Brookland Neighborhood Civic Association 1502 Otis Street, N.E. Washington, D.C. 20017 202.529-0953

January 11, 2012

Zoning Commission for the District of Columbia 441 4th Street, N.W. Suite 220-S Washington, D.C. 20001

Dear Zoning Commissioners,

The Brookland Neighborhood Civic Association (BNCA) looks forward to appearing before you at the January 19, 2012 public hearing on Case No. 10-28 –Application of 901 Monroe Street, LLC for Consolidated Review and Approval of a Planned Unit Development and Zoning Map Amendment for 901 Monroe Street, N.E. (Square 3829, Lots 3, 4, 11, 22,, and 820).

BNCA has been deeply involved in reviewing, discussing, and engaging on the 901 Monroe Street, LLC proposal for over two years. In our testimony to you on January 19, 2012, we will describe our engagement in the process and the reasons why the Association is supportive of the proposed project.

We will also describe our concerns regarding the Applicant's request for a C-2-B Zoning Map Amendment. These concerns echo many of the concerns you raised at the initial March 14, 2011 Regular Meeting on this case. I am attaching a transcript of that portion of the March 14, 2011 meeting to assist in your recollection of those concerns.

Sincerely,

Caroline Petti, President

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

REGULAR MEETING

+ + + + +

MONDAY

MARCH 14, 2011

+ + + + +

The Regular Meeting of the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened in Room 220 South, 441 4th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20001, pursuant to notice at 6:30 p.m., Anthony J. Hood, Chairman, presiding.

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

ANTHONY J. HOOD, Chairman KONRAD SCHLATER, Vice Chairman PETER MAY, Commissioner (NPS) GREG SELFRIDGE, Commissioner

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

SHARON S. SCHELLIN, Secretary
DONNA HANOUSEK, Zoning Specialist
ESTHER BUSHMAN, General Counsel
JAMISON WEINBAUM, Director of Office of
Zoning

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

| - | 1 |
|----|------------|
| : | 2 |
| : | 3 |
| 4 | 4 |
| į | 5 |
| 6 | 5 |
| 7 | , |
| 8 | 3 |
| 9 | , |
| 10 | |
| 11 | . |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |

of C2A zoning with the PUD and five percent FAR relief. Of course, OP will continue to work with the Applicant and the community to have concerns raised by OP's report by other District agencies and by the public addressed prior to a public hearing. That concludes OP's testimony. I'd be happy to answer any questions that the Commission may have.

very much, Mr. Cochran. Let me just ask right off, we're also being asked to set down in the alternative the associated C2A Map Amendment.

Has the Applicant agreed to that? Are they in favor of doing both?

MR. COCHRAN: The Applicant suggested that it would be up to OP if it wanted to offer that alternative.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: So, on the record, they are in agreement to us advertising the alternative?

MR. COCHRAN: I believe so.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I saw some

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

strong heads move. So yes, they are in agreement. Okay. Let's open it up. Any questions or comments. And I'm going to let my colleagues go first, but I do want to talk about this proposed benefit and amenities package. But I will leave it up to -- we will open it up to my colleagues first. questions or comments? Commissioner May?

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. I didn't see a future land use map in your report or in the Applicant's case. And I'm wondering why we didn't see that and I'm also curious as what it looks like.

MR. COCHRAN: We went -- okay. There was certainly no intention to omit the land use map from OP's report. The square in which the Applicant is proposing the development shows a moderate density mixed use commercial and residential development for about a quarter of the square and low density, residential development for the remainder of the square.

NEAL R. GROSS

| | The state of the s |
|----|--|
| 2 | quarters of the square is low density, |
| 3 | residential on the land use map? |
| 4 | MR. COCHRAN: As shown in the land |
| 5 | use map. Yes. |
| 6 | COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. Well, I |
| 7 | need to see that. I'm sure the other |
| 8 | Commissioners would like to see it as well. |
| 9 | Do you agree with the Applicant's method of |
| 10 | calculating what's cellar space and what's |
| 11 | not? Because, I mean, I was a little confused |
| 12 | by it and I don't necessarily agree with it. |
| 13 | MR. COCHRAN: I agree with the |
| 14 | Applicant's method of calculating the square |
| 15 | footage that should be excluded for the ramp |
| 16 | going down and I've seen no reason to question |
| 17 | the Applicant's calculation of the cellar |
| 18 | space. But I have not gone over that |
| 19 | thoroughly because I didn't see a need to. |
| 20 | COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. Well, I |
| 21 | |
| 22 | MR. COCHRAN: I'd certainly be |
| | |

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

COMMISSIONER

MAY:

So

three

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

| | ١ |
|----|---|
| 1 | |
| 2 | |
| 3 | |
| 4 | |
| 5 | |
| 6 | |
| 7 | |
| 8 | |
| 9 | |
| 10 | |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |

22

explore that further if you set it down.

COMMISSIONER MAY: I'd like to understand that better and, if they're doing it some different way and we've accepted that before, I'd like to know the circumstances of that being done before. Because again, it doesn't — it doesn't coincide with my memory of calculating cellar space, but I don't claim that my memory is perfect.

And then I'm very interested in seeing more about what the benefits of the project might be, because given the amount of land that's being significantly upzoned here, the benefits package doesn't seem to be proportionate

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Vice-Chairman?

VICE-CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Mr.

Chairman, thank you. I just want to note, on
the record, my general concurrence with the -with looking at the site for C2A in the
alternative. It seems like a better fit,

NEAL R. GROSS

19

20

21

22

given that I know we did C2B across the tracks Catholic University. But think it allows up to 90 feet height and I don't think we want people getting in the mind set that 90 feet would be appropriate here. So I just think C2A looks like a better fit. I'm happy to set down C2B, as well, if we get to that point. Also, I would like to put in a plug -- on these applications and the OP reports, getting to see both the generalized land use map and the future land use map. We need to see that. Otherwise, we're flying blind, so to speak. So that's something I would certainly like to see. And I'm not decided as to whether I need to see that before set down or not. But it's certainly something that should be in every application. It's fairly important.

The other thing I'm having a hard time getting my head around is we've got a small area plan for Brookland and we get snippets of it here and there in both the OP

NEAL R. GROSS

22

report and in the Applicant's statement, but I don't get a good sense for what is in the small area plan. And we do read that the small area plan recommends 50 feet of height, yet this application is for 60 feet of height. It sounds fairly prescriptive, so I'd like to understand some of the context. And maybe that just means -- I don't know if I can get a copy of the small area plan or you could even send me a link and we don't have to waste the it and I can read it paper on from my computer. But it would be good to see that, just to understand what's recommended there. Because I do have some concerns about the scale of the building in relation to surroundings. I think this is an -- this site is an excellent candidate for mixed use retail, residential, particularly on Monroe Street. But it's -- you would have to be very sensitive to the fact that there are existing row homes on that block and this building is going to be a lot taller than those row homes.

NEAL R. GROSS

| And then we would also, of course, look for | building and its proximity to the row homes. | appropriate, considering the size of the | to me. I also think shade studies are | C2A, as an alternative, makes a lot of sense | his comments. So I would simply say as an alternative, makes a lot of as an alternative, makes a lot of a me. I also think shade studies copriate, considering the size of ding and its proximity to the row how then we would also, of course, look benefit and amenity plan to be beefed his were to go to a hearing stage. I me just at set down, but I think we'd probably see more and understand, I the so we can really or link this as a local to the contract this as a local probably see to the value on undergrounding ity lines. I think it makes a local probably see more and understand, I the so we can really or lines a local probably see to the value on undergrounding ity lines. I think it makes a local probably see to the value on undergrounding ity lines. I think it makes a local probably seems to the value of the valu |
|--|---|---|--|---|--|
| this were to go to a hearing stage. 're just at set down, but I think we probably see more and understand, I e idea of the value on undergroundility lines. I think it makes a nse, so we can really evaluate this a | d then we would also, of course, look is benefit and amenity plan to be beefed this were to go to a hearing stage. I re just at set down, but I think we'd probably see more and understand, I the idea of the value on undergrounding ility lines. I think it makes a lonse, so we can really evaluate this as | ilding and its proximity to the row hor d then we would also, of course, look is benefit and amenity plan to be beefed this were to go to a hearing stage. I probably see more and understand, I this probably see more and understand, I this illity lines. I think it makes a lot onse, so we can really evaluate this as probably seems. | propriate, considering the size of ilding and its proximity to the row hor d then we would also, of course, look is benefit and amenity plan to be beefed this were to go to a hearing stage. I probably see more and understand, I this probably see more and undergrounding ility lines. I think it makes a lot onse, so we can really evaluate this as property of the value on undergrounding in the second s | propriate, considering the size of ilding and its proximity to the row ho d then we would also, of course, look is benefit and amenity plan to be beefed this were to go to a hearing stage. I re just at set down, but I think we'd probably see more and understand, I the idea of the value on undergrounding ility lines. I think it makes a lonse, so we can really evaluate this as | of that package. |
| is benefit and amenity plan to be beefed this were to go to a hearing stage. I re just at set down, but I think we'd probably see more and understand, I the idea of the value on undergrounding ility lines. I think it makes a local section of the probable of the value of the val | d then we would also, of course, look is benefit and amenity plan to be beefed this were to go to a hearing stage. I probably see more and understand, I this e idea of the value on undergrounding ility lines. I think it makes a lot | ilding and its proximity to the row hor d then we would also, of course, look is benefit and amenity plan to be beefed this were to go to a hearing stage. I probably see more and understand, I this probably see more and undergrounding ility lines. I think it makes a lot | propriate, considering the size of ilding and its proximity to the row hold then we would also, of course, look is benefit and amenity plan to be beefed this were to go to a hearing stage. I re just at set down, but I think we'd probably see more and understand, I the idea of the value on undergrounding ility lines. I think it makes a lo | me. I also think shade studies propriate, considering the size of ilding and its proximity to the row hold then we would also, of course, look is benefit and amenity plan to be beefed this were to go to a hearing stage. I re just at set down, but I think we'd probably see more and understand, I the idea of the value on undergrounding ility lines. I think it makes a lo | so we can really evaluate this as |
| is benefit and amenity plan to be beefed this were to go to a hearing stage. I re just at set down, but I think we'd probably see more and understand, I the idea of the value on undergrounding | d then we would also, of course, look is benefit and amenity plan to be beefed this were to go to a hearing stage. I l're just at set down, but I think we'd probably see more and understand, I this e idea of the value on undergrounding | ilding and its proximity to the row hor d then we would also, of course, look is benefit and amenity plan to be beefed this were to go to a hearing stage. I probably see more and understand, I this probably see more and undergrounding e idea of the value on undergrounding | propriate, considering the size of ilding and its proximity to the row had then we would also, of course, look is benefit and amenity plan to be beefed this were to go to a hearing stage. I re just at set down, but I think we'd probably see more and understand, I the idea of the value on undergrounding | propriate, considering the size of ilding and its proximity to the row ho d then we would also, of course, look is benefit and amenity plan to be beefed this were to go to a hearing stage. I re just at set down, but I think we'd probably see more and understand, I the idea of the value on undergrounding | lines. I think it makes a lot |
| is benefit and amenity plan to be beefed this were to go to a hearing stage. I re just at set down, but I think we'd probably see more and understand, I the | d then we would also, of course, look is benefit and amenity plan to be beefed this were to go to a hearing stage. I probably see more and understand, I this probably see more and understand. | ilding and its proximity to the row hor d then we would also, of course, look is benefit and amenity plan to be beefed this were to go to a hearing stage. I probably see more and understand, I this probably see more and understand, I this limits were to go to a hearing stage. | propriate, considering the size of ilding and its proximity to the row hold then we would also, of course, look is benefit and amenity plan to be beefed this were to go to a hearing stage. I re just at set down, but I think we'd probably see more and understand, I the | propriate, considering the size of ilding and its proximity to the row had then we would also, of course, look is benefit and amenity plan to be beefed this were to go to a hearing stage. I probably see more and understand, I the probably see more and understand, I the probably see more and understand, I the probably see more and understand. | idea of the value on undergrounding |
| is benefit and amenity plan to be beefer this were to go to a hearing stage. I re just at set down, but I think we'd | then we would also, of course, look benefit and amenity plan to be beefed this were to go to a hearing stage. I like just at set down, but I think we'd like it is not be also be a set of the stage. | then we would also, of course, look benefit and amenity plan to be beefed this were to go to a hearing stage. I lee just at set down, but I think we'd let | copriate, considering the size of ding and its proximity to the row ho then we would also, of course, look benefit and amenity plan to be beefer this were to go to a hearing stage. I se just at set down, but I think we'd | me. I also think shade studies copriate, considering the size of ding and its proximity to the row ho then we would also, of course, look benefit and amenity plan to be beefer this were to go to a hearing stage. I se just at set down, but I think we'd | probably see more and understand, I |
| is benefit and amenity plan to be beefed this were to go to a hearing stage. I | then we would also, of course, look benefit and amenity plan to be beefed this were to go to a hearing stage. I | then we would also, of course, look benefit and amenity plan to be beefed this were to go to a hearing stage. I | copriate, considering the size of ding and its proximity to the row ho then we would also, of course, look benefit and amenity plan to be beefer this were to go to a hearing stage. I | me. I also think shade studies copriate, considering the size of ding and its proximity to the row ho then we would also, of course, look benefit and amenity plan to be beefer his were to go to a hearing stage. I | just at set down, but I think we'd |
| benefit and amenity plan to be beefed | then we would also, of course, look benefit and amenity plan to be beefed | ding and its proximity to the row hor then we would also, of course, look benefit and amenity plan to be beefed | copriate, considering the size of ding and its proximity to the row ho then we would also, of course, look benefit and amenity plan to be beefer | me. I also think shade studies copriate, considering the size of ding and its proximity to the row how then we would also, of course, look benefit and amenity plan to be beefed | this were to go to a hearing stage. I |
| | then we would also, of course, look | ding and its proximity to the row hor then we would also, of course, look | copriate, considering the size of ding and its proximity to the row ho then we would also, of course, look | me. I also think shade studies copriate, considering the size of ding and its proximity to the row how then we would also, of course, look | benefit and amenity plan to be beefed |
| me. I also think shade studies opriate, considering the size of ding and its proximity to the row ho | me. I also think shade studies opriate, considering the size of | me. I also think shade studies | as an alternative, makes a lot of | | his comments. So I would simply say |
| his comments. So I would simply say as an alternative, makes a lot of sme. I also think shade studies opriate, considering the size of ling and its proximity to the row home. | his comments. So I would simply say as an alternative, makes a lot of s ne. I also think shade studies ppriate, considering the size of | his comments. So I would simply say as an alternative, makes a lot of s ne. I also think shade studies | his comments. So I would simply say as an alternative, makes a lot of s | his comments. So I would simply say | covered a very wide berth of |
| his comments. So I would simply say as an alternative, makes a lot of spriate, considering the size of ling and its proximity to the row ho | his comments. So I would simply say as an alternative, makes a lot of spriate, considering the size of | his comments. So I would simply say as an alternative, makes a lot of sae. I also think shade studies | his comments. So I would simply say as an alternative, makes a lot of s | his comments. So I would simply say | |

9

8

7

9

5

4

ω

 \vdash

2

11

This we're things exactly is Ф is getting perspective. Н how would like D CHAIRMAN very this ready quiet building to HOOD: to Н see, put neighborhood want Okay. if ıs. B to We large going set see One it building and to how Of down, fit. now the

17

15

16

14

13

12

18

NEAL R. GROSS

22

21

20

19

22

there and I'd like to see how it actually is going to fit. And what I mean by that, I mean I want to see a perspective. And I've looked through here a number of times in submission, trying to see exactly how that's going to fit. I need to see, if I'm going -and this is actually for the Applicant -- if I am standing at Brookland Station, looking that way, looking towards the site, how is that -how is all that going to relate? How am I going to -- how is that going to fit? know, I'd like to see it in relationship to the houses and to the school and what's behind I need to see different angles of how it's going to fit. Now, I think we tried to accomplish it in your submissions. But, actually, that didn't do it for me. I need to see a perspective of how it's going to exactly And I will tell you that I looked fit. through your submissions and none of them did it for me so I can see how that's going to fit. That's the first thing.

NEAL R. GROSS

6

7

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

That's one of the things we need to start seeing again. We did that some years ago, and it's about time. It's been about eight years ago and now it's about time for us to start looking at that again.

Okay. Commissioners, any other questions? Commissioner May?

COMMISSIONER MAY: I just want to go back to one issue that was raised, which, to me, goes to the heart of whether we're really ready to set this down tonight, which is the land use maps question. And hearing the response that three quarters of the square is -- in the land use map is designated for low density residential and, in fact, what's being proposed here is three quarters of the square being developed at moderate or more and mixed use. I mean, I'm not sure how I see how it fits. So I think I'd need to understand that a little bit better from the Office of Planning, seeing the map and seeing why, it's -- if it differs from the map, why it's

NEAL R. GROSS

| approp | riate. | appropriate. Maybe it goes to the Small Area | it goes | to the | Small | Area |
|------------|--------|--|---------------------|--------------------|-----------|-------|
| Plan, | I don | Plan, I don't know. | | But I just don't I | don't | I |
| don't | feel | don't feel totally comfortable given that | comfo | ctable | given | that |
| divergence | ence | from | what we know of the | e know | of of | the |
| Compre | hensiv | Comprehensive Plan. I don't know. | I don' | t know. | That's my | 's my |
| + 601176+ | | | | | | |

else? feel strongly Commissioner CHAIRMAN on that? Selfridge? HOOD: Vice-Chairman? Okay. Anybody Anybody else

month, right additional process to propose We We would before helpful to want see cause have be we in it, here So, to the helpful. B two make hold have as well. information VICE-CHAIRMAN significant We've Mr. map İÍ weeks. the on Chairman, all we that got one set But wait the Н H we second. down don't delay another think Hfor facts two SCHLATER: could think, here' decision. sn it think weeks; to in Ø Н look meeting would just you to what the think that's front it's look get at, know, I'd approval H So, going of would this that like some at, if sn be μ. H

NEAL R. GROSS

22

21

20

19

18

17

16

15

14

13

12

11

10

9

 ∞

7

9

5

4

W

2

H

| V. | VICE-CHAIRMAN | IRMAN | SCHLATER: | A | fourth |
|----------------|---------------|---------|--------------|--------------|----------|
| meeting? I | guess | what | I would | say is | s I'm |
| feeling a | little | | skittish | about | this |
| application, | just a | as to | whether | it's r | ready. |
| It sounds | like | there's | s been | plenty | У of |
| community ou | outreach, | | although ce | certainly | not |
| community co | consensus | on | this. | I like | the |
| building. I | like | how i | it relates | to | Monroe |
| Street. I l | like the | e idea | a of putting | | housing |
| adjacent to | a Metro | | and transit | | oriented |
| development. | Ιt | think | the arch | architecture | e is |
| excellent. | I th | think t | the quality | ity of | the |
| materials in | sort of | an | emerging | neighborhood | rhood |
| like Brookland | for | real e | estate dev | development | nt to |
| be willing to | create | р | building of | E quality | ty on |
| all sides is | something | | that's to be | e commended. | nded. |
| And there's | a lot | of go | good parts | about | this |
| project. And | And I want | to | support it. | . I'm | just |
| wondering if | we're t | there y | yet. | | |

COMMISSIONER

SELFRIDGE:

Thank

Selfridge?

20

CHAIRMAN

HOOD:

Commissioner

19

18

17

16

15

14

13

12

11

10

9

 ∞

7

0

5

4

W

N

 \vdash

(202) 234-4433

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

we're This 18 exactly things D TS. getting perspective. Н how would like Ф CHAIRMAN very this ready quiet building HOOD: to to Hsee, put want neighborhood if Okay. 15 D to We large going set see One building H. and to how \vdash of down, fit. now the

NEAL R. GROSS

22

21

20

19

18

17

16

15

14

13

12

11

10

9

 ∞

7

9

5

 ω

4

N

 \vdash