

MEMORANDUM

TO: District of Columbia Zoning Commission

FROM: *JL for* Jennifer Steingasser, Deputy Director Development Review and Historic Preservation

DATE: October 7, 2016

SUBJECT: **Supplemental Report** for ZC Case No. 15-21, Kenilworth Courts – First Stage PUD, Consolidated PUD and PUD Related Map Amendment

At the public hearing of September 8, 2016, the Commission requested OP provide an update on the applicant's status regarding the issues raised in the Final Report for ZC 15-21, dated August 31, 2016. The following are those issues and updates

1. Continue to work with the DC State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) on the preparation of a detailed work plan for review and approval by SHPO for a Phase 1B Archeological Investigation before any construction may begin.

The applicants' archaeologist informed the State Archaeologist that he is awaiting the results of the October 17, 2016 meeting before moving forward, which is acceptable to the State Archaeologist.

2. Work with DDOT on a more substantial TDM plan and a Loading Management Plan.

The applicants submitted a Loading Dock Management Plan (Exhibit 53) and a TDM Plan to the file. DDOT, in an email to OP dated October 6, 2016, indicated that it did not have any issues with the loading plan. The applicant will work with DDOT on any refinements that may be necessary to the TDM plan.

3. Work with DC Water to ensure the adequacy of the sanitary sewer system to service the proposed development before construction may begin.

OP requested but did not receive additional information from DC Water regarding the sanitary sewer system. The applicants indicated that they are continuing to coordinate with DC Water and that the Consolidated portion of the PUD would result in no net gain in the number of bedrooms.

4. Work with DOEE on the provision of electric charging stations within the private townhouse garages.

The applicants agreed to provide electric charging stations within the private townhouse garages.

5. Update Sheet S-16, Building Identification Diagram, and Sheet S-18, Stage I PUD Lot Analysis for Consistency, and update S-16 to clearly differentiate between the buildings requiring side yard versus rear yard relief, and specifically how much relief is necessary for each individual structure.

The applicants updated Sheet S-16 (Exhibit 18A5), dated September 6, 2016, specifically identifying the buildings requiring relief, and the type of relief required. Sheet S-18 (Exhibit 18A5) corresponds by specifically identifying the amount of relief required for each building.

6. Provide additional information documenting that the proposed private alley north of Quarles Street will be adequate to provide the functions it is intended to serve.

DDOT informed OP it was fine with the private alley and that it would not conform to public design standards.

7. Submit Sheet L-510, Tree Canopy Requirements, to the record for adequate review.

A Tree Canopy sheet (Exhibit 40B) was submitted to the file by the applicants, indicating the location of existing and proposed plantings. The applicants still must document conformance with the Tree Canopy Protection Amendment Act of 2016, including the specific location of heritage trees on site and the applicant's plan should any of these trees be impacted by the proposed development. The applicants continue to work with Urban Forestry on the review of this plan.

8. Submit an Enterprise Green Communities Checklist, required of sites within the Anacostia Watershed Development Zone.

A Green Communities Checklist of the mandatory criteria was submitted to the file on September 6, 2016 (Exhibit 40C). This checklist indicates that both the townhouses and multifamily buildings would be designed to obtain at least the minimum number of points necessary for certification.

9. Provide fencing around all sides of all townhouse rear yards.

The applicants now propose six-foot privacy fencing in the rear yards of the townhouses, but on the sides only. No rear fence is proposed so as to allow access from the off-street parking and for pedestrians, and the applicant informed OP that this design would provide a balance between safety, maintenance, community and back yard usage. OP disagrees and recommends the applicant provide fences across the back of the rear yards to maintain a sense of private space and definitively demarcate the extent of that space to increase rear yard usage. Gates should be provided in the fences for access to the off-street parking. Provision of fencing across the rear yards by the developer would also ensure uniformity across the backs of the townhouses, as individual residents may establish their own methods to establish a boundary to definitively separate private and community space.

10. Consider locating a retail food store on the first floor space of the apartment building within the consolidated portion of the site for the Consolidated portion of the site to serve the community.

The applicant worked with the DC Food Policy Council and obtained a letter of interest dated September 29, 2016 from Good Food Markets, LLC (Exhibit 53) to locate within the 4,500 square foot commercial space within the PUD. This letter from this provider indicated that it would provide fresh produce, healthy on-site prepared food, senior-citizen friendly discounts and selections, accept SNAP/EBT, and partner with local nonprofits in support of community health and expanded fresh food access. Although this provider has not definitely committed to locating at Kenilworth Courts, the letter from this provider indicates there are fresh food distributors interested.

11. Work with the Public Space Committee to locate additional trash receptacles within public space for the collection of incidental trash throughout the PUD.

The applicant still needs to work with the Public Space Committee for the location of incidental trash receptacles. An agreement with DPW for the routine emptying of those receptacles would be necessary.

The Commission also requested OP obtain additional information from DC Water regarding the status of the capacity of the sanitary sewer service to the site, and to request comments from MPD regarding the applicant's Safety and Security Plan.

MPD: The applicant submitted Sheet S-20, revised September 30, 2016, indicating the locations of various types of lighting, security cameras and trees, both existing and proposed. MPD, in an email to OP on October 7, 2016, responded that *"no matter the design of the location, MPD will still respond to assist with any call of service we receive."*

DC Water: OP requested additional information from DC Water regarding the status of the sanitary sewer system serving the PUD site, but none were received.

ANC 7D

The ANC met with the applicants at a special meeting on September 27, 2016 (See Exhibit 55). Not wanting to interfere with the ability of DCHA to obtain funding for the project, and anticipating that they would be provided with a draft Relocation Plan by December 13, 2016, the ANC voted to rescind its opposition to the application.

JS/sjm^{AICP}