GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

REGULAR PUBLIC HEARING CASE NO. 24-23

+ + + + +

MONDAY

FEBRUARY 24, 2025

+ + + + +

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

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

ANTHONY J. HOOD, Chairperson ROBERT E. MILLER, Vice Chair JOSEPH IMAMURA, Commissioner GWEN WRIGHT, Commissioner TAMMY STIDHAM, Commissioner

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

PAUL YOUNG, Zoning Data Specialist ELLA ACKERMAN, Secretary

OFFICE OF ZONING LEGAL DIVISION STAFF PRESENT:

JACOB RITTING, Esquire

ALSO PRESENT:

MATTHEW JESICK, DC Office of Planning

NOAH HAGEN, DC Department of Transportation

ERIC DEBEAR, ESQUIRE, Cozen O'Connor Counsel for Applicant

NICOLE WHITE, Principal, Symmetra Design

LUIS BOZA, Associate Architect, A2 Design, Inc.

LATONYA HENDERSON, Chief Executive Officer Cedar Tree Academy Public Charter School

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Regular Public Hearing held on February 24, 2024.

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

Case No. 24-23 Cedar Tree Academy Public Charter School
Introduction - Chairman Hood 4
Preliminary Matters 6
Applicant's Case Mr. DeBear
Questions/Comments from Commissioners Commissioner Imamura
Department of Transportation Report - Mr. Hagen 54
Office of Planning Report - Mr. Jesick 56
ANC 8A Report - Vice Chair Miller 58
Closing Statements - Mr DeBear 59

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

2 (4:00 p.m.)

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Good afternoon, ladies gentlemen. We are convening and broadcasting this public meeting by videoconferencing -- public -- I'm sorry; give me one moment. Let's try that again. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. are convening and broadcasting this public hearing by videoconferencing. My name is Anthony Hood. I'm joined by Vice Chair Miller, Commissioner Wright, Commissioner Stidham, and Commissioner Imamura. We're also joined by the Office of Zoning staff, Ms. Ella Ackerman and Paul Young, who will be handling all of our virtual operations, and our Office of Zoning Legal Division, Mr. Jacob Ritting. We will ask all others to introduce themselves at the appropriate time.

The virtual public hearing notice is available on the Office of Zoning's website. This proceeding is being recorded by a court reporter and is also webcast live via Webex and YouTube Live. The video will be available on the Office of Zoning's website after the hearing. Accordingly, all those listening on Webex or by phone will be muted during the hearing, and only those who have signed up to 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, then please call our OZ Hotline

number at 202-727-0789 to receive Webex log-in or call-in instructions or if you have not signed up to testify.

2.

All persons planning to testify must sign up in advance and will be called by name at the appropriate time. At the time of signup, all participants will complete the oath or affirmation required by Subtitle Z-408.7. If you wish to file written testimony and additional supporting documents during the hearing, then please be prepared to describe and discuss it at the time of your request -- at the time of -- describe and discuss it at the time of your request when submitting.

The subject of this evening's hearing is Zoning Commission Case Number 24-23, Cedar Tree Academy Public Charter School Design Review in the NHR zone at Square 5861, Lot 89. Again, this is 701 Howard Road Southeast, February 24th, 2025. The hearing will be conducted in accordance with the provisions of 11-Z DCMR, Chapter 4, as follows. We will have preliminary matters; the applicant's case -- the applicant has up to 60 minutes, but I would ask them to condense it. We have reviewed the record; just hit the highlights, unless my colleagues decide otherwise or would like to see otherwise -- report of the Office of Planning and Department of Transportation, but not in that order -- we will have other governments first, and then we will have the report of the Department of Transportation and the report of the Office of Planning, in that order -- report of other government -- report of the ANC; and then we will have testimony

of organizations and individuals, organizations five minutes individuals three minutes; and we will hear respectively in the order of those who are in support, opposition, or undeclared. Then we will have rebuttal and closing by the applicant. At that time, Ms. Ackerman, do we have any preliminary matters.

MS. ACKERMAN: Yes, we do.

2.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Sure. Let's go through them.

MS. ACKERMAN: Cedar Tree Academy Public Charter School is the applicant tonight, and they are represented by Eric J. DeBear of Cozen O'Connor. They plan to take 15, give or take, minutes to present. We do have an OP report, which is in support, at Exhibit 17. This will be represented by Matthew Jesick, and he plans to take three minutes. ANC 8A submitted a resolution at Exhibit 20, and they are in support as well.

Now I have waiver requests that I'm going to go over. On February 13th, 2-25, DDOT submitted a report at Exhibit 16, and the report stated that the Comprehensive Transportation Review for the subject zoning case was due on January 10th. Cedar Tree Academy Public Charter School submitted it on January 27th. Therefore, DDOT was unable to provide a timely report by the Zoning Commission deadline of February 14th. As such, DDOT requests a waiver from the 10-day District agency filing date.

On February 14th, the applicant submitted its revised CTR at Exhibit 18 and 18A, with a request to waive the 30-day filing requirement of Subtitle Z-401.8 to allow it to file a CTR

10 days before the hearing. On February 21st, DDOT submitted a report at Exhibit 23, stating that they have no objection to the approval of this design review application, with the following conditions included in the order. These conditions are to implement the Transportation Demand Management Program and a Performance Monitoring Plan, as proposed in the February 14th revised CTR for the life of the project, unless otherwise noted. The Commission should rule on these waivers at this time.

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

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Colleagues, again, we've heard the request from Ms. Ackerman. She spelled it out. Typically, what I've noticed when they ask for waivers, that means a continuing of work that's being done to address issues. It looks like -- for me, I don't have any objections to giving the waivers all the way around. I'm not going to go through all what dates and all that, but I think it's probably a better resolution that we go ahead and allow the work that has been done, even maybe up to the last day or so, to be able to give us a clearcut case, especially when it comes to transportation, but let me hear from others. And tonight I'm going to -- when we go to questions, I'm going to start with Commissioner Imamura. This is a design case, so I'm going to go to him first to get us started, but let me hear from my colleagues first. Vice Chair Miller.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, I agree with you that they were working on issues and that's why

we got some late reports, which we can evaluate the issues if we accept the -- if we accept the waiver, we can then evaluate the application and see what any additional information we might need. So I'm ready to go forward with a yes for that.

2.

2.2

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Commissioner Imamura.

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm in agreement with you, Vice Chair Miller. I think the supplemental report is important to include in the record here and weigh in our decision-making tonight, so I'm amendable to waiving -- approving the waiver.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Commissioner Stidham.

COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: I also agree with Commissioner Imamura. The information is definitely necessary and adds to this case, and I'm fine with the waiver request.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. And Commissioner Wright.

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes, I support the waivers.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I probably could have done that a lot easier as a general consensus, but I figured I wanted to hear from everybody individually. Okay. So, Ms. Ackerman, we'll accept that. And, again, the ANC is 8A, and I'm just going to let Commissioner Imamura -- once they finish, I'm going to come to you first. Ms. Ackerman, anything else?

MS. ACKERMAN: (Shakes head no.)

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Can we bring everybody up? Good afternoon, Mr. DeBear. Whenever your team gets up and ready,

you all may begin.

2.

MR. DEBEAR: Great. Thank you, Chairman Hood and members of the Commission. If Mr. Young could pull up the presentation filed in the case record. While he's doing that, I just wanted to give an opportunity to -- for the fellow team members to introduce themselves, starting with Dr. Henderson.

DR. HENDERSON: My name is LaTonya Henderson. Thank you for this opportunity.

9 MR. DEBEAR: And then Lou. Lou, if you're speaking, 10 you're on mute.

MR. BOZA: Sorry about that. My name is Lou Boza, and I am the associate architect with A2 Design, Inc.

MR. DEBEAR: And then Nicole.

MS. WHITE: Nicole White, Principal with Symmetra Design, traffic engineering and transportation planning.

MR. DEBEAR: Thank you. If Mr. Young could hop forward to slide -- we are going to try to keep this to the 15-minute time limit that Ms. Ackerman mentioned. I would note for the Commissioners, we've requested Mr. Boza and Ms. White as expert witnesses in architecture and traffic and transportation, respectively, and their resumes are in the record.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Mr. DeBear, let us -- let us deal with that. I know that we have accepted Ms. White previously. Any objections to continuing that status? I'm looking at my -- I'm looking at my colleagues, instead of going

1	around
2	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: No objection.
3	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I see no objections. Thank
4	you. Now, Mr who I'm sorry, Mr. DeBear. I don't have
5	that screen up. Who else was the other person, besides Ms. White;
6	Mr. Boza?
7	MR. DEBEAR: Just Mr. Boza, the project architect.
8	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Colleagues, what has he
9	been has he been proffered previously in front of the Zoning
10	Commission?
11	MR. DEBEAR: Lou, I don't
12	MR. BOZA: No.
13	MR. DEBEAR: Yeah.
14	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. The answer's no.
15	MR. DEBEAR: And his resume's in the record at 15C.
16	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I missed that, actually.
17	Colleagues, have you all had a chance to review that?
18	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: I did, Mr. Chairman, and I'm
19	comfortable with Mr. Boza as an expert witness in architecture.
20	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Any other objections or anybody
21	everybody else fine?
22	(No response.)
23	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Well, if Commissioner Imamura
24	says it's good, we're good to go, and we will make him an expert.
25	All right. Thank you. Mr. DeBear, you may begin.

MR. DEBEAR: Okay. If Mr. Young could pull back up that presentation, we can go to slide three I believe, and I'm going to then turn it over to Dr. Henderson to tell just tell you all a little bit about Cedar Tree.

MS. HENDERSON: I'll go ahead and tell you about Cedar Tree. Again, I'm LaTonya Henderson, the Chief Executive Officer of Cedar Tree Academy. Cedar Tree Academy is an early childhood public charter school serving grades pre-K through second grade. We started operating as Howard Road Academy in 1999 to 2012, and rebranded as Cedar Tree in 2013.

Our mission is to provide a safe learning environment that enhances the emotional and cognitive growth and development of our students while helping them become independent learners. We are here to address the achievement gap and primarily serve students at risk in Ward 8. We are currently -- we currently have 399 students with 89 full-time staff members. We have been approved by the DC Public Charter School Board to serve up to 600 students. Currently, we have 83 percent of our students who are at risk, and our children come from Ward 8, and a hundred percent of our children are low-income students, as defined by the CDFI Fund.

Our project -- we hope to build a new school building to increase our programming space and meet the needs of our students that we can't currently do in our existing building. We hope to provide a gym, a library, a cafeteria, and space for a

STEM program, an arts program, and a music program, and also provide wraparound services for our students and our families.

2.

2.2

The new building will have increased capacity to meet the needs of our students and our goal. We currently have a building of approximately 36,000 square feet with -- I'm sorry -- 3,600 square feet -- I apologize -- with 22 classrooms. We hope to seek -- to expand to fully develop an elementary school to serve students pre-K through fifth grade. We also hope to blend into the new project in our area, which is the Bridge District neighborhood, with this new design. With this, I'll yield to our next presenter.

MR. DEBEAR: And I'm not sure if we lost Mr. Young here, but the presentation is not up for some reason.

(PowerPoint presentation shared on screen.)

MR. DEBEAR: There we go. Thank you. If we could just move forward a couple slides now. Another, another. Okay. Great. I'm going to turn it over to Mr. Boza.

MR. BOZA: Sure. Thanks. So I'm going to take you through the site and the architecture design for the Cedar Tree School. So, as you can see here, the site is located at 701 Howard Road, just south of Poplar Point and with a quarter mile of the Anacostia Metro Station.

Next slide please. So the slot -- the site's bounded by Howard Road on the north, the off-ramp from 395 to Suitland Parkway to the south. To the west we have future development.

To the right -- sorry -- to the east is an existing building.

Here you can see highlighted the existing Cedar Tree building shown in orange. It's located on the west side of the existing lot.

2.

Next slide please. Here in this small map, you can see the red, the existing Cedar Tree building, the size of the existing lot. View number three shows the existing Cedar Tree building. View number one, you kind of catch a glimpse of the playground to the right of the existing Cedar Tree building, which is where the proposed school will go.

Next slide please. Zoning map. As mentioned already, it's in the North Howard Road zoning district. Next slide please. The existing site plan; again, Howard Road to the north, the retaining wall for the ramp on the south. On the left we see the existing Cedar Tree school building. In the center we see the existing entry, parking lot, and egress, two existing curb cuts on the site. And to the right we see the existing open field and playground for the current Cedar Tree School.

Next slide please. So the proposed site plan is to construct the new Cedar Tree School where the existing playground is, build the school there, demolish the existing school, and build a new parking lot where the existing school is currently, and a drive lane and drop-off zone in between the two. We have planned for a playground to the south of the building, between the building and the southern property line. We also have the

main entrance to the school. Where the students and parents will drop off the kids is on the western elevation of the building, where the red arrow points, sort of halfway down the length of the building. We also have an entry along Howard Road for public -- for when they hold community events at the school. Other features to point out include the bike -- short-term bike parking, which is on the eastern side of the school, about halfway down the length of the school.

2.

We have some bioretention areas for stormwater between the two curb cuts; also at the southeast -- southwest corner of the site. And then at the north -- northwest -- northeast corner of the site we have the Pepco transformer and generator for the school. Again, to the south of the school we have a loading area for less frequent deliveries, larger items to the -- to the school; and currently adjacent to the main entry we have a loading area -- really, a deliveries area for food service, which is coming into a warming kitchen for the school.

Next slide please. This slide shows a planting plan. Just important to point out some native local plants located in the bioretention zone. Plants that are of similar scale to ones in the neighborhood would be planted in the parking lawn, along the perimeter of the site.

Next slide please. Enlarged sidewalk plan again shows the -- some short-term bicycle parking on the street, some security gates at the entrance and egress, where the curb cuts

are, and, again, the vestibule for the public entry to the building along Howard Street.

2.

Next slide please. So I'll go through the plans now. The ground floor plan is open -- sorry -- open for community use, as well as school use. The main entrance to the building is here on the plan's south, so it's on the western side of the building. Entry is into a large welcome space. To the right side in blue is the gymnasium. To the left side, all the way at the end on Howard Street, is the cafeteria/multipurpose room. And you can start to see some architectural elements that I will address later. At the end, we have the egress stairs. Together those form an architectural element in the massing of the building that I'll talk about. And then, again, this sort of cut in the middle of the building where the welcome zone is, it will be also another architectural element I'll talk about in a few minutes.

Next slide please. So the second floor and the remaining floors are all classroom floors. This floor, we have the lower school students. Again, you can start to see that central core where we have utility areas, bathrooms, a communicating stair in the center, and then to the right is the two-story open space for the gymnasium. On the second floor and on the fourth floor, these larger classrooms in the center, sort of opposite the stair, are classrooms for STEM use.

Next slide. The third floor has -- in the red is the school library, and, again, classrooms are all purple.

Next slide. And the fourth floor is similar to the second floor, with additional STEM uses at the center core.

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

Next slide please. So on the roof, we have -- the egress stairs continue to the roof. We have a screened-in mechanical area for the HVAC rooftop units. And then on the remaining roof portion to the south of the mechanical units, we'll have the photovoltaic panels required to meet the zoning renewable energy amounts.

Next slide please. So I'll go through the elevations This is the elevation that faces Howard Street. I'm going to point out the sort of architectural elements that you'll see in the remaining slides. So you'll see that sort of tower off to the left. This is the egress stair. There's one located at Howard -- at the Howard Street end, another one at the They're connected by the mechanical rooftop units, other end. so we're calling that the bar. You see these colored panels that are representative of where all the classrooms will be. the classroom box. This white element that kind of wraps up and over the building is an architectural element that will start to frame the classrooms and address kind of entry and exit and differentiate the ends of the building from the long sides of the And then here you see in the background an element building. that's sort of bisecting all of those horizontally, which is an element that marks that center community space entry and the special classrooms.

So go to the next slide please. So the west elevation, this is the side of the building that faces the parking lot. Again, all the white is the wrapper. That's the element that frames the classrooms. On the left below you see the colored panels. This is where the cafeteria is. On the right you see the two-story element where the gymnasium is. At the center you see the box that kind of floats. Below it is the main entrance. And inside the box are the library and the special STEM classrooms, and then up on the roof beyond is the bar that contains the rooftop units and the egress stairs.

Next slide please. The south elevation that faces the playground, similar to the northern elevation, only here we have three sets of double doors that have direct access from the gymnasium out to the playground, and you can see the wrapper, you can see the stair tower and the bar, and the projection of the element at the central core.

Next slide please. And then the east elevation. This is the -- essentially the -- what we're calling the back side of the building that is facing the closest property line. Here you see the projection of the central core. Below it is the faculty room, and in that area is where the sort of circulation occurs at the top of the communicating stair.

Next slide please. So this slide talks about the materials that we're proposing for the building. Three primary materials are being proposed for the building. One is the

phenolic-colored panels, a corrugated metal panel, and an EFIS, Exterior Insulation Finish System. These materials are used to articulate and reinforce the massing of the building and its composition. The bar element that houses the egress stairs and the mechanical rooftop units is clad in the vertical corrugated metal panel that you see in the top right. These panels emphasize its volume. The corrugations are running vertically in order to emphasize its height. I know this building is shorter than most of the buildings in the area, so we're doing everything we can to make the building feel taller than it might be, so it runs vertically.

2.

Next slide. Oh, sorry, not next slide yet. The wrapper, the element that wraps around both long sides of the building is the Exterior Finish Insulation System, the EFIS. This material is a lightweight, although durable, stucco finish that's put over an EPS foam, so it provides the thickness we're seeking to give it sort of a compositional weight, but also provides all the required R-value for the exterior envelope at those locations.

And then the last material are these colored phenolic panels that will be placed over a rainscreen system. The phenolic panels are a flat panel based on a thermosetting resin that are reinforced with wood fibers and paper, and it's manufactured under high pressure and temperature. These panels have an integrated color built into them. They're extremely durable, and

we can clean them very easily if they have graffiti or anything like that on them. We've picked a palette of colors that is playful, that brings life to the school and says this is a school for children -- or a building for children.

2.

Next slide. So in this slide we see three details at the building. On the left we see a condition at Howard Street where we have the stair tower, the egress tower. We see the exterior wall at the classrooms on the second, third, and fourth floor, and you start to see these vertical signage banners that we have placed along Howard Street that would contain inspirational words or quotes that the school chooses that would, again, animate that Howard Street façade and indicate that this is a school building.

The second 3D view there shows a cut through the community or public entrance along Howard Street. It's a two-story vestibule. And it also shows the wrapper condition at Howard Street, how it slides off the building and expresses itself and frames that entrance. And, again, detail number three shows the same thing from the other side, so that sort of cantilevers over the edge, again, marking the entrance at Howard Street.

Next slide please. And the remaining slides are all 3D views of the building. This is the view from across the street, along Howard Street, so, again, you can see the stair tower, signage banners, the colored panels that are opaque, and you see the -- so you see the classroom glass. We're proposing

a colored film go over the glass to continue that colored stripe beyond just the opaque panel into the colored panel, so that the color of the light comes through the building.

2.

Next slide please. Again, another view from Howard Road. Next slide. The view from inside the lot at the parking lot, so the length of the building. Again, this end of the building is where the cafeteria is located at the ground floor.

Next slide. Same side of the building, but closer to the end where the gymnasium is located in this sort of area at the end; that's a two-story with the windows up high.

Next slide. This is the main entrance to the school. Again, the students and staff enter underneath the box where the signage for the school is located.

Next slide. A view possibly from the off-ramp looking at the back corner where the playground is and the wrapper and the bar that contains the egress and the mechanical units.

Next slide. And the eastern elevation of the building with the projection of the box and the bar containing the HVAC units. Next slide. I think that's it. Thank you.

MS. WHITE: Thank you. I have a number of transportation slides, but in the interest of time, I can jump ahead to the Transportation Demand Management Plan, and we can come back if there are any questions. We appreciate the continued efforts to coordinate our plan and the study with DDOT, so we have had a number of iterations, as stated earlier, of this, and

DDOT has no opposition to the project, as stated in the report, with the following conditions: the Transportation Management Plan and the Performance Monitoring Plan. Don't expect us to read all of the text here in the TDM Plan. We just highlighted in blue and bold some of the key elements of the One of the -- some of the feedback we received from DDOT about the plan is just to incorporate a few timelines into the plan, and so, for example, for the second bullet, where we're identifying Transportation Coordinators, we've added language, such as "Prior to the issuance of the building permit", so that's the level of detail we've been coordinating with DDOT on this. This is an attachment to the DDOT report, and the applicant is comfortable with the TDM Plan. They're already using a \$100 SmarTrip card for staff.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The next slide. Additional TDM measures, such as carpool, parking spaces, two preferential spaces in the front of the building, Capital Bikeshare memberships, and goDCgo is a tremendous resource that we've been working with on other school projects, and they look forward to working with goDCgo in implementing some of this.

If we can go to the next slide, the Performance Monitoring Plan. Beginning in the fall 2027 semester, the school will be required to conduct monitoring in the fall and spring semester, just to make sure the trip generation is consistent with what we've outlined in this report. And then, again, they're

required, after successful monitoring reports, to do monitoring again when they reach the proposed cap of 680 students. So, again, the school is comfortable with this Performance Monitoring Plan, and it will become part of the conditions of approval. And that's all I have, unless there are any questions.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. Before we go further, Ms. White, if you could just give us a ride-around, maybe one of the slides -- I think 34 or whatever the better slide is, just give us a trip around how the circulation pattern is, just briefly outline for us.

MS. WHITE: Yeah, absolutely. Can we go back to slide 34 then? So one of the things outlined in the DDOT report is we acknowledge there would be continued efforts and coordination with DDOT, as part of the public space approval process, with the curb cuts. And so the plan is currently showing two curb cuts, and there's flexibility that we're asking for, in case we go to one curb cut. There was a special tree permit in the timing of that, but there are no impacts associated with changing from two curb cuts to one curb cut, related to our plan. We would just need to update some of the maneuvering analysis.

I think there is another plan, if we go forward one, that shows site access, but there's a -- the next slide please. Keep going please. There's a vehicle -- yeah, the pick-up/drop-off plan, I thought this was a good one to look at, which is showing -- we did some existing observations of pick-up/drop-off

procedures, and we were able to determine what the queue was during that time period. And when you look at growth of the queue with the population increases, we wanted to make sure that there wouldn't be queueing offsite, and so we're showing, in this circulation route, vehicles coming in, and then there is supplemental area in the parking aisle just to the west, so, altogether, we'd have enough space for 24 vehicles and a small bus, which the school currently has. Does that answer that question or any further --

10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah, I think that was helpful.

11 Thank you very much, Ms. White.

MS. WHITE: Sure.

2.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thanks.

MR. DEBEAR: If Mr. Young could move forward a few slides, I'm going to try to be efficient here. We're already approaching over 20 minutes. This is the zoning sheet. This building is being proposed to be compliant with all the NHR standards, with the exception of the minimum residential FAR.

Next slide please. So there's actually a requirement in the NHR zone that every new development has a minimum of 2.5 FAR dedicated to residential uses. Obviously, we have school use here. We would not be meeting that. Nonetheless, in terms of meeting the special exception standard, certainly, a public education use is a matter-of-right use in the NHR zone, and it's actually one of the preferred uses identified for a designated

know, the ongoing use of this site for a public school would be complimentary and supportive of the new and, you know, currently being built character of this neighborhood. It's obviously envisioned as a really vibrant mixed-use neighborhood, and I think this entire project really is aimed at kind of complimenting what this neighborhood can and will become.

In terms of the relief resulting in the design that complies with the purpose of the NHR zone, we've outlined many of the reasons in the record, but, again, certainly, the architecture being more street activating than the current building; providing extensive landscaping and inviting outdoor space; improving pedestrian and bicyclists connectivity or improvements to the public space; and, certainly, incorporating the expected and required sustainability features in the NHR zone and based on this Commission's standards.

Next slide. We've outlined all of the design review criteria, and I want to kind of hop over that, although I'm happy to move back and discuss it, if the Commission has any questions.

If Mr. Young could go to the next slide. Next slide.

Next slide. Just to briefly touch on this, there are employment and training requirements in the NHR zone. We've provided information in the record as to how we're meeting that, and we're happy to discuss further. Next slide. There are design requirements for the designated street, and there's only one

street, being Howard Road, but we are meeting those. Next slide.

There's also -- the Commission would be looking at the general design review criteria, which I'm going to move past.

Next slide. Next slide. Next slide.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. DeBear, you can talk on some of this. You actually have a whole hour. I don't want you to feel like we're rushing you.

MR. DEBEAR: Okay. Well --

2.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: You have, actually, 45 more minutes.

MR. DEBEAR: Yeah. Okay. I want to be respectful of the Commission's time and certainly --

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: We're good. We're here. We're 13 good. We're good.

MR. DEBEAR: Okay. If you go to the next slide, I want to talk just a little bit about the Comprehensive Plan and the racial equity analysis. Next slide please. Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan. This property is designated on the Future Land Use Map for high-density residential, high-density commercial, and institutional. Certainly, you know, this building, obviously, being a public school building, is not going to achieve the kinds of densities that might be expected or projected in these FLUM designations, but we do feel, overall, again, we are a complimentary use and something that can fit within the neighborhood and provide a public school option for, hopefully, many, many new residents that will be moving in. The

institutional designation is synonymous or consistent with the local public facilities type expectation of what might be used here. And the GPM designates this as a Land Use Change Area, which is, again, I think acknowledging the expected NHR zone and what's going to likely be changing in this neighborhood over time, and we are continuing that momentum with this project.

Next slide. These are some of the Comprehensive Plan elements -- District elements that we believe this project is consistent with. In particular, the education facilities element identifies a number of goals that this project's achieving. As Dr. Henderson mentioned, the project will be providing -- Cedar Tree prides itself on providing wraparound services for families. As she noted, many of the families are in need and, certainly, serving the Ward 8 community is a great mission.

Next slide. Touching on community outreach, we've met with ANC 8A three times, the most recent of which was in January and resulted in the vote of support, which was unanimous, and it's in the record. As a public school, Cedar Tree has a longstanding relationship and role in the community. There's obviously been ongoing engagement and knowledge-sharing about the project with the families, as Cedar Tree kind of works to provide a useful building. There has been engagement with CC Prep in connection with some the NHR training requirements. And then we have spoken with Redbrick, who's the owner of most, if not all, of the adjacent properties that will be developed in the Bridge

District, and they are fully supportive as well, with a letter of support in the record.

2.

Next slide. I'm going to hop over this. This is in the Office of Planning report, the disaggregated data section of the racial equity analysis.

Next slide. And then, in summary, just the Commission has certain evaluating criteria when viewing an application through a racial equity lens, and we believe many, if not all of the outcomes are positive. Certainly, we will not be displacing, either directly or indirectly, any individuals. On the contrary, this will be providing a brand new school with increased capacity and better programming for a primarily -- a primary student body that's in Ward 8. It will also increase the school's ability to provide employment opportunities with the expected growth rate. They would also expect increased numbers of staff and faculty. And then the public space improvements and the environmental sustainability features will all lead to positive outcomes when viewed through a racial equity lens.

And, with that, we can move to the final slide, and that would end our presentation-in-chief. We appreciate the Commission's time. As I mentioned, we're all certainly available to go back through anything we might have moved past efficiently, and we appreciate your time.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Certainly, we want to thank the team, Ms. White, Mr. Boza, and Dr. Henderson, and you, Mr.

DeBear, for your presentation, and hopefully I didn't leave anyone out. We will ask our questions at this point, so I will go to Commissioner Imamura.

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

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I echo your comments. Dr. Henderson, thank you. Ms. White, Mr. Boza, and Mr. DeBear, thank you. I have a few questions and a few In general, I'm really -- the design of it I really comments. like. And I say that it reminds me of De Stijl -- the De Stijl Mr. Boza, you used the word "playful". I would say it's -- it is playful, which I wouldn't go so far as to say it's whimsical, but it's sort of this restrained use of color and Appreciate your explanation about the verticality of it -- the vertical design elements, rather. I know a lot of the images that were shown in the presentation highlighted the use of color, but my favorite elevation would be the east elevation. So there's sort of this rhythm and pattern, almost like keys on a piano, so I really appreciate the design work behind this. So, Dr. Henderson, I think in terms of artistic license and creativity here, that your architects did a wonderful job in the design of this building.

DR. HENDERSON: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: I also want to highlight I guess -- and I might have missed this -- again, we are achieving LEED Gold; is that right, Mr. Boza?

MR. BOZA: Yes. Yes.

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: All right. Terrific. I also appreciate -- I'm glad that, Ms. White, that you had highlighted, I think slide 36, which showed the 24 vehicles being queued, so, Mr. Boza and Ms. White, thank you for working together on that. I thought that's a pretty -- a very pragmatic solution there to extend your queueing distance there. I am curious, Mr. Boza -- I think one would be challenged to argue the DC region -- that there's a regionalism to DC. I don't believe that there is, but I'm curious about what inspired your design around -- like, in the surrounding neighborhood? So where did this -- what was the genesis of this design solution and what did you take away from the surrounding neighborhood to generate this unique design, I think, for this particular area?

MR. BOZA: Well, I think -- in general, I think we were trying to minimize the footprint of the design, so I think understanding the programmatic elements and consolidating them into compositional elements that worked together and created an overall clarity to the building that can be understood by the citizens of the neighborhood and the school-age children, to understand the building on that level. To be honest, there's not much in the immediate area of the Howard Road yet. I would say, seeing what's been proposed, there's a clarity to the buildings and the architecture in that area that I think our building would mimic. I think the materials, themselves, start to talk about a neighborhood or a city of vibrancy with color.

I think the corrugated metal starts to echo some of the kind of grittiness of the city, which I think is important to address. And then the cleanliness or the sort of -- the light material, that kind of off-white material, talks about sort of an innocence or a cleanliness to -- innocence to the school-age children, and I think, you know, conceptually, maybe is a little bit of a stretch for the citizens to understand, but I think those altogether really start to talk about an architecture that's of its place and really understandable of a bunch of different age groups and occupants of that -- of that area.

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Perfect. Thank you, Mr. Boza. I appreciate your response and hopefully it can be an additional opportunity to go a little deeper into the design decisions that were made. A lot of people just see sort of the finished product, but there's a whole lot more meaning and depth to it than what we see on paper, and so -- especially, I think the fact that the expression of form and color and materiality is also expressing what's happening on the inside of the building too, and a lot of people may not see that at first, but it's part of that architecture that I think is really successful.

MR. BOZA: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: One of the things -- one of the questions that I do have maybe for Ms. White and for you, Mr. Boza -- I guess either one of you can respond -- Ms. White, you had mentioned about the design flexibility for either two curb

1	cuts or one curb cut. I'm curious what the preferred design
2	solution is, because if you do go with the one curb cut
3	conceptually or if it does materialize, I think I remember seeing
4	the bioretention area located there. I'm curious what happens
5	to that. I know it would require at least some small
6	reconfiguration of it. What's the preferred curb cut and what
7	will happen to the bioretention area?
8	MS. WHITE: Well, I'll let Mr. Boza answer the question
9	about the bioretention. I will say, from DDOT's perspective,
10	they the preference is for fewer curb cuts.
11	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Sure.
12	MS. WHITE: And, initially, there was a special tree
13	situation as to why we have the two curb cuts.
14	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Okay. I was curious about that
15	too. We all know that DDOT's preference is one curb cut, so I
16	did that is noticeable there.
17	MS. WHITE: So it's an existing condition, and then,
18	also, there was initially a restriction due to the tree, and then
19	some additional information from DDOT and Urban Forestry about
20	the tree, and so just the timing of it was such that we proceeded
21	with flexibility.
22	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Okay. Can you tell me a little
23	more, Mr. Boza, about that tree, what the outcome is?
24	MR. BOZA: So what the outcome is or what the
25	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Or, you know, what tell me

more about the --

MS. WHITE: The bioretention pond.

MR. BOZA: Yeah. The bioretention pond, I think if we were going to go to the one curb cut, would essentially slide closer towards the building. It might become a little larger, because the one curb cut into the site would widen to the maximum of 24 feet, which would give us a little extra bioretention area. We -- the security fence would probably pull closer back to where the parking lot starts and would continue straight across towards the building to provide security at that point. So, you know, again, we -- I think it's more just sliding the bioretention over and then working the turning radiuses to get the lane closest to the building to kind of come back to the curb cut there on the left, the entry curb cut.

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: All right. If you see me looking to my left, it's because, as you were talking, I was looking at your plan there.

MR. BOZA: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: One of the -- so I think overall I think you have a really successful design solution. I think where I would say it would be great to see a little improvement is in the landscape design. So, admittedly, there's not a lot to work with; however, it's really in that parking lot area that it would be great to see a better sort of integration in your landscape solution with some of the plantings that you've

selected. I have no problems with the planting plan that you've provided. That's pretty standard there, the regional plants, but essentially what we do, we have this parking lot that's out there surrounded by what appears to be turf, I guess, or sod. Is that right; is that what it's surrounded by?

MR. BOZA: Yes, currently.

2.

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: So it would be nice -- you have this sort of really nice design element, in terms of the landscape solution here, but it's sort of segmented or fragmented. And it would be really, I think, successful if you could -- if it would embrace that parking lot at little bit, rather than sort of it being out on this open wide plane.

MR. BOZA: Uh-huh.

enhance that and might be a teachable moment too, right, about you know, native landscaping and things like that and somehow, you know, that could -- as I look at the plan here, there's a way I think that you could probably take another look at that and even bring that back around the building towards the playground there, but I think that's where the site plan really kind of screams at me, is that it's just this flat surface. And it could be too that -- not just to say that it could be done with the planting beds, but also perhaps berms or something to that extent too --

MR. BOZA: Yeah. Yeah.

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: -- to kind of conceal that parking lot a little bit.

MR. BOZA: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: So I think that's where it could probably be really, really successful as a complete design. Right now we have a really great design -- architecture, and it's just lacking that same sophistication in the landscape situation.

MR. BOZA: Thanks. Yeah.

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: So, outside of that, I think, Mr. Chairman, I don't have any other questions, except for one that just popped up. Mr. Boza, if you could just describe a little bit about accessibility. We never really touch on that on our hearings, but I think it's so important that you at least -- you have an opportunity to acknowledge that and just talk a little bit about accessibility.

MR. BOZA: In the building or, generally, the site as a whole?

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Just the site as a whole and generally around the building.

MR. BOZA: Well, again, everything meets all ADA requirements. I know that the -- in the site plan, the path from the parking lot to the building is a sort of raised path, so that's at the same level of the building, almost like a speed bump condition for the drive aisle, so there's no impediments at that location going into the building. The building does have a

communicating elevator right adjacent to that sort of central core. Corridors are of required width. All the bathrooms have the required ADA. And all the other sort of audio signaling and visual signaling for ADA are provided in the building as well.

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Perfect. All right. No doubt. Thank you very much, Ms. White, Mr. Boza, Dr. Henderson, and Mr. DeBear. This is on a really good path. So, with that, Mr. Chairman, thank you to my colleagues for your indulgence, and I yield back.

MR. BOZA: Thank you.

2.

MR. DEBEAR: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Let's go to Commissioner Wright. You can go next, and then I'll come to Commissioner Stidham, and then you, Vice Chair, and then myself.

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Thank you. I agree with a lot of the comments that Commissioner Imamura has said, and I particularly agree with his comment about providing landscaping around the parking lot, so that along the fence line that's along the street you actually have some landscaping, even maybe more bioretention area. You know, I think there's a lot of opportunities to screen the parking lot from the street.

I do very much like the way -- even though the main entrance for students is facing the parking lot, I really do like the way you've created another entrance facing the street, going into, I guess, the cafeteria that will be potentially available

for public events. And I like the vertical treatment near that doorway. I think it give it a lot of emphasis. So all of that is great.

2.

I do have a couple of comments about the driveway. I understand from a turning radius perspective why there would be a desire from the Department of Transportation to consolidate the two driveways into one. I would just really look at that carefully and, frankly, try to avoid that, if possible, because I look at it from the perspective of the pedestrian who is walking along in front of this building. And if you you're crossing a 24-foot-wide driveway, that is not a very appealing pedestrian experience.

Having the driveway separated with some green space bioretention between it is a much better pedestrian experience than one really gigantic driveway. And although I know you might have to adjust the widths of the two driveways in order to get your turning radiuses, radi (phonetic), or whatever the right term is, to work, I think that would be better than creating one really huge 24-foot-wide driveway, just from a pedestrian perspective and a bicycling perspective and, you know, people who are basically using the area in front of the building. But that's my only comment. I know you're going to have additional, you know, conversations with Department of Transportation about that. I understand the need for a turning radius that works for trucks. You know, I get it. I just think there may be some ways of doing

that without creating one giant, essentially, road that needs to be crossed by pedestrians and bicyclists who are in front of the building.

And I think, with that, those are my only comments. I think it's a really nice architectural design. I think it will be a great contribution to the community. It sounds like the work that you do at the school is fantastic and that you're really changing lives, which is great. And, all in all, I think it's a very good project, you know, again, with some of those little tweaks that we were just talking about, so thank you.

DR. HENDERSON: Thank you.

MR. BOZA: Thank you.

2.

2.2

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Commissioner Stidham.

COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Thank you, and thank you for the presentation. Can you remind me about the age of the students that'll be attending this facility and the numbers of children? I'm sorry.

DR. HENDERSON: Currently, we serve preschool, age three years old, all the way to second grade. Next year we will add third grade, and we hope that to add all the way to fifth grade, once we enter into the building.

COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Thank you. So I worry a little bit about the design -- the color used in the design and sort of the lack of fenestration of the windows to give, like, great

1	natural light into these spaces. They feel small to me, and with
2	the glazing of the color, I worry that color is going to you
3	mentioned that it was durable, but I worry that will it be able
4	to maintain a vibrancy or begin to look dull. It sort of the
5	building doesn't feel timeless. I mean, it does feel playful,
6	and I get that, but I do worry that over time that color will
7	fade to such that it will lose that appearance. Can you talk a
8	bit about the coloring and maybe the size of the windows and
9	MR. BOZA: Can we go back to one of the views, so I
10	can is that possible? The I can talk while we're going
11	back to the presentation, but the building is organized on a 30-
12	inch module, essentially, so, you know, two-and-a-half feet, so
13	you'll notice that some of the windows are one module wide
14	MR. DEBEAR: Sorry, Lou. If Mr. Young wants to go
15	to maybe an elevation might be
16	MR. BOZA: Yeah, I'm sorry. An elevation or the long
17	or the rendering of the long side of the school.
18	COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Right. Maybe Exhibit I think
19	it's 20 is it 3F5 has good renderings. You can talk. I have
20	it opened on my laptop.
21	MR. BOZA: Okay. So you'll notice along that long
22	keep going back maybe a couple more. Yeah, that's fine, that's
23	fine. So you'll notice the windows in the wrapper that are carved
24	out of the white element, some are kind of thin and some are a
25	little wider. The thin one, okay, is 30 inches wide, and the

height of that window is ten feet, so it's floor-to-ceiling glass in the classrooms. And then the -- adjacent to it, you see a wider opening in the wrapper. That's a five-foot-wide opening by ten feet high that's all glass. So, in terms of the amount of glass in each classroom, I'd say that every classroom has at least -- at least ten feet of horizontal width of glass by ten feet high, so a hundred square feet of window in all the classrooms. That's much more than most schools.

2.

COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes, I would say so for sure.

MR. BOZA: Yeah. It's a little -- it's a little deceiving that it's that big, but the -- but the -- again, you can see what -- the frame of the wrapper outlines two stories sort of above the gym, and at the other end of the building, that frame incorporates three stories. So what we're doing is playing with the scale again of the verticality. We're saying that from a distance that reads like one window, but, in fact, it's three stories high.

COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Okay.

MR. BOZA: And each of those stories is, you know, ten feet high floor to ceiling. And I will say that -- not to get into the details, but at the window it's ten feet high. The classroom ceiling is actually higher than that. It's -- the classroom ceiling is, I think, 10-6 or 11 feet high, so the interior volume of room is pretty large, and there's a lot of light coming into it. The idea of the color on the windows,

again, we'll need to play with the intensity of that. We like the idea of that color -- sort of continuing the pattern of the color to make that read as sort of a continuation. Again, it adds -- we feel it adds playfulness, not only to the exterior of the school, at night, let's say, when the lights are on, but also during the day there could be a subtle color effect on the -- on the ground. Again, we have to play with the intensity of that. We don't want it to be a distracting thing for the students, but we do think it has the potential to be something quite interesting and unique to the building. I feel like there was another question in there. I can't remember.

2.

COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: The durability of the actual color to --

MR. BOZA: Oh, yeah. So the phenolic panels are a material that you're seeing on a lot of buildings nowadays. It's about a little over a quarter-inch-thick panel that's -- again, it's essentially compressed paper with a resin in it. The color is through the panel, so it's not a color that's applied to the surface that will fade. It's embedded in the panel itself. So it's extremely durable, not only in terms of breaking or scratching, but in terms of retaining its color. So I don't see any -- there are other materials that would lose their color. I don't see these panels losing their color over time and that concern being an issue.

COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Okay. Great. Thank you. Can

you -- I noticed, looking at the existing site plan and the future site plan, that you've swapped the location of the building and the parking lot. Can you talk about that reasoning a little bit?

MR. BOZA: Sure. Sure. And I did -- I kind of skipped over that. So the phasing of the project will be such that the existing school will be operational during the construction of this building. So once this new school is complete, the students will move from the old school to the new school, and then, at that time, the old school will be demolished and the turnaround

10 area and the parking -- well, the turnaround area will be

11 partially complete -- will be finished, and then the parking lot

12 will be built, so we're essentially kind of, you know -- for a

moment time there will be two buildings on the site, and then

the existing building will be demolished and parking will be

15 added.

2.

COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Okay. I thought that might be the case, but I just wanted to get a sense of that, if there was -- if it was construction-related. So there's a reason for turning everything around, so thank you for that. And then -- so I am really concerned about the outdoor space and completely agree with Commissioner Imamura related to the treatment of that. It seems right now it's a bit of an afterthought or not even really thought that much about. I notice in the existing site plan that there are multiple play structures, and with children this age, you're going to a much significantly smaller play

structure. It doesn't feel that there's a lot of outdoor space or that the thought -- the space has been really considered for the fact that you're having preschool children up to age five, who really need that time to run around and do something. So can you talk about that decision?

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

MR. BOZA: Well, it does look compressed, the exterior space. What they will have additional is the gym inside, which they don't have now, so the area for the kids to run around is exterior and interior, and they connect directly, so I imagine there's going to be some kind of continuity between those two. Again, operationally, that's something that the school will decide. If we can go to the site plan, perhaps we can look at that a little bit more, but one of the things that I didn't mention maybe that -- I don't know if you were able to see on the site, the parking -- the play structures for the play area wraps around the back of the building as well. Currently, there's a proposed sort of small theatre area on the back of the building around the corner. We started to consider how the actual surface of the building might be used as play surface or an area where they could project a movie or draw or something like that. Yeah, this is fine (indicating). So on the -- on the right here, you see these sort of oval spaces, but that play area continues around the back of the building as well.

COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: I saw that in the site plan. I just feel that the school is losing a lot of that outdoor space

and for this age group of children, outdoor play is really important. It could be really a highlight of the outdoor space if you reconsider how you treat the landscaping and the bioretention to make it a more meaningful space --

MR. BOZA: Uh-huh.

2.

COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: -- for the children and something with more trees and shade and other opportunities.

MR. BOZA: Okay. Yeah. Thank you. That's a --

COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: And that's really all I had, Chairman. I yield back to you.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Vice Chair Miller.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you to the Cedar Tree Academy team for this application and presentation. There's a lot of work that's obviously gone into this, a lot of good works that have been accomplished so far at this academy. And I think with this expansion you continue to fulfill your mission of meeting the needs of the surrounding community, particularly the adverse kids, and I commend you for that, Dr. Henderson, and your entire team in providing this opportunity for children in the neighborhood and around the city.

So I appreciate all the -- I appreciate the community outreach that you also have done, and you've garnered the support of ANC 8A and the Congress Heights Community Training and Development Corporation, and you have those exhibits in the record, and other residential and developers in the neighborhood,

so I commend you for working with your neighbors on meeting the needs of the community and complimenting what's there in the community and providing something unique as well.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

I agree with all -- I really agree with almost all, if not all, of the comments of my esteemed colleagues on the design and other aspects of the project. It's always good to go toward the end, Mr. Chairman, because they cover a lot and then I don't have to say too much. So I will say I agree with Commissioner Imamura's comments about the overall attractiveness of the I agree with Commissioner Wright's comments, which I really hadn't noticed about the pedestrian experience, if you only had one curb cut versus two, even though DDOT prefers one, because they always prefer less of curb cuts, but it is a very big curb cut, as Commissioner Wright pointed out, making it somewhat unfriendly for the pedestrian and those who are in that area. DDOT's preference seemed, in part, because of truck turning radius, as Commissioner Wright pointed out -- large truck turning radius. Is there really large -- how many large trucks, Ms. White, are really going into this facility on a daily basis?

MS. WHITE: So I want to understand your question first.

And are you asking if DDOT's preference is for the one large because of trucks?

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes, I'm asking for confirmation.

MS. WHITE: No, DDOT's preference, per their design and engineering manual, is just for a given site to have one curb

cut, unless there are circumstances that require multiple curb cuts. So to answer your question, I think the need for 24 feet is as much about -- given the type of land use as a school, with inbound and outbound happening at the same time, unlike, let's say, an office building, where there may be predominantly inbound at one time and then outbound, we're going to have simultaneous inbound and outbound activity, and so we need a width that can accommodate that, so that's part of the consideration. The other part is for truck maneuvers. And so, typically, the vehicles would be about 24 feet. The zoning requirement is for 30 feet, and so there would be the occasional 30-foot truck that we'd consider as well.

2.

MR. DEBEAR: But I think just to add on, Commissioner Miller, I don't think it's expected that there will be many deliveries with large trucks. I think most deliveries will come to the smaller delivery entrance that's by the main student entrance, and the loading area, while we have to meet the requirement, and we do, it's really going to be limited to I think furniture, and I'm not even sure if anything else is going to be needed out of that.

MS. WHITE: Right, but --

VICE CHAIR MILLER: I appreciate that.

MS. WHITE: Yeah, that's exactly right. And in terms of the curb cut, I do think that, really, the predominant need in this case is -- and we'll definitely, when we get to that

public space process, take a look at it, and I've taken note of your comments about -- and concerns about it, too, the pedestrian experience. It's something that we actually talked about internally as a team, and so, you know, certainly, DDOT is the decision-maker, as part of that process, but, really, we want to accommodate that inbound and outbound activities so there are not adverse impacts to Howard Road.

2.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: And the small bus that the school currently has, that doesn't need the larger curb cut?

MS. WHITE: No, that wasn't the constraint there. That wasn't the --

VICE CHAIR MILLER: And, Dr. Henderson, are you -because you're increasing the size a lot more, are you going to
have more than one bus; and what are the buses used for now;
field trips or --

DR. HENDERSON: We uses buses for field trips, but, currently -- field trips, but, currently, the buses that come on a regular basis are our special needs students, and they're very small -- those smaller, shorter buses, and they come now on a daily basis. When we do go on field trips, we typically load the buses on Howard Road. We do about three field trips a year for all the children in the school. But, typically, the size of the vehicles that come in the parking lot now is kind of the size of a UPS van. That's the biggest delivery van that comes on the property now.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Right. That's what I kind of figured, so thank you. And so I also agree with the comments of my colleagues, particularly Commissioner Stidham, about maybe the loss of outdoor field space. I realize the gym, that's a big thing, getting a gymnasium. You don't have -- you don't currently have a gymnasium; is that correct?

DR. HENDERSON: Right, that is correct.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yeah, so that's a big thing, and that's -- I don't know what the square footage of that is. Maybe you can provide it, in response to this question. My question was going to be, what is the square footage of the existing open space field/playground space versus the proposed open space field/recreation -- playground space and what is the square footage of the gym, because I think the recreational -- particularly the outdoor -- and the outdoor recreational space is very important for everybody, but especially kids.

MR. BOZA: Sure. So I can quickly give you a rough number. The current existing open field where that -- where the playground is, is about 20,000 square feet. Now, that -- Dr. Henderson, the kids -- that goes from the back of the playground area, the fenced area, that whole field in front of that playground area, that's playground for the kids as well?

DR. HENDERSON: Correct.

MR. BOZA: So you use all that. So I'd say roughly about 12 -- I'm sorry -- 20,000. And let me quickly give you

the proposed -- I'm sorry. It just takes a second --2. VICE CHAIR MILLER: Will they still have a field or is the -- it seems like the field is gone. 3 MR. BOZA: The field is not -- no, there's not a field, 4 5 as currently exists. Sorry. It's just uploading here. 6 going to calculate the area of outdoor play space and indoor play 7 space again very quickly. 8 VICE CHAIR MILLER: And I'm sorry to ask you to do that very quickly, but using your estimates. 9 10 MR. BOZA: Yeah, with the gym, I'm going to say about --Well, can you do it without the VICE CHAIR MILLER: 11 12 gym, and then with the gym? 13 MR. BOZA: Sorry about that. Yeah, I can. Okay. 14 without the gym, about 8,000 square feet exterior; and then with the gym, about another 5,000 square feet, so 1,300 square feet, 15 16 as opposed to 20. 17 VICE CHAIR MILLER: And the field --18 MR. BOZA: And that essentially extends the playground 19 area to sort of the end of the loading dock, right. So if we 20 look at it and consider some of the comments made earlier and 21 try to extend the outdoor play area to the parking lot area, 22 potentially, there could be much more in that area, pending what 23 the bio -- happens with the bioretention area in that corner. VICE CHAIR MILLER: What's the potential --24 25 MR. BOZA: I'm saying -- I'm saying that currently the

outdoor play space extends to sort of the outermost point of the turning radius on the -- on the drive aisle right there (indicating). If the playground or outdoor space can be extended further west, we may be able to provide more additional outdoor play space in that area.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Well, I would encourage you to look for those opportunities to increase space.

MR. BOZA: Yeah, I agree.

2.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: And I hesitate to say this, because it's probably going to up against what DOE is saying, but if you put it on the roof even, to have a field, instead of the solar panels, to me, that's more important to have a field.

MR. DEBEAR: We do have a renewable energy requirement in the NHR zone that we have to meet, Commissioner Miller, so that's part of the reason why at least some solar panels would have to stay, but --

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Talk to DOE; that's what we did.

MR. DEBEAR: Yeah. And, obviously, what's squeezing the site, in terms of being able to have usable outdoor space for the kids, is the bioretention, providing the full kind of semicircle drive aisle that they don't have on the current site, and then, you know, the footprint of the building is obviously bigger too, so we're kind of trying to fit all those various needs and goals into, you know, the one -- the one site plan, but we -- your comments are certainly well taken and all the

other Commissioners who mentioned that. We understand.

MR. BOZA: They can also consider the -- again, when not in use, there's the cafeteria. The cafeteria becomes another multipurpose play area -- again, indoor, but another space for that.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Right, as it often in many public and private schools.

MR. BOZA: Right.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: So thank you for -- I don't think I have any other questions, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate all the teams' efforts to try to accomplish a lot of purposes here and everything you've done so far, and I wish you good luck as you go forward. Thank you.

MR. BOZA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. I want to thank all of my colleagues. I think your questions were very thoughtful, and I appreciate the questions, and we'll see whether the applicant can make some of those adjustments. But I do want to make sure that the gym and some of the things they proposed don't go away. As a young man growing up in this city and having to bounce the basketball in the snow was not a lot of fun. But let me ask -- let me ask Dr. -- and now we got a brand new gym there, but guess what, I'm too old to do some of the things I did then. But let me ask Dr. Henderson a question, and I'm probably dating myself. I noticed the colors, and I think

Commissioner Stidham mentioned them. I think she was talking about the different variations of colors of the panels, but if I'm not mistaken -- and this is going to verify whether what Saint Coletta's told me some 20 years ago, whenever we did that school, is correct. But, Dr. Henderson, those colors, does it attract the young folks or does it get their attention? It was something they used, and forgive me if I'm not exactly remembering, but you're an educator and I'm not. So what is it about those colors that the young folks love?

2.

DR. HENDERSON: I don't -- I don't know the answer to the question, but there are some studies behind the colors that we used in the project and the attention that it draws from the children. Absolutely, the colors make a difference.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So, after 20 years, you will verify what Saint Coletta's told me about the -- they went into an extravagant explaining to the Commission at that time, which was 20 years ago, what those colors meant, and I see -- and it took me back to Saint Coletta's when I saw those colors. I don't necessarily have a lot of questions. I think that you all have really addressed what my colleagues said. If it works -- I'm sure some of the questions they asked about the additional outdoor space, but just don't do nothing with the gym. And I know it's kind of hard to please all five of us, but I think you all have a good combination.

I do love and I was glad to hear Commissioner Imamura,

who's the designer on the Commission, but I do like the architecture. I mean, you know, I get fascinated when I see nice looking buildings, and I want to commend you all on that. Mr. Boza, it looks good. I like it. And I like the way you all made it fit. And I'm glad that Commissioner Stidham -- this is what happens when you go last; you can sit back and think about a lot of things. But I do like the question about the phasing, because Howard Road -- if anybody's familiar with Howard Road, it's not the easiest place, you know, and I was thinking, "Now, how are they going to do it; are they going to go away somewhere else to school?", but you're going to do it while the kids are still on site, and I'm sure that the safety measures will be put in place.

I don't have any additional questions. I appreciate all the work and time and attention that's been put to this, so we can continue to educate our young folks. So, with that, colleagues, any follow-up questions? Commissioner Imamura.

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just one. Mr. Boza, that's probably one of the nicest and finest comments that you received for this design here, saying that that's a nice looking building.

MR. BOZA: Thank you.

2.

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Right. I mean, that says a lot from somebody that's, you know, maybe not a designer, but that says, "Wow"; that really says something, so that resonates. I hope that on the inside you apply the same rigor, and I'm sure

you have. I would say insofar as I would say it's design
excellence. And so I think what you viewed from the panel is
that not to put the thumb on the scale, but this could really
be put forward with a for a design award, if you apply that
same sort of design and rigor to the landscape solution.
MR. BOZA: Thank you. Thank you. I appreciate it.
CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. No more questions?
(No response.)
CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Let's Ms.
Ackerman, do we have anyone from 8A here? I know we have a letter
of support from 8A. I think Ms. McKinney's supposed to be
representing Commissioner McKinney excuse me
Commissioner McKinney, who I know. Are they here?
MS. ACKERMAN: No, we don't have anybody from either
of the ANCs, and I reached out to them today, and ANC 8A, Jamila
White, said that she will not be testifying, and I did not get
an answer from the other ANC.
CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Okay. Good. All right.
Let's go to do we have a report of the any other government
agencies? I'm going to go to DDOT, and I'm going to go to OP,
but any other government agencies, like the Office of the Attorney
General or anybody like that?
MS. ACKERMAN: No.
CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Let's go to the Office of

here.

1

3

4

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. ACKERMAN: Yes, that's correct.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let's bring him up.

MR. HAGEN: Hi. Good evening.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Good evening, Mr. Hagen. You may

6 begin.

MR. HAGEN: Sure. So, for the record, I'm Noah Hagen is with the District Department of Transportation. DDOT supportive of the applicant's design review application for 701 Howard Road Southeast. In our February 21st report, which is in the record at Exhibit Number 27, we recommended approval with one condition. which is implementation of the applicant's Transportation Demand Management Plan and Performance Management Plan. Now, as you've heard in the applicant's presentation, they've agreed to this condition, and with those included in the zoning order, DDOT has no objection to the approval of this application.

The applicant has indicated, and you were just discussing this earlier, that they are still determining whether they'll provide access to their site with dual one-way curb cuts or a single two-way curb cut, and, as stated in their report -- DDOT's report -- our report -- excuse me -- DDOT prefers the single two-way curb cut, since it aligns with our safety standards and allows some of those larger trucks to access the site without having to drive over that -- over the curb and -- but, you know,

1	we expect that this discussion can be resolved during the public
2	space permitting process. And we look forward to continuing to
3	work with the applicant on this active discussion, as well as the
4	streetscape design, as it goes through public space permitting.
5	And thank you, and I'd be happy to answer any questions.
6	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Mr. Hagen. Let's see if
7	we have any questions for you. Commissioner Imamura.
8	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: No questions. Just thank you,
9	Mr. Hagen.
10	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Commissioner Wright, any
11	questions of Mr. Hagen?
12	COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: No, no questions.
13	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And Commissioner Stidham, any
14	questions?
15	COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: No questions. Thank you for
16	your report.
17	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And Vice Chair Miller, any
18	questions?
19	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thanks, Mr. Hagen, for your report.
20	No questions. Thank you.
21	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And, Mr. Hagen, since nobody else
22	had any questions, I won't make my comment. I'll wait until
23	another DDOT person comes. I won't make my comment to you,
24	because you're a good guy, so I won't do that. Let's see, Mr.
25	DeBear, you have any questions of Mr. Hagen?

MR. DEBEAR: I don't, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. All right. Thank you, Mr. Hagen. We -- oh, we don't have anyone from the ANC. We called for them. Mr. Hagen, thank you for your report. We appreciate it.

MR. HAGEN: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. Let's go to the Office of Planning, and I think we have Mr. Jesick.

MR. JESICK: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission. The Office of Planning reviewed this application against the criteria of the Northern Howard Road zone, and we concluded that the application met those criteria, and we recommend that the Commission approve the application. The NHR zone seeks to create a mixed-use neighborhood that has a vibrant streetscape, is safe for pedestrians and cyclists, and is environmentally friendly. The review criteria directly addressed those points, and the application would satisfy the criteria.

Furthermore, we found that the application would not be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan, including when viewed through a racial equity lens. The greatest impact of the application in that regard would be to provide enhanced educational opportunities to children, many of whom are classified as at risk by the Public Charter School Board, and by increasing the grade range up to Grade 5, the new school could

1	provide a more stable educational environment for families. So,
2	again, OP is happy to recommend approval of the design review
3	application. As the applicant noted, they also asked for relief
4	from the NHR residential requirement, and OP also recommends
5	approval of that special exception. Thank you. That concludes
6	my verbal testimony, and I can rest on the written report as
7	well, and I'm happy to take any questions.
8	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Mr. Jesick. We
9	appreciate your report. Always a good job. Let's see if we have
10	any questions from others. Commissioner Imamura.
11	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: No questions, Mr. Chairman.
12	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Commissioner Wright.
13	COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: No questions. Thank you.
14	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Commissioner Stidham.
15	COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: No questions. Thank you.
16	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And Vice Chair Miller.
17	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Jesick, for the
18	Office of Planning comprehensive report and your testimony here
19	today, and I have no questions. Thank you.
20	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Mr. DeBear, you
21	have any cross?
22	MR. DEBEAR: No questions.
23	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Mr. Jesick, you got off easy
24	today. Thank you very much. We appreciate all your hard work.
25	All right. Ms. Ackerman, I don't think we have anyone from the

ANC, so let me pull up the -- Vice Chair, do you have the report handy?

VICE CHAIR MILLER: I do, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Could you just go over it right quick for us? Thank you.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Exhibit Number 20 in our record has a letter addressed to the Zoning Commissioner from Advisory Neighborhood Commission 8A, dated February 12th, stating that at its regularly scheduled properly noticed meeting on January 14th, with a quorum of seven members -- Commissioners present, ANC 8A voted unanimously to support the zoning application of Cedar Tree Academy, noting that the Academy has been part of the community for many years, presented to the ANC three times to explain the new school building and the application -- zoning application and the improved programming that will be there and all the design and transportation issues.

So they conclude by saying they support the modern and attractive design of the new school building, as we obviously do. The proposed building will create a presence on Howard Road consistent with the expected development pattern nearby, and they appreciate Cedar Tree's proposed improvements to the streetscape on Howard Road and the vehicle and bicycle parking provided in the new school building, and they urge our approval, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Vice Chair Miller for giving us that recap of what ANC 8A has done. We also have

letters in from Commissioner McKinney, former Councilmember White, Mr. Vaughan, Morton, Ms. Campbell, and others who also are in support of this application. Hopefully, I've named everybody who wrote a letter in support, and, if not, it's in the record, but we appreciate the support. I didn't see any opposition.

And, with that, Ms. Ackerman, do we have anyone here -and, Mr. DeBear, I wasn't going to ask you if you had any
questions of the ANC report, because I don't think -- the Vice
Chair might not have been able to answer some of those questions,
so I skipped past that. No, I'm just joking. Ms. Ackerman, do
we have anyone who's here in support, opposition, or undeclared?

MS. ACKERMAN: No.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So, with that, Mr. DeBear, can you give us your closing?

MR. DEBEAR: Yes. We thank the Board tonight. We -- as you've heard from our testimony, we attempted and endeavored to design a building that meets the needs and goals of Cedar Tree Academy, along with the design goals of the Northern Howard Road zone. And, as Mr. Boza testified, the building was designed in a thoughtful and purposeful manner to achieve all of those goals, and we think we have put forth something that will add to the neighborhood and, certainly, compliment the expected growth in the neighborhood and, again, allow Cedar Tree to really flourish and hopefully grow into a full-service elementary school. We feel as though Cedar Tree's mission is an excellent one,

particularly viewed through a racial equity lens. And, again, we appreciate the Commission's time. And, with that, I will end my statement.

2.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Mr. DeBear, and to the applicant and to the team. We appreciate all the work — the leg work that you all have done to make this hearing a little easier for us as we move forward. I know my colleagues have asked for a few things. Mr. Ritting, I'm trying to remember. I think this is two-vote case — a one-vote case, correct? One vote. Okay. My colleagues are telling me it's one vote. So I know my colleagues have asked for some things, so, Ms. Ackerman and Mr. DeBear, do you have those things they asked for or do you all —

MR. DEBEAR: Yeah. On my list, I have, certainly, I think primarily the landscaping, both around the parking area, but also looking into whether we can provide increased outdoor play space for children.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Is that all we had? Anybody else have anything? Is that it, Commissioner Imamura? That's all?

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Well, I think it was also the prep for the two driveways, rather than one, but I think, again, that needs to be worked out with DOT, but I have a strong preference for two, rather than one.

 $\hbox{ CHAIRPERSON HOOD:} \quad \hbox{We can always send our signal, not}$ that we can tell them what to do, but we can always -- because I

kind of agree with you. We can always send the signal, and we 2. won't put that on the applicant. We can send our signal to them, not that it's going to have a whole lot of bearing, but we can 3 4 always do that. Do we have anything else? 5 (No response.) 6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. So, Ms. Ackerman, since 7 this is a one-vote case, we're going to have to set some time 8 limits and see when things can be in, so we can go ahead and do 9 this for final action. Could you give us some dates please? 10 MS. ACKERMAN: Yes. One moment. So let me know if this works for you guys. The applicant can provide a draft order 11 12 by -- does March 10th work, or is that too soon? 13 MR. DEBEAR: No, that should work. 14 MS. ACKERMAN: Okay. And we could let the ANC respond, 15 let's see, by March 6th. Does that work? 16 MR. DEBEAR: Did you say the draft order was due March 17 10th? Did I mishear that? 18 MS. ACKERMAN: Yes. Is that okay? 19 MR. DEBEAR: Well, the ANC you said March 6th. 20 MS. ACKERMAN: Oh, sorry. Let's say the ANC is March 21 12th. MR. DEBEAR: 22 Okay. 23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And we'll put it on our schedule for 24 when, Ms. Ackerman? Do we have two --25 MS. ACKERMAN: And we can put it on -- I'm sorry. What

1	was
2	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Do we have two meetings in March?
3	MS. ACKERMAN: Yes, I'm looking at them right now.
4	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I'll be quiet.
5	MS. ACKERMAN: Sorry. I'm just trying to pull it up
6	on my computer.
7	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: We have a meeting March 20th.
8	MS. ACKERMAN: Yeah, the well, did you want it to
9	go on the public meeting March 27th?
10	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: We have a public meeting March the
11	27th?
12	MS. ACKERMAN: Yes.
13	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Whatever you I don't see
14	that on my schedule.
15	MS. ACKERMAN: Yes, March 27th we have a public meeting.
16	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.
17	MS. ACKERMAN: Would you like it on that agenda?
18	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: If that's the date, yeah. Check
19	Mr. DeBear, check with the office too, because it says March
20	20th. Hold on hold on a second.
21	MS. ACKERMAN: March 20th we have a public hearing.
22	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Well, let's see if Z-doc's
23	(phonetic) wrong. I need to stop looking at Z-documents
24	(phonetic). Okay, Ms. Ackerman, whatever date you say it is,
25	that's what we're going to go with.

1	MS. ACKERMAN: Okay.
2	MR. DEBEAR: March 27th?
3	MS. ACKERMAN: Yes, March 27th. I know that's a
4	meeting, because that's my birthday, so I have that already
5	written out.
6	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Oh, remember well, remember,
7	we're going to tell you Happy Birthday, so join us for your
8	birthday.
9	MS. ACKERMAN: I'm not going to remind you.
10	MR. DEBEAR: And our supplemental information will be
11	due also on the 10th, I take it, in addition to the order?
12	MS. ACKERMAN: Yes.
13	MR. DEBEAR: Okay. And I can I'll list out the
14	dates again after we go through after we say I go through
15	the Commissioner roll call.
16	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Well, we're not going to do roll
17	call tonight.
18	MS. ACKERMAN: Oh, sorry.
19	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Just give us the final date, and
20	we'll be good.
21	MS. ACKERMAN: Okay. All right.
22	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Give us the dates again, yeah.
23	MS. ACKERMAN: Okay. So the ANC will respond by March
24	12th; the applicant can respond by March 10th with a draft order
25	and any other information; and this will go on the agenda for

1	March 27th, 2025.
2	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. We're all on the
3	same page? You have anything else, Ms. Ackerman? We're good?
4	MS. ACKERMAN: Yeah, we're good.
5	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. All right. So the and now
6	check this out, Ms. Ackerman, because I don't want to be wrong,
7	but I think the Zoning Commission will meet again give me one
8	second on February the 27th.
9	MS. ACKERMAN: Yes.
10	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So regular meeting. Okay. Regular
11	meeting on these same platforms at four p.m. So, with that, I
12	want to thank everyone for their participation tonight, and, with
13	that, this hearing is adjourned. Good night, everyone.
14	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the
15	record at 5:41 p.m.)
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

CERTIFICATION

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Public Hearing in Case No. 24-23

Before: DC Zoning Commission

Date: 02-24-24

Place: Webex Videoconference

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

Deborah B. Gauthier

Deborah B. Sauthier