

ANC 6D, Special Meeting AGENDA, 10/27/2020, 7pm, Virtual WebEx Meeting | MINUTES

As approved at the January 11, 2021 business meeting

The following Commissioners were in attendance: Gail CM Fast, Andy CM Litsky, Ronald CM Collins, Rhonda CM Hamilton, Fredrica CM Kramer, and Anna CM Forgie. Executive Director Shaun Carter was also in attendance.

1. Approval of the Agenda 7:00pm, 1 min

Called to order by CM Fast. Quorum of four Commissioners at start of meeting.

Motion to approve agenda, CM Collins. Second, CM Kramer. Vote: 4-0-0

2. Introduction of Commissioners, 4 min

3. ZC 20-14, 5 M St SW Design Review, 45 min

Robbie, Jason JBG Smith. Scheduled for Zoning hearing 11/12/20. Will focus on the residential scheme (with retail at base) of project instead of mix-ed use.

Changes made since last meeting in September:

- tier the building, set back the building, reduce the scale of building at SE corner.
- Retail: 23k sq feet, Residential 608 units, Parking 311 spaces, Biking: 144
- Two L-shaped sections of the project, NW Building & SE Building
- Set down 110 feet at levels 12 and 13 all the way around the corner of South Cap and M Street. More set back at the street level at South Cap and M Street.
- Balcony windows flipped inward towards the building as opposed to outward.
- Precast concrete structure. Limit number of facade types.
- Additional 3-foot setback for deeper depth at intersection of South Cap & M Street SW.
- More of an open-terrace feel on the corner of South Cap & M St SW; provides more transparency into the neighborhood.
- Lighting subdued; no neon/LED lighting; ambient glow to support safety at the pedestrian level of the building.
- M & Half St side has reduced interior connections of floors, creating a shorter stack
- More of a row home scale of building at pedestrian level when looking at the L and Half St SW side of building
- Landscaping (Jeff): Generous setback area allows much more space for trees and other landscaping. Really important as you come off of Fred Doug Bridge. Allows accent trees, etc; more townhouse character

- Multiple outdoor amenity areas with green space.
- Roof pool with infinity edge; green space; dog run on roof
- Subtle lighting for pedestrian safety; wall sconces; overhead down lights;
- Retail signage
- Affordable Housing

Base building doesn't generate an IZ requirement in D5 zone. Penthouse generates requirement for IZ at 50% MFI

Will have total of 20 affordable units on site.

Q&A & Comments

Nov 5 to Nov 12 extension of zoning hearing, due to election year and those of us running elections.

(CM Collins:)

Pg 11. What is short-term residential parking?

A: This refers to bike stations or locks for bikes around perimeter of project

You say 608 units, but bottom of Pg 11 says 615 units. Which is it?

A: 608 is where we stand tonight with replanning. We've lost 7 units.

Are you depending upon tax credits from DC as part of project?

A: No.

Is financing totally private? No government financing?

A: Yes.

(CM Litsky:)

Thanks for enhanced presentation of lighting design and assurance that it will be ambient.

Landscape plan- What are the trees that will be put in on South Cap and M?

A: Haven't finalized. Small oak trees. Will stay consistent with that is nearby. May add different types but haven't finalized.

At what do discussions with Urban Forestry begin for M St?

A: Conversation starts now. In constant discussion with both DDOT and Urban Forestry. Hopefully before end of the year.

Parking- Unusually large amount of parking. What is breakdown of parking for residents and parking for retail?

A: Most of this will be allocated for retail parking.

Are you looking to use these spaces for in-building tenants and users? This will not be a lot for sporting event use?

A: No. That is part of the DDOT condition. Only tenants of the building and retail shoppers. This isn't open to event parking. We want to be flexible enough to accommodate grocers.

(CM Kramer)

Shadow study– Can we get more detail? This will matter when we have adjoining properties.

-Still feel that it is a big, industrial-looking building. It still looks like extension of Navy Yard. Windows tilting back make the building base look heavier.

-I like the exterior of the previous rendition of the South Cap side of building.

-Building doesn't really reference the rest of mid-century SW. All of open-green space is private space. Doesn't really reference the sanitary housing.

-What does this do for SW?

-Parking. 311 spaces total, but how many for residents? 128 for residents?

A: I believe those are for bike parking. 185 spaces are for residents. 185 spaces for 608 residences.

(CM Hamilton)

Echoing what CM Kramer said. This is a missed opportunity. Delivering over 600 units of housing and this doesn't offer much for the community. Why not look deeper into seeing how the community will benefit from the project.

Regarding design of building, still reminds me of a raised parking garage, especially along South Cap St. Still has a lack of consistency.

Parking- concern is backing up traffic along Half Street, especially during rush hour and during games and when the inspection station is busy. Why so much parking?

A: Keeping options open for a grocer and their demand for at least 130 parking spaces.

-I don't see any reference in the design to the sanitary housing.

(Committee Head Forgie)

The building doesn't incorporate the neighborhood around it. How does it fit in with specific points of the neighborhood around it?

Parking- How sure are you that you will get a grocer?

Affordable housing is now about 3%

South Cap will be brought to grade. Don't see that in the plans for the building or landscaping.

Pg 21 – Creates a 'tunnel' with a private driveway going between the two buildings (between this building and the future site next door at L and South Cap).

Pg 60 – Does rendering of transparency accurately show what the project will be when other properties are built?

(CM Fast)

Listening to the Zoning Hearing on 10/1, I think we've communicated how the building could fit within the fabric of the neighborhood. Zoning shouldn't be inconsistent with the small area plan or comprehensive area plan.

South Cap view – hard to visualize what the building will look like without the colors shown.

A: We're going with a light gray, so it will look airy

M Street view. Just looks like a giant building sitting on the street. We wanted a tiered effect. You interpreted it as a set back. Was looking for a sloping down of the building on M Street. The pavilion looks odd and misplaced.

Parking – All of the SW parking garages are open, open drive, go down underneath. This design looks heavy. Can we have something detailed that if you don't get a grocer, what will happen with additional parking. We don't want this to be parking for stadium use or any other outside events.

Windows – Building looks heavier with windows and hanging balconies.

What are you planning to do with heritage trees?

A: Working with Urban Forestry and arborists to accommodate the trees there.

We don't want trees removed or moved.

A: We will not move them. Will see how UF accommodates the project.

View into courtyard. What is the view of the buildings from the courtyard?

A: You will have the view from the lobby/interior of building.

Affordable Housing

80% MFI is workforce housing, 50% and below is affordable

Basically, you're offering 1 affordable and 19 workforce.

(CM Collins)

Agree with CM Fast. This doesn't benefit the SW community.

(CM Litsky)

This is a big building. I believe to be the largest building (in terms of units) being built south of the Mall and expressway. We know what you are required to do, but what you should be doing is a different matter. Zoning Commission made comments about lack of affordability in this building. This percentage is not going to impress the Zoning Commission. Does not represent the neighborhood as a welcoming building. You're bringing a lot of people to SW who are paying a lot of money to JBG. Grocery store is not guaranteed.

(CM Kramer)

Echo other Commissioners. Community has an intense desire to maintain diversity. Affordable housing is our crisis, which needs to be addressed. This does not help address that issue. Does not support the small area plan. I don't think we should ever hear 'we don't have to do it, so we're not'. If you were offering 20%, we'd have 60 units.

(CM Hamilton)

You've heard requests from community and Commission. I find it hard to believe that this is the best that you can offer. We know that you're not required to, but this is a dis-service to the community that this is the best that you can offer...at this AMI. How does this benefit the community?

(Committee Head Forgie)

3% is being offered as affordable.

Why don't you put in more affordable units? We understand you are not required, other than profit?

There are some people in the community who can afford to live wherever they want and there are those who can't not.

A: Our team has tried to listen closely to concerns of the Commission. We believe it is a better project than it was 6 weeks ago. Robbie: JBG is a huge supporter of affordable housing. We recognize situation and the need. Becomes cost prohibitive to add more affordable housing. Land value and land transaction makes it difficult for JBG money to go along way to make this work with additional affordable housing.

Forgie: You talked about commitment to affordable housing that JBG made to DC. From previous meeting: "Hopefully, some of 150 units will be in SW"

Would strongly urge you to see if you can find more affordability in this building.

Kelly: I made those comments. The funds we raised with Washington Housing Initiative. \$100 million fund of equity. Those funds will preserve or create over 3,000 units. Focusing half of those dollars in DC. Hopefully will find ways to make that investment in SW.

Community

Harrah: (very difficult to hear) Sent in comments. Need to delay any approval to have a process where not only ANC and SWNA, so that SW residents can be involved with planning; support inclusive and green SW; respect architecture of SW; stepdown needs to be lower to a more residential level; very little green street-level public space; this looks like two huge boxes with a little box in between; it doesn't step down into SW.

Coy McKinney: Amidst BLM and affordable housing crisis, in a neighborhood where black Washingtonians were excluded, in this neighborhood where residents want to stay diverse; in the midst of all of the corporate groups who are now responding to the BLM movement and request for inclusion and diversity, this is happening. Disrespectful.

CM Fast motions to oppose ZC 20-14. Second, CM Collins. Vote: 5-0-0.

Will attend hearing on 11/12 with Zoning Commission.

4. Adjournment



Southwest / Navy Yard / Buzzard Point
Advisory Neighborhood Commission 6D

1101 Fourth Street, SW
Suite W 130
Washington, DC 20024
202.554.1795
Email: 6d@anc.dc.gov
Website: www.anc6d.org

November 10, 2020

Anthony Hood, Chairman
Zoning Commission of the District of Columbia
441 4th Street, NW, S200
Washington, DC 20001

OFFICERS

Chairperson
Gail Fast

Vice Chairperson
Andy Litsky

Secretary
Edward Daniels

Treasurer
Ron Collins

Submitted via IZIS

With a copy emailed to DCOZ-ZCSubmissions@dc.gov

**ANC 6D Response to Supplemental Pre-Hearing Statement
Z.C. CASE NO. 20-14, 5 M Street SW Design Review**

Dear Chairman Hood and Members of the Zoning Commission,

COMMISSIONERS

SMD 1 *Gail Fast*
SMD 2 *vacant*
SMD 3 *Ronald Collins*
SMD 4 *Andy Litsky*
SMD 5 *Fredrica Kramer*
SMD 6 *Rhonda Hamilton*
SMD 7 *Edward Daniels*

At a regularly scheduled and properly noticed special meeting on October 27, 2020, with a quorum present, a quorum being four Commissioners, Advisory Neighborhood Commission (ANC) 6D voted 5-0-0 to oppose ZC Case No. 20-14, a design review case located in the heart of ANC 6D. This was ANC 6D's second opposition vote on this project, and **we urge the Commission to provide our conclusions on this case great weight under law.**

As we have said before, the 5M project sits at the confluence of cultures and communities in ANC 6D. Though just across South Capitol from the rapidly changing Navy Yard neighborhood, the 5M site is a world away and firmly rooted in residential Southwest, a community with a strong tradition of inclusiveness, diversity, and tolerance. Located at South Capitol and M—arguably the two most important streets in our ANC—**this site presents the extraordinary opportunity to create a sense of place and serve as a gateway to Southwest.**

Following the directive of the Zoning Commission, ANC 6D met with the Applicant to discuss our concerns regarding the project and hoped, after our two meetings, to see revamped renderings that would show a building that both ANC 6D and the Applicant could be proud of. Unfortunately, we still feel the building is architecturally heavy-handed, domineering and unwelcoming.

In the revised renderings, ANC 6D was pleased to see that the Applicant had replaced the three-story grid on So. Capitol St with two-stories and added balconies and terraces that eliminated the “stacked tissue boxes” seen in the first iteration. ANC 6D is in agreement that the two-story grid softens the building design however ANC 6D repeatedly requested that the Applicant entertain the idea of taking the concrete framing and using it as an exoskeleton to “wrap” the entire project. By extending the exoskeleton around all three buildings, the Applicant would have addressed one of ANC 6D’s fundamental criticism of the project -- the lack of continuity to the streetscape.

On the flip side, ANC 6D feels the revised tilt-back windows create an even fatter and heavier design. The same can be said for the balconies on the North elevation and the Southwest corner (L and Half Streets) which look like hanging inside-out pockets and give the appearance of extending into public space. The balconies in the Applicant’s original submission were more aligned with balconies seen throughout Southwest. The Applicant should also rethink the maisonette entry stairs that still look and feel industrial, a theme ANC 6D has repeatedly emphasized is not consistent with the character of Southwest.

Where the Applicant has really squandered an opportunity is on M Street. ANC 6D has repeatedly discussed tiering the building on M Street as it makes it way into Southwest. The Applicant continually has interpreted tiering to mean set back, which it is not. We have argued that tiering the building, like seats in an amphitheater, would create a welcoming nod to the sanitary homes across the street. Since the Applicant is only required to use a minimum of 60% of the street wall to be constructed on the set back line, use the remaining 40% and tier the building starting at So. Cap and M Streets and ending at the Northwest corner on Half. This would create a welcoming nod to the sanitary homes across the street while creating a more cohesive project.

ANC 6D is still troubled by the amorphous proposal for the parking spaces in the building. The Applicant will be providing 185 parking spaces for residents with an additional 130 spaces reserved for its retail tenant. While the Applicant has indicated to the ANC that it will actively be seeking a grocer to fill the retail space, ANC 6D is concerned that the site cannot sustain the 24/7 commotion of truck traffic to stock it. With a general industry ratio of six spaces to every 1,000 feet for a grocery store, ANC 6D is not convinced that the retail square footage warrants the number of spaces they hope to get approved? More importantly, while the Applicant has indicated that it is “absolutely not” going to create a commercial parking lot if they do not secure the grocer, ANC 6D will definitely want in the Zoning order wording that restricts the Applicant from operating or leasing out any portion of the parking lot to a PMI or any other parking company to serve anything other than that which ends up as their retail tenant(s).

Finally, ANC 6D is concerned about the proposed addition of units on L St that now extend over the private drive directly adjacent to the lot owned by the Ruben Company. In meetings with the Applicant, we reiterated numerous times our concerns regarding at-risk windows, and/or a lack of sunlight and air for those residents living in those units. We are convinced they were added at the last minute in an effort to eke out a few more market-rate units in this already enormous project. More importantly, nowhere in Southwest is the entrance to a parking and loading area designed this way, again creating a design feature that is not synomous with Southwest. ANC 6D was not surprised when we saw the Ruben Company’s letter of opposition appear in the case file and their concerns aligned with ours.

In closing, our residents are steadfast in their desire to maintain the economic and racial diversity that makes Southwest so strong and vibrant. ANC 6D wants to be clear regarding the Applicant’s response to

the affordable housing issue. They are still positioned, based upon their penthouse habitable space, to provide only one (1) unit of affordable housing. The remaining 19 units they are proffering will be workforce housing. While their total contribution to the District of Columbia's housing needs has almost doubled; boasting that 2.6% is a lofty offer is shameful.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Gail Fast".

Gail Fast

Chair, ANC 6D

Southwest, Navy Yard, & Buzzard Point