

Tel 202.663.8000 Fax 202.663.8007 www.pilisburylaw.com

Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman

March 12, 2007

By Hand Delivery

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

Re: Zoning Commission Case No. 06-27, Square 54 PUD

Motion to Reopen the Record to Accept Applicant's Revised Design

Dear Chairperson Mitten and Members of the Commission:

At its February 26, 2007 Special Public Meeting, the Commission indicated its general approval for the key elements of the above-referenced application, including the use mix, site plan, overall density, materials, traffic mitigation, consistency with the Comprehensive Plan, and the appropriateness of the proffered amenities. However, the Commission expressed concern regarding the height of certain components of the Project and directed the Applicant to evaluate design alternatives that would: (1) reduce the height of the building along 22nd Street and (2) ease the transition between the heights of the Washington Circle component of the building. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Commission reopen the record in order to receive the Applicant's proposed design revisions which address the Commission's concerns regarding the Project's height.

The enclosed plans (attached as Exhibit A) reflect the following design modifications in response to the aforementioned concerns raised by the Commission:

- Along Pennsylvania Avenue and 22nd Street, the office component of the building has been reduced 15 feet 6 inches in height from 130' to 114'6";
- Along 22nd Street, The residential component of the building has been reduced 20 feet in height from 130' to 110'; and
- Along Washington Circle, the tallest height of the office component has been reduced 5 feet 6 inches, from 120' to 114'6". In addition, modifications were made to accommodate an additional floor at the lower Washington Circle frontage section (maintaining an appropriate height of 91'3") in order to ease the transition between the lower and taller portions of the structure and to regain some of the density lost by the other height adjustments.

The Applicant believes that these design changes address the concerns raised by the Commission in a manner which does not compromise the architectural integrity of the Project. The reduction in height was accomplished by removing one story from the office component and two stories from the residential component of the building, as well as decreasing floor-to-ceiling heights throughout the office component. However, the Applicant has not modified the building footprint or modified any other aspect of the Project's design to recapture additional density. These modifications result in a loss of 32,559 s.f. of gross floor area (14,739 residential and 17,820 office), for an overall FAR of 7.28 (a decrease of .21 FAR). Notably, despite the reduction in density, the Applicant will maintain the full array of amenities and public benefits proffered in connection with the Project. The Applicant believes that the proposed reduction maintains the right balance. Any further diminution in density would, however, require a total re-examination of the Project and its amenities and benefits.

The Applicant fully believes that, with the responsive design revisions detailed above, the information included in the record of this case fully satisfies the requirements for approval. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Commission reopen the record to admit this submission, any written response from the parties and the office of Planning addressing the height reductions proposed herein (due by March 19, 2007).

Since the record will be complete as of March 19, 2007, the Applicant hereby requests that the Commission schedule its decision for the case at a March 26, 2007 special public meeting.

We thank you for the time and attention you have given to this matter to date, and greatly appreciate your continued consideration.

Very truly yours,

Phil T. Feola

Samantha L. Mazo

Enclosure

While the affordable housing proffer remains the same (8% of the residential units as affordable housing and 5% of the residential units as workforce housing), the reduction in density results in a decrease in the total number of housing units. Accordingly, the resulting number of affordable units, previously detailed in the Applicant's July 14, 2006 pre-hearing submission, will be proportionately decreased.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a copy of this letter and enclosures were delivered by hand delivery on March 12 2007.

Travis Parker
Office of Planning
801 North Capitol Street, N.E.
4th Floor
Washington, DC 20001

Barbara Kahlow West End Citizens Association 800 25th Street, N.W. #704 Washington, DC 20037

Michael Thomas Chairperson, ANC 2A 2501 M Street, N.W., Apt. 611 Washington, DC 20037 ANC 2A West End Branch Library 1101 24th Street N.W. Washington DC 20037

Cornish F. Hitchcock Attorney at Law 5301 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W., Suite 350 Washington, DC 20015-2022

National Capital Planning Commission
Attn: Christine Saum
Marjorie Marcus
401 9th Street, NW
North Lobby, Suite 500
Washington, DC 20004

Samantha L. Mazo