GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ZONING COMMISSION

VIRTUAL PUBLIC HEARING

VIA WEBEX

MONDAY, APRIL 8, 2024

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

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

ANTHONY J. HOOD, Chairperson ROBERT MILLER, Vice Chairperson JOSEPH S. IMAMURA, Commissioner TAMMY STIDHAM, Commissioner

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

SHARON SCHELLIN, Secretary PAUL YOUNG, Data Specialist

OFFICE OF ZONING LEGAL DIVISION STAFF PRESENT:

HILLARY LOVICK, Esquire

This transcript serves as the minutes from the Public Meeting held on April 8, 2024.

Diversified Reporting Services, Inc.

1426 Duke Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(202) 467-9200

${\tt C}$ O N T E N T S

Case No. 23-28

Hill East (HE) Design Review, Parcel B-1 and Parcel B-2 in the Hill East Campus, Bounded by Burke St., 20th St., 21st St., and Independence Ave., SE (Sq. 1112E, Lots 809 & 815) - Ward 7

)

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	(4:00 p.m.)
3	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Good afternoon, ladies and
4	gentlemen. Today's date is April the 8th, 2024. We're
5	convening and broadcasting this public hearing by video
6	conferencing.
7	My name is Anthony Hood and I am joined by Vice
8	Chair Miller, and Commissioner Stidham, and Commissioner
9	Imamura.
10	We're also joined by the Office of Zoning staff
11	Ms. Sharon Schellin and Mr. Paul Young, who will be handling
12	all of our virtual operations.
13	And I would ask all others to introduce themselves
14	at the appropriate time. We also have Ms. Hillary Lovick,
15	our Office of Zoning Legal Division counsel. I would ask
16	others to introduce themselves at the appropriate time.
17	The virtual public hearing notice is available on
18	the Office of Zoning's website and this proceeding is being
19	recorded by a court reporter and platforms used are Webex

The video will be available on the Office of Zoning's website after the hearing.

20

21

22

23

24

25

and YouTube Live.

All persons planning to testify should have signed up in advance and will be called by name at the appropriate time. At the time of signup, all participants will complete

1 | the oath or affirmation required by Subtitle Z48.7.

Accordingly, all those listening on Webex or by
phone will be muted during the hearing and only those who
have signed up to participate or testify will be unmuted at
the appropriate time.

When called, please state your name before providing your testimony. When you are finished speaking, please mute your audio. If you experience difficulty accessing Webex or with your telephone call-in, or have not signed up, then please call our OZ Hotline number at 202-727-0789. Again, 202-727-0789.

If you wish to file written testimony or additional supporting documents during the hearing, then please be prepared to describe and discuss it at the time of your testimony.

The subject of this evening's hearing is Zoning

Commission case number 23-28. This is the Hill East Parcel

B, LLC design review and Parcel B1 and Parcel B2 in the Hill

East Zone District at Square 112E, Lots 800 and 915,

Independence Avenue Southeast.

Again, today's date is April the 8th, 2024.

The hearing will be conducted in accordance with provisions of 11-Z DCMR Chapter 4 as follows. The preliminary matters, the applicant's case has up to 60 minutes, a report of government agencies, government

```
1
    agencies report of Department of Transportation and Office
 2
    of Planning, report of the ANC. I believe we have 7F and
 3
    7D, if not I can stand corrected.
              Testimonies of organizations, five minutes and
 4
 5
    individuals, three minutes and we will hear, in the
    following order, from those who support, opposition, and
 6
 7
    undeclared.
8
              Then we'll have rebuttal and closing by the
9
    applicant.
10
              Again, the OZ Hotline number is 202-727-0789 for
11
    any concerns during this proceeding.
12
              At this time --
              MS. SCHELLIN: I'll have to call you right back.
13
14
    I'm about to go --
15
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Ms. Schellin is going to
16
    call whoever that is right back.
17
              At this time, the Commission will consider any
18
    preliminary matters.
19
              Does the staff have any preliminary matters?
20
              MS. SCHELLIN: Just a couple quick ones.
              The first one, I just want to make a note that the
21
22
    applicant filed some revised plans. So they filed a waiver
23
    to be able to update their application less than 20 days
    prior to the hearing.
24
```

So if the Commission would vote on that waiver or

```
just by consensus okay it?
 1
 2
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right.
              MS. SCHELLIN: And that's at Exhibit 28.
 3
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD:
                                 I saw that. I have no
 4
 5
    objections as long as that's what they talked about when
    they had those letters of support from the ANC, but I have
 6
 7
    no objections.
 8
              Any objections, anyone?
9
              VICE CHAIR MILLER: No, Mr. Chairman. Can you
    hear me, by the way?
10
11
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah, I can hear you.
12
              VICE CHAIR MILLER: Because I'm having trouble
    with my video, but as long as the audio is working, I'll
13
14
    stay tuned.
15
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you.
16
              MS. SCHELLIN:
                            Okay.
17
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay, Ms. Schellin, we're good.
              MS. SCHELLIN: And then proffered expert
18
19
    witnesses. There all at -- the resumes are all at Exhibit
20
    3E, as in Edward. The first one -- well, let's see, let's
    do the previously approved and that would be Jim Watson in
21
22
    transportation planning.
23
              He's with Wells and Associates. If the Commission
    would accept him in this case?
24
25
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Any objections?
```

```
1
              Not hearing or seeing any, we will continue that
 2
    status.
              MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. And then, let me check who
 3
    they decided on the other ones. Sometimes they send us a
 4
    list but then they decide on different ones to have.
 5
              Okay, so their other proffered experts are going
 6
 7
    to be Rose-Ana Torres, and she's being proffered in
    architecture.
9
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I'm looking at Ms.
    Torres' resume. I don't have any objections.
10
              Let me hear from others? Any objections?
11
12
              Okay, no objections.
13
              MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. Susan Mentus, and she is in
14
    architecture also.
15
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So do we need both? Are they
    both doing the same thing? One of them a landscape
16
17
    architect?
              MS. SCHELLIN: One is LEED --
18
19
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. LEED.
20
              MS. SCHELLIN: Ms. Mentus is LEED.
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Okay. All right. Yeah,
21
22
    I see. Let me hear from others, any objections?
23
              COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: I don't have any
    objections, Mr. Chairman. I don't know if we need a
24
25
    proffered expert on LEED, but I'm comfortable with both of
```

```
1
    them. They're both (inaudible).
 2
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.
 3
              MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. And they have Brian Bolan on
    their list, however, he did not sign up to testify.
 4
 5
    they do call him he'll need to take the oath. I did make
    mention of that to the attorney, and the last time I
 6
 7
    checked, he still had not signed up to testify.
8
              I'll doublecheck to see if maybe he's done it
    recently. No, he has not.
9
10
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.
11
              MS. SCHELLIN: So I'm assuming he's not going to
12
    testify.
13
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD:
                                 Okay.
              MS. SCHELLIN: But they did ask for expert status
14
15
    for him.
              So I don't know what to -- maybe you need to ask
16
    the applicant about that.
17
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So we will proceed with the two
    that we all have agreed to and if we -- in case Mr. Bolan
18
19
    comes up, they can bring that up. If not, we can -- he can
20
    -- we can always get his testimony.
21
              MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. And then --
22
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Anything else?
23
              MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. We will have Mr. Jutte from
24
    DDOT, that's Preston Jutte. I've got to help him get one.
25
    So as soon as I finish with you, I will help him get on.
```

```
1
              We have Joel Lawson from OP. You have ANC report
 2
    in the record. The ANCs are 7F and 7D, and I think I'm
 3
    ready to turn it over to you. Thank you.
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. All right. Let's bring
 4
 5
    everybody up. Let's take about two minutes and get
    everybody up and I need about a minute. Let's take two
6
 7
    minutes and get everybody up.
8
              (Pause.)
9
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Two minutes
    are up, thank you for your indulgence.
10
11
              Are we ready, Ms. Batties and Ms. Schellin, are we
12
    ready?
              VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yeah, I don't know. I --
13
              MS. BATTIES: Yes, we're ready on our end.
14
15
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'm hearing somebody talking.
    I'll wait for Commissioner Stidham --
16
17
              MS. SCHELLIN: Ms. Batties, I'll send Mr. Cohen
18
    another link just for him to forward that, okay?
19
                            Case No. 23-28
20
              MS. BATTIES: Okay. Thank you.
              And then if Mr. Young can pull up our slide deck
21
22
    and then we'll get started.
23
              Good afternoon, for the record Leila Batties and
    Christopher Cohen with Holland & Knight on behalf of the
24
25
    applicant, Hill East Parcel B LLC, which is a partnership
```

1 | between Blue Skye Development and Donatelli Development.

Also joined -- we're joined this afternoon by GTM

Architects, Wells & Associates of (inaudible) for this

project and then ParkerRodriguez, who is a landscape

architect.

And Mr. Avrit will be available to answer questions.

Could you please go to Slide 3?

The subject property and the proposed development are the second phase of the 67-acre Hill East Street

Development, as envisioned by the Hill East Master Plan.

The subject property consists of two parcels identified as Parcels B1 and B2 on the Hills Master Plan, and together, consist of approximately 2.6 acres. The parcels are zoned HE-2.

As shown on the slide, Parcel B1 consists of approximately 77,740 square feet of land area and that parcel will be redeveloped with a residential apartment building consisting of approximately 350 residential units.

The maximum height will be 80 feet and the project density will be 4.8 FAR. Parcel B2 consists of approximately 36,000 square feet of land area and will be redeveloped as a mixed-lease building consisting of approximately of 14,000 square feet of ground floor retail and 144 units above.

The maximum building height will be 80 feet and the project density will be approximately 4.8 FAR.

Consistent with the AWI Act and the District's land disposition requirements, 30 percent of the total units will be affordable. Further, of that 30, half will be for households earning up to 60 percent MFI and the other half will be households earning up to 30 percent MFI.

The applicant has provided a thorough Comp Plan analysis, including the original equity pool at Exhibit 22A of the case record.

We'd also like to note Mr. Chairman, in response to your comment about the school setup plans that were filed. We opted to provide the Zoning Commission with the full set of plans, instead of having piecemeal plans that were revised, so that everything would be in one package and everything that's been presented has been shared with both ANCs 7F and 7D.

This applicant, just by way of background, this applicant was selected, and if you could go to slide 4, please, Mr. Young?

This applicant was selected as a developer for this phase of the Phase III development in 2021. The applicant was also the developer of two residential buildings in the first phase of Hill East, which is the Zoning Commission approved the design review in 2016.

The first building, the Park Kennedy has 262 units opened in December of 2021, and the second building, the Ethel, opened in 2023 with 100 permanent supported housing units at 14,000 square feet of (inaudible).

I mention this because the applicant responded to the RFP for Phase I in (inaudible) and has been actively engaged with the community since that time, as part of the RFP process, through the design review process, and construction of the projects.

They have been equally engaged with Phase II. We provided this list of community meetings that the developer has participated in since 2020, for this particular phase of Hill East.

The most recent meetings, after the applicant who was postponed from its original hearing date last month, were two. We met on March 25th with ANCs 7D's Committee on Housing, Economic Justice, Zoning, and Alcoholic Beverage/Cannabis, and from that meeting, we walked them through all of the waivers and the details of the project and they voted to support the project, and ANC 7D has submitted a resolution in support of the project at Exhibit 30 of the record.

On March 26th, ANC 7F held a special meeting where we discussed this project and from that meeting we were able to answer the questions and concerns they had, and they have

submitted a resolution of support of the project at Exhibits
through 31B of the record.

This is an application for a design review, as you know. In accordance with Subtitle K Chapter 4, which is the Hill East Design and Development Standards, and in accordance with the review standards in Subtitle X, Chapter 6.

The application meets all of the design review criteria with a few exceptions for what we're requesting a waiver and the relief needed is basically minor and the architects GTM will walk through those.

We also need a variance or are requesting a variance for the requirement that the building be one, be constructed without any setback and the intersection of Independence Avenue and 20th Street and the intersection of Independence Avenue and 21st Street.

The applicant is proposing aligning a park along Independence Avenue, in lieu of constructing the building to the property line.

And so this relief, this part of the application meets the three-pronged variance test. First, there's an exceptional situation in that the linear park was presented in the applicant's response to the RFP, after input from the District and neighborhood stakeholders.

Second, it would be practically difficult to meet

the requirements to build the property line and construct a park as represented and approved in the RFP.

And third, granting the variance and allowing the park will not present a substantial detriment to the public good. To the contrary, the park would be a benefit.

We have worked with the Office of Planning and DDOT throughout this process and we're pleased that they're supportive of the application.

We accept the conditions that were proposed by DDOT and Jim Watson will go over those in more detail. The only thing I will note in OP's report. OP has requested that the applicant provide full-size balconies on Building B2 facing Burke Street.

Currently, the project has Juliet balconies, which were integrated after our -- after the applicant's initial discussions with the Office of Planning. And there are three reasons that the applicant decided not to have the balconies on the Brook Street façade, or actually, any façade of the buildings and those three reasons are first, without significantly increasing the cost, the applicant is unable to incorporate enough full-size balconies to have an equitable distribution across unit types and income levels.

Second, the layout of several units would need to be rearranged. Specifically, the bedrooms and living spaces would need to be reoriented to accommodate the walk-out

balconies. 1 2 And third, the full-size balconies are problematic. Problematic from a (inaudible) standpoint. 3 There are a lot of rules associated with balcony use in 4 5 rental building and if the rules are not followed, it creates a challenge, from the standpoint of not just dealing 6 with the residents, but also, the building's aesthetics. 7 And this developer, having experience with a lot 8 of this -- these buildings, has made the decision not to 9 provide or does not think that it would be the best thing 10 11 for the long-term maintenance and esthetics of the building, 12 to have full-size balconies. 13 So for these reasons, we respectfully request that 14 the Zoning Commission approve the building design as 15 proposed. And with that, that concludes my opening remarks 16 and I'm going to turn it over, next, to Rose-Ana Torres with 17 GTM. 18 MS. TORRES: Good afternoon, my name is Rose-Ana 19 Torres and I'm one of the architects on this project, and I 20 am with GTM Architects of Washington, D.C. If you please could go to the first slide, it's 21 22 Slide 5. Please, thank you very much. 23 Here you can see a vicinity plan that shows where 24 the two parcels are located, the area in general. You can

see, on the top right, you see it behind the stadium and

then a little bit further down left, the Armory, and the Independence Avenue and then across the street, that's where all of the B1 parcel is located.

Next slide, please?

This is more of a context plan that shows a little bit more into the B1 and B2 parcel. B1 and B2 are adjacent to the St. Coletta of Greater Washington, which is located to the left and B1 is across the armory and 2 faces Burke Street.

Next slide, please?

This slide shows the outline of both buildings, B1 and B2, and the relationship to St. Coletta. The applicant is also providing 100 parking spaces to St. Coletta and a private entrance to access the garage, which is just next to the St. Coletta building.

B1 is setback approximately 20 feet from the northern property line for Parcel B1 to create space for public linear park. The park will be made for Robert F. Kennedy in honor of his life and legacy.

The park creates a buffer for Buildings 1 and pedestrians from hidden traffic on Independence Avenue. But more importantly, it creates a recreation area for the community.

The park will also provide a wider green network connecting the surrounding neighborhood to the Anacostia

Waterfront Park. 1 2 Next slide, please. 3 This slide shows the layout of the first (inaudible) of Building B1 and B2. And before I continue, I 4 5 just want you to know that this plan now has been rotated and North is now to your left, as well as Independence 6 7 Avenue. 8 Building B1 is bordered to the north by Independence Avenue and B2, which is the right building. 9 It's bordered south by Burke Street. Both buildings are 10 11 bordered west by 20th Street and east by 21st Street. 12 A private drive separates building B1 and B2. The private drive is accessed from 20th and 21st street. 13 14 Building B1 is a seven-story residential building and it has 15 approximately 350 units. 16 B2 is also a seven-story mixed-use building. 17 includes approximately 144 units and about 14,000 square 18 feet of retail space on the ground floor. Both buildings 19 share a two-level garage below ground. 20 A main building entrance is for both buildings are on 21st Street, which is on the top of the page. The 21 22 private drive access is loading, garage entrance, trash pickup, and other back of the house activities for both 23

And then to the right you can see, all in red, you

24

25

buildings.

can see the approximately 14,000 square feet retail. We have a landscaped courtyard that provides outdoor amenity spaces for residents of both buildings.

And then we have the Robert F. Kennedy Park, which will provide an attractive visual outdoor connection to people using the co-working spaces and leasing spaces that, shown here on the left-hand side, in purple, on the top that's the leasing and the orange or salmon color, that's the co-working spaces for the residents.

The next slide, please.

This shows the typical floor for building B1 and B2 and B1 is a mixture of studios, one, two, and three-bedroom units, while B2 has a mixture of studio, one and two bedrooms.

Next slide, please.

Here you can see the penthouse on B1. This penthouse lounge has amenities on the roof terrace and otherwise, we have mechanical equipment on the rest of the building as well as on B2.

Next slide. Would you please continue to the next slide?

This is a context rendering showing the RFK Stadium from the rear and in the back -- in the background, and you also can see, to the left, you can see the Armory and then our two buildings, B1 and B2.

1 The next slide, please?

2.0

This view shows both buildings at the corner Independence Avenue and 21st Street. The linear park is clearly defined along Independence Avenue and on top of Building 1 is the penthouse lounge with adjacent landscape terraces that I mentioned earlier.

Residents and the guests will enjoy views of the US Capitol on to the west and the Anacostia River to the east.

Please, the next slide?

This is still a slide or rendering that is

Independence Avenue and the corner of 21st. Two towers we have here. Two tower elements flank the Independence Avenue façade and accentuates each corner of the building.

The towers are intended to serve as a gateway into the Hill East neighborhood. To address the architectural principles of base, middle, and top we added a belt course on top of the ground floor, which separates the base from the middle.

A setback at the seventh floor and corresponding change in building materials distinguish the top from the bottom (inaudible). At the top level we added a cornice and an architectural ground to provide strong definition of the roofline.

To enhance the look of the towers, the windows are

vertically proportioned and grooved. The windows are also framed to protect the metal. Frames created shadowboxes for a visual play on light and shadow.

And the next slide, please?

On this slide you can see both buildings. To the left is B1 and to the right is B2. Our overall approach for -- to designing these two buildings is to create two distinctive buildings.

A series of projecting bays enhance the façade on B2. The bays in the center of the façade have (inaudible) metal. At the ends we used brick to accentuate the building corners.

The cast stone base and the brick veneer wraps the first floor. Above the first floor is a continuous belt course that separates the base from the middle portion of the building.

Above the belt course the brick veneer transitions to a mixture of brick veneer and metal panels. The top floor is accentuated with stock cementitious paneling and a cornice to cap the building.

Next slide, please?

This is B2 facing Burke Street. The first floor along Burke Street is dedicated to retail use. The façade of the ground floor retail space incorporates a series of retail bays defined with storefront windows.

1 Retail space and outdoor seating on the ground 2 level is designed to activate the street and promote a 3 pedestrian friendly neighborhood for the community. Next slide, please. 4 5 These next slides we're going to talk mainly about the materials. Here it is B1 and we're showing the 21st 6 7 Street entrance, which is highlighted with a linear panel 8 that is cladded in metal and highlighted in a -- in a copper-colored canopy. 9 The main building materials on B1 are veneer, cast 10 11 stone, metal panels, and glass. Cementitious panels are 12 used only on the seventh floor, penthouse, private drive, 13 and the courtyard. We are trying to create more architectural 14 15 interest by introducing (inaudible) stained colors. 16 The next slide, please. This is Independence Avenue view. This slide is 17 18 similar to the previous one where on Independence Avenue we 19 have on the base nearly two-story spaces to create 20 transparency between the interior spaces the Robert F. Kennedy Park. 21 22 Next slide, please. 23 This shows the private driveway. The base is mainly brick veneer. We can see on this slide the entrance 24

to the back lobby, which is on the right hand, loading, and

1 to trash pickup. 2 The tower elements wrap the materials around the 3 corners. The next slide, please. 4 Here we see a little -- a little bit better 5 6 defined the materials that we have shown on the façade and 7 you also can see clearly the corners and the architectural 8 crown. 9 Next slide, please? This slide shows the relationship of both 10 11 buildings, B1 and B2 and the façade of the 20th Street into 12 21st Street. Next slide. The next slide, please? 13 14 This shows B2 at the private drive and the main 15 building materials on building 2. 16 Can you please go one back? One slide back. 17 thank you very much. 18 The main building materials on Building 2 are 19 brick veneer, cast stone, metal panels, and glass. 20 Cementitious -- the cementitious panels are only used partially on the top floor. 21 22 The base is cast stone and brick. The bays are cladded in metal, and the top, as you can see in the lighter 23 24 grey on this slide, is cementitious panel, as well as the

top corners is the cementitious panel material.

Next slide, please?

This slide shows the private drive. The bays are brick veneer and the tower elements wrap the brick veneer materials around the corner. The courtyard is mainly cementitious panel.

The next slide.

This slide shows also a little bit more in detail the variations of the materials and where they are located.

Next slide.

This shows the proposed landscape around the building, which provides residents with a walkable and pedestrian friendly destination. All streets and sidewalks are lined with shade trees and understory plantings that provide year-long seasonal interest.

A prominent entrances, special paving's, side furnishing and bricks will enbridge (sic) the settings and establish a sense of neighborhood identity.

Along independence Avenue, as we mentioned before, a linear park is proposed in honor of Robert F. Kennedy. The park will be activated by public art, seating areas, parking, and thoughtfully designed landscape that combine and foster a sense of identity that is engaging for nearby residents and the community.

This concludes my presentation and I will give it over to (inaudible).

MS. MENTUS: Good afternoon. My name is Susan Mentus and I'm with GTM Architects of Washington, D.C. If you can go to the next slide, I'm going to be talking about the waivers and the variance that we are requesting. They're listed here. There's five waivers, one variance and I'll go in further detail with each of these items if you'd like to go to the next slide, please. This is the first waiver for a portion of B2. We are requesting a waiver from Subtitle A, Section 48E.1C, which requires a minimum clear floor to ceiling height of 14 feet measured from grade for the area of the ground floor dedicated to preferred uses. Building 2 has retail along Burke Street, which is a preferred used. The building cannot achieve the required 14-foot clearance for the full retail area due to the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

a preferred used. The building cannot achieve the required 14-foot clearance for the full retail area due to the topography, which slopes down from 20th Street, shown on the left of the plan, which is in the middle of the page here, towards 21st Street, which is shown on the right.

The grade changes approximately eight feet, which is shown with the horizontal yellow lines at the bottom drawing.

The grade impacts the 14-foot clear height requirements since the height is measured from the exterior grade to the underside of the retail ceiling. The retail

space is approximately 18 feet high at its tallest point and reduces to around 11 feet at its lowest point.

On this slide, the portion of space that does not comply with the 14-foot requirement is the light pink color on the left of this space.

Next slide, please.

For the front of Building B1, we are requesting a waiver and a variance for the linear part, which is on Independence Avenue. For the front of Building B1, we are requesting a waiver from Subtitle K, Section 419.2, which requires that the front of the building or structure extend to the property line for not less than 90 percent of the property line.

In addition, for a portion of Building B1, we are requesting a variance from Subtitle K, Section 420.2, which requires that the fronts of buildings located at street intersections be constructed to the property lines (inaudible) each intersecting street for a minimum of 50 feet from the intersection.

The linear park along Independence Avenue was a requirement of the RFP and is also an amenity for both the building residents and the Hill East community as a whole. The park will provide a pedestrian friendly experience along a primary street advancing the objectives of the Hill East Zone District.

It will provide a buffer between Independence

Avenue and the residential buildings. It will help activate
the base of the building, and help create pedestrian
connection to the waterfront.

For these reasons, we are requesting the waiver and variance listed on the slide.

Next slide, please.

For Building B1, we are also requesting a waiver from Subtitle K, Section 419.7, which requires a façade articulation of less than two feet in depth. In this slide, the colors in the diagram are shown to show the various setbacks along the facades and they're not intended to show the color of the building.

Because of the scale of Building B1, we have created deeper setbacks of three feet, which you can see in pink on the slide. This setback will create more depth and interest along the façade, as well as create a clear hierarchy of the different planes.

The three-foot setback also helps the tower elements at the building corners appear more monumental and adds to the overall architectural design of B1.

Next slide, please.

For Building B2, we are requesting the same waiver I just noted for B1, which is relief from Subtitle K, Section 419.7, which requires the façade articulation of

less than two feet in depth.

The reason for this waiver request is that we will be using standard brick sizes, which creates a setback of exactly two feet, instead of a setback of less than two feet.

Next slide, please.

For the ground floor of Building B1, and out of an abundance of caution, we are requesting a waiver from Subtitle K, Section 417.1E, which requires that not less than 65 percent of the ground floor frontage along Independence Avenue be devoted to preferred uses and main building entrances or lobbies to offices and residential spaces.

The preferred uses referenced in the zoning regulations include retail, entertainment, assembly, performance, and other services.

Ground floor uses at B1 will include the leasing office, communal workspace, residential amenity space, and an entrance into the leasing office. Although the 65 percent requirement would be met with these uses, we are requesting a waiver out of an abundance of caution.

Proposed uses on the ground floor with the adjacent linear park will help activate the streetscape while creating a neighborhood-like feel along Independence Avenue.

Thank you very much. That is the final waiver requested. I'm going to hand it over to Jim Watson.

MR. WATSON: Good afternoon. My name is Jim

Watson with Wells & Associates. I'm a transportation

planner, a senior associate with the firm.

I'm going to briefly go over the transportation elements of the project. From a vehicular parking perspective, we're required to have new parking spaces. Of those, we're providing 138 spaces to serve the requirements, as well as 100 spaces to serve St. Coletta, that Rose-Ana talked a little bit about earlier.

That will give the entire development 238 total parking spaces. Bicycle parking, we're providing 233 long-term spaces and 30 short-term spaces to serve the 166 long-term and 29 short-term space requirement.

We're also providing two loading berths, as well as one service and deliveries space as required. We're providing two (inaudible) spaces.

Next slide, please.

Very quickly. For the access to the site. Rose-Ana touched on this a little bit, but primary pedestrian access is being provided by 21st Street. From the private drive, there's access to the parking, which both B1 and B2 share parking in one large four plate low.

And loading for B1 is provided along the alley

there. You can kind of -- or along the service drive. You can see that kind of midway. Service space is provided from a interior loading space there for B1, and directly across from there is B2 service and loading for B2.

If we go to the next slide, please.

Bicycle parking is actually going to be provided primarily below grade for B1. There's an elevator and stairwell that are both accessed from a bicycle lobby directly from the service drive.

The stairwell will include bike rentals, so small ramps on either side are for people to be able to walk their bikes down directly into the bike room. There's also a small bike room provided off of the 20th Street side, as you can see on the bottom right side.

Next slide, please.

And I'm just going to go briefly over the Transportation Management Plan highlights. We did have two conditions with DDOT. One was to implement a TDM plan. Second was to construct an Independence Avenue Road diet.

So briefly, there are many more Transportation

Management Plan elements, but I wanted to kind of point to

some of the highlights. Our bike parking does exceed the

zoning requirement. The long-term bike storage room is

going to hold cargo, tandem, and kid's bikes.

We're providing bicycle repair stations. There

are five UV parking spaces. Among the incentives, there are
Capital Bikeshare, Smart Trip Card incentives. We're
providing shopping carts for residents. Unbundling parking
-- cost of parking from rent, as well as providing a Capital
Bikeshare station that will be worked out with DDOT on
location.

The last thing I want to talk a little bit about is the Independence Avenue Road Diet, which was the second condition from DDOT.

If you go to the next slide?

Very briefly. The Independence Avenue Road Diet will convert the existing streetscape along Independence Avenue from the existing three and four-lane through eastbound traffic to be a bit more residential friendly, bringing that down to two lanes.

So the curb, the southern curb will be pushed out a bit such that you're able to have a parking lane on the southern curb there fronting B1 and the north lane will be striped out on each side.

So that when you approach Independence Avenue or approach 19th Street on Independence Avenue and then cross 19th Street along St. (inaudible) and then along the front of B1, it would carry forth the similar two lanes that you see to the west of the property.

And with that, I guess I'll turn it back over to

```
you, Leila?
 1
 2
              MS. BATTIES: That concludes the applicant's
 3
    presentation, Mr. Chair.
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you very much to the
 4
 5
    teams, to the applicant. I think that was very well done.
    I really appreciate the way you all were very succinct and
 6
 7
    we didn't even have any background noise. So thank you.
8
              Let me just ask this question and then I'll --
    before I go to Commissioner Imamura first, let me ask a
9
    question or two. I'm just trying to get my orientation
10
11
    right, trying to figure some things out.
12
              Kind of have the programmatic of this building as
13
    well.
14
              Is this the same applicant who did the Ethel?
15
              MS. BATTIES:
                            Yes.
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So is this kind of
16
17
    mirroring the Ethel? And I'm getting my orientation messed
    up now, but anyway. It looks like it's kind of mirroring
18
19
    the Ethel when I look at it, but that's all right. I think
2.0
    we can deal with that.
21
              MS. BATTIES: Mr. Young, if we can pull up the
22
    PowerPoint presentation and go to the map?
                     Slide 5.
23
              Yeah.
24
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: What did you say the name of
25
    this building is going to be? The Kennedy? Robert Kennedy?
```

```
1
              MS. BATTIES: They haven't named it yet. The park
 2
    will be named after Robert F. Kennedy.
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Oh, okay. Okay. Okay.
 3
                            So Slide 6, I'm sorry. And I can
 4
              MS. BATTIES:
 5
    just show you where the Ethel and (audio cutout) buildings
 6
    are.
 7
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD:
                                 That would be good because I
8
    want to see the relationship between this and St. Coletta,
9
    and also the Ethel.
              (Pause)
10
11
              MS. BATTIES: Mr. Young, are you able to hear me?
12
              MR. YOUNG: There we go. It takes a while.
13
              MS. BATTIES: I just didn't --
14
              (Pause)
15
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: What slide are we looking at,
    Ms. Batties?
16
17
              MS. BATTIES:
                            Slide 6.
18
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Slide 6? Okay.
19
              MS. BATTIES:
                            Thank you. So you'll see obviously
20
    the subject property is shown highlighted B1 and B2. The
    immediately to the west, there's a green site, parcel,
21
    that's St. Coletta of Greater Washington.
22
23
              Then, if you move further to the right -- to the
    south, right under St. Coletta, there's the Ethel.
24
                                                        That's
25
    on Parcel F1. And then, immediately south the Ethel is the
```

```
1
    Park Kennedy Building.
 2
              And so the Park Kennedy Building has 262 units.
    The Ethel has 100 units.
 3
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Okay.
 4
 5
              Do you all know right off when St. Coletta's was
           I know it was in front of the Zoning Commission some
 6
 7
    years back.
 8
              Does anybody --
9
              MS. BATTIES: When it was approved?
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah. When we dealt with it?
10
11
    I can't remember, but I know we dealt with it.
12
              MS. BATTIES: Yeah, we will look that up.
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: That's okay. And the reason
13
14
    I'm asking is I know one of the issues that came up then was
15
    why was the Commission letting a school have type of
16
    position near a metro.
17
              And now, after all these years, you starting to
18
    see all these homes starting to come up. Sometimes we just
19
    have to be patient. I see the Ethel. I see the Park
20
    Kennedy and whatever is going to be, if this is approved,
    this B1 and B2, so I don't know if anybody who was back then
21
22
    listening, but now things are starting to realize where
23
    people can live and then also still obtain and be able to
24
    access the metro easily.
25
              So that was just my point. I may have other
```

```
1
    questions as well, but I wanted to go there just while I
 2
    think about other questions I may have. But I'll see what
 3
    my colleagues have to say as well.
              All right, Commissioner -- thank you all.
 4
              Commissioner Imamura --
 5
 6
              COMMISSIONER IMAMURA:
                                     Thank you --
 7
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: -- any questions or comments?
              COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: I have a few questions, a
8
    few comments. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
9
              Ms. Batties, thank you for this succinct
10
11
    presentation completed by you and the team.
12
              Let me pull my questions up here. I'll try to
13
    bundle them in a logical way.
14
              First, I just want to comment that I appreciate
15
    the additional design refinements that the applicants made,
16
    in terms of emphasizing a bit more with base, middle, to top
17
    with the materiality in response to feedback from OP.
18
              So that's also a complement to OP for their design
19
    sensibility. So thank you, OP, for pushing that effort.
20
              There are a number of laudable goals here with
    this project. The 30 percent affordable housing, 15 percent
21
22
    reserved for households earning 30 percent MFI and another
    15 for 60 percent MFI. So I appreciate that.
23
24
              It seemed like a pretty good mix, but I just want
25
    to doublecheck. If somebody could comment, maybe Ms. Torres
```

1 can comment on what the mix of those units are again on B1 2 and B2? 3 MS. BATTIES: And while she's looking that up, I will -- I wanted to note that St. Coletta was approved by 4 5 the Zoning Commission in 2004. CHAIRPERSON HOOD: 2004? Good gracious. 6 7 been here a long time. Okay. 8 (Laughter.) 9 MS. TORRES: Okay. Sliding over. Sliding over, this is the mix. We have the proposed of both buildings, we 10 11 have 34 studios, 354 one bedrooms, 95 two bedrooms, and 11 12 three bedrooms, which brings this project to a total of 494. 13 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Great. Thank you for the 14 specific numbers there, Ms. Torres. I appreciate that very 15 much. 16 I'm glad to see substantial amount of two 17 bedrooms. I'd like to see a little -- a few more three 18 bedrooms, but I think the mix seems reasonable. 19 I also noticed -- I'm going to just kind of walk 20 through my notes here. So Ms. Torres, I -- you can stay there in that seat or this might be for Ms. Mentus. 21 22 About net zero energy certification, I noticed that you all are pursuing LEED Silver and I think DOE had 23 24 pushed or encouraged you to pursue a little bit more, Ms. 25 Torres, towards LEED Gold. Can you just explain a little

```
1
    bit more on where you're at with your LEED Silver? How far
    short you are LEED Gold and where you stand with all that?
 2
 3
              MS. TORRES: We are right in the middle. I would
    say between that LEED Silver.
 4
 5
              COMMISSIONER IMAMURA:
                                     Okay.
              MS. TORRES: With the (crosstalk) in my head right
 6
 7
    now, so I apologize for that.
8
              COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: No, that's okay. Don't
    mean to put you on the spot. Just wanted to see how close
9
    we were to the edge of, you know, achieving LEED Gold,
10
11
    right? It sounds like that might be a stretch goal there,
12
    but --
              MS. TORRES: Okay. I found it. My co-worker
13
14
    Susan here, she's showed it to me. We are at 54.5 points
    and Silver and Gold is at 60.
15
16
              COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Okay.
17
              MS. TORRES:
                           Thank you, Susan.
18
              COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: So right on the edge there.
19
    So maybe still achievable, just a few more points to grab.
20
    So I would certainly want to encourage pursuing that a bit
21
    more.
22
              Can you talk a little bit more about the
23
    photovoltaics that you plan to install? The roof plans and
24
    the landscape plans didn't really include a lot of detail
```

and I just wanted to ask if you could walk us through that a

```
bit more?
1
 2
              MS. TORRES: So this project is going to be net
 3
    zero energy ready for the residential part. We were not
    planning to have photovoltaic panels on the roof.
 4
 5
              COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Okay. Is that something
    that you all have explored at all or --
 6
 7
              MS. TORRES: Yes. For sure, yes.
8
              COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Okay. Sure. And I know
    that when you come before the Zoning Commission, the public
9
    doesn't really have an opportunity to hear all the design
10
11
    iterations that you went through. They only see the final
12
    plan and the final design solutions.
              So if you can just explain how you considered PVs
13
    and why it wasn't feasible or what the decision was not to
14
15
    include them?
16
              MS. TORRES: The photovoltaic panels?
17
              COMMISSIONER IMAMURA:
                                     Yes. Did you say you
    didn't --
18
19
              MS. TORRES: Why they're not feasible?
20
              COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yeah. Did you say you
    don't have any PVs that you're installing?
21
22
              MS. TORRES: No, not right now, but I think that
    the ownership is looking into it and reviewing if this is a
23
    possibility.
24
25
              COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Okay. Thank you very much
```

1 for that response. I do have a few more questions, design 2 related.

MS. BATTIES: Oh, I'm sorry. I just wanted to note that the applicant did meet with DOE, they were part of the meeting with the Office of Planning. And so they will continue to work with DOE through the permitting process.

There were several recommendations in the DOE report that the applicant will continue to discuss and explore as part of the final construction package.

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Battise. Appreciate that response as well.

I always feel that design provides the best solution to any problem or challenge. And so I really believe there's probably a design solution there that perhaps might be able to incorporate some PV panels somewhere.

The 18 Juliet balconies, Ms. Torres, on the southern façade and I noted that you're unable to incorporate more walk-out balconies because of the unit layouts.

I'm curious, sort of again, going back to the design iterations that you all went through, if balconies were considered at the beginning or was it towards the end or was it you were already perhaps maybe in DD's and it just wasn't feasible to reconfigure the space?

MS. TORRES: Yes. It definitely would be easier, because we are in DD right now, if they would have been incorporated during SC or concept.

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: I think the Juliet balconies are a nice I guess in-between, but would have liked to have seen at least inboard balconies there, but I understand that sometimes the arrangement of spaces really limits the opportunity to do that.

In terms of the waivers and the waivers and the area variance that you're requesting, I appreciate the slides that you put together to explain what those -- what those issues were and the design solutions that you needed the waivers for, the variance. That was very helpful.

MS. BATTIES: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: What I would say is that I noted, and I know you all had noted this too, about the linear park being part of the RFP concept, and so that sort of set expectations at the outset, but I'm always in favor of parks over maybe pushing a building to its property line.

So I think the park is definitely an amenity to the public. So I am supportive of that.

Appreciate the context image with RFK, that was very helpful. Again, the overall sort of design solution, I think as you pointed out, trying to develop two distinct buildings there, I think, was successful. They are very

stately.

Appreciate the building materials that you applied, for the most part. I think the materiality certainly accentuates the vocabulary, the architectural vocabulary very well.

So architecturally, I think both buildings provide a nice solution. I would add though, the private drive, I'd like to know a little more about this. At the base there's the dark masonry that you -- that you're suggesting. And I'm curious, in terms of sort of a the private drive and the dark base and the shadows from B2, I think it's building B2, what that private drive might look like at, you know, with the darker brick there, what that might look like at night, as well as, you know, in the winter time it can be rather dark and cold, but if you could describe a little bit about your lighting strategy in the private drive, just to address safety and security a little bit more, especially with the dark-colored brick there, you know, you'll definitely need an enhanced lighting plan.

MS. TORRES: Well, first of all I want to say that I really appreciate your design sensitivity to this. This is really great.

Our idea was here that for sure lighting is going to play a very important component in lighting this up, and we are also going to have a few bioretention areas that are

```
1
    going to have greenery in it and we wanted to pick up some
 2
    of the brick that we're using on Burke Street and some of
    the other facades.
 3
              We wanted to repeat it, but I think that you're
 4
 5
    very sensitive statement. I think it is something that I
    believe that we should back into it. And I'm just looking
 6
 7
    at my co-worker Susan and she is also nodding.
8
              I think we would like to look at it, maybe to
    lighten it up a bit.
9
              COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Okay. I appreciate that.
10
11
    Certainly, again, I'm comfortable with the color palette.
12
    What I'm just curious about is that private drive could be
    very dark or could become very dark with the shadows that
13
    are being cast there --
14
15
              MS. TORRES: Yeah.
16
              COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: -- so --
17
              MS. BATTIES: Just for clarity. Are you talking
18
    about a lighting plan? I just want to make sure. I think
19
    she's thinking color and I think you're talking lighting.
20
              COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Right. A light plan, an
    electrical light plan with that safety -- I'm concerned
21
22
    about the safety and security at that private drive and I
```

It's difficult to tell with the level of detail in

so that may play a factor in there too.

don't know what the distance is between the two buildings,

23

```
1
    the drawings.
              MS. TORRES: Yeah. Absolutely, I think -- yeah,
 2
    we can -- yeah, we can do this. I think that the lighting
 3
    is going to be for safety very important, and I have to say,
 4
 5
    especially as a woman, I'm very sensitive to that,
    especially driving into the garage --
 6
 7
              COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.
              MS. TORRES: -- and I think -- thank you, yes.
 8
              COMMISSIONER IMAMURA:
                                      It's a very long sort of
9
    private drive there, which is, I guess, brings my next
10
11
    question.
12
              The Zoning Commission has seen a lot of these sort
    of two building proposals, oftentimes in between with sort
13
    of a landscape connection. Here we have a private drive
14
    where all the back of house services are located.
15
16
              That certainly makes a lot of sense to me, but
17
    again, I'm curious what, at the very conceptual stage, you
18
    all had worked through and why you ultimately decided at the
19
    back of house services being inboard rather than sort of
20
    outboard at one of the sides where it actually creates a,
    you know, could have been a courtyard that's connecting the
21
2.2
    two.
23
              So I'm just kind of curious about that design
    decision?
24
25
              MS. TORRES: We didn't want to see any curb cuts
```

or any entrances into the garages and back of house through the main streets. We believe and we think that, especially 21st Street and Burke Street, are going to be highly activated by the retail space and by the future development.

Where some of these less attractive spaces would not enhance the pedestrian experience. I think it was important for us to put this there for all in the private drive.

So for the pedestrian that is walking to Burke Street, to the park, or to the retail, or somebody walking towards the Anacostia waterfront, that they have a positive and good experience walking.

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Ms. Torres.

I think it makes sense to me that, on along the periphery, that you're activating public space. I was just curious to hear more about other sort of design solutions that you might have considered that would have eliminated sort of this private drive that's kind of bifurcates both buildings there, rather than creating sort of a --

MS. TORRES: Well, we had to follow all the DDOT policies, one, and what we did is consistent with DDOT. And secondly, also the grading was a little bit of a challenge for us.

The only street I would say where we could have maybe have a garage entrance or any of the back of the

```
1
    house, would have been on 20th Street, but there the grade
    is really high and for us to drive into the garage or to the
 2
 3
    trash pickup, we would have required quite a ramp.
              It was -- that would have been very difficult.
 4
 5
              COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: All right. Thank you, Ms.
             That makes, actually -- that makes a lot of sense
 6
 7
    about the grading, the significant grade difference there.
8
              I appreciate you bringing that up, and that also
    reminds me too to thank Ms. Batties and your team, Ms.
9
    Torres, for submitting a complete updated set of plans,
10
11
    rather than sort of piecemeal.
12
              I appreciate that. That made a lot of sense to
13
         Also, I thought it was rather comprehensive too.
14
    appreciate the addition of the civil set and your landscape
15
    set, if you had your landscape architect there I would be
16
    very interested in speaking with them and hearing more about
17
    that, but I'm not done with Ms. Torres yet, I still have a
18
    couple of questions for Ms. Torres.
                                          Sorry.
19
              MS. TORRES: Oh, not that's -- I'm doing a lot of
20
    sliding here today.
21
              COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Sorry, Ms. Torres.
22
              Just a couple more questions. The mechanical
23
    screening.
24
              MS. TORRES:
                           Yes.
25
              COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: So I know in the renderings
```

it looks rather light, right? So you kind of have to look 1 2 for it. But it seems, and I thought I saw some notation 3 there about 18 feet is what you're anticipating, but I think 4 you're also asked for some flexibility with that, the 5 height. So can you talk a little bit about your mechanical 6 7 screening? It looked like you're anticipating sort of a metal mesh screening or perhaps, I don't know, if you could 8 describe that a bit more? 9 MS. TORRES: It's (crosstalk) paneling and we did 10 11 the same things at the Ethel with the Park Kennedy because 12 we did also -- we were the architects for these two 13 projects. And we spent, actually, quite a lot of time 14 looking at color palettes. If color palette that disappear 15 16 if it is a little bit clouded, you know? That was our main 17 intent. 18 So Susan and I spent quite a lot of time up on the 19 roof and holding up colors until we had the right color for 20 the screening. For the screening, our, I don't want to say it is 21 22 a problem, but because of the mechanical system and because 23 of net zero and everything is still pretty new, we still

So we thought we'd go a little bit higher, 18

don't know the exact height of our mechanical system.

24

```
1
    feet, and we hope that we are not going to use the 18 feet,
 2
    but our intent is that it disappears and that you won't see
 3
    it, and that if the mechanical engineer selects a mechanical
 4
    unit that it is much lower. That's what we are hoping for.
              COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Okay. Well, I hope for
 5
 6
    that too.
 7
              MS. TORRES: Thanks.
8
              COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: And I appreciate the
    explanation for that. My colleagues might remember that
9
    former commissioner always preferred a darker color, but I
10
11
    actually -- I disagree with that and believe that, Ms.
12
    Torres, you're on the right path that a lighter color --
13
              MS. TORRES:
                           Thank you.
14
              COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: -- is more appropriate and,
15
    actually, does fade away.
16
              MS. TORRES: Yeah.
17
              COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: And we know this because
18
    even Disney provides a lighter color for their buildings to
19
    fade away. So I appreciate that.
20
              And the last -- my last question is I think you
    described it as a metal cornice or crown at the four corner
21
22
    -- I think it's at all four corners of the building. It's
    almost, I quess, a shading element, a metal shading element
23
    of some kind.
24
```

And I couldn't quite make that out. I just -- I

1 was curious, for my own interest, where that evolved or 2 developed from? It's almost like a cap, if you will. Sort 3 of baseball cap at the corner. 4 MS. TORRES: Yeah. 5 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: So yes, it flares, and so I noticed the flare in the renderings. I'm curious if the 6 7 flare is for aesthetics or is there something behind the flare, in terms of the functionality? 8 9 MS. TORRES: The flare is a -- good point, the flare is more for aesthetics. What we wanted to achieve 10 11 here, especially because of Independence Avenue and we spent 12 a lot of time there. Cars are really driving really fast 13 and we wanted to make this corner really more prominent on 21st Street and on 20th Street, because, for us, this is 14 15 what people are going to see. This is what should be the 16 entrance into Hill East. It's like a gateway. 17 So we wanted, not only through the towers, to make 18 this clear, but even to have more of an accentuated roofline 19 with the flaring up baseball cap, that's a interesting term, 20 so with the baseball cap. Basically, we say, here we are, you know, just to 21 22 be more visually dominant. 23 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Okay. All right. Thank 24 you very much.

I'm not sure, I guess my first instincts was it

```
1
    was a slight deviation from the vocabulary that you've
 2
    already established, and so it certainly stood out in that
 3
    way.
              So you know, I'm not sure that I've been won over
 4
 5
    yet with that design element, but overall, though, I think
    you all did a nice job.
 6
 7
              Now --
 8
              MS. TORRES: Thank you, appreciate --
9
              COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes, Ms. Torres.
                                                        I would
    have -- the one comment I would have is I wish you had more
10
11
    detail in your landscape plans.
12
              MS. TORRES: Oh.
              MS. BATTIES: Mr. Avrit with ParkerRodriguez is on
13
14
    the --
15
              MR. YOUNG: He might be an attendee, so they might
16
    have to bring --
17
              MS. BATTIES:
                            Yeah, he -- I'm told he might be an
    attendee, so he would have to be elevated to (inaudible).
18
19
              COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Do we have his resume?
20
              MS. BATTIES: We're not proffering him as an
21
    expert.
22
              COMMISSIONER IMAMURA:
                                     Okay. Very good.
23
              MR. AVRIT: This is Dan Avrit.
24
              COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: All right. Mr. Avrit,
25
    thank you very much for joining. I just have a couple
```

questions for you.

Again, as I commented, and this is -- I'm sure that you would have liked to see more detail in the landscape set too for the presentation tonight. There wasn't a lot of detail, just because of the scale of the drawings, and I get that.

I would have liked to see some details, but in general, just wanted to ask, just the one question and if you would indulge me, please, just to talk a little bit about your planting palette that you selected and then, more specifically, I'm curious about your stormwater management, how you worked with the civil engineer.

I'm hoping you all worked with a civil engineer for your stormwater management plan.

MR. AVRIT: We are -- yeah, so we are currently working with the civil engineer on to develop the stormwater management plan. We're trying to get some of those bios that are tricky, because they stop kind of down the hill to keep those --

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yeah.

MR. AVRIT: -- relatively shallow. That is definitely our preference because sometimes they get a little too deep. So we want to develop that.

We've been doing a lot of work kind of finding the best material that works in bios, you know, to keep it

looking kind of lush and healthy throughout the year. And regarding the plant palette. We definitely like to use natives, you know, keep it very kind of adaptive. Sometimes natives are not always the best performers or are readily available for nurseries.

But definitely be an adaptive material. I think

- you know, and generally want to promote a lot of seasonal interest throughout the year. Not just kind of have a one season plant material, that it really does change with seasons, but also, you know, paying attention to all seasons so that there's winter interest as well as summer interest and yeah, this is pretty easy to get spring flower material in there, but kind of throughout the season and come up to fall interest that can really be beautiful and apt to a space.
- Just there's a lot to work through and we're currently kind of working through a few of those issues kind of as the streetscape evolves, but that's something that will become more readily apparent when we submit for public space.
- COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: All right. Thank you, Mr. Avrit. Somebody must have slipped you a note that I'm generally focused on the seasonal aspect of it, particularly winter. Everybody forgets about winter. So --
- MR. AVRIT: They do. I totally agree.

```
1
              COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: And I appreciate your sort
 2
    of explanation of the lush and densely planted streetscape,
 3
    but also not to forget maintenance.
              So as you work through your sign development, I'm
 4
 5
    sure you'll keep that in mind. And please keep pushing with
    the civil engineer, with your stormwater management
 6
 7
    strategy.
8
              So it's important for landscape architects to kind
    of be leading that effort.
9
10
              MR. AVRIT: Yeah, sometimes that's our struggle.
11
    We'll keep that in mind.
12
              COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: All right. Very good.
13
    Thank you, Mr. Avrit.
14
              MR. AVRIT: Thank you.
              COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Mr. Chairman, I think I'm
15
16
    satisfied with my questions and the comments that I -- and
17
    the responses by the applicant, and I yield back.
              I'm interested to hear Commissioner Stidham's and
18
19
    Vice Chair Miller's questions as well.
20
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you.
              Vice Chair, could you go next?
21
22
              VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
23
              And thank you Leila Battise and the applicant's
24
    architectural and the entire team for your presentation
25
    today.
```

It's gratifying, as someone who was on the City
Council staff when the Hill East Resurrection 13 Master Plan
came over from former Mayor Anthony Williams 22, 23 years
ago. I think it was 22 years ago that we approved it.

It's gratifying to see the implementation going forward, slowly but surely, and this is very -- certainly a very exciting aspect of it with the amount of housing and the amount of affordable housing and a deeper -- at deep levels as required by the Anacostia Waterfront Plan.

Commissioner Imamura, I appreciate all of your questions and comments. They were very thorough and covered a lot of ground and I won't try to -- I won't repeat -- I'll try not to repeat some of the comments I shared with you.

But I share pretty much all of the -- generally -- most of the comments that Commissioner Imamura made and the dialogue with the applicant's team. And I generally am very impressed with the design, the projecting bays, the different colors and materials and articulation, I think it's -- and the -- certainly the linear park, all is very attractive.

I'm not sure about the -- I'm not sure about the lighter color on the penthouse structure. I guess maybe with a couple more years with Commissioner Imamura you might get to the place that former Commissioner May got me too, which I wasn't first inclined to be there, for the darker

- penthouse structures fading into the grey, the grey and blue sky, but I found that to be the case after seeing the buildings go up that had lighter colors versus darker colors.
 - It is counterintuitive to think that a dark color against a grey or white or blue sky would fade away, but I don't know, I guess it's a subjective thing and maybe we're not always looking up or down from a plane or from another rooftop with amenities like -- that will be in the area.
 - So I'm not sure where I am on that, but let me just confirm that the setback in the height of the penthouse structures are all within the, you know, the one-to-one setback and within the height limitation, I think they are. Some of the renderings just they look pretty prominent, probably because you wanted us to be able to see what's being proposed.
 - But I just want to make sure that they -- the one-to-one step back and the height are within the limits?
 - MS. BATTIES: Yes.

- VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes. Ms. Batties has confirmed that. Thank you.
- I need to confirm one other thing, on the transportation conditions of DDOT. The applicant is agreeing to the DDOT, all the DDOT conditions, including the Independence Avenue Road Diet condition for the portion of

```
this site that -- of the Avenue that's in front of -- it's
1
 2
    this site?
              MS. BATTIES: Yes, the applicant agrees to all of
 3
    the conditions proposed by DDOT.
 4
 5
              VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay.
                                          Thank you for that
    confirmation.
 6
 7
              I also am not sure about what Commissioner Imamura
    interestingly called a baseball cap, the rooftop element
8
9
            It did stand out and it did call attention to the
    there.
    building and the height of the building and to the
10
11
    penthouse, the higher height of the penthouses behind it.
12
              So I'm not sure I personally am fond of the
                   If it actually looked like a baseball cap
13
    baseball cap.
14
    with maybe a W on it, that might make a lot of sense,
15
    especially since the Senators played at RFK not too far away
16
    for many, many years.
17
              Anyway, that's all kind of subjective comments.
    Let me, about the balconies. I'll ask Office of Planning.
18
19
              I appreciate you having worked with Office of
20
    Planning additionally the need to incorporate the Juliet
    balconies that apparently may not have been there and maybe
21
22
    are in an original or maybe not as many in an original
    concept, so I appreciate that integration and responsiveness
23
    to OP.
24
```

I'll ask OP -- and I appreciate also the dialogue

1 you had with Commissioner Imamura that the design is maybe evolved to a point that it's maybe too late, in terms of 2 3 cost and reconfiguration. But I'll ask OP whether they're satisfied with the 4 5 responses that you gave on that issue as to why you can't do more walk-out, full balconies. 6 7 But let me ask you, is one of the constraints, which I've seen in the past and I've asked OP to look at the 8 issue, and I'm not sure where OP is on looking at the issue. 9 Is one of the constraints the FAR of the 10 11 buildings? You're at 4.8 FAR for these residential 12 buildings. That's the maximum, that is the maximum FAR of the -- of this zone district. 13 14 I know, in some other cases, there was concern 15 about exceeding the FAR if they had the walk-out, full balconies and I've asked OP to look at the issue of not 16 17 including the square footage of balconies in the calculation 18 of FAR for the purposes of meeting the FAR requirement. 19 MS. BATTIES: That's not the case, there. And I 20 think they were contemplating just walk-out balconies that would not count toward FAR. 21 22 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. They would not count? So that's not the issue, but there are other costs and 23 reconfiguration issues associated with that? 24

MS. BATTIES:

Yes.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Well, so I will ask OP to respond and we'll see what they say on that issue.

I don't think I have any other questions, Mr. Chairman. I'm generally impressed with the project. I'm happy that it's moving forward, and I appreciate all of the responses that have been given today and all the information that's been provided into the record and I appreciate the community engagement, going back to ANC 7D and 7F and working on their issues and concerns.

I'm not looking at their latest comments in front of me, but to the extent they've had any conditions, you've agreed to all of their conditions or are addressing all of their concerns that -- in the way that they've suggested that you worked out?

MS. BATTIES: Yes. So primarily, what they wanted is an understanding of like the labor requests and the details on the variances and the waivers. When we met with both ANCs, we walked them through each waiver and the variance in detail and they were happy with the results.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: And I also appreciate all the detail that you provided on those waivers and variance, which I'm totally comfortable with. I think that the reasons that you've articulated in the record and here today make total sense, as to whether it's the topography or whether it's the linear park accommodation or whatever the

reason that was provided.

2.0

It made sense to proceed with the design that you have presented and it is an attractive design. So thank you very much, Ms. Battise and the team for being here today and for your work on this project and with the community.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you.

Commissioner Stidham, any questions or comments?

COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Thank you.

I have a -- well, a couple comments and I think one question. I have to agree, I'm not a huge fan of Juliet balconies. I feel they're not really a meaningful space, outdoor space for people who are making their home here, and I would encourage you to think about if there is a way to incorporate it -- incorporating them that still fits with the other objectives of the project.

I would -- I also too would like to see a lot more three-bedroom units, more families here. So I'm sort of not thrilled that there are so few of them. I believe the number was 11 and it would be great to see a lot more of those.

I think -- my question is -- so I'll go to the landscape plan first. While there's not a lot of detail there, I think that space even becomes more meaningful without the balcony space.

Τ	And I would hope that you would consider it
2	looks like there's a lot of structured space, space for
3	eating and preparing food. I don't see a lot of play space.
4	So I would encourage you to take a look at that as you look
5	a little further.
6	Not really clear on what's going to be included in
7	that park space out front, but be thinking about things that
8	are interesting, not just to the people who are walking in,
9	but the children who will be living there too, hopefully.
10	So I encourage you to go look at that.
11	MS. BATTIES: I'm sorry, Commissioner, are you
12	talking about the park on Independence Avenue?
13	COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Right. You're naming it
14	after Kennedy. The strip park on one of the projects.
15	And then help me understand
16	MS. BATTIES: (Crosstalk)
17	COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Go ahead. I'm sorry.
18	MS. BATTIES: I'm sorry. I just wanted to note
19	that that will be approved through Public Space Committee
20	because a portion of that project property for the park is
21	public space.
22	So we'll have we'll be able to do some
23	improvements there, but, you know, we will have restrictions
24	just based on what DDOT's requirements (audio cutout).
25	COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Understood.

Help me, the interior space, that's supposed to serve for both buildings, how will that space be welcoming to the people who are living in the other building? Because it's -- I believe it's completely confined to the interior? You know, they're basically walking through the lobby to get to that space, so how are people in the other building feeling welcomed to use that space, along with those that are living in the building? MS. TORRES: Good question. The different ways how the residents from B2 can go to the B1 amenity space. They either -- oh, yeah. could pull up slide -- it's -- I think it's slide number 8? There are two ways. COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Okay. MS. TORRES: The resident can go through the lobby of B2, get out onto 21st Street and then enter the main residential entrance on B1 and through the lobby and through the lounge and then into the courtyard. That is one way. The second way is they can go all the way down to the garage -- they can go through the garage and there we have connecting elevators in the first level garage where they go down on B2 elevators, get out of the garage and then get into the B1 elevator and go up. COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Okay. All right. I think

that -- going through the garage helps at least feel

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 connected to the other building. 2 MS. TORRES: Yes. And they're all sharing the 3 You know the bike space, and the EV stations. Everything that is down there is shared. 4 5 The courtyard itself, the nice thing is that some of the residential units that are around the courtyard, they 6 7 will have like a little outside terrace. 8 And then the courtyard itself, our fantastic landscape architect, is going to create different spaces 9 there for several people at the same time or several groups 10 11 to enjoy it. 12 I hope this answered your question. It did. 13 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: I would just add, I think the spaces could be really interesting, I just would 14 15 encourage you to include play spaces as well, so that there 16 is -- it looks like it's organized sort of in rooms to break 17 up the spaces and to offer different things to different 18 groups. 19 MS. TORRES: Yes. 20 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: So --MS. TORRES: Definitely an organic layout, that 21 22 was the vision of the landscape architect. 23 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: I like that. I like that. 24 I hope that he takes it further.

There was one other question about the retail and

```
1
    the waiver request associated with the retail. I believe it
 2
    was out of an abundance of caution. Could you go into that
    a little bit further, please?
 3
              MS. TORRES: That is correct. Because of an
 4
 5
    abundance of caution. Approximately 73 percent of that
    space is going to comply with the 14 feet clear height.
 6
 7
              COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: No, that the amount of
8
    retail space is the question.
9
              MS. BATTIES: I can explain.
10
              MS. TORRES: Oh, please.
11
              MS. BATTIES: We were asking for that and for an
12
    abundance of caution because we went to the Zoning
13
    Administrator to get an interpretation as to whether or not
14
    the communal like office space or work stations would count
15
    toward meeting the preferred use requirement.
16
              We did not get a confirmation back from the Zoning
17
    Administrator. I even want to say maybe Office of Planning
18
    at one point thought we didn't need the waiver, but since it
19
    wasn't clear, we requested the waiver.
20
              COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Got it. Got it. Okay,
21
    that is helpful. Thank you.
22
              Chairman Hood, I think that's all I have.
23
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you.
24
              One of the things that I've learned over the years
```

on the Zoning Commission, that's why there's five of us.

remember one case where all five people told the applicant something different.

And at the end, I told them good luck. Come back whatever the votes are.

Let me just first of all say that I believe that this is neatly packaged. I like the design. I've heard some of my colleagues' questions and comments. I liked everything I saw in the submission, but I will caution you, you know, I hear about we need to upgrade some stuff.

One thing, I don't like a lot of crowded stuff. I don't like my room to be packed to where I can't move around in it, so you know and I heard that about the landscape plan. I would defer to some, but sometimes I won't.

So I'm sure that while one commissioner or two has asked for upgrades, but make sure that it's across the board. I would not like to see it cluttered. A neighborhood cluttered -- and another thing is, what I'm seeing in the city management, we got to make sure we take care of stuff.

You know, we're planning stuff and we don't take care of it. So what -- I'm sure that this applicant and this developer have watched what they've done all over the city and they've been taking care of it. They've worked with the community engagement and I appreciate that.

I know we did foam-based coating for this area,

that was a big issue too. And I think, again, that's why I
said I see this forming to me neatly packaged.

I will say this though, the bicycle parking, and I don't want to get in trouble here, do we need that much bicycle parking? Who is the audience we're trying to attract here? Because there's got to be an audience, a clientele you're trying to attract.

I get the income numbers, like 30 percent, 20 percent MFI, but that's quite a bit of bicycle parking for being close to a metro. So maybe it's -- maybe -- I know you've run the numbers. I believe -- I know bicycles are very prevalent, but I want to make sure that that has been analyzed so that we ascertain and we can justify how many bicycle parking. Because we got a bit here near metro.

MR. WATSON: Absolutely and it's a valid question. You know, and I appreciate that. You know, when we look at zoning, we're required to have 166 spaces. You know, we're providing 233, which is about 77 more than zoning.

You know, I think one of the things we think about when we're thinking of where the location is. DDOTs implemented a considerable bicycle -- bike infrastructure on Capitol Hill and Hill East and the area.

You've got the Anacostia Trail that's nearby there. So there's a significant amount of bike infrastructure that we want to make sure we're able to

respond, you know, to any need that may be there from potential residents, no matter what their income are.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I appreciate that. I
4 just want to make sure that we have examined everything.
5 And I think that helps me.

I wasn't pro or conning it, I was just trying to figure out, making sure that we either leave room -- we're not overbilling. You know, we leave room to expand, but we -- because right now, I'm sure, if this facility was fully developed and ready to go and it was approved and everything, I don't know if all those spaces would probably go -- those bicycle spaces would be utilized.

And plus, I'm thinking, and I've said this before and I know people disagree with me, I'm thinking when you get over like 70 or 75, you're not going to be riding -- well, my former colleague, since his name was brought up, he would disagree with me and I'm sure the bicycle community would disagree with me, but we don't know where we're going to be 15 and 20 years from now.

We may be riding bikes now -- and I hope we all are still riding bikes at 70 and 80 years old, but the folks over here that living near me, when we were dealing with the bike issue, saying, Anthony Hood, I'm not riding no bike to my doctor's appointment.

These are people in their 80's. So we have to

```
1
    balance it. That's all I'm saying.
              Let me ask you this, about the repair. How does
 2
 3
    that work? Is there somebody manning that or is that --
    I've heard that before, or is it just where I can go in and
 4
 5
    fix my own flat tire? How does that work?
              MR. WATSON: So the bicycle repair stations is
 6
 7
    that what you're referring to?
8
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Right.
9
              MR. WATSON: Yeah. So it's for the -- they're not
    manned at all. It's basically kind of a small little
10
    station with a set of tools attached to it. There's a bike
11
12
    air pump there. It just kind of allows people to do minor
    repairs to their bikes, you know, on their own as needed.
13
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Okay, thank you for
14
15
    that.
16
              I have a couple more questions. And I appreciate
17
    the work with the ANC. I have to commend both ANCs. I
    think they're both in unison, wanted to postpone this, if I
18
19
    recall this correctly.
20
              But I do want to commend ANC 7F and 7D too, but
    7F, I had to search for their support. They wrote three
21
22
    letters and you had to really look hard to find their
23
    support.
              So I appreciate all the work that has been done by
24
25
    both. I think we only had two ANCs, correct?
```

1 Ms. Battise? Yeah. 2 MS. BATTIES: Yeah. CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah. I appreciate the work of 3 both ANCs. 4 5 Now, let me ask this about the, and I think you mentioned this, about the affordable units. How does 6 7 that -- let me see, how do I want to ask that. 8 How are people being notified that this may And I notice this is a design review, how is the 9 happen? messaging going, besides just through the ANCs? How is this 10 11 whole messaging process being done? Communication 12 (crosstalk) --13 MS. BATTIES: (Crosstalk) --14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: This project is coming. have affordable housing? You know, this is what we have 15 here? This is what's coming right near the Metro? How is 16 17 that being advertised? 18 MS. BATTIES: So I will say, this applicant is 19 very much engaged with the community at all levels. 20 know, in fact, it's either the Ethel or the Park Kennedy, they run like a training program out of that building. 21 22 So they're engaged. And they also have control over I think three other parcels within Hill East. So they 23 24 are visible, engaged, actively engaged stakeholders and the 25 community knows them and they know what's coming down the

pike.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Yeah, I'm pretty sure they're engaged not just in this area, but all over the city, so I just wanted you to put that on the record.

Let me see what else I may have. And that whole conversation about materials. I think materials -- I heard Commissioner Imamura and Vice Chair Miller talking about the lite and the dark.

For me it's a little goes -- but I have learned to go with the dark and I'll tell you why. Not just even -- not just with the penthouse, because yesterday I looked at a building that this Commission voted on and I was horrified with all the dirt that was coming down those lite colors, it really just turned -- and I'm like, you know, and I think that's why I've kind of, Vice Chair, I've kind of learned from Commissioner May, also from John Parsons, and also from the late Gerald E. Press about that.

So they've taught me that and I've actually seen it. So that's -- leaves to be desired on light and dark colors. But what I ask applicants to do, and I think Commissioner May has done this too, as well in recent years.

If you're going to use those lighter colors, come up with some kind of a way to clean them, because when you ride by some of these buildings, when you've been here 25 years and you ride by some of these buildings, you -- they

```
1
    were voted on in 1998 and you look at them, you get very
    disappointed when they're not kept up. So I'll leave it at
 2
 3
    that.
              But other than that, I think this is a great
 4
 5
              I like the way it's packaged, is the word I'm
    going to use. And I'll leave it at that.
6
 7
              Any follow-up questions?
 8
              Okay. All right.
9
              Ms. Schellin, do we have anyone from ANC 7F or
10
    7D?1
11
              MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir.
12
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Do we have any other
    government agencies, besides DDOT, and I don't think DDOT is
13
    here, but do we have any other --
14
15
              MS. SCHELLIN: DDOT is here.
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Oh, DDOT is here? Okay.
16
17
              MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.
18
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: What about any other --
19
              MS. SCHELLIN: No others.
20
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.
21
              MS. SCHELLIN: No others. Just DDOT and OP>
22
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let's go -- okay. Let's go to
    DDOT and then we'll go to OP. And thank the applicant
23
24
    again. We'll come back shortly.
25
              MS. SCHELLIN: We have Maxine Brown-Roberts from
```

```
1
    OP. Do you want them both up at the same time?
 2
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah. No, let's just bring up
 3
    DDOT first. We have a new person --
 4
              MS. SCHELLIN: Just DDOT? Okay.
 5
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: -- I didn't recognize his name.
              MS. SCHELLIN: Sure. It's Mr. Jutte.
 6
 7
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Jutte?
 8
              MS. SCHELLIN: I may have pronounced it wrong.
9
              MR. JUTTE: You did. That's okay. I'll deal.
    It's happened my whole life. Every graduation. I get it.
10
11
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Jutte, is this your first
12
    time on the Zoning Commission?
13
              MR. JUTTE: Yes, sir.
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Well, first of all I want to
14
15
    welcome you to the Zoning Commission. And have you been to
16
    the BZA yet? I have a standing question.
17
              MR. JUTTE: Not yet, no.
18
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Well, I'll ask you later
19
    then.
20
              Mr. Jutte, welcome again. You may begin.
              MR. JUTTE: Thank you.
21
22
              Good evening, Chairman Hood, and members of the
    Commission. For the record, I'm Preston Jutte with the
23
24
    District Department of Transportation.
25
              DDOT is supportive of the applicant's proposal to
```

1 develop parcels B1 and B2 on the Hill East Campus and our 2 March 29th, 2024, report, which is in the record as Exhibit 3 27, we recommend approval with two conditions, construction of a road diet on Independence Avenue Southeast by using 4 permanent materials, and implementation of a Transportation 5 6 Demand Management Plan. 7 As you heard in the applicant's presentation, they have agreed to both of our requested conditions and with 8 9 those included in the zoning order, DDOT has no objection to the approval of this design review application. 10 We look forward to continuing to work with the 11 12 applicant on the road diet, as well as the design of the streetscape and the curbside management plan as they go 13 14 through public space permitting. 15 Thank you and I'd be happy to answer any 16 questions. 17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Jutte, let me ask you. Was 18 this easier to analyze because the Metro was closer? 19 MR. JUTTE: I'm not sure how to answer that 20 question. I guess, what exactly are you asking? CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'm just asking you, when you 21 22 did your analyzation and your DDOT, and your transportation 23 management and all -- everything you analyzed to give us a 24 report, was it easier for you to analyze because the Metro

25

was near?

```
1
              MR. JUTTE: I think for our purposes it's a
 2
    factor, but I'm not sure I would say it's easier or harder.
    It impacts the parking rates, you know, what we look at, but
 3
    I'm not sure I could say it's easier or harder, one way or
 4
    the other over the --
 5
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So you just --
 6
 7
              MR. JUTTE: -- for the purposes of analysis.
8
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'm going to pick on you now
    since you're new. So now you are -- since you're new, I can
9
    pick on you. The rest of them know I do this.
10
11
              So basically, you still use your, what is it the
12
    quide, the transportation quidebook, you still use that in
13
    your analyzation?
14
              MR. JUTTE: Yes, sir. We use the Comprehensive
15
    Transportation Review Guidelines.
16
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Okay. All right, I'm
17
    going to leave you alone on that. So I think it's good.
18
    Thank you for your report.
19
              MR. JUTTE: Excellent. Thank you.
20
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Commissioner Imamura, do you
    have any questions or comments?
21
22
              COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, no
    questions.
23
24
              Mr. Jutte, welcome to the Zoning Commission.
25
    Thank you for bringing your talent and expertise to DDOT and
```

```
1
    to the Zoning Commission tonight. Appreciate the work that
    you put into your report and, again, welcome.
 2
 3
              MR. JUTTE: Thank you. Appreciate it.
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And Vice Chair Miller?
 4
 5
              VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
              Thank you, Mr. Jutte, for being here, for joining
 6
 7
    DDOT well enough. You just joined DDOT -- well, are you
8
    just joining DDOT or just joining this part of DDOT, but
    we're happy to have you here.
9
10
              MR. JUTTE: Thank you.
11
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And Commissioner Stidham, any
12
    questions or comments?
              COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: No, just echo the welcome
13
14
    and we look forward to you joining us more often.
15
              MR. JUTTE: Thank you.
16
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So Mr. Jutte, let me just say,
17
    don't -- it's not going to always be that way, but let's
18
    just see how it goes, okay?
19
              Does the applicant have any cross of the District
20
    Department of Transportation?
21
              MS. BATTIES: No, we don't.
22
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Ms. Batties?
23
              MS. BATTIES: No, we don't.
24
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you.
25
              All right. Again, Ms. Schellin, we don't have
```

anybody from the ANC, right? 1 2 MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir. 3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. 4 All right, Mr. Jutte, thank you very much. 5 greatly appreciate it. 6 All right. Let's go to Ms. Brown-Roberts. 7 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman 8 and members of the Zoning Commission. This is Maxine Brown-9 Roberts from the Office of Planning and I don't know why my video isn't showing, but I'll go ahead. 10 11 You can hear me? 12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah, we can hear you fine. MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Yes. Okay. Sorry about that. 13 The Office of Planning recommends that the Zoning 14 15 Commission approve this design review application, along 16 with the requested waiver and variance. 17 Next slide. The Office of Planning found that the application 18 19 generally meets the mandatory design review criteria for 20 Subtitle X, Section 604 which seeks to promote consistency with the Comprehensive Plan map and policies. 21 22 The Hill East Master Plan, and the Hill East 23 Design Guidelines outlined in Subtitle K for the Hill East 24 Zone, as well as the housing and retail use as the proposal 25 would provide active and passive open space areas for

residents, as well as the general public. Safe pedestrian and bicycle and vehicle spaces, and encourage the use of transit and sustainability.

We are supportive of the architecture that meets the mandatory design. We are supportive of the architecture. Other features we found compelling included the linear park along Independence Avenue, the architectural crown to accentuate the roofline, the tower elements, the private drive to provide access to shared loading berths, trash pickup and other back of the house activities of both buildings, as well as what should be visible porous ground floor at the retail area along Burke Street.

The regulations allow an applicant to seek waivers and relief through the design review process and this application includes a handful of areas that would require waivers.

Some of the waivers could be traced back to providing the setback from Independence Avenue, sculpting the building away from the property lines to allow some depth to the changing rhythm of the building façade and responded to the topography of the site.

None of the waivers or the variance would result in undo impacts on any adjacent properties or the overall development of the Hill East as envisioned by the Master Plan.

Subtitle X 604 also asks us to evaluate the project's consistency with the Comp Plan, and we do this through a Racial Equity Lens. Our full racial equity analysis can be found beginning on page 26 of our report, but to summarize, the project would further a number of policies related to equity.

The project would meet its affordable unit's requirement by providing units at zero to 30 percent, 30 to 50 percent, and 60 to 100 percent AMI. There also would be varying unit sizes, including some three bedrooms.

Along with the housing, there would be an extension of Burke Street and the construction of 20th and 21st Street. The development limits curb cuts making it much safer for pedestrians and it is easier to walk to and from the metro.

With the development's proximity to Metrorail and buses, residents would have transportation options, making it easier to access employment or other locally, city-wide, or others in the region.

Next slide.

Regarding the FLUM, the HE-2 zone and the proposed development would not be inconsistent with the medium density residential and commercial uses recommended. The FLUM also recommends institutional uses.

However, as addressed in our report, the vision

for a hospital at Hill East was envisioned at the time of the Master Plan has been relocated to St. Elizabeth's.

Next slide.

The Policy Map recommends the area for a land use change area and the future planning analysis area. All these recommendations are reflected in the Hill East Master Plan.

The resilience focused areas are reflected in the sustainability elements included in the proposal. Many of the recommendations of the Master Plan has been included in the Capitol Hill area element and the Capitol Hill policy area focus area.

Next slide.

When evaluated through a racial equity lens, the proposal would provide housing and affordable housing at various AMI and would provide variety in unit sizes. The data shows that the Capitol Hill is becoming more diverse, however, it has one of the lowest amount of affordable housing in the District.

According to the mayor's 2019 Housing Equity Report, which has been updated in February 2024, Capitol Hill has projected -- was projected to provide 1,400 affordable units by 2025.

However, to date, only 22.9 percent of the projected units have been provided. The affordable units

- 1 generated by this project would go towards meeting the 2 housing goals for the planning area and advance the Comp 3 Plan policies related to housing.
- 4 We did identify, in a report, that we would like 5 to have additional balconies on Building B2, and the Commission has sort of talked about it already, and so we 7 are going to leave that decision up to the Zoning Commission to make.

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- However, as stated in our report, one of the things that we think on this building B2 was that most of the recreational facilities are in -- are in building B1 and, you know, those residents will always have to be leaving their building to go to another building, and I think this would give them some additional outdoor space.
 - Regarding the -- I think the aesthetics that the applicant has concerns about, I think that's something that could be managed.
 - So I think that was a two question. Mr. Miller also asked about the open balconies, the open balconies counting towards FAR, they don't, and we have not done any further analysis on that, but currently, the open balconies do not count towards FAR.
 - So in summary, again, the Office of Planning recommends approval of the application.
- 25 Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I'm available for

```
questions.
1
 2
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you very much, Ms. Brown-
 3
    Roberts. Let's see if we have any questions or comments.
              Commissioner Imamura?
 4
 5
              COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: No questions. Thank you,
    Ms. Brown-Roberts for your report.
 6
 7
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Commissioner Miller? Vice
    Chair Miller?
8
9
              VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
              Thank you, Ms. Brown-Roberts, for your report and
10
11
    your presentation here today.
12
              So I appreciate you leaving it up to the
13
    Commission on the balcony question, but were you satisfied
    with the response that the applicant gave to the
14
15
    recommendation that walk-out balconies could be
    accommodated?
16
17
              You were saying that the aesthetics, I think in
18
    one of the responses you gave or one of the comments you
19
    made just now was that the aesthetics, at least, could be
20
    managed.
              Do you think the reorientation of the units and
21
22
    the whatever costs is involved could also be managed?
23
              MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: I don't know about the
    costing, because we haven't done an analysis on that.
24
25
    was something that was conveyed to us by the applicant.
```

Τ	But at the same time, I consider numerous, you
2	know, buildings throughout the city that has balconies, you
3	know, to various income levels and that sort of thing.
4	So I don't know what the cost is in regarding this
5	application. I will say that, yes, you know, we work with
6	the applicant, they work with us on the design of the
7	building and we were very encouraged about that.
8	We did mention we did bring up the issue about
9	the about balconies early and they did come back with the
10	Juliet balconies, but again, you know, sometimes we don't
11	catch everything at these meetings and it's when we get the
12	full package before us that some things really hit us and
13	stuff like that.
14	So that was the situation in this case.
15	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Well, thank you for
16	that response and thank you for all of your work and
17	recommendations to the applicant on this project.
18	Thank you very much.
19	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Thank you.
20	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Any questions or
21	comments, Commissioner Stidham?
22	COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: No, none from me. Thank
23	you, Ms. Brown-Roberts for being here this evening.
24	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Okay. Thank you.
25	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I have to Ms. Brown-Roberts,

```
1
    I don't have any questions for you, but thank you, again,
 2
    another well-done report. We appreciate it. Thank you.
              Let's see if we have Ms. Battise, does the
 3
 4
    applicant have any cross?
 5
              MS. BATTIES: No, we don't.
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. And again, we don't, at
 6
 7
    this point, have I don't believe, anyone from either the
8
    ANCs.
9
              So thank you, Ms. Brown-Roberts.
              MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
10
11
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So let's see if we have anyone
12
    who would like to testify in support, opposition, or
13
    undeclared.
14
              Ms. Schellin?
15
              MS. SCHELLIN: We do not.
16
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.
17
              Ms. Batties, do you have any closing remarks or
18
    any rebuttal or closing?
19
              MS. BATTIES: No. We again, just respectfully
20
    request that the Zoning Commission approve the application
    of the building's design as proposed. And I just want to
21
22
    reiterate that the applicant has considered the cost and the
23
    management of balconies, which as you know this is not their
24
    first project, and they made the decision that, in this
25
    case, of Juliet balconies is the appropriate alternative to
```

```
full walk-out balconies. Thank you.
1
 2
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Ms. Batties, let me just ask
 3
    you. Didn't you mention that the RFP was out there some
    years now, it just sat there?
 4
              MS. BATTIES: Well, the first phase was out in
 5
    2012 and then the second RFP came out in 2020. The RFP for
6
7
    this phase two.
8
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay, phase two, okay.
9
              All right. Thank you.
              Any follow-up questions or comments?
10
11
              All right. Did anybody ask for anything? And I
12
    believe this is a design -- is that two votes, Ms. Schellin,
13
    or one?
14
              MS. SCHELLIN: This is a one vote --
15
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.
16
              MS. SCHELLIN: -- case.
17
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. Did anybody ask for
18
    anything? Did --
19
              MS. SCHELLIN: No. I think there was just to make
20
    sure that they were good with the conditions that OP, DDOT,
    and I believe the ANC had some concerns. Were those all
21
2.2
    addressed?
23
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah.
              MS. SCHELLIN: I believe Ms. Lovick will --
24
25
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah, let me -- I was asking --
```

```
1
              MS. SCHELLIN: Just go ahead and make sure she has
    everything she needs. If you guys are thinking about
 2
 3
    proceeding this evening?
 4
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Make sure who has everything
 5
    they need?
 6
              MS. SCHELLIN: Ms. Lovick.
 7
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.
8
              MS. SCHELLIN: As far as for the order that
9
    everything's been addressed.
10
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let me make sure we have --
11
              MS. SCHELLIN: (Crosstalk).
12
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: -- everything we need first.
13
              MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. That you guys feel you've
    addressed everything as far as --
14
15
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah. Then we'll go to Ms.
16
    Lovick --
17
              MS. SCHELLIN: -- with DDOT, OP --
18
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: -- and everybody else.
19
              MS. SCHELLIN: -- because I did have to answer a
20
    call and email, so I didn't hear whether they addressed
21
    those concerns or not.
22
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. No problem.
23
              Does anybody need anything or have any hesitation
    that we need to hold off?
24
25
              Let me just go down my regular order for the
```

night. 1 2 Commissioner Imamura? 3 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: No requests, Mr. Chairman. Nothing to hold this up. I did encourage the applicant to 4 5 think more about a lighting plan in the private driveway, private drive, but I don't think that we need to hold this 6 7 up to review that. I'm certain that they'll take that into serious 8 consideration. 9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: 10 Okav. 11 And Vice Chair Miller, anything? 12 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I was 13 having trouble finding my cursor to unmute myself. 14 No, I think, you know, I think there are certain 15 things we might have preferred to see the, and we were 16 encouraging the applicant to pursue if this goes forward, 17 whether it's the lighting plan that Commissioner Imamura said, the LEED Gold versus Silver, the walk-out balconies 18 19 versus the Juliet balconies. 20 You could get rid of the baseball cap trellis rooftop structure if you want to. You know, if you want to 21 22 -- if we proceed tonight, if you want to put in the draft zoning order the flexibility to do all those things so you 23 don't have to come back to us, whether it's legal, more 24 25 detailed lighting, landscaping plan, walk-out balconies, and

1 more three-bedroom units, as Commissioner Stidham had 2 mentioned. You know, I think, if we could have that 3 4 flexibility in the order to make those improvements, if you 5 can do it, that would make the project even better, but I'm not prepared, after 22 years of seeing this Master Plan on 6 7 the shelf, seeing it implemented. 8 I don't want to do anything to hold up it being implemented. 9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: 10 Okay. Commissioner Stidham? 11 12 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: No, I don't need anything 13 further. 14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. 15 Yeah, I don't want it to stay on the shelf and I 16 don't want it to go back to the shelf. I know some of the 17 things that we've asked for, some requested individually we 18 may have, but I think, overall it's beneficial to the city. 19 So we can do that. We can do, as the Vice Chair 20 mentioned, about putting the flexibility in there if possible, especially the lighting plan, but I believe this 21 22 applicant, Ms. Torres, and those people that we've discussing with all of the applicant, and I don't mean those 23 24 people, but the applicant, and also the community. 25 I believe that they will adhere and do what's best

```
for the best interest of the residents of this city. I have
1
 2
    every bit of confidence in that. So I am ready.
              We can do the flexibility. Put it in the order
 3
    whatever, I'll leave that up to our legal folks, but I
 4
 5
    believe that this is ready to move forward.
              So with that, unless I hear any objection, we will
 6
 7
    go ahead and move forward.
8
              Would somebody like to make a motion?
                                      I'll make the motion,
9
              COMMISSIONER IMAMURA:
    unless I saw Vice Chair Miller move forward, so I'll yield
10
    to Vice Chair Miller.
11
12
              VICE CHAIR MILLER: That was very perceptive.
13
              I would move that the Zoning Commission take
    action, approval action on case number 23-28, Hill East
14
    Parcel B LLC., Design Review in Parcel B1 and Parcel B2 in
15
16
    the Hill East Zone District at Square 112E lots 809, 815 on
17
    Independence Avenue Southeast and ask for a second.
18
              COMMISSIONER IMAMURA:
                                      Second.
19
              CHAIRPERSON HOOD: It's been moved and properly
20
    second.
              Any further discussion?
21
22
              Not hearing any, Ms. Schellin, would you do a roll
    call vote, please?
23
24
              MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.
25
              Commissioner Miller?
```

İ	
1	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.
2	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Imamura?
3	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.
4	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood?
5	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.
6	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Stidham?
7	COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes.
8	MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is four to zero to one to
9	approve final action with the flexibility stated on the
10	dais.
11	So four to zero to one to approve final action as
12	discussed and the minus one being the third mayoral
13	appointee seat, which is vacant.
14	And if we could have a draft findings of facts,
15	conclusions of law uploaded to ISIS with an Word version
16	emailed to me within four weeks, that would be great.
17	MS. BATTIES: Thank you so much.
18	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Do we have anything else on
19	this case?
20	MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir.
21	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. The Zoning Commission
22	has a monthly meeting on April the 11th. Is that correct?
23	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, Thursday.
24	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Oh. I thought today was
25	Thursday. Again, okay.

Τ	All right. So April the 11th the Zoning
2	Commission with have its regular monthly meeting. We have a
3	number of agenda items on the agenda and we will be on these
4	same platforms at the same time.
5	Again, we want to thank Hill East Parcel B, LLC.,
6	for working with the community and coming back, we think,
7	with a win-win for the District of Columbia.
8	So thank you and with that, this hearing is
9	adjourned. Good night everyone.
10	(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 6:03
11	p.m.)
12	* * * *
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
l.	•

1	TRANSCRIBER CERTIFICATE
2	
3	This is to certify that the foregoing transcript
4	In the matter of: Public Hearing
5	Before: DC Zoning Commission
6	Date: 4-8-2024
7	Place: Teleconference
8	was accurately transcribed under my direction; further,
9	that said transcript is a true and accurate record of the
LO	proceedings.
-	Cuptal L. Helyard
L1 L2	
L2 L3	Transaction None
	Transcriber Name
L4 L5	
L6 L7	
L 7	
L0 L9	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	