

GOVERNMENT OF  
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

```

- - - - - :
IN THE MATTER OF:           :
                               : Case No.
Application of Enterprise    : 66-68A
Community Development, Inc. :
                               :
- - - - - :

```

MONDAY

NOVEMBER 9, 2020

+ + + + +

The 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, Chairperson
- 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

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

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

OPENING STATEMENT  
 Anthony Hood . . . . . 4

PRESENTATIONS:  
 Cary Kadlecek with Goulston & Storrs . . . . . 10  
 Case No. 66-68A, Application of Enterprise Community  
 Development, Inc.  
  
 Stacie Birenbach, Senior Director of Real Estate,  
 Enterprise Community Development. . . . . 12  
  
 Scott Matties - Architect . . . . . 15

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS:  
 Commissioners: . . . . . 30

CLOSING REMARKS: . . . . . 72  
 Cary Kadlecek

ADJOURN:  
 Anthony Hood . . . . . 74

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

(9:41 a.m.)

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: This hearing will please come to order.

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

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

Tonight's hearing is Zoning Commission Case Number 66-68A; it's the Enterprise Community Development, Inc., modification of significance for a large-scale plan development for Edgewood Commons at Square 3630, Lots 2, 5, 803, 805, 807, 810 through 813.

Today's date is November 9th, 2020.

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

All persons planning to testify must sign up in advance and will be called by name at the appropriate time. At the time of sign-up, all participants will complete the oath or affirmation required by Subtitle Z 408.7.

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

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

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

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

21           Again, the Office of Zoning number, hotline number is  
22 202-727-5471, for any concerns during this proceeding.

23           At this time, the Commission will consider any  
24 preliminary matters. Does the staff have any preliminary matters?

25           MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir.

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

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

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

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

11           (No verbal response)

12           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I don't see anyone with any  
13 objections. So, no objections will be had by general consensus.

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

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

19           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Any objections, Commissioners, to the  
20 motion?

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

23           (No verbal response)

24           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: No objections. So, that will be  
25 general consensus, as well.

1 Do we have anything else, Ms. Schellin?

2 MS. SCHELLIN: Proffered expert witnesses.

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

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

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

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

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: 23(b). An expert in transportation.  
9 Do we need time or are we good?

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

13 I would note that his experience, I think six years with  
14 Gorove Slade and eight years total, is a little less than I would  
15 normally expect. I mean, I don't know whether -- what the  
16 recollection is of the other commissioners, but for some reason,  
17 I'm thinking that we would, you know, we would, you know, in cases  
18 where it's not an absolute -- well, I don't know. I just, I have  
19 this recollection that 10 years might have been a threshold for  
20 us, but I could be wrong about that. Anybody else have an  
21 opinion?

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

1 MS. SCHELLIN: I do not.

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

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

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

8 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yeah.

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

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

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So, I would -- I'm getting an echo.  
16 I guess we need to make sure we're on mute. But I can just say,  
17 you know how I am about traffic, so, you know, I see that he has  
18 eight years' experience, total, but six years with Gorove Slade,  
19 so I guess it's over five.

20 So, I guess it's just how we rationalize it, because  
21 when I hear from traffic experts and I'm in traffic, I think about  
22 them constantly. So, I don't have any problems with giving him  
23 expert status. I hope he will (audio interference) Gorove Slade  
24 and other engineers have done and continue to improve his game on  
25 transportation, so I don't have issue with that, and I don't think

1 -- so, general consensus.

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

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

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

8 So, we will -- Ms. Schellin, we will put him as an  
9 expert in traffic and wish him well as he continues his journey in  
10 life.

11 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: You even give Mr. VanPelt a hard  
12 time, Mr. Chairman.

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

15 I think, then, there's only one other proffered expert  
16 and that's Scott -- I'm not sure if it's Matties or Matties --  
17 with -- he's the expert in architecture. He's been before the  
18 BZA, but not the Commission, so ...

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Well, I think --

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

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

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

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

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

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

9 MR. KADLECEK: Good afternoon. For the record, Cary  
10 Kadlecek from Goulston & Storrs, land-use attorney for the  
11 Applicant.

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

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Well, let's go with what  
16 you've prepared. I think 30 minutes is fine, unless I see any  
17 objections from any of my colleagues.

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

20 MR. KADLECEK: Great. Thank you, again, Mr. Chairman  
21 and Members of the Commission.

22 Again, Cary Kadlecek with Goulston & Storrs. We're here  
23 today to present to you the application for a modification to the  
24 large-scale plan development, which the precursor entitlement to a  
25 PUD in 1966 for the Edgewood Commons campus, a proposed 151-unit,

1 all-affordable, age-restricted apartment building with an adult  
2 daycare center, will be an important addition to the campus that  
3 will allow many of Edgewood Commons' existing senior residents to  
4 age in place. The building, as is proposed, is commonly known to  
5 us as Edgewood 5.

6 In addition to the requested modification to allow the  
7 building on the campus, the Applicant requests flexibility from  
8 the long-term bicycle-parking requirements to reduce the number of  
9 spaces and from the limitation on the number of participants in  
10 the adult daycare facility to allow up to 60 participants.

11 Because of the recent changes to the plans in response  
12 to DDOT and OP's requests, the Applicant also requests flexibility  
13 from several provisions of the loading regulations to allow a  
14 loading zone on a private drive adjacent to the building. And  
15 those will be discussed a little bit further when we get into the  
16 specifications of the project.

17 Following extensive engagement with District agencies  
18 and the community, we are pleased to have the support of DDOT, OP,  
19 and ANC 5E, as reflected in all of the reports filed on the  
20 record. As described in the application materials, and will be  
21 further described in this presentation, the proposed building will  
22 offer superior benefits and amenities and will not be inconsistent  
23 with the comprehensive plan.

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

1 MS. BIRENBACH: Thank you, Cary.

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

3 Great. Good afternoon, Commissioners. My name is  
4 Stacie Birenbach. I'm a senior director of real estate at  
5 Enterprise Community Development. I've been a Ward 5 resident for  
6 15 years.

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

11 Enterprise is the successor organization to the  
12 Community Preservation and Development Corporation, which  
13 redeveloped and has owned Edgewood Commons since the late 1990s,  
14 early 2000s.

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

18 The community is well-served by transit, healthcare,  
19 shopping, and houses of worship. Multiple programs designed to  
20 increase the quality of life for the community operate from former  
21 retail spaces on the campus. Programs are interim-use engagement,  
22 food distribution, literacy and job training, health and wellness  
23 checkups, and daycare.

24 Many of our households have members who have lived at  
25 Edgewood Commons for multiple generation. We have at least 200

1 senior households living in our non, age-restricted apartments,  
2 demonstrating the need and desire for these seniors to age in  
3 communities.

4           Our proposed project consists of 151 affordable housing  
5 apartments and amenities that are designed to meet the social,  
6 health, and accessibility needs of seniors. In addition to the  
7 large cafe and program spaces on the first floor, each residential  
8 floor is designed with communal space to facilitate social  
9 connections among residents of each floor. The property will also  
10 include 7,000 square feet of adult daycare space that will have  
11 the capacity to serve about 60 participants per day. The daycare  
12 will provide meals, individualized therapy, and daily programming,  
13 such as art and fitness, to older adults living with chronic  
14 conditions. We anticipate that enrollment will pull from the  
15 Edgewood campus and the surrounding communities.

16           Next slide, please.

17           We've included exterior amenities as part of the  
18 building and site design. Additionally, the building is well-  
19 connected to the rest of the campus. In recent years, Enterprise  
20 invested over \$2 million to create campus-wide site amenities,  
21 including a new playground, interactive water features, a  
22 community garden, and an acceptable walking and fitness trail.

23           Now, you can forward to the next slide. Okay. Thank  
24 you.

25           Residents at the new building will be seniors age 60 and

1 above. All residents will have incomes at or below 60 percent of  
2 the area median income, although, as part of our financing, we  
3 anticipate serving lower-income households at 50 percent or below  
4 AMI.

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

9 We are offering 52 Inclusionary Zoning units that will  
10 remain affordable after any financing covenant expires. That  
11 equates to 25 percent of the residential gross-floor area, and  
12 there's an exhibit that shows the location of those IZ units.  
13 That said, as a mission-driven, affordable-housing developer, we  
14 anticipate extending our original financing covenants in order to  
15 meet and obtain the long-term affordability of the entire project;  
16 in addition, these affordable units will not impact the current or  
17 future affordability of any of the other affordable homes at  
18 Edgewood Commons.

19 We've worked extensively with the ANC, SMD, and the SMD  
20 5E02, Patricia Williams. We've been meeting with Patricia  
21 Williams prior to our initial application filing and since then.  
22 We've heard some neighborhood concerns, which include impacts to  
23 parking and long-term affordability.

24 As a result of these community concerns, we completed a  
25 parking-utilization study that demonstrates our ability to absorb

1 | the parking demands of the new building into our existing parking.  
2 | We also increased the percentage of the floor area covered by  
3 | Inclusionary Zoning in our commission.

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

6 |           Thank you for the opportunity to testify today, and next  
7 | up we have Scott Matties.

8 |           MR. MATTIES: Good afternoon, everyone.

9 |           Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, thanks for your  
10 | time today.

11 |           I'm going to walk you through the architecture of the  
12 | project.

13 |           If you could advance the slide, please.

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

17 |           We have a number of slides in this that are really in  
18 | for reference. So, to the extent there are questions, we can  
19 | always circle back.

20 |           But here's the site, you know, here are the aerials from  
21 | sort of the four cardinal directions. Our site is kind of the  
22 | green patch that you see in each of these on the lower right, most  
23 | prominently viewed from the south. You can get a sense of the  
24 | scale of the buildings on campus. There are some low-scale, 33-  
25 | and-a-half story buildings fronting on Edgewood Street and then

1 sort of to the rear of the site, closer to the adjacent shopping  
2 center, there are more high-rise.

3 Next slide, please.

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

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

13 Go to the next slide, please.

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

23 Next slide, please.

24 So, at the ground level, we have, you know, a few things  
25 going on here I just want to highlight. We'll see these, you

1 know, three dimensionally, as well, as we track through. But  
2 there is an existing driveway that comes in off of 4th Street on  
3 the left of the slide. Existing surface parking, you see, is sort  
4 of toward the bottom of the image. We're creating a new drop-off  
5 at our front door, which is sort of central in the plan there.

6 The topography -- there are two things that are  
7 important to determine that's on the site topography. One, this  
8 is sort of at the low point of the overall property and there's  
9 about a story of fall from the back or the top; the top on the  
10 slide to where our front door is on the south side, there's about  
11 a story of fall. So, we're (audio interference) on the first  
12 floor on the low side, so to speak.

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

23 There is an entry on the second floor. You can kind of  
24 see on the right edge where it says it's existing adjacent park,  
25 there is a fitness amenity that's intended for use by the overall

1 campus and there's a second-floor entry adjacent to that existing  
2 point, which serves that.

3           And so, the other thing that I just want to highlight  
4 here is, you know, the shape of the building kind of has a bend to  
5 it and that is intentional for a couple of reasons, which you'll  
6 see three-dimensionally and hopefully it'll make a little bit more  
7 sense, but in plan, today there does not exist a direct accessible  
8 route from Edgewood Street to this big playground directly  
9 adjacent to the right. So, there's a stairway configured  
10 differently than shown here, but that exists today. So, part of  
11 this kind of loopy pathway that we create is a new handicapped-  
12 accessible route from the eastern edge of the site to this primary  
13 playground. And, in part, this bend is to give that pathway a  
14 little bit more space to make it work.

15           Next slide, please.

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

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

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

4           All right. Next slide, please.

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

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

15           So, our proposed building is, as I mentioned earlier, of  
16 the sort of high-rise family of buildings on campus. We have a  
17 couple of relatively straightforward architectural, urban-design  
18 weldments going on. We've got, you know, we're highlighting the  
19 corners; the eastern end and the western end. This is showing the  
20 western end with the architectural focal points in the materials  
21 and the detailing that give a view from, in this particular view,  
22 from the neighborhood, from 4th Street into the campus.

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

24           This is in the middle of the plan, and we're going to  
25 focus on this a little bit more in a couple slides, but you can

1 see in the middle of the plan there, there's a little two-story  
2 piece at the drop-off and a very, you know, a primary bay that  
3 comes up from the middle of the plan; that's the entry sequence.  
4 That bay in the middle of the plan is an amenities space on each  
5 floor, which we'll talk about in a little bit.

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

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

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

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

20 Next slide, please.

21 Next slide, please.

22 So, as we track around on the exterior, this is the view  
23 from Edgewood Street, there are some sort of natural screening  
24 elements here. There's the existing buildings. And, you know,  
25 the campuses, as they exist today, is pretty green. I mean, you

1 know, there's a lot of vegetation that helps, kind of help break  
2 down the scale of our proposed building from the neighborhood.

3 Next, please.

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

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

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

25 And you'll notice the mass in here, the two-story mass,

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

5 Next, please.

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

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

17 Next, please.

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

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

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

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

5 Next, please.

6 Next, please.

7 Next, please.

8 Next.

9 Next.

10 Next.

11 Next, please.

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

19 Next, please.

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

22 Next, please.

23 And then lastly, I just want to focus or call attention  
24 to this lounge in the middle of the plan. You'll see the laundry  
25 is directly adjacent. We had a lot of conversation with the

1 Office of Planning staff about laundry and how it should be  
2 incorporated.

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

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

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

21           Also, we have -- are planning on or committing to do  
22 Enterprise Green Communities 2020 program, which is newly adopted,  
23 and which is, generally, I think it said in the stock report,  
24 generally equivalent to (audio interference). If that's correct,  
25 it doesn't have the tiering system like the other programs do, but

1 one thing that's new in that program is that Energy Star  
2 compliance is mandatory and that's a pretty big deal in terms of  
3 testing during construction and conformance, the confirmation of  
4 system-conforming during construction.

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

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

10 We've been working with Enterprise Community  
11 Development, the project team, and DDOT related to the  
12 transportation aspects of the Edgewood Commons project and I'm  
13 going to touch on the highlights of our view and coordination with  
14 DDOT.

15 As shown here, the project we are discussing tonight is  
16 situated in the Edgewood Commons campus, just north of the Rhode  
17 Island Avenue, near Edgewood Street and 4th Street NE. It's  
18 located near the Rhode Island Avenue, Brentwood Metro station,  
19 less than a half-mile walk to the southeast; additionally, there  
20 are several Metro bus lines and a Metro XTRA route in the vicinity  
21 of the site, with stops adjacent to the site on 4th Street and  
22 Edgewood Street.

23 There are east-west bike lanes on Franklin Street to the  
24 east and north-south bicycle lanes on 4th Street, adjacent to the  
25 site. The Metropolitan Branch Trail is also nearby and there's a

1 Capital Bikeshare station near the site at 3rd and Evarts Street.

2 Next, please.

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

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

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

15 Anticipated bicycle circulation is shown in green.  
16 Pedestrian circulation is shown in blue. Bicycle access is  
17 primarily envisioned to take place via the private drive  
18 connecting the long- and short-term bicycle parking spaces to the  
19 4th Street bicycle lanes.

20 Pedestrian access to the main entrance will primarily  
21 take place via the private drive, with secondary entrances  
22 accessible by existing connections through the Edgewood Commons  
23 campus.

24 Next, please.

25 We coordinated with DDOT and OP and have agreed to

1 provide pedestrian striping along various walking routes,  
2 connecting the site with the Rhode Island Avenue-Brentwood Metro  
3 station.

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

9 Next, please.

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

17 The project will include 28 long-term and 10 short-term  
18 bicycle parking spaces. This is fewer than the 53 long-term  
19 spaces required by Zoning. The Applicant is requesting zoning  
20 relief from the long-term bicycle parking requirements, as the  
21 dwelling units in this project will serve an elderly population  
22 who are less likely to use bicycles for transportation; however,  
23 the project exceeds the nine short-term spaces required by Zoning.  
24 DDOT has no objection to the required long-term bike-parking  
25 relief.

1           Next, please.

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

6           Following extensive coordination with DDOT and the  
7 Office of Planning, the loading berth was relocated to a curbside  
8 loading zone in order to provide an outdoor dining terrace. The  
9 loading facilities are circled in red in the figure.

10          To help facilitate truck movements and manage and  
11 minimize conflicts with vehicles and pedestrian along the private  
12 drive, a loading-management plan is being proposed. The loading-  
13 management plan includes many of the typical elements for projects  
14 in the District, but as agreed to with DDOT, it includes  
15 additional, limited delivery hours for trash and recycling, as  
16 well as deliveries and moving activities. DDOT has concurred with  
17 the proposed loading-management plan and has no objection to the  
18 project's loading scheme.

19          Next, please.

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

25          Next, please.

1           For this project, we performed a comprehensive  
2 transportation review, which was scoped with DDOT. Our study  
3 concluded that the development of the site will enhance the  
4 surrounding area and non-automobility through the reconstruction  
5 of sidewalks and landscaping and the addition of non-auto  
6 amenities.

7           We have coordinated extensively with DDOT during their  
8 review. We're pleased to have their support in the form of a no-  
9 objection staff report. DDOT's report did have some conditions,  
10 which we believe we have worked through with them. I'll just go  
11 over them quickly.

12           As mentioned previously, DDOT requested that loading  
13 facilities be relocated to a curbside loading zone, which the  
14 Applicant has agreed to. The Applicant agreed to the provision of  
15 a loading-management plan and also agreed to improve pedestrian  
16 accommodations along the private drive.

17           As for the rest of DDOT's conditions, the Applicant will  
18 maintain four-foot sidewalk width from 4th Street to the project  
19 site and the Applicant has agreed to stripe a high-visibility  
20 crosswalk and install curb ramps on their property, connecting the  
21 sidewalk adjacent to the proposed building to the new western-most  
22 staircase to the Bryant Street project, no later than one year  
23 after the staircase is constructed, if not constructed by others.

24           At this time, we believe we have addressed all DDOT  
25 concerns. That concludes my testimony and I'll be available for

1 any questions. Thank you.

2 MR. KADLECEK: Thank you, Commissioners. That concludes  
3 our presentation, and we are now available for questions.

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you very much for your  
5 presentation.

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

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

15 And I do appreciate the fact that the design of the  
16 building has improved somewhat, but I still have some concerns  
17 with the design of the building and I'm hoping you might be able  
18 to bring up some of the renderings, in fact, I can probably tell  
19 you which one.

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

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

2 MR. MATTIES: Yeah, I'll take that. This is Scott  
3 Matties.

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

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

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

10 COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. All right. So, I guess I can  
11 accept that.

12 Can you tell me what the design logic is with, you know,  
13 the sort of three-story bay projections that are hopping up and  
14 down along the side of the building, I mean, why isn't it just two  
15 or three sets of full bays all the way to the bottom? Or why  
16 isn't it -- you know, why aren't they all at the top? Why aren't  
17 they just doubles at the top?

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

21 MR. MATTIES: Yeah, I think that really is the  
22 rationale; it's just to try and create some visual interest. You  
23 know, the overall (audio interference) is to have, you know, an  
24 architectural event at the east end and the west end and then  
25 something in the middle at the entry and then both, on the south

1 facade that we're seeing and also on the north. It's really kind  
2 of, you know, connecting tissue that's really somewhat background  
3 building, for lack of a better term.

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

7 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah.

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

11 COMMISSIONER MAY: Uh-huh. Okay.

12 And then you also have this circumstance where you have,  
13 you know, just take the end -- within that middle section of  
14 building, toward the left of the image that we have right now,  
15 there are three bays -- sorry -- three floors of windows that have  
16 the cementitious panel and then you -- and then the next bay of  
17 windows is, you know, brick most of the way and then you've got a  
18 cluster of four, spanning two bays.

19 MR. MATTIES: Yep.

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

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

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

13           I also think that you can benefit from having some of  
14 the colors be a little bit darker, and maybe it's just a rendering  
15 thing, but I think right now you have too many of these, you know,  
16 sort of pale colors. And, you know, the orange brick and the  
17 brown brick, I don't think, are really working super-well  
18 together. So, I just, I feel like some more refinement. I mean,  
19 I can go into a lot more about it.

20           I also don't really understand why you even have the,  
21 that sort of lower band of the cementitious panels, because it --  
22 I mean it -- I kind of want to have the brick all be continuous  
23 and then have, you know, take that whole thing and shift it down  
24 and then maybe that gives you a better opportunity to have, you  
25 know, bay projections toward the top or bay projections in the

1 middle in some consistent way. I just feel like it's, again, it's  
2 just a little bit incoherent.

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

9 As to the rest of it, you know, I appreciate the  
10 Applicant, you know, agreeing to the commitment to 25 percent IZ  
11 units after the initial affordability period is over and I  
12 appreciate the resolution of a loading situation, understanding  
13 that relief is needed. It's too bad that something couldn't be  
14 worked out so that you could actually get the loading into the  
15 building and still maintain the terrace. There's probably a way  
16 to do that, but it involves more grade manipulation and probably  
17 greater cost, so I'll accept this.

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

20 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Commissioner May.

21 Commissioner Shapiro?

22 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

23 A few comments and questions. First of all, I  
24 appreciate the advanced sustainability, the green roof, and  
25 especially the coincident solar panels with the green roof. And I

1 | also appreciate the 25 percent IZ in perpetuity. Nice negotiation  
2 | with the ANC and I appreciate that commitment.

3 |           So, I would join Commissioner May. I had the same  
4 | reaction around the fiber cement panels at both, the color and the  
5 | disjointedness of it. I felt pretty strongly about that. It  
6 | didn't -- I couldn't make sense of it and, you know, money is a  
7 | real issue, and this is a nice project, and so there's a part of  
8 | me that just feels like, I'm not even sure that I care so much  
9 | about the percentage of each, but just to have some kind of  
10 | coherence to it would help for me. So, I really join with him on  
11 | that.

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

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

15 |           Which one is it?

16 |           You know, I'm not going to worry about this much because  
17 | I'm looking at it. It's the west elevation, not the east  
18 | elevation that I had more concerns with, but there's a lot going  
19 | on with this, I think, in part, because of how it functions. So,  
20 | don't worry about that. Don't even find that slide.

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

25 |           Can you all help me with this? Mr. Matties?

1 MR. MATTIES: Yeah. The green wall is at the west end  
2 of the building.

3 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: I see it on the east elevation,  
4 right?

5 MR. MATTIES: Yeah.

6 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: The east side of campus.

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

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

11 MR. MATTIES: It --

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

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

14 It does and its primary function is that, you know, the  
15 space inside of that is all either mechanical or utility kind of  
16 spaces, so there really is an opportunity to fenestrate that to  
17 improve the facade. So, instead of having just a simple blank  
18 wall, we're introducing a green screen to clad that. It would be  
19 clad in brick, but it would have a green screen applied on top of  
20 that to soften that because we really don't have the program  
21 inside, on the inside of that spot that, you know, you really want  
22 to fenestrate.

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

1 MR. MATTIES: Yes. Yes.

2 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Good. Good.

3 I wonder if this could be an opportunity, instead this,  
4 if this could be an opportunity for some kind of an art wall.  
5 There isn't -- or some other kind of art feature, because I don't  
6 see anything else like that anywhere around this building.

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

11 MR. MATTIES: There is. I mean, it is -- one of the  
12 pedestrian entrances to the campus off of 4th Street comes along  
13 that edge. So, from that perspective, yes, we would expect a fair  
14 amount of pedestrian traffic going by there.

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

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

23 What else do I have?

24 Oh, the pedestrian access through the neighboring  
25 property, this might be for the Applicant or Mr. Kadlecek, but

1 | there's a letter that you refer to, an agreement with Bryant.

2 |           MR. KADLECEK: Yeah. We've been coordinating with them.  
3 |     The Applicants coordinate pretty extensively with the developer  
4 | of that project to the south.

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

12 |           COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: And remind me, again, what the  
13 | timing is on that.

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

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

21 |           MS. BIRENBACH: Hello?

22 |           COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: So, then, I'm trying to get a  
23 | handle on what --

24 |           MS. BIRENBACH: Hi, this is Stacie.

25 |           I know we've actually been in touch with MRP this past

1 week and they are about to start pre-construction on the  
2 pedestrian access that is closest to the Metro station. So, that  
3 is not under construction today, but it will be at the end of the  
4 month.

5 And then the side that is closest to this project, where  
6 the driveway will be, the timeline that they provided me was 2022.

7 So, they have to go through their permitting process for sort of  
8 that. That's not under construction, but they're still doing  
9 final design on that part of their project.

10 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Okay. And so, this is -- and  
11 maybe this is more for my -- thank you very much for that -- and  
12 this may be more for my colleagues than me, but it's unclear to me  
13 if we're -- if we were to approve something like this that has  
14 something that's on the neighbor's property and there's not even  
15 an agreement in place, then what are we actually approving?

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

18 MS. BIRENBACH: Uh-huh.

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

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

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

1 MS. BIRENBACH: It's signed.

2 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Okay.

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

4 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: And do we have that?

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

7 MR. KADLECEK: It has not.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Okay.

2 MR. KADLECEK: Anything, obviously, that's over the  
3 property line, MRP is responsible for, but there is coordination  
4 going on between the parties about that, of course. Everybody  
5 wants these things to work together and so that's the natural  
6 result.

7 But, you know, once the property line, we are not asking  
8 the Commission to, of course, approve anything that extends beyond  
9 the property line.

10 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: So, you are approving up to your  
11 property line? You're requesting up to your property line or --

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

14 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Gotcha.

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

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

18 Let's go to Commissioner Turnbull.

19 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

20 Thank you for your presentation tonight. I'm glad to  
21 see you've made some changes from what we originally saw on what  
22 is really a very relevant and important project. I greatly  
23 appreciate it.

24 I mean, this is 151 senior units, which I think is very  
25 significant. Very significant. And the 25 percent IZ, I think,

1 is very significant, also, so I greatly appreciate your efforts on  
2 doing that. I think that's really meaningful.

3 But I kind of go along with -- I guess I want to know a  
4 little bit more about the Hardie panels or these cement panels.  
5 It looks like -- it's hard to tell exactly on some of the  
6 elevation on some of the renderings -- but on the elevations, it  
7 looks like a very rectangular grid, like they're like two feet by  
8 four feet?

9 MR. MATTIES: Yeah, they're -- it's probably more like  
10 an 18-inch-high module --

11 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: And --

12 MR. MATTIES: -- and they are rectangular, yes.

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

15 MR. MATTIES: Yes.

16 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: -- or an aluminum reglet?

17 MR. MATTIES: Yes, it would be an aluminum reglet. It  
18 would have kind of a recessed joint.

19 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. I guess one of the things  
20 I'm surprised, Commissioner May -- one of the things you always  
21 worry about is the weatherability on a project and, especially to  
22 the extent of what you have with the cement panels, and I'm just  
23 concerned about the lifespan and the workability of these. I  
24 mean, what's your experience in working with this for -- on  
25 projects like this?

1 I guess I'm concerned, personally, about the appearance  
2 of a building like this with all of these light panels and  
3 staining, weatherability, things just falling apart after a while.

4 MR. MATTIES: I'm sorry, was that a question for us, Mr.  
5 Turnbull?

6 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes, that is a question for you.

7 MR. MATTIES: Yeah. I think, you know, we have used  
8 these panels. You know, they've been on the market for probably  
9 10 years or so. You know, I take the note about the color and  
10 weatherability and potential staining; that's a good point.

11 You know, the panels are, you know, treated in some  
12 respect, to try to minimize stain or to make them more stain-  
13 resistant.

14 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: And are they pre-finished or a  
15 pre-finished panel?

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

18 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.

19 MR. MATTIES: -- and that's still part of our, kind of  
20 our budget flowchart to understand the cost of either approach.

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

1 I'm trying to look at my notes here. The loading area,  
2 the drop-off area, the loading area, how do you -- once you load,  
3 once you get your deliveries, where do they go? How do you get  
4 them in the building?

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

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

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

9 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Site plan 14?

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

14 That's it. Thank you.

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

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

25 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: And that loading area is for

1 | people coming in, that's like for supplies, that's for the  
2 | building use, itself, and that's for all the -- if I'm moving in,  
3 | everybody is coming in and out there, right?

4 | MR. MATTIES: That's correct.

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

7 | MR. MATTIES: Yes.

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

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

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

18 | MR. MATTIES: Correct. Correct. Up to guardrail  
19 | height, so about 42 inches above the terrace level, itself, will  
20 | be solid.

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

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

25 | MR. MATTIES: I think we have room for 28 on the

1 interior.

2 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. I was just curious,  
3 because the OP report has listed 25 and you're looking for -- to  
4 go down to 25, but you're going to provide 28?

5 MR. MATTIES: Yes, sir.

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

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

18 And so, I think I would agree with them that the  
19 consistency, overall, of looking at it is a little bit unsettling.

20 I would agree with him and you may just want to take another look  
21 at that and see if you can have some other approach or try to make  
22 it seem a little more consistent.

23 I don't mind the idea of something projecting but I  
24 think at some point, it should relate to maybe what's going on  
25 inside the building and this just looks like, well, no, we want to

1 | be playful on the outside, which in its own right may be okay, but  
2 | just looking at the one rendering, the exterior rendering on 26,  
3 | page 26, it really does look unsettling.

4 |           If you want, maybe Paul can bring Number 26 up, Sheet  
5 | 26.

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

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

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

1 balance each other out and then blend with each other.

2           So, I would agree with that. I think you've got a  
3 wonderful project here. I think it's got a lot of features that  
4 are very nice, but I just -- I'm a little unsettled by the wall,  
5 also.

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

7           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner  
8 Turnbull.

9           Let's go to Vice-Chair Miller.

10          COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

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

25          Did I hear -- I heard the 25 percent and I saw the 25

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

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

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

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

12 COMMISSIONER MILLER: Right.

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

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

17 That one. Thank you.

18 Next.

19 Yeah. And so, I think the total units is actually 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-two  
24 number I heard, which I didn't compute with the 25 percent. So, I  
25 guess, I don't know why that comes out that way, but I'm glad that

1 | it does, the 62 in perpetuity.

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

8 |           Do you -- but you're not -- that's not being proffered  
9 | as a requirement in this particular application, but do you have a  
10 | number or a percentage on that, the number or percentage that's  
11 | 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 or  
15 | below 60 percent of the AMI. I don't anticipate that changing, so  
16 | we do anticipate that we would have affordability at or below 60  
17 | percent and that we would also have a number of units set aside  
18 | for permanent, supportive housing for homeless individuals. So, I  
19 | do think our finance requirements will require a 100 percent at 60  
20 | percent, unless that changes in the future.

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

24 |           So, Mr. Kadlecek or Ms. Birenbach, do you have an  
25 | objection to this application approving the 60 percent MFI level

1 for 100 percent of the units, since that's what you anticipate?

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

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

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

17 COMMISSIONER MILLER: Okay. Well, if -- when we get to  
18 the point of -- and I say it's going to be a "when," not "if" --  
19 we get to the point of a zoning order, (audio interference) of  
20 this modification of significance, maybe the applicant's attorney  
21 can work with our own counsel to at least make some notation about  
22 the anticipation of more, even more, even a deeper level of  
23 affordability than what's being required by the order. As has  
24 been testified today, predominately, hoping to get financing for  
25 50 percent MFI and for permanent, supportive housing, which I

1 assume would be below 30 percent MFI.

2 Is that correct, Ms. Birenbach?

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

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

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

10 MS. BIRENBACH: Very much so.

11 COMMISSIONER MILLER: Have you had discussions with the  
12 -- I don't know if there's a tenant's organization or community  
13 organization already or yet or are they aware of what's happening  
14 and supportive?

15 MS. BIRENBACH: Yes, they are.

16 COMMISSIONER MILLER: We don't have any documentation  
17 about your interaction with them, with the existing tenant  
18 community.

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

20 MS. BIRENBACH: That's correct.

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

23 COMMISSIONER MILLER: I see.

24 And so, going to the ANC, I appreciate that you did  
25 respond, you were responsive to them and to OP and others about

1 the, on the Inclusionary Zoning and perpetuity set-aside after the  
2 40-year financing for the all-affordable.

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

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

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

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

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

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

20           Thank you all for your presentation and thank you, Mr.  
21 Chairman.

22           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

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

25           I know I am supposed to be asking the Applicant, but I

1 want to tell Commissioner May that fighting for attention, I like  
2 that. I'm probably going to use that. I may not use it for this  
3 hearing, but I just want you to know that when you hear it again,  
4 know I got it from you.

5 (Laughter)

6 COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay.

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

11 MS. BIRENBACH: Can you define what that means -- what  
12 you mean?

13 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Who do you have on your development  
14 team -- I know you went and met with the ANC, but do you have  
15 anybody on your development team that you may have hired or  
16 solicited information from them or put them under contract? Who  
17 on your team is from the community?

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

20 We have, as part of Enterprise Community Development, we  
21 have, as I mentioned, we own and operate the 792 existing units.  
22 We have a property management company that operates the company,  
23 as well as, what we call our "Community Impact Strategies Group."

24 And our Community Impact Strategies Group is the part of  
25 the organization that does resident-services programming, outreach

1 to residents, not necessarily tenant meetings, but they're called  
2 "network meetings," where we get together and discuss what's  
3 happening in the community and involve them, and informing them of  
4 what's happening both, from operational and development  
5 discussions. So, we work hand-in-hand with existing staff at  
6 Enterprise to do outreach to the community.

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

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

10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Excuse me?

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

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

15 MR. KADLECEK: Yeah.

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

18 MS. BIRENBACH: Well, I was a 10-year resident of ANC  
19 5E. I lived in Eckington. Now, I'm in Michigan Park. So, I'm  
20 not -- but I don't -- that's like pretty far away from Edgewood  
21 now.

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

24 (Laughter)

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

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

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

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

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

14 MS. BIRENBACH: Okay. So, we have a partner who is  
15 going to operate the adult daycare. We have a letter agreement  
16 with Iona Senior Services. They are a longstanding senior-service  
17 organization that currently operates a program, an adult daycare  
18 program in Ward 3, and are expanding currently to Congress Heights  
19 in Ward 8.

20 So, they are our partner in this and they are going to  
21 be working hand-in-hand with us to do outreach and recruitment for  
22 program participants on campus, as well as the broader community,  
23 to the extent that we have additional seats to fill. I can't tell  
24 you everything about how their programming works, but they go  
25 through the Office of Aging to sort of go through their statement

1 of need process to become licensed and certified in Ward 5.

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

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

6 The only other question I have on that issue is, that  
7 was fully exhausted with ANC, fully talked about how that was all  
8 going to work and everything with the seniors that are on-site,  
9 and the seniors are going to be solicited and try to bring -- all  
10 of that was discussed, correct?

11 MS. BIRENBACH: Yes.

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you.

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

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

20 I do agree with Commissioner May, especially with the  
21 lighter materials. I think he's asked you to re-look at that and  
22 revisit some of it. Some of the other stuff I agree with, as  
23 well, but I'm always on the lighter materials. Some of the design  
24 I leave up to Mr. Turnbull and Commissioner May, but I do agree  
25 with a lot of their comments, so I'm looking forward to seeing

1 | what comes back.

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

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

7 |           And, you know, we did have access to those design  
8 | materials. We weren't specifically trying to use the same pallet  
9 | or anything of that nature, but I think they're pallet is somewhat  
10 | similar in that I think they do use some fiber cement, maybe a  
11 | little more metal panel, and a fair amount of bricks. And I do  
12 | think that, perhaps, their pallet is a little bit darker than ours  
13 | in terms of color, but we were trying to, particularly with the  
14 | brick, trying to have a color pallet in our brick selections that  
15 | was more in tune with the other buildings on our campus.

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

19 |           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Again, I would echo my colleagues,  
20 | Commissioner May and Commissioner Turnbull and actually all of my  
21 | colleagues and the comments that have already been mentioned. So,  
22 | I -- that response.

23 |           Let me also is ask Mr. Solomon from DDOT. Now, we gave  
24 | you expert status, Mr. Solomon, so I'm looking forward to some  
25 | expert answers.

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

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

5           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Well, welcome.

6           Let me ask, in your traffic analysis, who did you work  
7 along -- did you do this independently or did you work along with  
8 one of your colleagues with the traffic analysis at Gorove Slade?

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

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

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

20           In your analysis, was all that taken -- and Rhode Island  
21 Avenue, you know, they're changing the water systems on Rhode  
22 Island Avenue and hopefully that'll all be complete, but in your  
23 analysis, was all of that taken into consideration, because most  
24 of the time, the traffic manual only deals with that specific  
25 site.

1           What did you do in your analysis?

2           MR. SOLOMON:    So, thank you for the question.  I  
3 apologize, my wife is still working.

4           CHAIRPERSON HOOD:  Oh, no, that's fine.

5           MR. SOLOMON:  I have a new (audio interference) is  
6 waking up.  You might be hearing him screaming in the background,  
7 too.

8           CHAIRPERSON HOOD:  That's fine.

9           MR. SOLOMON:  For the comprehensive transportation  
10 review, we weren't required to do a transportation-impact analysis  
11 as the trip generation for the site was so low.  So, DDOT -- and  
12 I'll let DDOT answer to that during their testimony -- but that  
13 trip generation was just considered so low that we weren't  
14 required to analyze intersections and we, instead, focused on  
15 multi-modal accommodations.

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

22           MR. SOLOMON:  Correct, Mr. Chairman.

23           CHAIRPERSON HOOD:  All right.  So, I'm going to stop  
24 asking you questions right now.  I want to -- but I'm going to  
25 look at this and I will always remember you and Mr. VanPelt from

1 this case.

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

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

4 Okay. Let me see if my colleagues have any follow-ups?

5 Anybody? I'm not seeing anybody.

6 Vice-Chair Miller?

7 COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

8 I neglected to mention, I think, my appreciation for the  
9 addition of communal balconies and the addition of balconies and  
10 the addition of terraces, communal terraces, I believe, also  
11 beyond what the original application provided. And I think that  
12 the outdoor terrace for the dining area is also another beneficial  
13 feature of this project and I just wanted to chime in on that.  
14 Thank you.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Vice-Chair.

16 I will say I do appreciate all of the interactions with  
17 the community.

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

22 I'm just curious.

23 MR. KADLECEK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That's a good  
24 question.

25 Because it's so old, as we explained in our initial

1 filing when we filed the application, PUD didn't even exist in  
2 1966, and so there was this concept called the "large-scale plan  
3 development" that effectively operated the same thing, but,  
4 procedurally, it was a little different.

5           When we started exploring this project some more, we  
6 actually reached out -- to give you a sense of how long ago we  
7 started working with this -- Mr. Bergstein was still around. So,  
8 we worked with Mr. Bergstein and basically developed this strategy  
9 that for purposes of approval, this would be treated as a PUD and  
10 the process we would use would be a modification of significance  
11 because it is the closest analog and, frankly, the only thing that  
12 exists in the zoning regulations right now to get this approved.

13           There is a covenant recorded on the property, the same  
14 way that there is a PUD covenant recorded on PUDs. So, this is  
15 the mechanism that allows us to modify that. So, there was  
16 consultation with OAG several years ago on that.

17           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

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

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

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

25           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I was trying to see if they wanted to

1 cross-examine anything they've heard.

2           So, anyway, let's move on. Let's go to the Office of  
3 Planning. And while Mr. Cochran is coming up, I do want to say  
4 there's a lot -- I appreciate Mr. Cochran's report because there  
5 was a lot of input from DPR, the Department of Parks and  
6 Recreation; the Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs; the  
7 Department of (audio interference) Environment; and the Department  
8 of (audio interference) Development.

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

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

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

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

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

23           So, OP does recommend that the Commission approve  
24 application 66-68A. This would modify an existing PUD by  
25 permitting the construction of a new building, providing 151 units

1 of independent-living apartments for seniors earning, no more  
2 than, at this point, 60 percent of the MFI, as well as associated  
3 offerings, including an adult day treatment facility.

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

11           While they're not providing washers and dryers in each  
12 unit, they've redesigned each floor's communal lounge and laundry  
13 area to provide for more separation between those two functions.  
14 They've modified the design to enable provision of a resident's  
15 designing terrace, while still providing for an internal loading  
16 area. Also, that would serve for storage and trash, and that area  
17 would be accessed from a dedicated lie-by -- a lay-by, excuse me  
18 -- on their own adjacent private street.

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

1 Street NE.

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

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

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

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

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

11 Commissioner May?

12 (No verbal response)

13 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Commissioner Shapiro?

14 (No verbal response)

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Commissioner Turnbull?

16 (No verbal response)

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And Vice-Chair Miller?

18 COMMISSIONER MILLER: No questions, thank you.

19 Thank you for your report.

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

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

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

24 MR. KADLECEK: No questions, thank you.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you very much, Mr.

1 Cochran. We appreciate your report.

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

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

5 How are you?

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

7 How are you?

8 MS. VACCA: Great. Thank you, Chairman Hood, and  
9 Commissioners.

10 For the record, my name is Kimberly Vacca with the  
11 District Department of Transportation.

12 DDOT is supportive of the proposed modification of  
13 significance to an existing PUD project, to construct an  
14 approximately 150,000 square foot senior living facility. The  
15 proposed development is projected to generate less than 25 vehicle  
16 trips in a peak direction during the weekday evening peak hours  
17 and is expected to have a minimal impact on the District's  
18 transportation network.

19 DDOT supports the construction of additional residential  
20 units, overlying primarily on the existing oversupply of on-site  
21 parking.

22 Additionally, DDOT supports the reduced number of long-  
23 term bicycle parking spaces and the removal of the loading berth  
24 and platform in order to preserve the outdoor terrace, that would  
25 be lost due to the height clearance of an internal loading (audio

1 interference).

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

5 DDOT supports the proposed modification of significance  
6 with the approval of the loading-management plan and TDM plans and  
7 two additional conditions, which are that the Applicant must  
8 ensure that all sidewalks are ADA accessible and (audio  
9 interference) four-feet wide, and, two, that if not completed by  
10 others, the Applicant will stripe a high-visibility crosswalk and  
11 install curb ramps on the property, connecting the sidewalk  
12 adjacent to the proposed building to the new, western-most  
13 staircase to the Bryant Street project, no later than one year  
14 after the staircase is constructed.

15 Overall, DDOT supports the project and welcomes any  
16 questions. Thank you.

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you very much, Ms. Vacca.

18 Let's see if we have any questions.

19 Commissioner May?

20 (No verbal response)

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Commissioner Shapiro?

22 (No verbal response)

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Commissioner Turnbull?

24 (No verbal response)

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Vice-Chair Miller?

1 (No verbal response)

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So, Ms. Vacca, you heard me ask Mr.  
3 Solomon a question about all the development on Rhode Island  
4 Avenue, what's going on, on Edgewood, 4th Street, all the  
5 development that's going on down there, and I'm sure that the  
6 District Department of Transportation, I'm sure, in your analysis,  
7 in approval of this project with everything else that's going on,  
8 I'm sure you considered the whole -- you didn't do, necessarily, a  
9 traffic study, but I'm sure you encompassed everything that's  
10 working and everything that's going to be developed there at its  
11 end.

12 Would that be a correct assessment?

13 MS. VACCA: Not necessarily, no.

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

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

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So, apparently, there's some data  
23 that you look for and if it does not exceed that data -- if it  
24 does exceed that data, you take it to the next step, and if it  
25 doesn't, you -- I guess the transportation handbook that I've been

1 hearing about for years, doesn't require you to take it to the  
2 next step.

3 Is that a fair assessment?

4 MS. VACCA: That is fair, correct.

5 So, we looked at the senior housing and the adult-  
6 daycare uses and the type of modes, the mode percentages that the  
7 users would use, and then we looked at the size of the project,  
8 including the number of units and the density, to determine how  
9 many projected trips that those uses, and those densities would  
10 generate.

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

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

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

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

21 So, thank you very much.

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

24 MR. KADLECEK: No questions.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So, thank you very much, Ms. Vacca.

1 We appreciate your testimony -- I mean your presentation.

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

4 (No verbal response)

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

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

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. A notice from Bradley Thomas,  
9 Exhibit 30, Commissioners, and let me just read maybe the last  
10 paragraph. Well, actually, it's on the form, and I think someone  
11 alluded to it, but the vote was nine zero to zero and I guess the  
12 vote was taken on 11/05/2020.

13 And let me see, and after several Zoom meetings, door-  
14 to-door placement flyers, concerns were -- and I think Ms.  
15 Birenbach mentioned this earlier about the concern about the  
16 parking, as well as the residents of Edgewood Commons. The IZ  
17 report, the request of the minimal of 80 percent was not  
18 acceptable.

19 5E02, the single-family District, agreed upon 25 percent  
20 of (audio interference) affordability.

21 ANC -- let me see -- ANC 5E recorded a vote on the  
22 motion to adopt Report 900. I believe that's -- and someone can  
23 help me with this -- I believe that is a prove-up -- yeah. A  
24 number of members to constitute a quorum.

25 Mr. Kadlecek, did the ANC approve -- is all this

1 approval? Did they approve this project?

2 MR. KADLECEK: Yes, they did.

3 And, actually, they vote -- the ANC meeting that they  
4 voted was actually October 20th. I think they wrote the letter on  
5 the 5th of November, but the meeting where they voted was October  
6 20th.

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

9 MR. KADLECEK: Yeah, I'm not sure exactly why it's  
10 written the way it is, but they voted to support the application  
11 on the October 20th meeting.

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

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

17 MS. SCHELLIN: That is correct.

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

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

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

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

6           The only thing I will say in closing is we understand  
7 that the Commission is looking for the team to look at the  
8 exterior plan a little bit, so that is something that we will  
9 prepare.

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

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

17           MR. KADLECEK: Okay.

18           MS. SCHELLIN: So, our meeting after that is December  
19 17th. So, it's not really that far away.

20           MR. KADLECEK: Okay. That's fine.

21           So, we'll aim for the 17th, but then I guess we need to  
22 work backwards --

23           MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.

24           MR. KADLECEK: -- with the schedule.

25           MS. SCHELLIN: So, how much time do you think you guys

1 need to provide everything that the Commission asked for?

2 MR. KADLECEK: I'll ask --

3 MS. SCHELLIN: Do you think --

4 MR. KADLECEK: Sorry. Go ahead, Ms. Schellin.

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

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

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

10 MR. MATTIES: Yeah, I think that's reasonable. Thank  
11 you.

12 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay.

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

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

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

18 And if -- I don't know whether OP and DDOT want to  
19 respond, but if they choose to, they will also have until December  
20 10th, 3:00 p.m. to provide a response.

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

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

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

1 MR. KADLECEK: Okay.

2 MS. SCHELLIN: And then we'll put that on for 12/17 at  
3 4:00 p.m., and that's it.

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Are we all on the same page?  
5 Do we have anything else, Ms. Schellin?

6 MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir.

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

8 Commissioners, any other comments or questions?

9 (No verbal response)

10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Before we close, the Zoning  
11 Commission will be meeting again Thursday, November 12th, Case  
12 Number 20-14, the VNO south capital, LLC, and three lots in Square  
13 649, LLC, design review. That's Square 649. That's this-coming  
14 Thursday at 4:00 p.m.

15 Anything else, Ms. Schellin?

16 MS. SCHELLIN: That's it.

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I know I've been thinking  
18 about it, but I wanted to make sure I cover everything.

19 So, with that, I want to thank everyone for their  
20 participation in this hearing tonight and this hearing is  
21 adjourned.

22 MS. SCHELLIN: Bye.

23 MR. KADLECEK: Thank you.

24 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the  
25 record at 5:46 p.m.)

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: DCZC

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)