

GOVERNMENT OF  
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

REGULAR PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

THURSDAY

MARCH 20, 2023

+ + + + +

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

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

SHARON SCHELLIN, Secretary  
PAUL YOUNG, Zoning Data Specialist

OFFICE OF ZONING LEGAL DIVISION STAFF PRESENT:

DANIEL LIU, ESQUIRE

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Regular Public Hearing held on March 20, 2023

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

Case No. 22-39

BD Parcel 2, LLC ..... 4

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 March 20th, 2023. We are convening and broadcast of this public hearing by video conferencing. My name is Anthony Hood, and I'm joined by Vice Chair Miller, Commissioner May, and Commissioner Imamura. We're also joined by the Office of Zoning staff, Ms. Sharon Schellin, our secretary and Mr. Paul Young, who will be handling all of our virtual operations. And also from the Office of Zoning legal division, Mr. Dennis Liu. I will ask all 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 Webex and 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, 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, please state your name before providing your testimony. When you are finished speaking, please mute your

1 audio. If you experience difficulty accessing Webex or with your  
2 telephone call-in or have not signed up, then please call OZ  
3 hotline number at 202-727-0789. If you wish to file written  
4 testimony or additional supporting documents during the hearing,  
5 then please be prepared to describe and discuss it at the time  
6 of your testimony.

7 The subject of this evening's hearing is Zoning  
8 Commission Case No. 22-39, it's the BD Parcel 2, LLC design review  
9 in a NHR zone at Square 5861, Lot 991 at 633 Howard Road, S.E.  
10 Again, today's date is March 20th, 2023, and this is particularly  
11 of interest to ANC 8C. Okay. ANC 8C. All right.

12 The hearing will be conducted in accordance with  
13 provisions of 11 Z D.C.M.R. Chapter 4 as follows: preliminary  
14 matters; applicant's case -- I believe the Applicant -- I didn't  
15 see anything in the record but support, but I believe the  
16 Applicant can hit all the highlights in about 25 to 30 minutes  
17 or less -- we'll have report of other government agencies; report  
18 of the Department of Transportation; and Office of Planning;  
19 report of the ANC, I believe in this case of the ANC 8C, maybe  
20 another one, I can't remember right off, anyway; testimony of  
21 organizations five minutes; and individuals three minutes; and  
22 we will hear in the following order from those who are in support,  
23 opposition, and undeclared; then we'll have rebuttal and closing  
24 by the Applicant. Again, the OZ hotline number is 202-727-0789  
25 for any concerns during these proceedings. At this time, the

1 Commission will consider any preliminary matters. Does the staff  
2 have any preliminary matters?

3 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. Oops. Yes. So the first  
4 one is that at Exhibit 25, the Applicant revised their application  
5 and they did this on Friday, which is less than 30 days prior to  
6 the hearing. And they did it in response to DDOT and OP. And  
7 so therefore, they have requested a waiver for submitting that  
8 less than 30 days prior to the hearing. So if the Commission  
9 would please consider their request for the waiver and make a  
10 decision on that.

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I certainly don't have a problem  
12 with the last minute. I didn't hear that -- and I guess I will  
13 leave it to the Applicant to let us know whether or not they did  
14 reach out to the ANC which looks like it's a lot of support. But  
15 I want to make sure that whatever they did, if we move forward,  
16 that they have reached out to the ANC, even though it's Friday  
17 and I know today is Monday, so make sure that they have a copy.  
18 Let me hear from others. Any objections?

19 Okay. Not seeing any, we will accept that contingent  
20 with a condition, Ms. Schellin, that they have made an attempt  
21 to advise the ANC and also the subject matter. So I'll leave it  
22 at that. Yes.

23 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. And Mr. Oates can confirm that  
24 when he comes forward. So the proffered expert witnesses, Exhibit  
25 10B from Gorove Slade, who's been previously accepted by the

1 Commission, Robert Schiesel, and then Maribel Wong from Gorove  
2 Slade. We have not seen this one before. So also in traffic -  
3 - a traffic consultant. So that's at Exhibit 10B also. So if  
4 we could have that one. And I don't see -- the Applicant's not  
5 listed any experts in architecture or anything. It's kind of  
6 weird.

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. It looks like, okay, it  
8 looks like Mr. Schiesel who we have already -- he's the civil  
9 engineer traffic consultant. But Ms. Maribel Wong -- I know this  
10 is a large project. I'm not necessarily sure why we need to  
11 proffer both, but I don't -- I don't think I have a issue, but  
12 let me hear from others. Anybody have any objections?

13 Commissioner May?

14 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah. Are we actually going to hear  
15 from both? I mean, a lot of times they put in two people, you  
16 don't know who's going to be here. Looks like Mr. Schiesel is  
17 here. I don't see Ms. Wong here. So maybe we need to hear from  
18 the Applicant who is actually going to testify.

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay, Ms. Schellin -- anybody else?  
20 Okay. Ms. Schellin, can you bring them up please?

21 MS. SCHELLIN: That would be Mr. Utz. We also have  
22 Eran Chen from ODA Architecture proffered in architecture, Brooke  
23 Whiting Cash from Lemon Brooke Property and Landscape  
24 Architecture. It looks like only Robert Schiesel is going to be  
25 testifying, and Shane Dettman, who has previously been accepted

1 in planning. So those are the experts.

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So all those people that you just  
3 named, they are not being proffered tonight, they're just --

4 MS. SCHELLIN: They are.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. All right. Let's hear  
6 from Mr. Utz first to see who he's proffering --

7 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay.

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: -- as well.

9 MR. UTZ: Thank you. Good late afternoon,  
10 Commissioners. We did want to proffer Eran Chen, Brooke Whiting  
11 Cash, Shane Dettman, (indiscernible), and Rob Schiesel. We do  
12 not need to proffer Maribel Wong. But she is in there. We just  
13 wanted --

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So it looks like we only have two  
15 people that I am unaware of I believe, Ms. Schellin.

16 Any objections to Mr. Schiesel and Mr. Dettman? So no  
17 objections there. Has any -- any one of the other two -- and  
18 I'm -- have either of the other two been proffered? Okay. Let's  
19 take one at a time.

20 COMMISSIONER MAY: Previously approved?

21 MS. SCHELLIN: Chen? No, they have not. Eran Chen in  
22 architecture.

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Let's do Mr. Chen. And where  
24 is his -- I did -- I looked at Chen. Where is his resume? Oh,  
25 it's 25E, is it?

1 MR. UTZ: It is.

2 MS. SCHELLIN: I believe so.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah, it's 25E, yeah, 25, 25E. He's  
4 the first one.

5 MS. SCHELLIN: So he's the first one.

6 COMMISSIONER MAY: He's fine.

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah. Yeah, I would agree.

8 COMMISSIONER MAY: I think he needs to be licensed in  
9 a few more states though. I mean, only five states and the  
10 District of Columbia.

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: With all those license, he needs to  
12 put on his resume where he's not licensed because he is clearly  
13 licensed, okay.

14 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. What's the next one --  
16 any -- if no objections, we will for sure make Mr. Chen. I  
17 haven't seen that many licenses before, so I commend him.

18 Let's go to the next person,

19 Ms. Schellin?

20 MS. SCHELLIN: Whiting Cash with Lemon Brook proffered  
21 in landscape architecture.

22 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: No issues there.

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'm looking to our expert.  
24 Commissioner Imamura, any objections?

25 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: No.

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So nobody has any objection,  
2 I'm going to leave it on the expert on that one, so. Okay.

3 Ms. Schellin, we will make him an expert as well,  
4 Whiting Cash an expert. I think that's the name. Whiting Cash?  
5 Okay. Anything else, Ms. Schellin?

6 MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir. Other than to say that we have  
7 Aaron Zimmerman from DDOT, and we have, I believe, it's Matt  
8 Jesick from OP along with Mr. Lawson. And I don't think  
9 Jennifer's here this evening. Yeah. So just Mr. Lawson. And  
10 the Applicant represented by Mr. Utz, I believe, will take up to  
11 30 minutes. I don't think they planned to take the full 30  
12 minutes. And the ANC is represented, it says, by Georgette Joy  
13 Johnson or Robin McKinney, and so far I've not seen either one  
14 of them, but maybe they'll be on by the time you need them.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Schellin, for  
16 getting us all straight.

17 All right. Mr. Utz I did not see, unless I missed it  
18 -- it wouldn't be -- I've missed things before -- I didn't see  
19 any opposition in this record unless it's something that I didn't  
20 see. But I will ask you to govern your presentation to us and  
21 hit the highlights, but govern it as I -- me not seeing any  
22 opposition, so -- or us not seeing any opposition. So I'll turn  
23 it over to you.

24 Commissioner May?

25 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah, I just -- I wanted to highlight

1 that I -- we didn't see opposition per se, but there were  
2 references to opposition or concerns that might have been raised  
3 by the ANC, and maybe you can shed some light onto that question  
4 showed up in some of the some of the letters of support obvi.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. And yeah, again, if we hit  
6 those highlights, I think that'll be great going forward.

7 So Mr. Utz, turn it over to you.

8 MR. UTZ: Great. Thank you so much, Commissioners. I  
9 believe I am off mute. So we really appreciate the opportunity  
10 to bring this to you today. My name is Jeff Utz, and I, along  
11 with my colleague Shane Dettman, are with the law firm of Goulston  
12 & Storrs. We're here on behalf of the Applicant in the case BD  
13 Parcel 2, LLC. The application is the second phase in the build-  
14 out of the North Howard Road zone district. It's for the property  
15 at 633 Howard Road, S.E., which has a lot area of approximately  
16 117,000 square feet.

17 As the Commission likely recalls, the NHR zone was  
18 created by Order No. 18-18 and the property itself was mapped in  
19 the NHR zone by order of 18-19. The Commission reviewed and  
20 approved the first phase of the NHR zone in Order 21-13, which  
21 is the Douglass Building just to the north of the property. The  
22 NHR zone requires that each project within the zone is subject  
23 to design review approval by the Commission under Subtitle K,  
24 Section 1005. The zone district is geared towards ensuring that  
25 development in the area contains a mixture of residential and

1 commercial uses and activated streetscape.

2           The project before you today is a model of how text  
3 amendments creating new zones with design review can work. The  
4 project we'll present -- we will present has a significantly  
5 heightened level of inclusionary zoning, a unique and meaningful  
6 sustainability approach, including the construction of mass  
7 timber, significant investments in public and open space,  
8 emphasis on an enhanced pedestrian and ground-floor retail  
9 experience, incorporation of bike-friendly design in a highly  
10 articulated building on all four sides, actually two of them on  
11 all four sides, among other noteworthy aspects.

12           The application proposes a two-building mixed use 130-  
13 foot-tall set of structures with a total FAR of approximately 7.9  
14 FAR, at 818 units, 151 lodging units, 24,700 square feet of retail  
15 with parking and bike spaces. The result will be a highly  
16 articulated context sensitive set of structures that are well  
17 within the heightened density allowed as matter of right and will  
18 be additive for this prominent location.

19           The Applicant team has been meeting with the Office of  
20 Planning, DDOT, and other agencies regarding the project and  
21 greatly appreciates the time and ideas of these agencies. And  
22 we've also had a great deal of outreach to and interaction with  
23 the community and we also appreciate their involvement as well.  
24 With that, I'd like to turn it over to Sohael Chowfla of Redbrick,  
25 and he can say a little bit more about the application and the

1 Applicant.

2 MR. CHOWFLA: Hi. Good afternoon, everyone. I'm Sohael  
3 Chowfla with Redbrick. First of all, I'm just seconding what  
4 Jeff said. I want to sincerely thank all the District agencies  
5 who we've have been working with over the past several months and  
6 weeks to bring this project in front of the Commission. And of  
7 course, thank you to the Commission for taking the time to review  
8 our application materials all the way up 'til Friday and for the  
9 opportunity to present today.

10 Before we walk through the project, I just would like  
11 to take a few seconds to introduce Redbrick and provide some  
12 updates in our recent projects in the District. Redbrick is a  
13 community-minded developer. We're based in the District and we  
14 have significant experience delivering projects in Ward 8. We  
15 build with intention and our goal is to fuse responsible  
16 innovative development with long term value creation and to  
17 generate positive impact for our residents, tenants, neighbors,  
18 and stakeholders. One of our major projects in D.C. is the Saint  
19 Eaves campus for which we were awarded the Master Developer in  
20 2014. At Saint Eaves we recently delivered several projects,  
21 including the new headquarters for Whitman and Walker, a  
22 community health provider, a 250-unit mixed income building in  
23 which over 200 units are designated affordable, and 88 new  
24 townhomes.

25 A very exciting new project coming up this summer, we

1 will be delivering a 25,000 square foot retail pavilion that will  
2 be constructed entirely of mass timber. The pavilion will  
3 celebrate local black businesses and provide them with a platform  
4 for collaboration and entrepreneurial growth in the District.  
5 Next slide please?

6 Today, I'm excited to present the next phase in the  
7 evolution of the Bridge District. By way of background, the  
8 Bridge District is located on Howard Road near the Anacostia  
9 Metro and the recently completed Frederick Douglass Memorial  
10 Bridge. The District is also located near Suitland Parkway and  
11 enjoys close proximity to open green spaces and nature at  
12 Anacostia Park and the Anacostia Waterway. When completed, the  
13 neighborhood will embody a physical, cultural, social, and  
14 economic bridge between historic Anacostia and the rapidly  
15 growing Capitol Riverfront and Navy Yard submarket. This design  
16 review case that we're presenting today represents Redbrick's  
17 continued build-out of the NHR zone, and the Bridge District will  
18 comprise the second phase of the overall development. So here's  
19 the project site within the Bridge District. It's the trapezoidal  
20 shape on the south side of Howard Road. Next slide please?

21 Here's the view of the site looking north towards the  
22 Washington Monument. The site comprises approximately 2.7 acres  
23 and will be constructed in two phases from west -- from east to  
24 west. The first project in the Bridge District, the Douglass,  
25 Zoning Case 21-13, is currently under construction. We started

1 last summer, 2022, and will be delivering in early 2025. This  
2 project will contain approximately 760 units and will include  
3 over 40,000 square feet of street activating ground-floor retail.  
4 Actually, the first of three tower cranes just went up. So within  
5 the next few months, the project will start coming out of the  
6 ground, which is really an exciting and major visible milestone  
7 for the development of the neighborhood in general. It's also  
8 important for me to note that Redbrick is committed to  
9 sustainability, and so the Douglass, you know, while the project  
10 is committed to the 4.1 goal, we're actually targeting the  
11 platinum and (indiscernible) zero carbon from operation. And we  
12 hope to achieve those. Next slide please?

13           So the Bridge District overall is approximately eight  
14 acres. It's comprised of about -- of six buildings constructed  
15 in a phased manner. And our overall vision for Howard Road is  
16 an activated ground floor with vibrant retail and dynamic open  
17 spaces and a supporting mix of office and residential uses as  
18 well. The landscape master plan and open space plan provides the  
19 framework for our design of the neighborhood. The master plan  
20 is anchored by a park on the northwest side of the neighborhood  
21 by the Douglass, which is currently under construction and we're  
22 working with DDOT on that part. A bicycle and pedestrian  
23 promenade connects east to west on the north side of the  
24 development and a series of north-south oriented open spaces  
25 punctuate the master plan, creating a (indiscernible) ground

1 floor with extensive retail programing and a series of multi-  
2 sided buildings as well. Each building in the Bridge District  
3 has been designed distinctly, which will ultimately result in an  
4 organic and unique neighborhood composition with a variety of  
5 uses and spaces catering to a broad mix of people. Within this  
6 context, we have designed Parcels 1 and 2 of the Bridge District  
7 with our partners, ODA Architects. Here's a quick summary of the  
8 development program that we'll be presenting today. The project  
9 site comprising of Parcels 1 and 2, outlined here in red, will  
10 include a total of 882 multi-family units and 150 short-term  
11 rental lodging units across two buildings. The project will meet  
12 the NHR zone affordability requirements and include 12 percent  
13 IZ units. Half of those IZ units will be three-bedroom units  
14 and nearly all of those three-bedroom units will be affordable  
15 at the 50 percent and 60 percent MFI level. The ground floor of  
16 the project will contain approximately 24,000 square feet of  
17 retail that has been collectively designed to accommodate a  
18 variety of users. We will focus on local and small businesses  
19 for this use, including retailers from Ward 8. Parcel 2 will be  
20 constructed first and will be a masonry building and Parcel 1  
21 will be constructed second and will be a mass timber building.  
22 In order to effectively deliver the project, we have selected a  
23 team comprised of preeminent design firms and leaders in their  
24 field. And with them, we're driving towards the continued  
25 successful delivery of the neighborhood and the project and all

1 the benefits that it will bring. Our team includes our design  
2 architect, Eran Chen of ODA architects who are based out of New  
3 York, but with significant experience in D.C.; our landscape  
4 architect, Brooke Whiting Cash, with Lemon Brooke, who are also  
5 the master landscape architects for the broader neighborhood; our  
6 traffic engineer, Robert Schiesel with Gorove Slade; and our  
7 civil engineer Will Lattanzio of Wiles Mensch; and of course our  
8 land use counsel Jeff Utz who's a familiar face to all of you.  
9 I will now hand it over Eran Chen to walk you through his vision  
10 for the project design. Thanks, Eran.

11 MR. CHEN: Thank you. Thank you Sohael. Hello,  
12 Commissioners. My name is Eran Chen. I'm the founder and  
13 executive director of ODA. We're the design architects on the  
14 project. We're very proud to collaborate with Redbrick, and we  
15 love working in D.C. Before I start, I should say that our  
16 mission at ODA is to create buildings that are not only highly  
17 articulated and well designed, but also that are contributing in  
18 a meaningful way to their surrounding on every level. That means  
19 finding a way that these buildings contribute to expansion of the  
20 public realm, they're good neighbors to their blocks and to their  
21 tenants, and expand the indoor-outdoor connection. We're doing  
22 it through porosity and connectivity. Next slide please?

23 I'd like to highlight those aspects of our design here,  
24 which also reflects the questions that we received from you,  
25 Commissioners. The forum of the building was meant to expand the

1 envelope to reach as much natural light as possible and to  
2 articulate the facades that are facing the surrounding in the  
3 most diverse way that creates a sense of village. On the  
4 southwest corner of Parcel 1 you see the toss -- stepping of the  
5 building, excuse me, that means to break that facade. And in  
6 the northwest side of that, the recesses that I'm going to touch  
7 on by creating a urban plaza that cuts through the entire vertical  
8 of the building as well as the recesses on building two on every  
9 direction. Next please?

10           The ground floor is very telling because it shows how  
11 the partee (phonetic) of the building kind of creates the DNA in  
12 the way that it grows vertically up. Along the Howard Road you  
13 see three of these plazas that extends the sidewalk and are meant  
14 to create public gathering spaces that are open to the sky. The  
15 center one is deeper than the other two, and it cuts through the  
16 entire block creating like features, features not only from  
17 above, through skylights, but all the way at the end of it with  
18 a water feature and a green patch that allows for transparency  
19 throughout. Next slide please?

20           And when you look at the program, you'll see in red the  
21 retail program. The retail on the left is a big one that anchors  
22 the entire complex here to the west. And then in yellow, the  
23 entrances to the lobbies and residential. All of them are  
24 articulated to create positive intensity of ground-floor  
25 activity, both indoor and outdoor. We consolidated the curb cuts

1 and the support services for the building in an alleyway that is  
2 bordering the school on the east. You see the loop that  
3 internalized the loading for both residents and retail, and you  
4 see the entrance to the visitor parking at the ground floor as  
5 well as the ramp going up and down. The drop-off area, again, a  
6 unique way to kind of draw attention of peoples in, draw  
7 pedestrian activity, and it's anchored by two yellow bike lounges  
8 area that hopefully would serve not only building tenants but the  
9 entire community of bikers around. Next slide?

10           The second floor demonstrate the deep cuts through the  
11 mass of the building, and those two courtyards are actually united  
12 as a continuous amenity space at the second floor. The amenities  
13 are indicated a dark yellow, the residents are on the lighter  
14 yellow. But again, I want to point out to the outlet of these  
15 courtyards in the way that they engage the public realm. On the  
16 right side, this courtyard amenity's opening up through a big  
17 gateway into Howard Road as well as at the center. And on the  
18 left side you see the themed connection between the two bars.  
19 This is a glass bridge on every floor that create transparency  
20 of indoor-outdoor, and again create transparency or add to the  
21 transparency of the building. Next slide?

22           As the volume stretches -- next slide?

23           We're basically maximizing the height. We have the 45-  
24 degree setback of the penthouse. Next slide please?

25           And we'll talk a lot about the balconies in a way not

1 only to improve the quality of life, but really articulate the  
2 dynamic nature of these facades and personalize the building.  
3 We're increasing community engagement. Next slide? Next slide  
4 please? Oops. Did we all lose the presentation or is it only  
5 me?

6 MR. UTZ: I think we all did.

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah, give him a moment, it'll come  
8 back up. There we go.

9 MR. CHEN: Sure. Thank you. Can you please just  
10 maximize the view? The roof plan just complies with solar panels,  
11 green areas, mechanical setbacks, et cetera, and we have two  
12 pools that are engaged by indoor amenity space as well. Next  
13 slide?

14 Again, the ground floor, I'm not going to repeat  
15 myself, but it shows how detailed this public engagement is and  
16 the way that the building is almost elevated from the ground  
17 floor to create this level of porosity. Next slide?

18 Second floor. You see the second-floor amenity space  
19 that unites all these indoor amenities. Next slide?

20 Typical floor. Next? Next? Thank you. Next one?

21 This section manages to illustrate again the level of  
22 connection that we're trying to achieve here with those  
23 courtyards. And so the building kind of lifts itself in three  
24 places to create connections of that courtyard, both internally  
25 but also as a viewpoint on the second floor to the street and

1 Howard Road. And this interchange of visual connections, again,  
2 is one of the things I want to emphasize to the Commissioners  
3 today. Next slide?

4 I want to say something about Building 1 and the timber  
5 construction we're using. We're super excited about this because  
6 this is going to be one of the first residential timber building  
7 in the scale in the northeast in the United States. And what  
8 we're going to do here is going to be clearly looked at not only  
9 within D.C. but within the country and the world. The system  
10 allows for reduction of between 15 to 20 -- sorry, 20 to 30  
11 percent of the carbon footprint of the building. It's the most  
12 sustainable thing to do. It also creates a very unique sort of  
13 residential experience, but it does come with a few technical  
14 limitations that I want to explain. Number one, the grid is very  
15 rigorous. You cannot be as flexible as otherwise you do with  
16 concrete. And so we have worked really hard to adjust this into  
17 a residential application, very rare, mostly used in offices.  
18 You also see that the 12 floors are built on top of a concrete  
19 podium in order to comply with the maximum 12 stories regulation  
20 and a maximum of 180 feet. And you'll see that the way that this  
21 application is built does not allow -- next slide please?

22 -- a natural cantilever beyond the building facade.  
23 What I intend by that is concrete and steel can cantilever beyond  
24 the facade, timber cannot, and therefore all of the balconies and  
25 everything that is attached to that facade has to be meticulously

1 engineered. And what you see on the top right is sort of almost  
2 like a kit-of-parts, by which those columns, the angled columns,  
3 are supporting the balcony that is then anchored to the columns,  
4 and therefore, as I said before, it does not allow us with a huge  
5 amount of flexibility and has to be very, very detailed. But  
6 that language of kit of parts is what we wanted to embrace and  
7 create a building that only sings -- screams the fact that it's  
8 a timber construction in a way that would be seen by all. Next  
9 slide?

10           Let's talk a little bit about the facade treatment.  
11 Next slide please?

12           We wanted to connect the building in proportion and in  
13 a horizontal lines, but yet differentiate them and make each one  
14 profoundly of its own. Building 2, if you see here, is inspired  
15 by sort of the language of -- now I forgot the word -- Bahhaus,  
16 I'm sorry, thank you -- Bauhaus architecture. And what we're  
17 doing here is a brick, a gray brick building with punch windows  
18 that is broken up through the recesses I pointed out in the  
19 massing where we changed the material from brick into window wall  
20 and then articulated with horizontal line of balconies. These  
21 are meant to be dynamic and to be powerful as you look at them  
22 from far away, as well as from close by. The way we did it is  
23 the edge of the slab is covered by a metal panel that creates  
24 this kind of shiny edge and then the underside by a metallic  
25 paint. And the closer you get to the building, the more of the

1 kind of bronze-y color you adhere to, the farther you go, the  
2 more of the brick that you see, that kind of dynamic relationship  
3 creates really a wealth of visual experience from the street and  
4 also for the tenants. Next slide?

5           Building No. 1 is absolutely unique and one of a kind.  
6 As I mentioned, I think day and night this would appear from the  
7 highway and from distance as a super unique expression of a  
8 sustainable building, cutting edge and novel for D.C. The volume  
9 is very simple because what I explained about the structure and  
10 therefore we use the kit-of-parts, the balconies and their  
11 support to create the articulation on the facade. We -- on this  
12 side, as you can see, we arranged the balconies in a gridded way  
13 so each one of the tenants would have a double height volume  
14 above them, create a sense of openness, but also would encourage  
15 sort of eye contact between different neighbors. You see in the  
16 expression at the bottom, the concrete base separated by two  
17 horizontal lines of the metal, and then we articulate the top as  
18 a modest cornice that is modern, is adhering to the simplicity  
19 of the volume, but also we cannot go farther beyond that without  
20 additional support, as I explained before. Next?

21           We have the south facade is super articulated with  
22 those kind of vertical piers, almost breaking the otherwise long  
23 facade into almost like a vertical community. And because the  
24 massing is more articulated, we kept the facade very orderly and  
25 stacked. But beyond the fact that we expand the amount of

1 apartments that has corner glass and enjoy the view, again we  
2 expose the inner side, the inner continent structure of the  
3 building with an exposure of the columns at the corners, something  
4 very unique, a very unique detail that is usually is not seen.  
5 So from day and night, everybody will be able to enjoy the  
6 structure, the wood structure, as well as the wood ceilings on  
7 the apartments themselves. Next one?

8           We're zooming a little closer in Building 2. And I  
9 just want to point out again what I explained before. The recess  
10 of the facade allows us to do three things: one, change material  
11 from brick to glass, emphasizing or break the visual linearity  
12 of it; the rounded corner of balconies emphasizes that it's almost  
13 like an independent building; and then the recessed plaza unites  
14 the open-to-the-sky cut within the building with the second-floor  
15 bridge that you see here underneath the mural, which we see as a  
16 public art piece, and creates and increase the transparency to  
17 the second floor. These kinds of things really help mitigate  
18 connection from the building to the pedestrian level. And then  
19 the second thing I want to articulate is the ground floor retail.  
20 As you can see, no brick comes down. It's a full glass -- a  
21 linear glass facade which emphasizes the program inside day and  
22 night and enhances the activity both on the sidewalk and in those  
23 plazas. Next slide?

24           Here I want to point out two very important things to  
25 me. The first one, again, the kit-of-part language of those

1 balconies and to the point that commissioners made, they are  
2 organized, but they are limited to the column grid because they're  
3 attached to the column's rhythm that we have. They have to work  
4 both for the apartments and for the structural connection. And  
5 then the recess, which will become a vertical garden supported  
6 by those intermediate floors which are in transplanted balconies.  
7 And this kind of green wall will be seen from a distance and will  
8 follow the glass bridge that unites and connects the inner  
9 courtyard of Building 1 to the street. Next slide?

10           So those kind of visual experiences in between the  
11 buildings that gives us a hint of what's happening inside is  
12 maybe illustrated in a more powerful way or the most powerful way  
13 at the center plaza. And you see how we -- with the advance of  
14 skylights on the platform above, as well as the waterfall and the  
15 green space all the way at the other side, invites people to come  
16 in through a very elite open space. Next slide.

17           Quick views of the courtyards. It's a beautiful  
18 experience, but I want to point out the art that you see beyond  
19 the glass, we have segments of the building that are single  
20 loaded, and the single loaded corridor allows to bring natural  
21 light into the circulation, but also it's an unbelievable  
22 opportunity to bring public art in large scale in and around the  
23 building. Next slide?

24           And here the view of courtyard on Building 2. On the  
25 left side under the mural is where we have the gateway or the

1   bridgeway between the two courtyards. This is where you would  
2   go and connect to the other building. And on the right under  
3   the mural, again a 20-foot open -- actually, it's 50 foot from  
4   the floor, from the street, 20 foot from here, open gateway to  
5   the street itself. Next slide?

6               Okay. With that, I'd like to hand it into -- to the  
7   landscape team. I would be happy to answer any questions  
8   afterwards. Thank you.

9               MS. WHITING CASH: Hi, Brooke Whiting Cash from Lemon  
10   Brooke Landscape architects. If you can go to the next slide  
11   please? Thank you.

12              Thank you for your time today. Lemon Brooke's been  
13   lucky enough to be involved in planning and design throughout the  
14   Bridge District on all parcels and exterior spaces to date of the  
15   buildings that are in development. This has enabled us to have  
16   a coordinated holistic approach to placemaking on a neighborhood  
17   scale, as well as provide a sustainable forward-looking landscape  
18   infrastructure that addresses flood risk, stormwater, the urban  
19   forest, and bringing lasting value to the District and its  
20   residents. Our overarching goal has been to create a variety of  
21   engaging outdoor spaces that provide a range of opportunity for  
22   a diversity of users to successfully populate the urban realm  
23   throughout the District. We're currently engaged in design and  
24   development discussions with DDOT for both the small plaza spaces  
25   on the west of Parcels 1 and 2 and the larger DDOT-controlled

1 park space to the north of Howard Road. This plan includes a  
2 new home for the popular sandlot that's currently occupying  
3 Parcel 1 and additional publicly accessible recreational  
4 amenities for children, pets, and the larger community, as well  
5 as bicycle and pedestrian connections to the new Frederick  
6 Douglass Bridge and across the river into the District. Next  
7 slide please?

8 As Eran already touched on, by consolidating to a  
9 single vehicle entrance, the site organization provides a two-  
10 block stretch of building space that's uninterrupted by vehicular  
11 driveways. This enables an extended pedestrian experience that's  
12 punctuated by this variety of human-scaled spaces of different  
13 character and programs that enliven the street edge. Next slide  
14 please?

15 As part of the Bridge District work, Redbrick is  
16 involved in raising and redeveloping the section of Howard Road  
17 to address flood concerns. This renovation of the road will  
18 employ a mix of familiar and novel elements to create an urban  
19 framework for the public realm. We have strategically designed  
20 tree pits to mitigate stormwater and provide for long term health  
21 of new street trees. Additionally, the street level building  
22 facade has been set back four feet behind the property line along  
23 this length of Howard, which provides a more generous pedestrian  
24 experience than that provided for in the narrow right-of-way that  
25 exists in Howard Road. Next slide please?

1           The dispersion of building entry points along the  
2 building facades and deeper into the building encourages  
3 pedestrian circulation through these accessible open spaces and  
4 further activates this ground level of the building. This  
5 relationship of interior and exterior spaces provides porosity  
6 and further activation of the building exterior face. Next slide  
7 please?

8           Dining and retail opportunities can draw visitors in  
9 from outside of the immediate neighborhood, which helps enhance  
10 the critical mass of occupied spaces and bolsters the perception  
11 of safety as the neighborhood is growing and establishing itself.  
12 Visual connectivity between the overlooking second-floor amenity  
13 spaces, ground-level plaza spaces, sidewalks, and plaza spaces  
14 in the building and under construction across the street furthers  
15 this engagement between residents and enriches the livelihood of  
16 the street life. Next page please?

17           This is the second-level terrace, again a series of  
18 green spaces that coordinate and offer access to building  
19 residents to various amenities that are arranged around the  
20 second floor of the building. Next slide please?

21           This is the penthouse level with pools and additional  
22 green space seeking to fulfill the District green area ratio  
23 requirements and manage stormwater. And last slide please?

24           Additional opportunities to meet District goals of  
25 stormwater and sustainability. Thank you. Next slide?

1 I'm going to hand over to Shane.

2 MR. DETTMAN: Thanks, Brooke, and good evening,  
3 Commissioners. Next slide, Mr. Young, please?

4 I'll take the design and the landscaping and  
5 architectural design that was just presented to you and very  
6 briefly go through the various design review standards that are  
7 set forth in the North Howard Road zone under Subtitle X, as well  
8 as the general design review standards under Subtitle X and  
9 demonstrate how the proposed design satisfies all applicable  
10 design criteria. I'll also touch upon the areas of design  
11 flexibility and design relief that are being requested. I will  
12 note that at the outset of the application, we did request relief  
13 from one of the North Howard Road zone criteria with respect to  
14 the 500 year flood plain. We requested that out of an abundance  
15 of caution. The -- as Ms. Cash mentioned, the design of Howard  
16 Road and the design of the project site will actually be -- part  
17 of it is to be elevated out of the 500 year flood plain. So the  
18 prohibition on buildings located within the 500 year flood plain  
19 again because the site will be raised out of the flood plain, we  
20 believe that we don't need that relief. We requested it out of  
21 an abundance of caution. And in the report, the Office of  
22 Planning, and I believe DOEE also agreed, that the relief wasn't  
23 requested -- or wasn't required. So in our submission on Friday,  
24 we noted that in our cover letter and to the extent that the  
25 Commission also agrees that relief is not required, we would only

1 ask that in the final zoning order it be noted that relief is  
2 not required in order to avoid any issues at time of permitting.  
3 Next slide please?

4 Looking at the design review criteria under Subtitle K  
5 of the North Howard Road zone, one of the provisions is to  
6 demonstrate that the project achieved the objectives of the North  
7 Howard Road zone. I think just in terms of the design as it's  
8 been presented, it's clear that the project will address the  
9 desired mix of residential and commercial uses. It also provides  
10 a variety of business-related uses and particularly the preferred  
11 uses that will be provided at the ground floor. It's well within  
12 the heightened density that's permitted under the North Howard  
13 Road zone. And I believe the renderings clearly demonstrate that  
14 it is of a superior quality when it comes to architecture and  
15 landscape architecture. Next slide?

16 With respect to the ground floor and those design  
17 review criteria pertaining to the desired mix of uses, the design  
18 of the streetscape activation along the ground floor, connections  
19 to -- internal connections as well as connections throughout the  
20 Bridge District, and minimizing conflict between vehicular  
21 traffic and bicycle and pedestrians, as Ms. Cash mentioned, the  
22 project provides a two-block-long unbroken pedestrian realm with  
23 only the singular consolidated curb cut at the far east end of  
24 the project, leading to all parking and loading facilities. So  
25 those three particular provisions are met. Next slide?

1           The project has been designed on all four sides with  
2 highly articulated walls, facades, and again the pedestrian realm  
3 along Howard Road will also provide a very safe and active  
4 streetscape with lots of ground floor activation. Next slide?

5           And it's already been testified that the project is  
6 committing to achieving the goals in terms of minimizing the  
7 impact on the environment, certainly the LEED rating will go far  
8 to achieve that provision, not to mention the mass timber that's  
9 proposed for Building 1. Next slide?

10           The North Howard Road design review criteria have a  
11 few provisions that talk about the Applicant's efforts to  
12 coordinate with DOES on apprenticeship, internship, and in  
13 training opportunities. Efforts to include local businesses in  
14 the ground-floor programming of the project, particularly Ward 7  
15 and Ward 8 businesses. Those are touched upon in the slide here  
16 and in a moment when I hand it off to Ms. Morton for some testimony  
17 around the Applicant's efforts to -- around community engagement,  
18 she'll touch upon those as well. Next slide?

19           There are a number of designated street design criteria  
20 that must be met under Subtitle K, Section 1004. Just a note in  
21 these next few slides, all of those provisions with respect to  
22 the required ground-floor height of 14 feet when preferred use  
23 is extending at a minimum of 36 feet back into the space, the  
24 amount of glazing along the ground floor, as well as the direct  
25 -- no direct access to any parking and loading facilities, all

1 of these provisions under K 1004 are met. Next slide? And Mr.  
2 Young, you can go one more as well please?

3 I mentioned that we have a couple areas of zoning  
4 flexibility being the open courts in two spaces along Howard  
5 Road. The width of those courts is actually -- the minimum width  
6 of those courts is actually met if you could measure from facade  
7 to facade. We met with the zoning administrator and the width  
8 of those courts actually having to be measured from face of  
9 balcony to face of balcony, and so we do need a bit of relief -  
10 - or flexibility, I should say, there, as well as a rear yard  
11 for the project. You can see in the image on the left, it's kind  
12 of an odd configuration of District-owned properties, probably  
13 have been that way for many decades, when those properties came  
14 into District ownership for purposes of constructing the South  
15 Capitol Street right-of-way and Suitland Parkway. But because  
16 it is not public right-of-way along the entire length of the rear  
17 of the project, it's a combination of public right-of-way and  
18 District-owned properties that are used for transportation  
19 purposes, from a technical perspective, we do need flexibility  
20 for the rear yard. On the right, we do need two areas of zoning  
21 relief, that short-term bicycle parking location. The  
22 requirements, all of the short-term bicycle parking must be  
23 located within 120 feet of a primary entrance of a building.  
24 That term is not defined in the regulations. We do have a number  
25 of short-term bicycle parking spaces along Howard Road that meet

1 the 120-foot requirement, and then the large majority of short-  
2 term bicycle parking spaces is located in the southeast corner  
3 of the project near the retail parking. Those spaces are located  
4 within 120 feet of a residential entrance, but because we don't  
5 know -- we don't have a definition for primary entrance, out of  
6 an abundance of caution we requested relief from that. We have  
7 requested relief -- full relief from the long-term bicycle  
8 parking shower and changing facilities on the basis that we don't  
9 believe that given the very, very few employees that the lodging  
10 use will likely have, we don't believe that a full complement of  
11 the shower and changing facilities -- the demand just won't be  
12 there. We initially requested full relief, but in response to  
13 DDOT and OP's reports, we've amended the plans on Friday to  
14 include two of the four required showers and four of the six  
15 required lockers. And so while we still do need relief, we're  
16 just asking for partial relief at this point. Next slide?

17           The design review criteria under Subtitle X, there is  
18 some redundancy of these criteria, but if you refer it -- and in  
19 comparison to the North Howard Road design review criteria. So  
20 I'll go very quickly that the -- all the design review criteria  
21 under Subtitle X relating to street frontages and activation of  
22 the ground floor are met, as well as the encouragement to provide  
23 public gathering spaces and open spaces, as Mr. Chen testified,  
24 the three plazas along Howard Road will greatly enhance the public  
25 realm and activate the ground floor of the project. Next slide?

1           In terms of buildings striving for active and inspired  
2 facades, again we can just think back to Mr. Chen's testimony  
3 about the highly particular facades on Building 1 and Building 2  
4 with the balconies and the high-quality materials around -- on  
5 all four sides of the project to see that this particular design  
6 criteria is met. Next slide?

7           Connectivity. Sohael mentioned this in his testimony  
8 about not only does the project have internal connectivity  
9 between the two buildings with the second level amenity terrace,  
10 but also just as they think through the larger master plan of  
11 the Bridge District and thinking through all of the connections  
12 throughout the District between public space and private space,  
13 and in particular, the large public park that will be on the far  
14 west side of the Bridge District, the project, as well as the  
15 Bridge District in general, will have great connectivity. Next  
16 slide?

17           Part of the designing criteria requires an evaluation  
18 of comprehensive plan consistency, and as the Commission knows,  
19 the comprehensive plan that was adopted in 2021 places a heavy  
20 emphasis on racial equity. This slide just shows just some of  
21 the language that you find in the framework element, as well as  
22 the implementation element around the importance of racial equity  
23 and how District agencies, including the Commission, shall  
24 evaluate all actions through a racial equity lens as part of its  
25 comprehensive plan consistency analysis. Next slide? Next slide

1 please?

2           In accordance with the Commission's recently updated  
3 racial equity tool, the four-part tool, and the first one directs  
4 applicant to the citywide and the area elements of the  
5 comprehensive plan for guidance in terms of what does the  
6 comprehensive plan say, just generally, but also with regard --  
7 particularly with respect to racial equity. We did a thorough  
8 analysis of all comp plan policies and citywide elements, the  
9 area elements, and took guidance from that as we were undertaking  
10 our evaluation of this project. Here are the policies that'll  
11 be advanced by the project in four of the elements. Next slide?

12           Several elements in the economic development and urban  
13 design elements will be advanced. And next slide?

14           I wanted to note here you can see on the right the  
15 location of the project in relation to the planning areas of the  
16 comprehensive plan. While it's physically located within the  
17 lower Anacostia waterfront planning area, which we did a full  
18 evaluation on, given its proximity to the far southeast and  
19 southwest planning area, we also looked at that element for policy  
20 guidance in terms of how the project might advance some of the  
21 planning development priorities for that particular planning  
22 area. Next slide?

23           I won't go into detail here, but part two of the  
24 Commission's racial equity tool, which actually is directed at  
25 the Office of Planning, but just to note that we did look at a

1 fair amount of census data that's been posted on the Office of  
2 Planning's website with respect to various demographic and  
3 socioeconomic data. Again, just like the comprehensive plan,  
4 looking at this data to see what kind of guidance that we can  
5 glean from census data as we were undertaking our evaluation. I  
6 know last week the Commission inquired of an applicant on whether  
7 or not we saw any trends. We looked at this data. We did see  
8 some interesting trends and we're happy to answer any questions  
9 as part of the Commission's questions. I won't go into it in  
10 detail here. Next slide?

11           Wanted to hand it over to Lindsay Morton, who is with  
12 Redbrick, director of community engagement, to talk a little bit  
13 about the Applicant's community engagement efforts.

14           MS. MORTON: Thanks Shane. Again, my name is Lindsay  
15 Morton. I serve as the director of community engagement and  
16 corporate impact at Redbrick, LMD, and I'm here before you  
17 thankfully to testify to some of the work I and my colleagues  
18 have been doing in the community to engage Ward 8 stakeholders.  
19 Here is just a summary, a quick summary, of our significant  
20 outreach over the last several months and even into years. When  
21 I started in this role in 2022 -- oh 1, excuse me -- I inherited  
22 a group of meetings that had been taking place since 2010, and  
23 I've continued to maintain efforts along with my colleagues to  
24 meet with key stakeholders from our advisory neighborhood  
25 commissions, both ANC 8A and 8C, as well as the Anacostia Bid,

1 Anacostia Coordinating Council, and also identifying new and  
2 emerging groups that have come online over the last few months,  
3 those include the Popular Point Citizens Listening Group and the  
4 Ward 8 Community Economic Development Group.

5           Most recently, in October of 2022, we presented the  
6 project to a group of about 20 Ward 8 influencers and stakeholders  
7 who represented the business, clergy, and nonprofit communities.  
8 Since that time, we've followed up and had meetings with the  
9 Anacostia Park -- Friends of Anacostia Park, excuse me. We've  
10 also continued to engage the historic Anacostia Preservation  
11 Society by way of email. In February of this year, we continued  
12 our efforts to engage both with our ANC commissioners and the  
13 constituents they represent. We actually presented at both the  
14 ANC 8C and 8A public meetings. Earlier this month, we had an  
15 open house where we heard from about 20 plus neighbors from ANC  
16 8A. They were able to tour the project site, see renderings and  
17 share feedback directly with our team. We're also meeting later  
18 this month with our neighbor, Cedar Tree Academy, sharing project  
19 updates with parents, teachers, and school community members.  
20 And next month in April we'll be launching some formal surveying  
21 opportunities just to continue to hear more from our community  
22 members. If we can go to the next slide please?

23           And again, as you've heard, I hope, throughout the --  
24 and seen throughout the course of this presentation, we are a  
25 community-minded developer. And so our opportunity not only to

1 just listen to folks, but really leverage their learnings and  
2 turn those into partnership opportunities for us is really  
3 important. We value any opportunity that we can activate a  
4 partner to help support goals that we've heard clear are directly  
5 in line with community needs and aspirations, at the top of which  
6 is being able to hire and provide subcontracting opportunities  
7 for local businesses. We've had great success with this up at  
8 Saint Elizabeth's East already, where our general contractor,  
9 Davis, was not only successful in hiring a number of worthy  
10 businesses, but was also able to significantly spend money for  
11 local subcontractors. Additionally, our project is unique  
12 because we plan to invest over \$2 million directly into community-  
13 based organizations. When we talk about community preservation,  
14 we know that it's important that the small local mom and pop  
15 style organizations that have been a part of community resilience  
16 for years be sustained and supported. And so this investment  
17 will ensure that those organizations can continue to lead the  
18 great mission critical work that they've been doing for a number  
19 of years. And again, an example of a partnership that I think  
20 is significant is with Samwell Anacostia. We've continued to  
21 hear the need for amenities and experiences. And so we've  
22 activated a wonderful partner in Samwell Anacostia to be able to  
23 provide not only those experiences, but really start to think  
24 about how the space can highlight and amplify and ultimately  
25 incubate black owned and local businesses through this

1 partnership. And last but not least, as a corporate firm, we  
2 are solely committed to charitable donations and volunteer days  
3 as a part of every project. And so I am also proud to say we  
4 are doubling down on our efforts to not only give, but be present  
5 in community, to continue to serve, and we'll be joining the  
6 Anacostia Bid in a few weeks for a beautification event and the  
7 Ward. And I'll be happy to take questions later. I'll turn it  
8 back over to Shane.

9 MR. DETTMAN: Thanks, Lindsay.

10 Mr. Young, next slide?

11 Commissioners, I'll just round out the presentation  
12 with just wrapping it up with an evaluation of equitable  
13 development indicators. Again, this is in the record. I won't  
14 spend any time on it, but only to say that, you know, this is  
15 the last part of the Commission's racial equity tool in terms of  
16 taking, you know, the information that you glean from the  
17 comprehensive plan, the community outreach, this aggregated data  
18 and filter -- siphon that through a number of equitable  
19 development indicators to see how the project might advance  
20 certain aspects of equitable development. I'll only note that  
21 with respect to displacement, the site is vacant, there'll be no  
22 direct displacement, and that in terms of available housing, so  
23 because the site is vacant, this is over 800 net new units that  
24 will go towards addressing the increasing and continued demand  
25 for housing in the District of Columbia, 85 of which will be IZ

1 units all at the 50 percent and 60 percent MFI levels. And as  
2 Sohael mentioned, a majority of the square footage that's devoted  
3 to inclusionary zoning units in this project will be three-  
4 bedroom units. Next slide?

5 Lindsay touched upon some of the employment  
6 opportunities, job creation, job training, and again those are  
7 listed there for you. Several transportation improvements will  
8 result from the project which are listed there at the bottom of  
9 the slide. Next slide?

10 And certainly the North Howard Road zone in and of  
11 itself has a number of sustainability design review criteria  
12 which will help advance racial equity from an environmental  
13 perspective. Sohael mentioned LEED Gold. There's the mass timber  
14 aspect of the project. It's a transportation-oriented  
15 development, which not only has sustainability benefits, but also  
16 increases access to opportunity from an employment perspective.  
17 Next slide?

18 So in conclusion, the project satisfies all applicable  
19 design review criteria both in the North Howard Road zone as well  
20 as Subtitle X. We believe that the project also meets this burden  
21 of proof for all the requisite special exception zoning relief  
22 that was requested. When read as a whole and through a racial  
23 equity lens, the comp -- the project is not inconsistent with the  
24 comprehensive plan. And it's particularly strong in the  
25 equitable development indicators relating to displacement,

1 housing, affordable housing, environmental, as well as access to  
2 opportunity. And with that, I'll hand it back over to Jeff.

3 MR. UTZ: Great. Thank you so much, Shane.

4 Can you advance one more slide please? Thank you.

5 So this is our final slide. Apologies for running a  
6 bit longer than anticipated, but we did want to touch on the  
7 agency reports, their conditions, and the state of those  
8 conditions. It's ultimately a really good story. So we did want  
9 to highlight this. I know there's a lot to read on this slide.  
10 We tried to put it all in one place. At the top of the slide,  
11 it shows that the OP report, that indicated support of the  
12 application with three conditions. Briefly, these conditions  
13 relate to the materials on the building to balcony edges being  
14 consistent with what is shown in the plan in either an applied  
15 metallic paint or similar finish or metal panel, and these same  
16 balconies, including rounded corners and rounded overall shape.  
17 The Applicant agreed to both of those conditions, that's the  
18 first and second bullet. The third bullet requests setting a  
19 minimum of one-third of the pocket parks and courtyard along  
20 Howard as free public access. The Applicant and OP have been  
21 working on that element, that condition, and are happy to report  
22 that we figured out an approach that is suitable, and it involves  
23 limiting the extent of the outdoor retail seating and dining  
24 areas. Ultimately, we have inserted those, that exhibit into the  
25 record, it's Exhibit 25B. It's called the outdoor retail seating

1 and dining area diagram in that exhibit.

2           Moving on to the DDOT report, the bottom half of this  
3 slide, DDOT indicated that it had no objection to the application,  
4 with four conditions listed on the slide. Briefly, these relate  
5 to the first bullet, is implementation of the proposed TDM plan  
6 and additional TDM measures, as requested by DDOT. The Applicant  
7 agrees to that condition. The second bullet relates to the  
8 submission of revised plans that include some long-term bicycle  
9 parking and showers and lockers. As we talked about a bit before,  
10 the Applicant team submitted revised plans showing the two  
11 showers and four lockers on the revised ground level, and that  
12 is also listed in Exhibit 2B -- I'm sorry, 25B. The third  
13 condition in the DDOT report is the evaluation of construction  
14 of a pedestrian connection to the Suitland Trail. And this is  
15 something that we have been coordinating with DDOT about.  
16 Ultimately, we will work through the public space approval  
17 process to evaluate the potential for such a connection to the  
18 trail. And then the fourth item is the potential for a shared  
19 driveway and access agreement for the benefit of the owner to the  
20 east being allowed to share that driveway in the event of their  
21 redevelopment. And again, we've been working with DDOT to reach  
22 a position that is mutually agreeable where the Applicant will  
23 design and construct that driveway. And then in the event of  
24 redevelopment of the property to the east, pursue the shared  
25 access agreement. And the language that we inserted into the

1 Exhibit 25 response on Friday reflects that language that we  
2 believe DDOT is amenable to. So in summary, the Applicant greatly  
3 appreciates the time and ideas of all the agencies that have  
4 worked on this project, and we're happy to say that we think it  
5 helps refine and improve the project. And again, we really  
6 appreciate their involvement.

7           Going back to the first part of the discussion with the  
8 Commission, the question about the ANCs and some of the community  
9 outreach, Lindsay did touch on a great deal of it, but I wanted  
10 to just come back and mention some more details on that. The  
11 property is on the border of ANC 8A and ANC 8C. So both are  
12 automatically parties to this application. ANC 8C liked the  
13 project, supported the project, voted to support the application  
14 and their support letter is in the record at Exhibit 11. And we  
15 also did meet with ANC 8A and requested support from them. They  
16 voted down a resolution to submit a letter of support, but they  
17 did not vote to oppose it. We will maintain our engagement with  
18 both ANCs and the community generally.

19           And along those lines, the team has been very actively  
20 pursuing wide general community engagement, as you can tell from  
21 Lindsay's testimony. And as a result, there are a great deal of  
22 letters in the record that reflect that support from individuals  
23 and organizations alike. So with that, that concludes our  
24 presentation. And again, apologies for running a bit long, but  
25 we'd be happy to answer any questions you might have. Thank you

1 so much.

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Utz, and  
3 team. I really appreciate the very thorough presentation. I  
4 usually go to Commissioner May first. He's having some problems,  
5 so I'm going to let Commissioner Imamura go second. I'm going  
6 to go first to give him time to collect his thoughts. First,  
7 can we -- well, let's not put it up yet. Let me see. I want to  
8 talk -- let's talk, Mr. Chen. First of all, you have all the  
9 licenses and I don't. I am going to start off my questions with  
10 that, but I've been around long enough that I have a Philadelphia  
11 license. But explain to me again why such of the difference,  
12 and you may have mentioned this, I just may not have caught it,  
13 why such a difference in the style between Building 1 and Building  
14 2? And you talked about it a little bit on the balconies, but I  
15 wanted to -- yeah, take me through the course. Help me to  
16 understand why such a difference. Because I like Building 2. I  
17 love it. I'm just trying to figure out what's going on -- why  
18 such a difference in the makeup and how it looks?

19 MR. CHEN: Thank you, sure, Mr. Hood. I mean, two  
20 aspects to the difference between them. First of all, we did  
21 look at the context of phase one of this entire project, meaning  
22 the buildings that are built across the street from us. And it  
23 seemed to us that each one of those buildings are pretty big in  
24 its presence. And therefore, we would like to create a shared  
25 proportion and connection between all of them, but make sure that

1 they're not identical or not even similar in order to create  
2 variety of richness in the entire composition of that particular  
3 neighborhood. We don't want this to feel like a neighborhood  
4 that was designed by a single architect and that the whole thing  
5 looks the same way. The variation, I think, helps. It creates  
6 a more human and timeless type of esthetic. Number two is our  
7 choice to do a timber building on Building 1. That's an exception  
8 to the rule. It's a unique opportunity. Very few developers  
9 would go that route. And so I want to salute them, Redbrick,  
10 for allowing and pursuing that direction. It's a pretty novel  
11 type of construction these days. Everybody's trying to do it and  
12 very few are. And you have a building that is fully built from  
13 -- essentially from wood, from layered wood, it should look and  
14 feel different than the other one which is made of brick. And  
15 so what we did do is maintain the alignment and proportion of  
16 the entire thing. And if you look at the perspective view of  
17 both buildings together, both the ground floor is almost  
18 perfectly aligned, now we have to kind of adjust to the sloping  
19 of the street and have a consistent experience at the very street  
20 level of the sidewalk. And also the horizontal lines, the  
21 placement, et cetera, are proportionally, I think, compelling.

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you for that  
23 explanation. And everything you said, I just want you to know,  
24 from my point of view, you definitely accomplished it. So I  
25 appreciate it, especially with the similarities, you didn't want

1 them to look similar and you definitely accomplished it. So I  
2 understand now. I understand what you're trying to do so I  
3 appreciate the comments.

4 Mr. Utz let's go back to ANC 8A. So you said they  
5 chose not to -- they -- what did -- they chose not to take a  
6 position or what did they decide to do?

7 MR. UTZ: So they voted down a resolution to submit a  
8 letter of support.

9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And so they don't have anything in  
10 the record?

11 MR. UTZ: Correct.

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Is more of this in 8- -- which one  
13 abuts, is it 8C that abuts or is it 8A?

14 MR. UTZ: 8C abuts, and the property's located at 8A.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So how did 8A kind of leave it?  
16 They voted not to send a letter, but they are going to continue  
17 to work with Redbrick, correct, is that it? Okay.

18 MR. UTZ: Yes.

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And I guess I can go now to Mr.  
20 Chowfla or Ms. Morton. Ms. Morton let me just say, your  
21 presentation with the community was very, very well done. And I  
22 actually work on a group here in Ward 5. I like the name. We  
23 have a different name. We're going to change it to the Ward 5  
24 influencers. So I really like that. Who are they, who are the  
25 Ward 8 influencers?

1 MS. MORTON: Yeah, it's a formal but informal group of  
2 folks, again ranging from clergy, business leaders, government  
3 leaders. I can certainly provide the direct attendee list from  
4 that meeting, but we keep it open, really capturing a cross-  
5 section of folks most relevant to us near the project, but also  
6 into Ward 8 and also really trying to hear a diverse range of  
7 opinions. So not just from our public safety enthusiasts and not  
8 just from our faith leaders, but from folks who are passionate  
9 about young people, passionate about returning citizens,  
10 passionate about the environment. And so it's an open list, and  
11 I'm, you know, happy to share the attendee list from our first  
12 session.

13 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I think I know probably most of the  
14 Ward 8 influencers, so I don't necessarily need that, but I'm  
15 glad to know that you all are doing that, continue to do that  
16 because I can tell you one thing about Ward 8, they stick  
17 together. So continue to work with them in that fa- -- can you  
18 or Mr. Chowfla tell me a little bit about the Training Grounds.  
19 I know early on they were involved. Are they still active, are  
20 they still involved? I know they -- it was a lot of support.  
21 Actually, I think when we first started Redbrick, we were in the  
22 hearing room and that was a conversation. I don't think I'm  
23 going too far back. But can you all tell me a little bit about  
24 -- is that still in play?

25 MS. MORTON: Yeah, I'm happy to start. I have not had

1 direct interaction with Training Grounds specifically, but more  
2 broadly our strategy around training is to really maximize our  
3 efforts there. We've heard clearly from the councilmember from  
4 Ward 8, as well as the community, about the need to ensure that  
5 residents have the opportunity even before jobs come online to  
6 be educated and trained up to be able to access those  
7 opportunities. We're working with partners such as DEODC and  
8 other groups in the community to really identify the appropriate  
9 training opportunities on the table as an opportunity to invest  
10 or in some folks through core training that will give them the  
11 basics of construction and make them essentially job ready as  
12 more jobs come online and then through our general contractors  
13 we're also investing in apprenticeship opportunities. Those are  
14 going to be more focused on skilled laborers and skilled  
15 opportunities. So we have a pretty sort of colorful and abundant  
16 strategy with regard to training. We see it as really important  
17 and we're doing a number of different things to meet the need.

18 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Ms. Morton, I think -- when I was  
19 mentioning Training Grounds I meant there was a group, their name  
20 was Train- -- are we talking about the same thing?

21 MS. MORTON: Sure. Yeah, no. And as -- I'm sorry, I  
22 haven't personally interacted with Training Grounds, haven't  
23 caught up with them. Happy to do some research there. But we've  
24 been working with a couple other partners, including folks like  
25 work -- Light Hope Work, DEODC, as well as the Jobs Not Guns

1 collective through Crave, who I think you'll hear from later. So  
2 we have continued to meet other partners. I think Training  
3 Grounds is probably still active, although I haven't interacted  
4 with them.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. I know they were  
6 very excited. A couple of gentlemen came down to the hearing  
7 room some years back and I would like for us to just follow up  
8 and see where they are. I know Tom Brown was working with them,  
9 so let's just follow up and see where they are and this -- makes  
10 a thing, not to take the other ones out who, you know, I know  
11 things change over the years, but I really appreciate your  
12 testimony and your comments of how you're working and engaging  
13 with the community.

14 MS. MORTON: Sounds good.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And last, and I say last, I've been  
16 trying to figure this whole thing out about Howard Road. I don't  
17 know if Mr. Schiesel is around, but I've been trying to figure  
18 out the traffic backs up -- maybe it doesn't no more. I will  
19 tell you honestly, I stay away from Howard Road because of all  
20 the traffic, unless I just have to go down in that area. But I  
21 am trying to figure out how the impacts of this project can  
22 continue to exacerbate what's already going on down there. I  
23 know from esthetically, from the look it's going to definitely  
24 make it look a lot better. But I'm just concerned about the  
25 connection, and I know about the showers and the bicycles, to me

1 that's not -- I mean, I'll follow some of my other colleagues'  
2 lead on that. I'm concerned about the backups on Howard Road,  
3 Suitland Parkway, that whole area -- and I'm not just blaming it  
4 all on this project. But how will this project either increase  
5 the issues or help decrease it? I know DDOT has a few  
6 recommendations on some ways to move, and I'm not sure who -- if  
7 Mr. Schiesel is around. He can kind of walk me through that, or  
8 Mr. Truffalo, whomever.

9 Mr. UTZ: So Rob Schiesel should be on, although I  
10 actually don't see him in the attendee list of the panel.

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'll tell you what. I will save  
12 that question if he's not available. There he is. Yeah, I see  
13 him. I see him now.

14 MR. UTZ: There he is, okay, great.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Schiesel, I haven't talked to  
16 you in a while, so I had to have a traffic question.

17 MR. Schiesel: Yeah, well, I can't speak as much to all  
18 the regional traffic you mentioned, you know, the new ovals, the  
19 new patterns that that were just created there. I can speak a  
20 little bit more to the, you know, what we studied in our  
21 comprehensive transportation review, which is something that is  
22 different than, say, the Bridge District studies in the past,  
23 notably the Douglass Parcels 3 and 4 included new counts because  
24 this study -- the timeline of this study was able to take place  
25 after the completion of the new traffic oval. And so those counts

1 were taken. And I mean, all those results are in our  
2 transportation review that show the peak hour traffic on Howard  
3 Road working. That's not to say that there isn't issues that  
4 are regional based because anytime you're in proximity to 295,  
5 Suitland Parkway, South Capitol Street, and all the other major  
6 arterials, there's going to be times when just regional traffic  
7 issues can back up onto things like Howard Road. We see this  
8 all the time in neighborhoods that are adjacent to major regional  
9 connectors. But as for Howard Road itself, our traffic studies  
10 and projections show that the Bridge District parcels are fine,  
11 you know, that the amount of traffic generated just on Howard  
12 Road can be accommodated on Howard Road.

13 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Schiesel. I  
14 was trying to find my unmute. So you say it can be accommodated,  
15 but it doesn't necessarily mean the -- we don't necessarily have  
16 any recommendations to like maybe speed up the traffic light? If  
17 you did, I didn't see it.

18 MR. SCHIESEL: No. It's one of the -- so what's going  
19 on like Parcels 1 and 2 here, as far as how much that moves the  
20 dial compared to 295, the traffic oval, changes in the Bridge  
21 District aren't going to dictate changes to the regional network.  
22 So yeah, we did look at a few things, but for example, some of  
23 the traffic signals like Firth Sterling, some of the ones, you  
24 know, what's going on in the traffic oval itself, tweaking those  
25 isn't going to necessarily -- it's not something you would do in

1 response to these new buildings. It'd be part of a whole regional  
2 strategy, which was -- a new one was just developed when the  
3 traffic oval went in. So I think, you know, those type of  
4 questions would be for more of a, you know, District-wide or  
5 regional-wide approach to think about changing things. It's not  
6 like what's going on with the Bridge District parcels is a big  
7 enough change that it would alter like the conclusions of the  
8 studies that went into creating all the changes that were just  
9 implemented.

10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I know this is a -- and I  
11 appreciate it. I know this is a design review case, but, you  
12 know, we keep reviewing and approving, and at some point we've  
13 got to stop and say are we creating problems. But I know -- I  
14 appreciate the language of regional strategy. I will ask Mr.  
15 Zimmerman a few questions about what's going on in that area  
16 regionally. And I do know the bridge project has improved 295,  
17 even though it hasn't improved further up 295, for some reason  
18 we always still keep getting that bottleneck. But we'll talk  
19 about that over the years and hopefully one day we'll resolve  
20 that problem. So anyway I appreciate your comments.

21 I don't have any other questions. And while I have the  
22 mic before I turn it over to my colleagues, let me wish -- and  
23 our court reporter never gets any credit. I never acknowledge  
24 him. And I just realized today -- or tomorrow is his birthday.  
25 So Gary Euell I want to wish you on behalf of the Commission and

1 all of us that you have served for years and every Monday and  
2 Thursday and some other nights, a very happy birthday and enjoy  
3 your day. I would sing, but I'm not going to do that. But enjoy  
4 your birthday tomorrow. I know you can hear me say this, but  
5 enjoy your birthday tomorrow.

6 All right. So let me go -- Commissioner May?

7 COMMISSIONER MAY: I'm kind of interested in you  
8 singing, because then the court reporter would have to put all  
9 that into the transcript.

10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Well, I'm sure that Redbrick wants  
11 to finish the hearing because everything might cut off if I start  
12 singing.

13 COMMISSIONER MAY: I don't want to crash the system.  
14 Maybe that would be -- maybe that was why I was having trouble.  
15 Anyway, I did miss a little bit of the community outreach  
16 discussion. I'm sorry I missed that. And I'm sorry if any of  
17 the questions I ask are -- were covered because I was having  
18 troubles for the last hour or so. Hopefully, it's straight.

19 So let me ask a couple of architectural questions. The  
20 -- first of all, the mass timber construction, this is unusual.  
21 I mean, I don't think we've seen -- we've seen some mass timber,  
22 but it was like -- I think it was a -- an addition to a top of a  
23 building and not a whole building, and certainly not one that's  
24 12 stories. So this is -- I mean, have there been other buildings  
25 in the District yet of this scale made of mass timber?

1 MR. CHOWFLA: No. This is Sohael. This would be the  
2 first, Commissioner May.

3 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah.

4 MR. CHEN: There's only -- to the extent of my knowledge,  
5 there's only one building of that scale that has ever been, as a  
6 residential building, timber has built in the United States.

7 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah.

8 MR. CHEN: And it's almost the same size, slightly  
9 bigger, but less number of apartments. So it's definitely going  
10 to be an iconic statement.

11 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah, absolutely. The -- I think  
12 my questions about the courtyards have been answered. It was not  
13 totally clear what the spatial experience would be in the -- in  
14 some of those courtyards. And there were some views that were  
15 like internal of the courtyards, but sort of the spaces that were  
16 actually public spaces and how they related to the street, I had  
17 some questions about that. And if we wind up requesting more  
18 information, I might ask for some additional views of those areas.  
19 Can you tell me what the percentage of units are that would  
20 actually have balconies? Because there are a lot of balconies  
21 popping out of that building, what's the percentage?

22 MR. CHEN: So the overall percentage is slightly over  
23 50 percent of the entire units. And considering that in Building  
24 1, because the courtyard is a little tighter, we don't have  
25 balconies. That makes the percentage of units with balconies

1 facing out larger than 60 percent. So it's a good amount.

2 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah. What is the cornice on  
3 Building -- well, the mass timber building -- I get so confused  
4 because you've got Building 1 is in phase two and Building 2 is  
5 in phase two and the text is on the left and it doesn't align  
6 with the blocks, and so I have no idea which building is which  
7 number. So the build -- the mass timber building, what is the  
8 cornice actually made of there? Maybe there's a detail of it  
9 that I missed, but I just it's a little bit confusing and it  
10 doesn't look really elegant like the rest of the building.

11 MR. CHEN: Yes, sure. So if you look at the rendering,  
12 the every slab edge is covered by a U-shaped aluminum profile  
13 that we see as the balcony, almost like, as I said, a kit-of-  
14 parts, and then supported -- it's supported by the column, the  
15 balconies. And that U-shaped profile surrounds the entire facet  
16 of the building on every slab edge. However, at the top we  
17 duplicate that detail, and so there's essentially two of them.  
18 It's about three feet overall of a continuous horizontal banding,  
19 two U-shaped profiles that are stacked. And you know, it's the  
20 same detail as the division between the retail level and the  
21 second floor. So we kind of repeat the same -- exactly the same  
22 detail.

23 COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. Yeah, it's interesting  
24 because in the renderings, it just it looks like it's the reverse  
25 and that it almost looks like a W beam.

1           MR. CHEN: Right. No, it's just basically two U-shaped  
2 profiles facing outwards.

3           COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. Yeah, I generally like that  
4 detail. I imagine it's -- it may be a challenge making sure it's  
5 all waterproof, but we don't care about waterproofing at the  
6 Zoning Commission.

7           MR. CHEN: Right. We'll manage with the waterproofing.  
8 I think that the -- as opposed to Building 2, which is not the  
9 timber one where we have a very expressed horizontal cornice that  
10 sticks out, and it also speaks to the language of the entire  
11 building, which has those kind of very strong horizontal thing.  
12 Here we wanted to be a bit more modest because of the nature of  
13 the timber.

14          COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah

15          MR. CHEN: And anything that would be extending or  
16 extruded out will have to be supported by an additional element,  
17 which seemed very heavily -- you know, it would be too kind of a  
18 messy detail.

19          COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah.

20          MR. CHEN: We thought there's enough going on.

21          COMMISSIONER MAY: I mean, it does feel a little bit  
22 unresolved, but I'm not -- I mean, I think there are enough other  
23 things going on in this building that you don't necessarily need  
24 the busyness at the top. But it's interesting because on the  
25 other building, the concrete building, you've got a really

1 massive overhang of edge there, which is quite a contrast and not  
2 necessarily -- I mean, it just it feels a little bit awkward,  
3 but I'm not trying to -- I'm not going to fuss about that. It's  
4 -- they are certainly going to be very interesting and unique  
5 buildings to look at. And I think, I mean, it's -- there aren't  
6 many places in Washington where we see architecture that's this  
7 lively, and so -- and to me it's reminiscent of phase two of The  
8 Wharf. I'm not even sure I have the phasing right, but it's --  
9 and I think you might have done one of those buildings, right?

10 MR. CHEN: Right.

11 COMMISSIONER MAY: So it's that further downriver  
12 section of The Wharf where you've got much more exciting  
13 expression as opposed to the rest of The Wharf, which is also,  
14 you know, very nice. But it's got pieces above it, right, it's  
15 boxy like the one end of The Wharf and it's more expressive like  
16 the other end, so it'll be interesting.

17 It's nice to see this kind of investment in interesting  
18 architecture on this (indiscernible). So on the bike parking -  
19 - well, actually, I'm sorry, I'm going to stick with something  
20 that's slightly more -- actually -- I kind of missed the flood  
21 plain explanation, right? So this is -- the building, because  
22 of the grading changes and stuff basically, is going to be out  
23 of the floodplain, is that what it boils down to?

24 MR. CHEN: Essentially. Yeah, essentially, yes. But  
25 in addition, all the mechanical systems are raised. Nothing is

1 located at the subcellar or the cellar and everything is raised  
2 above that. But we are, correct me if I'm wrong, so we're  
3 clearing the flood zone.

4 COMMISSIONER MAY: You're clearing the flood plain.  
5 Yeah. Okay. Are you tuned into the levee scheme that the Joint  
6 Base Anacostia-Bolling is working on 'cause I just saw some  
7 diagrams the other day of sea walls and things like that, are  
8 you guys paying attention to that?

9 MR. CHEN: Could you repeat that please?

10 MR. CHOWFLA: I can -- I would like -- I have not been  
11 tuned into that, Commissioner May, but I would love to understand  
12 what you're talking about.

13 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah. Okay. I'll see if I can find  
14 out more about it and whether there's any information that can  
15 be shared. That will come to you through my deputy (audio  
16 glitch) you guys as well, so. The -- let's see -- and one last  
17 architectural. And the flexibility due to the construction type,  
18 so can you give me a sense of what you're anticipating might go  
19 awry when you get to permitting and you need to be -- what you  
20 need the flexibility for?

21 MR. CHEN: Yes, so mainly on Building 1, as I explained,  
22 where the balconies' locations are pretty strict and the way that  
23 they're tied back into the building, because every edge of that  
24 balcony needs to fall on a column. Unlike a concrete construction  
25 you can put it wherever you want, the attachment of the balcony

1 has to fall on the column. And therefore, if there's going to  
2 be some like slight variations in the column spacing as we  
3 finalize the timber system, we're still kind of, you know, is it  
4 18 feet, is it 17 feet, you might create some variations of the  
5 balconies on that building. But I don't foresee any major thing  
6 that anybody would be able to see. I just -- we can't at this  
7 point 100 percent anchor those because of the column locations.

8 COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. All right. That makes sense.  
9 And bike parking, so I didn't see enough -- or I didn't see a  
10 lot of information on exactly why it's such a challenge getting  
11 the bike parking where ideally it should be within 120 feet of  
12 the main entrance on the -- presumably on the fronts of the  
13 building. Why -- is it just that there's just not enough space?  
14 I don't know. Somebody explain to me why it's such a problem  
15 and it can't be done on the outside, because we don't usually  
16 run into this kind of a challenge.

17 MS. WHITING CASH: You want me to field that one, Eran?

18 MR. CHEN: Sure, sure.

19 MS. WHITING CASH: I think what didn't come through in  
20 the presentation is the importance that's being given to bikes  
21 in the overall design. And that central courtyard and those rear  
22 lobbies also include these dedicated resident bike rooms and the  
23 potential of a bike lounge. So we have the opportunity to band  
24 together short term bike parking as well that's undercover and  
25 directly adjacent to these showers for building employees. And

1 so that seemed to us to be a good opportunity to really celebrate  
2 bikes as a central idea here and co-locate that short-term bike  
3 parking together with all these other bike amenities that we're  
4 planning as part of the project.

5 COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. So you're explaining to me  
6 why the location where you put them is good. My question is why  
7 could they not be out front? Because let me tell you, when I go  
8 for a bike ride, I'm not celebrating, I'm just looking for the  
9 nearest place to park.

10 MS. WHITING CASH: Right. Yeah, we're hoping to  
11 incorporate some into that small DDOT parcel on the end, and then  
12 there will be some as well within the street frontage in between  
13 the tree pits. So there will be retail-related bike storage  
14 right there along the street. It's just a tremendous amount of  
15 bike storage and feeling that with the rear entry that that rear  
16 location and proximity to those rear entries, you know, felt  
17 satisfactory to us.

18 COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. But I mean, the people who  
19 are using the retail and they're coming by bike aren't necessarily  
20 -- unless they know that there is covered parking and there's  
21 some other real benefit to being there, they're not necessarily  
22 going to go there. And people are terrible about reading signs.  
23 So what -- I mean, I guess I'm still not fully understanding why  
24 it's so hard to get -- I mean, how many short-term bike spaces  
25 are needed? I've forgotten.

1 MS. WHITING CASH: In the realm of 60 for the two  
2 buildings combined.

3 COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay.

4 MR. CHOWFLA: I think if I may --

5 COMMISSIONER MAY: If --

6 MR. CHEN: I think if I may, what we're saying is that  
7 we don't have shortage of placement to put the bike. In fact,  
8 if we open the plan, we have bike -- temporary bike storage on  
9 each side of the building, the back side and in the front. In  
10 addition, as Brooke said, we can have even bike storage or parking  
11 right in front of the retail. What I think we're saying is that  
12 at the main plaza, if you want to call it, the one that is the  
13 deepest, we have -- at grade we have a good concentration of bike  
14 storage there because we're also creating what we call the unique  
15 bike lounge. And the bike lounge, which would be open to  
16 everyone, would include not only parking for bikes, but it would  
17 include service stations for bikers as well as like a coffee shop  
18 and stuff like that. So I don't think there's any limitations  
19 on our part. We're just saying that we want to consolidate the  
20 good amount of them at the center.

21 MR. SCHIESEL: I would just add that that if you look  
22 -- you have to -- I see the short-term bike parking working in  
23 several ways. As Brooke said, the whole streetscape along Howard  
24 Road has bike racks along it in between the tree pits. And then  
25 there's also bike parking near the plaza. The retail visitors

1 will likely not use the undercover parking next to the residential  
2 lobbies. We expect that to be mostly for the residential visitors  
3 who, there's a good chance, would prefer a covered spot right  
4 adjacent to the lobby wherever they're -- where whoever they're  
5 visiting is living. But there are a fair amount of retail based  
6 U racks along the streetscape.

7           What's a little bit odd here is I think you heard some  
8 of the building design saying how focused it was on Howard Road,  
9 and how all the storefronts and their lobby doors are on there.  
10 One of the reasons is, for a site this big, the actual amount of  
11 public street frontage or practical street frontage is pretty  
12 limited. Those sites don't have Suitland Parkway and highways  
13 fronting basically two of its four sides. And I think that kind  
14 of limits and why on most cases spreading out the U racks along  
15 the streetscape or what's available along the site usually is  
16 enough to do it. Here it's just a little bit more creative in  
17 some of the vertical or other design solutions that were  
18 discussed, kind of have the same kind of feeling like, you know,  
19 the reason those lobbies are a little bit internal, and it's so  
20 we could focus the retail on Howard Road, kind of led to a similar  
21 solution for the bike parking. But I would definitely say a  
22 retail visitor probably on Howard Road or the plaza and the  
23 residential visitors, the hotel employees, the retail employees  
24 on the covered spots internal. That's the plan.

25           COMMISSIONER MAY: Well, okay, so I'm --

1 MR. CHOWFLA: Would it be helpful to you to pull up the  
2 exhibit?

3 MR. DETTMAN: Can we bring up page 72 of the PDF, Mr.  
4 Young?

5 MR. CHEN: Maybe it's the most helpful to just open the  
6 floor plan.

7 MR. DETTMAN: Page 72 of the PDF will -- is perfect.  
8 Commissioner May, just to kind of give you an idea of where --  
9 so the requirement for short-term bike parking is 52 for the  
10 project, 41 of which is driven by the residential component of  
11 the project. And so what this diagram shows, to directly answer  
12 your question is that there's -- the regulation says that all the  
13 short-term parking, the 52 spaces, have to be located within 120  
14 feet of a primary entrance. As I mentioned, that's not defined.  
15 There -- if we were only to look to the two residential lobbies  
16 on Howard Road and then the retail entries along Howard Road,  
17 there just isn't enough space along the curb of Howard Road to  
18 locate all 52 required parking spaces just because of the site  
19 being (audio glitch) tree boxes, there's additional bench seating  
20 that was put in along Howard Road in response to the Office of  
21 Planning's comments, you know, then there's going to be bike  
22 racks there and whatnot. So we can tell you how many spaces are  
23 actually located along Howard Road, but there just isn't enough  
24 space given other streetscape elements to locate all 52. But to  
25 Mr. Scheisel's comment, if you look in the lower right, there's

1 a larger oval there, there's that bank of short-term spaces,  
2 that's about 30 spaces, and that's located in close proximity to  
3 what I call like a maybe it's a secondary residential entrance.  
4 There's two residential entrances over there. And so  
5 (indiscernible) number of spaces --

6 COMMISSIONER MAY: All right. I'm going to stop you -  
7 - can I -- can we stop for a second? I understand the other  
8 locations and I understand the benefits of the other location.  
9 My question is just about the, you know, your statement that the  
10 450 feet of building front -- sorry, 500 feet of building, you  
11 can't find space for 52 spaces, I mean for 52 bikes. So tell me  
12 how many there are there?

13 MR. DETTMAN: Brooke, do you know that?

14 MR. CHEN: Between the, Brooke, between the ones on the  
15 left, the oval on the left, and then the two ovals in our plaza  
16 at the center, which are opened by parking, how many bikes do  
17 you have there?

18 MS. WHITING CASH: Well, we accommodate -- and I'm  
19 talking about bike spaces, so that's two bikes per rack. So we  
20 have 12 along, Howard. We have another 8 there at the west and  
21 at that small DDOT park area, and then we have approximately  
22 another 16 in that, 14 to 16, in that central plaza area.

23 MR. CHEN: So how many bikes overall?

24 MS. WHITING CASH: It -- let's see, over 30 within the  
25 front portion of the site.

1           COMMISSIONER MAY: So that's inclusive of the park all  
2 the way at the western end there?

3           MS. WHITING CASH: Yes, that's correct.

4           COMMISSIONER MAY: And the 16 or so in the center  
5 section?

6           MS. WHITING CASH: Yes, correct. So we did look to  
7 visit is it sort of relevance, we did look at locating bike  
8 parking within the four-foot building setback as a way to provide  
9 greater street proximity. But that works in counter to a couple  
10 of things: one, having the fully glazed and engaged storefronts  
11 by putting bikes in front of it that separates people from that  
12 and that experience. It also creates a lot of obstruction. Part  
13 of the reason of setting that building facade back the four feet  
14 is due to the narrowness of the Howard Road right-of-way. We  
15 worked with DDOT extensively on the renovations to Howard Road,  
16 and we're skinnying up the road to give additional sidewalk space.  
17 However, it's still under an eight-foot sidewalk. And so with  
18 the anticipated intensity of eventual development of this area,  
19 the building's being set back to give a more generous feeling of  
20 a 12-foot sidewalk, so if we put bikes immediately at the face  
21 of the building, now we've sort of worked --

22           COMMISSIONER MAY: No, that would have been bad. You  
23 don't need to talk anymore. It would have been bad. I get that.  
24 I mean, I still am a little bit puzzled as to why you can't, but  
25 we've already spent too much time on this, so I'm just going to

1 stop questioning it and accept that, you know, you've done  
2 something that's acceptable in this circumstance. But it's -- I  
3 will say that, you know, that the negative impact of not having  
4 enough spaces up front like that is that you're going to wind up  
5 with people parking bikes kind of everywhere that they can lock  
6 stuff up. And so they'll be locking them to trash cans and tree  
7 boxes and anything else under the sun. So if you don't plan for  
8 enough in the right places, you wind up getting cluttered up with  
9 bikes locked everywhere. And it's a problem in many, many  
10 developments across the city. There's so many places I go where  
11 I can't find -- I mean, new, brand new places, right? The Navy  
12 Yard, brand new places. I can't find a decent parking space  
13 outside of the bike shop, you know? I mean, it's just -- it's  
14 bad. So just this is the problem you run into.

15 MR. CHEN: That's a point well taken. We're going to  
16 relook at that. I don't think it's a code issue or anything  
17 else. It's just a matter of convenience. I agree, Peter. We'll  
18 revisit that.

19 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah, well, I mean, it's a zoning  
20 regulation issue, but that's okay. All right. Thank you. Sorry  
21 about that. We're going on too long about that, Mr. Chairman, I  
22 will hand off the rein.

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: No problem, Commissioner May. I knew  
24 you would cover the bicycles very thoroughly. You did. So thank  
25 you.

1 Commissioner Imamura?

2 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I  
3 thought we were about to start a Commission's Coalition for  
4 Cyclists. I would just comment some positive comments to share  
5 with the project team here. This is a tremendous project with a  
6 lot of potential, certainly transformative in this Bridge  
7 District neighborhood. I think Mr. Dettman talked a little bit  
8 about connectivity. I think Ms. Whiting Cash also talked a little  
9 bit about that. Ms. Morton, I think I read somewhere that there  
10 were over 300 public meetings, which is rather impressive.

11 I think that the idea of a mass timber construction is  
12 aspirational, could be a model example in the city with a 20 to  
13 30 percent cut in embodied carbon. I think it's a tremendous  
14 reach. I think the most successful, one of the most successful,  
15 things about this project that I really appreciate is the  
16 continuous amenity space on the second floor. I think that has  
17 tremendous benefit and a great sort of moment for the landscape  
18 architecture team to really exercise some creativity. We don't  
19 often get a chance to see that when we build up the property line  
20 as well as the vertical garden. That kind of struck me, I think.

21 I want to compliment the Chairman for his comment about  
22 style difference. And I had the same question only in a different  
23 way. The shape grammar is very different in the architectural  
24 vocabulary between the two buildings. So I'm curious in terms  
25 of your design discussions, at what point -- or I'm sure at some

1 point you had, at least early in conception, Building 2 with  
2 similar shape, grammar, and vocabulary to Building 1 and at what  
3 point sort of there is the deviation or decision to make them  
4 different, uniquely different?

5 MR. CHEN: And I think that when we -- thank you for  
6 the question. I think that when we started off the design  
7 process, we collectively, meaning us as architects and our  
8 client, spoke about the character of these two buildings as they  
9 relate to the rest of the development and to what degree they  
10 want to be either similar or different.

11 I think, you know, there was an initial concern by our  
12 client that because we are one architect designing two buildings,  
13 they might look too much alike. And I certainly don't have that  
14 concern. But we decided strategically that they would be  
15 different. We thought it's an advantage to the city. We thought  
16 in this particular area, in, you know, the context of the, what  
17 we call the, built environment is not very intense, and therefore  
18 each one of those typologies could become an anchor for future  
19 expansion and development for future projects. And that's the  
20 strategic decision we've made, and therefore the buildings were  
21 designed as different buildings.

22 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: All right. I appreciate your  
23 responsive Mr. Chen. And I know you had made a comment about  
24 the variety of richness, but, you know, I only see these two  
25 buildings, I would think variety would be a third component to

1 that, then we'd have some sort of variety there. I know you did  
2 talk about the alignment proportion really referring to sets of  
3 datums to kind of tie the two projects together. I still think  
4 they're, in the best positive way, uniquely different. And so  
5 you are successful in that regard. I had hoped to see sort of  
6 some sort of compatibility with one another, but I certainly  
7 understand your design approach to that.

8 I want to move on to landscape architecture and design,  
9 and Ms. Whiting Cash, the way you described sort of site  
10 organization, human scale spaces, the public realm, certainly  
11 your precedent images, Paisley Park, that's everybody's favorite.  
12 So those were helpful imagery to convey your concept through  
13 this. One question I do have for you and Mr. Chen is that at  
14 the intersection of Howard Road and Suitland Parkway, where  
15 there's that park on the north side of Howard Road and on our  
16 property here, where Building 1 exists in the retail storefront  
17 there, it seems like -- I'm curious what conversations you all  
18 had early in your concept development. It seems like that would  
19 be a great connection to the park to the north there at that  
20 intersection there. I almost feel like there was a missed  
21 opportunity there, so I'm really curious about what your  
22 conversations were amongst each other about that sort of  
23 connection there back to the park on the north side because you  
24 did talk about sort of this comprehensive design solution for the  
25 entire Bridge District.

1 MS. WHITING CASH: Well, we're just starting the  
2 discussions with DDOT about the park to the north. There's been  
3 internal discussions with Redbrick for quite a while, but the  
4 process with DDOT is just starting to hear their comments and  
5 feedback about what they'd like because they are in control of  
6 those parcels as well as that small parcel to the south. Part  
7 of the discussion with DDOT has also been about developing street  
8 crossing locations, and, you know, we do see that small parcel  
9 on the south side as a sort of node where the Suitland Trail  
10 comes in. That's where there already is an established crosswalk  
11 condition that was part of the South Capital Bridge work that did  
12 sort of stretch just onto Howard to create that crossing. There's  
13 quite a lot of grade to negotiate. So we're working, you know,  
14 as we go through this process with DDOT, about how we can really  
15 create a sort of anchor and gateway of these public spaces, but  
16 that one to the south isn't very big. So we're looking to create  
17 some sort of a moment there that is an announcement and does have  
18 a dialog with the larger DDOT space across the street. But to  
19 be perfectly honest, we haven't really dove into the design and  
20 heard DDOT's, you know, list of wants yet to refine that.

21 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you Ms. Whiting Cash. I  
22 think that that makes a lot of sense. And I'm glad that we're  
23 in agreement that that could be a moment there and has some  
24 potential, just again, you know, going back to it being a node  
25 connection back to the north of the park there. So I hope that

1 the team explores that a bit more with DDOT. I think that could  
2 probably be just a great anchor and make that corner, that edge  
3 condition, feel more complete. So right now --

4 MS. WHITING CASH: We expect that would be part of our  
5 public space review working with them through that piece as we  
6 get to hear their input as well as our work with them across on  
7 the north side.

8 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: I would have almost liked to  
9 have had the architecture pulled back a bit from the edge. So  
10 it certainly is an edge condition, an architectural solution, but  
11 I think it really needs a landscape architect solution. So thank  
12 you very much for that. Outside of that -- oh, I do have one  
13 more question Ms. Whiting Cash. I'm curious, I know that -- I'm  
14 curious about your participation or role in stormwater management  
15 and whether you led that effort or were you contributing to that  
16 effort that was led by a civil engineer? I think sometimes  
17 landscape architects are best positioned for that. So I'm curious  
18 what your role was and contribution to the stormwater management  
19 strategy?

20 MS. WHITING CASH: Well, we've been lucky to work with  
21 Wiles Mensch across the street at the Douglass as well. So we  
22 worked -- you know, we had the same landscape civil team working  
23 there. So we have a lot of lessons learned there. So it's a  
24 joint process, a lot of back and forth between looking at soil  
25 profile media depth options, this civil, you know, doing

1 calculations and cistern sizing. That's also related to other  
2 sustainability, metrics of meeting the stormwater goals. So I'm  
3 not sure either one of us really leads, it's sort of a constant  
4 back and forth in that position to look at how we can best manage  
5 those requirements.

6 COMMISSIONER MAY: Perfect. That's a very tactful  
7 answer. Thank you very much, Ms. Whiting Cash, I appreciate  
8 that.

9 Mr. Chairman, I don't think that I have any other  
10 questions and just want to compliment the team again on a great  
11 project that will bring more affordable housing to this area of  
12 the city that needs it. And with that, I yield my time.

13 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. Thank you, Commissioner  
14 Imamura.

15 Vice Chair Miller?

16 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank  
17 you to the Redbrook -- Redbrick team for your presentation today  
18 and for all your work on this project and also other projects,  
19 but this project, which is a very large project, for a while  
20 you've been working on it, and I appreciate all of the comments  
21 by the team: Mr. Utz, Mr. Chen, Ms. Cash, Ms. Morton, Mr.  
22 Scheisel, and Mr. Dettman, and I've probably left somebody out,  
23 but.

24 I really do like the design. I think it's just very  
25 attractive, very interesting. The mass timber is not only,

1 obviously, as you've stated, more environmentally sustainable,  
2 but that's just -- it's unique and it's -- I just happen to find  
3 it very, very attractive. All the balconies and the articulation,  
4 this is a lot of -- it's over 800 units of housing, over -- and  
5 150 lodging units, and 25,000 square feet of retail, I mean,  
6 there's a lot there. But all that articulation and breakup, the  
7 balconies, the support system for the balconies, I like -- it  
8 just -- it's interesting and the LEED Gold, and the fact that  
9 all of the -- that half of the -- that 85 of the 818 or so  
10 residential units, 12 percent as required by the North Howard  
11 zone that we created, is devoted to affordable housing, but half  
12 of the 85 units are in the three-bedroom range, which is not  
13 required. It's encouraged I think. Maybe it is required. Maybe  
14 there are incentives for it, I can't really remember in the Howard  
15 Road zone, but. So it's all very -- and they're at the 50 and  
16 60 percent median family income level. I'm sure this is in the  
17 record, but I just don't have -- don't -- can't think of it off  
18 the top my head, of the 818 units between the two buildings,  
19 what's the total size breakdown? I know you got half of the 85  
20 IZ units are three-bedroom, so that's 40 at three-bedroom at  
21 least. But then you've got -- I assume you've got market rate  
22 three-bedrooms. So just how many of the units just are three  
23 bedrooms, two bedrooms, one-bedroom studios just out of curiosity  
24 in terms of the size mix, if somebody is able to answer that off  
25 the top of your head? If not, I'm sure it's in the record, and

1 I can go find it.

2 MR. CHEN: Give us a minute. I'm going to look for  
3 the number.

4 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I can move on to something else.

5 MR. SCHEISEL: Yeah, we will quickly look it up and if  
6 you move on to something else.

7 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. I only have -- I don't have  
8 much more else, but my one thing I do have is the -- if you have  
9 a -- if you can just provide a fuller response, I know you did  
10 provide a written response to all of the agency comments, and I  
11 thank you for your responsiveness to Office of Planning, DDOT,  
12 the community, the ANC, both 8C and 8A, and others in the  
13 community. And you did provide responses, official responses,  
14 written responses, to the agency comments in the record, but if  
15 you could just here in your testimony today respond to the  
16 Department of Public Rec- -- Parks and Recreation comment, which  
17 I think was echoed by the urban design division of Office of  
18 Planning as well, encouraging more family-friendly, public  
19 accessible spaces such as a splash pad, playable art, community  
20 garden, dog park, either on your property or working with DDOT,  
21 which I think you've made reference to, to accommodate those  
22 features right near the site or on the site. But can you just  
23 comment on the amenities that are both -- the indoor -- both the  
24 outdoor amenity and the indoor amenity space because there's a  
25 lot of amenity space being provided, but they were encouraging

1 more family-friendly features such as those that I've mentioned.

2 MR. SCHEISEL: Yeah. So I think -- thank you for your  
3 question, Commissioner Miller. We will be -- as we advance the  
4 designs of the open space in the park to the west of the Douglass  
5 and in coordination, as Commissioner Imamura suggested, of the  
6 open space on the immediate west of this project, when we advance  
7 this design, I think that we will certainly look to incorporate  
8 those types of elements, whether it's elements that are family-  
9 friendly or playable in some way or even playable art type  
10 features. I think those are all things we're interested in and  
11 will look to incorporate those into the design of those spaces.  
12 So those are on the exterior of the building.

13 On the interior of this building, specifically, as you  
14 noted, we do have a significant amount of amenity space in that  
15 second level of the project. And then we do have a significant  
16 amount of family-sized units in the building as well. So we are  
17 looking to kind of match the two up, and we're incorporating  
18 kids' rooms and sort of kids' areas in the amenity space for  
19 building residents. And then in the design of the central  
20 courtyard space, thinking about how we can have multiple types  
21 of uses and users occupy that space, including people of all  
22 ages, so that they can play. And so we are thinking about that  
23 as an important part of our use mix of the Bridge District, you  
24 know, catering to a broad variety of ages and age groups and  
25 young families. So hopefully that answers your question.

1           VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes, for the most part it does.  
2 What's the total amount square footage of the indoor amenity  
3 space and of the outdoor amenity space, do you have that or? I  
4 mean, I saw --

5           MR. SCHEISEL: Yes, we do have that. So the total  
6 amount is -- it's over 20,000 square feet I believe. I can  
7 quickly look it up on our chart. So we're dedicating a  
8 significant amount of that space to a kids' playroom. And then  
9 the outdoor space will have a variety of things in there that'll  
10 include spaces that kids can use. You know, there's some lawn  
11 areas, open areas that are sloping so that, you know, kids can  
12 roll down it, or just like multi-functional play spaces that  
13 could be used by a variety of ages. We have -- sorry, I'm just  
14 looking this information up.

15           It's not distinguished between amenities and unit areas  
16 on that floor.

17           So Eran, do you know what the breakdown is on level  
18 two? I mean it's --

19           MR. CHEN: Yeah, I'm getting the -- gathering all the  
20 numbers for Commissioner Miller, but the amenity indoor spaces  
21 are about 25,000 square feet -- 25,000 square foot enclosed area.  
22 And the, you know, of course, we've got the outside area, which  
23 is quite large.

24           In terms of the breakdown of apartments, we have it by  
25 building. And though slightly different, on Building 1, 35

1 percent of the apartments are studios, 43 percent of the  
2 apartments are one-bedrooms, 17 percent are two-bedrooms, and 6  
3 percent, which are mostly affordable, are three-bedrooms.  
4 Building 2 would have a slightly bigger amount of smaller units.  
5 So we'll have 51 percent of studios, we'll have 25 percent of  
6 one-bedrooms, 19 percent of two-bedrooms and 5 percent of three-  
7 bedrooms. Overall, yeah, 337 units on Building 1, 481 units on  
8 Building 2.

9 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chen. I appreciate  
10 that. And thank you, Ms. Morton, for all of the ongoing community  
11 engagement and outreach and future implementation of those goals  
12 that you've set for the project. And just going back to the  
13 family-friendly amenity space that you'll be looking to  
14 incorporate, I think that will contribute, as the agencies have  
15 said, as your own statements have said, to the positive equity  
16 impacts of this -- potential positive -- substantial positive  
17 equity impacts of this project. So thank you very much. Thank  
18 you all.

19 MS. MORTON: Thank you.

20 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you.

22 Ms. Schellin, do we have anyone here from ANC 8C or 8A?

23 MS. SCHELLIN: Let me check. There was another person  
24 I saw that had signed up. Let me see if he is on. I'll have  
25 Mr. Young look too. Salim K. T. Adofo, Salim Adofo?

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Well, he's the chair of -- yeah, the  
2 chair of ANC 8C. If you can bring him up?

3 MS. SCHELLIN: He's for 8C, he's the only one that from  
4 an ANC that signed up. I'm double checking the other pages.  
5 Yes, he's the only ANC rep that signed up.

6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. If you can bring him up and  
7 I'll see if he has any cross-examine --

8 MS. SCHELLIN: See if he's up.

9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: -- if he has any cross-examination,  
10 and then we will hear from him after we go through our other  
11 process.

12 MS. SCHELLIN: I do not see him.

13 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: You don't see him on there? Okay.

14 MS. SCHELLIN: No. Mr. Young, you didn't see him?

15 MR. YOUNG: I do not.

16 MS. SCHELLIN: He's not resp- -- right. So he's not  
17 up.

18 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Well, Ms. Schellin, while I  
19 have you, do we have any reports from any other government  
20 agencies that want to testify?

21 MS. SCHELLIN: Other than Mr. Zimmerman from DDOT and  
22 Matt Jesick from OP, no others.

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So I have DDOT and OP. I  
24 mean, those others like OAG, so they don't want to testify. Okay.  
25 Let's go then -- thank you Ms. Schellin -- let's go to District

1 Department of Transportation, just bring Mr. Zimmerman up.

2 All right. Mr. Zimmerman, you may begin.

3 MR. ZIMMERMAN: Good evening, Chairman Hood, and  
4 members of the Commission. I'm Aaron Zimmerman with the District  
5 Department of Transportation. DDOT is supportive of the  
6 Applicant's proposal to develop Parcels 1 and 2 of the Bridge  
7 District project. In our March 10th, 2023 report, Exhibit 15,  
8 we recommended approval with a few conditions, which are a TDM  
9 plan, providing an easement for future shared driveway access,  
10 and further exploring a pedestrian connection to the Suitland  
11 Parkway Trail. As you heard in the Applicant's presentation,  
12 they have agreed to our requested conditions with some revisions,  
13 which DDOT is in agreement with. These are memorialized in the  
14 March 17, 2023 Gorove Slade response to DDOT memo, which is  
15 Exhibit 25C on the record. So with these revised conditions  
16 included in the zoning order, DDOT has no objection to the  
17 approval of this design review application, and we look forward  
18 to working with the Applicant on the streetscape and pedestrian  
19 connection as they go through public space permitting. Thank  
20 you.

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Mr. Zimmerman. Let's see  
22 if we have any questions of Mr. Zimmerman.

23 Commissioner May?

24 Commissioner Imamura?

25 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: I do not.

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And Vice Chair Miller?

2 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Maybe one question, Mr. Chairman.  
3 Mr. Zimmerman, just maybe following up on the Chairman's initial  
4 question about transportation, I saw in your report that your  
5 guidelines would normally call for 300 to 350 on-site vehicle  
6 parking spaces for a project of this size, which is very large,  
7 over 800 residential units, 150 lodging units, retail. But your  
8 guidelines, I think you said -- your report says -- called for  
9 no more than 300 to 350. And this project has I think 520 some  
10 odd parking spaces. Can you just -- and I've read the report  
11 and the Applicant's transportation report as well. But can you  
12 for the record here, can you just briefly say why this is not  
13 over parked and why it won't -- why the -- that amount of induced  
14 demand for vehicles coming there, as your language sometimes  
15 uses, won't happen and unduly exacerbate traffic conditions in  
16 the neighborhood?

17 MR. ZIMMERMAN: So in our CTR guidelines, we provide,  
18 you know, benchmark parking rates based on land use and distance  
19 to transit. And a lot of this was based on research that DDOT  
20 did over the years based on data collected at other residential  
21 buildings around the District. And so when we released our  
22 guidelines a couple of years ago, you know, these rates kind of  
23 fit in throughout the zoning required parking. So this project  
24 doesn't exceed the zoning maximums, but kind of between the zoning  
25 minimum and the zoning maximum, our rates kind of break up that

1 spectrum a bit. And so if a project goes substantially over  
2 that, you know, there's a couple of things that we work with them  
3 on with their transportation study.

4           The first is, you know, making sure that the auto mode  
5 share in the transportation study is a little bit -- is assumed  
6 to be a little bit higher than normal, considering how close it  
7 is to a Metro to kind of account for that. So the mode share -  
8 - the auto mode share with this project was, you know, assumed a  
9 little bit higher than normal, and that was taken into account  
10 in the study, you know, on that, so. And then also on the TDM  
11 plan, you know, this whole concept of induced demand, you know,  
12 we seek to mitigate that through non-automotive means. So a  
13 number of things that the Applicant is proposing and committing  
14 to, you know, like bike share station and, you know, a number of  
15 other things, a full robust TDM program, you know, those are  
16 really intended to blunt that additional potential induced demand  
17 for driving.

18           And then sort of building off your question,  
19 Commissioner Miller, and Chairman Hood's comment earlier about  
20 this area and Howard Road and backups and general, you know,  
21 traffic concerns on there, the Applicant study did also take a  
22 look at, you know, not just the traffic for these two parcels,  
23 but it assumes traffic for the two parcels on the north side that  
24 have already been approved, you know, one of the phases of Berry  
25 Farm I believe, as well as some of the projects on Martin Luther

1 King, Jr. Avenue, such as Reunion Square. So you know, it really  
2 did take into account the potential for a little bit more traffic  
3 that could be generated at this project based on the additional  
4 parking, but also a number of the projects up and down Howard  
5 Road and around the area.

6 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Zimmerman. I just  
7 wanted to hear again that what I had -- what you had written and  
8 what the Applicant's transportation consultant study showed, but  
9 we'll see if it all plays out. Hopefully, it will. Thank you.

10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Zimmerman I, too, want to thank  
11 you. I am not going to ask you to read a strategy question  
12 because I already know the answer. I appreciate your analysis  
13 of what you just gave us. And I want to correct something I said  
14 at another hearing, that I said I would be thinking about you  
15 every time in traffic. I want to change that. I'll be thinking  
16 about you and myself and the Commission because we do this jointly  
17 as we go through and analyze, as we approve, and you give us the  
18 advice of -- and DDOT, you all are an award winning District  
19 Department of Transportation in the city, so you all are the  
20 experts and we depend on that, so I don't have any questions for  
21 you, but we appreciate all your work. You sound very  
22 enthusiastic. You can let -- well, I'll let your director know  
23 you sound very enthusiastic, but I will still think about you  
24 when I'm in traffic.

25 So anyway, let me open it up to the Applicant. Does

1 the Applicant have any questions of Mr. Zimmerman?

2 MR. UTZ: We do not.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Ms. Schellin, again we don't  
4 have anyone from ANC, right? I have to call for it, even though  
5 I already know -- probably know the answer.

6 I believe you said no.

7 MS. SCHELLIN: That's correct. No.

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: For the record. Okay. Thank you.

9 All right. Well, thank you, Mr. Zimmerman. Appreciate  
10 your report.

11 Now let's go to the Office of Planning.

12 Mr. Jesick, whenever you're ready.

13 MR. JESICK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of  
14 the Commission. I am Matt Jesick and will be giving testimony  
15 (audio blank) Planning recommends that the Commission approve the  
16 --

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Jesick, I don't know, maybe it's  
18 just me, but I can't hear you. Can others hear him? Okay.  
19 Nobody can hear you. Can you speak up? Did we lose you?

20 MR. JESICK: Just one second.

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

22 MR. JESICK: Can you hear me now?

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I can hear -- about 30 years ago, I  
24 probably could hear, but I'm getting old, and, yeah, no, I can't  
25 hear you -- we can't hear you.

1 MR. JESICK: Well, I'll try to speak up. Is that any  
2 better?

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah, there you go right there.  
4 Whatever you just did, we can hear you now.

5 MR. JESICK: Okay. Well, thank you again, Mr. Chairman  
6 and members of the Commission. And OP recommends --

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Jesick, whatever you did,  
8 whatever you hit, you came up and you sounded good, then you went  
9 right back down.

10 (Pause.)

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: If we need to take a moment to let  
12 you work on that, we can do that.

13 Obviously we lost -- oh, no, he's still there. Is  
14 anybody else having a problem hearing or was that just me and -  
15 -

16 VICE CHAIR MILLER: No, it was going in and out.

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

18 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Mostly out.

19 MS. SCHELLIN: I couldn't hear him either.

20 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Sometimes I don't  
21 know if it's just me, so. Okay.

22 Do you want to take time, Mr. Jesick, to reboot and  
23 come back?

24 (Pause.)

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I see your name disappeared. I know

1 you did that. And I will go on to the -- there we go. Something's  
2 going on.

3 (Pause.)

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Ms. Schellin, while Mr.  
5 Jesick is rebooting, let me move on to the ANC report. Again,  
6 let me call for anyone from the ANC, of ANC 8C, nobody else, as  
7 we've already talked to Mr. Utz, we're not expecting anything but  
8 continued dialog with ANC 8A.

9 MR. UTZ: We do have a Ian Callender is in the queue  
10 and we were just notified that he might need to drop off in a  
11 second if there is a willingness to take folks out of order? We  
12 know that he's just about to not be able to join us much longer.  
13 He actually might have already dropped off.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let me ask this, Mr. Utz, now he's  
15 with the ANC?

16 MR. UTZ: He not with the ANC, he would be persons or  
17 parties in support or opposition -- I'm sorry, persons in support  
18 or opposition. So he is not with the ANC.

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So while we're waiting on Mr.  
20 Jesick, let's go to him if he's here since he has to leave.

21 MS. SCHELLIN: I don't see him.

22 MR. UTZ: We might have lost him.

23 MS. MORTON: He's actually logging in momentarily.

24 MR. UTZ: Okay. Great.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. Well, let me just read

1 the ANC report. Exhibit -- it's our Exhibit 11, I believe, is  
2 that the latest one? Looking at it right quick, Exhibit 11. Let  
3 me open it up. Let me read the ANC report, and basically the  
4 ANC -- ANC 8C is supportive. It has a supportive letter, which  
5 our Exhibit 11, and it says "Therefore the ANC is in support of  
6 design review application. Thank you for giving great weight to  
7 the recommendations of ANC 8C and we hope that you will promptly  
8 approve the design review application." And this is from Chairman  
9 Adofo, ANC 8C. See if anything -- okay, Mr. Jesick?

10 Who's the person that has to drop off, Mr. Utz?

11 MR. UTZ: It is Ian Callender. I'm not sure if he has  
12 been able to rejoin. He did drop off and I think he's going to  
13 rejoin momentarily.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So meanwhile, let's -- Mr.  
15 Jesick, there you go, you're probably good now.

16 MR. JESICK: Can you hear me now?

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Say something again.

18 MR. JESICK: Can you hear me?

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: It's --

20 MR. JESICK: I'll call in.

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: You want to call in? Okay. Okay.

22 Mr. Utz, let me know if the other person joins us.  
23 We'll take him right after the --

24 MS. SCHELLIN: He's not yet. I keep refreshing and I'm  
25 not seeing him yet.

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I hope this is not all downhill from  
2 here. It's been going pretty good so far.

3 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Mr. Chairman, while we're waiting,  
4 can I just ask a question about the 8A resolution that was voted  
5 -- resolution of support that apparently was voted down, so we  
6 have nothing officially in the record from 8A. If Mr. Utz knows  
7 the vote count of that, I just was curious what the -- if there  
8 was a vote count or if it was a roll call vote?

9 MR. UTZ: I think it was seven to zero to vote it down,  
10 if I'm remembering right, but I don't have those particular notes  
11 in this room. But it was around seven to zero.

12 VICE CHAIR MILLER: And was that last month or was that  
13 along -- previous to that?

14 MR UTZ: It was last month. And then we also met with  
15 their executive committee, I believe, the month before that. And  
16 then there have been ongoing engagement and dialog before that  
17 as well, but the actual vote itself was last month.

18 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Thank you very much.

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Jesick --

20 MR UTZ: We were just told that -- sorry.

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: What did you say, Mr. Utz?

22 MR UTZ: We were just told that Ian is on by phone so  
23 that it appears that he has joined us now, Ian Callender.

24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Ms. Schellin, if we can bring  
25 him up and let him go first and then we'll go to OP.

1 MS. SCHELLIN: I'll leave that to Mr. Young, but I  
2 don't see anyone by phone.

3 Mr. Young, do you see him? I just refreshed.

4 MR. YOUNG: I brought him up. I believe it's the 301  
5 number. He just needs to unmute himself.

6 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. So you saw someone by phone?

7 MR. YOUNG: Yeah.

8 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay.

9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah, he just he just unmuted. So  
10 we'll take your testimony if you can identify yourself, we're  
11 ready to go.

12 MR. CALLENEDER: All right. Good evening, everyone.  
13 I apologize that I could not be present visually. I actually  
14 just left the house, but my name is Ian Callender, D.C. native  
15 and cultural architect of all things creative via Suite Nation,  
16 a CBE design and development firm based in Washington, D.C. We've  
17 launched some notable community projects in the area, such as  
18 Blind Wino now Culture House in Southwest D.C., adjacent to the  
19 Randall School and Rubell Museum Development, Sandlot Southwest,  
20 Southeast, and Anacostia the Bridge District, and Georgetown,  
21 where we reclaim vacant properties and beautify them for  
22 community benefit. Anarena Social Arts Club, a 501(c)(3)  
23 nonprofit arts organization that supports artists, creatives, and  
24 curators of color with complimentary gallery and studio space to  
25 uplift their study and skill within the arts atmosphere.

1           Our Sandlot Anacostia location is currently housed at  
2 633 Howard Road, S.E. It has been a great interim amenity to  
3 the neighborhood, and once the site is ready for construction of  
4 this building, we'll be transitioning to our first permanent home  
5 across the street adjacent to the Douglass Building, which will  
6 be the first to deliver in the Bridge District.

7           Not only do we support this project in totality, but  
8 the allyship and partnership of Redbrick and the entire  
9 development head office team has been extremely positive and  
10 overwhelmingly supportive. They hold true to the preservation  
11 of local culturally relevant retail and reserving space for those  
12 that were there prior to its development. I cannot stress enough  
13 how much we are in support of Redbrick's Bridge District refresh  
14 of Poplar Point and look forward to opening in the years to go  
15 and permanent position in. Thank you.

16           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. Mr. Callender, that is  
17 the kind of testimony I heard previously about Redbrick some  
18 years ago. So thank you for taking the time. I know you're on  
19 your way. Let's see if we can -- have any questions of you right  
20 quick.

21           Does -- do any commissioners have any questions?

22           Okay. Does the Applicant have any questions?

23           MR. UTZ: We do not.

24           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. And we don't have anyone from  
25 the ANC.

1           So Mr. Callender, thank you very much. And we do have  
2 your letter as well. So thank you.

3           MR. CALLENDER: Thank you very much. Everyone have a  
4 good evening.

5           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. You too. Thank you.

6           Let's go to Mr. Jesick, now we're ready for you.

7           Mr. Lawson are you going to stand in?

8           MR. LAWSON: Thank you Mr. Chair, members of the  
9 Commission. I just got a note from Matt that he's in the process  
10 of calling in right now. If you want, we can proceed forward or  
11 if you want to wait for, you know, another few seconds, he should  
12 be on shortly.

13          CHAIRPERSON HOOD: We'll wait for him. We can wait.

14          MR. LAWSON: Okay. Thank you.

15          (Pause.)

16          CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Ms. Schellin, do we have  
17 anyone here while we're waiting on Mr. Jesick, do we have anyone  
18 here?

19          MS. SCHELLIN: Absolutely. Yes. In support?

20          CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah, in support, opposition,  
21 undeclared.

22          MS. SCHELLIN: Absolutely.

23          MR. JESICK: Mr. Chairman?

24          CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes. Oh, there you go. All right.  
25 Let's do that.

1 MR. JESICK: Can you hear me now?

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: We can hear you good now. Let's go  
3 right ahead.

4 MR. JESICK: I apologize about that. I don't know what  
5 happened with the audio.

6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. No problem.

7 MR. JESICK: So thank you again. The Office of Planning  
8 does recommend approval of this design review application. We  
9 found that it meets the criteria of the Northern Howard Road  
10 zone, which seek to promote active streetscapes, active ground  
11 floor uses, pedestrian and bicycle safety, a high level of  
12 architectural design, and of course augmented IZ provisions.

13 OP is very supportive of the design, including the  
14 outdoor plazas, the mass timber framing to hopefully reduce the  
15 carbon footprint of the project. We support the numerous  
16 balconies, the very engaging ground floor and also the  
17 consolidated vehicular and loading access. And we've identified  
18 a few key features in the proposed conditions of approval and  
19 discussed those with the Applicant. We support the Applicant's  
20 proposed condition regarding the plazas contained in Exhibit 25,  
21 Page 3, so we can substitute our proposed condition language with  
22 their updated proposed condition.

23 OP's also recommending approval of the flexibility and  
24 relief necessary with this project. As discussed earlier, it was  
25 a rear yard, court dimensions, and short-term bike parking.

1 Previously, we had recommended denial of complete relief to the  
2 number of bicycle-related shower and changing facilities, but OP  
3 can now recommend approval of the Applicant's revised partial  
4 relief to those facilities.

5           Regarding the comprehensive plan -- next slide please,  
6 Mr. Young? Thank you. The project would be, of course,  
7 consistent with the NHR zone, which allows up to 130 feet in  
8 height and 9 FAR. And the NHR zone itself is consistent with  
9 the future land use map, which calls for high density mixed use  
10 on the site. And we evaluated the project's relationship to the  
11 comp plan through a racial equity lens and we feel that there  
12 are a few key areas where the project would advance the plan's  
13 goals regarding equity. Of course, there's housing and  
14 affordable housing. As was noted, there are over 800 total units  
15 and the provision of residential units of any kind would reduce  
16 the upward pressure on rents and housing prices. And that is,  
17 of course, also helped by the enhanced inclusionary zoning  
18 requirements of the NHR zone, which require a greater than normal  
19 amount of IZ, lower MFI levels for some of the units, and also  
20 does require a large percentage of three-bedroom units.  
21 Regarding connectivity, the project would improve access to all  
22 transportation modes. It would provide housing within walking  
23 distance of metro for access to citywide job opportunities.  
24 Residents of this project could also bike or walk to high  
25 employment areas, for example the Navy Yard. And it also provides

1 easy access for automobiles to regional job centers. We also  
2 feel the project would help to create a more equitable  
3 environment. Because of the on-site renewable energy and a high  
4 LEED score, the project would contribute to an overall healthier  
5 city. Also, by improving connections, the project would allow  
6 easier access to recreational amenities, which hopefully would  
7 lead to healthier outcomes for residents. The project would also  
8 further a number of urban design policies related to equity,  
9 including providing active, engaging, and safe streetscapes,  
10 transparent facades for more public safety, and the provision of  
11 plazas that can be public gathering places. In regard to  
12 employment, of course there is the construction employment, and  
13 employment for the businesses which would locate in the buildings  
14 after construction. But more than that, the Applicant has, as  
15 has been noted, already been working with local Ward 7 and Ward  
16 8 companies to provide services on the site, and information in  
17 the record indicates that the Applicant could use local  
18 contractors going forward for construction management and  
19 maintenance on the project. The Applicant has also provided  
20 internship opportunities for high school and college students.  
21 And very importantly, the Applicant has proffered to provide  
22 discounted rent to local businesses, which we feel could  
23 potentially lead to greater job growth in the neighborhood. So  
24 when evaluated through a racial equity lens, we feel the project  
25 would not be inconsistent with the comprehensive plan.

1           This concludes my verbal testimony, but again OP  
2 recommends approval of the application and I'd be happy to take  
3 any questions. Thank you.

4           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Mr. Jesick. We  
5 appreciate your report as always, very well done. Let's see if  
6 we have any questions or comments.

7           Commissioner May?

8           COMMISSIONER MAY: I have no questions or comments.  
9 Thank you very much.

10          CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Commissioner Imamura?

11          COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: No questions. Just want to  
12 comment on Mr. Jesick's stick-to-it-iveness. So thank you, sir.  
13 Good report.

14          CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

15          And Vice Chair Miller?

16          VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank  
17 you, Mr. Jesick, for your very comprehensive 53-page report. I  
18 read every page. And yes, we've all been there with the  
19 technology. So thank you for hanging in there. Can you just  
20 remind me for the Northern Howard Road zone, is it a requirement  
21 that there be a certain amount of three bedrooms or is it -- and  
22 just is it encouraged language, or is it incentivized language,  
23 or can you just remind me what the provision is for the three-  
24 bedrooms for this type of -- for the inclusionary zoning units  
25 in this particular zone that we created?

1 MR. JESICK: Yes, I don't have the exact language in  
2 front of me, but I believe half of all IZ the floor area must be  
3 three-bedroom units if I'm not mistaken. The incentive, so to  
4 speak, was built into the zone in that the applicant can achieve  
5 130 feet and 9 FAR, which under the previous zoning they could  
6 not have achieved. So it was sort of built into the zoning, the  
7 incentive.

8 VICE CHAIR MILLER: And is that the height of these  
9 particular buildings, 130?

10 MR. JESICK: Correct, yes.

11 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. All right. Thank you very  
12 much. Thank you for your report.

13 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Mr. Utz, do you have any  
14 questions of Office of Planning?

15 MR. UTZ: No, thank you.

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And we don't have anyone here from  
17 the ANC last we checked. So thank you, Mr. Jesick. We appreciate  
18 your report.

19 Okay. Let's go to those who are in support, Ms.  
20 Schellin.

21 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. Okay. From the top of the  
22 list, we have Sandra Seegars, William Lattanzio. He may be part  
23 of the Applicant's team.

24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Utz is shaking his head.

25 MR. UTZ: Yes, He is.

1 MS. SCHELLIN: He is?

2 MR. UTZ: That's -- he's with Wiles Mensch, a civil  
3 engineer, yep.

4 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. Pastor Ricardo Payne.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right.

6 MS. SCHELLIN: Katrina (sic) Noell.

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: These are all in support, Ms.  
8 Schellin, or just people who wanted to testify?

9 MS. SCHELLIN: And that's the end of the list. Yes,  
10 sir.

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Oh, okay.

12 MS. SCHELLIN: And Ms. Noell is representing the  
13 Anacostia Business Improvement District.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

15 MS. SCHELLIN: And Sandra Seegars is representing CRAV,  
16 all caps. I'm not sure what that stands for.

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: We'll find out. I thought she was  
18 with the Applicant's team, Ms. Seegars.

19 MS. SCHELLIN: Sandra Seegars?

20 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah, I thought she was with the  
21 Applicant's team. Okay. But we'll find out.

22 MS. SCHELLIN: They're all three of them are five-  
23 minute.

24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. All right.

25 Ms. Seegars, we're going to start with you.

1 MS. SEEGARS: Good evening. Good seeing you again, Mr.  
2 Hood.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Always good to see you.

4 MS. SEEGARS: Okay. I'm Sandra Estes (phonetic)  
5 Seegars, convener and founding member and I'm in -- I'm a  
6 proponent for the project, a founding member of the Concerned  
7 Residents Against Violence, CRAV, on behalf of CRAV, co-conveners  
8 and founding members, Darrell Gaston, Reverend Anthony Mali, co-  
9 convenors Anthony Muhammad, Robinette Whitland, who is a  
10 commissioner, and Sandra Williams, and of course Pastor David  
11 Venable, respectfully submit this letter to support the design  
12 review application in the NHR zone for 633 Howard Road, S.E. As  
13 a current Ward 8 resident, former Ward 8 advisor and neighborhood  
14 commission member, and a founding member of Concerned Residents  
15 Against Violence, and the ACC, which you all know that, through  
16 -- I'm not going to read all of that, so I'm going to go down to  
17 my statement.

18 Through my conversations with the developer of the  
19 property, it was apparent to me that the developer prioritized  
20 community feedback during his design exercises, which resulted  
21 in plans that directly respond to community needs and  
22 aspirations. The proof of this in their thoughtful and  
23 sustainability design Bridge District community that will bring  
24 significant improvements to the community, including but not  
25 limited to housing that is affordable and convenient for parking,

1 walking, and other forms of public transportation; street  
2 activated retail that will close key amenity gaps, food, and  
3 service retail, and create cultural experiences; and artistic and  
4 sustainable buildings that will create a vibrant and  
5 environmentally friendly community in Ward 8. Additionally, --  
6 I'm reading from my computer -- additionally, through my ongoing  
7 communication with the developer's direct -- director of  
8 community engagement and cooperative impact, Lindsay Morton, I  
9 have appreciated the developer's willingness to partner with and  
10 support community organizations and groups like CRAV. And I look  
11 forward to CRAV expanding the relationship with the developer to  
12 support efforts to recruit and hire Ward 8 residents for job  
13 opportunities, as well as provide insight on low and property -  
14 - excuse -- low -- on how -- excuse me -- on how the property in  
15 the Bridge District can create a safe and secure environment for  
16 residents, neighborhoods, and visitors.

17 I would like to take a moment to address a possible  
18 opposition to the project. The CBA, real estate development, and  
19 the rental -- and the rental -- or the rent. ANC 8E and 8C have  
20 been dialing -- -- wait a minute -- delaying the process working  
21 on the CBA for almost a decade. No CBA should take that long.  
22 It started under the late former 8C Chairperson Mary Cuthbert.  
23 Subsequently, 8A chairperson Troy Prestwood resigned, then 8A  
24 chairperson Jamila White with the assistance of former 8C Vice  
25 Chair Mustafa after it was said they were to tweak it, discarded

1 the original and started over and took it to a totally unorthodox  
2 direction. It seems that 8C chairperson, Commissioner Salim  
3 Adofo signed one that reflected the objective of the original  
4 CBA. The Zoning Commission should not let an ANC delay a project  
5 because they are vacillators. I would suggest letting Redbrick  
6 do an RFP and distribute the money. The matter of development -  
7 - developing properly takes expertise that commissioners do not  
8 have. I believe the Office of Advisory Commission needs to budget  
9 money to provide an independent entity to provide expert opinions  
10 on real estate development. Real estate developers are not  
11 created overnight. They must understand the economy and other  
12 things that usually requires a degree in engineering,  
13 agriculture, urban planning, business real estate to get sense  
14 of development. Commissioners demonstrate their vast lack of  
15 knowledge of development when they tell a developer they can  
16 merely remove the top floor of the building.

17           The last matter is the amount of the rent. I understand  
18 people want low-income housing, but we have people in Ward 8 and  
19 we are trying to attract those with other ranges of income. As  
20 far as high-rise apartments, we now have four high rise apartments  
21 in Ward 8 that has been converted to accommodate low-income  
22 people. Additionally, I was told the rent for these units would  
23 be around \$1,100 a month for one-bedroom, which is average in  
24 Ward 8. The short leases units are a cross between an apartment  
25 and a hotel that would accommodate visitors. We have a little

1 over 100 in D.C. I believe that would be worth trying in Ward  
2 8. If it does not pan out, they can always convert to regular  
3 apartments. The last point, the ANC should lobby the government  
4 and demand them to do more funding projects so they can  
5 accommodate extremely low-income residents. Therefore, CRAV  
6 strongly supports this design and hope you vote yes today. That  
7 ends my statement. I respectfully submit this.

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Seegars. If you can  
9 hold tight for a few moments, we might have some questions of  
10 you.

11 MS. SEEGARS: Okay.

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Ms. Schellin, who was next, was it  
13 Pastor Payne?

14 MS. SCHELLIN: The pastor, Payne.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Pastor Payne, you may begin.

16 PASTOR PAYNE: Thank you, Chairman Hood, and Zoning  
17 commissioners. I am Pastor Ricardo W. Payne, pastor emeritus the  
18 Lighthouse Baptist Church and executive director of Serving Each  
19 Other. I wrote to express my ardent support of the design review  
20 application on behalf of Redbrick.

21 Since 1978, I've served in a variety of faith-based  
22 leadership roles for over 46 years in southeast Washington and  
23 now as pastor emeritus of the Lighthouse Baptist Church and the  
24 executive director of Serving Each Other. Without apology, I've  
25 been engaged with Redbrick LMD's systematic transformation of our

1 community, and without exception every instance of their project  
2 management and redevelopment has been characterized as having  
3 full transparency and effective management of the expectations  
4 of the community and the D.C. government. From active and  
5 corporate engagement to provide intentional support for a mobile  
6 medical unit to Ward 8 for the uninsured and under-resourced  
7 constituency, to providing meals at Thanksgiving over the past  
8 seven years, totally 70,000 meals collectively during the  
9 Thanksgiving and Christmas holiday to include toys as well to our  
10 community, I believe, and unapologetically state, that Redbrick  
11 is decisively concerned and committed to the well-being of our  
12 community. In short, I unequivocally and vehemently support  
13 Redbrick's LMD's desire to redevelop NHR zone 633 Howard Road,  
14 S.E. Thank you, Chairman. Thank you, commissioners.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Pastor Emeritus Payne. We  
16 appreciate your testimony. If you can just hold tight, we may  
17 have some questions for you as well.

18 Ms. Schellin --

19 PASTOR PAYNE: Yes, sir.

20 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: -- who was next, Ms. Schellin?

21 MS. SCHELLIN: The person is Kristina Noel or Noell?

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Ms. Noel or Noell, you may  
23 begin.

24 MS. NOELL: It's [No-ell]. Thank you very much.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Ms. Noell. Okay. Thank You.

1 MS. NOELL: And thank you for your time today, Chairman  
2 and Zoning commissioners, I really appreciate you allowing me to  
3 testify today. On behalf of the Anacostia Business Improvement  
4 District, I'm writing to express our support of the design review  
5 application in the NHR zone for 633 Howard Road, S.E., Square  
6 5861, Lot 991.

7 Our mission, the Anacostia BID's mission, is to lead,  
8 enhance, inspire, and engage in smart growth and equitable  
9 development efforts that revitalize and create an inclusive,  
10 thriving, sustainable, innovative, and vibrant part of the  
11 community. To that end, the Anacostia BID has a history of  
12 working and creating positive impact in concert with partner  
13 organizations. Our partnership with Redbrick has touched many  
14 facets of our mission, from our successful collaboration on  
15 several matters related to the Bridge District master plan, the  
16 creation of an arts and cultural district, neighborhood safety  
17 and community engagement, our work together impacts and enhances  
18 the community through beautification projects along and around  
19 the MLK, Martin Luther King, Jr. Avenue corridor, our cross-  
20 cutting small business initiatives, art to go-go, community  
21 safety discussions, and more.

22 As an organization that is deeply invested in the  
23 health and vitality of the community, we have been impressed with  
24 Redbrick's commitment to the community. Based on our knowledge  
25 and of -- of and expertise with Redbrick, ABID believes, which

1 is the Anacostia BID believes, the project will continue to  
2 amplify the Ward 8 community and provide needed and desired  
3 neighborhood-serving amenities, as well as the incorporation of  
4 arts and culture experiences for residents and visitors alike.  
5 We strongly encourage -- well, actually we have no doubt that  
6 Redbrick will be thoughtful in their -- and intentional about  
7 ensuring that their project is designed to extend opportunities  
8 to the broader community. And we strongly encourage the District  
9 of Columbia Zoning Commission to approve the requested design  
10 review and to forward -- to move forward with this project that  
11 will create a stronger connection to our business corridors.  
12 Short and sweet, thank you, I hope you vote to move this forward.  
13 It will be very impactful for our communities as a whole.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I want to thank the three of you for  
15 your very powerful strong testimony. This is -- that testimony  
16 is what I recall some years ago when I heard about Redbrick and  
17 the work they did in the community. So Ms. Noell, I really  
18 appreciate your comments because you mentioned -- first you say  
19 strongly encouraging, then you said I have no doubt.

20 And Pastor Payne, I am a deacon in my church and I was  
21 told years ago don't ask preachers can they preach, but if you're  
22 an emeritus, I know you can preach, so I'll just leave that alone.  
23 And I appreciate your support as well.

24 And Ms. Seegars, only thing I would say, I already know  
25 that you and others are influencers, so I know you were one of

1 the people I was thinking of when Ms. Morton mentioned about Ward  
2 8 influencers. So I get what you said about the delay that has  
3 been going on. I get that. I know that you mentioned that, and  
4 I'm sure with all the support in the record, I don't see, for  
5 me, it won't be stymied. So thank you for taking the time, all  
6 three of you, for taking the time to come down and testify. Let  
7 me see if my colleagues have any questions or comments.

8 Commissioner May?

9 COMMISSIONER MAY: No other questions or comments,  
10 thank you.

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

12 And Commissioner Imamura?

13 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: No questions. Thank you all.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So when I look to call the next  
15 person, I look to see where they are and they seem to be moving  
16 around on my screens, so that's funny how that works.

17 And Vice Chair Miller?

18 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I thank each of you for your  
19 testimony and for all of your work in the community.

20 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. Let's see if we have any  
21 questions of the Applicant?

22 MR. UTZ: We do not, thank you.

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you three again for taking the  
24 time, your groups and all the work that you all do. And I'm sure  
25 it will continue, so thank you all very much.

1 MS. SEEGARS: You're welcome. Bye-Bye.

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Bye-Bye.

3 Ms. Schellin, do we have anything else -- I mean, anyone  
4 else to testify?

5 MS. SCHELLIN: No one else.

6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Mr. Utz, I don't think you  
7 have any rebuttal, so if you can give us a closing?

8 MR. UTZ: Sure. Thank you, Chairman Hood and thank  
9 you, everyone. We really do appreciate the opportunity to present  
10 this evening. As you have seen, the application meets the  
11 development review standards, it meets the comp plan review  
12 analysis, it meets the racial equity analysis in very detailed  
13 ways. The project is truly an ideal model of a text and map  
14 amendment (indiscernible) to design review project. The project  
15 is exceptional and implements and exceeds all intended  
16 requirements in the zone.

17 In addition, there is a great deal of agency support.  
18 The team has been engaged with OP, DDOT, DOEE, EPR and other  
19 agencies and really appreciates their involvement as well. As  
20 you have seen, the conditions were all agreed to and we found  
21 kind of a solution along each of those conditional elements.  
22 There is also broad and long-time community engagement that the  
23 guests tonight have spoken to. We agree that it has been a  
24 fulsome effort and it will continue, ultimately culminating in  
25 support from ANC 8C and the other letters in the record and the

1 testimony this evening.

2           So with that, we would respectfully request an approval  
3 as soon as the Commission deems it acceptable. And again, we  
4 greatly appreciate your chance -- your time with us this evening.

5           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Mr. Utz, and everyone.  
6 Let's see how we are going to proceed here.

7           Are we asking for anything major, Commissioners? And  
8 I know this -- I believe this is one vote, right? Yeah, I think  
9 it's one vote. I'm sure somebody will correct me if it's not.  
10 Let me hear where others are because I know where I am. I'm  
11 ready to move forward unless there's some unreadiness.

12           Commissioner May, any questions, commen- -- I mean.

13           COMMISSIONER MAY: No. I mean, no, I didn't -- there  
14 were some views I would have liked to have seen, but they're not  
15 important enough to hold this up unless someone --

16           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So you went out. I think I know  
17 what you said, but the last part of it went out. I got the gist  
18 of it.

19           COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah. No. I'm good unless somebody  
20 else wants to request something.

21           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

22           Commissioner Imamura?

23           COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Not requesting anything,  
24 prepared to move forward with the vote tonight.

25           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And Vice Chair Miller?

1 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I'm ready to move forward, Mr.  
2 Chairman, I think it's a great project.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. All right. So with that,  
4 would somebody like to make a motion? Let one of my colleagues  
5 do it.

6 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Be happy to make a motion if that's  
7 okay.

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Sure.

9 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I would move that the  
10 Zoning Commission approve Zoning Commission Case No. 22-39, it's  
11 BD Parcel 2, LLC design review in the Northern Howard Road zone  
12 at Square 5861, Lot 991 at 633 Howard Road, S.E. and asked for a  
13 second.

14 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Second.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. It's been moved and properly  
16 second. Thank you. Any further discussion?

17 Not hearing anything, Ms. Schellin, would you do a roll  
18 call vote please?

19 MS. SCHELLIN: Mr. Miller?

20 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

21 MS. SCHELLIN: Mr. Imamura?

22 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.

23 MS. SCHELLIN: Mr. Hood?

24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.

25 MS. SCHELLIN: Mr. May?

1 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.

2 MS. SCHELLIN: Vote is four to zero to one to approve  
3 final action in Zoning Commission Case No. 22-39. We'd ask the  
4 Applicant to provide a draft order.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Ms. Schellin, we don't need  
6 any dates or anything because that's only a one vote case, so  
7 we're good, right?

8 MS. SCHELLIN: Correct. If they could just provide the  
9 order in, say, two weeks?

10 MR. UTZ: Sure, we'd be happy to. Thank you.

11 MS. SCHELLIN: Thank you.

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. The Zoning Commission has  
13 worked very hard, so I'm going to give you all until March the  
14 30th. No, we're going to be off until March 30th. Zoning  
15 Commission will meet again March the 30th on these same platforms.  
16 And we will -- it'll be our regular -- I guess our second meeting  
17 of the month. And with that, I want to thank everyone for their  
18 participation tonight, all the great work that's been done with  
19 this project and in the community. And I wish everyone to have  
20 a great week and be safe. And this hearing is adjourned. Good  
21 night.

22 (Whereupon the above-entitled meeting was adjourned.)  
23  
24  
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript.

In the matter of: Public Hearing

Before: DCZC

Date: 03-20-2023

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