



January 25, 2007

VIA HAND DELIVERY

Ms. Carol Mitten, Chairperson
District of Columbia Zoning Commission
Office of Zoning
441 4th Street, NW, Room 210
Washington, DC 20001

Re: Zoning Commission Case No. 06-27, Square 54
Post Hearing Submission

Dear Chairperson Mitten and Members of the Commission:

As requested by the Commission during the January 4, 2007 public hearing, the Applicant submits the following additional information for the record in the above-referenced case.

I. The Office Component: Curtain Wall Study

At the Commission's request, the Applicant's architect has provided additional detailed renderings of the office component that visually express the articulations and refinements to the glass curtain walls described by the Applicant's architect during the January 4, 2007 hearing. These renderings are attached as Exhibit A and include the following:

- Views from Washington Circle. These views illustrate the manner in which the design breaks the office component into separate elements, providing variations in height stepping down to Washington Circle, and also illustrate the active and vibrant pedestrian activity that will be created at the street level.
- Washington Circle Curtain Wall Study. This study illustrates the depth of the masonry spandrel and projected accent which will provide shadow and light gradations on the face of the spandrel. The variations of vertical mullions will break down the overall scale of the façade, while the projected fins will catch the light as they curve around Washington Circle.
- Pennsylvania Avenue Curtain Wall Study. The Pennsylvania Avenue façade is similar to the Washington Circle curtain wall, but is lighter in its reading. Projections are replaced with reveals that will provide strong shadow lines.

- 22nd Street Curtain Wall Study. Similar to the Washington Circle curtain wall, the 22nd Street façade includes a masonry element to mediate the scale of the wall. The variation of the vertical mullions and depth of spandrel will provide additional shadow and definition.

II. The Residential Component: Corner of 22nd & I Streets

A. *Preferred Design*

At the January 4, 2007 public hearing, the Commission expressed concerns regarding the proposed rooftop design elements of the residential component at the intersection of 22nd and I Streets. Exhibit B includes the view of the residential component from 23rd and I Streets that was previously included in the Applicant's December 26, 2006 submission and presented to the Commission on January 4, 2007 (the "**Preferred Design**"). This view demonstrates how the Preferred Design breaks down the overall height of both residential components by creating a two-story band at the top of the structure that is overlapped with projected bays to create a façade of different heights and scales. The residential components are capped with a cornice that is consistent on all facades of the structure. Additionally, the residential component at the corner of 22nd and I Streets steps down as it faces I Street and the pedestrian plaza. Also included in Exhibit B is a composite roof plan associated with the Preferred Design.¹

The Applicant believes that the Preferred Design for the residential component at 22nd and I Streets is superior from an architectural design standpoint and appropriate for the surrounding context.

B. *Alternate Design*

In consideration of the concerns expressed by the Commission, the Applicant's architect has revisited the design of the residential component at the intersection of 22nd and I Streets and prepared an alternate design which is attached as Exhibit C (the "**Alternate Design**"). Under the Alternate Design, the residential component at 22nd and I Streets now rises to 110 feet at the I Street frontage, with the top two floors set back 37 feet along I Street. The two-story accent with overlapping bays is shifted away from the street edge and towards the courtyard, and is re-aligned with the 23rd Street residential component.² Also included in Exhibit C is a composite roof plan associated with the

¹ Please note that the composite roof plan does not include the green roof elements presented by the Applicant at the November 20, 2006 public hearing, but the roof will include those elements.

² Further, the Applicant's architect has added a bay along the interior wall of this residential component. As a result, the floor area ratio ("FAR") of the Project remains the same.

Alternate Design.³ Finally, Exhibit C includes a height study diagram that shows the measured and zoning heights of the Alternate Design, including all setbacks.

The Alternate Design may require the following additional flexibility in order to accommodate its changes:

1. As a result of the design modification, the interior layouts may change and could allow the Applicant to accommodate up to three additional apartment units. Therefore, the Applicant requests flexibility to construct a range of 333 – 336 apartment units.
2. As shown on the composite roof plan included in Exhibit C, the Alternate Design affects the design and placement of the roof structure for the residential component at 22nd and I Streets, which will contain mechanical equipment essential to the operation of the residential component as well as the grocery store below. Accordingly, the Applicant requests flexibility to revise the design of this roof structure in order to accommodate the necessary mechanical equipment.

As stated above, the Applicant favors the Preferred Design that was submitted as part of the original PUD application and presented to the Commission at the public hearing. From the inception of the planning process, the intent has been to break down the scale of this mixed-use development into multiple components and elements. Unlike a typical Washington block, views are provided through the block, and a large portion of the site is dedicated to open space. The Applicant's architect believes that the Preferred Design provides a stronger architectural resolution and that its setbacks will successfully mediate the scale of the Project across the site. However, if the Commission determines that the Alternate Design is preferable, the Applicant agrees to modify the Project design accordingly.

III. Perspective of the Project along 22nd Street NW

As requested by the Commission, attached as Exhibit D is the view from the intersection of 22nd and I Streets, showing the 22nd Street façade of the office and residential components. This view shows the massing step down to I Street as the continuous cornice wraps around this corner of the building, unifying the entire residential complex with a single architectural element. The 5-foot setback at the top of the brick aligns with the masonry bay of the office component to unify the scale of both components as they face 22nd Street. Exhibit D also includes a view from 22nd and I Streets that reflects the Alternate Design.

³ Again, the composite roof plan does not include the green roof elements presented by the Applicant at the public hearing, but the roof will include those elements.

IV. Courtyard Gate

As requested by the Commission, the Applicant's landscape architect has provided further detail on the proposed gate located at the entrance to the interior courtyard between the residential and office components on 23rd Street. Attached as Exhibit E are plans and sections that illustrate two potential gate designs: a "sliding gate" and a "pocket sliding gate."

- The "sliding" gate option will leave the movable 30-foot section of gate that spans the crosswalk exposed when the gate is open. In the open position, the movable section of gate is stored flush behind the fixed section of gate.
- The "pocket sliding" gate option allows the moveable 30-foot section of gate to recede into a specially designed "pocket" at the base of the retail space in the office component. (In order to accomplish this, the moveable 30-foot section breaks down into three 10-foot subsections.)

Both gates will operate by way of a depressed track and wheel system. There will be a track embedded in the crosswalk that sits flush with the top of the paver surface, and the bottom of the moveable section of gate will have a wheel that can travel in the groove of the depressed track. Neither gate design would impede or restrict pedestrian access to the public courtyard when it is open. The proposed gate would measure approximately 6-8 feet in height.

V. Conclusion

The attached documents address the issues raised by the Commission during the January 4, 2007 public hearing. The Applicant believes that the information included in the record of this case fully satisfies the requirements for consolidated PUD and Zoning Map Amendment approval and looks forward to the Commission's decision on this case at an upcoming public meeting.

Sincerely yours,



Phil T. Feola



David M. Avitabile

Enclosures

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE


I hereby certify that copies of this letter and enclosures were hand delivered to the persons listed below on January 25, 2007.

ANC 2A (6 Copies)
St. Mary's Court
725 24th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20037

Vincent Micone
Chair, ANC 2A
1099 22nd Street, NW #1005
Washington, DC 20037

West End Citizens Association
c/o Barbara Kahlow
800 25th Street, NW
Apt. # 704
Washington, DC 20037-2208

Foggy Bottom Association
Cornish F. Hitchcock,
5301 Wisconsin Avenue, NW
Suite 350
Washington, DC 20015



David Avitabile