I would -- I'm getting an
25 echo. I guess we need to make sure we're on mute. But I can

1 just say, you know how I am about traffic, so, you know, I see
2 that he has eight years' experience, total, but six years with
3 Gorove Slade, so I guess it's over five.

4 So, I guess it's just how we rationalize it, because
5 when I hear from traffic experts and I'm in traffic, I think
6 about them constantly. So, I don't have any problems with
7 giving him expert status. I hope he will (audio interference)
8 Gorove Slade and other engineers have done and continue to
9 improve his game on transportation, so I don't have issue with
10 that, and I don't think -- so, general consensus.

11 But you all know how I feel about traffic, so ...

12 COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering if
13 you're think anybody is a traffic expert.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I was trying not to say that,
15 especially when I'm sitting in traffic. So, that's just where
16 I am.

17 So, we will -- Ms. Schellin, we will put him as an
18 expert in traffic and wish him well as he continues his journey
19 in life.

20 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: You even give Mr. VanPelt a
21 hard time, Mr. Chairman.

22 MS. SCHELLIN: And I think he's been with us for over
23 10 years, at this point.

24 I think, then, there's only one other proffered
25 expert and that's Scott -- I'm not sure if it's Matties or

1 Matties -- with -- he's the expert in architecture. He's been
2 before the BZA, but not the Commission, so ...

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Well, I think --

4 MS. SCHELLIN: That's the last one.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I think our usual thing is if
6 they've been in front of the BZA, I don't know if we ever go
7 back and forth -- I'm sure one of us probably sat on that case,
8 whichever case it was -- so let me see if any objections or we
9 need more time or we're good -- okay.

10 So, we will give him expert status, Ms. Schellin.

11 MS. SCHELLIN: And that is, I believe, all that I
12 have. I don't know if Mr. Kadlecek or -- has any or not. Any
13 -- I don't think they have any preliminary matters themselves.

14

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let's bring everybody up on the
16 team that's going to be doing the presentation.

17 Good afternoon, Mr. Kadlecek. Can you let us know
18 how much time you're going to be needing.

19 MR. KADLECEK: Good afternoon. For the record, Cary
20 Kadlecek from Goulston & Storrs, land-use attorney for the
21 Applicant.

22 Our presentation is 30 minutes. We can shorten that
23 if it's the Commission's pleasure, but that's how much time we
24 have allocated currently for what we've prepared.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Well, let's go with what

1 | you've prepared. I think 30 minutes is fine, unless I see any
2 | objections from any of my colleagues.

3 | I don't see any, so Mr. Kadlecek, we'll turn it over
4 | to you. You may begin.

5 | MR. KADLECEK: Great. Thank you, again, Mr. Chairman
6 | and Members of the Commission.

7 | Again, Cary Kadlecek with Goulston & Storrs. We're
8 | here today to present to you the application for a modification
9 | to the large-scale plan development, which the precursor
10 | entitlement to a PUD in 1966 for the Edgewood Commons campus, a
11 | proposed 151-unit, all-affordable, age-restricted apartment
12 | building with an adult daycare center, will be an important
13 | addition to the campus that will allow many of Edgewood
14 | Commons' existing senior residents to age in place. The
15 | building, as is proposed, is commonly known to us as Edgewood
16 | 5.

17 | In addition to the requested modification to allow
18 | the building on the campus, the Applicant requests flexibility
19 | from the long-term bicycle-parking requirements to reduce the
20 | number of spaces and from the limitation on the number of
21 | participants in the adult daycare facility to allow up to 60
22 | participants.

23 | Because of the recent changes to the plans in
24 | response to DDOT and OP's requests, the Applicant also requests
25 | flexibility from several provisions of the loading regulations

1 to allow a loading zone on a private drive adjacent to the
2 building. And those will be discussed a little bit further
3 when we get into the specifications of the project.

4 Following extensive engagement with District agencies
5 and the community, we are pleased to have the support of DDOT,
6 OP, and ANC 5E, as reflected in all of the reports filed on the
7 record. As described in the application materials, and will be
8 further described in this presentation, the proposed building
9 will offer superior benefits and amenities and will not be
10 inconsistent with the comprehensive plan.

11 And with that, I'm going to turn it over to our first
12 presenter, Stacie Birenbach with Enterprise Community
13 Development.

14 MS. BIRENBACH: Thank you, Cary.

15 I'm (audio interference) my audio working.

16 Great. Good afternoon, Commissioners. My name is
17 Stacie Birenbach. I'm a senior director of real estate at
18 Enterprise Community Development. I've been a Ward 5 resident
19 for 15 years.

20 Enterprise is the Nation's fifth largest not-for-
21 profit, affordable housing developer with 16,000 apartments
22 throughout the mid-Atlantic. Nearly 3,000 of those are in the
23 District of Columbia.

24 Enterprise is the successor organization to the
25 Community Preservation and Development Corporation, which

1 redeveloped and has owned Edgewood Commons since the late
2 1990s, early 2000s.

3 Edgewood Commons is a mixed-income, intergenerational
4 community consisting of four properties with 792 affordable
5 homes. Two hundred are age-restricted for seniors.

6 The community is well-served by transit, healthcare,
7 shopping, and houses of worship. Multiple programs designed to
8 increase the quality of life for the community operate from
9 former retail spaces on the campus. Programs are interim-use
10 engagement, food distribution, literacy and job training,
11 health and wellness checkups, and daycare.

12 Many of our households have members who have lived at
13 Edgewood Commons for multiple generation. We have at least 200
14 senior households living in our non, age-restricted apartments,
15 demonstrating the need and desire for these seniors to age in
16 communities.

17 Our proposed project consists of 151 affordable
18 housing apartments and amenities that are designed to meet the
19 social, health, and accessibility needs of seniors. In
20 addition to the large cafe and program spaces on the first
21 floor, each residential floor is designed with communal space
22 to facilitate social connections among residents of each floor.

23 The property will also include 7,000 square feet of adult
24 daycare space that will have the capacity to serve about 60
25 participants per day. The daycare will provide meals,

1 individualized therapy, and daily programming, such as art and
2 fitness, to older adults living with chronic conditions. We
3 anticipate that enrollment will pull from the Edgewood campus
4 and the surrounding communities.

5 Next slide, please.

6 We've included exterior amenities as part of the
7 building and site design. Additionally, the building is well-
8 connected to the rest of the campus. In recent years,
9 Enterprise invested over \$2 million to create campus-wide site
10 amenities, including a new playground, interactive water
11 features, a community garden, and an acceptable walking and
12 fitness trail.

13 Now, you can forward to the next slide. Okay. Thank
14 you.

15 Residents at the new building will be seniors age 60
16 and above. All residents will have incomes at or below 60
17 percent of the area median income, although, as part of our
18 financing, we anticipate serving lower-income households at 50
19 percent or below AMI.

20 We will finance construction through tax-exempt
21 bonds, low-income housing tax credits, credit grants, and the
22 Housing Production Trust Fund. These programs carry
23 affordability terms of 30 years or longer.

24 We are offering 52 Inclusionary Zoning units that
25 will remain affordable after any financing covenant expires.

1 That equates to 25 percent of the residential gross-floor area,
2 and there's an exhibit that shows the location of those IZ
3 units. That said, as a mission-driven, affordable-housing
4 developer, we anticipate extending our original financing
5 covenants in order to meet and obtain the long-term
6 affordability of the entire project; in addition, these
7 affordable units will not impact the current or future
8 affordability of any of the other affordable homes at Edgewood
9 Commons.

10 We've worked extensively with the ANC, SMD, and the
11 SMD 5E02, Patricia Williams. We've been meeting with Patricia
12 Williams prior to our initial application filing and since
13 then. We've heard some neighborhood concerns, which include
14 impacts to parking and long-term affordability.

15 As a result of these community concerns, we completed
16 a parking-utilization study that demonstrates our ability to
17 absorb the parking demands of the new building into our
18 existing parking. We also increased the percentage of the
19 floor area covered by Inclusionary Zoning in our commission.

20 ANC 5E voted to support this project on October 20th
21 in a vote from 9 to 0.

22 Thank you for the opportunity to testify today, and
23 next up we have Scott Matties.

24 MR. MATTIES: Good afternoon, everyone.

25 Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, thanks for

1 your time today.

2 I'm going to walk you through the architecture of the
3 project.

4 If you could advance the slide, please.

5 We'll keep it fairly high-level, focused primarily on
6 the exteriors. We'll touch on the interiors a little bit, but
7 we're really going to focus more on the exterior.

8 We have a number of slides in this that are really in
9 for reference. So, to the extent there are questions, we can
10 always circle back.

11 But here's the site, you know, here are the aerials
12 from sort of the four cardinal directions. Our site is kind of
13 the green patch that you see in each of these on the lower
14 right, most prominently viewed from the south. You can get a
15 sense of the scale of the buildings on campus. There are some
16 low-scale, 33-and-a-half story buildings fronting on Edgewood
17 Street and then sort of to the rear of the site, closer to the
18 adjacent shopping center, there are more high-rise.

19 Next slide, please.

20 So, the campus itself, it was mentioned it is a
21 pretty big campus. This is really the last buildable site on
22 the campus. The property, at this point, is a combination of
23 record lots and tax lots. There are four record lots, the kind
24 of two smaller ones to the east side on the right of the slide
25 and a smaller one on the west side at 4th and Edgewood.

1 But the big record lot in the middle, Record Lot 6,
2 as was noted, is where we will be building or where we're
3 proposing our building. We created new tax lot, 812, for that
4 project.

5 Go to the next slide, please.

6 So, here's the building situated, proposed building
7 situated on the record lot -- excuse me -- on the tax lot. We
8 have met with the zoning administrator a couple of times,
9 actually, to confirm some interpretations relative to setbacks
10 and other zoning metrics. And, you know, our setbacks are to
11 be measured from the record lot lines, not from the tax lot
12 lines, so we're representing that here, but we're also trying
13 to give you a sense of the separation and the distance from our
14 proposed building to the other adjacent buildings on the
15 campus.

16 Next slide, please.

17 So, at the ground level, we have, you know, a few
18 things going on here I just want to highlight. We'll see
19 these, you know, three dimensionally, as well, as we track
20 through. But there is an existing driveway that comes in off
21 of 4th Street on the left of the slide. Existing surface
22 parking, you see, is sort of toward the bottom of the image.
23 We're creating a new drop-off at our front door, which is sort
24 of central in the plan there.

25 The topography -- there are two things that are

1 | important to determine that's on the site topography. One,
2 | this is sort of at the low point of the overall property and
3 | there's about a story of fall from the back or the top; the top
4 | on the slide to where our front door is on the south side,
5 | there's about a story of fall. So, we're (audio interference)
6 | on the first floor on the low side, so to speak.

7 | We've got -- I just want to highlight a few at-grade
8 | outdoor amenities. You'll see, starting on the right side,
9 | there's a small patio for the adult daycare, which is about the
10 | third, the eastern third of the ground floor. There's kind of
11 | what we call a "front porch," which is sort of in the central
12 | part of the building that is adjacent to interior amenities for
13 | residents on the ground floor. And then at the far-western
14 | edge on the left, we have what we call the "cafe terrace,"
15 | which is also on the first floor and is adjacent to dining on
16 | the interior, as part of the pretty robust amenities in that
17 | space.

18 | There is an entry on the second floor. You can kind
19 | of see on the right edge where it says it's existing adjacent
20 | park, there is a fitness amenity that's intended for use by the
21 | overall campus and there's a second-floor entry adjacent to
22 | that existing point, which serves that.

23 | And so, the other thing that I just want to highlight
24 | here is, you know, the shape of the building kind of has a bend
25 | to it and that is intentional for a couple of reasons, which

1 | you'll see three-dimensionally and hopefully it'll make a
2 | little bit more sense, but in plan, today there does not exist
3 | a direct accessible route from Edgewood Street to this big
4 | playground directly adjacent to the right. So, there's a
5 | stairway configured differently than shown here, but that
6 | exists today. So, part of this kind of loopy pathway that we
7 | create is a new handicapped-accessible route from the eastern
8 | edge of the site to this primary playground. And, in part,
9 | this bend is to give that pathway a little bit more space to
10 | make it work.

11 | Next slide, please.

12 | So, just following on up with outdoor space, working
13 | with Office of Planning staff, this is a quick summary of where
14 | our resident outdoor space is on the building. The green, I
15 | just mentioned, the cafe terrace to the left, the central patio
16 | to sort of in the middle, and then on the right, the yellow is
17 | the adult daycare patio.

18 | And in addition to that, on the far left, there's
19 | sort of the pink ark there. That is a balcony that is on each
20 | floor, Floors 2 through 8, that's at the end of a corridor on
21 | the residential floors. We'll see that three-dimensionally.

22 | We've added a couple terraces on the third floor, you
23 | see in blue, and then on the ninth floor, you see in purple, is
24 | opportunities for residents to get outside for a little bit.

25 | All right. Next slide, please.

1 So, how -- the mass of this, how it fits into the
2 overall site. So, you can see, I think, the building on this
3 property fit into the existing condition. There's a couple of
4 things going on that I just want to highlight.

5 What you see on the right is the shopping center
6 property. We've done our best to approximate the future
7 development there. Some of it is in progress, you may well
8 know that, particularly on the upper edge of that property.
9 But this will give you a sense of the scale of the future of
10 that, that will be our future context.

11 So, our proposed building is, as I mentioned earlier,
12 of the sort of high-rise family of buildings on campus. We
13 have a couple of relatively straightforward architectural,
14 urban-design weldments going on. We've got, you know, we're
15 highlighting the corners; the eastern end and the western end.

16 This is showing the western end with the architectural focal
17 points in the materials and the detailing that give a view
18 from, in this particular view, from the neighborhood, from 4th
19 Street into the campus.

20 If you'll go to the next, please.

21 This is in the middle of the plan, and we're going to
22 focus on this a little bit more in a couple slides, but you can
23 see in the middle of the plan there, there's a little two-story
24 piece at the drop-off and a very, you know, a primary bay that
25 comes up from the middle of the plan; that's the entry

1 sequence. That bay in the middle of the plan is an amenities
2 space on each floor, which we'll talk about in a little bit.

3 If you'll go to the next, please.

4 And then at the eastern end, we also see this similar
5 architectural motif, this focal point at the eastern corner,
6 and that's really the view from the campus. That's sort of an
7 internal view. You get these long views as a pedestrian on
8 campus. We're kind of marking that corner to accentuate that
9 view.

10 You're also seeing a little bit of this bend that we
11 mentioned and how it allows those views, those pedestrian views
12 of the campus to be maintained to a certain degree.

13 And also, if you'll go to the next slide, please,
14 you'll also see, you know, that bend kind of gives a more
15 orthogonal relationship between our proposed building and the
16 adjacent Edgewood 4 building across the playground.

17 Next slide, please.

18 Next slide, please.

19 So, as we track around on the exterior, this is the
20 view from Edgewood Street, there are some sort of natural
21 screening elements here. There's the existing buildings. And,
22 you know, the campuses, as they exist today, is pretty green.
23 I mean, you know, there's a lot of vegetation that helps, kind
24 of help break down the scale of our proposed building from the
25 neighborhood.

1 Next, please.

2 Here's that view, that internal view within the
3 campus of that corner, adjacent to the, you know, the
4 playground, which you kind of see in the foreground. Also
5 highlighted at the base, just below that, is the location of
6 that fitness center that was meant to be used campus-wide, and
7 to the left of that is a second-floor entry that serves that.

8 The material pallet -- if you'll go to the next,
9 please -- the material pallet, in general, is pretty
10 straightforward, I think. There are two brick selections;
11 there's kind of a reddish-orange brick that you see that's in
12 keeping with the campus material. There's kind of a gray brick
13 that is similar in color value to the pre-cast concrete you see
14 on some of the buildings on campus. And then there are fiber
15 cement panels that are either on the whitish side or kind of a
16 deep gray.

17 This view is kind of showing the entry view. Now,
18 there's a couple of things that I want to highlight is, (A),
19 we're working with OP staff, we have worked on this so that it
20 is a little bit more distinctive architecturally in its
21 material and its mass, relative to the rest of the building.
22 We're using those same two bricks, just in an alternating,
23 coursing pattern to give it a little bit of a distinction.

24 And you'll notice the mass in here, the two-story
25 mass, we've done groupings, two-story groupings of the windows

1 and then it also kind of, we feel, like, gives the brick a nice
2 human scale of drop-off, which are now dropping-off adjacent to
3 a 90-foot building.

4 Next, please.

5 And here's a highlighting of that. So, a few things,
6 a quick highlight here. You can see the open space I
7 mentioned, the terrace on the far left, the stack of outdoor
8 balconies at the end of the corridor.

9 If can you zoom in -- the next slide we'll zoom in on
10 the entry and you can get a sense of the front porch with the
11 trellis and, again, that notion of that human scale of that
12 two-story piece at the entry, the groupings of the windows, the
13 sunshades that we've added. And I think you can pick up on
14 this -- the screen quality is good -- this alternating color
15 pattern of the brick.

16 Next, please.

17 And then lastly, kind of pulling out to the 4th
18 Street neighborhood end, you get a sense of that focal point at
19 the end of the building, also picking up the balconies.

20 And then if you'll go to the next slide, please,
21 there's the view. Also, you can get this view from 4th Street,
22 as well. It's a little oblique, but it gives you that sort of
23 corner tower and architectural element that marks the entry to
24 the site.

25 So, that's really the highlights. If you progress

1 through the slides, there's a handful of three-dimensional
2 slides which we really don't need to focus on. So, if you
3 could just kind of track through those, those are really meant
4 to be included for reference in case questions came up about
5 the elevations.

6 Next, please.

7 Next, please.

8 Next, please.

9 Next.

10 Next.

11 Next.

12 Next, please.

13 I just want to focus for a minute on this -- this is
14 the ground-floor plan -- just to highlight and reinforce what
15 Stacie was saying earlier. The yellow is the adult daycare on
16 the eastern end and the green is resident-serving amenities
17 spaces all on the ground floor, kind of working together. You
18 can get a sense of how these outdoor amenities, directly
19 adjacent, are accessible from and usable by the inside-outside
20 use of the space.

21 Next, please.

22 You know, the upper-right corner is that fitness on
23 the second floor I mentioned, with the entry off the
24 playground.

25 Next, please.

1 And then lastly, I just want to focus or call
2 attention to this lounge in the middle of the plan. You'll see
3 the laundry is directly adjacent. We had a lot of conversation
4 with the Office of Planning staff about laundry and how it
5 should be incorporated.

6 This is where we left off with that. We have this
7 social lounge that's adjacent, directly adjacent to the
8 laundry. We have modified the laundry so that there's more
9 enclosure so that it provides a little bit more privacy for the
10 laundry function, while still being somewhat accessible to the
11 lounge, as a place for those, you know, doing their laundry, to
12 be able to socialize, congregate, spend some time.

13 With that, I'm going to -- if you can just kind of
14 track through, please, until you see the Gorove Slade title
15 sheet. I'm going pass -- nope, sorry. Sorry. Could you go
16 back one.

17 I just want to highlight one last thing: the roof
18 plan sustainability features. This is showing, you know, our
19 solar array, which from the initial filing, we've more than
20 doubled the amount of area we're devoting to that. We did a
21 little bit more research and found that we can have a green
22 roof and solar panels, coincident. So, that's what we're
23 showing here. And in terms of sustainability, you know, that's
24 one of our primary, in essence, in terms of sustainability.

25 Also, we have -- are planning on or committing to do

1 Enterprise Green Communities 2020 program, which is newly
2 adopted, and which is, generally, I think it said in the stock
3 report, generally equivalent to (audio interference). If
4 that's correct, it doesn't have the tiering system like the
5 other programs do, but one thing that's new in that program is
6 that Energy Star compliance is mandatory and that's a pretty
7 big deal in terms of testing during construction and
8 conformance, the confirmation of system-conforming during
9 construction.

10 So, with that, I'll pass it over to Mr. Solomon to
11 talk about transportation.

12 MR. SOLOMON: Good afternoon, Commissioners. For the
13 record, I'm Daniel Solomon, transportation planner and project
14 manager with Gorove Slade.

15 We've been working with Enterprise Community
16 Development, the project team, and DDOT related to the
17 transportation aspects of the Edgewood Commons project and I'm
18 going to touch on the highlights of our view and coordination
19 with DDOT.

20 As shown here, the project we are discussing tonight
21 is situated in the Edgewood Commons campus, just north of the
22 Rhode Island Avenue, near Edgewood Street and 4th Street NE.
23 It's located near the Rhode Island Avenue, Brentwood Metro
24 station, less than a half-mile walk to the southeast;
25 additionally, there are several Metro bus lines and a Metro

1 XTRA route in the vicinity of the site, with stops adjacent to
2 the site on 4th Street and Edgewood Street.

3 There are east-west bike lanes on Franklin Street to
4 the east and north-south bicycle lanes on 4th Street, adjacent
5 to the site. The Metropolitan Branch Trail is also nearby and
6 there's a Capital Bikeshare station near the site at 3rd and
7 Evarts Street.

8 Next, please.

9 Scott walked through the site plan earlier, but I
10 would like to recap the transportation elements of the plan.
11 Vehicular unloading access to the development will be from an
12 existing curb cut on 4th Street. All parking, pickup/drop-off,
13 and loading activity will be accommodated by the existing
14 private drive.

15 The image on this slide shows that vehicular
16 circulation to the parking and pick-up/drop-off area in yellow
17 and loading circulation in red.

18 All loading will be head-in/head-out at 4th Street.
19 I would like to mention that the curb cut on 4th Street will be
20 reconfigured and aligned with Channing Street, including
21 signalization by the Bryant Street project to the south.

22 Anticipated bicycle circulation is shown in green.
23 Pedestrian circulation is shown in blue. Bicycle access is
24 primarily envisioned to take place via the private drive
25 connecting the long- and short-term bicycle parking spaces to

1 the 4th Street bicycle lanes.

2 Pedestrian access to the main entrance will primarily
3 take place via the private drive, with secondary entrances
4 accessible by existing connections through the Edgewood Commons
5 campus.

6 Next, please.

7 We coordinated with DDOT and OP and have agreed to
8 provide pedestrian striping along various walking routes,
9 connecting the site with the Rhode Island Avenue-Brentwood
10 Metro station.

11 The figure on this slide shows pedestrian
12 connectivity to and from the Rhode Island Avenue Metro station
13 through the Bryant Street development to the south. The figure
14 also shows where additional striping, new curb ramps, and new
15 crosswalks will be provided on-site; those are denoted in blue.

16 Next, please.

17 With regards to parking, there'll be 15 vehicular
18 parking spaces, 5 of which are new ADA spaces and 10 existing
19 spaces on the Edgewood campus will be reserved for this
20 development. A parking study of the entire Edgewood Commons
21 campus was conducted in 2018, finding that approximately 100
22 spaces were unused. DDOT has agreed with the amount of parking
23 provided by the development.

24 The project will include 28 long-term and 10 short-
25 term bicycle parking spaces. This is fewer than the 53 long-

1 term spaces required by Zoning. The Applicant is requesting
2 zoning relief from the long-term bicycle parking requirements,
3 as the dwelling units in this project will serve an elderly
4 population who are less likely to use bicycles for
5 transportation; however, the project exceeds the nine short-
6 term spaces required by Zoning. DDOT has no objection to the
7 required long-term bike-parking relief.

8 Next, please.

9 Loading will be accommodated by a 30-foot curbside
10 loading zone along the private drive and a 20-foot service-and-
11 delivery space located across the private drive, meeting zoning
12 requirements for the size and number of loading facilities.

13 Following extensive coordination with DDOT and the
14 Office of Planning, the loading berth was relocated to a
15 curbside loading zone in order to provide an outdoor dining
16 terrace. The loading facilities are circled in red in the
17 figure.

18 To help facilitate truck movements and manage and
19 minimize conflicts with vehicles and pedestrian along the
20 private drive, a loading-management plan is being proposed.
21 The loading-management plan includes many of the typical
22 elements for projects in the District, but as agreed to with
23 DDOT, it includes additional, limited delivery hours for trash
24 and recycling, as well as deliveries and moving activities.
25 DDOT has concurred with the proposed loading-management plan

1 and has no objection to the project's loading scheme.

2 Next, please.

3 Here, I have listed the highlights of the TDM plan.
4 It includes many of the typical components expected of such a
5 package. We believe this TDM package is appropriate for this
6 type of project to help encourage non-SOV and non-auto trips.
7 DDOT finds the TDM plan to be sufficient.

8 Next, please.

9 For this project, we performed a comprehensive
10 transportation review, which was scoped with DDOT. Our study
11 concluded that the development of the site will enhance the
12 surrounding area and non-automobility through the
13 reconstruction of sidewalks and landscaping and the addition of
14 non-auto amenities.

15 We have coordinated extensively with DDOT during
16 their review. We're pleased to have their support in the form
17 of a no-objection staff report. DDOT's report did have some
18 conditions, which we believe we have worked through with them.

19 I'll just go over them quickly.

20 As mentioned previously, DDOT requested that loading
21 facilities be relocated to a curbside loading zone, which the
22 Applicant has agreed to. The Applicant agreed to the provision
23 of a loading-management plan and also agreed to improve
24 pedestrian accommodations along the private drive.

25 As for the rest of DDOT's conditions, the Applicant

1 will maintain four-foot sidewalk width from 4th Street to the
2 project site and the Applicant has agreed to stripe a high-
3 visibility crosswalk and install curb ramps on their property,
4 connecting the sidewalk adjacent to the proposed building to
5 the new western-most staircase to the Bryant Street project, no
6 later than one year after the staircase is constructed, if not
7 constructed by others.

8 At this time, we believe we have addressed all DDOT
9 concerns. That concludes my testimony and I'll be available
10 for any questions. Thank you.

11 MR. KADLECEK: Thank you, Commissioners. That
12 concludes our presentation, and we are now available for
13 questions.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you very much for
15 your presentation.

16 And let's start off with Commissioner May. Do you
17 have any questions or comments?

18 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah. So, I mean, I appreciate
19 all that has been updated since the project was originally sent
20 down and how it has changed and the moves have been made to
21 address the concerns of the Office of Planning, and I think
22 generally speaking, it's pretty good. I mean, I don't have any
23 issue with the communal laundry or the lack of individual
24 balconies; those are not really my concerns.

25 And I do appreciate the fact that the design of the

1 building has improved somewhat, but I still have some concerns
2 with the design of the building and I'm hoping you might be
3 able to bring up some of the renderings, in fact, I can
4 probably tell you which one.

5 Okay. So, page 17 in the slide presentation, yeah,
6 that's good. So, I mean, I have a number of questions. I
7 mean, first of all, it's -- I'm not enthusiastic at the
8 prospect of the extensive use of cementitious panels, large
9 panels on a building of this size, but I'm assuming that's
10 being done simply for the cost-savings that comes with it.

11 Is that right or is this just a design choice?

12 MR. MATTIES: Yeah, I'll take that. This is Scott
13 Matties.

14 Yes, is the short answer. We have been working
15 through budget issues and as it is an affordable-housing
16 project, that has been a primary consideration.

17 COMMISSIONER MAY: Right. So, it's just having more
18 brick and less cementitious panel would just be too expensive?

19 MR. MATTIES: At this point, we think so, yes.

20 COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. All right. So, I guess I
21 can accept that.

22 Can you tell me what the design logic is with, you
23 know, the sort of three-story bay projections that are hopping
24 up and down along the side of the building, I mean, why isn't
25 it just two or three sets of full bays all the way to the

1 bottom? Or why isn't it -- you know, why aren't they all at
2 the top? Why aren't they just doubles at the top?

3 I mean, what's the -- it's coming across as just
4 being sort of random manipulation of the facade in an attempt
5 to make it interesting, but it just seems incoherent.

6 MR. MATTIES: Yeah, I think that really is the
7 rationale; it's just to try and create some visual interest.
8 You know, the overall (audio interference) is to have, you
9 know, an architectural event at the east end and the west end
10 and then something in the middle at the entry and then both, on
11 the south facade that we're seeing and also on the north. It's
12 really kind of, you know, connecting tissue that's really
13 somewhat background building, for lack of a better term.

14 I think the intent was to incorporate these bays
15 both, to give the interior of the units a little bit of
16 distinction, but more so, on the exterior for the massing --

17 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah.

18 MR. MATTIES: -- to give it a little bit more visual
19 interest so that the sort of background building, as I
20 mentioned, has a little bit more visual interest.

21 COMMISSIONER MAY: Uh-huh. Okay.

22 And then you also have this circumstance where you
23 have, you know, just take the end -- within that middle section
24 of building, toward the left of the image that we have right
25 now, there are three bays -- sorry -- three floors of windows

1 | that have the cementitious panel and then you -- and then the
2 | next bay of windows is, you know, brick most of the way and
3 | then you've got a cluster of four, spanning two bays.

4 | MR. MATTIES: Yep.

5 | COMMISSIONER MAY: I mean, you're just doing too
6 | much, and this is where the incoherence comes in. It's like I
7 | don't -- I understand what you are trying to do with the, you
8 | know, to create the sort of background building portion of
9 | this, of the facade, but it just -- it's coming across as being
10 | really mixed up.

11 | And I would suggest that -- you know, I mean there
12 | are a whole lot of things I could suggest. First of all, just
13 | not treating the bays the way that you have those bay
14 | projections where it's some up and down like that.

15 | You know, look at other alternatives that are a
16 | little bit more coherent, because right now it's like they're
17 | all, you know, sort of fighting for attention and there's isn't
18 | -- I mean, there's no rhyme or reason. There's no rationale
19 | for why some are up, some are down, and why it's -- you know,
20 | you've got -- you don't have any kind of real rhythm going
21 | across the facade. It's, you know, it's like an A, B, C, B, A,
22 | B -- I mean, it's just like it doesn't make any sense.

23 | I also think that you can benefit from having some of
24 | the colors be a little bit darker, and maybe it's just a
25 | rendering thing, but I think right now you have too many of

1 | these, you know, sort of pale colors. And, you know, the
2 | orange brick and the brown brick, I don't think, are really
3 | working super-well together. So, I just, I feel like some more
4 | refinement. I mean, I can go into a lot more about it.

5 | I also don't really understand why you even have the,
6 | that sort of lower band of the cementitious panels, because it
7 | -- I mean it -- I kind of want to have the brick all be
8 | continuous and then have, you know, take that whole thing and
9 | shift it down and then maybe that gives you a better
10 | opportunity to have, you know, bay projections toward the top
11 | or bay projections in the middle in some consistent way. I
12 | just feel like it's, again, it's just a little bit incoherent.

13 | All right. I'm going to stop going on about that.
14 | I'm know that -- I'm sure that Mr. Cochran has been working
15 | with you very closely on how to improve the facade and I can
16 | see, again, some evidence of that, but it's -- I still feel
17 | like it's, the whole composition was just not quite there. So,
18 | I would love to see some alternatives.

19 | As to the rest of it, you know, I appreciate the
20 | Applicant, you know, agreeing to the commitment to 25 percent
21 | IZ units after the initial affordability period is over and I
22 | appreciate the resolution of a loading situation, understanding
23 | that relief is needed. It's too bad that something couldn't be
24 | worked out so that you could actually get the loading into the
25 | building and still maintain the terrace. There's probably a

1 way to do that, but it involves more grade manipulation and
2 probably greater cost, so I'll accept this.

3 Yeah, I don't think I have anything else to comment
4 on. Thank you.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Commissioner May.
6 Commissioner Shapiro?

7 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

8 A few comments and questions. First of all, I
9 appreciate the advanced sustainability, the green roof, and
10 especially the coincident solar panels with the green roof.
11 And I also appreciate the 25 percent IZ in perpetuity. Nice
12 negotiation with the ANC and I appreciate that commitment.

13 So, I would join Commissioner May. I had the same
14 reaction around the fiber cement panels at both, the color and
15 the disjointedness of it. I felt pretty strongly about that.
16 It didn't -- I couldn't make sense of it and, you know, money
17 is a real issue and this is a nice project, and so there's a
18 part of me that just feels like, I'm not even sure that I care
19 so much about the percentage of each, but just to have some
20 kind of coherence to it would help for me. So, I really join
21 with him on that.

22 On the east elevation, that felt even more disjointed
23 and maybe that's just -- can you just bring that up?

24 Paul, can we get the -- thank you, appreciate it.

25 Which one is it?

1 You know, I'm not going to worry about this much
2 because I'm looking at it. It's the west elevation, not the
3 east elevation that I had more concerns with, but there's a lot
4 going on with this, I think, in part, because of how it
5 functions. So, don't worry about that. Don't even find that
6 slide.

7 So, and I want to ask you about the green wall. I
8 just noticed that in passing and now I'm seeing it on the east
9 elevation. So, I'm looking at my own slides, so I don't even
10 know what slide it is.

11 Can you all help me with this? Mr. Matties?

12 MR. MATTIES: Yeah. The green wall is at the west
13 end of the building.

14 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: I see it on the east
15 elevation, right?

16 MR. MATTIES: Yeah.

17 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: The east side of campus.

18 MR. MATTIES: To facing 4th Street. That's right.

19 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: So, I'm just trying to get a
20 sense of what that -- who sees it, what it does. Does it wrap
21 around the corner? Is it a --

22 MR. MATTIES: It --

23 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Yeah. Go ahead, I'm sorry.

24 MR. MATTIES: Yeah, I'm sorry.

25 It does and its primary function is that, you know,

1 | the space inside of that is all either mechanical or utility
2 | kind of spaces, so there really is an opportunity to fenestrate
3 | that to improve the facade. So, instead of having just a
4 | simple blank wall, we're introducing a green screen to clad
5 | that. It would be clad in brick, but it would have a green
6 | screen applied on top of that to soften that because we really
7 | don't have the program inside, on the inside of that spot that,
8 | you know, you really want to fenestrate.

9 | COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: You know, I'm wondering if --
10 | first of all, when you say green screen, are you talking about
11 | organic? Is this alive green?

12 | MR. MATTIES: Yes. Yes.

13 | COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Good. Good.

14 | I wonder if this could be an opportunity, instead
15 | this, if this could be an opportunity for some kind of an art
16 | wall. There isn't -- or some other kind of art feature,
17 | because I don't see anything else like that anywhere around
18 | this building.

19 | I don't know. I can't tell. Is this something that
20 | folks are going to be walking by or is there sort of a
21 | sightline that makes it kind of prominent, even if there's not
22 | a lot of other use to it?

23 | MR. MATTIES: There is. I mean, it is -- one of the
24 | pedestrian entrances to the campus off of 4th Street comes
25 | along that edge. So, from that perspective, yes, we would

1 expect a fair amount of pedestrian traffic going by there.

2 I would have to confer with our client, but, you
3 know, in terms of whether it's a green screen to help kind of
4 soften that blank wall, or a private solution, you know,
5 architecturally, I think either could be successful.

6 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Yeah, but I think the
7 advantage of the art wall, too, is it's an opportunity to do
8 some kind of work with the community, as well. So, you know,
9 additional work with the community. So, I would encourage that
10 exploration.

11 What else do I have?

12 Oh, the pedestrian access through the neighboring
13 property, this might be for the Applicant or Mr. Kadlecek, but
14 there's a letter that you refer to, an agreement with Bryant.

15 MR. KADLECEK: Yeah. We've been coordinating with
16 them. The Applicants coordinate pretty extensively with the
17 developer of that project to the south.

18 We ended up getting a letter from them. To be
19 honest, it wasn't some sort of end-all be-all, it was just
20 providing a little more specificity to what they were in charge
21 of, with respect to that shared drive, and what the Applicant
22 in this case is responsible for. And, really, most of those --
23 not most -- but really all of the pedestrian connections to the
24 Metro station are being provided by that developer to the
25 south.

1 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: And remind me, again, what the
2 timing is on that.

3 MR. KADLECEK: It's -- I don't know, exactly. It's
4 at least a two-phase project. The phase that's under
5 construction now is the phase that's further away from this
6 project. So, what's closer now is several years off.

7 I don't know that they even have a timeline quite
8 yet, but that's certainly something we can maybe try and find
9 out a little bit more information on with regard to timing.

10 MS. BIRENBACH: Hello?

11 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: So, then, I'm trying to get a
12 handle on what --

13 MS. BIRENBACH: Hi, this is Stacie.

14 I know we've actually been in touch with MRP this
15 past week and they are about to start pre-construction on the
16 pedestrian access that is closest to the Metro station. So,
17 that is not under construction today, but it will be at the end
18 of the month.

19 And then the side that is closest to this project,
20 where the driveway will be, the timeline that they provided me
21 was 2022. So, they have to go through their permitting process
22 for sort of that. That's not under construction, but they're
23 still doing final design on that part of their project.

24 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Okay. And so, this is -- and
25 maybe this is more for my -- thank you very much for that --

1 and this may be more for my colleagues than me, but it's
2 unclear to me if we're -- if we were to approve something like
3 this that has something that's on the neighbor's property and
4 there's not even an agreement in place, then what are we
5 actually approving?

6 Because I can't tell, Miss -- it's Birenbach -- did I
7 get that right?

8 MS. BIRENBACH: Uh-huh.

9 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: So, what I'm hearing is there
10 isn't a signed letter.

11 MS. BIRENBACH: So, we have, basically, an easement
12 agreement with the developer to allow them to do this work.

13 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Yeah, but I mean, do you have
14 it or don't you have it or is it in negotiation? Because I'm
15 trying to get a handle on --

16 MS. BIRENBACH: It's signed.

17 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Okay.

18 MS. BIRENBACH: It's signed. And we have --

19 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: And do we have that?

20 MS. BIRENBACH: I don't believe that it's been filed,
21 but I --

22 MR. KADLECEK: It has not.

23 MS. BIRENBACH: I'd defer to Cary.

24 MR. KADLECEK: And so -- yeah, no, I think we were
25 talking about two different things, Commissioner Shapiro.

1 What I -- the letter that we referred to that you
2 were talking about was just a letter that MRP was going to file
3 on the record, basically explaining a few of these things.

4 And what Stacie is referring to is the agreement,
5 actually, between the parties about who's responsible for what
6 and that does exist, but, no, it is not in the record.

7 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Okay. I'm just trying to get
8 a handle on it. You know, this is a little bit of gray area; I
9 get it. I'm just trying to get a handle on if we were to
10 approve this, is this piece of it something that's enforceable
11 at all and, you know, by whom?

12 MR. KADLECEK: Yeah. Well, we're not proposing that
13 you all approve something that's not on this property.

14 So, what we're ask for your approval for is those
15 connections, essentially, that lead up to the property line.

16 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Okay.

17 MR. KADLECEK: Anything, obviously, that's over the
18 property line, MRP is responsible for, but there is
19 coordination going on between the parties about that, of
20 course. Everybody wants these things to work together and so
21 that's the natural result.

22 But, you know, once the property line, we are not
23 asking the Commission to, of course, approve anything that
24 extends beyond the property line.

25 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: So, you are approving up to

1 | your property line? You're requesting up to your property line
2 | or --

3 | MR. KADLECEK: Yeah. So, all those, like, crosswalks
4 | and everything, those would be up to our property line.

5 | COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Gotcha.

6 | Okay. All right. I think that's all I have for now,
7 | Mr. Chair. Thank you very much.

8 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

9 | Let's go to Commissioner Turnbull.

10 | COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

11 | Thank you for your presentation tonight. I'm glad to
12 | see you've made some changes from what we originally saw on
13 | what is really a very relevant and important project. I
14 | greatly appreciate it.

15 | I mean, this is 151 senior units, which I think is
16 | very significant. Very significant. And the 25 percent IZ, I
17 | think, is very significant, also, so I greatly appreciate your
18 | efforts on doing that. I think that's really meaningful.

19 | But I kind of go along with -- I guess I want to know
20 | a little bit more about the Hardie panels or these cement
21 | panels. It looks like -- it's hard to tell exactly on some of
22 | the elevation on some of the renderings -- but on the
23 | elevations, it looks like a very rectangular grid, like they're
24 | like two feet by four feet?

25 | MR. MATTIES: Yeah, they're -- it's probably more

1 | like an 18-inch-high module --

2 | COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: And --

3 | MR. MATTIES: -- and they are rectangular, yes.

4 | COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: And what's between them? Is
5 | this like a stainless steel-U reglet or a --

6 | MR. MATTIES: Yes.

7 | COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: -- or an aluminum reglet?

8 | MR. MATTIES: Yes, it would be an aluminum reglet.
9 | It would have kind of a recessed joint.

10 | COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. I guess one of the
11 | things I'm surprised, Commissioner May -- one of the things you
12 | always worry about is the weatherability on a project and,
13 | especially to the extent of what you have with the cement
14 | panels, and I'm just concerned about the lifespan and the
15 | workability of these. I mean, what's your experience in
16 | working with this for -- on projects like this?

17 | I guess I'm concerned, personally, about the
18 | appearance of a building like this with all of these light
19 | panels and staining, weatherability, things just falling apart
20 | after a while.

21 | MR. MATTIES: I'm sorry, was that a question for us,
22 | Mr. Turnbull?

23 | COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes, that is a question for
24 | you.

25 | MR. MATTIES: Yeah. I think, you know, we have used

1 | these panels. You know, they've been on the market for
2 | probably 10 years or so. You know, I take the note about the
3 | color and weatherability and potential staining; that's a good
4 | point.

5 | You know, the panels are, you know, treated in some
6 | respect, to try to minimize stain or to make them more stain-
7 | resistant.

8 | COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: And are they pre-finished or
9 | a pre-finished panel?

10 | MR. MATTIES: They can be. They can be acquired pre-
11 | finished or they can be painted in the field and that's --

12 | COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.

13 | MR. MATTIES: -- and that's still part of our, kind
14 | of our budget flowchart to understand the cost of either
15 | approach.

16 | COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. I guess I'm okay with
17 | the balconies. I'm sure Commissioner -- the vice chair will be
18 | upset we didn't get more balconies. But I understand your
19 | concern and just trying to work with just having a communal
20 | balcony on the far end at both locations.

21 | I'm trying to look at my notes here. The loading
22 | area, the drop-off area, the loading area, how do you -- once
23 | you load, once you get your deliveries, where do they go? How
24 | do you get them in the building?

25 | I mean, you're sort of at the tail end and how do --

1 MR. MATTIES: I'm sorry, sir.

2 If you bring the plan up, I can walk you through
3 that. It's pretty (audio interference) the plan. Yeah, it's
4 on --

5 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Site plan 14?

6 MR. MATTIES: Well, if you go to Sheet 15, which is
7 the basement plan -- I'm sorry -- it's 15 on the lower-right
8 corner, so keep going a little bit, a few more in where you get
9 to the plan sequence.

10 That's it. Thank you.

11 So, the loading area, you can see notated there on
12 the lower left. There will be -- we'll still have a not as
13 tall or as wide, but still an overhead door that you can -- you
14 can see there's a curb cut there to facilitate delivery access
15 into the building. But if you go into that area, that sort of
16 open area and then you go diagonally up to the right, that's
17 our service elevator.

18 So, a delivery truck would stop there, would be able
19 to go in, directly into that basement level, and then right to
20 the service elevator and go, you know, to the first floor.

21 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: And that loading area is for
22 people coming in, that's like for supplies, that's for the
23 building use, itself, and that's for all the -- if I'm moving
24 in, everybody is coming in and out there, right?

25 MR. MATTIES: That's correct.

1 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. What are you doing to
2 help -- now, right above this is the sort of outdoor lounge
3 area.

4 MR. MATTIES: Yes.

5 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Now, are you doing anything
6 to screen the loading area from this? Is there anything you
7 can do to -- I mean, are people simply to look out and see a
8 truck unloading its goods?

9 MR. MATTIES: Well, the edge along the terrace, you
10 know, we'll bring the brick up to guardrail height. So, you
11 know, we're not going to stop that at the terrace level and
12 then have an open rail. So, that will help, in part, screen --

13 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: You're saying it won't be an
14 open rail; it'll be a solid wall?

15 MR. MATTIES: Correct. Correct. Up to guardrail
16 height, so about 42 inches above the terrace level, itself,
17 will be solid.

18 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. I had a question on
19 the bicycles. You want relief for 25 bicycles. The plans call
20 that you're providing 28 on the inside, on the interior.

21 What is it going to be on the interior, 28 or 25?

22 MR. MATTIES: I think we have room for 28 on the
23 interior.

24 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. I was just curious,
25 because the OP report has listed 25 and you're looking for --

1 to go down to 25, but you're going to provide 28?

2 MR. MATTIES: Yes, sir.

3 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. I guess I would go
4 along with my colleagues. I guess Commissioner May had started
5 about the design of the facade with the projections and how
6 they seem almost kind of, like, random.

7 And I always don't mind flexibility, don't mind a
8 little free-form, but I think if it was -- I don't know -- I
9 forget the words that Commissioner May said, but he said
10 there's no consistency. There's a randomness that's really --
11 you can't relate it to what's really happening inside, if
12 there's like a two-story unit or -- it just seems like it's
13 very -- it seems like you can move those things up and down
14 anywhere, you could slide them.

15 And so, I think I would agree with them that the
16 consistency, overall, of looking at it is a little bit
17 unsettling. I would agree with him and you may just want to
18 take another look at that and see if you can have some other
19 approach or try to make it seem a little more consistent.

20 I don't mind the idea of something projecting but I
21 think at some point, it should relate to maybe what's going on
22 inside the building and this just looks like, well, no, we want
23 to be playful on the outside, which in its own right may be
24 okay, but just looking at the one rendering, the exterior
25 rendering on 26, page 26, it really does look unsettling.

1 If you want, maybe Paul can bring Number 26 up, Sheet
2 26.

3 Yeah, I think it just -- I almost get a feeling that
4 they're going to fall off at certain points. Maybe it's the
5 rendering, it's just -- it's not communicating what it's
6 supposed to be doing. But I also think that the lower band,
7 you have a tan brick at the bottom and then you go to the
8 cement panels, which are all this beige, and it's just -- I'll
9 tell you, I'm really not that -- I don't know if I want to live
10 here -- I shouldn't say that -- well, I guess what I'm saying
11 is that it's a little unsettling.

12 I feel that there could be something done more to
13 make it a little more inviting. It just looks -- I'm not sure.
14 It could be an Olympic village residence. It's just -- I feel
15 there has to be a more stabilizing factor to this. It just
16 leaves one feeling that it's not finished, that you're still
17 toying with the idea on how to really finalize materials and
18 placement of items and it's like we're at Step 1 and we need to
19 go to Step 2 or 3.

20 So, I would also have you take another look at the
21 elevation along on the other side, also, as to what you really
22 want to do and how to make it more consistent, to make the
23 materials seem to make sense with one another. They've got to
24 balance each other out and then blend with each other.

25 So, I would agree with that. I think you've got a

1 wonderful project here. I think it's got a lot of features
2 that are very nice, but I just -- I'm a little unsettled by the
3 wall, also.

4 And, Mr. Chair, those are my comments.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner
6 Turnbull.

7 Let's go to Vice-Chair Miller.

8 COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

9 And thank you to the Applicant for the presentation
10 and to Enterprise for all the affordable housing that you have
11 developed in the city and continue to develop.

12 I really don't have any comments beyond what my
13 colleagues have said. I don't necessarily -- I think it's a
14 very important project for an all-senior, though, this senior
15 seems to be down to 50 years old. We've heard other senior
16 projects where it's 55 years old. It doesn't matter, I'm
17 beyond both, but it's an all-senior, independent living at no
18 more than 60 percent median family income, and for the 40 years
19 that you have financing under LIHTC or other project-based,
20 rental-assistance programs, but then you're -- and I appreciate
21 you increasing the Inclusionary Zoning set-aside for perpetual
22 affordability at the same 60 percent maximum MFI in perpetuity,
23 beyond that 40 year.

24 Did I hear -- I heard the 25 percent and I saw the 25
25 percent figure. I thought in the earlier presentation, I

1 | thought I heard a number of units associated with that. I know
2 | what 25 percent is of 151. I guess it's 37 or something -- 30
3 | something -- high 30s. But then I thought I heard you say 52.
4 | I thought I heard a fifty-two number, but maybe I misheard and
5 | maybe Ms. Birenbach or somebody could just clarify.

6 | Is there an actual number associated with the 25
7 | percent IZ set-aside that you presented?

8 | MR. MATTIES: Mr. Miller, it's Scott Matties.

9 | It's actually it's an area calc, so it's 25 percent
10 | of the area --

11 | COMMISSIONER MILLER: Right.

12 | MR. MATTIES: -- on our IZ summary chart, according
13 | to -- I'm reading that -- it's too small -- I don't know.

14 | If you could bring up -- early in the presentation,
15 | there's the IZ summary diagram, the second or third sheet in.

16 | That one. Thank you.

17 | Next.

18 | Yeah. And so, I think the total units is actually
19 | 62.

20 | COMMISSIONER MILLER: Yeah.

21 | MR. MATTIES: It's more than 25 percent of the units,
22 | but on an area basis, it's 45 percent of the GFA.

23 | COMMISSIONER MILLER: Yeah, I guess it was the sixty-
24 | two number I heard, which I didn't compute with the 25 percent.
25 | So, I guess, I don't know why that comes out that way, but I'm

1 | glad that it does, the 62 in perpetuity.

2 | And I think I heard Ms. Birenbach or someone say,
3 | also, that you anticipate that due to the financing, that you
4 | have -- you're planning to get for this or have lined up for
5 | this affordable housing, that you anticipate that there'll
6 | actually be a lower median family income; there'll be a certain
7 | percentage that will be below 60 percent MFI.

8 | Do you -- but you're not -- that's not being
9 | proffered as a requirement in this particular application, but
10 | do you have a number or a percentage on that, the number or
11 | percentage that's going to be below 60 percent MFI?

12 | MS. BIRENBACH: Sure. And based on the current
13 | qualified allocation plan and priorities of the District, they
14 | have been requiring that all new construction projects are at
15 | or below 60 percent of the AMI. I don't anticipate that
16 | changing, so we do anticipate that we would have affordability
17 | at or below 60 percent and that we would also have a number of
18 | units set aside for permanent, supportive housing for homeless
19 | individuals. So, I do think our finance requirements will
20 | require a 100 percent at 60 percent, unless that changes in the
21 | future.

22 | COMMISSIONER MILLER: Well, that's important and
23 | that's very beneficial and a very important public benefit for
24 | the District.

25 | So, Mr. Kadlecek or Ms. Birenbach, do you have an

1 objection to this application approving the 60 percent MFI
2 level for 100 percent of the units, since that's what you
3 anticipate?

4 MR. KADLECEK: Well, I'd defer to Stacie on that, but
5 I think it's the way the application was presented was that
6 they weren't, just because they got all this (audio
7 interference) financing, they weren't able to make (audio
8 interference) so, it would be, in any event, no more than 60
9 percent, but what Stacie is saying is it most likely will be 60
10 percent.

11 And I just don't want to commit us to something
12 that's ends up not being able to be satisfied. But I'd defer
13 to Stacie.

14 MS. BIRENBACH: Yeah, I think we'd like the
15 flexibility, depending on, you know, if and when financing to
16 sort of follow a financial feasibility for the project and,
17 again, you know, the requirements for the District financing,
18 how far at certain levels. But to the extent that they change,
19 we'd like the flexibility from the Zoning Commission to really
20 be at or below 60.

21 COMMISSIONER MILLER: Okay. Well, if -- when we get
22 to the point of -- and I say it's going to be a "when," not
23 "if" -- we get to the point of a zoning order, (audio
24 interference) of this modification of significance, maybe the
25 applicant's attorney can work with our own counsel to at least

1 make some notation about the anticipation of more, even more,
2 even a deeper level of affordability than what's being required
3 by the order. As has been testified today, predominately,
4 hoping to get financing for 50 percent MFI and for permanent,
5 supportive housing, which I assume would be below 30 percent
6 MFI.

7 Is that correct, Ms. Birenbach?

8 MS. BIRENBACH: Yes, that's correct.

9 COMMISSIONER MILLER: Okay. So, I think that's a
10 very commendable aspect of the project.

11 And you're marketing, you intend to market it to
12 maybe people who already live in Edgewood Commons, who might be
13 wanting to avail themselves of the daycare and other supportive
14 services that you'll have in this building?

15 MS. BIRENBACH: Very much so.

16 COMMISSIONER MILLER: Have you had discussions with
17 the -- I don't know if there's a tenants organization or
18 community organization already or yet or are they aware of
19 what's happening and supportive?

20 MS. BIRENBACH: Yes, they are.

21 COMMISSIONER MILLER: We don't have any documentation
22 about your interaction with them, with the existing tenant
23 community.

24 They are all tenants, I assume, not condo-owners?

25 MS. BIRENBACH: That's correct.

1 MR. KADLECEK: I was just going to say, (audio
2 interference) actually lives on the campus.

3 COMMISSIONER MILLER: I see.

4 And so, going to the ANC, I appreciate that you did
5 respond, you were responsive to them and to OP and others about
6 the, on the Inclusionary Zoning and perpetuity set-aside after
7 the 40-year financing for the all-affordable.

8 They also, apparently, made some reference to parking
9 concerns. I assume you did present to them, what you presented
10 in the record here on this case, that there are a hundred
11 surplus, unused parking spaces in that development today.

12 Is that correct that there are about a hundred unused
13 or plus parking spaces, currently?

14 MS. BIRENBACH: Yes. We presented the parking study
15 to the ANC and have had numerous resident meetings about
16 parking on the campus and discussions with our operations group
17 to sort of prepare for the additional utilization.

18 COMMISSIONER MILLER: Okay. So, I don't really have
19 any other comments.

20 I colleagues have made a lot of design comments.
21 I'll look. I assume the architect will come up with some,
22 maybe, alternatives that maybe are responsive to that. I
23 really don't have anything to add there.

24 But -- so, that's it for my questions.

25 Thank you all for your presentation and thank you,

1 Mr. Chairman.

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

3 (Audio interference) a lot of good comments and I
4 want to start off with Commissioner May.

5 I know I am supposed to be asking the Applicant, but
6 I want to tell Commissioner May that fighting for attention, I
7 like that. I'm probably going to use that. I may not use it
8 for this hearing, but I just want you to know that when you
9 hear it again, know I got it from you.

10 (Laughter)

11 COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay.

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let me ask the Applicant, who --
13 and I'm not sure, Mr. Kadlecek, who can answer this -- Ms.
14 Birenbach or whomever -- who, on your development team is from
15 the community?

16 MS. BIRENBACH: Can you define what that means --
17 what you mean?

18 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Who do you have on your
19 development team -- I know you went and met with the ANC, but
20 do you have anybody on your development team that you may have
21 hired or solicited information from them or put them under
22 contract? Who on your team is from the community?

23 MS. BIRENBACH: We do not have anybody on our team
24 that we've hired to be part of this.

25 We have, as part of Enterprise Community Development,

1 we have, as I mentioned, we own and operate the 792 existing
2 units. We have a property management company that operates the
3 company, as well as, what we call our "Community Impact
4 Strategies Group."

5 And our Community Impact Strategies Group is the part
6 of the organization that does resident-services programming,
7 outreach to residents, not necessarily tenant meetings, but
8 they're called "network meetings," where we get together and
9 discuss what's happening in the community and involve them, and
10 informing them of what's happening both, from operational and
11 development discussions. So, we work hand-in-hand with
12 existing staff at Enterprise to do outreach to the community.

13 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you for that answer.

14 MR. KADLECEK: Mr. Hood, I actually live in the same
15 ANC, to the extent that that's helpful.

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Excuse me?

17 MR. KADLECEK: I said I live in the same ANC, to the
18 extent that that's helpful.

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So, you know I've asked that
20 question before, then, so ...

21 MR. KADLECEK: Yeah.

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: That's going to be one of my
23 standing questions. Sometimes I forget to ask it, so thank
24 you.

25 MS. BIRENBACH: Well, I was a 10-year resident of ANC

1 5E. I lived in Eckington. Now, I'm in Michigan Park. So, I'm
2 not -- but I don't -- that's like pretty far away from Edgewood
3 now.

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So, the more you talk, the better
5 you're getting, because I grew up in Michigan.

6 (Laughter)

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let me go to any next question.

8 Thank you, both. I appreciate you bringing that up.

9 Let me -- Ms. Birenbach, while I have you, I noticed,
10 you know, we were talking about the senior adult treatment and
11 a lot of times if we approve stuff, we laid on, Well, the
12 Zoning Commission approved it.

13 Has that been fully -- I know you have a (audio
14 interference) in there with I think 25 members and you're
15 trying to go to 60. I believe that's how I recall it, but what
16 actually goes on there and are we going to make sure that the
17 residents, because the way it was articulated in your
18 submission, were the residents were going to get first dibs to
19 be able to use those services.

20 Kind of explain and run me through a little bit of
21 that.

22 MS. BIRENBACH: Okay. So, we have a partner who is
23 going to operate the adult daycare. We have a letter agreement
24 with Iona Senior Services. They are a longstanding senior-
25 service organization that currently operates a program, an

1 adult daycare program in Ward 3, and are expanding currently to
2 Congress Heights in Ward 8.

3 So, they are our partner in this and they are going
4 to be working hand-in-hand with us to do outreach and
5 recruitment for program participants on campus, as well as the
6 broader community, to the extent that we have additional seats
7 to fill. I can't tell you everything about how their
8 programming works, but they go through the Office of Aging to
9 sort of go through their statement of need process to become
10 licensed and certified in Ward 5.

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Birenbach.

12 I really appreciate that. I think you've answered my
13 question. You actually answered it fully, especially when you
14 told me Iona was working on it, and I appreciate it.

15 The only other question I have on that issue is, that
16 was fully exhausted with ANC, fully talked about how that was
17 all going to work and everything with the seniors that are on-
18 site and the seniors are going to be solicited and try to bring
19 -- all of that was discussed, correct?

20 MS. BIRENBACH: Yes.

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you.

22 I think my last question -- oh, let me ask this, and
23 maybe this is for Mr. Matties. The 4th and Bryant Street
24 project, as we know, is being developed and you all have
25 already mentioned.

1 Did we look at this project as far as how it's being
2 developed versus -- did we do any comparables or did we try to
3 see to make sure that we kind of have the same character in the
4 -- but let me back up before I ask it.

5 I do agree with Commissioner May, especially with the
6 lighter materials. I think he's asked you to re-look at that
7 and revisit some of it. Some of the other stuff I agree with,
8 as well, but I'm always on the lighter materials. Some of the
9 design I leave up to Mr. Turnbull and Commissioner May, but I
10 do agree with a lot of their comments, so I'm looking forward
11 to seeing what comes back.

12 But did we look at the project that's being
13 developed, since they're in close proximity, and your project?

14 MR. MATTIES: Yeah, we had the opportunity to look
15 at, back when there was, itself, a PUD, and then it became the
16 large-tract development. The design is effectively the same.

17 And, you know, we did have access to those design
18 materials. We weren't specifically trying to use the same
19 pallet or anything of that nature, but I think they're pallet
20 is somewhat similar in that I think they do use some fiber
21 cement, maybe a little more metal panel, and a fair amount of
22 bricks. And I do think that, perhaps, their pallet is a little
23 bit darker than ours in terms of color, but we were trying to,
24 particularly with the brick, trying to have a color pallet in
25 our brick selections that was more in tune with the other

1 buildings on our campus.

2 We do have, you know, brick and pre-cast concrete on
3 our campus and we were trying to be more sympathetic to that
4 than the neighbor to the south, per se.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Again, I would echo my colleagues,
6 Commissioner May and Commissioner Turnbull and actually all of
7 my colleagues and the comments that have already been
8 mentioned. So, I -- that response.

9 Let me also is ask Mr. Solomon from DDOT. Now, we
10 gave you expert status, Mr. Solomon, so I'm looking forward to
11 some expert answers.

12 Mr. Solomon, first of all, this is your first time in
13 front of the Zoning Commission?

14 MR. SOLOMON: This is my first time testifying in
15 front of the Zoning Commission.

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Well, welcome.

17 Let me ask, in your traffic analysis, who did you
18 work along -- did you do this independently or did you work
19 along with one of your colleagues with the traffic analysis at
20 Gorove Slade?

21 MR. SOLOMON: So, Dan VanPelt, (audio interference)
22 comprehensive transportation review and there were other staff
23 members that helped, as well.

24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So, if somebody could put
25 on mute, unless it's in somebody's home, if they could just put

1 | it on mute.

2 | When you did your analysis -- you know, we got a lot
3 | going on with the 4th and Bryant Street. We've got a lot going
4 | on with Edgewood Street; that's a cut-through. Maybe I can use
5 | it here, sometimes traffic fights for attention when it's
6 | cutting through 4th Street along with Edgewood.

7 | In your analysis, was all that taken -- and Rhode
8 | Island Avenue, you know, they're changing the water systems on
9 | Rhode Island Avenue and hopefully that'll all be complete, but
10 | in your analysis, was all of that taken into consideration,
11 | because most of the time, the traffic manual only deals with
12 | that specific site.

13 | What did you do in your analysis?

14 | MR. SOLOMON: So, thank you for the question. I
15 | apologize, my wife is still working.

16 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Oh, no, that's fine.

17 | MR. SOLOMON: I have a new (audio interference) is
18 | waking up. You might be hearing him screaming in the
19 | background, too.

20 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: That's fine.

21 | MR. SOLOMON: For the comprehensive transportation
22 | review, we weren't required to do a transportation-impact
23 | analysis as the trip generation for the site was so low. So,
24 | DDOT -- and I'll let DDOT answer to that during their testimony
25 | -- but that trip generation was just considered so low that we

1 weren't required to analyze intersections and we, instead,
2 focused on multi-modal accommodations.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So, Mr. Solomon, what you're
4 telling me is that DDOT is going to be responsible for all that
5 traffic that's going to be fighting for attention around Rhode
6 Island Avenue, Edgewood, (audio interference), 4th Street with
7 all this new development. So, that's okay, I'm not going to --
8 but you already satisfied all of DDOT's requirements?

9 MR. SOLOMON: Correct, Mr. Chairman.

10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. So, I'm going to stop
11 asking you questions right now. I want to -- but I'm going to
12 look at this and I will always remember you and Mr. VanPelt
13 from this case.

14 All right. So, thank you, Mr. Solomon.

15 I don't really have anything else. Let me see.

16 Okay. Let me see if my colleagues have any follow-
17 ups? Anybody? I'm not seeing anybody.

18 Vice-Chair Miller?

19 COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

20 I neglected to mention, I think, my appreciation for
21 the addition of communal balconies and the addition of
22 balconies and the addition of terraces, communal terraces, I
23 believe, also beyond what the original application provided.
24 And I think that the outdoor terrace for the dining area is
25 also another beneficial feature of this project and I just

1 wanted to chime in on that. Thank you.

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Vice-Chair.

3 I will say I do appreciate all of the interactions
4 with the community.

5 But Mr. Kadlecek, let me ask you a question. From
6 1966, how do we get to using this tool, a modification of
7 consequence -- I mean, significance -- I'm sorry -- how did we
8 get to using this tool, as opposed to something else?

9 I'm just curious.

10 MR. KADLECEK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That's a
11 good question.

12 Because it's so old, as we explained in our initial
13 filing when we filed the application, PUD didn't even exist in
14 1966, and so there was this concept called the "large-scale
15 plan development" that effectively operated the same thing,
16 but, procedurally, it was a little different.

17 When we started exploring this project some more, we
18 actually reached out -- to give you a sense of how long ago we
19 started working with this -- Mr. Bergstein was still around.
20 So, we worked with Mr. Bergstein and basically developed this
21 strategy that for purposes of approval, this would be treated
22 as a PUD and the process we would use would be a modification
23 of significance because it is the closest analog and, frankly,
24 the only thing that exists in the zoning regulations right now
25 to get this approved.

1 There is a covenant recorded on the property, the
2 same way that there is a PUD covenant recorded on PUDs. So,
3 this is the mechanism that allows us to modify that. So, there
4 was consultation with OAG several years ago on that.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

6 And I did read that. So, I was just wondering how we
7 got there, but I appreciate the information.

8 So, we're going to go now to the -- let me ask Ms.
9 Schellin, do we have anybody from ANC 5E on?

10 MS. SCHELLIN: I just checked and there was nobody
11 that had signed up, but I will look and see if the designated
12 person is on.

13 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I was trying to see if they wanted
14 to cross-examine anything they've heard.

15 So, anyway, let's move on. Let's go to the Office of
16 Planning. And while Mr. Cochran is coming up, I do want to say
17 there's a lot -- I appreciate Mr. Cochran's report because
18 there was a lot of input from DPR, the Department of Parks and
19 Recreation; the Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs;
20 the Department of (audio interference) Environment; and the
21 Department of (audio interference) Development.

22 So, those, from what I -- of those entities, met and
23 commented on it, so I will skip past that after Mr. Cochran
24 does his report (audio interference) acknowledge those
25 governmental entities.

1 So, Mr. Cochran, I'm going to turn it over to you.

2 MS. SCHELLIN: Before you do, I just checked, and
3 Patricia Williams is not listed as one of the attendees on
4 right now.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Schellin.

6 MR. COCHRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and I apologize
7 for the background in this. My name is Stephen Cochran. I'm
8 representing the Office of Planning in this case, and it's
9 difficult to change a background on a Webex site if you don't
10 have your own Webex account.

11 So, OP does recommend that the Commission approve
12 application 66-68A. This would modify an existing PUD by
13 permitting the construction of a new building, providing 151
14 units of independent-living apartments for seniors earning, no
15 more than, at this point, 60 percent of the MFI, as well as
16 associated offerings, including an adult day treatment
17 facility.

18 The project would not be inconsistent with the
19 comprehensive plan and the final proposal addresses the
20 concerns raised by the Commission, OP, DDOT, and other District
21 agencies, and the ANC. Most notable among those post-set down
22 changes, the Applicant has set aside, as you know, 25 percent
23 of the units for IZ after the initial financing period expires.
24 They've added a community balcony on each floor.

25 While they're not providing washers and dryers in

1 each unit, they've redesigned each floor's communal lounge and
2 laundry area to provide for more separation between those two
3 functions. They've modified the design to enable provision of
4 a resident's designing terrace, while still providing for an
5 internal loading area. Also, that would serve for storage and
6 trash, and that area would be accessed from a dedicated lie-by
7 -- a lay-by, excuse me -- on their own adjacent private street.

8 They've more than doubled the proposed square footage
9 of solar panels. They've agreed to provide and stripe
10 pedestrian crossings in a well-marked path for pedestrian
11 access to the Rhode Island Avenue Metro station, which is, as
12 you've noted, would be dependent upon similar work, also, on
13 the MRP property. And, finally, they've modified the design of
14 the building's western entrance to soften its appearance from
15 the PUD entry off of 4th Street NE.

16 The project has been recommended for approval by ANC
17 5E and the record doesn't contain any filings in opposition to
18 the application.

19 OP's report addresses these and other aspects of the
20 project in more detail, of course.

21 So, that concludes our testimony for today, but we
22 would, of course, be happy to answer any questions.

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, again, Mr. Cochran.

24 Let's see if we have any questions of the OP.

25 Commissioner May?

1 (No verbal response)

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Commissioner Shapiro?

3 (No verbal response)

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Commissioner Turnbull?

5 (No verbal response)

6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And Vice-Chair Miller?

7 COMMISSIONER MILLER: No questions, thank you.

8 Thank you for your report.

9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Cochran.

10 Again, we don't have anyone from ANC 5E.

11 Let's see if the Applicant had -- do you have any
12 questions for the Office of Planning?

13 MR. KADLECEK: No questions, thank you.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you very much, Mr.
15 Cochran. We appreciate your report.

16 Now, do we have -- who do we have from DDOT, Ms.
17 Schellin? Do we have anybody? I could look.

18 MS. VACCA: Hi, this is Kim Vacca with DDOT.

19 How are you?

20 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Oh, okay. Ms. Vacca, go right
21 ahead.

22 How are you?

23 MS. VACCA: Great. Thank you, Chairman Hood, and
24 Commissioners.

25 For the record, my name is Kimberly Vacca with the

1 District Department of Transportation.

2 DDOT is supportive of the proposed modification of
3 significance to an existing PUD project, to construct an
4 approximately 150,000 square foot senior living facility. The
5 proposed development is projected to generate less than 25
6 vehicle trips in a peak direction during the weekday evening
7 peak hours and is expected to have a minimal impact on the
8 District's transportation network.

9 DDOT supports the construction of additional
10 residential units, overlying primarily on the existing
11 oversupply of on-site parking.

12 Additionally, DDOT supports the reduced number of
13 long-term bicycle parking spaces and the removal of the loading
14 berth and platform in order to preserve the outdoor terrace,
15 that would be lost due to the height clearance of an internal
16 loading (audio interference).

17 The Applicant has agreed to a loading-management plan
18 and a transportation-demand management plan to address the lack
19 of loading berth and long-term bicycle parking reduction.

20 DDOT supports the proposed modification of
21 significance with the approval of the loading-management plan
22 and TDM plans and two additional conditions, which are that the
23 Applicant must ensure that all sidewalks are ADA accessible and
24 (audio interference) four-feet wide, and, two, that if not
25 completed by others, the Applicant will stripe a high-

1 | visibility crosswalk and install curb ramps on the property,
2 | connecting the sidewalk adjacent to the proposed building to
3 | the new, western-most staircase to the Bryant Street project,
4 | no later than one year after the staircase is constructed.

5 | Overall, DDOT supports the project and welcomes any
6 | questions. Thank you.

7 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you very much, Ms. Vacca.

8 | Let's see if we have any questions.

9 | Commissioner May?

10 | (No verbal response)

11 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Commissioner Shapiro?

12 | (No verbal response)

13 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Commissioner Turnbull?

14 | (No verbal response)

15 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Vice-Chair Miller?

16 | (No verbal response)

17 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So, Ms. Vacca, you heard me ask
18 | Mr. Solomon a question about all the development on Rhode
19 | Island Avenue, what's going on, on Edgewood, 4th Street, all
20 | the development that's going on down there, and I'm sure that
21 | the District Department of Transportation, I'm sure, in your
22 | analysis, in approval of this project with everything else
23 | that's going on, I'm sure you considered the whole -- you
24 | didn't do, necessarily, a traffic study, but I'm sure you
25 | encompassed everything that's working and everything that's

1 going to be developed there at its end.

2 Would that be a correct assessment?

3 MS. VACCA: Not necessarily, no.

4 So, our typical process for these types of projects
5 is we look at what is being proposed on the site and then we
6 assess whether the number of trips, based on the proposed use
7 and density, will generate more than 25 vehicle trips.

8 If that is the case, then we look at a much larger
9 transportation analysis, but because this proposed project had
10 less than 25 vehicle trips, they were not required to do a
11 larger, comprehensive transportation study.

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So, apparently, there's some data
13 that you look for and if it does not exceed that data -- if it
14 does exceed that data, you take it to the next step, and if it
15 doesn't, you -- I guess the transportation handbook that I've
16 been hearing about for years, doesn't require you to take it to
17 the next step.

18 Is that a fair assessment?

19 MS. VACCA: That is fair, correct.

20 So, we looked at the senior housing and the adult-
21 daycare uses and the type of modes, the mode percentages that
22 the users would use, and then we looked at the size of the
23 project, including the number of units and the density, to
24 determine how many projected trips that those uses and those
25 densities would generate.

1 And because the number of trips is very low, we did
2 not feel that a larger, more comprehensive study was required.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Vacca.

4 I will yield to the award-winning District Department
5 of Transportation, because I don't have any formal training in
6 traffic or in transportation and stuff, but I just know that
7 when I'm sitting there, I always think about all the experts
8 that come down and tell me how great everything is.

9 And I'm not picking on you, Ms. Vacca, but that's
10 just how it's always been.

11 So, thank you very much.

12 Let's see if we have -- Mr. Kadlecek, do you have any
13 questions for Ms. Vacca?

14 MR. KADLECEK: No questions.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So, thank you very much, Ms.
16 Vacca. We appreciate your testimony -- I mean your
17 presentation.

18 All right. The report of the ANC, that's exhibit --
19 Ms. Schellin, we don't have anyone from ANC, do we?

20 (No verbal response)

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So, I will read the ANC report,
22 and it's Exhibit 30.

23 MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir, we still don't.

24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. A notice from Bradley
25 Thomas, Exhibit 30, Commissioners, and let me just read maybe

1 the last paragraph. Well, actually, it's on the form, and I
2 think someone alluded to it, but the vote was nine zero to zero
3 and I guess the vote was taken on 11/05/2020.

4 And let me see, and after several Zoom meetings,
5 door-to-door placement flyers, concerns were -- and I think Ms.
6 Birenbach mentioned this earlier about the concern about the
7 parking, as well as the residents of Edgewood Commons. The IZ
8 report, the request of the minimal of 80 percent was not
9 acceptable.

10 5E02, the single-family District, agreed upon 25
11 percent of (audio interference) affordability.

12 ANC -- let me see -- ANC 5E recorded a vote on the
13 motion to adopt Report 900. I believe that's -- and someone
14 can help me with this -- I believe that is a prove-up -- yeah.

15 A number of members to constitute a quorum.

16 Mr. Kadlecek, did the ANC approve -- is all this
17 approval? Did they approve this project?

18 MR. KADLECEK: Yes, they did.

19 And, actually, they vote -- the ANC meeting that they
20 voted was actually October 20th. I think they wrote the letter
21 on the 5th of November, but the meeting where they voted was
22 October 20th.

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I was just -- I usually
24 look for buzz words and I don't exactly see it, but --

25 MR. KADLECEK: Yeah, I'm not sure exactly why it's

1 written the way it is, but they voted to support the
2 application on the October 20th meeting.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. And I'm sure that if Mr.
4 Thomas and others had a problem, I'm sure we would have known.
5 So, we will take that as a support letter.

6 So, next, Ms. Schellin, I don't think we have anybody
7 to testify in support or opposition or undeclared.

8 MS. SCHELLIN: That is correct.

9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So, I'm calling for it again.

10 We don't have anyone -- let the record reflect no one
11 has even signed in or attempted to call the number to testify
12 either in support, opposition, or undeclared, and we take that
13 as the Applicant that has done his due diligence with the
14 community, because it looks like we have nothing but support in
15 moving forward and all of the issues have been resolved from
16 the record. That's what the record represents, I think, to the
17 Commission.

18 Okay. So, Mr. Kadlecek, do you have any closing or a
19 rebuttal -- I mean, a rebuttal or closing? I don't think you
20 have any rebuttal -- well, you may have some. Go right ahead.

21 MR. KADLECEK: No, we don't. Thank you. We do not
22 have any rebuttal.

23 The only thing I will say in closing is we understand
24 that the Commission is looking for the team to look at the
25 exterior plan a little bit, so that is something that we will

1 | prepare.

2 | And so, then, I think I'd look to Ms. Schellin in
3 | terms of scheduling. I will say that being an affordable
4 | project, ideally, the team would like to get before the
5 | Commission in their November public meeting if that is at all
6 | possible, but I don't know how late we can submit something to
7 | get on that meeting.

8 | MS. SCHELLIN: I don't think you can, because the ANC
9 | has a week to respond and the meeting is next Thursday.

10 | MR. KADLECEK: Okay.

11 | MS. SCHELLIN: So, our meeting after that is December
12 | 17th. So, it's not really that far away.

13 | MR. KADLECEK: Okay. That's fine.

14 | So, we'll aim for the 17th, but then I guess we need
15 | to work backwards --

16 | MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.

17 | MR. KADLECEK: -- with the schedule.

18 | MS. SCHELLIN: So, how much time do you think you
19 | guys need to provide everything that the Commission asked for?

20 | MR. KADLECEK: I'll ask --

21 | MS. SCHELLIN: Do you think --

22 | MR. KADLECEK: Sorry. Go ahead, Ms. Schellin.

23 | MS. SCHELLIN: Could you do that by December 3rd?

24 | MR. KADLECEK: Yes. Scott, will you be able to make
25 | any revisions by December 3rd?

1 I think that should work for us, but I just want to
2 make sure that works for the architect.

3 MR. MATTIES: Yeah, I think that's reasonable. Thank
4 you.

5 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay.

6 MR. KADLECEK: Okay. Thank you. Yes, thanks.

7 MS. SCHELLIN: So, submissions from the Applicant by
8 December 3rd, 3:00 p.m.

9 And then if the ANC chooses to respond, they would
10 have until 3:00 p.m. on December 10th.

11 And if -- I don't know whether OP and DDOT want to
12 respond, but if they choose to, they would also have until
13 December 10th, 3:00 p.m. to provide a response.

14 And if we could have a draft order, also, on the 3rd,
15 that would give OAG two weeks prior to the meeting to review
16 it.

17 MR. KADLECEK: That works for us. Thank you.

18 MS. SCHELLIN: You can just leave the ANC response
19 area blank if you need to or whatever, okay.

20 MR. KADLECEK: Okay.

21 MS. SCHELLIN: And then we'll put that on for 12/17
22 at 4:00 p.m., and that's it.

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Are we all on the same
24 page?

25 Do we have anything else, Ms. Schellin?

1 MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir.

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: We are all on the same page.

3 Commissioners, any other comments or questions?

4 (No verbal response)

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Before we close, the Zoning

6 Commission will be meeting again Thursday, November 12th, Case

7 Number 20-14, the VNO south capital, LLC, and three lots in

8 Square 649, LLC, design review. That's Square 649. That's

9 this-coming Thursday at 4:00 p.m.

10 Anything else, Ms. Schellin?

11 MS. SCHELLIN: That's it.

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I know I've been thinking

13 about it, but I wanted to make sure I cover everything.

14 So, with that, I want to thank everyone for their

15 participation in this hearing tonight and this hearing is

16 adjourned.

17 MS. SCHELLIN: Bye.

18 MR. KADLECEK: Thank you.

19 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the

20 record at 5:46 p.m.)

21

22

23

24

25

C E R T I F I C A T E

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Public Hearing

Before: DCBZA

Date: 11-09-20

Place: Teleconference

was duly recorded and accurately transcribed under my
direction; further, that said transcript is a true and accurate
record of the proceedings.

HUNT REPORTING COMPANY
Court Reporting and Litigation Support
Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia
410-766-HUNT (4868)
1-800-950-DEPO (3376)