

GOVERNMENT OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

REGULAR PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

THURSDAY

OCTOBER 23, 2023

+ + + + +

The Public Hearing 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 HOOD, Chairperson
ROBERT MILLER, Vice Chairperson
JOSEPH S. IMAMURA, Commissioner
TAMMY STIDHAM, Commissioner

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

SHARON SCHELLIN, Secretary
PAUL YOUNG, Data Specialist

OFFICE OF ZONING LEGAL COUNSEL:

HILLARY LOVICK, Esquire

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Regular Public Hearing held on October 23, 2023.

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

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

Case No. 23-15

Brookland Plaza Owner, LLC 4

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

(4 p.m.)

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Today's date is October the 23rd, 2023. Happy birthday to my daughter. We are convening and broadcasting this public meeting by video conferencing. My name is Anthony Hood and I'm joined by Vice Chair Miller, Commissioner Stidham and Commissioner Imamura. We are also joined by the Office of Zoning Staff Ms. Sharon Schellin, as well as Mr. Paul Young who will handling all of our virtual operations as well as Ms. Hillary Lovick who is our Office of Zoning Legal Division counsel.

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 sign-up, 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 meeting 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

1 are finished speaking, please mute your audio. If you experience
2 difficulty accessing Webex or with your telephone call-in, or
3 have not signed up, then call our OZ hotline number at 202-727-
4 0789.

5 If you wish to file written testimony or additional
6 supporting documents during the hearing then please be prepared
7 to describe and discuss it at the time of your testimony. The
8 hearing will be conducted in accordance with the provisions of
9 11 Z D.C.M.R. Chapter 4 as follows; preliminary matters,
10 applicant's case, the applicant has up to 60 minutes -- I'm
11 understanding they're asking for 35 minutes. I've asked them to
12 hit Exhibit 20 and all the highlights and the outstanding issues
13 that may still arise in their presentation -- reports of other
14 government agencies, report of the Department of Transportation
15 and the Office of Planning, report of the ANC, in this case I
16 believe it's just ANC 5B, testimony of organizations and
17 individuals, organizations five minutes, individuals three
18 minutes, and we will hear in the following order from those who
19 are in support, opposition or undeclared. Then we'll have
20 rebuttal and closing by the applicant.

21 The subject of this evening's hearing is Zoning
22 Commission case No. 23-15 Brookland Plaza Owner, LLC Voluntary
23 Design Review at Square 3822, Lots 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 31,
24 33, 35, 37, 802 and 809. Again, today's date is October the
25 23rd, 2023.

1 At this time, the Commission will consider any
2 preliminary matters but let me say this again. If anybody has
3 any issues, 202-727-0789. At this time the Commission will
4 consider any preliminary matters. Does the staff have any
5 preliminary matters?

6 MS. SCHELLIN: Just a couple very quickly. There are
7 some proffered expert witnesses. The two who have previously
8 been accepted are Shane Dettman in land use, Gabriela Canamar in
9 land design, if the Commission would accept those two in this
10 case. I'm sorry, and a third one. Dan VanPelt in transportation.
11 If those three could be accepted?

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes, we have accepted them
13 previously; correct?

14 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Any objections? Okay. Not
16 seeing any. Anything else?

17 MS. SCHELLIN: Then there's a fourth one. Benjamin
18 Kasdan in architecture.

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. Any objections?

20 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Mr. Chairman, I don't
21 necessarily object but his resume is sort of in an unusual format
22 so in fact I had skimmed right past him. He is licensed. It
23 doesn't really identify similar project types although he's
24 specifically called out projects like the other expert witnesses.
25 I don't have a problem but I would just say for KGTy in future

1 | they probably should submit more than just a bio and something
2 | that's a familiar format that we see pretty consistently so. But
3 | I think Benjamin Kasdan, from what I can tell, I know he's
4 | licensed by his credentials there. It doesn't say where but I'm
5 | satisfied and I only bring this up because of the Commissioner
6 | May tenure. So it doesn't quite say how long he's been
7 | practicing.

8 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Well, thank you, Commissioner
9 | Imamura. I appreciate you bringing that up. You are the
10 | architect of record for us and I appreciate you pulling that up.
11 | So what we're going to do, let's bring him up. Let's ask him
12 | some questions because I agree his, we normally don't, you're
13 | right Commissioner, we don't normally accept just bios and before
14 | I forget, I also want to wish a happy birthday to Vice Chair
15 | Miller. I believe your birthday was either yesterday or today,
16 | or I'm not sure. Is it yesterday or today?

17 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: Today.

18 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Today. Okay. I'm sorry, I knew
19 | it was, okay.

20 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: And congratulations for your team
21 | beating our team. They were both horrible teams but yours was
22 | the least horrible.

23 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: We were the winning horrible team
24 | so thank you very much, and happy birthday to you as well.

25 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you.

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So let's do this. Let's, Mr.
2 Kasdan, hopefully I pronounced our name right. Yes, Kasdan.
3 Let's see if we have a few questions for you and I'm going to go
4 to Commissioner Imamura. My questions might not be architectural
5 questions. What I would suggest though in the future, KTGy, is
6 that you put types of projects of like minds of what you've done
7 to the specific case that we're dealing with.

8 But let me go to my colleague, Commissioner Imamura,
9 if you can have -- let's ask some questions to get on the record,
10 if you don't mind.

11 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Sure. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
12 Mr. Kasdan, thank you for appearing tonight. I have no doubt
13 that you have a work portfolio of similar project types, but
14 typically our practice is that somewhere in the resume that at
15 least demonstrates ten years or more in professional practice.
16 I know that you've been out west in California and have moved
17 all the way to the east coast here. Certainly I see that your
18 license and no doubt, but can you just for the record confirm
19 that n you have ten years and let us know where you're licensed.
20 We're not able to hear you, Mr. Kasdan.

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: You're on mute. Now this is Goulston
22 & Storrs. I don't want you all to get like on your competitors,
23 they usually have these problems. But usually in the past --

24 MR. KASDAN: (Indiscernible).

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Now we can.

1 MR. KASDAN: Can you hear me now?

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. Here you go.

3 MR. KASDAN: Okay. Thank you, Commissioners. This is
4 not the first time I have spoken to the Commission but we will
5 take that into consideration. Yes, I have been licensed since
6 2008 as a licensed in D.C. since 2011. I have 20 years of
7 experience. I'm at KGTU. I'm a principle at KGTU and happy to
8 answer any other questions, and everything I've done is in multi-
9 family privacy mixed use projects.

10 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Sure. Thank you, Mr. Kasdan.
11 I hope that you take it more than just into consideration so,
12 that you just revise anything and your bio should become before
13 the Zoning Commission again, but certainly a substantial amount.
14 Mr. Chairman, I'm satisfied. Just wanted that on the record.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner
16 Imamura. Why don't we supplement the record, Mr. Kasdan, and I'm
17 asking counsel as well if they're listening. Why don't we
18 supplement the record with the additional of what Commissioner
19 Imamura and I spoke about, I think that would be great.

20 Anything else, Ms. Schellin. Oh, I'm sorry. Did my
21 other colleagues have any questions of Mr. Kasdan? I'm sorry.
22 Okay. All right. Ms. Schellin, do we have anything else
23 preliminary?

24 MS. SCHELLIN: OP is represented by Matt Jesick. DDOT
25 is represented by Noah Hagen, however he may be late and if he

1 is then Aaron Zimmerman will step in. ANC 5B submitted a report
2 at Exhibit 21 today. They will not be participating in the
3 hearing so I just wanted to advise you of that. Other than that,
4 we are ready to go.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Let's bring everyone up.

6 MS. SCHELLIN: Oh, I'm sorry Wait one second. This
7 case, the Applicant provided an updated CTR that was provided
8 less than 20 days prior to the hearing so we just ask that the
9 Commission would waive the rules to accept that late filing.

10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Any objections? Not seeing
11 any we will accept it.

12 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. Great. Thank you.

13 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. I think it's Mr.
14 Kadlecek. Let's -- if you can bring everybody up.

15 MS. SCHELLIN: Cary Kadlecek.

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Kadlecek. We will turn it over
17 to you. You may begin.

18 MR. KADLECEK: Okay. Thank you, Chairman Hood and
19 members of the Commission. For the record, good afternoon. I'm
20 Cary Kadlecek with the law firm of Goulston & Storrs on behalf
21 of the Applicant. I am joined today by my colleagues Derick
22 Wallace and Shane Dettman.

23 Today we are pleased to present this application for a
24 voluntary design review for the project known as Brookland Lanes.
25 The application will allow for a new mixed use residential and

1 retail building with approximately 337 residential units and
2 incorporates the historic Brookland bowling alley building, also
3 known as the Atlantic Electric building as its centerpiece on the
4 site that currently does not contain any assets (phonetic).

5 Located close to the Brookland metro rail station the
6 transit-oriented project is well positioned to add new housing
7 and retail opportunities for growing a diverse community of
8 District residents in the Brookland and University Heights
9 neighborhood.

10 With this voluntary design review application, we
11 requested flexibility for the building and penthouse height, lot
12 occupancy and side yard development standards. We've also
13 requested special exception relief from the penthouse that has
14 the minimum loading requirements. The building otherwise
15 conforms to the matter-of-right development standards in the mU-
16 4 zone but the design and the need for this application are the
17 results of the HPRB review process and the Applicant's response
18 to (indiscernible).

19 We are pleased to have the support of the Office of
20 Planning, DDOT and the ANC 5B, all of which have filed reports
21 in the record and, Mr. Chairman, just to answer your question
22 about Exhibit 20, we will address that in the course of the
23 presentation. Much of it's sort of already addressed as far as
24 far as the building is designed.

25 With that, I'm going to turn it over to Robert Grooms

1 who is a representative of the Applicant.

2 MR. GROOMS: Good afternoon, members of the Commission.
3 My name is Robert Grooms and I am with Urban Investment Partners,
4 the developer for the proposed Brookland Lanes project. UIP is
5 a vertically integrated company that has been investing within
6 the District for over 20 years with a specialized focus on the
7 adaptive reuse and historic preservation of the many assets
8 within the City that are both historic in nature and
9 architecturally significant and therefore we believe that this
10 project is well suited for our area of expertise and passion
11 (phonetic).

12 The site for the proposed Brookland Lanes development
13 is an assemblage of parcels located along 10th Street and Bunker
14 Hill Road just across from Turkey Thicket Recreation Center.
15 Anchoring the development is the Atlantic Electric building which
16 has historic designation and significance within the community
17 and (indiscernible).

18 The building was originally constructed in 1938 for the
19 Brookland Recreation Center as a duckpin bowling alley, one of
20 the first in the District. Within a year of its opening, due to
21 its popularity a second story was added with additional lanes.
22 The bowling alley operation -- -

23 CHAIRPESRON HOOD: Mr. Grooms? Mr. Grooms, let me
24 interrupt and I hate to interrupt. We can stop the clock. I
25 understand, and I want to make sure the public is able to hear

1 | you clearly. I don't know if you can move closer or if there's
2 | something that we can do so we can hear a little clearer. It's
3 | a little muffled but I can understand it, but I want to make sure
4 | the public understands it because we don't want them saying we
5 | couldn't understand, then we've got to start all over again. I
6 | don't now --

7 | MR. GROOMS: Can you hear me more clearly now?

8 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let me ask my colleagues. I was
9 | flagged that you sounded a little muffled. I don't know if the,
10 | I can hear you. Can everybody hear him straight without being
11 | muffled?

12 | COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: He's a little muffled, Mr.
13 | Chairman.

14 | COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: There's some echoing too, making
15 | it hard to hear.

16 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Do you all have more than one
17 | device on?

18 | MR. KADLECEK: Well, we're in a conference room with
19 | mikes, so maybe it's the mikes not picking it up.

20 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: See what you can do --

21 | MR. KADLECEK: (Indiscernible).

22 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: -- see what we can do, Mr. Kadlecek.
23 | Maybe you can move closer to the equipment, something because we
24 | don't want to have to have another hearing. I don't.

25 | MR. KADLECEK: (Indiscernible). Also if Mr. Young, I'm

1 | sorry, we forgot to ask Mr. Young to pull up the slide
2 | presentation.

3 | Yes, if you can go, skip two more slides I think. Yes,
4 | this one. Okay. We'll try to speak louder and move directly
5 | underneath the microphone.

6 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

7 | MR. GROOMS: Would you like me to start over with my
8 | introduction?

9 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: You can so we can get it for the
10 | record. That's fine.

11 | MR. GROOMS: All right. Good afternoon members of the
12 | Commission. My name is Robert Grooms. I am with Urban Investment
13 | Partners, the developer of the proposed Brookland Lanes project.

14 | UIP is a vertically integrated company that has been
15 | investing within the District for over 20 years with a specialized
16 | focus on the adaptive reuse and the historic preservation of the
17 | many assets within the City that are both historic in nature and
18 | architecturally significant and therefore we believe that this
19 | project is well suited for our area of expertise and passion.

20 | The site for the proposed Brookland Lanes development
21 | is an assemblage of parcels located along 10th Street and Bunker
22 | Hill Road, just across from Turkey Thicket Recreation Center.
23 | Anchoring the development is the Atlantic Electric building which
24 | has historic designation and significance within the community
25 | and the driver behind why we have engaged in the PDR process.

1 The building was originally constructed in 1938 for the
2 Brookland Recreation Center as a duckpin bowling alley, one of
3 the first within the District and in the year of its grand opening
4 due to its popularity a second story was added with additional
5 lanes. The bowling alley was operational until approximately the
6 mid 50s when a major fire destroyed the interior. Afterwards,
7 the interior was renovated and the building was used and
8 transformed to what we know today as the Atlantic Electric
9 Building. Nonetheless, the exterior of the building still
10 possesses its integrity of design with the massing,, the brick
11 detailing and the architectural expression that is reflective of
12 the art deco style.

13 With that understanding of its historical significance,
14 our goal as a team was to take a collaborative approach with the
15 various stakeholders and community representatives such as the
16 Historic Preservation Office, the D.C. Preservation League and
17 the Art Deco Society of Washington as well as community-led
18 organizations such as the ANC 5B, Brookland Neighborhood Civic
19 Association, the Michigan Park Civic Association and the Edgewood
20 Civic Association.

21 As you can see in the image on the screen that documents
22 our various outreach efforts, our goal was to learn from the
23 various experts on the best approach not only to preserve the
24 historic integrity of the Atlantic Electric building, but how to
25 integrate new construction that is contextual, complementary and

1 compatible within the communities that already have a strong
2 established identity and sense of place. The end result is a
3 project that has underwent an extensive HPRB process with several
4 design iterations that strongly considered the feedback that we
5 received from HPRB as well as community residents as well.

6 Can we please transition to the next slide? As you can
7 see on the image on the screen, I'm sorry, if you can go back
8 one more, please. Thank you. As you can see on the image on
9 the screen just below the timeline, the massing of the building
10 was significantly transformed from the very first iteration which
11 is the product of continual engagement with the various
12 stakeholders and we believe that the project is much stronger as
13 a result. Outside of the design and the massing of the building,
14 we also had several project goals that we worked with, with the
15 community residents. The current features of the site include
16 an autobody collision center, a rental car facility, the Atlantic
17 Electric facility as well as a strip mall retail center. The
18 fact that its current position is not very walkable or pedestrian
19 friendly due to the significant number of curb cuts creating
20 unsafe interaction between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicular
21 traffic. This was a point of emphasis from residents and as a
22 team we worked to design the solution that provided a development
23 that was transit-oriented reducing the need of (indiscernible)
24 and improve streetscape and pedestrian friendly experience while
25 incorporating community-oriented retail that compliments the

1 character of the neighborhood and capitalizes on local amenities
2 such as Turkey Thicket Park.

3 Next slide, please. We have engaged with existing
4 businesses located within the Plaza such as the District
5 Veterinary Hospital and the Pizza Bolis, both of which are
6 confirmed to return once this project is complete. We have also
7 engaged in early conversations with Petit Scholars which is a
8 community anchor and it's our desire to create an opportunity for
9 them to return to the development.

10 In conclusion, our team believes that we have developed
11 a really special project, not necessarily because of anything
12 unique that we bring to the table but more so due to the process
13 of continual engagement with local stakeholders, community
14 members and our ongoing ANC coordination. We have strong support
15 from the ANC 5B Commission and received a unanimous vote of
16 approval for the HPRB process as well as the PDR process which
17 brings us here today and I'm sure I can speak on behalf of the
18 entire team in expressing our gratitude for the many
19 relationships that we've developed and including the opportunity
20 to partner with organizations such as the D.C. Park and Recreation
21 to participate as a community sponsor with the privilege to
22 contribute and to serve the community beyond the physical expense
23 of a building, and with that I'd like to introduce Ben Kasdan,
24 our architect who will walk you through the details of the design.

25 Thank you.

1 MR. KASDAN: Thank you, Robert, and thank you
2 Commissioners and Chairman Hood.

3 If we can move to the slide, please. Thank you. So
4 this diagram really shows how where in the world we are and you
5 can see that the project is located at the intersection of 10th
6 Street and Bunker Hill Road. This is very close to Michigan
7 Avenue, a short distance away from the Brookland CUA metro
8 station.

9 If you can go to the next slide. The project is really
10 divided into three separate buildings and the centerpiece is that
11 historic building that Robert mentioned. It's directly across
12 the street from Turkey Thicket Park. There's a crosswalk, there's
13 a line nearly in the center of it and we've proposed along with
14 a cooperative effort with the ANC and the community and the HPRB
15 staff report, and those other organizations from which we
16 solicited and incorporated comments and feedback with the three
17 different buildings.

18 So if we can go to the next slide. The key is really
19 to celebrate and reinforce the historic resource in the middle
20 which is an art deco building that was originally a recreational
21 facility that has since been a different use, an office and
22 electrical supply (phonetic) for many years and to bring it back
23 as kind of the main part of this community as another recreational
24 space. So there'll be the amenities. There'll be the leasing
25 office and we're proposing a pool on the top of the roof and then

1 | it becomes a connector between building A to the north and
2 | building B to the south and in speaking with the main stakeholders
3 | the building mass and proportions and forms (phonetic) have
4 | really been sculpted in a lot of different ways for a few
5 | different reasons, but primarily to relate better to the
6 | neighbors and so building A is more adjacent to the existing
7 | townhome and single family community so that sets down mass to
8 | be about the same height as its neighbors and as a result, the
9 | majority of or some of that massing has sort of shifted south to
10 | building B which is the mixed use building and that really becomes
11 | the catalyst for why we are seeking PDR relief in that we are
12 | (indiscernible) and a couple of other things too.

13 | If you can go to the next slide. Actually, I think I'm
14 | going to skip this next one pretty quickly too. So let's go to
15 | the following one in the effort of saving some time.

16 | So another thing that we're asking for that Cary
17 | mentioned. We're slightly over lot occupancy for level 1 and
18 | level 2, mainly as we kind of incorporate the retail space which
19 | is the pink and the residential space which is the yellow, and
20 | the historic building which is the yellow with the
21 | (indiscernible) blue.

22 | You can go on to the next slide, actually. There's a
23 | number of sections, I won't get into too many of this. We can
24 | answer as many questions as you like afterwards, but the building
25 | height is slightly over. You can actually go to the next slide.

1 In building B, which is the south building, again in
2 pink is the retail space. The majority of the massing is closest
3 to Michigan Avenue which makes some sense from an urban design
4 standpoint as well.

5 Actually go two more slides and I'll start to talk
6 about the architecture. Thank you. So, again, you can start to
7 see the three buildings. The middle one's a little bit hard to
8 see from this view which is the historic resource. But in the
9 south building, building B what you're seeing here about 50
10 percent of the street facing units have balconies. There are a
11 couple of instances where we have kind of technicality in terms
12 of the stairs going to the roof that are kind of encroaching into
13 the penthouse dimensions and the loading is a technicality too,
14 but what I really want to talk about just how we got to this
15 space, and we can go to the next slide. You can just see the
16 pedestrian experience a little bit better.

17 The idea of incorporating a really walkable pedestrian
18 environment along the sidewalk is really what we're going for.
19 Robert mentioned the amount of curb cuts that exist now but when
20 we designed this space the thought was to really incorporate some
21 elements of art deco architecture but not in a mimicking way, but
22 really as a re-interpretation to essentially to reinforce, to
23 support and to really celebrate the historic building in the
24 middle. So you're kind of seeing the retail size, the taller
25 buildings.

1 So if you go to the next slide you can see how the
2 massing of this building really sets down as it gets adjacent to
3 the townhomes nearby, the retail promenade is a place that's more
4 residential, and landscape expression in the sidewalks, and then
5 go to one more slide and this is really the alignment of the
6 crosswalk that goes to Turkey Thicket Park. Celebrating the
7 historic building you can see sort of the sculpting of the
8 terracing and other art deco-related move as the building kind
9 of really steps away to celebrate the historic resource. The
10 materials are primarily brick, some cement fiber, panel and
11 siding, storefront windows, some metal panels and the last thing
12 I wanted to touch on is it really has to do with staying
13 (phonetic) the building.

14 The project is targeting LEED gold. We're a little
15 early to know exactly what that means. It'll likely have solar.
16 It will likely have a green roof but we're a little bit too early
17 to commit to that. What we know is it will exceed the City's
18 (indiscernible) and with that I'm going to hand it off to Gabi
19 (phonetic) from LandDesign.

20 MS. CANAMAR CLARK: Thank you Ben. Good afternoon
21 members of the Commission. My name is -- can you all hear me?

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes. Yes, we can.

23 MS. CANAMAR CLARK: Okay. Thank you. For the record
24 my name is Gabriela Canamar Clark. I am a partner with
25 LandDesign, urban designers and master (phonetic) architects and

1 I will explain the experience, theme and approach to all public
2 areas of the project.

3 Next slide, please. We'll start on (indiscernible)
4 conditions of the project as it was mentioned before in a visual
5 tour very quickly, beginning with the area around the repair shop
6 along Bunker Hill Road along the car rental side on 10th Street
7 and all the way to the historic building. As you can see there
8 are distinct and wide curb cuts, several of them, limited the
9 street trees and (indiscernible) areas at the back of the curb.

10 Next slide, please. Continuing in a northerly
11 direction along 10th Street there are wider curb cuts and a few
12 small trees along the shopping entrance.

13 Next slide, please. For the streetscape, the project
14 design around the three frontages of the project applying all
15 pertinent requirements from the D.C. Design and Engineering
16 Manual as well as the D.C. Public Realm Design Manual. Starting
17 from the curb of the building, of the street, the area in green
18 depicts the tree in that safe zone ranging from four to eight
19 feet in width with the widest proposed around 10th Street. The
20 areas in pink are intended to be sidewalk ranging from five to
21 ten feet in width with the widest proposed around 10th Street
22 (indiscernible). The area in purple closest to the building are
23 the zones that will accommodate the landscape buffer from the
24 from the residential units of building A at the ground level,
25 which is page left, as well as affording other amenities for the

1 future ground level retail on the southern portion of the building
2 or building B, which is page right.

3 Nest slide, please. This image is lined up sort of
4 showing in greater detail the tree and landscape zone with a
5 continuous row of street trees and landscapes that will have two
6 connections to the street for quick connection pick up and drop
7 off activity and the buffer around the ground level residential
8 portion of the building as well. With a (indiscernible) focus
9 vision for the project, the images here are indicative of the
10 quality and character of the proposed landscape approach with
11 layers of evergreen and deciduous shrubs, grasses, and perennials
12 for year round features. I would like to mention that the
13 streetscape design is subject to the D.C. Public Space review
14 process.

15 Next slide, please. This is also a view from above
16 conceptually showing what Robert mentioned, or what Ben mentioned
17 before, the potential green roof that would be located at the
18 rooftop level as well as the potential amenities courtyard.
19 Responding to their size, the small courtyard on building A page
20 left will be a more attractive and contemplative (phonetic)
21 space. In the middle, which is above the historical, resource
22 will be the roof of the historic building to be a swimming pool
23 with a full deck and along both the courtyard page right will be
24 designed to include a more active amenities for the future
25 residents and their guests.

1 Next slide, please. I chose these couple of cross-
2 sections from our project to illustrate on both of them how the
3 landscape supports the two sections we're talking about. Section
4 C is the top of the page and it's a cross of the southern portion
5 of the building where the retail will be located and the residents
6 amenity courtyard on top of the project. Section B is at the
7 bottom of the page and it's a cross of the northern portion of
8 the building where the ground floor retail units will be
9 benefiting from having a landscape edge with the same cadence of
10 street trees in the ground level vegetation. You can also see
11 the passive (phonetic) amenity courtyard (indiscernible) on the
12 western plat.

13 This concludes my portion of the presentation. I will
14 be passing it on to Dan VanPelt to talk about transportation.

15 Thank you very much.

16 MR. VANPELT: Good afternoon. Thank you, Gabi.
17 Commissioners, for the record I'm Dan VanPelt. I'm Vice President
18 and Senior Principle of Gorove Slade.

19 We have had the pleasure of working with the UIP, the
20 project team and DDOT relating to the transportation aspects of
21 Brookland Lanes project. This afternoon I'm going to touch on
22 the highlights of our review and our coordination with DDOT.

23 As shown the project we are discussing is situated in
24 the University Heights neighborhood along 10th Street, Northeast.
25 It's located within a quarter mile of Brookland Catholic

1 University metro station. Nearby there are eight high frequency
2 metrobus routes with ten stops on 10th Street, Bunker Hill Road,
3 12th Street, Brookland and Catholic University station
4 (indiscernible). Brookland Lanes has its frontage on 10th
5 Street, Bunker Road and a public alley. The project has access
6 to several on and off-street bicycle facilities including the
7 Metropolitan Branch Trail that's nearby. Bike facilities on 12th
8 Street, Newton, Monroe and 8th Street. Additionally, there are
9 five Capital Bikeshare Stations located near the site in the
10 neighborhood and the site is afforded great transit and multi-
11 modal access.

12 Next slide. Moving down to the site level. Vehicular
13 and loading access will be from the public alley that runs along
14 the western part of the site which can be accessed via 10th
15 Street. All eight existing curb cuts on 10th Street and Bunker
16 Hill Road will be closed and the public realm will be greatly
17 enhanced, as you've heard just a moment in Gabi's testimony. The
18 image on this slide shows the circulation of vehicular parking
19 in yellow and loading (phonetic) circulation in dark green,
20 anticipated bicycle circulation is shown in light blue,
21 pedestrian circulation is shown in dark blue. Bicycle access is
22 primarily envisioned to take place via the public alley
23 connecting to the long term bicycle spaces on the basement level.
24 Short term bike spaces will be available at multiple locations
25 along the site's frontage on 10th Street and pedestrian access

1 to the residential lobby and the retail will take place via
2 entrances along 10th Street.

3 Next slide, please. Regarding parking there'll be 99
4 vehicular parking spaces located in the below grade garage which
5 is appropriate for a site this well situated to transit. Two of
6 those spaces will be equipped with electric vehicle charging
7 capabilities meeting zoning requirements and DDOT's standards for
8 vehicular parking. The project will include 115 long term and
9 26 short term bicycle spaces exceeding zoning and meeting the
10 DCMR requirements. Additionally, the secure bike room will
11 include at least six cargo and tandem bike spaces and at least
12 12 of those will have, 12 of the bike spaces will have electrical
13 outlets. DDOT is supportive of the number of bicycle spaces that
14 are being provided by the project.

15 We'll continue to work with DDOT through the public
16 space approval process and maximize on-street parking along 10th
17 Street and create a pick-up/drop-off zone in zones where
18 appropriate.

19 Next slide. Loading will be accommodated via four 30
20 foot loading berths meeting the needs of the project. These
21 facilities will be accessible from the public alley. The loading
22 facilities are highlighted in purple on this slide and the trash
23 rooms are located inside the building and those are highlighted
24 in orange. All loading maneuvers will be head in/head out from
25 the alley.

1 Next slide. This slide contains the performed a
2 comprehensive transportation review which was scoped with DDOT.
3 Our study concluded that the development of the site will not
4 have a detrimental impact on the surrounding transportation
5 network and minimizes impact by short term and long term bicycle
6 parking accommodating loading out of the public realm,
7 significantly improving streetscape conditions and with the
8 implementation of the transportation demand management plan. We
9 have coordinated with DDOT for the review complete to have their
10 support in the form of a no objection staff report.

11 DDOT's report did have a couple of conditions which the
12 Applicant agrees to. I'll just go over it real quick. DDOT
13 supports the proposed TDM plan and the Applicant agrees as
14 (indiscernible) to the life of the project. Also DDOT asked for
15 continued coordination on matters of public space and the
16 Applicant agrees to that.

17 I've listed the highlights of the TDM plan here on the
18 slide. Our plan includes many of the components expected in such
19 a package and have detailed in the CTR. DDOT finds the TDM plan
20 to be robust and supports it.

21 That concludes my testimony, and I'll pass it over to
22 Shane Dettman.

23 MR. DETTMAN: Thanks Dan, and good afternoon Mr.
24 Chairman and members of the Commission. My testimony today is
25 going to summarize the project satisfaction for the standards of

1 review that are applicable to a voluntary design review
2 application under Subtitle X of the 2016 zoning regulations.

3 Next slide, please. No, I'm sorry. Stay here, Mr.
4 Young. Thank you. So the standard of review for voluntary design
5 review application includes specific design review criteria under
6 Subtitle X, 604.7 consistency with the comp plan under X 604.5
7 and general special exception criteria under Subtitle X, 901.2.
8 Our detailed evaluation of these standards can be found in
9 Exhibits 4 and 4E of the record.

10 My slides this afternoon I've prepared took the
11 Commission through all of the, you know, the relevant design
12 review standards about the comprehensive plan, but in the
13 interest of time what I'll do is I'll focus my comments on the
14 specific design review criteria and then leave it there and I'm
15 happy to discuss any sort of comprehensive plan questions you
16 might have during the Q & A portion of the hearing today.

17 Next slide. With respect to the specific design review
18 criteria, the first one the criteria looks for projects that have
19 street frontages that are designed to be safe, comfortable and
20 encourage pedestrian activity and the project satisfies this
21 criteria. Compared to the existing conditions image on the left
22 the project will eliminate all curb cuts along with two street
23 frontages of the property. In total that amounts to about 200
24 feet of curb cuts that will be completely removed from the project
25 site with the only vehicular access being from the public alley

1 to the north. The elimination of curb cuts along with the project
2 activated ground floor commercial uses and related public ground
3 improvements will result in a safe, comfortable and uninterrupted
4 pedestrian environment.

5 Next slide. Here you can just see another look at the
6 existing conditions on the left. You can see the broken sidewalk,
7 the unutilized site and on the right a rendering of the proposed
8 project with its safe pedestrian sidewalks, streetscape as well
9 as activated street frontages.

10 Next slide. The next design review criteria looks at
11 public gathering spaces and open spaces being encouraged in
12 projects, particularly one where you're near a metro or where
13 open space and green space in the neighborhood is lacking. This
14 criteria is also met by the project. You can see that there is
15 a public gathering space. Mr. Kasdan described it during his
16 testimony circled in red here. The public gathering space is
17 appropriately situated mid-block on this project. It's
18 appropriately separated from the congestion and the noise that
19 could occur along Michigan Avenue. It's also separated from the
20 lower scale residential uses to the north so effectively are
21 mitigating any sort of noise that could emanate from the gathering
22 place just outside the ground floor retail. It's also located
23 immediately adjacent to the crosswalk that leads across the
24 street to the recreational opportunities that are at Turkey
25 Thicket Park and Recreation Center.

1 Next slide. Here we just see a rendering on the left
2 of sort of the character that's envisioned for the new public
3 gathering space which is situated in between the historic
4 landmark building with the residential amenities that will be
5 located in that building as well as the neighborhood serving
6 retail spaces that are on the ground floor of the southern portion
7 of the project.

8 Next slide. The design review criteria looks for new
9 developments with respect to the historic character of
10 Washington's neighborhoods and I think when it comes to this
11 criteria it really starts with the treatment of the historic
12 landmark building on the site. As you can see our project has
13 evolved, and Mr. Kasdan did a great job of describing how the
14 project evolved as a result of the HPRB process.

15 On the right you can see the initial proposal that was
16 submitted to HPRB where a new development sort of envelopes the
17 majority of the historic landmark building. On the left you see
18 the proposed design where you see the massing pulled away from
19 the historic landmark sort of making it the keystone of the
20 project, if you will, giving the massing of the project away from
21 the historic building and really sort of respecting the view of
22 the historic building along Perry Place.

23 Next slide, please. Here you just see a comparison of
24 the original elevation of the project. Again on the bottom you
25 can see the initial exterior design. Here you can really see

1 | how the proposed (indiscernible) is kind of enveloping the
2 | historic resource and then the proposed project on the right.

3 | What you can also see on the right side of this image
4 | is the sculpting and the height reductions that were made to the
5 | project on the northern side in response to the lower scale
6 | residential development to the north as well as community input.

7 | Next slide. In terms of the design review criteria
8 | looking for active and inspired site designs you see a couple of
9 | renderings here and Mr. Kasdan also touched upon those things in
10 | his presentation. You know, the staff (phonetic) are very
11 | responsive to the surrounding context, both the south as well on
12 | the north in response to the residential neighborhood both in
13 | their massing and their height as well as their material pallet.

14 | Next slide. Gabriela touched upon in her testimony to
15 | the landscape design for the project and it certainly compares
16 | to the existing conditions on the site which is currently very
17 | under utilized and overly impervious. The new landscape design
18 | for this site both on site as well as the surrounding public
19 | realm would increase the sustainability of the landscaping of the
20 | site.

21 | Next slide. The final design review criteria looks at
22 | connectivity and supporting developments that promote
23 | connectivity both internally to the site as well as externally
24 | around the site. Mr. VanPelt touched upon how connectivity was
25 | brought through both internally and externally to the project in

1 his testimony. With respect to internal connectivity, as was
2 mentioned loading and parking access to the site will be accessed
3 through an existing curb cut, the public alley on the north line
4 for head in and head out only with over 200 feet of curb cuts
5 being removed along the street frontages and externally as a
6 result of the improved streetscape and removal of the curb cuts
7 pedestrian activity, bicycle circulation is improved to and
8 around the site in the surrounding context.

9 So with that, Mr. Chairman, I'll leave it there and,
10 again, happy to answer any questions with respect to
11 comprehensive plan, if you have any.

12 MR. KADLECEK: Thank you, Shane. That concludes our
13 presentation so we're happy and available to answer any
14 questions.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you to the team. We
16 appreciate the very succinct presentation. I'm going to go to
17 Commissioner Imamura first, then I'll go to Commissioner Stidham
18 second and Vice Chair Miller and I will go last, in that order.
19 Thank you.

20 Commissioner Imamura?

21 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want
22 to thank the Applicant and the project team. I think there are
23 some successful elements of this project and there are some other
24 elements that where I could use your help for clarification. So,
25 and I hope to hit on all my questions, Mr. Chairman. If I don't

1 I may come back. We'll work backwards I think, I've written a
2 number of notes here if you'll allow me.

3 I think first of all, this might be for Mr. Dettman.
4 Just a couple of questions here about the PDR designation on the
5 property and it doesn't appear that the project includes any PDR
6 space, and so I just wanted to ask if you could address that and
7 if there are any plans to include PDR space, if there's anything
8 existing on that site that will be preserved and sort of if you
9 can reconcile that with, you know, the other comp plan policies
10 as well as inconsistencies.

11 MR. DETTMAN: Sure. Mr. Young, could you bring up the
12 presentation? Near the end of my slides there's an image of the
13 comprehensive plan future land use map that will help me address
14 your question, Commissioner.

15 Go through, go the other way, towards the end of the
16 presentation. Next one, and the next one. All right. So
17 Commissioner Imamura, the property on the north side you can see
18 on this map is designated for mixed use and one of the striped
19 sides is PDR. The southern portion or maybe the southern two
20 thirds of the property is designated for mixed use also but has
21 medium density commercial medium density residential.

22 So the description for a PDR designation in the
23 comprehensive plan framework element specifically talks about,
24 you know, how areas that are striped for mixed use with a PDR
25 stripe, how the PDR use stripe should be addressed and that's

1 that first bullet on this slide where it talks about how areas
2 that are striped to include PDR development must include PDR
3 space and site continued existing PDR space the amount should be
4 substantially preserved.

5 So you'll see in our comprehensive plan evaluation at
6 Exhibit 4E we address this specifically. We first did a
7 comprehensive evaluation of what uses are currently on the site
8 and find that the majority of them are automotive related vehicle
9 storage. The only active PDR use that might be on the site is a
10 small portion of the electric supply used as in the existing
11 historic landmark building. A search for the Certificate of
12 Occupancy for that use doesn't list square footages but it's not
13 a big building. It's not very much active PDR use, so to the
14 extent that that's considered active PDR use, you know, we think,
15 I think the Applicant is currently looking at and evaluating what
16 the ground floor commercial program is going to be and certainly
17 there could be some uses that go into the ground floor that might
18 be considered maker space although it falls in like the retail
19 category. But at this point, there's no definitive idea that
20 it's actually going to have any kind of use in the southern
21 portion of the building and the ground floor retail portion that
22 would satisfy the PDR stripe.

23 But again, given the very little amount of use that's
24 currently on the site that might be PDR, we believe that, you
25 know, to the extent that that is somewhat inconsistent with that

1 policy of the comprehensive plan, we think that the project
2 consistencies with many other policies related to TOD, housing,
3 affordable housing, activation ground for retail, we believe that
4 that inconsistency would be on base (phonetic).

5 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: All right. Thank you, Mr.
6 Dettman. I'm satisfied with that answer. Appreciate your
7 response.

8 The next question I have has to do with the existing
9 tenants. I did notice and appreciate the slide about the three
10 tenants that have expressed interest to return. Also noticed
11 that there's a list of almost a dozen other, a dozen tenants in
12 total. So I'm curious about those other tenants and if any effort
13 has been made for their relocation elsewhere or what the status
14 if of those tenants, if someone could respond to that.

15 MR. GROOMS: Hi. Yes, so in regards to the status of
16 the other tenants we don't necessarily have an update for any
17 future re-se of the location at this time and we are still very
18 much in the process of exploring all options that are available
19 to us. We're also being considered what the community has
20 responded to us about the desire to have community oriented retail
21 that is local business that is, in conjunction with needs to
22 support the community. So those are some options that we're
23 exploring, even with the potential to explore about other small
24 businesses that may have been displaced by our developments
25 within the area.

1 So, again, we're very early in that process. I don't
2 have an update on the other existing tenants but we are exploring
3 all options that are available to us.

4 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Grooms, and I'm
5 especially pleased to hear that you're looking at other
6 potentially displaced tenants within the area (indiscernible) as
7 well. So certainly I think that would be important to document
8 and keep a good record. All right, thank you, Mr. Grooms. I
9 appreciate your response for that as well.

10 Mr. Kasdan, I think I've got a couple of questions for
11 you. I'd like to kind of work backwards from just where we talked
12 a little bit about transportation. So, Mr. Young, at your
13 earliest convenience if you can pull up slide 24, please and Mr.
14 Kasdan, this is about -- my question's about circulation
15 essentially just sort of separating vehicular and pedestrian
16 bicycle circulation here. I think what was really successful,
17 let me just say on slide No. 3 in 33 and 34 it showed a couple
18 of iterations that you went through, design iterations, one from
19 June, 2022 where the project is now essentially your last revision
20 of April, 2023. Did appreciate slide 33-34 that shared the before
21 and after HPRB review.

22 I mention that because I'm interested to know what
23 other iterations did you go through for your sort of I guess
24 circulation plan here? What I see, and I hope that maybe you
25 can correct me here, but there seems to be an intense amount of

1 focus on vehicular and loading and bicycle all coming through on
2 the out and I think Mr. Young, and I'm going to ask one other
3 question here, Mr. Kasdan, so it's a two part question. Mr.
4 Young, if you could pull up slide 25 next.

5 All right. I think Mr. VanPelt had mentioned the long
6 term bicycle parking is appropriately located in the basement in
7 the cellar area where vehicular parking is, I zoomed in, this
8 seems to me to be only a double line drive that shows no access
9 into that space. I realize it's very conceptual here but what I
10 see is that I'm somebody who rides a bicycle, I'm going to go
11 through the back alley all the way down the ramp, the parking
12 ramp and through the parking garage to get to the bicycle parking.

13 And so if you could just hep steer me, no pun intended
14 here, in a better direction.

15 MR. KASDAN: Yes. Thank you for the question. So the
16 first one about other iterations, I think you're probably
17 referring to an earlier concept in which the, if you go to the
18 originals it's actually flipped over, where the ramp and the
19 vehicular circulation came from Bunker Hill Road, not from the
20 public alley and we received favorable feedback from the
21 community, HPRB staff and Board about that idea and we received
22 the exact opposite direction from DDOT and so we had to go back
23 and renegotiate with those are other stakeholders and at the end
24 of the day the DDOT version wins the public space as it comes
25 down to it and they were pretty adamant. We tried hard to

1 convince (phonetic) the other way but they wanted the vehicular
2 circulation from the existing public alley, not from Bunker Hill
3 Road. So that's how we got to this version. There's also other
4 revisions. I don't now if you want to hear about those or not,
5 but I have a feeling you're speaking mostly about that one.

6 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: No, I'd be happy to hear just
7 quickly summarizing the other iterations that you went through.
8 I really appreciate your explanation about sort of DDOT's
9 preference here versus HPRB and the communities, but just curious
10 bout any other iterations, very succinctly please.

11 MR. KASDAN: At an eye level originally the historic
12 building was built to the same height (indiscernible) the
13 historic building and it pretty quickly made sense to make
14 building A, the northern building, shorter and make building B
15 taller. There were lots of other minor things and the amount of
16 intervention into the historic building or not. There were some
17 different iterations with that and also I believe what we landed
18 at is essentially what we see here where all the interior
19 functions that support the rooftop amenity things (phonetic) are
20 largely invisible from the pedestrian realm and pretty low key
21 and some of the iterations are more heavy handed (indiscernible).

22 So those are the main differences of the various
23 iterations and I can talk more about that or I can talk about
24 the bike parking.

25 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Let's move on to the bike

1 parking. I appreciate the explanation of the other iterations.
2 I thought perhaps there might have been other circulation
3 iterations which I was interested in here but and the purpose for
4 bringing that up, you know, there are members of the public that
5 only see sort of these final plans and so it's very helpful for
6 them to understand, you know, that the design team went through
7 various iterations and this is how we landed so it's not sort of
8 first time shot at it, that you've gone through some various
9 vignettes here, if you well.

10 But I would like to hear a little bit more about the
11 long term bicycle parking, please, and how do I arrive and get
12 there.

13 MR. KASDAN: So the route that you described is one way
14 to get there. You can also use the internal circulation and the
15 elevator if you didn't want to ride down the ramp. We also
16 sometimes incorporated some bike friendly features, inside stairs
17 and we haven't got there on this project yet but I think our team
18 would be up for entertaining some of those features as well as a
19 rail that you can take your bike down those stairs as well. But,
20 gain, super early in this process.

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So let me interrupt. I'm being
22 told, I don't think this pertains to the Commissioners, but I'm
23 being told that Mr. Kasdan, or whoever speaks if you can identify
24 yourself first for court reporting purposes. So other than the
25 Commissioners, I think are fine. It's everybody else who speaks.

1 Thank you.

2 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: All right. Thank you, Mr.
3 Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Kasdan. I appreciate that. I think
4 that, I would hope Mr. Grooms would be up to that. Certainly I
5 think it's obvious that riding your bicycle down the ramp probably
6 isn't the most safe approach to storing your bicycle there so I'm
7 glad that there is an elevator there. Again, it was difficult
8 to tell because this design here is very conceptual. So
9 incredibly difficult to tell what's going on.

10 I will say that one of the successful things, the sort
11 of design moves that you all did was sort of stepping back
12 building A and really the different architectural elements and
13 building A, building B and separating from the historic building
14 there. I think that was a successful move that you didn't mimic
15 any of the, asserting the design elements of that. Thank you,
16 Mr. Young.

17 I have a couple more questions though for you, Mr.
18 Kasdan, an maybe Ms. Canamar. If we could pull up, let me see,
19 probably a couple of things. I guess you might know this better,
20 Mr. Kasdan, if we can get either a perspective or plain view of
21 10th Street or on the retail space there, I think I saw a
22 perspective view maybe that Mr. Dettman might have used or Ms.
23 Redden (phonetic) might have used.

24 But my point is along the retail space there, I think
25 Ms. Canamar mentioned the sidewalk is about five to ten feet wide

1 I suppose. I saw there were some spaces outside the retail stores
2 or the retail space that were divided by railing and it's there
3 in your perspectives and it could just be a place that's, you
4 know, in your images, your illustrations, as a placeholder but
5 clearly you are successful I think on building A along the
6 sidewalk there along 10th Street. There's some nice landscaping
7 that is happening there and I see all hardscape. There's a plan,
8 in fact I think there was a comment that was made either by the
9 urban design division about including a little more landscape
10 solutions along the south side of 10th Street and I see you're
11 smiling Mr. Kasdan so you know exactly what I'm getting at.

12 MS. CANAMAR CLARK: (Indiscernible) I'm trying to turn
13 on my (indiscernible). I apologize (indiscernible) video and
14 my computer is not. But if you can still hear me.

15 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Question, Ms. Canamar. Can you
16 --

17 MS. CANAMAR CLARK: (Indiscernible).

18 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: -- yes.

19 MS. CANAMAR CLARK: Yes. And think to answer your
20 question. It is on the building A on the north side and many of
21 the plans can be pulled up so we can all kind of see, I don't
22 know what page that would be (indiscernible). It could be any
23 of the first view or maybe this one right here. On building A
24 which is, this is the northern building, there are units on the
25 ground floor, so the landscape strategy is to provide a landscape

1 amenity plan or landscape strip where the streetscape would be
2 located, I don't know if you can see in this, followed the by
3 the sidewalk and, again, the sidewalk would vary. That's what I
4 stated in my testimony, they would be varied within depending on
5 where we are with the project because there are different setbacks
6 and each street or streetscape has different dimensions. But we
7 will optimize those dimensions within the allowed width within
8 the D.C. (indiscernible) Manual and the Public Realm guidelines.

9 Beyond the sidewalk, as you can see this area in green
10 and this is where I talk about a buffer because there are units
11 on that first floor. So we think that that would all on either
12 side and for exactly, for those units on the first floor to have
13 a little bit of a buffer with more shrubs and other layers of
14 landscaping. So I don't think that this is the crux of your
15 question necessarily but I wanted to explain.

16 On the retail side, so you can advance to the next
17 slide, I know this is what you're getting at, please, the one
18 that was before or after showing building B in a little more
19 detail. Keep going.

20 MR. KASDAN: Keep going the other way.

21 MS. CANAMAR CLARK: Oh, the other way? Previous. There
22 you go.

23 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: There we go, yes.

24 MS. CANAMAR CLARK: So, yes, the large rail. I see the
25 railings on page down left, I think those are illustrative and I

1 think at the point these renderings were done the before the
2 landscape design started to take on more shape, it's very, very,
3 conceptual. Those are indicative, and Ben can correct me because
4 these were done by an illustrative, a firm did the illustrations
5 either within their firm or done by a third party. So we have
6 retail estimation and some of those retail tenants will become a
7 food and beverage type of place and you can imagine some of these
8 being a little bit of that café zone that they mentioned that is
9 allowable within the plaza (phonetic).

10 They seem to be a little, this perspective shows very
11 little space, you know, you see the mother and the stroller there
12 shown, I think it's suffice to say, you know, this is what I can
13 tell you that from the plan view when you go back to my diagrams
14 showing, I think it's slide, I don't have this in front of me.
15 Keep going to where you have a diagram in plan view, oh, yes,
16 keep going. One more, two more, there you go.

17 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.

18 MS. CANAMAR CLARK: The area in green is a consistent
19 landscape where the street trees will be, so that's clear. The
20 area in pink is the sidewalk and that's, you see the cross-
21 sections on the top right. The sidewalk will vary anywhere from
22 five to ten feet depending on where we are. Bunker Hill is
23 extremely tight for accommodating both sidewalk and landscape
24 with trees. 10th Street on the purple side will have an area
25 for those retail tenants to have a safe outdoors for a beverage

1 | or any other activities. I think what you're referring to is
2 | those dash lines that show there (indiscernible) I think they're
3 | protection from above (phonetic) if I'm not mistaken. I can see
4 | Ben nodding.

5 | So hopefully that answers your question. There will
6 | be more landscaping once the project goes towards public review
7 | of the streetscape and public open space. But that's basically
8 | the rationale. You can see the left is more designated to a
9 | buffer for the residents. On the right is more dedicated to the
10 | activities of the retail tenants.

11 | COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Ms. Canamar, for your
12 | response there. Clearly from my point of view, Mr. Kasdan, and
13 | the project team you need your landscape architect involved a bit
14 | more in that area of your plan. Additionally, I think that, you
15 | know, this isn't just my comments. There's comments in the record
16 | here from Urban Design and perhaps even OP, but your landscape
17 | plan needs incredibly more detail.

18 | As I said before, you've got some things that are
19 | retally successful about this project. There are things that
20 | need improvement or additional work and I would encourage you,
21 | Mr. Kasdan, Mr. Grooms and the project team to give your landscape
22 | architect a little more agency here about these plans a bit
23 | further. I understand, I've heard this many times already this
24 | afternoon but this is still early, it's still conceptual but you
25 | are before the Zoning Commission, you have gone before HPRB and

1 these are things that you'd could kind of lock down pretty easily
2 that really doesn't change the element of the design in any
3 substantive way but I think would improve the public realm in a
4 good way. So certainly seeing those guard rails, those hand
5 rails there, it's a bit of a concern there at the retail space.
6 I would encourage you probably next time to do something
7 different.

8 All right. The green roof. If we could go to slide
9 21, Mr. Young, please. Thank you, sir. Again, this is my comment
10 here is just the fact that again I think I see a lot of west
11 (phonetic) planting explanations, a lot of buffers, buffer
12 planting with some precedent images but I really think that it
13 would be important to see some more detail here in terms of
14 materiality, and potential, you know, plant selections. You
15 know, I think that would be important and add a little more
16 information to this in order for me and the Zoning Commission to
17 make a more informed decision here. So I'd like for you to add
18 that.

19 Also if we could stay on this slide, Mr. Young. Mr.
20 Kasdan, you had mentioned you're targeting LEED gold. I didn't
21 see a LEED scorecard and I know you had mentioned it's a little
22 too early to know where and how many sort of opaques and solar
23 panels you'll need and where they will go. I'm just kind of
24 surprised to hear that it's a little early but now we're going
25 to hit LEED gold. So if you could kind of walk me through that

1 rationale so that I have a better understanding of where you're
2 at.

3 MR. KASDAN: This is Ben Kasdan, principle at KGTY,
4 architects.

5 So they were targeting LEED gold and looking at other
6 similar projects such as the Hanover 8th Street which is not too
7 far away from here, that we are the design and architect of record
8 for. They're similar kinds of buildings, similar kind of rooftop
9 solution and what you're seeing here is similar to that and the
10 solar ends up going on what would be the white, so on top of the
11 penthouse roof wherever it could fit. There's a lot of things
12 that want to be on roofs, mechanical equipment, AC condensers,
13 ventilation, exhaust, solar (indiscernible). So a lot of things
14 are competing for the same amount of space and we're really coming
15 to you for some specific PDR relief and we have more information
16 that we've been sharing about the same building strategies,
17 looking at other similar projects, again Hanover Street was able
18 to get LEED gold and so we're tracking in a very similar way on
19 this project at this point.

20 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: So if you're looking at other
21 example projects that have achieved LEED gold and you think you're
22 able to get it, attain LEED gold here and thank you for explaining
23 that there's a lot of competing things that (indiscernible),
24 something that you certainly don't need to explain to me but I
25 think it's important for the public to hear. I'm just really

1 | puzzled or perplexed at like, you know, where do you think you're
2 | going to get most of your points and have you looked at that yet?
3 | Is it, you know, I have questions about your stormwater management
4 | strategy. I have questions about what your building envelope is
5 | like. But my guess is you're going to tell me, well, it's still
6 | conceptual, we don't know. So can you at least, I don't know,
7 | maybe please, you know, fill me on some of that.

8 | MR. KASDAN: It's also conceptual -- Ben Kasdan, KGT
9 | -- it's still conceptual. We're not able to commit any of that
10 | stuff yet.

11 | MR. KADLEEK: This Is Cary Kadlecek. So I'll just add.
12 | So there's of course the minimum requirements that will be
13 | satisfied. We're not asking to not satisfy the requirements
14 | under the code with respect to the stormwater management
15 | requirements and the GMR as well as the Green Building Act
16 | requirements. Those will all be satisfied. That's the baseline
17 | for (indiscernible).

18 | So the point we're trying to make is anything beyond
19 | what's required and, again, this is not a PUD, whether they
20 | actually get all the points for LEED gold is still to be
21 | determined because there are specific environmental LEED points
22 | haven't been fully vetted yet but we were asked to provide more
23 | explanation about those things in the OP report and so that's
24 | when Mr. Kasdan was explaining that, that was the aspiration and
25 | that certainly is the goal. But because those points haven't

1 | been fully developed yet based on the specific construction level
2 | detail of the project that's not known yet. But to be clear, we
3 | are not asking for any relief or seeking anything that deviates
4 | from what the law requires as a minimum.

5 | COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Kadlecek. I get
6 | all that. I just thought and hoped that maybe this would be a
7 | little bit more baked. You know, I know that I did see in the
8 | record, right, the request for a little more details about where
9 | the solar panels may go. The GAR, there's no back-up information
10 | for that. Not seeing anything for LEED, right, and so you're
11 | coming to the Zoning Commission here for us to make a
12 | determination with some partial, you know, not all the facts here
13 | but would make me feel a little more comfortable about moving
14 | forward with this. As I said there's some successful parts about
15 | this project.

16 | I knew that, I'm just curious and I'll ask this, Mr.
17 | Kadlecek and Mr. Kasdan. You know, the residents on the north
18 | there along the alley were concerned about the height and that's
19 | one of the things obviously, and they're concerned and I'm always
20 | concerned about height, mass, scale, that sort of thing. I don't
21 | know, I'm curious, was a shadow study ever done?

22 | MR. KASDAN: Yes, there was. This is Ben Kasdan, KGTY.
23 | Yes, we conducted a shadow study as a part of the ANC outreach.

24 | COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Did I miss that in the record?
25 | Is that in the record somewhere? Did I miss that, Mr. Kadlecek?

1 All right. Is that something maybe something we can add in the
2 record, please?

3 MR. KADLECEK: Yes.

4 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: All right. Mr. Chairman, I
5 don't mean to have sucked all the air out of (indiscernible), so
6 I will yield but I may have some additional questions. I'm
7 guessing my fellow Commissioners might highlight a couple of
8 areas that may need a little more focus.

9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner
10 Imamura, and before I forget, I could wait and do it. As
11 Commissioner Imamura was drilling down on LEED, landscaping, on
12 the first page of the OP report I want the Applicant to drill
13 down on that as has already been requested by Commissioner
14 Imamura. But that's when you'll find a lot of that, I need you
15 to drill down on that. If not, point to where it is in the
16 record, especially No. 3 and that was probably one of my, but
17 you know what? Let me hold off, let me hold off because I want
18 to drill down on some of this.

19 Let's go to Commissioner Stidham.

20 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Thank you, Chair. So I had just
21 a few questions. The Applicant's statement refers to working
22 with ANC, I believe 5B, as well as the Brookland Neighborhood
23 Civic Association and the Edgewood Civic Association. Looking
24 like it has occurred prior to the hearing and these associations
25 were supportive of the project, but I've not seen anything in the

1 record to indicate that from any of these organizations. Maybe
2 you could elaborate a little bit more about your work with them
3 and maybe why we're not seeing anything from them on the record.

4 MR. GROOMS: Yes. Thank you for your question. This
5 is Robert Grooms with UIP for the record.

6 So unfortunately our ANC Commissioner Collene Costello,
7 she did have some illness this week and so she was not able to
8 give the ANC 5B letter of support and earlier that was submitted
9 this morning so that has been filed and submitted for the record,
10 and in regards to the other groups that we communicated with we
11 did have a various meetings with them to keep them updated on
12 the project to hear feedback and to continue to work through any
13 issues that we had. To my knowledge there is no letters of
14 support or any testimony of support that'll be presenting with
15 today, however (indiscernible) --

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Hold on. I'm not sure who that,
17 give me, hold off a second. I'm not sure who that is that's
18 unmuted where all the traffic is. Mr. Grooms, is the traffic
19 bad there where you all are? Is that where all the background's
20 coming from?

21 MR. GROOMS: Yes. There was a loud vehicle that just
22 passed by.

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: It's been quite a few so I want you
24 all to ask your counsel to do a traffic study down there in that
25 area. All right. You may continue.

1 MR. GROOMS: So yes. As I was saying we've had very
2 positive interactions with the communities. We've established
3 many great relationships and so that's something that we'll
4 continue to do. We'll continue to have this open engagement and
5 dialogue as we continue to move forward with the project as well.

6 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Okay. I think it would be good
7 if they were on the record supporting this. This is a big change
8 for the neighborhood so it would probably be good to hear from
9 them.

10 As a follow-up to Commissioner Imamura's question
11 related to LEED certification. I do think that you're missing a
12 lot of information related to that. I know you say it's
13 conceptual and you're not sure where it's going. But one of the
14 design review requirements is that you show you're minimizing the
15 impact to the environment and doing so through that LEED
16 certification status as well as some additional landscaping as
17 was mentioned. So I think we need to understand more about your
18 approach there and how you plan to do that.

19 MR. KADLECEK: Yes, understood. Was that a question
20 or was that just a request, sorry?

21 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: that was a request.

22 MR. KADLEEK: Okay. Understood.

23 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Okay, and with that I don't
24 think I have any other questions. Thank you, Chairman.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Commissioner Stidham.

1 Vice Chair Miller?

2 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank
3 you, Cary Kadlecek, Ben Kasdan and the Applicant's team for
4 bringing this voluntary design review case forward to the
5 Commission and your engagement with the community and for all of
6 your work on the project.

7 I thank my fellow Commissioner for all of their
8 questions and comments thus far which I associate myself with and
9 I appreciate Commissioner Imamura being very thorough in his,
10 especially thorough in his questions and know that it doesn't
11 steal any thunder from any of the rest of us, it's a gift. Thank
12 you. We appreciate it, especially on my birthday when I don't
13 really want to be here, although it's a pleasure always to be
14 with the public and my colleagues.

15 I guess ANC 5B, we do have their letter of support. I
16 think we got it today, Exhibit 17, that may have been mentioned.
17 So let me just go to that for a minute. You may have touched on
18 this. You may have responded to this. They have a unanimous
19 vote of five to zero in support of this application and they
20 appreciated meeting with the Applicant multiple times and
21 responding to their feedback. They said in their last paragraph,
22 and I just wanted you to confirm what they're saying here.

23 I'm quoting from Chairperson 5B, ANC 5B Costello's
24 letter, resolution letter to us in which they state,

25 The Applicant has expressed its willingness to

1 incorporate and pay for traffic safety features at its facility
2 including the pedestrianization of a portion of Bunker Hill Road
3 NE adjacent to the property using tactical elements (such as
4 planters and flexiposts). The Applicant and the ANC will work
5 together to submit this request to the Public Space Committee at
6 a later date. This partial road closure is very important to
7 the community and will make the roadway design considerably safer
8 for residents."

9 You may have already addressed this, I might have
10 missed it but if you could, if the Applicant's team could address
11 that comment of the ANC 5B at this point.

12 MR. GROOMS: Absolutely. Robert Grooms for the record,
13 with UIP. Happy birthday to you as well.

14 So we've been in close communication with the ANC and
15 it was their -- they expressed the dangers of that particular
16 intersection and particularly with pedestrian and vehicles and
17 we know that there's been a number of fatalities that happened
18 just because of the dangers of that intersection, and so the idea
19 was brought to us by the ANC and supported by the community that
20 if there could be a partial street closure of Bunker Hill Road
21 that part where our project site is, either a partial street
22 closure so that it's one way vehicular traffic only or a full
23 street closure so that it is just pedestrian oriented just along
24 that particular part of our site.

25 That was something that of course because the safety

1 and the well being of the community was important to us and in
2 our design we need to emphasize the need for more pedestrian
3 public safety along 10th Street, and so because it was brought
4 to us and that would be something that we would support, we did
5 say that we would be supportive to that and we would be committed
6 to doing studies and things that needed to be done.

7 However, with that we also expressed to the community
8 that is that property that we own so that is, we can't necessarily
9 fully commit to that without going through the appropriate
10 processes. However if it did come to that and it went through
11 the appropriate processes and that we were in fact able to create
12 that partial street closure, then at that juncture we would be
13 in support of including temporary measures such as flexiposts or
14 planters to block vehicular traffic in support of what the ANC
15 and the community wish to see at that particular intersection.

16 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Well, thank you for that
17 response. Mr. Chairman, I turned off my video because I'm having
18 some connectivity issues. If it gets worse I'll just stop and
19 you can go on to your own questions --

20 CHAIRPERSON HOO: (Indiscernible).

21 VICE CHAIR MILLER: -- in the hearing, but I'll keep
22 my video off for the time being My other question to the
23 Applicant was we have a, and you may have touched on this again,
24 we have a letter that was submitted from neighbors on Perry Place,
25 Northeast, the 900 block of Perry Place, Northeast which they say

1 they're the closest residential street to the property. I just
2 wonder if you could address each of the issues, you may have
3 already addressed it. If you could just could recap briefly,
4 very briefly, each of the -- your response to each of the issues.
5 They support this project going forward generally but they had
6 five issues that they expressed concern about.

7 First was, and so I wanted you to just quickly address
8 them here, first was entrance to -- this is Exhibit 16 submitted
9 I believe yesterday by Cathy Jacquart of 909 Perry Place,
10 Northeast.

11 MR. KADLECEK: I'm happy to -- we're happy to go through
12 them. I have the letter open in front of me if you want me to
13 just go through them.

14 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes, that would be, yes, thank you.
15 That would be very helpful. If you could go through rather than
16 me going through them, that would be very helpful. Thank you.

17 MR. KADLECEK: It's no problem. I'll just save you the
18 time. So I'm happy to do so. Cary Kadlecek from Goulston &
19 Storrs.

20 Just briefly addressing the issues in the letter. They
21 mostly were addressed in our presentation or they all were, but
22 I'll just recap. So the first one has to do with entrance to
23 the parking garage. This is something that we've spoken about,
24 both Mr. Kasdan and Mr. VanPelt have spoken about, how the
25 original design was parking entrance off of Bunker Hill Road and

1 that was a no go (iniscernible) by DDOT so now all the access to
2 loading, parking, bicycle parking is through the alley and that's
3 how we ended up with the design we've got now with respect to
4 that.

5 Adequate parking, as Mr. VanPelt mentioned in his
6 testimony, 99 parking spaces is within the sort of the range that
7 DDOT deemed appropriate for a site this close to transit. Again,
8 it's less than a quarter of a mile from the Brookland and Catholic
9 University metro site. So if the Applicants believe based on the
10 guidance given by DDOT that the number of parking spaces is
11 adequate.

12 The additional height. As Mr. Kasdan noted during the
13 course of his presentation and as also Mr. Grooms touched on, the
14 height for the building has already been shifted to the south
15 block, building B, because of the sculpting that happened through
16 the design process would be (indiscernible) with the neighbors
17 and so that's why the building to the north that is most close
18 to the rowhouse neighborhood on Perry Place it maxes out at 50
19 feet but in fact, I mean if you recall, it actually steps down
20 closer to the alley and so for the portion of that building that's
21 closest to the alley, it's only three stories, and about 38 feet
22 tall so actually just in line with what a rowhouse height is so
23 it's very closely aligned with that.

24 With respect to the side and rear yard requirements,
25 we are no longer requesting rear yard relief. The side yard

1 relief really has to do with some technicalities because those
2 courts where there's indentations, you might know that in the MU
3 zone any setback from the side lot line is considered a side yard
4 so there, some places where we technically don't comply with the
5 side yard requirement even though they sort of look to and act
6 like courts but there's just a few where we don't actually check
7 all the requirements for side yards but nevertheless we need the
8 relief for those and as long as the penthouse setback, it's a
9 minor request for relief.

10 It's on the building A on the norther block there's a
11 stair tower that is not set back from the northernmost building
12 line but it still steps back from the property line. The reason
13 that a penthouse setback relief was needed was just because of
14 that exact setback, step backs rather, that were scaling down to
15 the residential neighborhood to the north but because of the
16 stair tower needs to reach the highest floor of the building,
17 i.e., the penthouse, there and that's the way that the interior
18 (indiscernible), we needed some minor setback relief for that
19 portion of the penthouse. But anywhere else the penthouse
20 complies with setbacks.

21 So those were all essentially addressed in our
22 presentation, but in answer to your question, Mr. Miller, that's
23 just a recap of how we responded to all those issues, most of
24 which have been addressed in the design itself.

25 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I appreciate that response, Mr.

1 Kadlecek, and another recap question. I know Commissioner
2 Imamura asked about this and I think Chairman Hood may have more
3 questions, but if you can again just recap how the existing
4 commercial businesses, this is designated as a neighborhood
5 commercial center on the generalized policy map of the
6 comprehensive plan. You're proposing very commendably a lot of
7 residential, 337 residential units over ten percent of which I
8 think are going to be affordable under our inclusionary zoning
9 regulations and 30,000 square feet of retail.

10 But if you can just again address how the existing
11 commercial and maybe PDR retails there since PDR is designated
12 for a very small portion of this site and there's apparently I
13 guess one existing use electronics related or auto related, I
14 don't know, that may fit into that category. If you could just
15 recap how you're accommodating or making commitments to existing
16 commercial retail tenants and/or PDR tenants and your vision for
17 what's going to come back into that space. That's a question
18 we've always asked even before we had our racial equity analysis
19 tool, but it's been emphasized even more so, potential
20 displacement not only of residents which isn't the case here
21 although many, many decades ago it may have been in terms of
22 residents being there. But if you can just address how the
23 existing resident, existing businesses and the new businesses
24 will be accommodated, again.

25 MR. GROOMS: Absolutely. Thanks for the question.

1 Robert Grooms with UIP for the record.

2 So we are bringing back the same amount of retails
3 that's actually existing there on site now and we have engaged
4 with two of the largest retail tenants that's currently on site,
5 the District Veterinarian and Petit Scholars. With District
6 Veterinarian we've already committed to having them to return,
7 so that's something that is already a firm commitment and in
8 respect to Petit Scholars, we've begun those talks and they're
9 interested to be able to return as well and so it's a goal of
10 ours to get Petit Scholars to be able to return to the site
11 because we do believe that they're (indiscernible) and so that
12 -- and that's something that we've also heard from the neighbors
13 as well. So that's the desire, and that's a desire of ours as
14 well, and then also Pizza Bolis as well is an existing tenant
15 that we've already been able to get a commitment to return as
16 well.

17 In respect to the other existing retail that's on site,
18 we don't any substantial updates there yet. We are still very
19 early in the process of exploring all of our retail opportunities.
20 We've heard from the neighbors that they desire to have small
21 businesses, local businesses and community-supported businesses
22 to return to the site so that's something that we're actively
23 engaged in and trying to facilitate as well.

24 In addition, we've even expressed with the many groups
25 that we've reached out to that we're, you know, we're happy to

1 search for any small businesses that may have been displaced by
2 developments within proximity to ours, and so if that's any type
3 of relationship, hardship, that we've created to get them to
4 return to our site that's something that we're committed to
5 facilitating also.

6 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you for that response, Mr.
7 Grooms. The bowling alley, I'm not familiar with the bowling
8 alley but when did the bowling alley go out of existence? Was
9 it, it must have been -- might have been decades ago but I'm
10 pleased to see how you're preserving the façade of the historic
11 bowling alley. I assume bowling alley use is not envisioned as
12 part of this development or is it possible, or maybe there's
13 already, I don't know, is there already new bowling alley use in
14 the neighborhood? There's a lot of new entertainment uses that
15 are cropping up all over, but can you just address my curiosity
16 about the bowling alley historic use and maybe potential future
17 use?

18 MR. GROOMS: Absolutely. Robert Grooms, UIP for the
19 record. And so the bowling alley originally built in 1938 as a
20 duckpin bowling lanes. The bowling alley operated until about
21 the mid century. That's when a interior fire actually destroyed
22 the interior and then it was renovated to now be the Atlantic
23 Electric Building. So it's been operating as the Atlantic
24 Electric since about the mid century.

25 In respect to the new development, we do not have, it's

1 not our intent to actually propose a bowling alley per se that's
2 open to the public. However, we will be playing off of that
3 history, that design imagery, so it will be a feature if you will
4 in terms of our interior packages and that's kind of the theme
5 that will play up with the interior design of the building. So,
6 you know, thinking about maybe we could take the old folding
7 floors and repurpose them with an (indiscernible).

8 So there's not going to be a specific bowling alley
9 that is operational and open to the public, it's just going to
10 be a design as we recall the history of the Atlantic Electric
11 building.

12 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Well, thank you for that
13 response. I wanted to associate myself with the, particularly
14 with the landscaping and LEED gold sustainability comments of my
15 fellow Commissioners and just a final question.

16 On the housing, which is mostly what this project is,
17 337 housing units compared to some which of are, two of which I
18 think are affordable to 60 percent MFI and then there are some
19 triggered by the 50 percent. Can you just specifically tell me
20 how much is triggered by the penthouse? How much of the 50
21 percent MFI square footage is triggered by the penthouse space
22 and what the size configuration is at both the market rate and
23 the affordable housing? I'm sure that's in the record but if
24 you could just recap that again for us. Thank you.

25 MR. KADLECEK: Yes. We'll pull up that penthouse

1 | habitable space, that it would be, Mr. Miller, as you know it
2 | would be ten percent of the habitable penthouse space would be
3 | devoted to 50 percent MFI units. We're looking up exactly what
4 | the penthouse floor (phonetic) is right now to give you an
5 | estimate of what that would be, but yes and as you noted in the
6 | record, it's approximately 32 IZ units would be generated by this
7 | project at 60 percent MFI mostly and then of course some of the
8 | few 50 percent that would be generated by the penthouse. But we
9 | can get that number if you want to move on to another question
10 | in the meantime.

11 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Thank you. That would be
12 | fine. Okay, thank you, Mr. Kadlecek and Mr. Kasdan and the
13 | Applicant's team and thank you to my fellow Commissioners. That's
14 | it for me now, Mr. Chairman.

15 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Vice Chair Miller. Mr.
16 | Grooms, let me ask and I'm -- let me start with you, Mr. Kadlecek,
17 | and I'm going to ask everyone else to go on mute. Mr. Kadlecek,
18 | why does the Zoning Commission do voluntary design review? What
19 | do you think? Why are we even doing this? Why did we even create
20 | this?

21 | MR. KADLECEK: Sorry, I was muted there. Cary Kadlecek
22 | from Goulston & Storrs on behalf of the Applicant for the record.

23 | That's a good question. I don't want to speak for the
24 | Office of Planning but my understanding is the voluntary design
25 | review process is essentially a way for a project to avail itself

1 for design review in exchange for some flexibility from the design
2 standards, but not density.

3 So it's basically, it's sort of a catch all way to get
4 some flexibility height and some of the other design standards
5 that are laid out in order to essentially, you know, not have to
6 go through the BZA and get a bunch of relief and sort of doing
7 it a more cohesive way. But it isn't a PUD. There's no more
8 density that's being sought here. It's really just flexibility
9 in a way that otherwise meets the matter-of-right standards for
10 the zone.

11 So that's my understanding of it but I don't want to
12 speak for OP and what their intent was in creating it, but that
13 is how we in the development community have used it thus far.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I think -- I'm going to give
15 you 50 percent correct and let me give you the other 50 percent
16 correct and when I say that, that's not to the question, I'm just
17 giving you 50 percent for each question.

18 My next question to you is, do you know what the name
19 of the bridge is that is right near the project that you all are
20 proposing? Michigan Avenue there's a bridge. I've asked this
21 question across the street, they didn't know, so I'm asking now
22 on this side of the street. Do you know what the name of the
23 bridge is?

24 MR. KADLECEK: I'm looking at our team. I don't think
25 anyone knows it, no. Sorry.

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Noone knows what the name of the
2 bridge is? The name of the bridge is Charles Drew. It was done
3 in 1982 by former, the late Mayor Marion Barry, and look it up.
4 Mayor Jarvis would kill me if I didn't mention that and I think
5 it's important when we start developing neighborhoods that we
6 find out all the specifics that are going around the neighborhood,
7 and I'll leave it at that for now.

8 I will -- in full disclosure, I did notice, I was coming
9 home from church and I saw this green sign so I got out the car,
10 went up to the electrical building which I know it to be Atlantic
11 Electric and said there's a zoning case here. So that was my
12 first noticing. I left it alone at that point. So one of the
13 things that concerns me, I'm not sure if you all are aware about
14 Turkey Thicket. Turkey Thicket in Ward 5 in the City is a major
15 voting place and I'm very concerned about 10th Street and traffic
16 and some of the other things that have already come up. What
17 mitigations, and I probably should more or less ask DDOT is there
18 any parking being taken away on 10th Street?

19 Well, let me back up. Let me back up. Taking away
20 the curb cuts I think actually helps and I'm leaving, okay, I
21 see, Dan, I'm sorry, Mr. VanPelt shaking his head. So I'm going
22 to let you, because you know I'm always interested in traffic.
23 So tell me about 10th Street. Right now 10th Street without this
24 project and what we have existing is an issue. What mitigations
25 do you have in place to make sure we do not expound upon that

1 problem?

2 MR. VANPELT: Chairman Hood, for the record Dan VanPelt
3 with Gorove Slade.

4 So I think one of the things about this project is
5 there are very active uses currently on the site today and
6 actually in the CTR and I looked at what the new uses on the
7 site, we're actually at a decrease in peak hour distress
8 (phonetic). I think that's going to be helpful for the
9 neighborhood in terms of traffic on 10th Street because some of
10 those nearby intersections, especially Michigan, they're all
11 distressed during peak times.

12 But I think in terms of what this site will be doing
13 where it's actually reducing the number of vehicular trips with
14 this proposed development, and I think the other thing that you
15 picked up on, Chairman Hood, is that with this redevelopment it's
16 just a number of curb cuts and I think as Mr. Dettman, Shane,
17 testified earlier I think it's 200 feet or so of curb cuts that
18 goes away. That's an opportunity for at least ten more parking
19 spaces that don't exist there today. We'll go through them as
20 we detail the public realm and work through that process, approval
21 process with DDOT, what we want to do is find opportunities for
22 more street parking so the taxpayers (indiscernible) this project
23 in the community and then the issue as to the parking actually
24 helps the traffic (indiscernible) putting some friction
25 (phonetic), this helpfully slows down the traffic and that makes

1 | it, you know, buffers for pedestrians on the sidewalk.

2 | So I hope that helps answer your questions.

3 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: It does, and I thank you, Mr.
4 | VanPelt. Mr. VanPelt, the other thing is I think the residents
5 | on Perry Place, they asked for some assistance, I think the zone
6 | parking, and you know what I think about zone parking. But I
7 | would like to just ask, and with your help, if you all could
8 | reach out to the residents on Perry Place. Perry Place is a cul-
9 | de-sac. You just go, you go up, you turn around and you come
10 | back out. I think it's very important that we work with the
11 | residents, and I'm talking to Mr. Grooms and others, that we work
12 | with the residents. I think it's still, I don't believe they'd
13 | opened it up but I think that it's important that we work with
14 | those residents to give them some relief because those of us in
15 | this area, in this City, we go over to Turkey Thicket, we pick
16 | 10th Street to park on for the most part.

17 | Let's talk about, thank you, Mr. VanPelt, Mr. Kadlecek
18 | and Mr. Grooms, let's talk about the Bunker Hill Road and the
19 | alley entrances, and I think this is maybe explained and I
20 | appreciate my colleagues really drilling down on a lot of the
21 | other questions which I don't need to mention again, but I do
22 | support everything I've heard from my colleagues and especially
23 | Commissioner Stidham and Imamura, and Vice Chair Miller. But
24 | Commissioner Stidham said something about the different groups,
25 | I think Brookland and Edgewood.

1 One of the things I know about, I've been in this City
2 a long time, well I've been on this Commission a long time and
3 been in the community doing community work myself. If Michael
4 Clark, President Clark, knew this project he would weigh in. So
5 I do want to see that you are, I know you went to Chairperson
6 Costello and the rest of them, I get that. But I think Clark
7 and the rest of them have not been, because that name was
8 mentioned, not his name but his association and he usually weighs
9 in. So I want to make sure that Mr. Clark weighs in. These are
10 people and the Commission, we live in the City too. These are
11 people we face. They've come to us and said well, why did you
12 all do that? You know, we didn't have an input. So I appreciate
13 Commissioner Stidham bringing that up. I'd like to see that, I
14 think this is a one vote case and we want to move forward.

15 Before I forget, Mr. Kadlecsek, you actually got 100 on
16 your question. I appreciate that. I want to make sure I tell
17 you that. But the reason I'm not giving you 100 because you
18 didn't get the second part of the question, so I'm going to give
19 you 50. So thank you.

20 Now, my colleagues have hit a lot of this. I do think,
21 I do like the idea of getting rid of some of the curb cuts on
22 10th Street because right now for me when I'm over there to me
23 it's a disaster at times. Not all the time, but it's very busy
24 over there and I want to make sure that's mitigated.

25 One of the businesses, and I'm not sure if it's still

1 | there, was there -- is that club still over there? It had the
2 | biggest square footage or has that club left? Or are you all
3 | aware of that, maybe they left, about the club that, it's years.
4 | I'm not sure.

5 | MR. KADLECEK: Yes, we're, Chairman Hood, we're not
6 | aware of any club --

7 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

8 | MR. KADLECEK: -- so I think it must be gone.

9 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So it's gone? Okay. And let me
10 | just say this. Please make sure we work with Petit Scholars. I
11 | think the citizens need that type of business and this is not
12 | the first case that we've heard about Petit Scholars, dealing
13 | with our young folks and daycare I think it's very important. So
14 | I'm sure that hopefully you can work it out with Petit Scholars.

15 | But I'm concerned about, I think we said we're going
16 | to use the alley. Is that, are we talking about the north alley
17 | or the south entrance which is Bunker Hill Road to go back and
18 | forth into the parking area?

19 | MR. KADLECEK: There's only one alley that's a public
20 | alley, so it's to the north of where this project site is between
21 | where the project site is and to the Perry Place neighborhood to
22 | the north there's a 20 foot wide (indiscernible) that would serve
23 | as a loading and the parking and the bicycle parking for the
24 | project.

25 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So I'll ask that question and I'll

1 be frankly honest. Bunker Hill Road looks to me like an alley,
2 but it's not so it must be very low maintenance. All right. And
3 that's what gets you back up until, what's that, cable television.
4 Is that correct?

5 MR. GROOMS: Yes, that's correct. Robert Grooms, for
6 the record, UIP. Yes, that's correct. Comcast is just to the
7 west of us.

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So Comcast, that's not part
9 of the project? They're not included?

10 MR. GROOMS: That's correct.

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay, good. Now, let's talk about
12 Enterprise. What are discussions going on like with Enterprise,
13 and I get the Pizza Bolis, I get all that, but what about
14 Enterprise?

15 MR. GROOMS: So, again, Robert Grooms for the record,
16 with UIP. It's my understanding that Enterprise's desire is to
17 find another location. So they have no desire to return and as
18 far as I'm aware they're seeking alternative retail space.

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. But do you all had, you all
20 did try to make an offer to them for them to stay?

21 MR. GROOMS: We had to have made an offer for them to
22 stay just because it is retail use that is not in conjunction
23 with what we're trying to bring to the community and what
24 community members had expressed to us, and in addition, and our
25 efforts to make it more pedestrian friendly, pedestrian oriented

1 along 10th Street, having a rental car facility that would require
2 us keeping preserving curb cuts is just not in the line of what
3 we're trying to bring to the community and what the community
4 has expressed as well.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I certainly am not going to
6 try to undo what the community has worked on and I'm sure if you
7 got a, not necessarily unanimous, but if you got a majority of a
8 community to delay (phonetic) a project working with the
9 community, I'm not going to try to undo that here.

10 Let me ask you this, Mr. Grooms. Who from your
11 development team is from the community?

12 MR. GROOMS: I cannot speak specifically on who's from
13 the community but we are -- our corporate office is located within
14 the larger Brookland or ANC 5 areas and so we do patronize or
15 line up the businesses that are around and many of us do live in
16 D.C. and then, you know, we also do work and play in the area.
17 But in terms of who specifically is from the community that's
18 just information that I don't have available.

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So I'm glad to hear that you
20 all are in the Ward 5 area and that's not necessarily a
21 requirement, but I've always, and you're not the first person.
22 I ask this question all over the City. I think it's very
23 important is that the people who are making these decisions in
24 collaboration with our community are people who know the
25 community. A lot of times people come in and make these

1 recommendations and they don't understand the community and what
2 better way to have a partnership like I think what you've done
3 from what I see in this record.

4 Let's go back to the alley, well you all it's Bunker
5 hill Road. Explain to me again how that's going to be used, Mr.
6 VanPelt? What's going on with Bunker Hill Road and why was there
7 a request to either close it off and use half of it, what was
8 the genesis behind all of that?

9 MR. VANPELT: Would it be helpful to pull back up that
10 diagram that shows the circulation? Maybe that would be --

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

12 MR. VANPELT: -- (indiscernible) Mr. Young could pull
13 it up.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: That would be very helpful. Thank
15 you.

16 MR. VANPELT: And, again, Dan VanPelt with Gorove
17 Slade. I think it was discussed earlier by Mr. Kasdan, we talked
18 with DDOT early on and originally the plan was for access from
19 Bunker Hill, so on the right hand side of this image there was a
20 curb cut that had access from Bunker Hill into the parking and I
21 understand that that was really the community's desire to orient
22 that traffic either access away from the townhomes on the north
23 (phonetic).

24 We talked with DDOT early on and DDOT, as you know and
25 we all know with DDOT and I'm sure they're going to talk about

1 | this when they give their staff report, it's really important for
2 | them in terms of the public realm and that pedestrian character
3 | and know that the metro station is to the south and we're going
4 | to have future pedestrians, future residents that are going to
5 | be using this new space, they want them, have it be very
6 | pedestrian friendly and we have a public alley. There's a public
7 | right-of-way that exists on the northside and behind this
8 | property that the policy was use that first. DDOT told us that
9 | the plan that we had previously had we needed to rethink that
10 | and we need to reorient our access towards the public alley system
11 | (indiscernible) access policy reasons.

12 | So that's the plan that we have in (indiscernible) map
13 | today where we have using an alley that is on the north which is
14 | on the left side of the page that comes off 10th Street along
15 | the north side of the project and then wraps around on the
16 | western side (indiscernible) on the page here to go back to the
17 | parking and the loading facility areas of the project. That's
18 | how we ended up at this current design.

19 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. And let me just add I do like
20 | the design. I like the concept of how we're keeping, which I
21 | did not know, I learned something different. Ever since I've
22 | been around and can remember I thought it was electric. It might
23 | have been something before that but when you go in there now I
24 | do know that it might have been a bowling alley which must have
25 | left in the 50s or 60s. I don't think it left in the 70s. If

1 | it did I just don't remember.

2 | But let me just ask, what is it? We're not widening
3 | the street, are we or are these pictures just deceiving me and I
4 | now they're not to scale, but are we widening 10th Street? Are
5 | we making it wider?

6 | MR. VANPELT: No, I don't believe there's any intent
7 | to widen the car way (phonetic).

8 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Because I will tell you, as wide as
9 | it is when I look on some of these views, that would solve some
10 | of my issues with 10th Street. But I can't just blame it on this
11 | project because I think as go further down towards the recreation
12 | center, it gets even more confined and that's one of the issues
13 | that I had. But I can bring that all that up with DDOT and,
14 | again, if we can drill down with updating the plans, as my
15 | colleagues have already mentioned, Commissioner Imamura in
16 | particular, and also Commissioner Stidham and Vice Chair Miller.
17 | But one of the things I will say is that I think this is a one
18 | vote case. Mr. Kadlecek on that, or our counsel?

19 | Hold on one second. How you doing Archie (phonetic)?
20 | Archie, is this a one vote case?

21 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: Archie? Anthony's asking a
22 | question.

23 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Is this a one vote case?

24 | ARCHIE: Yes or no.

25 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes or no.

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: He says no. Okay. Ms.?

2 MS. LOVICK: This is Hilary. Yes.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Lovick. Good
4 to see you, Archie. Good to see you buddy. I saw you the other
5 day, I wanted to wave to you. You must like zoning man. It's
6 good to see you.

7 All right. So, Mr. Kadlecek, this is a one vote case
8 so all those things when you have all that ready before we move
9 forward. I don't have any additional questions. Again, I do
10 like the project and I'm glad that it's working out like it is.

11 Oh, I do have one more question before I go to
12 Commissioner Imamura. In your analysis, Mr. VanPelt, I believe
13 it's more of the metro. That's another thing that gives me the,
14 the metro's right behind. Is there a way other than walking out
15 on 10th Street and going across, isn't there a back way and still
16 be able to go to the Brookland metro station as opposed to walking
17 out? There used to be a back a back way.

18 MR. VANPELT: Yes. I think -- are you talking about
19 the building itself or are you talking about the metro station?

20 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: From the building. Is there going
21 to be a way for me to go the back way, or the citizens to go the
22 back way to the metro as opposed to walking up and going across
23 the Charles Drew Bridge and going around from the --

24 MR. VANPELT: You can go under. You can take Bunker
25 Hill and go under. So if you want to --

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

2 MR. VANPELT: -- sorry.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So under, okay. So, all
4 right. I appreciate you all answering my questions. Some of
5 them may have been redundant but when you go last that happens.

6 Commissioner Imamura, you have any follow-up?

7 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Just one more. Thank you, Mr.
8 Chairman. You helped remind me to ask Mr. VanPelt. I understand
9 that, you know, the design team's a little handcuffed to your
10 based off of DDOT's decision to move the entrance, the vehicular
11 entrance and loading north to the alley. I'm curious, Mr.
12 VanPelt, in your professional opinion is there, there's no
13 measurement there and no dimensions for the alley. Is it
14 sufficiently wide enough or is it -- are there plans to widen it
15 to handle a.m./p.m. peak trips for 300 and some residents to come
16 in and out of and loading both directions?

17 MR. VANPELT: Sorry, I hit the wrong button there. Dan
18 VanPelt with Gorove Slade.

19 So the width of the alley is 20 feet and there's no,
20 and that is the intent is to have the alley be 20 feet wide and
21 with 20 feet of dimension, two trucks can pass one another and
22 that's pretty common that we see in the commercial areas of the
23 District where you have two way traffic flow and you can have
24 loading activity in both directions.

25 So 20 feet is sufficient for the type of access that

1 we're talking about here where you're going to have a mix of
2 commercial vehicles coming to the loading facility and we have
3 99 parking spaces so it's, you know, it's a relatively good sized
4 garage but it's not a huge garage by any means. So with that
5 width, and we have the capacity that we need to serve this
6 project.

7 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: All right. Thank you, Mr.
8 VanPelt. Certainly agree with you and the rest of the project
9 team that Bunker Hill Road I think would have been a great
10 solution but I certainly understand DDOT's preference to take the
11 entrance up north to the alley.

12 All right. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and thank you Mr.
13 VanPelt. Appreciate your response.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Good. Thank you. Let me, Vice
15 Chair I see your hand. Do you have any further questions?

16 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes. Archie reminded me to ask
17 you, Mr. Chairman, one additional question which might have
18 already been addressed But the concern, not the concern but
19 the recommendation by the Office of Planning's urban design
20 division to incorporate additional balconies into the south
21 building. Did you already respond to that? Mr. Kadlecek or Mr.
22 Kasdan?

23 MR. KASDAN: Yes. For the record, Ben Kasdan, KGTy.

24 Yes, so we are proposing 47 percent of the street facing
25 (indiscernible) balconies in the south building.

1 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I'm sorry. Could you repeat that
2 again?

3 MR. KASDAN: We're proposing 47 percent of the street
4 facing units, south balconies in the south building.

5 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Was it increased as a result
6 of the Office of Planning's comments or that was the proposal
7 that they were commenting on?

8 MR. KASDAN: That was the proposal they're commenting
9 on and we're not proposing increasing at this time.

10 VICE CHAIR MILLER: And why are you not?

11 MR. KASDAN: Because we have the amount of balconies
12 based upon our back and forth with the Historic Preservation
13 Planning Board.

14 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. I should probably review
15 that dialogue that you had with the design review body of this
16 government. I certainly don't want to second guess or make you
17 have to run through multiple design hoops beyond the hoops that
18 you already are jumping through. So, 47 percent is pretty good,
19 so okay. Thank you very much.

20 COMMISSIOENR IMAMURA: Mr. Chairman, I just have one
21 more, sorry.

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Commissioner Imamura.

23 COMMISSIOENR IMAMURA: Thank you, sir. Sorry. I'll
24 make this quick.

25 Mr. VanPelt, I just wanted to bring clarity for the

1 record here. The Perry Place folks had just, I know in the letter
2 wanted to confirm but I think given our dialogue I think I
3 understand but want to just put it for the record. They wanted
4 to know that whether or not the alley would be one way eastbound
5 beyond the parking garage entrance but I don't think that's the
6 case. It's two way, is that right, the way you're proposing it?

7 MR. VANPELT: Yes. I think, and this is Dan VanPelt
8 with Gorove Slade, there is a portion once you get to the part
9 of the project where the alley is signed one way and goes on the
10 private (phonetic) property, but the portion of the alley that
11 we're talking about is immediately north of this project from
12 10th Street would be two ways. So traffic would be expected to
13 come in and out that same piece of alley from 10th Street.

14 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: All right. That's what I wanted
15 to clarify. Thank you, Mr. VanPelt. Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
16 for your indulgence.

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Sure. Any follow-up questions? All
18 right.

19 Mr. Grooms, I do have two quick comments. When you
20 mentioned the neighborhood engaged in different businesses, and
21 this may be in the record, I'm just looking at the list of tenants
22 that exist now and I have missed it once. What are some of the
23 businesses, if you're able to tell me, I know when you're under
24 contract sometimes you can't, but what's some of the type of
25 businesses that the neighborhood is asking you all to try to

1 receive in this area?

2 MR. GROOMS: So definitely any type of dining retail
3 facility, things that are complementary to activities that will
4 go on at Turkey Thicket, for example, and the example that we
5 talked with the community, you go to Turkey Thicket Park, spend
6 a day at the playground and then you can come across to our site
7 to get perhaps coffee, perhaps ice cream. So things that are
8 very neighborhood supportive and so we don't have any specific
9 commitments from those type of retail facilities at this juncture
10 just because of where we are in the process but that is our focus
11 to get retailers that are community supportive that would provide
12 complimentary type of retail experience.

13 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And I will say this, Mr. Grooms, and
14 I mean this lightheartedly, that I do frequent that street, 10th
15 Street, and if this is approved and everything goes forward and
16 I get into a lot of traffic on 10th Street, I want you to know
17 that I will be thinking about you for years to come because I
18 tell everybody that. When you tell me something in zoning, I
19 think about you when I'm sitting there in traffic. So I want
20 you to know you will be remembered by me, so.

21 All right. Thank you all for your presentation. Thank
22 you all. All right. Let's see if we, Ms. Schellin, do we have
23 anyone here from the ANC?

24 MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir. They will not be participating.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. All right. Get my agenda up,

1 and I think, colleagues, there were some very good questions on
2 drilling down. I like that. I can't find my agenda though.

3 Okay. Let's go -- Ms. Schellin, do we have any other
4 reports from other government agencies that we have not
5 mentioned? I know we've got DDOT and OP coming, but any others?

6 MS. SCHELLIN: No others.

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

8 MS. SCHELLIN: No others.

9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let's bring up, is Mr. Zimmerman?

10 MS. SCHELLIN: It's going to be, Noah Hagen is here
11 now.

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Mr. Hagen, if you --

13 MS. SCHELLIN: And Mr. Jesick.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: -- and Mr. Jesick in that order.
15 Let's go to DDOT first and then OP. Thank you. You may begin.

16 MR. HAGEN: Good evening, Chairman Hood and members of
17 the Commission. For the record I'm Noah Hagen with the District
18 Department of Transportation.

19 DDOT is supportive of the Applicant's proposal to
20 redevelop the former Brookland Lanes property. In their October
21 13th report, Exhibit 13 in the record, we recommended approval
22 with one condition which is the implementation of our
23 transportation demand management plan and as you heard in the
24 Applicant's presentation, they've agreed to our requested
25 conditions and with those included in the zoning order, DDOT has

1 no objection to the approval of this application.

2 We look forward to continuing to work with the
3 Applicant on the design of the streetscape and the curbside
4 management plan as they go through public safe permitting and I'd
5 be happy to answer any questions.

6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Mr. Hagen, and Mr. Hagen,
7 let me apologize, Ms. Schellin and myself, for pronouncing your
8 name incorrectly. Hopefully it won't take me as long to get your
9 name corrected as it did another person who used to present in
10 front of us. Took me almost five or six years to get her name
11 correct, but hopefully I have Mr. Hagen down.

12 So let's see if we have any questions or comments.
13 Commissioner Imamura?

14 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr.
15 Hagen, if you could just articulate a decision that DDOT made.
16 We heard in response from the Applicant why entrance into the
17 building is from the alley, not from Bunker Hill but can you just
18 articulate why DDOT made that decision or encouraged the
19 Applicant to reconsider?

20 MR. HAGEN: Yes, absolutely. So it's DDOT's policy
21 that when an alley is available vehicular parking is provided
22 from that alley and the reason for that is that curb cuts are
23 detrimental to the pedestrian realm since they create conflict
24 between vehicles and pedestrians and especially since it's along
25 a walking route to the metro. You know, we thought it was really

1 | important that there'd be an unbroken pedestrian path along that
2 | area and also the green space and curbside parking and street
3 | trees could also remain along there which wouldn't be possible
4 | with a curb cut in that area.

5 | COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Hagen. From the
6 | aerial view it appears that there's a couple of other curb cuts
7 | there along Bunker Hill immediately adjacent. So I certainly
8 | appreciate the uninterrupted pedestrian public realm for
9 | pedestrian safety but it just appears that there's some other
10 | curb cuts for parking along Bunker Hill. But I appreciate your
11 | response and that's all I have, Mr. Chairman.

12 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Commissioner Imamura.
13 | Any other questions? Okay. Commissioner Stidham and Vice Chair
14 | Miller, any other questions? Oh, okay.

15 | Let's go to -- let's see if the Applicant has any
16 | questions of Mr. Hagen. It got it right that time, Mr. Hagen.
17 | The next time I'll probably have it messed up but work with me,
18 | and I appreciate your understanding. Mr. Kadlecek, do you have
19 | any questions of DDOT?

20 | MR. KADLECEK: No questions. Thank you.

21 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Hagen, I'm not going to ask you
22 | any questions. I think Commissioner Imamura asked what I would
23 | ask and I may as well not drill down. I think you all are the
24 | experts. You all are the award winning Department of
25 | Transportation. I don't necessarily always agree but you all

1 have the awards, I don't. So thank you very much for your
2 presentation and your analysis.

3 Mr. Jesick, you may begin.

4 MR. JESICK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the
5 Commission.

6 The Office of Planning recommends that the Commission
7 approve this design review application. We found that it met the
8 design review criteria of Subtitle X, § 604 which seek to promote
9 a safe pedestrian environment, active public spaces, historic
10 preservation, attractive architecture and sustainability, and we
11 are very supportive of the architecture.

12 The Applicant team, as noted, has already gone before
13 the HPRB and worked with HPRB staff to preserve the Brookland
14 Lanes building and pushed the massive and new construction away
15 from the historic building so they would still read as an
16 independent structure on the streetscape. Other features that
17 we found compelling include the public plazas, the closing of the
18 multiple curb cuts, access to all parking and loading from the
19 alley, the visually porous ground floor of the commercial area
20 and the way the building steps down to the north to better relate
21 to the existing residential development.

22 As the Applicant has noted, they've requested a handful
23 of areas of flexibility and relief and I won't get into a lot of
24 detail there except to say that OP supports those areas of
25 flexibility and relief. We also thank the Applicant for working

1 with us to simplify that a little bit removing the request for
2 rear yard relief and also removing the request to put penthouse
3 habitable space in the setback area which we think is an
4 improvement.

5 Next slide, please, Mr. Young. Subtitle X also asks
6 us to evaluate the project's consistency with the comprehensive
7 plan and we do this through a racial equity lens and our full
8 racial equity analysis can be found beginning on page 15 of our
9 report. But just to summarize the project would further a number
10 of policies related to equity. At the top of that list is housing
11 and affordable housing. The project would provide a large number
12 of housing units, both market rate and affordable through the IZ
13 requirement and that would go a long way toward meeting the
14 Mayor's housing goal for the upper Northeast planning area.

15 As has been discussed quite a bit this evening, the
16 project would improve connectivity and walkability and provide a
17 lot of transportation access to every mode of transport,
18 especially metro rail, metro bus, but also the site is in a very
19 walkable location to lots of amenities. It's very bikeable and
20 even automobile, there's a lot of access especially given the
21 proximity to Michigan Avenue and then of course historic
22 preservation by preserving a key element of the neighborhood's
23 history, you're preserving or enhancing the equity by recognizing
24 the populations that have lived in the neighborhood in the past.

25 We look forward to potentially seeing additional

1 information from the Applicant regarding sustainability as noted
2 by the Commission, and we appreciate the information provided
3 tonight about those small local businesses that are going to be
4 returning to the site, so we appreciate the Applicant updating
5 us with that information.

6 Just quickly in regard to the future land use map.
7 There is no PUD for this project. There's no map amendment, so
8 the MU-4 zone would continue to apply and this project is
9 consistent with the MU-4 zone and the zone itself is consistent
10 with the future land use map which does call for a mix of moderate
11 to medium density mixed uses on the site. So in summary, when
12 evaluated through a racial equity lens the project would not be
13 inconsistent with the comprehensive plan.

14 Next slide, please, Mr. Young. And these are the bullet
15 points that we just pulled from our written report and the
16 Commission discussed these at length and we appreciate the
17 Applicant providing more information on these items tonight, and
18 the Commission asking some more detailed questions about those.
19 Our recommendation was not subject to any resolution of these
20 items but we felt that it would help to round out the discussion
21 of the project so we appreciate the new information.

22 That concludes my verbal testimony. But again, OP
23 recommends approval and I would be happy to take any questions.
24 Thank you.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Mr. Jesick, and let me

1 | thank you and the Office of Planning for your first page
2 | acknowledging the bridge that I've been trying to make sure that
3 | everybody knows the name of, so thank you and that did not fall
4 | on deaf ears for me. So thank you very much for putting that on
5 | your presentation.

6 | Let's see if we have any questions or comments.
7 | Commissioner Imamura?

8 | COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Just a comment, Mr. Jesick. I
9 | always appreciate your matter of fact reports and thank you for
10 | addressing how this potential project might impact the trends in
11 | the neighborhood. So I appreciate that, and also want to thank
12 | OP for working with the Applicant. I agree with you, Mr. Jesick,
13 | that the architecture is good and I do appreciate the fact, while
14 | I didn't share this with the Applicant, appreciate how they've
15 | celebrated the historic building and the public gathering space
16 | and it's in a good location. I think I just wish I would have
17 | been able to hear a little bit more about the details, seeing a
18 | little more detail in the landscape (indiscernible).

19 | Thank you, Mr. Jesick.

20 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Commissioner Stidham, any
21 | questions of the Office of Planning? Okay. I'm sure you said
22 | no. Vice Chair --

23 | COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Sorry. I couldn't get off mute
24 | fast enough.

25 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. Vice Chair Miller?

1 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank
2 you, Mr. Jesick, for your report. Appreciate it.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I too thank you, Mr. Jesick, as
4 well. So that way you have a unanimous vote. Thank you for your
5 report.

6 Before you go, let's see Mr. Kadlecek, do you have any
7 questions, cross or anything of the Office of Planning?

8 MR. KADLECEK: No questions. Thank you.

9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you very much.
10 Appreciate it, Mr. Jesick, thank you. All right. Ms. Schellin,
11 I think we are ready to go, the ANC voted. We do, Exhibit 17 I
12 think has been updated but the ANC voted I believe unanimously
13 in support of this project and I'll just leave it at that. ANC
14 5B and thank Chairperson Costello and the other Commissioners for
15 what they have done. Let's see here. Okay.

16 Ms. Schellin, do we have anyone who would like to
17 testify in support, opposition or undeclared?

18 MS. SCHELLIN: We only have one person signed up this
19 evening to testify and that is John Feeley.

20 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Let's bring --

21 MS. SCHELLIN: And he's in opposition.

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let's bring Mr. Feeley up. Mr.
23 Feeley.

24 MR. FEELEY: All right. Can you hear me?

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes, we can. You may begin.

1 Introduce yourself, you may begin.

2 MR. FEELEY: Yes, my name is John Feeley. I'm a life
3 long resident of Brookland and I live near the proposed Brookland
4 Lane development. I've long been interested in the preservation
5 of historic resources in the Brookland and the former Brookland
6 bowling alley.

7 I oppose the granting of some of the zoning relief
8 requested in Application 22-15 by Brookland Plaza Owners, LLC.
9 I request that my objections be included in the record log for
10 this hearing. Work and health demands prevented me from
11 submitting my objections 24 hours before this hearing. I hope
12 that the Commission would understand that for me.

13 The Applicants are requesting flexibility to allow
14 additional building height on the southern portion of the
15 development to a height of 65 feet. First of all, this proposed
16 height is over the height limit of 50 feet included in the
17 Brookland CUA small area plan of 2009 and incorporated into the
18 D.C. Comprehensive Plan of 2021. Heights over 50 feet would
19 require a planned unit development to get that relief they seek.
20 Also this proposed height for the southern section of the
21 development would contrast with the 50 foot proposed height for
22 the northern section and these contrasting heights would create
23 an imbalanced roof line that ignores the central portion of the
24 proposed development of the Brookland bowling alley building.

25 The building itself is a classic symmetrical art deco

1 structure. The norther and southern sides of the development
2 should compliment this essential symmetrical design element by
3 both confirming to a height of 50 feet.

4 Also to preserve the balance, design and vision in
5 reference to height, I would object to the request for the
6 flexibility they want following side yard and back yard
7 requirements in either the northern or southern portions of the
8 development. Similar side and back yard dimensions should be
9 used on both the northern and southern sections of the development
10 for balance, I think.

11 I also am concerned about the project's impact on the
12 adjacent residential neighborhood, the Perry Place rowhouses and
13 the Turkey Thicket garden apartments. These adjacent
14 neighborhood dwellings conform to the existing requirements for
15 the size of side and back yards and the new development should
16 conform to these limits. In doing so I think that that will also
17 prese3rve the normal buffer areas and spaciousness that already
18 exists in the neighborhood.

19 In closing, I also share the concerns raised about
20 additional parking impact for the immediate neighborhood and the
21 entrance from 10th Street for the proposed parking garage. I
22 agree with the suggestion that this entrance should be approached
23 from an alley extension with access from Bunker Hill Road on the
24 southern end of the project and I thank the Commission for the
25 opportunity to share my views on this matter.

1 Thank you.

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Mr. Feeley, and I
3 appreciate all your hard work you've done in the Brookland area
4 and in the City for years and I mean years. But do we have your
5 written testimony? If not, I would like to get it into the record
6 because --

7 MR. FEELEY: I have emailed it to the email address
8 that Ms. Ackerman gave me earlier today.

9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Ms. Schellin, can we get Mr.
10 Feeley's submission and I want to make sure that, because I didn't
11 see it unless others did and I may have missed it, but I want to
12 get Mr. Feeley and I want the Applicant to respond to it. I want
13 the Applicant to respond to it. Mr. Feeley's been at it a long
14 time and that's just what I want, and I want to be able to look
15 at it myself.

16 So thank you. Let's see if we have any other questions.
17 Commissioner Imamura? Okay. Commissioner Stidham, any
18 questions? Okay. And Vice Chair Miller, any questions?

19 VICE CHAIR MILLER: No. Thank you, Mr. Feeley.

20 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. And let's go to, Mr.
21 Kadlecek, do you have any questions of Mr. Feeley?

22 MR. KADLECEK: No questions. Thank you.

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Mr. Feeley, I understand you
24 may have ha some challenges. Have you had an opportunity to work
25 and speak with the ANC and also with, and being a former

1 Commissioner I know you know the routine. But have you had a
2 chance also to talk to the Applicant about some of your concerns?

3 MR. FEELEY: No, no I haven't. I have to say that in
4 my new job, I did go recently to the meeting concerning the metro
5 plans for our metro site but no, I have not shared my concerns
6 with the team working on the project.

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Well, thank you very much and
8 I appreciate all the work you've done and will continue to do.
9 Thank you. All right.

10 MR. FEELEY: You're welcome.

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. Ms. Schellin, anybody
12 else?

13 MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Mr. Kadlecek, let me make
15 sure because this is a design I've got to make, yes, we can bring
16 you back up. Do you have any rebuttal or closing?

17 MR. KADLECEK: No rebuttal at this time. I think we
18 understand some of the requests that the Commission has made so
19 we will prepare the additional information to the extent that
20 we're able to provide it everything that the Commission has
21 requested and we look forward to moving forward expeditiously on
22 this project.

23 But I thank the Commission for their time tonight and
24 happy to answer any last questions, if there are any and, Mr.
25 Hood, just for you I just want to add for the record I am a Ward

1 5 resident, not in Brookland but I do live in Ward 5.

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Mr. Kadlecek. I was
3 thinking 50 percent but I do want to know when the bowling alley
4 left. If you do that I can give you the other 50 percent. I'm
5 glad you're a Ward 5 resident, so thank you.

6 MR. KADELCEK: I think, I'm looking at Mr. Grooms but
7 I believe it was in the 50s when the building had an interior
8 fire.

9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Well, no wonder I don't
10 remember that. Okay. That's what I was just trying to remember,
11 so thank you, Mr. Kadlecek. Today I'm going to be nice. I'm
12 going to give you 100.

13 MR. KADLECEK: Thank you.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Do my colleagues have any follow-up
15 questions or comments? Okay. Ms. Schellin, do we have any --
16 I'll let you take it over from here. You're on mute, Ms.
17 Schellin.

18 MS. SCHELLIN: Sorry. How much time, Mr. Kadlecek, do
19 you think you need to provide the requested documents?

20 MR. KADLECEK: Give me a second. I'll talk to the
21 team.

22 MS. SCHELLIN: Sure.

23 MS. LOVICK: Hello, it's Hillary. I just want to ask,
24 can we clarify what is desired as additional submissions to the
25 record because I have a list but I just want to make sure that

1 my list is exhaustive or did you have that, Chairman?

2 MR. KADLECEK: I can give you --

3 MS. SCHELLIN: No, we leave it up to the Applicant and
4 they can always go back and watch the video. So we don't
5 (indiscernible).

6 MS. LOVICK: Okay. Well, I mean, okay, if that's what
7 you want to do. I mean, we have done it both ways but there was
8 just a lot of questions so I wanted clarity, but you know what?
9 I'm not in charge, so I will remove myself now.

10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Kadlecek, do you have a list,
11 very quick and Ms. Schellin, we have in recent years because we
12 want to make sure we want to put the burden on the Applicant,
13 not on ourselves. But, Mr. Kadlecek, can you run off the list
14 for our counsel?

15 MR. KADLECEK: I think I have the list so let me just
16 run what we have. So more detail on planting landscaping, more
17 detail on LEED and/or GAR, adding the shadow study that was part
18 of the HPRB to this record, providing anything in the record with
19 respect to the community organizations that the Applicant has
20 interacted with, responding to Mr. Feeley's testimony, and that's
21 all I have. That's all we have.

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Does anybody recall anything that
23 we may have missed? Okay. And he'll go back, as Ms. Schellin
24 said, and look at that so hopefully that'll suffice for our
25 counsel for now.

1 Anything else? Ms. Schellin, could you finish
2 whatever you want.

3 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. So, Mr. Kadlecek, how much time
4 do you think you need?

5 MR. KADLECEK: Two weeks, please.

6 MS. SCHELLIN: Two weeks? Okay. So that would be
7 until, today's the 23rd, until the 6th of November 3 p.m., for
8 you to make your submission and then if you would work with the
9 ANC, OP and DDOT if they choose to respond they can provide a
10 supplemental response to by 11/13 and then we'll put this on the
11 11/30 agenda.

12 CHAIPERSON HOOD: Okay. Are you finished, Ms.
13 Schellin? Are we all on the same page?

14 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Is everybody on the same
16 page? Okay. Great.

17 Before I close out, the Zoning Commission will meet
18 again. We have our regular monthly, one of our regular public
19 meetings coming up October the 26th at 4 p.m., on these same
20 platforms and we have a number of various items on the agenda,
21 and if you want to join us it will be 4 p.m., on these same
22 platforms.

23 I want to thank everyone for their participation
24 tonight, the Applicant and the community for all their hard work,
25 all the people who have given us reports, the Office of Planning,

1 DDOT and any other report and I thank my colleagues tonight also
2 for their questions.

3 With that, and always I want to thank our staff and
4 whoever I didn't thank. I thank you as well. So with that I want
5 to thank everyone, and this hearing is adjourned. Good night
6 everyone.

7 (Whereupon, the above-entitled hearing, at 6:25
8 p.m., was adjourned.)

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Public Meeting

Before: ZC

Date: 10-23-2023

Place: Teleconference

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

JULIE SOUZA