

GOVERNMENT OF  
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

MONDAY

JANUARY 24, 2022

+ + + + +

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

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

- ANTHONY J. HOOD, Chairperson
- ROBERT MILLER, Vice Chairperson
- PETER SHAPIRO, Commissioner
- PETER G. MAY, Commissioner
- JOSEPH IMAMURA, Commissioner

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

- SHARON SCHELLIN, Secretary
- RON BARRON, Zoning Data Specialist
- PAUL YOUNG, Zoning Data Specialist

OFFICE OF ZONING LEGAL DIVISION STAFF PRESENT:

- JACOB RITTING, Esquire

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

- MATTHEW JESICK

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

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the  
Regular Public Hearing held on January 24, 2022.

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

PRESENTATION:  
 ZC Case No. 21-21 - Steuart Investment Company, CG Design  
 Review and Special Exception Relief from Penthouse  
 Setback, South Capitol Street, north of S Street, SW,  
 (Square 662, Lot 801 and Square 662E, Lot 800),  
 Ward 6.  
 Christine Roddy . . . . . 7

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS:  
 Commissioners. . . . . 38

CLOSING REMARKS:  
 Anthony Hood . . . . . 86

ADJOURN:  
 Anthony Hood . . . . . 90

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

(4:00 p.m.)

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Today's date is January the 24th, 2022. We are convening and broadcasting this public hearing by videoconferencing. My name is Anthony Hood, and I'm joined by Vice Chair Miller, Commissioner May, Commissioner Shapiro, and Commissioner Imamura. We're also joined by the Office of Zoning staff, Ms. Sharon Schellin, who will be -- also Mr. Ron Barron, as well as Mr. Paul Young, who will be handling all of our virtual operations. And from the Office of Zoning Legal Division, Mr. Jacob Ritting. I will ask others to introduce themselves at the appropriate time.

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

All persons planning to testify should have signed up in advance and will be called by name at the appropriate time. At the time of signup, all participants will complete the oath or affirmation required by Subtitle Z, 408.7 accordingly, and all those listening on Webex or by phone will be muted during the hearing, and only those who have signed up to participate or testify will be unmuted at the appropriate time. When called,

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

1 please state your name and home address before providing your  
2 testimony. When you are finished speaking, please mute your  
3 audio. If you experience difficulty accessing Webex or for your  
4 telephone call-in, or have not signed up, then please call our  
5 OZ hotline number at 202-727-5471. If you wish to file written  
6 testimony or additional supporting documents during the hearing,  
7 then please be prepared to describe and discuss it at the time  
8 of your testimony.

9 The subject of this evening's hearing is Zoning  
10 Commission Case No. 21-20. This is Steuart Investment Company,  
11 Capitol Gateway Design Review and Special Exception Relief from  
12 the Penthouse setback at Square 662, Lot 801, and Square 662E,  
13 Lot 800, South Capitol Street north of South -- north of S Street,  
14 Southwest.

15 Again, today's date is January 24th, 2022. The hearing  
16 will be conducted in accordance with provisions of 11 BZ, DCMR  
17 Chapter 4, as follows: Preliminary Matters; Applicant's Case, the  
18 Applicant has up to 60 minutes, we're going to try to do it this  
19 evening in 40; report of the Office of Planning and District  
20 Department of Transportation; report of other government  
21 agencies; report of the ANC, in this case, I believe, it's 6 --  
22 just a second, I think that's Commissioner Daniels, 6D; testimony  
23 of organizations, five minutes and individuals 3 minutes; and we  
24 will hear in the following order from those who are in support,  
25 opposition, undeclared; then we will have rebuttal and closing

1 by the Applicant. Again, the Office of Zoning hotline number is  
2 202-727-5471 for any concerns during these proceedings.

3 At this time the Commission will consider any  
4 preliminary matters. Does the staff have any preliminary  
5 matters?

6 MS. SCHELLIN: Just a couple. Offered experts, the  
7 three that have previously been before the Commission and  
8 accepted, Sami Kirkdil in architecture, Dan -- Don Hoover, I'm  
9 sorry, in landscape architecture, and Erwin Andres in  
10 transportation, if the Commission would accept them since they've  
11 previously been accepted. And then there are two who have not  
12 been accepted before, Christopher Huffer, also in architecture,  
13 and another landscape architect, Liam Butt. So that's what you  
14 have before you for experts.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So unless I hear any  
16 objections, we will keep everyone who has expert status in place.  
17 Let's look at Christopher Huffer; hopefully, I pronounced that  
18 correct. His resume is in Exhibit 11D, and Ms. Schellin has  
19 already teed that up. Any objections? He's being proffered as  
20 an expert in architecture.

21 (No audible response.)

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I don't hear or see any  
23 objections. Okay. So let's go to Liam Butt. Our resume is in  
24 11D. And she is being proffered in landscape architecture.

25 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: I'm good with it, Mr. Chair.

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Not seeing any objections,  
2 so we will give her expert status, as well. I think it's a lady,  
3 but whoever it is, we will give them expert status, as well.

4 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. All right. So you have five  
5 experts. I'm not sure who will be testifying. I'm sure -- so  
6 Christine Roddy and Lawrence Ferris are the representing  
7 attorneys, and Matthew -- Matt Jesick, Jennifer Steingasser, and  
8 Joel Lawson will come up for the Office of Planning; Kimberly  
9 Vacca for DDOT; and we have Fredrica Kramer for 6D, the ANC; and  
10 I believe that's all I have for you at this time.

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Schellin.  
12 Let's go ahead and get everyone up.

13 Mr. Young, if we can bring all those -- the Applicant's  
14 team up.

15 Ms. Roddy, good afternoon. When everybody comes up,  
16 you may begin. The floor is yours.

17 MS. RODDY: Thank you and good afternoon. Christine  
18 Roddy with Goulston & Storrs. We appreciate the opportunity to  
19 present the design review application for a multi-family building  
20 on Square 662 in Buzzard Point. The site is located in the CG-  
21 4 Zone District and abuts South Capitol Street, which then makes  
22 it subject to design review by the Zoning Commission.

23 The property is currently used as a concrete batching  
24 plant, and that will be removed, and the site will be developed  
25 in phases, the first of which is the project that we are

1 presenting tonight. And it will be a residential building with  
2 approximately 430 units and 17,500 square feet of ground floor  
3 retail. And consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the  
4 Buzzard Point Vision Framework Plan, the project includes a  
5 number of carefully thought out features that will activate the  
6 streetscape through design, site planning, generous pedestrian  
7 connections, and improved vehicular connections.

8 This application, just to get into some of the  
9 technical stuff, does include a special exception request to  
10 include mechanical equipment in a separate stair penthouse on the  
11 eastern edge of the roof, and that would typically be required  
12 to be located in the main penthouse enclosure. And you'll see  
13 it in the presentation tonight, but breaking up that penthouse  
14 and providing two separate structures does reduce the overall  
15 impact of the penthouse. It minimizes --

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Ms. Roddy. Ms. Roddy, I'm not sure  
17 what happened. I don't if anybody else, but I see you're -- you  
18 were sounding really clear at one time, then it, kind of, went  
19 away.

20 MS. RODDY: Okay. Does this sound better?

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: If everybody else will go on mute,  
22 and I'm going to go on mute. Let's see how that works. Everybody  
23 else go on mute.

24 MS. RODDY: So with respect to the penthouse enclosure  
25 -- okay, great. So by doing the two separate penthouse

1 | enclosures, we're able to minimize the visibility of that  
2 | penthouse, as well as maximize the terrace space on the east side  
3 | of the building.

4 |           The application also seeks design review flexibility  
5 | to locate the parking and loading access on South Capitol Street  
6 | via a private alley that runs between South Capitol and Half that  
7 | would otherwise be restricted under the regulations. And you'll  
8 | see in the plans that the proposed alley consolidates parking and  
9 | loading circulation in one place and that allows it to be (audio  
10 | interference).

11 |           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: You seem to be going away again. I  
12 | don't know if there's somebody else in the room with you that  
13 | needs to mute, but everybody I see right here --

14 |           COMMISSIONER MAY: (Indiscernible.)

15 |           MS. RODDY: I'm sorry?

16 |           COMMISSIONER MAY: It sounds like your microphone is  
17 | getting muffled.

18 |           MS. RODDY: Maybe it's my hand?

19 |           MS. SCHELLIN: Is there anybody else there with you?

20 |           MS. RODDY: Yes, but they're all muted. Are you all  
21 | muted? Okay.

22 |           MS. SCHELLIN: They may have to actually -- okay.  
23 | They've got their computer on mute?

24 |           MS. RODDY: Yeah. I'll move away. Maybe that helps.

25 |           MS. SCHELLIN: Yeah, it may help. They can't just have

1 | their sound turned all the way down. They, literally, have to  
2 | have it on mute.

3 | MS. RODDY: Okay. Okay. All right. So I'm going to  
4 | pick up with the flexibility that we're seeking.

5 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: No, that didn't do it. That's not  
6 | going to get it. They may just have to turn -- you may have to  
7 | turn a couple of them off if you all are sitting right there by  
8 | each other.

9 | MS. RODDY: Okay. We're shutting off.

10 | (Pause.)

11 | MS. RODDY: Okay. So I mean, I think I was saying, I  
12 | think I mentioned the alley was one of the points of flexibility.  
13 | Another point of flexibility is the penthouse setback. The  
14 | penthouse abuts the northern building wall, and it's not set  
15 | back. It's currently an open court, as an interim condition, but  
16 | it will become a closed court with the second phase of  
17 | development. And even in that interim condition, that penthouse  
18 | will be set back from our street by over 200 feet.

19 | And then the final flexibility is --

20 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: It's not working. You know what?  
21 | Let's give you a moment to shut down, Ms. Roddy.

22 | MS. RODDY: Yes.

23 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Why don't you shut down and come  
24 | back, and maybe it'll work.

25 | MS. RODDY: Okay.

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let's take about a three-minute  
2 break until Ms. Roddy comes back.

3 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the  
4 record at 4:10 p.m., and reconvened at 4:13 p.m.)

5 MR. MOSELEY: Commissioner Hood, this is Scott Moseley  
6 with the Steuart Investment Company. Christine is going to try  
7 to do it on my computer. So she's --

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

9 MR. MOSELEY: -- going to sit in my --

10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: You sound loud and clear, so.

11 MR. MOSELEY: Okay. Good. And she's just going to sit  
12 right here.

13 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. And Ms. Roddy, if that goes  
14 down at his computer -- he just sounded loud and clear. If that  
15 goes down, then we have another problem, don't we.

16 MS. RODDY: Yeah. Then we're going to be calling the  
17 hotline.

18 Okay. So the -- I managed to string this flexibility,  
19 which was a very interesting talk to begin with, out as long as  
20 possible. So the final area is the side yard. The side yard  
21 requirement is approximately 21 feet of space on the height of  
22 the building. There is a requirement in South Capitol Gateway  
23 Overlay for a 15-foot setback, and that eastern yard is our side  
24 yard, and that's where the 15-foot setback is otherwise required.  
25 And there's also a requirement that 60 percent of the building

1 facades be built to that 15-foot setback. So we're seeking the  
2 flexibility to resolve that conflict in the regulations as it  
3 applies to this site.

4 So we are happy to be here tonight with the support or  
5 no objection from the Office of Planning, DDOT, and the ANC. The  
6 Office of Planning, as well as DOEE, recommended that the  
7 Applicant consider moving its LEED goal from Silver to Gold and  
8 to incorporate solar. And so the Applicant is going to do both.  
9 And we have incorporated those changes into the presentation this  
10 evening.

11 The Applicant is asking for some flexibility to add  
12 additional solar, if possible, beyond what we're showing you  
13 tonight without having to come back to the Commission, so long  
14 as it doesn't require additional relief from the Zoning  
15 Regulations.

16 Another comment that the Office of Planning had made  
17 is they had recommended moving one of the two bedroom IZ units  
18 to the exterior of the building, and the Applicant has done that,  
19 and so we will show you that, also, in the presentation tonight.

20 Then the Applicant has agreed to the comments that have  
21 been made by DDOT in its report. It requested that eight parking  
22 spaces be reserved for car sharing, and the Applicant is fine  
23 with that; that the bikeshare commitment be modified slightly,  
24 the Applicant, again, was okay with that modification; and that  
25 the Applicant commit to a minimum of six electric vehicle charging

1 stations, which, again, they're fine with.

2           And then, finally, the ANC, in their letter of support,  
3 asked that any approval of the application be based on the design  
4 for the alley that we negotiated with the ANC, and of course,  
5 we're fine with that. That design is included in the submittals  
6 that we have already filed, as far as what we are going to present  
7 this evening.

8           Finally, as previously noted, the project presented  
9 tonight is the first phase of the development of Square 662. The  
10 second phase will occupy the northern portion of the square, and  
11 that will be the subject of a subsequent design review  
12 application; however, the Applicant would like flexibility to  
13 introduce interim uses on that northern portion that will not  
14 already be absorbed by construction staging for Phase I, such as  
15 food and beverage, a top -- limited parking, and that would have  
16 access to (audio interference).

17           So with that, we have four witnesses this evening. We  
18 do have Erwin Andres available for questions, but in the interest  
19 of time, we have taken his portion of the presentation out, and  
20 he's happy to answer any questions that you have that are  
21 transportation related. Otherwise, we have Scott Moseley, who  
22 will testify as a representative of the property owner, Steuart  
23 Investment Company; John Begert will testify as a representative  
24 of MRP; and then Don Hoover as the landscape architect; and Chris  
25 Huffer will be the representative for the architect's team, SK&I,

1 will testify tonight.

2           So with that, I will turn it over to Mr. Moseley.

3           MR. MOSELEY: Hi. How are you? If you could bring up  
4 the slide presentation and just go ahead and advance to Slide 3,  
5 please, and I'll just talk while we're looking at that site page.  
6 Yeah. That's perfect right there. Thank you.

7           Well, good afternoon. My name is Scott Moseley, and  
8 I'm with the Steuart Investment Company, which is the current  
9 landowner of the subject property. Steuart is a Washington-based  
10 company which has been doing work in D.C. since close to the  
11 beginning of the last century, so for more than 120 years, we've  
12 been active in Washington. Since the mid-1990s, we have primarily  
13 been a real estate and development company, and in the last decade  
14 or so, we and our partners have delivered more than 1,000  
15 apartment units in D.C., including a Giant Food grocery store in  
16 one of those buildings.

17           Those projects, all of which we continue to own today,  
18 were all developed on already-owned parcels of land associated  
19 with prior Steuart businesses, and we look forward to continuing  
20 that trend with these parcels in Buzzard Point with our partners  
21 and development team here today.

22           So taking a look at the sites on the screen, Steuart  
23 has owned all these -- all the sites shown here for more than 50  
24 years. Collectively, they total nearly five acres. Obviously,  
25 as Christina mentioned, our Phase I being discussed today is

1 | sited in the bottom one-third of the large 662 and 662E squares.  
2 | As you know, that area is currently occupied by Superior Concrete,  
3 | which will be leaving prior to development commences, obviously.

4 |           The remainder of Square 662, representing our future  
5 | Phase II, where we hope to land a grocery store, is currently  
6 | being used by the construction team which built the new Frederick  
7 | Douglass Memorial Bridge and traffic ovals. The bridge builder  
8 | also occupies that site to the immediate north, Square 660, but  
9 | they're going to be leaving just at the end of this month as that  
10 | project winds down and their lease expires.

11 |           I will also note that that 660 square was much larger  
12 | at one point, but we transferred approximately a half-acre to the  
13 | City back in 2017 to accommodate the creation of the traffic  
14 | oval.

15 |           Lastly, we also own the approximately one-acre site off  
16 | to the right, there, on the water, known as Square 708S. This  
17 | is currently leased to the Metropolitan Police Department which  
18 | utilizes the site as a heliport.

19 |           So, you know, when we took a look at all this, you  
20 | know, given the contiguous nature of these Steuart parcels,  
21 | themselves, coupled with the adjacency of our partner's sites and  
22 | projects, which John Begert of MRP will highlight shortly, we  
23 | truly believe this gives the team a unique opportunity to approach  
24 | the overall phase development of the area in a holistic or  
25 | cohesive manner, and one that respects and is in line with the

1 Buzzard Point Vision Framework and other plan guidelines.

2           So, yeah. I want to be mindful of time, but that's  
3 just a quick overview of the parcels currently owned by Steuart  
4 on Buzzard Point. And I'd also just like to say that we've  
5 enjoyed being part of this development team and planning process,  
6 and we have certainly enjoyed working with Ms. Kramer and the  
7 rest of the ANC 6D Commissioners leading up to this hearing, and  
8 we look forward to continuing that relationship and work on our  
9 Phase II development and the future development of the parcels I  
10 just described.

11           Thank you for your time, and I will be turning it over  
12 to John Begert of MRP. Thank you. And if you could just advance  
13 the next slide, too.

14           MR. BEGERT: Hi, good afternoon. My name is John  
15 Begert with MRP Realty. What I'd like to do first, as you look  
16 at this slide of the overall plan, is talk about our development  
17 team. And Scott mentioned it briefly, but the development team  
18 consists of MRP Realty, who is a long-time developer, operator,  
19 and investor and owner in the City; along with our partner Florida  
20 Rock Properties, who has -- this would be their fourth property  
21 in the Southeast/Southwest neighborhood; and then, obviously,  
22 Steuart Investment Corp. We're excited to have the join the  
23 team. We're all long-term owners and long-term stewards in the  
24 District, and we're excited to present this plan to you, this  
25 specific building and then overall comprehensive plan that Scott

1 mentioned.

2           Just to, kind of, guide you through what we've done in  
3 the past, starting in the bottom right of this slide, that was  
4 our first development, Dock 79. We came to the Zoning Commission  
5 back in 2011 with a PUD. We built that project. It's been very  
6 successful. Adjacent to that, kind left of that, on this screen  
7 is the Maren. That was built three years ago. Excited about  
8 that. Stabilized and built some great retailer partners, as  
9 well. Our partner, Florida Rock, controls the density adjacent  
10 to that. It will be unlocked when the bridge is finalized in  
11 the Southeast side of the screen you see. And then, obviously,  
12 as you go, kind of, around the clock -- around the horn, you'll  
13 see the future development parcels, three of which are controlled  
14 by the Steuart family, and the other two are controlled by our  
15 partner, Florida Rock.

16           So as you can see, it's a pretty compelling and, kind  
17 of, generational real estate opportunity that we don't take  
18 lightly. So we're excited to present this first building.

19           All right. So the first phase of this pipeline is the  
20 redevelopment. We've taken a very deliberate approach with the  
21 phasing and the design of this. We feel like this Phase I is  
22 the right phase to get started, remove the existing concrete  
23 plant. The Verge property, seen in the upper left-hand corner,  
24 that is under construction and will deliver in about four months.  
25 So obviously, Phase I, across the street from S Street represents

1 a great opportunity to develop adjacent. And I think, at the  
2 end of the day, you'll see an overall plan that will be nine  
3 buildings owned by the same long-term owners and long-term  
4 investors in the City.

5           There's a lot of work that needs to be done on site to  
6 make Phase I successful. The project is the site of the existing  
7 Superior Plant. If you're unfamiliar, it's an existing concrete  
8 batching plant with frontage on Half, R, S, and a dead-end piece  
9 on South Cap. There's a sidewalk on Half Street, otherwise the  
10 frontage is -- it's pretty rough around there, and, you know,  
11 don't have a lot of sidewalks or access, a number of curb cuts  
12 that -- to accommodate truck traffic. It's a little bit of the  
13 *Wild West* down there. And so the pedestrian traffic around the  
14 site, you know, is walking in the street and/or, kind of, unsafe  
15 conditions.

16           In this phase, we'll provide generous pedestrian spaces  
17 adjacent to the building, as well as interim conditions to the  
18 waterfront and to other -- to the other existing building, which  
19 we think make a lot of sense.

20           A portion of the property is located in the 500-year  
21 floodplain, so we're elevating roadways, we're elevating related  
22 spaces to ensure the site's success for residential and mixed-  
23 use development.

24           The existing conditions of the property don't take full  
25 advantage of the proximity to the nearby resources, such as the

1 waterfront, the new Ellipse, the existing buildings in Southeast.  
2 And so we're excited to transform, kind of, you know, this rough,  
3 industrial site into a mixed-use development that can provide  
4 connections to these exciting resources for the whole community  
5 and the neighborhood.

6           The team started our outreach probably a year ago with  
7 Commissioner Kramer and DDOT and OP, and we spent a lot of time  
8 on getting the plan right by the neighborhood and the community.  
9 We went to Public Space Committee to make sure the circulation  
10 worked. The grocery, obviously, is a huge goal for us with Phase  
11 II. We needed to get the curb cuts and the circulation correct,  
12 and we were pleased to achieve the support from the Public Space  
13 Committee and from the neighborhood and the ANC. And we owe a  
14 lot of gratitude to Commissioner Kramer and the whole ANC for  
15 their help getting us there.

16           During that time, the ANC raised a number of great  
17 comments with respect to the private alley, which is a huge  
18 feature of our design, and also a couple other things that we  
19 think were great in monitoring construction air quality during  
20 construction, the focus on the grocer with Phase II, construction  
21 job fairs once we get under construction with the first phase.  
22 So those were great comments, and we addressed them, and we plan  
23 to implement all of them.

24           I think Scott mentioned it, it's been a long process,  
25 but it's really been worth it. We think we've got a great team

1 on the design side, we've got a great building, we've got great  
2 partners, and what we're presenting tonight incorporates comments  
3 from all those stakeholders, and we're really excited to be in  
4 front of you. So with that, I will turn it over to Don Hoover,  
5 our landscape architect. Thank you.

6 MR. HOOVER: Good afternoon. My name is Don Hoover  
7 with Oculus. We're the landscape architects on the project. If  
8 you could go to the next slide. There we go.

9 So I'm going to be talking about the public spaces of  
10 the project, and while the amount of public open space for this  
11 application is rather limited, it is just one piece to a very  
12 big puzzle. And so in order to inform what to do on this parcel,  
13 the design team has studied, in master plan form, all of these  
14 properties and the surrounding, adjacent properties and the  
15 entire waterfront from Yards Park all the way down to the Point  
16 to get a vision for what we think all these properties -- where  
17 we should be headed, and it's by no means complete. It's a master  
18 plan that we've, you know, shared with Office of Planning and  
19 we're going to continue to be working with them, but it was enough  
20 information so that it informed what we could do on this site.

21 As John mentioned, we've been -- this exercise -- the  
22 planning exercise started about a year ago, and I can tell you  
23 that the ownership partners emphasized from day one that the  
24 public realm was very important, and that the public realm should  
25 be driving this plan, so it should inform what the buildings want

1 to do rather than the buildings informing what the public realm  
2 does.

3           The -- I think in addition to that, you know, there was  
4 a number of studies done by the City, you know, the Buzzard Point  
5 Vision Plan, we worked closely with that study, following those  
6 recommendations, as well as the Bramble (ph.) Plan when it comes  
7 to resiliency, and in this case, if we didn't own all these  
8 properties, I'm not quite sure how we could have pulled that off.  
9 So it's worked out quite well.

10           Next slide.

11           So this is just a few shots of the existing site, and  
12 as was said earlier, it is, kind of, rough and tumble. You can  
13 see, basically, from Water Street to the waterfront -- or I'm  
14 sorry, from Half Street to the waterfront, there is no pedestrian  
15 realm. It's, kind of, more service and industrial belt. There's  
16 a big improvement, quite an investment to get everything up to  
17 where we want it to be.

18           Next slide.

19           So this is the plan of the immediate properties. The  
20 application is, of course, for the 662, Phase I, shown in red,  
21 and you can see on this plan a result of some of the master  
22 planning that was done, setting the finished-grade elevations  
23 along the waterfront, as well as for the buildings. Again, the  
24 -- trying to deal with the resiliency and making this project fit  
25 into the larger plan prepared by the City, I think everything is

1 being raised by three to four feet along the waterfront. And so  
2 that study really informed how to set this first building.

3           Also, I think, out of that master planning effort, it  
4 was concluded that S Street was to be a primary retail street,  
5 kind of the heart of the retail, as well as the South Capitol  
6 Public Plaza.

7           Next slide.

8           We also studied the transportation, the circulation in  
9 and around the site. The -- and I think this was brought up  
10 earlier, the alleyway, which you see here between Phase I and  
11 Phase II, that was one of the big moves to try to deal with  
12 service and for parking access for not only Phase I and Phase II  
13 of the 662 block, but also for the 708 parcel to the east. So  
14 all that service, all the parking, will be moving on that  
15 alleyway. Then, of course, S Street is two-way. There's one  
16 connection through South Capitol Public Plaza. Then there's a  
17 one-way -- future one-way loop along the waterfront that ties  
18 into T Street.

19           Next slide.

20           And then this is just isolating down to the -- what's  
21 going to be done in this space in terms of the circulation, so  
22 you can see how this site functions. The previous slide, kind  
23 of, told you where everything was going in the future.

24           Next slide.

25           And this is the pedestrian connections, of course, on

1 the streets. We also think there's going to be some pedestrian  
2 movement in the alley. And then the blue arrows that you see on  
3 here is the interim connections that, when Phase I is done, we  
4 want to make sure we have a pedestrian connection to the oval,  
5 as well as a pedestrian connection down to the waterfront to the  
6 trail system and walkway system set up by the bridge improvements.

7 Next slide.

8 Focused a bit more on our plan. What this is showing,  
9 the dashed line, is the extent to which permanent improvements  
10 will be made -- the long-term improvements. So you've got,  
11 basically, the plaza paving, which is all shown in gray, which  
12 will also extend up the private service alley; and then you got  
13 the streetscape pavement, shown in the beige; and then the --  
14 Half Street will be, you know, in conformance with the rest of  
15 the S Street streetscapes that have already been completed.

16 I wanted to point out on here one of the goals that was  
17 set up when we were doing visioning for the whole project, was  
18 really paying attention to the outdoor retail space. In the age  
19 of COVID and post-COVID, we felt that it was really important to  
20 have these very generous outdoor spaces, which is, of course, in  
21 high demand for the last couple years and we think will continue.  
22 And so as a result of that, we have set back the building  
23 voluntarily an additional 5 to 10 feet -- five foot at the corners  
24 and 10 foot in the body of the building.

25 Next slide.

1           And this is just showing extending the improvements,  
2 what they look like, into the future, just in terms of right  
3 around our site, showing S Street extending, and the Plaza, which  
4 is yet to be designed, but we know, generally, how it's -- how  
5 the structure of it is set up.

6           Next slide.

7           So this is a section at the corners where you can see  
8 that voluntary five-foot setback of the building which gives us  
9 an amenity zone of approximately 14-foot wide for outdoor cafe  
10 space or other building amenities. And then you also have the  
11 -- your typical 10-foot sidewalk clear zone and six-foot tree  
12 zone or LIDs in this case.

13          Next slide.

14          And then this is the 10-foot voluntary setback. And I  
15 think the hope is that we have, you know, indoor/outdoor  
16 relationships with, you know, with these -- with this private  
17 outdoor space to really make the indoor/outdoor very seamless  
18 and very functional.

19          Next slide.

20          And this is just a cut through the plaza. The street,  
21 as it passes Water Street -- I'm sorry, S Street, as it passes  
22 Water Street, becomes a flush-curb condition. The remains of S  
23 Street, as well as the street that cuts across the plaza, that  
24 will all be curbless. Again, you can see the outdoor amenity  
25 zone up to 25 foot deep, after a cafe zone against the building.

1 And then where we show future South Capitol Street, that's just  
2 eyewash, there. The design for that will be forthcoming.

3 Next slide.

4 The alleyway, I think it was mentioned earlier, we  
5 don't view this space as just being utilitarian. While it does  
6 provide access for service and for access to the parking garage,  
7 we also know that this is a highly visible space. Pavements in  
8 the alleyway, we're intending to do something pretty nice and  
9 really think about the facades of the building. It's not a  
10 (indiscernible) house, but really a place that has a public look  
11 to it.

12 Next slide.

13 And the ANC took great interest in the alley, concerned  
14 about safety and a number of other issues. We worked with them  
15 quite a bit, and this is -- I'm not going to go through all of  
16 this, but this is -- these are all the things that, through  
17 working with them, were all the ideas that were implemented to  
18 provide pedestrian safety and, you know, and safety with -- for  
19 vehicles and public use. So there was a lot that was done and  
20 discussed and collaborated with the ANC on this, and I think  
21 we're now at a spot where we all feel pretty good about it.

22 Next slide.

23 And this is just a slide showing the functionality of  
24 the alleyway where the loading service is located and the garage  
25 entries and the short-term parking and then the pedestrian way

1 that's along the one on the north edge. And then it's also  
2 showing just pedestrian movements around the streetscapes and  
3 access ways from the streetscapes into the building.

4 With that, I'm going to turn it over to Chris Huffer  
5 to talk about the architecture. Thank you.

6 MR. HUFFER: Good afternoon. My name is Chris Huffer  
7 with SK&I Architecture. If you wouldn't mind skipping to Slide  
8 21, please. All right.

9 So as everybody has mentioned, our block is located on  
10 S Street between Half and South Capitol Street with R Street on  
11 the north side of Phase II. Because of our location and our --  
12 in Zone CG-5, we are required to have a setback on South Capitol  
13 Street. So we have a 15-foot required setback on the Plaza side,  
14 followed by a one to one setback above 110 feet, which you can  
15 see there on the right side of the building. Along with our  
16 required setbacks, as Don mentioned, we are voluntarily setting  
17 back the building an additional 5 to 10 feet on S Street to help  
18 improve the pedestrian experience on the ground level.

19 As you've previously seen on the plans, and as Don  
20 mentioned, our goal for S Street, going from the waterfront all  
21 the way to Audi Field, is to create a vast, kind of, retail and  
22 pedestrian-friendly street that extends between those two  
23 elements. So with -- back on our site, we are centering our  
24 retail on the major corners of South Capitol Street and S and on  
25 Half Street and S.

1           As you saw on the previous plans, one of our main goals  
2 was to, kind of, have a visual representation of our plan into  
3 the architecture, and kind of, incorporate and design the  
4 building to be, you know, compatible with our -- with the site  
5 and our neighbors. So here in the massing, you can see the  
6 setback on the right side to the South Street -- Capitol side,  
7 but in addition to that, we've also set back the elevation on  
8 the Half Street side, which is that top left of the building  
9 there. We've done that to create a symmetrical facade, but also  
10 to correspond to our neighbor to the south, the Verge, which --  
11 its building height in only 110 feet. So we're trying to create  
12 a compatibility of our view shed going through the street.

13           In addition to, kind of, you know, visualize the plan  
14 into the architecture, you can see that we have two, kind of,  
15 bookend sides, on those two (indiscernible) facades on Half  
16 Street and on the Plaza on South Capitol Street. Our goal was  
17 to create a sturdy element on those sides that is connected by  
18 our amenity and private space in the middle, but connecting them  
19 through use of the architecture and our materiality.

20           In the middle, you see a larger white frame that is  
21 incorporated with balconies and bay conditions. One of the  
22 advantages that we had in terms of setting the building back 10  
23 feet in that middle area is it allows us to create a different  
24 amount of unit types that you don't actually see in this area or  
25 in the City because of the zoning regulations for bays and

1 balconies. By setting back our building, we're able to, kind of,  
2 create that articulation to the facade and create a different mix  
3 of units that will help distinguish our building and integrate  
4 it into the neighborhood.

5 As Christine mentioned, we are requesting a special  
6 exemption of relief on our stair and penthouse mechanical  
7 enclosure, which you can see on the top right of the penthouse,  
8 there, adjacent to the pool. Our goal here is to, kind of, open  
9 up the viewshed on the east side of the property in, you know,  
10 in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan and Vision Plan, you  
11 know, setting back the building on South Capitol Street to open  
12 up that viewshed to the Capitol and to the waterfront. So in  
13 order to do that, you know, we had to separate some of our  
14 mechanical equipment and our egress requirements, and in order  
15 to try to, kind of, keep that viewshed open, we're requesting the  
16 ability to have a small mechanical enclosure detached from the  
17 main penthouse.

18 Next slide, please.

19 Here's a view from the plaza on the southeast corner  
20 of the site. Here you can see, kind of, that strong language on  
21 the plaza that's integrated with recessed balconies to, you know,  
22 create a sense of depth and articulation to the facade, but also  
23 help, you know, activate this facade by creating eyes on the  
24 plaza and enhance the pedestrian experience.

25 One of the advantages of having a setback at 110 feet,

1 | it allows us to, kind of, create a base, middle, top condition  
2 | with the architecture. So you can see on those bottom two, three  
3 | levels, we are creating a double-height space for potential  
4 | future retail in the architecture, and, you know, bringing that  
5 | in with the middle, those three set of three-bay rhythms, and  
6 | then setting it back to the top, and it creates a top condition  
7 | in the back.

8 |           Next slide, please.

9 |           Here you can see the full S Street facade, as I  
10 | mentioned, kind of a symmetrical nature that we are trying to  
11 | achieve with those two solid corners on Half Street and South  
12 | Capitol Street connected by a multiple-story base on the bottom.  
13 | Here you can, kind of, see those bookends wrapping the middle  
14 | element in the middle, and that articulation with the bays and  
15 | the balconies that help activate this façade not only at the  
16 | ground level, but also above it here.

17 |           Please skip to Slide 25, please.

18 |           Here is a view on S Street looking east towards  
19 | Frederick Douglass Bridge, which you can see down the street.  
20 | One of our goals with the main element in the middle of that big,  
21 | large white frame was to make it white to talk with the Frederick  
22 | Douglass Bridge. So basically, you see our white element on the  
23 | building, and it, kind of, pulls you down the street and picks  
24 | up on the white of the bridge. So we are trying to utilize that  
25 | to, kind of, you know, work ourselves into the neighborhood and

1 have elements that talk to the rest of our neighboring properties  
2 and public facilities.

3           Here you can see, even on Half Street, the building is  
4 articulated with recessed balconies and set back, again, at the  
5 110 feet to talk to and correspond with our neighbors to the  
6 right, but also just creating that base, middle, top condition  
7 that creates a nice proportion for the building.

8           Next slide, please.

9           This is an aerial, kind of, looking into the courtyard,  
10 which is, kind of, our interim condition until Phase II is  
11 developed. This facade is integrated with, you know, projecting  
12 and recessed balconies utilizing the same materials from the top  
13 levels of the penthouse and bringing it down into the courtyards.  
14 The interim condition where it touches Phase II will be supported  
15 by free-standing columns in the interim for the interim  
16 structure. I guess it will be, also, the final structure for  
17 the building, but then it will eventually be clad when Phase II  
18 becomes built.

19           Please skip to -- oh, next slide, please.

20           Here's a view looking down the alley from Half Street  
21 so you can see how we are projecting over the alley, but you can  
22 also see down the alley that we have the additional red brick  
23 materials wrapping itself around the building. So as Don  
24 mentioned, our goal for the alley, it is, you know, a private,  
25 but public, space, and we wanted to, kind of, integrate with the

1 rest of the building. So we want to bring around that materiality  
2 throughout the alley and have it wrap around the building, so it  
3 feels like an integrated piece of the design.

4 Skip to Page 29, please.

5 This is a view from the middle of the alley. As Don  
6 mentioned, we went through extensive back and forth with the ANC  
7 to, kind of, create a space that everybody was comfortable and  
8 happy with, you know, utilizing different materials and design  
9 elements to create a safe pedestrian passage on the right side  
10 that is distinguished by different paving, but also bollards for  
11 the loading to protect people from loading and the traffic coming  
12 through the street.

13 Next slide, please.

14 This is another view, starting to focus on the  
15 pedestrian experience from the plaza. So you can see the idea  
16 here is to, kind of, open up the S Street to correspond,  
17 similarly, with the plaza on the east side. So we wanted to have  
18 that, you know, unified experience throughout the whole building  
19 and streetscape.

20 Next slide, please.

21 This is a view in front of the residential portion, the  
22 lobby. So this is in the middle of the building where the  
23 building is set back that additional 10 feet of streetscape here.  
24 Our goal with the middle of this facade is to, kind of, create  
25 an interesting experience that, kind of, pulls you down towards

1 | the water so you can see the rippling of the side glass there  
2 | to, you know, kind of draw you down the street towards the bridge.

3 |           Next slide, please.

4 |           And this is down by the corner. so this is adjacent  
5 | to one of the corner retail spaces where you can see how  
6 | advantageous it is to set the building back that 5 and 10 feet  
7 | here on the ground floor where, you know, no matter what the use  
8 | of that retail space is, there'll be ample indoor/outdoor space  
9 | use for the retail and/or, you know, coworking space in our  
10 | amenity area. So you can feel that the setback, along with the  
11 | traditional materials that we're using for the base, the brick  
12 | detailing, creates a very proportional and friendly pedestrian  
13 | experience.

14 |           Next slide, please.

15 |           Just to quickly go over the planned materials for the  
16 | building, the red brick -- red and black brick at the corners  
17 | and at the base. Our goal was to, kind of, use a traditional  
18 | material that, kind of, works with several of the other future  
19 | developments in the area. So, you know, we looked at our  
20 | neighboring context, and, you know, we wanted to integrate with  
21 | the building. So our goal was to use those materials that not  
22 | only talk and speak to the neighborhood, but also brings the  
23 | scale and proportion down and enhances the pedestrian experience.  
24 | The white and the gray is proposed as a metal panel of varying  
25 | sizes, and integrated within those metal panel areas are the bays

1 and the balconies using aluminum railings.

2           Next slide, please.

3           So here are just a few examples of our potential, you  
4 know, integrated canopy design with the retail spaces. The ground  
5 floor will be a mixture of, obviously, the future retail, but  
6 also of storefront and glass with a cast stone base around the  
7 bottom.

8           Next slide, please.

9           So as Don mentioned, and I'll go over a few things  
10 here. This is our ground-floor plan. As we've gone over, the  
11 Half Street side and South Capitol side are anchored by retail,  
12 which corresponds with our neighbors to the south, the Verge,  
13 which is also retail centered on S Street. We have our 5 and 10  
14 foot setbacks at these ground levels, and that 15 foot setback  
15 on the east side, there.

16           One of the other advantages that we're trying to take  
17 care -- take advantage of with this alley that we've been working  
18 on is further consolidating as much traffic and loading and drop-  
19 offs as we can through this alley instead of having additional  
20 curb cuts on Half Street and S Street. So as you can see here,  
21 we have our garage entry, our loading, but also we've created an  
22 area for short-term parking which we are anticipating using for,  
23 you know, future Uber, Amazon, kind of, delivery drop offs, but  
24 as well as, kind of, short term guest parking for the people  
25 coming to the area.

1           Let's see, skip to Slide 38, please.

2           As Christine mentioned, we are -- we have added solar  
3 to our penthouse here. So you can see it in the bottom left  
4 highlighted in that yellow. Right now, we're anticipating, kind  
5 of, fit as much as we can in this area, and we're requesting  
6 flexibility to potentially go a little bit higher once the design  
7 evolves, but we wanted to mention that we are going to integrate  
8 that request into the design.

9           Next slide, please.

10           An additional comment from Office of Planning was to  
11 have a two-bedroom IZ unit located on the exterior of the building  
12 on the street side. So you can see on the top left, we've moved  
13 one of our two-bedroom IZ units to that top, left location, in a  
14 location that will also have an extensive balcony.

15           Next slide, please.

16           And further, one of the additional Office of Planning  
17 requests was for us to achieve a LEED Gold certification. So we  
18 have updated our plan, and we are committing to getting to LEED  
19 Gold.

20           With that, I'm going to pass it back to Christine.  
21 Thank you very much.

22           MS. RODDY: Thanks. And before we open up for  
23 questions, I did want to address the letters in the record that  
24 request a greater set aside for affordable housing. And I'd like  
25 to make one clarification solely for the record, and that is that

1 much of the testimony that was submitted references the 2015  
2 Southwest Neighborhood Small Area Plan and that plans call for  
3 greater and deeper levels of affordability. We just wanted to  
4 clarify that this project is not located within the boundaries  
5 of that small area plan. That said, that does not change the  
6 importance of affordable housing or the need for affordable  
7 housing, and this team wholeheartedly understands that.

8 We would like to say that this project realizes  
9 numerous goals and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan. It is  
10 revitalizing an underutilized parcel along a significant corridor  
11 by adding residential density. The development creates a dynamic  
12 pedestrian-focused streetscape with a design that complements  
13 significant view corridors. It advances a resilient design. It  
14 builds and improves pedestrian infrastructure. It limits its  
15 curb cuts. It incorporates significant enhancements to public  
16 space to support an active and generous pedestrian environment.

17 There are a number of competing demands on this site,  
18 and it will require a significant level of investment to make it  
19 successful for residential use. The site, as you know, is  
20 currently a concrete batching plant. It's located in the 500-  
21 year floodplain. There is minimal pedestrian circulation  
22 existing today. Converting it from a long-standing industrial  
23 use to residential use will require a lot of work, and the  
24 Applicant is going above and beyond what is otherwise required  
25 to ensure the project successfully integrates into the fabric of

1 | the neighborhood. And you heard it's raising adjacent  
2 | (indiscernible) way out of the floodplain to make the area more  
3 | resilient than it is today. It is investing and creating  
4 | pedestrian connections that don't currently exist, not just  
5 | around the site, but between the site and the oval and the  
6 | riverwalk.

7 |           And so that's one of the backgrounds of why the  
8 | Applicant isn't proposing a greater set aside than what the IZ  
9 | program requires, but you can look at MRP's track record and see  
10 | that they prioritize affordable housing. They have 950  
11 | affordable units online or in the pipeline in the District, alone.  
12 | And so I reference these competing demands and challenges to  
13 | provide context, because the team understands the need for  
14 | affordable housing.

15 |           And I know that the Commission understands and realizes  
16 | this is not a PUD and that the project is not requesting  
17 | additional density or height that isn't otherwise allowed by its  
18 | zoning. It is complying with the IZ requirement. And the IZ  
19 | program, itself, takes into account the market pressures created  
20 | by new development. It is, in and of itself, a mitigation  
21 | measure, and that has been acknowledged by the Court of Appeals  
22 | in the recent Cole case.

23 |           Many of the letters also reference and say that the  
24 | project is counter to Southwest history as a model of equity and  
25 | inclusion, and we disagree with that assessment. The

1 Comprehensive Plan requires the Commission to evaluate policies  
2 through a racial equity lens. Racial equity considerations under  
3 the Comprehensive Plan are substantive and procedural, and I  
4 think that the procedural consideration is clearly satisfied in  
5 that we're having this conversation right now in a public forum  
6 and people have had an opportunity to weigh in, whether it be  
7 through written submissions or the opportunity to testify this  
8 evening. We've also participated in the ANC process, and that  
9 was another public forum where people were able to participate  
10 and submit their comments or to show up at the meetings and submit  
11 their comments.

12 Substantively, the project is removing a use that is  
13 not compatible with nearby residential uses, the concrete  
14 batching plant. It creates dust, it creates noise, there's heavy  
15 truck traffic associated with it, it's a very intense use to have  
16 in such close proximity to residential neighborhoods.

17 The project will provide residential housing where none  
18 currently exists. It will not displace anyone, and as the  
19 analysis that we have submitted by our sale (indiscernible), the  
20 provision of additional housing, whether it be market-rate  
21 housing or affordable housing, will help stabilize housing prices  
22 because it increases supply, and that's a view that was shared  
23 by OP and is in their written report, as well.

24 The project's introducing safer and enhanced  
25 vehicular/pedestrian circulation. It creates better access for

1 | the community to the neighborhood's assets. It also will be  
2 | certifiable to LEED Gold Level, which, again, is an environmental  
3 | enhancement over the existing concrete plant. And the project  
4 | will include measures to make the area more resilient, not just  
5 | for the residents, but for the area, itself.

6 |           So we believe that the project presented this evening  
7 | realizes the goals that were planned for this site and  
8 | accomplishes what the design review process is intended to  
9 | achieve, a thoughtful project that is superior to what might  
10 | proceed as a matter of right that contributes to the District's  
11 | vision for the South Capitol Street corridor.

12 |           And with that, we're happy to answer any questions.

13 |           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Roddy, and to  
14 | the team -- the development team -- Applicant's team. We  
15 | appreciate your very succinct presentation to us. We may have a  
16 | few questions.

17 |           And Ms. Roddy, I do want to expound a little bit on the  
18 | letter from -- one of the letters. I think you may be referring  
19 | to Ms. Jennifer Ho's letter. I do want to have a conversation  
20 | with you about that.

21 |           Let's start out, though, with others. Commissioner  
22 | May, do you have any questions or comments?

23 |           COMMISSIONER MAY: Sure. Why not? I have a handful.  
24 | The -- let's see. First, on the -- I'm curious about the phasing,  
25 | right, where, basically, you're building half a building, right,

1 | because it's backing up to the future phase. When do you think  
2 | that future phase is actually going to get built?

3 | MS. RODDY: The future phase will be two years following  
4 | construction of the first phase.

5 | COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. And the -- so what is it  
6 | going to look like on the north side of the building for two  
7 | years while that's there, and of course, I assume two years is  
8 | what you're expecting, but I can't imagine you're actually  
9 | guaranteeing that. So what are they going to look like on the  
10 | north side?

11 | MR. HUFFER: Well, I think that the north side is going  
12 | to be -- you know, I think we showed that northeast aerial in  
13 | the presentation. It's going to be a metal panel-clad facade  
14 | integrated with hanging and recessed balconies.

15 | COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. Not -- that's not what I'm  
16 | asking. I'm asking about the temporary condition, right.

17 | MR. HUFFER: Oh, the --

18 | COMMISSIONER MAY: You're going to have two large blank  
19 | walls that are going to be joined up with the future building.  
20 | I did not see -- I saw an elevation that showed that, and it's,  
21 | just, like a big, blank wall. And we don't have any views from  
22 | the north that show us what this building will look like from  
23 | -- you have, you know, dozens of other views, but nothing from  
24 | the north that shows what this is going to look like for two  
25 | years.

1 MR. HUFFER: So those blank walls, we are anticipating,  
2 potentially, utilizing some art with either, you know, a local  
3 artist putting in murals. I think, additionally, we'll be using  
4 signage for the building on that location for the temporary --

5 COMMISSIONER MAY: So it's going to be giant  
6 advertising banners on the side of the building?

7 MR. HUFFER: Well, I wouldn't say "giant," but --

8 COMMISSIONER MAY: Well, I've seen many buildings go  
9 up in that part of the City, and when the circumstance presents  
10 itself, invariably, there are giant signs visible from the  
11 freeway or visible from South Capitol, right. It's going to be  
12 -- it's part of the marketing of it.

13 I think I'd, kind of, like to see what you're intending  
14 for those two years, and it would be helpful to have an actual  
15 perspective view from the north that shows what those things look  
16 like, because we really don't know what this thing is going to  
17 look like for that period. I'm glad it's only two years. Two  
18 years is, like -- is nothing, but -- well, not quite nothing,  
19 but you know, no guarantee it's actually going to be two years,  
20 and I just want to know that it's going to look okay. And I like  
21 the idea of doing something to decorate it. I'm not sure that,  
22 you know, advertising is the best way to do it. So --

23 MR. HUFFER: Yeah. Understood. We will take a look  
24 at that and get back to you.

25 COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. Thank you. So at some point,

1 | someone said that much -- or some of the site is within the 500-  
2 | year floodplain. Is that -- I mean, is the building -- I mean,  
3 | I noted that DOEE had comments about floodplain, and their  
4 | comments were a little bit generic, but the idea of the -- of  
5 | keeping all of the truly habitable space out of a 500-year  
6 | floodplain is just smart. So in the end, will any portion of  
7 | the -- even the retail -- ground-floor retail be within the 500-  
8 | year floodplain, or will it all be elevated above that?

9 |           MR. HUFFER: No, it's all going to be elevated above  
10 | that. So that was, kind of, one of the advantages of raising  
11 | and creating that cohesive plaza space was to not only, you know,  
12 | have it flow better from Half Street to the waterfront, but also  
13 | to raise everything out of that floodplain.

14 |           COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. So on the IZ units, I note  
15 | that your diagram shows that some of the same units on each floor  
16 | are repeated many floors up, and that's not something that we  
17 | typically see. And I think the regulations call for them to be  
18 | distributed. I'm not sure that stacking like that -- I mean,  
19 | certainly when -- if this were a PUD, we would object to the  
20 | stacking. I don't -- since IZ unit placement is not truly in  
21 | our domain for a design review case, or at least I don't think  
22 | it is, I would just point it out that that's -- that doesn't seem  
23 | to be consistent with what our -- what the regulations call for.  
24 | Maybe I'm wrong about that.

25 |           MR. HUFFER: I mean, I think right now we are -- you

1 know, this is showing that we are going to be complying with all  
2 the regulations in the long term as the design goes through the  
3 drawing process and construction process. You know, the unit mix  
4 and the numbers of the units will change, but this is, kind of,  
5 we're showing this is our intention of the conceptual way out.  
6 And I understand the stacking question, but it was more the sense  
7 that we wanted to show that we were, for the interim, showing  
8 that they will be consistently put throughout the building, not  
9 just on the bottom floors. Every -- we wanted to have that --  
10 all of the floors covered. So you know, obviously, this is, you  
11 know, in flux as the design will progress, but we will be  
12 complying with all the requirements in the long term.

13 COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. All right. So I appreciate  
14 the explanation of why you included a large portion of the facade  
15 with the white metal panel finish. I'm a little confused about  
16 what that white metal is. In your presentation, I saw a metal  
17 panel sample in a photograph, which, I think it showed three  
18 different colors, right? Am I -- do I understand that correctly,  
19 or is --

20 MR. HUFFER: Yes. You know, right now, until we get  
21 the actual, final manufacturer picked out, the construction  
22 process, we're just showing a slight range in that color from,  
23 you know, different shades of white, but we want it to be within  
24 that range.

25 COMMISSIONER MAY: Are they really white? I mean, it

1 | seemed like some of them were almost in the gray category, it  
2 | wasn't just off-white. Maybe it's just the photo that I got.

3 |           MR. HUFFER: If anything, it could be, you know, the  
4 | intention is white to match with the bridge, so --

5 |           COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah.

6 |           MR. HUFFER: Yeah.

7 |           COMMISSIONER MAY: So you may be aware that I have  
8 | concerns about white metal panel, in particular, because of the  
9 | way that it can get dirty and streaked from pollution and whatnot  
10 | washing down the facade or washing off of balconies or things  
11 | like that, and I don't, you know, to some extent this is a matter  
12 | of the detailing of it, not just in terms of how well you shed  
13 | water, but also when the water is just running down the side, is  
14 | it, you know, creating, you know, basically a dirty building, or  
15 | is it, you know, are the -- is the metal -- the metal panels  
16 | constructed and joined in such a way that it actually can enhance  
17 | the look of it? And it seems like you're just trying to make it  
18 | all just one big white piece, right, that's it's -- so it's very  
19 | tight joints and not, you know, I don't want to spend too much  
20 | on what it is, I just want to understand why you think that you  
21 | can build this and have it look good without somebody out there  
22 | having to scrub it every few months.

23 |           MR. HUFFER: So I -- I mean, I think it's -- that is  
24 | one of the additional reasons for, kind of, that slight range,  
25 | you know, we might look at, you know, something that's not super-

1 | bright white and maybe has a slightly more eggshell look to it  
2 | that helps mitigate some of that. However, I'd like to point  
3 | out that across the bridge at the Maren, where we also have the  
4 | very large white element, that's been up for the few years now,  
5 | and I think it looks as good as it did the day it was put up.

6 |           COMMISSIONER MAY: What building is that?

7 |           MR. HUFFER: The Maren.

8 |           COMMISSIONER MAY: Maren. What's the location of that?

9 |           MR. HUFFER: 71 Potomac Avenue.

10 |          COMMISSIONER MAY: All right.

11 |          MR. HUFFER: It's just right on the other side of the  
12 | bridge, first building.

13 |          COMMISSIONER MAY: Do you have a recent photograph of  
14 | it?

15 |          MR. HUFFER: If you go to page 19 on the presentation,  
16 | on the top right, there is a photo of it. I guess on the top  
17 | two.

18 |          COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah. That's a little hard to see.

19 |          MR. HUFFER: Yeah.

20 |          COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay.

21 |          MR. HUFFER: But in terms of the design of it, I think,  
22 | in terms of water, you know, having a horizontal ledge, if you  
23 | look at the design, all of our white elements are vertical with  
24 | not -- I mean, besides the roof and the bottom, nothing being  
25 | horizontal, so there's not, like, a lot of ledges with the white

1 -- for water to keep dripping down. So we think that having the  
2 vertical elements go all the way, consistently, that there won't  
3 be a lot of areas where that dirt can pile up.

4 COMMISSIONER MAY: Uh-huh. And is it -- the metal of  
5 it, is this a true rain screen with no cross joints, or are there  
6 going to be cross joints?

7 MR. HUFFER: It's going to be a true rain screen.

8 COMMISSIONER MAY: All right. I'm still a skeptic,  
9 because I've seen too many buildings with white metal panels not  
10 look very good after a while, but you know, maybe I'll take a  
11 look at the Maren --

12 MR. HUFFER: Yeah. Yeah.

13 COMMISSIONER MAY: -- and see what it looks like.

14 MR. HUFFER: Like I said, I think, you know, the Maren,  
15 right across, has a lot of white on it. So it's a good example  
16 of being in the area.

17 COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. All right. And then let's  
18 see, I think I have one more question (indiscernible). Oh, yeah.  
19 So the Office of Planning made comments about possible relief  
20 needed for -- setback relief needed at the temporarily open courts  
21 --

22 MR. HUFFER: Uh-huh.

23 COMMISSIONER MAY: -- and I'm wondering if you all have  
24 -- maybe Ms. Roddy wants to talk about whether she agreed with  
25 that's an issue or not.

1 MS. RODDY: Right. We did request that flexibility.  
2 So that was part of the application. It is an open court in the  
3 interim period, but once Phase II is constructed, that will be a  
4 closed court. So setback relief would no longer be required once  
5 Phase II is constructed.

6 COMMISSIONER MAY: Why is it an open court?

7 MS. RODDY: Because it opens on to R Street, which is  
8 200 feet to the north, in that interim condition.

9 COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay.

10 MS. RODDY: It's set back considerably. It is just  
11 that it, technically --

12 COMMISSIONER MAY: No, I know --

13 MS. RODDY: -- for a yard, I guess.

14 COMMISSIONER MAY: -- physical condition is. I was  
15 trying to remember my definitions of "open court," but it will  
16 be -- it will eventually be a closed court, then it will not  
17 need the relief.

18 MS. RODDY: Correct.

19 COMMISSIONER MAY: And last thing, I assume that the  
20 bike room is going to have charging capability for e-bikes?

21 MR. HUFFER: Yes.

22 COMMISSIONER MAY: I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you.

23 MR. HUFFER: Yes, it will.

24 COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. Thank you. I'm pretty sure  
25 you said "yes," but I want to make sure it got into the

1 transcript. That's it for my questions. Thank you.

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Commissioner  
3 Shapiro?

4 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just a  
5 few quick questions. One, I want to associate myself with a  
6 couple of -- well, all the remarks of Commissioner May, but two  
7 specifically. The public art piece, that design for that interim  
8 -- to use along those -- the walls on the north facade, I feel  
9 strongly about that, as well. And so if you could put some  
10 attention to presenting that to us. It's okay to have public  
11 art that will then go away, but there are solutions to that, and  
12 I'd like to see that -- those options presented to us.

13 The other one, specifically, is around the white metal  
14 panels, as well. I loved the facade articulation that you  
15 presented, and I really like that white element there. And your  
16 rationale for it, the way it speaks to the bridge, I think, is  
17 just lovely. And I have the same concerns around how those white  
18 metal panels would wear. So I appreciate your attention to that,  
19 as well.

20 A couple other ones, on the -- I appreciate your  
21 commitment to LEED Gold certification, specifically related to  
22 the solar panels. You have a small section of solar panels. How  
23 much green roof do you have?

24 MR. HUFFER: I am not sure what the total number is,  
25 but we are meeting -- we are amply -- our requirement is a 0.2

1 GAR, and I think we are surpassing that by a decent amount, but  
2 I don't have the actual square footages.

3 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: So the DOEE has lots -- has  
4 material for you and guidelines for how to integrate solar into  
5 green roof and getting the best advantages of both. So if you  
6 could look at that. I'd like to see a stronger commitment up  
7 front, and that's the easiest way to do it. You could just  
8 integrate it right into the green roof that you have available.

9 MR. HUFFER: Yes, sir.

10 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: It's (indiscernible) --

11 MR. HUFFER: We have those guidelines, and I think  
12 that's the plan. We just need to take the next step and in the  
13 -- with the design.

14 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: So you might -- just like to see  
15 as much commitment as you can, up front, in this design review  
16 process to solar, and if you can step it beyond what you have,  
17 beyond just the flexibility to allow, you know, (indiscernible)  
18 more if you can do it.

19 MR. HUFFER: Understood.

20 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: The other thing, and this is a  
21 more -- this is my last question, but I'm just testing my senior  
22 memory, the alley line that you have, it goes right across the  
23 street to -- I think it was a project that we just had before  
24 us, the Hoffman Building, and they have an alley that cuts  
25 through, as well, and that alley and your alley, may be the

1 special limits around this, they don't line up. And so you're  
2 bringing the pedestrian traffic to -- right into Half Street, but  
3 in the middle of the block, and I imagine, with all that -- you  
4 know, maybe not in the short term, but in the medium to long  
5 term, that alley is going to have a lot of pedestrian use. And  
6 so what are people -- what is your plan? I mean, what do people  
7 do when they come out onto Half Street from that alley? And  
8 especially if they're heading to Audi Field, the quickest way  
9 would be to cut right through the alley and the building across  
10 the street.

11 MR. HUFFER: Yeah, I think with the --

12 MR. ANDRES: Go ahead, Chris.

13 MR. HUFFER: I mean, I think we just anticipate them  
14 either going up to R Street or S Street. I think, you know, on  
15 our side, by the time you get to that portion of our site, it  
16 will be, probably, farther south already if you're coming from  
17 the oval where those pedestrian connections are going to be coming  
18 down into the site or under the bridge, you're going to be  
19 already, kind of, on S Street. So, you know, we're providing  
20 the alley to be pedestrian friendly, but we're not anticipating  
21 it could be the main use. I mean, that's, kind of, why we're  
22 setting the building back on S Street, is we're encouraging  
23 pedestrians to use S Street.

24 MR. ANDRES: Uh-huh. Yes. And that's correct. You  
25 know, with respect to where the pedestrian entrances are for both

1 | the Phase I and, ultimately, the Phase II building, they're not  
2 | going to be proximate to that alley. If anything, they're going  
3 | to be -- concentrate either further north or located, as Chris  
4 | said, off of S Street. And S Street, itself, is considered --  
5 | the eastern terminus of it is considered a pedestrian facility  
6 | with the potential for closing it for special events. So -- and  
7 | you know, S Street lines up really well as you head west towards  
8 | the stadium.

9 |           COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Okay. And maybe this is in a  
10 | little bit in disagreement with the ANC on this, because as you're  
11 | describing it, it sounds like we should, you know, make sure that  
12 | we don't over-design that alley for pedestrian access, because  
13 | we don't want -- it sounds like you don't want to invite a lot  
14 | of pedestrian traffic in that alley.

15 |           MR. HUFFER: I mean, I think we understand that people  
16 | are going to use the alley, so we want to make sure that is, you  
17 | know, safe and walkable just in the interim. You know, nobody  
18 | likes -- I mean, it's -- we're anticipating it being a very lively  
19 | area in the long term, and, you know, we don't want it to be a,  
20 | you know, completely, you know, smelly area, right, like, people  
21 | would be scared to walk there. So --

22 |           COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Got you. Okay. And it is a  
23 | balancing act. I get it.

24 |           MR. HUFFER: Yeah. Yeah.

25 |           COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: That's all the questions that I

1 have, Mr. Chair. I'll leave it at that.

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. Commissioner Imamura.

3 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

4 Mr. Huffer, I will work my way backwards from some of  
5 the topics that Commissioner Shapiro talked about, and  
6 Commissioner May, starting with sustainability and your  
7 commitment for LEED Gold. So I understand the project was  
8 originally designed to meet Silver. So what additional points  
9 were you able to grab for LEED Gold, and how confident are you  
10 that that you will attain those points? How many additional  
11 points do you need to be over that LEED Gold threshold? It looked  
12 like it was 60.

13 MR. HUFFER: Currently we are at 61, and you know,  
14 right now, until we take the next step in design, we feel that's  
15 a conservative number. I think there is several other, according  
16 to our sustainability consultant, that we should be able to hit,  
17 some of them related to solar. You know, I think a few of the  
18 other options are we're looking at integration of walk-off mats  
19 and different VOC-type materials, fly ash concrete, but I think  
20 in terms of where we were, we were mid-50s and meet LEED Silver,  
21 so it wasn't a big stretch for what this -- you know, we wanted  
22 to come in conservatively, but we were definitely committed to,  
23 you know, providing a sustainable building. So I think, shooting  
24 Gold for us shouldn't be a huge reach.

25 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: All right. That's what I wanted

1 to hear that and how you're committed to that.

2 MR. HUFFER: Yeah.

3 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Certainly adding some more  
4 photovoltaic panels and working that into the design solution  
5 will, you know, certainly help, and I think Commissioner Shapiro  
6 had mentioned many sources that you all already have, but I would  
7 like, you know, to see a stronger commitment there.

8 In terms of the design gestures, I certainly appreciate  
9 your description of base, middle, top, that was pretty evident.  
10 Your white metal panels, I think Commissioner May pointed out  
11 that there were, sort of, three hues there. Also the cool gray  
12 that you all had provided. I certainly appreciate the gesture  
13 in terms of the white and tying it back to the bridge. I don't  
14 know if people will actually get that, if that will really  
15 resonate, but it does pop in terms of, like, the vocabulary and  
16 geometry of the architecture that we saw. So I certainly don't  
17 have an issue with that.

18 I thought the rippled windows along S Street was sort  
19 of interesting, but I don't know if people, again, will really  
20 pick that up in terms of the rhythm of that and how that ties  
21 back to the bridge, but again, just a creative idea. I just  
22 don't know if that will read really well. I think one of the  
23 great things in terms of the design solution was your effort to  
24 be compatible with the Verge development, so I appreciate that  
25 and being in context with the surrounding neighborhood in terms

1 | of materiality.

2 |           I certainly appreciate the number of recessed  
3 | balconies. I understand that there's a request for some, I guess,  
4 | 10 percent of those for -- those balconies in terms of total  
5 | number of balconies that you all provide. So do you have a count  
6 | of how many recessed balconies you already have?

7 |           MR. HUFFER: I mean, our overall balcony and terrace  
8 | number is about 60 percent, right now, of all units.

9 |           COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: I imagine that actually won't  
10 | change a whole lot because of the elevations and perspectives  
11 | that you already provided. It seemed pretty complete, in that  
12 | it, sort of, develops a rhythm and pattern to the facade already.  
13 | So I wouldn't imagine that there'd be great change to the number  
14 | of balconies or terraces that are (indiscernible).

15 |           MR. HUFFER: Yeah. I think that's correct. I mean,  
16 | we're still nailing down some of our final, you know, unit mix,  
17 | but I think, like you said, it's -- it won't change too much. Or  
18 | we're -- our goal is to be in that vicinity.

19 |           COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: In terms of the unit mix, again,  
20 | as Commissioner May pointed out, I mean, IZ may not be, sort of,  
21 | within the design review, but is there anything that would prevent  
22 | you all from a greater distribution of those IZ units rather than  
23 | having them stacked?

24 |           MR. HUFFER: Yeah. In terms of distributing through  
25 | the building, yeah. I think that's definitely something we'll

1 | look through and definitely provide.

2 |           COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: But there's not anything that  
3 | would prevent you from, sort of, unstacking them and looking at  
4 | a different sort of --

5 |           MR. HUFFER: Yeah. Yeah.

6 |           COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: -- distribution?

7 |           MR. HUFFER: Yep.

8 |           COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: In terms of the architecture, I  
9 | think it certainly, and I mean this in the best possible way, I  
10 | think there's enough articulation in the facade and just a general  
11 | sense of the design that it's, and I mean this, again, in the  
12 | best possible way, but it's vanilla enough that it fits in with  
13 | the character of the surrounding neighborhood. So no outlandish  
14 | gestures, so that's -- I think that's good.

15 |           In terms of the landscape architecture, I would like  
16 | to ask Mr. Hoover just a question about resiliency. So I know  
17 | that, Mr. Hoover, you made a comment that setting the first  
18 | building speaks to the resiliency because it is in the 500-year  
19 | floodplain. What other, sort of, design gestures or moves have  
20 | you all considered that, sort of, builds on your resiliency  
21 | strategy?

22 |           MR. HOOVER: Well, the -- yeah. The -- setting the  
23 | elevations, it -- you know, making sure that all the buildings  
24 | are up out of the 500-year floodplain was the, kind of, the first  
25 | move.

1           Some of the other ones are, at this point, aspirations,  
2 I mean, where we want to head. I think -- and it's not really  
3 part of this parcel, but it's really the bigger picture, what's  
4 done at the waterfront. Living shoreline is a big piece of where  
5 we're headed for much of the property along the waterfront.  
6 What's already been bulkheaded will remain bulkheaded, but yeah,  
7 so I'd say that living shoreline. There's a few other things  
8 that we have up our sleeve that we're hoping to be able to afford,  
9 but we don't want to talk too much about those quite yet. Yeah.

10           COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Okay. All right. I certainly  
11 can appreciate that. So thank you --

12           MR. HOOVER: Sure.

13           COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: -- for that Mr. Hoover.

14           The last question that I have, I think, speaks to both  
15 what Commissioner Shapiro and Commissioner May had mentioned,  
16 just about the elevations. This will go back, I think maybe to  
17 Mr. Huffer. In terms of the elevations of the north side of that  
18 building, but also, I think it was on Slide 50 where we saw an  
19 elevation of those giant blank walls there. Do we also know  
20 what's going to happen -- I think somebody, I think had mentioned  
21 that there would be parking, food in the lot north to this, and  
22 what's going to happen there? Any plans or any ideas?

23           MR. HUFFER: I think in the interim, we're looking at,  
24 you know, some temporary uses for either a dog park, parking, or  
25 you know, food truck parking, and you know, just things that will

1 activate that parcel in the interim.

2 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: And I assume that would be paid  
3 parking there?

4 MR. HUFFER: Yeah.

5 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: I think just to speak to what  
6 Commissioner May and Commissioner Shapiro said, what that  
7 elevation will look like for the next two years is going to be  
8 very important.

9 Those are all the questions that I have. So Mr. Chair,  
10 I'll yield back.

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Vice Chair Miller?

12 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank  
13 you to the Applicant's team for bringing this design review  
14 project forward in Southwest D.C. And thank you for all your  
15 engagement with the community, ANC 6D, your responsiveness to  
16 their concerns, particularly about the alley, ensuring that the  
17 pedestrian and vehicular use of it is safe, and your incorporation  
18 of the design into the -- that you're presenting here today into  
19 the -- to be part of the order, and your changes that you've made  
20 in response to Office of Planning, DOEE comments on LEED Gold  
21 -- going from LEED Silver to Gold and adding the solar, that's  
22 certainly appreciated. And you're looking at ways to increase  
23 those opportunities, as Commissioner Shapiro's dialogue indicated  
24 with you.

25 I share all the comments of my colleagues. I'm not

1 | sure I really have any specific questions. It's a very attractive  
2 | design -- facade articulation, use of materials and colors, and  
3 | all the balconies. We love balconies. And I think the way you  
4 | have both recessed and outward balconies helps break up what is  
5 | a -- would otherwise seem like a big building, 430 units of market  
6 | -- of housing, 43 -- and 43 of which will be Inclusionary Zoning  
7 | units. I think I saw the breakdown of those units. I saw --  
8 | it's in this -- one of the slides that you had here and that I  
9 | read earlier, but just confirm that of those 43 Inclusionary  
10 | Zoning units, 13 are going to be studio, 19 are going to be one-  
11 | bedroom, and 11 are going to be two-bedroom, which roughly  
12 | approximates the percentages of the market-rate mix in the  
13 | building, as well?

14 |           MR. HUFFER: Yes. I mean, they're going to be within  
15 | those percentages, yeah.

16 |           VICE CHAIR MILLER: And I appreciate you moving, as OP  
17 | had suggested, one of the two-bedrooms to have the exterior view,  
18 | as opposed to the courtyard view. So I appreciate that. And  
19 | you're looking at, maybe, even further equitably distributing  
20 | them throughout the building.

21 |           I thought -- Ms. Roddy, I thought you might have made  
22 | a comment, which I didn't think was the case in this particular  
23 | application, on the -- even though IZ is not technically part of  
24 | a design review case, I thought you might have said that there  
25 | are more -- that there's a greater amount of -- it's meeting the

1 IZ. It's clearly meeting the Inclusionary Zoning requirements  
2 by the amount and by the affordability level, but did you say  
3 that there's a greater amount and deeper affordability level than  
4 what the Inclusionary Zoning required? I didn't think that there  
5 was in this particular case, but --

6 MS. RODDY: No. The project will be meeting what is  
7 required under the IZ program here.

8 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Just wanted to clarify that.  
9 So and I was happy to hear, as (indiscernible) that  
10 this second phase, which will have the grocery store, which the  
11 neighborhood certainly is desirous of, will be happening,  
12 hopefully, in fairly short order.

13 The 17,000 square feet of retail that's on this phase,  
14 what kind of retail are you anticipating there? I mean, I saw -  
15 - I guess is saw outdoor cafe on the -- in one of the -- oh, by  
16 the way, while I'm on that, I appreciate on the design the  
17 additional voluntary setback at the ground level. I think that  
18 does create a warm pedestrian environment. It activates that  
19 space for the outdoor cafes or whatever retail, or pedestrians  
20 are going to be there. But what retail are you envisioning on  
21 this phase?

22 MR. HUFFER: Right now, we're, you know, we're open to,  
23 I guess, anything, really, but we are trying to focus on services  
24 for the neighborhood. So potentially, you know, an urgent care  
25 or, you know, things along those lines, instead of just purely,

1 | you know, restaurants and bars.

2 |           VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Okay. Thank you. That's  
3 | really it, Mr. Chairman. I don't have any other questions. I  
4 | appreciate the Applicant bringing this forward. I think it's an  
5 | attractive project. I share all the comments that my colleagues  
6 | have made, and I turn it back to you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

7 |           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. I'm going to  
8 | take a different avenue. I'm going to talk more about the racial  
9 | equity. I think the design is spectacular. I love the design,  
10 | other than the whiteness, I think you would probably pay a little  
11 | attention; I think Commissioner May and others may have mentioned  
12 | that. But Ms. Roddy, whoever can talk to me about affordable  
13 | housing, let's talk about that.

14 |           So -- and let me preface my remarks. As of lately, the  
15 | Zoning Commission has been -- by our former counsel, which was,  
16 | maybe, three or four months ago, we've been talking about  
17 | affordable housing, and they expect us to get there quicker. And  
18 | my problem, when I read these cases and I look at these letters  
19 | from Ms. Ho, and hopefully, Ms. Hale, or however her name is  
20 | pronounced, and the other letter, I think, from Mr. Williams,  
21 | Brian Williams, my concern is when we were trying to put -- when  
22 | they were advising us and we were trying to get to these levels  
23 | and get to some of the stuff that they're saying now that we can  
24 | do, it was always proceed with caution. But now is, you can get  
25 | it done. So I'm waiting to have a dialogue with them, and I hope

1 | they are listening, because I'm waiting. Because you were the  
2 | ones who advised us on a lot of this and told us to proceed with  
3 | caution. So now I want to know what the difference was in three  
4 | months that it's been in seven years. So that's, kind of, where  
5 | I am on all this.

6 |           And it's very frustrating when I look at what the  
7 | residents now are saying the Zoning Commission can do this, the  
8 | Zoning Commission can do that, and they have the endorsement  
9 | label of our former legal counsel, who always had us proceed with  
10 | caution. And I'm looking forward to having a public debate --  
11 | or a public conversation, because I want to know why was it  
12 | proceed with caution then, and now it's move forward. So I'm  
13 | very perplexed with that.

14 |           But I do want to ask Ms. Roddy, and I'm not sure who  
15 | -- I'm not picking on you, but I'm just trying to get to the  
16 | bottom of some this that's coming out all of a sudden. And some  
17 | of this, as I mentioned previously, are things that this  
18 | Commission has been trying to grapple and get to, and as the Vice  
19 | Chair and others have always said over the years is, "We're just  
20 | a small piece of it." But we have tried to execute and exercise  
21 | our small piece of it for years. We're trying to get there.  
22 | Incrementally, we -- I think we are making some advancement.

23 |           But -- and I know that, you know, we're also looking  
24 | at whether or not more affordability in our Capitol Gateway design  
25 | cases, I know we're looking at that. I know, particularly, we

1 | try to play by our rules. Our rules say that. We have the Office  
2 | of Planning looking at that to see whether or not we should do  
3 | that or not, or how far we can go, incrementally, what the  
4 | unintended consequences are.

5 |           When I look at your exhibit where you did your analysis  
6 | on the racial equity -- and Ms. Roddy, I'm going to ask you this,  
7 | and I'm going to ready right from what you have. "Racial equity."  
8 | It's on page number 1. It says, "The property will create new  
9 | housing on a site that is currently occupied by industrial use,  
10 | a concrete batching plant." I don't know, Florida Rock has been  
11 | around a while. They've been there probably as long as I have.  
12 | I remember those conversations about Florida Rock and the  
13 | concrete and the stadium. I remember all that.

14 |           This says, "We'll include affordable housing to assist  
15 | in the District's Inclusionary Zoning Program. From an equity  
16 | perspective, the project increases housing opportunities in  
17 | affordable housing."

18 |           While I understand you all are going by the rules, and  
19 | I'm not asking you to do anything, but it's like almost -- not  
20 | just you -- this Applicant, Ms. Roddy, but just in general, we  
21 | always do -- I'm not saying bare minimum, but we always do what's  
22 | required. We don't do that extra step. And I think that's what  
23 | some communities are pushing us at.

24 |           And I look at these two letters, here, they're saying,  
25 | well, you all can do this, and you all can do that. And the

1 Attorney General said this and -- so that's a whole other facet,  
2 but to me, sometime, let's push the envelope. And I'm just having  
3 this discussion to start it. I'm not saying that this Applicant  
4 has to do it, because I love the design. I know you all are  
5 playing by the rules that are in place now. And I know the  
6 Commission, the Office of Planning, and the City have some more  
7 work to do to try to get to deeper levels, but I mean -- and I'm  
8 not necessarily just lashing out. I'm just trying to figure out  
9 -- I'm trying to figure out where is the compromise, where is  
10 the balance that where we can get to more residents, because here  
11 is the bottom line of all this I'm saying. I actually agree with  
12 their letters. I do not disagree with them. But I also, on the  
13 other side, I can't just march -- just run right to it because  
14 I know there are some other unintended consequences. But I think  
15 we need to start having that discussion. We need to figure it  
16 out, and at some point in time, I think it needs to be exercised.

17           So my question to you, Ms. Roddy, is what I'm starting  
18 to pick up a lot from different applicants, not just your  
19 applicant. You just happen to be the one I'm thinking about just  
20 tonight, is that we are just -- we are coming in and saying, "Oh,  
21 we meet the requirement."

22           Why, sometime, don't we try to go a little beyond the  
23 requirement? I don't know if that's fair for me to ask you that  
24 tonight and put you on the spot. But if you choose not to answer  
25 that, I will accept that, but I would like to know from, maybe,

1 | this Applicant, Steuart, why is it that sometimes we don't go  
2 | beyond the requirement?

3 |           MS. RODDY: And I appreciate that, and I understand the  
4 | question, and we understand that it's obviously a hot topic in  
5 | the District, because affordable housing is in need. And I think  
6 | that when you look at the development team, like I said, they do  
7 | prioritize affordable housing. MRP has a significant number of  
8 | units in the pipeline or already that have been built, 950  
9 | affordable units. So it is something they're not -- they don't  
10 | shy away from.

11 |           But I think with this particular site, and you used the  
12 | word "balance," and I think that's what that is here, that there  
13 | is a lot that needs to be done to convert this concrete batching  
14 | plant to a residential use. So I think it's important to note  
15 | no one's being displaced, but in converting that long-term  
16 | industrial use to residential, there's a number of improvements  
17 | that need to be made. In addition to that, it's in a 500-year  
18 | floodplain, so there's some resiliency efforts that need to be  
19 | undertaken in order to make this a successful residential site,  
20 | as well.

21 |           So I understand the need for affordable housing,  
22 | certainly. I think that in order to make this a successful  
23 | residential site given the long-standing history of this  
24 | particular property, that -- unfortunately for this site, that  
25 | the IZ -- the Applicant is committing to what is required in the

1 IZ Program so that it can make this work as a residential site  
2 to make the improvements that are otherwise required.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I appreciate the answer, and you  
4 know, not just you, Ms. Roddy, but if I asked, I would probably  
5 get something similar to that somewhere, so I'm just trying to  
6 figure out, from our standpoint, from the Zoning Commission's  
7 standpoint, because everyone's wits -- basically thinking that  
8 we're not doing what we need to be doing as far as getting  
9 affordable housing. And when I read their letters, again, like  
10 I stated, I agree with them. So I just need to try to figure  
11 out how to get there.

12 So I appreciate your answer. I think I will settle for  
13 that for now, but let me ask you, what was the -- and I can't  
14 remember off the top of my head, what was the MFI on a number of  
15 these affordable units?

16 MS. RODDY: 60 percent.

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: 60. Now, that raises another  
18 discussion. Now, I think -- I don't know if you've been around,  
19 but I'm always looking at zero to 30, because I can tell you, 60  
20 percent -- we don't get to the residents who are writing these  
21 letters. We don't get to them. And I'm not just picking on this  
22 Applicant, Ms. Roddy, so I hope you're -- the people you're  
23 representing don't think I'm just picking on them. I'm going to  
24 start having these conversations. But 60 percent, I know that's  
25 what's in front of us, but we really don't get to those levels

1 of where people are writing these letters are. That's where they  
2 are. So I, you know, and I can understand it. It's actually  
3 -- and I want the public to know, it's actually mind-boggling.  
4 We get beat up for not getting there, but there are so many other  
5 things that go into place, and I'm just perplexed by -- you were  
6 my counsel all these years. You know we really want to get there,  
7 but now I can automatically go there, but it was proceed with  
8 caution.

9           So I'm looking forward to having a dialogue with the  
10 Office of Attorney General, Karl Racine (indiscernible), and find  
11 out what happened in four months that can get us there all of a  
12 sudden. So I think that's important. I think the residents are  
13 depending on us, and I'm up to the task.

14           So Ms. Roddy, I'm not going to ask you any more  
15 questions on that. I appreciate your having a dialogue with me.  
16 But on a brighter note, again, like I stated earlier, I really  
17 think the design is really going to really do a lot of good things  
18 for the Southwest Community, and I hope they enjoy the beautiful  
19 look, which I think it is, but we got to find a way to get to  
20 the zero to 30 percent and get different folks who are -- let's  
21 make it affordable to the folks who are writing us these letters.

22           That's all I have. I think my colleagues have covered  
23 it pretty fully. Again, Ms. Roddy, thank you for responding to  
24 my fact-finding mission. Thank you.

25           All right. Commissioners, are there any second round

1 of questions or comments?

2 (No audible response.)

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Not seeing any. Let's go to  
4 Ms. Kramer -- Commissioner -- Vice Chair Kramer, I think you're  
5 still a Vice Chair. Do you have any cross-examination before we  
6 hear from your testimony?

7 COMMISSIONER KRAMER: Oops. I do (audio interference),  
8 Chairman Hood. I can -- I'm going to deal with the affordable  
9 housing issue (audio interference) when I'm into my (audio  
10 interference). I very much appreciate your comments on that.

11 On the specific questions for cross, we -- you talked  
12 about -- the Applicant talked about the use of the other retail  
13 space, which is going into -- which would be happening in Phase  
14 I. And since we have understood, happily, that that -- that the  
15 Applicant is aiming for not -- no eateries and other spaces --  
16 other "food and beverage" places was the way it was characterized  
17 to us, and I want to make sure that -- because you have a lot  
18 of outdoor space that people keep describing as "cafe spaces,"  
19 that that's -- would not be in service to actual cafes. The --  
20 you just recently described the fact that you're looking for a  
21 -- possibly a, what do you call it, an urgent care facility or  
22 something else, and we are delighted that that's the case, but I  
23 just want you -- I wondered if there's further clarification on  
24 it, because you have a lot of spaces that keep being referred to  
25 as "cafe spaces." And we're hoping that's not inconsistent.

1 I also have a question on the improved -- the plaza  
2 side on the east of the project. There are, in the slides it  
3 shows automobile traffic sort of circling the building and going  
4 out again. This is the end of the -- so, kind of, a dead end of  
5 South Capitol Street. We talked, and my testimony and the report  
6 to the ANC -- to the Zoning Commission describe that area as --  
7 with the potential for integrating it into the surrounding green  
8 spaces, which we're hoping will happen. So I'm -- I want to --  
9 we felt that we add a bit of caution in seeing that as any kind  
10 of through -- traffic through space. And I just want to know  
11 whether you have a response to that.

12 On the white exterior -- I guess you've answered that.  
13 We have the same comments as everybody else does. We are  
14 overjoyed with the white and the -- how it resonates with the  
15 bridge but would be concerned if you're not -- I assume you're  
16 going to take into account materials that will shed water and  
17 dirt and grime very easily.

18 And my last question, sort of for reiteration for the  
19 record, is the comment that was just made by someone, I forgot  
20 whom, about that the alley is not intended for pedestrian use.  
21 We worked long and hard at that and are very happy that -- with  
22 the solution that you came up with for protecting pedestrians,  
23 but I want to make sure that what we thought of as we worked on  
24 that was this is going to be an area that's so heavily used by  
25 pedestrians, that they will take advantage of a 30-foot alley.

1 And that's why we're happy to see you have put in the protections  
2 that you do. So if you have any further comments on that, I'd  
3 be delighted to hear it. We do -- we are trying to be careful  
4 about pedestrian use.

5 Thanks.

6 MR. HUFFER: Yes. So I think in terms of the retail  
7 uses, we just want to clarify that, you know, we are flexible  
8 with what's going to be developed there in the long term. So  
9 we're not necessarily precluding anything, but the, you know, the  
10 goal is to focus on those service-based uses, but in the long  
11 term, you know, we have to evaluate what the market is doing when  
12 we get to that point.

13 But you know, in terms of the seating in that area in  
14 front, you know, we want it, you know, it's shown as tables and  
15 whatnot in the perspectives for now, but that is just, obviously,  
16 a placeholder, and depending on the use there, we are going to  
17 give that use the ability to use that space. We just want to  
18 show that that space can be activated by whatever tenant is there  
19 in the long term.

20 And then in terms of the alley, I think we agree with  
21 you. You know, obviously, we worked with you guys long and hard  
22 about the use of the alley. And we agree that it will be used,  
23 and we don't want it to be an unfriendly, unsafe area, and that  
24 was the goal of working with you guys in terms of the design of  
25 the alley, in terms of the materiality, the protection with the

1 bollards, and also bringing around the materiality of the ground  
2 floor of the street-side part of the building through to the  
3 alley so it was an integrated portion of the building.

4 I think just our long-term goal is we would prefer  
5 people use the street, just because that's where all the activity  
6 and the retail or potential uses will be. So I'll let Don comment  
7 on the access points.

8 MR. HOOVER: I think the question was about -- you had  
9 a question about the future South Capitol Street plaza, and you  
10 made a comment -- I think you may have been looking at one of  
11 the sections that shows vehicles going through the plaza space,  
12 which is true. There is -- you know, in Phase I, and in future  
13 phases, there will be that vehicular connection through the plaza  
14 space.

15 The design of the plaza, we heard you in the past, and  
16 in terms of making sure there was enough green included in the  
17 design, and the design of the plaza will be coming, you know,  
18 someday, in the next phase, I suspect. It's not -- we're only  
19 building it, you know, a small portion of the plaza in this space.  
20 So as shown on page 9, that's the extent of the plaza that's  
21 built now, and then, you know -- what that future plaza looks  
22 like, we'll, you know, we'll be working with you all and Office  
23 of Planning on developing that.

24 Did that answer your question or confirm the direction  
25 that that's all headed?

1           COMMISSIONER KRAMER: Sort of. I'm trying to reiterate  
2 what the ANC was -- felt very strongly and enthusiastic about was  
3 that the -- because you are -- this abuts the bioretention area  
4 above it or north of it, and the -- whatever green can be used  
5 in the oval that we were hoping and would hope that there will  
6 be details in the -- in what you finally design that will be  
7 green enough to sort of resonate with the -- with those other  
8 green spaces so that -- so it is true, on some of your plans,  
9 that there will be traffic that really will circle the building  
10 is the way I understood it, because it's a dead-end, basically.  
11 But you're not encouraging lots of, you know, there's, sort of,  
12 an active street there -- an active vehicular street there, that  
13 was the -- that was how we interpreted the drawings and the --  
14 and had the conversation with you when we were discussing this.  
15 So I'm --

16           MR. HOOVER: That's correct.

17           COMMISSIONER KRAMER: -- reiterating that point. We  
18 really want to see a plaza, not something that you're just  
19 building an intended street around.

20           MR. HOOVER: Yes, we agree.

21           COMMISSIONER KRAMER: Okay. And in terms of the other  
22 response, excuse me, to the -- I know that the -- you'll -- market  
23 forces will determine what kind of tenancy you have in those  
24 units, but we were really delighted to hear that you were -- that  
25 the intention was not food and beverage, that the intention was

1 | trying to get other kinds of neighborhood-serving activities,  
2 | because we have none of that in Buzzard Point. So I just want  
3 | to be clear that we're still on that page, and we'll work with  
4 | you on that.

5 | MR. HOOVER: Very good.

6 | (Pause.)

7 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Commissioner Kramer, have all your  
8 | questions been answered?

9 | COMMISSIONER KRAMER: I think so. Thank you.

10 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Okay. Good. We'll move  
11 | right on, and we'll come back to you shortly.

12 | COMMISSIONER KRAMER: All right.

13 | MR. HOOVER: All right.

14 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let's go to the Office of Planning  
15 | and DDOT. I think Mr. Jesick and Ms. Vacca, and I know Mr. Lawson  
16 | and Ms. Steingasser are coming up, as well. So Mr. Jesick,  
17 | whenever you're ready, you may begin.

18 | MR. JESICK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Members of the  
19 | Commission.

20 | The Office of Planning reviewed this design review case  
21 | against the relevant criteria of Subtitle K and Subtitle X.  
22 | Specifically, the project would further the goals of the Capitol  
23 | Gateway Zone and help create a mixed-use walkable environment  
24 | with active streetscapes. The project would also not be  
25 | inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan or the Buzzard Point

1 Vision Framework.

2           In our written report, we did encourage the Applicant  
3 to include a higher degree of sustainability on the project, so  
4 we're very encouraged this evening, just to hear that the  
5 Applicant is committed to LEED Gold, and to include solar in the  
6 design.

7           OP concludes that the project has met the design review  
8 criteria, and therefore, we recommend that the Commission approve  
9 the application. OP also supports the areas of flexibility relief  
10 sought in the application.

11           And that concludes my testimony, but I'd be happy to  
12 take any questions. Thank you.

13           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Mr. Jesick, straight to  
14 the point. Thank you. Let's go -- oh, we may have some questions.  
15 Let's go to Ms. Vacca and we'll get the DDOT report.

16           MS. VACCA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For the record, my  
17 name is Kimberly Vacca with the District Department of  
18 Transportation.

19           DDOT is supportive of the requested approval for a  
20 multi-phase, mixed-use development. The proposed development is  
21 expected to generate 59 inbound and outbound a.m. peak-hour trips  
22 and 79 inbound and outbound p.m. peak-hour trips. As such, the  
23 Applicant was required to submit a comprehensive transportation  
24 review with a traffic impact analysis.

25           The Applicant is proposing 300 off-street vehicle

1 spaces in a below-grade parking garage, which is 55 spaces more  
2 than DDOT's preferred parking maximum. The CTR study assumed 20  
3 to 40 percent trips would travel by vehicle. Based on a TIA,  
4 one of the 10 approved study intersections would have an approach  
5 that degrades in level of service. Given the level of service  
6 impact and high parking ratio, DDOT required the Applicant to  
7 mitigate the transportation impacts through a TDM plan. The  
8 Applicant is also proposing a Capital Bikeshare station as  
9 mitigation.

10 DDOT supports the Applicant's proposed TDM plan in the  
11 December 22nd, 2021, CTR with the following revisions, as  
12 outlined in the DDOT report: modify the residential TDM condition  
13 to state, "Designate eight parking spaces in the vehicle parking  
14 garage for car-sharing and micro-mobility services"; modify the  
15 Capitol Bikeshare TDM condition to state, "Install one Capital  
16 Bikeshare station with a minimum of 12 bike stalls located on  
17 site or at an off-site location within the ward or at a location  
18 to be determined by DDOT"; and thirdly and lastly, if the  
19 Applicant is proposing any electrical vehicle charging stations,  
20 include a bullet in the TDM stating the minimum amount. DDOT  
21 recommends six for this site, one per 50 spaces.

22 Overall, DDOT supports the project and welcomes any  
23 questions. Thank you.

24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Vacca, and thank you  
25 both. Let's see if we have any questions of either OP or DDOT.

1 Commissioner May?

2 COMMISSIONER MAY: No, I do not. Thank you.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Commissioner Shapiro?

4 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: No questions, Mr. Chair. Thanks  
5 for the reports.

6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And Commissioner Imamura?

7 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: (No audible response.)

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And Vice Chair Miller?

9 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I have no questions. Thanks for  
10 the report.

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I don't necessarily have any  
12 questions either. I think I was going to ask you a question,  
13 Mr. Jesick, but I think I'm -- I think I already know the answer  
14 to that question I was going to ask you, so there's no sense in  
15 me -- just to hear myself talk.

16 All right. So thank you both. Let's see if the  
17 Applicant -- Ms. Roddy, do you have any questions of either the  
18 Office of Planning -- or cross of either Office of Planning or  
19 DDOT?

20 MS. RODDY: No.

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And Vice Chair Kramer --  
22 Commissioner --

23 COMMISSIONER KRAMER: No questions. Thank you. Thank  
24 you, Mr. Chair.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. Okay. Thank you both.

1 We appreciate your reports, and let's move right on. Did we have  
2 any other government reports -- let me look -- just a second --  
3 I'm sure we did -- that have not been mentioned? If somebody  
4 can help me with that right quick? Can't see any. I don't think  
5 we did. I don't think so.

6 MR. BARRON: There were some comments on the OP report.

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah. I got it. I got it.

8 MR. BARRON: Okay.

9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I was looking for it. Okay. We did  
10 have some comments from DHCD, DOEE, and DCFEMS. Mr. Barron, was  
11 that what you were going to do?

12 MR. BARRON: That was what I was referring to, yes.

13 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I got it. Thank you. Again,  
14 well, let me just read the DOEE -- well, I should -- I need to  
15 probably read all of them.

16 The -- let me just read quickly for the DHCD, the  
17 Department of Housing and Community Development submitted the  
18 following comments to the Office of Planning report that the DHCD  
19 had no objection to design review application, at least the  
20 specifics of -- didn't see any specifics in the report of the  
21 housing proposed other than they'll meet the IZ requirement. The  
22 DHCD requested they do more than just meet the IZ requirements,  
23 specifically providing more square footage than required and a  
24 deeper affordability.

25 DOEE, the Department of Energy and Environment

1 submitted a January 14th, 2022, letter to OP which acknowledged  
2 that the Applicant's efforts to achieve LEED Silver designation.  
3 The Agency strongly encouraged the Applicant to seek  
4 certification at the Gold level and offered a number of strategies  
5 for improving energy efficiency. I think that's been covered.

6 And then the Office of the Fire Marshal submitted a  
7 letter to OP on December 17th, 2021, a memorandum in which they  
8 stated that the Office of the Fire Marshal has no objections to  
9 the project moving forward; however, the Applicant needs to  
10 ensure that all department access and service feature  
11 requirements are in accordance with the applicable law, and I'm  
12 sure they'll take care of that.

13 And thank you all, Office of Planning, for always  
14 getting those other comments in from other agencies.

15 Okay. Let's go to the report of the ANC. Vice Chair  
16 Kramer, would you -- it's your turn, your turn.

17 COMMISSIONER KRAMER: Thank you very much. Good  
18 evening Commissioners. My name is Fredrica Kramer. I am  
19 Commissioner for ANC 6D-05 and Vice Chair of ANC 6D. I'm  
20 testifying today on behalf of ANC 6D and our Commission's report  
21 which we submitted to the Zoning Commission on December 13th,  
22 2021.

23 As ANC 6D stated in its report to the Commission, we  
24 voted to approve the design review of Phase I redevelopment of  
25 Square 662 at 1700 Half Street. This first phase will provide

1 two substantial benefits to the growing Buzzard Point community  
2 and the broader community of Southwest.

3 First, the Applicant is attempting to target a grocery  
4 for the large ground-floor retail space that will be developed  
5 in Phase II. While that facility will not be available until  
6 the second phase of construction, this neighborhood-serving  
7 grocery store will be the first of vitally needed local services  
8 for the new residents in Buzzard Point, as well as those nearby  
9 north of Potomac Avenue, Southwest. The ANC has been so  
10 supportive of this potential tenant that it took the relatively  
11 unusual step of supporting the approval of curb cuts for Phase  
12 II at the DDOT public space -- excuse me, Public Space Committee  
13 hearing in order that the Applicant might be able to successfully  
14 solicit bids from potential vendors of the needed grocery.

15 Second, the construction of this project will eliminate  
16 one of the two concrete plants in Buzzard Point that have supplied  
17 concrete to the massive number of redevelopment projects in  
18 Southwest and Buzzard Point. In the process, these plants have  
19 also been the source of continual dust and air pollution inflicted  
20 on local residents, particularly those in the low-income African  
21 American community immediately north of the site, who suffer with  
22 underlying health conditions that exacerbate their risk from this  
23 constant onslaught of dust and pollutants.

24 The project has other positive design features that are  
25 important to cite. The proposed building has a multitude of

1 balconies, as others have noted, a feature that ANC 6D has pressed  
2 many developers to provide as we eliminate much outdoor space in  
3 redevelopment and as more residents work from home as a result  
4 of COVID-19 and changes in the structure of the workforce that  
5 are likely to prevail. The balconies are both inset and outward  
6 hanging, which gives added texture to the building.

7           The brick ground-level design gives the building  
8 warmth, and the brick bookend portions of the structure add  
9 texture and visual appeal. In addition, the white central  
10 portion, which others have commented on, adds lightness and  
11 visual interest to the building and complements the white of the  
12 new Frederick Douglass Memorial Bridge seen a block away and  
13 across the river, a bow to the neighborhood and context in which  
14 the building sits, and an oft-ignored attribute in other new  
15 buildings in Southwest. I've stated that we are concerned -- we  
16 love the white, we hope that they will solve the -- any problem  
17 of dirt and dust accumulating.

18           Although built to a full height of 130 feet, the upper  
19 two floors are set back on the east side, and there are various  
20 setbacks on the other facades which also adds to the lightness  
21 of the design and picks up the gray panel color used in different  
22 portions of the facade, adding, again, visual interest to the  
23 design.

24           ANC 6D wishes to also call attention to -- call to the  
25 attention of the Zoning Commission other issues in order that

1 they might be part of your considerations and addressed in the  
2 final order.

3           First, while the project will be developed in two  
4 phases, the east/west alley between Half Street and what will  
5 become an extension of South Capitol Street will be used by both  
6 pedestrians and motor vehicles, in particular, trucks accessing  
7 the loading zones for retailers; cars accessing the short-term  
8 parking area; other traffic, potentially, circling around S  
9 Street or Half Street as traffic, essentially, dead-ends at the  
10 southern extension of South Capitol Street; and vehicles that  
11 will access Square 708S, the yet to be developed parcel on the  
12 riverfront east of Square 662, and also owned by the Applicant.

13           The alley is 30 feet wide and designed to permit two-  
14 way traffic. While not intended as a main pedestrian  
15 thoroughfare, it is likely to attract pedestrians as Buzzard  
16 Point welcomes increasing number of visitors attending the games  
17 of the two stadia frequenting the many new eateries coming into  
18 the neighborhood or just interested in the new river vistas and  
19 trailways. This is what I alluded to before in my questions.

20           ANC 6D was concerned that the alley would get frequent  
21 pedestrian use and those individuals needed to be protected from  
22 trucks coming in and out, backing up, and potentially, intruding  
23 into the pedestrian space. The result of a concentrated effort  
24 between the Applicant and the ANC, which others have repeated,  
25 as well, the Applicant has restricted pedestrian traffic to a

1 designated 6-foot lane using different surface material and  
2 strategically-placed bollards to ensure that trucks will not be  
3 able to inadvertently back into the pedestrian lane. ANC has  
4 asked that the drawings and specific specifications for the  
5 alleyway to ensure these protections are included in the final  
6 order.

7           Second, the roughly 17,000 square feet of ground-floor  
8 commercial space that's part of Phase I Application is expected  
9 to house, as I just said, non-food and beverage tenants, and ANC  
10 applauds that consideration. Our Commission expects to continue  
11 discussions with the Applicant so that the ultimate tenants may  
12 fill some of the void in neighborhood-serving amenities that  
13 continue to be a challenge in Buzzard Point.

14           Third, S Street will have relatively light traffic,  
15 although it's currently handling truck traffic to the Vulcan  
16 Concrete Plant. Although the Applicant is hoping to have made  
17 repaving and other improvements to S Street as part of its current  
18 completion of the building at 1800 Half Street, just south of  
19 this project, parking and curbside management for the development  
20 of Square 662 should take into account the anticipated traffic  
21 on the street until that second concrete plant is gone and that  
22 parcel is redeveloped. It should also take into account safe  
23 pedestrian passage, especially during construction, for the  
24 children accessing the early childhood program at Eagle Academy  
25 Public Charter School, which is on the next block.

1           It's also worth noting that the eastern end of the  
2 building completed in Phase I abuts a substantial public space.  
3 This is what I just alluded to in the cross-examination. While  
4 not part of this design review, the Applicant anticipates  
5 proposing to improve the space as a landscaped public plaza as  
6 part of Phase II. ANC 6D has discussed this opportunity with  
7 the Applicant since it would provide much needed open and green  
8 space being lost as Buzzard Point is redeveloped, and also because  
9 it abuts the bioretention area and the new traffic oval to the  
10 north and would complement these green spaces with a pedestrian-  
11 and resident-friendly amenity. We look forward to the fully-  
12 developed proposal for Phase II.

13           On a further and last note, I understand that several  
14 residents have filed comments in opposition to this project  
15 because it will provide only the minimum number of affordable  
16 units required by law. I am delighted to hear that the Chair  
17 and the Commission is equivalently concerned about this issue.  
18 ANC 6D, as a Commission, has stated repeatedly the need for  
19 affordable housing greater than currently required. Our vision  
20 for Southwest is a community of equity and inclusion.

21           I understand, and we understand that this -- these  
22 couple of blocks south of the border of the Southwest Small Area  
23 Plan -- that the site is a couple of blocks south of our Small  
24 Area Plan boundaries, but Southwest is a community, a whole  
25 community. As we said in redistricting and as the Council heard,

1 that we were a community all the way through Buzzard Point. We  
2 have a crisis in affordable housing in the District. When we  
3 have a -- when we are operating under a PUD, developers have  
4 found the ways to go above the IZ requirements, and we look to  
5 the developers and the Zoning Commission to achieve that -- the  
6 greater affordability. We are -- we, as a Commission, more  
7 broadly, have been hamstrung in our efforts to achieve greater  
8 affordability because of the limits of inclusionary zoning, as  
9 well as the boundaries of design review.

10 The Zoning Commission has also stated that you have  
11 asked for guidance and, apparently, have gotten preliminary  
12 guidance from the Council so that all of us who are concerned  
13 about the current limitations can hope that this will be addressed  
14 in the very near future. I hope that these repeated experiences  
15 as we review each one of these projects are further impetus to  
16 the Zoning Commission and the Council to address what has become  
17 an urgent problem.

18 I thank you, and I look forward to your questions.

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Vice Chair Kramer. I  
20 really appreciate your last comments, and I agree with you 100  
21 percent. My only problem is time is of the essence, because,  
22 you know, we're having a discussion, and I know we got to find  
23 that happy balance about the affordability and adding more  
24 affordability and IZ units, but I'm just nervous that we're going  
25 to wait until we get to the point that a lot of it's already

1 built out.

2           So those are my comments. And you all keep pressing,  
3 we'll keep pressing, and eventually, we will find the happy  
4 medium, I'm sure. So thank you for all the work that your ANC  
5 is doing. I don't have any questions for you. So let me see  
6 what my -- let me go in another order. Well, no, I'll go in the  
7 same order. Commissioner May?

8           COMMISSIONER MAY: I don't have any comments or  
9 questions. Thank you.

10          CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Commissioner Shapiro?

11          COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: No questions, Mr. Chair. And  
12 Vice Chair Kramer, just thank you for your excellent, thorough  
13 report and all the hard work of you and your fellow Commissioners  
14 on project after project. Thank you.

15          CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And Commissioner Imamura?

16          COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: I have nothing further to add,  
17 Mr. Chair, ditto.

18          CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And Vice Chair Miller?

19          VICE CHAIR MILLER: I concur, thank you.

20          CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Again, thank you Vice Chair  
21 Kramer. Let's see if the Applicant has any questions or comments  
22 or cross for Commissioner Kramer.

23          MS. RODDY: We do not, thank you.

24          CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. All the work and  
25 the time that you've put into it, Commissioner Kramer, does not

1 go lost on us. Let's continue to work together and let's just  
2 make it happen as soon as we can.

3 COMMISSIONER KRAMER: Thank you very much.

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. Okay. Mr. Barron, do  
5 we have anybody signed up to testify either in support,  
6 opposition, or undeclared?

7 MR. BARRON: We do not, Mr. Chairman.

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Let the record reflect that  
9 I've been told by Mr. Barron that we do not have anyone here to  
10 -- signed up to testify either in support, opposition, or  
11 undeclared.

12 Okay. So Ms. Roddy, you have any rebuttal or closing?

13 MS. RODDY: Well, I'll just give my closing now if  
14 that's okay.

15 We appreciate everyone's time this evening and  
16 throughout this process. We appreciate this is the first phase  
17 of this pipeline of developments that are coming. So we look  
18 forward to continued discussions with the stakeholders, with the  
19 ANC, with OP, DDOT as the designs for future phases, as well as  
20 we continue with the design for this project, as well.

21 So we appreciate everyone's time and investment on  
22 this. I'm happy to be here with the support of OP and DDOT, as  
23 well as the ANC. It was the effort of a lot of parties, and we  
24 appreciate that.

25 And we also just would reiterate that we truly believe

1 that this project is not inconsistent with several key features  
2 of the Comprehensive Plan, as well as the Buzzard Point Vision  
3 Framework Plan, and realizes a lot of the goals and objectives  
4 set forth. So we are excited to see this move forward, and we  
5 appreciate your time and hearing the presentation.

6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Roddy. Any  
7 further questions of the Applicant?

8 (No audible response.)

9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay, I'm not seeing any. Thank you  
10 very much, Ms. Roddy.

11 I'm trying to remember, did anybody ask for anything?

12 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.

13 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Commissioner May. Okay.

14 Mr. Barron --

15 COMMISSIONER MAY: I had asked for views from the north  
16 that give us, sort of, a perspective view of the unfinished  
17 building -- the unfinished ends of it. And I think we were also  
18 looking for some information on how they will treat that in the  
19 two years when it's in that condition. I think -- that was the  
20 gist of what I was looking for.

21 MS. RODDY: The IZ distribution, as well as the  
22 (indiscernible).

23 COMMISSIONER MAY: I'm not looking to see the IZ  
24 distribution, I just mentioned that it's -- because, again, IZ  
25 distribution, I don't think is, really, part of a design review

1 case, myself. I just wanted to remind you that I did not think  
2 that that was consistent with what we would typically expect.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Commissioner Shapiro.

4 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Yeah. I did ask for -- and I  
5 think Ms. Roddy just mentioned it, to give us, sort of, a -- take  
6 the next step on the solar array, and to plan the integration  
7 with the green roof.

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Anybody else?

9 (No audible response.)

10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Ms. Roddy, I will again mention --  
11 I would ask that the Applicant -- you said you all had many more  
12 projects coming. I would -- this is just an ask, it's not in  
13 the standards, but you see where the Commission is, you see the  
14 plight that we're given. The residents are pushing us. So I'm  
15 going to push you all to try and increase the envelope of what  
16 you're doing. And this is just merely an ask right now, because  
17 it's not anything that's -- it memorialized, and it's not in the  
18 regulations. And I think you will find a happier community if  
19 you try to push -- push a little more, a little harder, especially  
20 with affordability. And I -- so I'm probably mixing you up,  
21 because I heard what Commissioner May said, and I'm saying  
22 something different, but the good part about it is you all have  
23 been developing for years. You know how to try to find that  
24 happy medium and that balance, as well. So I'll leave it at  
25 that.

1 Anything else?

2 (No audible response.)

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. Mr. Barron, do we have  
4 any dates?

5 MR. BARRON: Yeah. So the Commission is meeting twice  
6 in February, February 10th and February 24th are the next public  
7 meetings. For the February 10th date, that would give the  
8 Applicant until the 31st of January to respond and to the 7th of  
9 February for any parties to respond. If that's -- see if you  
10 can let us know whether or not that's -- is that enough time for  
11 you?

12 MS. RODDY: (Indiscernible.)

13 MR. BARRON: I'm sorry, that was a yes?

14 MS. RODDY: Yes, we can make that work.

15 MR. BARRON: Okay. All right. So then we will --  
16 we'll put it on the schedule for February 10th, and then the  
17 Applicant -- if you can respond by January 31st at 3:00 p.m.,  
18 and then parties will have until February 7th at 3:00 p.m., as  
19 well, to respond to anything. And also if you could provide your  
20 draft orders by the 7th, that would be good, too.

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So we took Ms. Kramer off.  
22 So let's bring -- Mr. Young, bring Ms. Kramer back up and make  
23 sure that schedule meets the ANC -- they are the only party --

24 COMMISSIONER KRAMER: Unfortunately, I don't have the  
25 -- we should be -- I don't know when I will -- I have to get a

1 calendar. I'm sorry. I don't remember when our February meeting  
2 is.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah. I guess you all probably  
4 would want to review -- do you all want to review again,  
5 Commissioner Kramer?

6 COMMISSIONER KRAMER: (No audible response.)

7 MR. BARRON: She'll be back in a moment.

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Oh, okay. Thank you.

9 (Pause.)

10 COMMISSIONER KRAMER: I do apologize. Our ANC meeting  
11 is on the -- our public meeting is on the 14th, and our admin  
12 meeting is on the 7th. So we can't vote on anything if we're  
13 required to respond by the 10th.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Commissioner --

15 COMMISSIONER KRAMER: Yeah.

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Commissioner Kramer, I'm not sure  
17 there's anything, from what I heard was asked for, is something  
18 that you all probably would respond to, but you know what, why  
19 don't we move it, Mr. Barron, to the end of the month, our second  
20 meeting in February so that way we can clear all the hurdles.  
21 Any objection to that?

22 Ms. Roddy, any objection to that? That way we'll meet  
23 any issues that the Commission may have. Any objections?

24 MS. RODDY: No. No objections.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So that will solve that

1 | problem a lot easier.

2 | (Cross-talk.)

3 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Give us a new schedule, Mr. Barron.

4 | MR. BARRON: Yeah. So for the record, that would give  
5 | us -- that would be put on the meeting on February 24th. That  
6 | will give the Applicant until February 14th to provide the  
7 | materials, and until February 21st for other parties to respond  
8 | and for the Applicant to provide draft orders. Again, both of  
9 | those by 3:00 p.m.

10 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So let's give them until the 15th,  
11 | because they meet the 14th. Can we --

12 | MR. BARRON: No, the 21st would be the date for the ANC  
13 | to respond.

14 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

15 | MR. BARRON: The 14th would be the date for the  
16 | Applicant to submit their materials.

17 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Well, let me be quiet. Okay.  
18 | All right.

19 | MS. RODDY: We'll submit prior to that 14th date to  
20 | make sure that the ANC has something to review.

21 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Sorry, Ms. Roddy?

22 | MS. RODDY: Our deadline is the 14th, which coincides  
23 | with the ANC's meeting. So I was just saying that we will  
24 | coordinate the ANC to make sure that we have the information they  
25 | need prior to their meeting.

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Okay. I got it. I got it.  
2 Good. Very good. I'm going to stay out of dates. All right.  
3 All right. So we all on the same page.

4 My colleagues, do you have anything in closing  
5 remarks, and questions or comments?

6 (No audible response.)

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. So I'm going to thank  
8 everyone for their participation tonight. Commissioner Kramer  
9 and the Commission, I want to thank you all for your involvement.  
10 I want to thank everyone for their participation.

11 The Zoning Commission will be meeting on -- one second  
12 -- January the 27th, and it's for our regular monthly meeting at  
13 4:00 p.m. on these same platforms. So with that, I want to thank  
14 everyone for their participation tonight. This hearing is  
15 adjourned. Good night.

16 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the  
17 record at 6:14 p.m.)

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

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: DC Zoning Commission

Date: 01-24-2022

Place: Teleconference

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

---

GARY EUELL

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