

GOVERNMENT
OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

-----+
 IN THE MATTER OF: :
 :
 PUD and Related Map Amendment: Case No.
 at Square 643-S, Lot 801 : 07-13
 Trustees of the Corcoran :
 Gallery of Art and MR Randall:
 Capital LLC :
 -----+

Thursday,
November 8, 2007

Hearing Room 220 South
441 4th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

The Public Hearing of Case No.
07-13 by the District of Columbia Zoning
Commission convened at 7:08 p.m. in the
Office of Zoning Hearing Room at 441 4th
Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20001,
Anthony Hood, Chairperson, presiding.

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

- ANTHONY J. HOOD Chairperson
- GREGORY N. JEFFRIES Vice-Chairperson
- JOHN PARSONS Commissioner (NPS)
- MICHAEL G. TURNBULL Commissioner (AOC)

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

SHARON S. SCHELLIN Secretary

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

MATT JESICK
JENNIFER STEINGASSER

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PRESENT:

JACOB RITTING, ESQ.

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Public Hearing held on November 8, 2007.

T-A-B-L-E O-F C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

INTRODUCTION:

Chairperson Anthony J. Hood 4

PRELIMINARY MATTERS:

Sharon Schellin 6

DIALOGUE REGARDING DESIGN:

Vice-Chairperson Gregory Jeffries 14
 Commissioner John Parsons 18
 Commissioner Michael G. Turnbull 23
 Chairperson Anthony J. Hood 25
 Shalom Baranes (Architect) 26

VOTE ON PARTY STATUS OF SQUARE 643 ASSOCIATES:

Ms. Schellin 59

HEARING ADJOURNED:

Anthony J. Hood 61

1 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

2 6:39 p.m.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Now I will open
4 up Zoning Commission Case No. 07-13, Trustees
5 of the Corcoran Gallery. You know who's
6 joining me, Vice Chairman Greg Jeffries,
7 Commissioner John Parsons and Commissioner
8 Mike Turnbull. Most of you were here for the
9 introduction. You know that the subject of
10 this evening's hearing is Zoning Commission
11 Case No. 07-13, which was postponed from
12 September 27, 2007. This is a request by the
13 Trustees of the Corcoran Gallery for approval
14 of a consolidated PUD and related Map
15 Amendment for property located at 65 I Street
16 SW.

17 Notice of today's hearing was
18 published in the DC Register on April 27,
19 2007. Copies of the announcement are
20 available to my left in the wall bin near the
21 door.

22 The hearing will be conducted in

1 accordance with 11 DCMR 3022, as follows:
2 preliminary matters, applicant's case, report
3 of the Office of Planning, report of other
4 Government agencies, report of ANC 6D -- Mr.
5 Sobelsohn is representing ANC 6D --
6 organizations and persons in support, and
7 organizations and persons in opposition. The
8 following time constraints will be maintained
9 in this meeting: Applicant 45 minutes,
10 organizations five minutes, and individuals
11 three minutes.

12 All persons appearing before the
13 Commission are to fill out two witness cards.
14 These cards are located on my left on the
15 table near the door. Upon coming forward to
16 speak to the Commission, please give both
17 cards to the reporter sitting to my right
18 before taking a seat at the table.

19 The decision of the Commission in
20 this case must be based exclusively on the
21 public record. To avoid any appearance to the
22 contrary, the Commission requests that persons

1 present not engage the members of the
2 Commission in conversation during any recess
3 or at any other time. Please turn off all
4 beepers and cell phones at this time so as not
5 to disrupt these proceedings.

6 Would all individuals wishing to
7 testify please rise and take the oath.

8 (Whereupon, the witnesses were
9 sworn in.)

10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Ms.
11 Schellin, I think we have a preliminary
12 matter?

13 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. We have two.
14 First we have a party status request that was
15 filed by Cynthia Giordano on behalf of Square
16 643 Associates that was received this
17 afternoon for your consideration.

18 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I think we do
19 have it. I just need to find it.

20 MS. SCHELLIN: I'm sorry. It was
21 just handed to you and it's probably towards
22 the back, Exhibit 54.

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: It was in the
2 hand-outs that we had tonight?

3 MS. SCHELLIN: Tonight.

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Just give us a
5 moment and let me look at this. Exhibit 54?
6 Okay. I've got it.

7 VICE-CHAIRPERSON JEFFRIES: Ms.
8 Schellin, this was received today?

9 MS. SCHELLIN: Correct.

10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: What I would
11 like to do, I would like to hold this in
12 abeyance, this request for party status. I
13 don't think we have to rule on this right now.
14 I think we're going to move in a different
15 direction. So, with that -- and plus, I
16 haven't had a chance to read it, first of all,
17 and digest it and see if this person is
18 affected significantly. But if you wouldn't
19 mind, Ms. Giordano, we're not going to deny
20 you yet.

21 MS. GIORDANO: Okay. If I could
22 have an opportunity to speak before you deny

1 me, I'd appreciate it.

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: As I said, we
3 won't. That's what I said, we haven't denied
4 you.

5 MS. GIORDANO: All right. I hear
6 you. Thank you.

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Unless you
8 think we should, because you've already come
9 to the table. Okay. Do we have another
10 preliminary matter?

11 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. We do.
12 At Exhibit 45, we have a request from the
13 Applicant relating to how to proceed with this
14 case. They'd like to have a dialogue with the
15 Commission regarding the design, then proceed
16 with the rest of their case, and come back for
17 a further hearing with regard to the design.

18 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. It looks
19 like either way we're going to -- the request
20 is to talk about dialogue, proceed with the
21 rest of the case, and then come back to finish
22 talking about any other outstanding issues.

1 I am inclined to waive -- to move in favor --
2 and I want to hear from my colleagues -- to
3 let's have the dialogue, but let's not move
4 forward with the rest of it. Let's do it all
5 at one time. And then we can also take up the
6 party status application, once everything is
7 clean and on the table and there's no what
8 ifs. I'd like to hear from my colleagues. If
9 not, we'll stay the same.

10 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Well, yes.
11 Certainly. I mean, if we're going to have a
12 dialogue about design and Mr. Baranes is going
13 to get back and make some changes, we ought to
14 hear that when he's ready.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And sort of
16 address that? I mean, you know, I'm not in
17 favor of carving out design issues from this
18 overall package. So I'd like to see
19 everything in one comprehensive package. So
20 I don't have a problem with having some level
21 of discussion around design tonight. But, you
22 know, at some point, I'd like design, along

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 with several aspects of the application to
2 come before the Commission so we can look at
3 it in totality.

4 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I would
5 concur, Mr. Chair. I think we need to look at
6 the whole package. And, instead of -- we
7 can't do it piecemeal in one hearing and then
8 another. But the dialogue is the initiation
9 of that.

10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Well,
11 Ms. Brown, what we're going to do, we're going
12 to engage in a dialogue on some of the issues,
13 I guess, architectural and what not. Also,
14 I'm going to ask Mr. Baranes -- I guess he
15 doesn't need to come to the table, because
16 we're not going to go to a back and forth. I
17 think what my colleagues have said is that
18 we're going to throw some things out. We're
19 not going to design the project, but we're
20 going to throw some issue out and concerns
21 that we have, and have had actually since set
22 down. And we're going to do that tonight.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 But we're not going to go forward with the
2 rest of the hearing. We're going to do it all
3 at one time. And I think we already have some
4 dates that we've carved out. And we'll go
5 from there. We won't do the dates yet, but
6 we'll -- let's go over that dialogue. Do you
7 have any problems with that?

8 MS. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, we are
9 fully prepared to go forward tonight. And I
10 don't envision it to be that different from
11 what would normally occur in a -- in a
12 presentation of a PUD package. Frequently,
13 you do request further design modifications of
14 a project. And what he had anticipated
15 tonight was to do a full presentation of the
16 current design concept, but allow the design
17 development dialogue a little bit more in sync
18 with the Commission, but do a full
19 presentation, and then be able to come back
20 with any further developments that you
21 request, just as you would and have done in
22 some other cases, and be allowed to get on the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 record every other aspect of the case.

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. I
3 will tell you, I've never been in favor of
4 doing it and I'm not in favor of it now. But
5 I will tell you that I think that our concerns
6 were expressed at set down. We expressed our
7 concerns on the 27th or 28th and, to some
8 degree, we still have those same concerns. So
9 I think the dialogue and what you asked for,
10 I think, is acceptable. And you've heard my
11 colleagues. So I would rather for us to move
12 in that fashion. Those dates are not too far
13 off, to where we can have it, as Mr. Jeffries
14 stated, in one complete package.

15 MS. BROWN: Okay. Just for
16 clarification then, if -- will we have any
17 further design comments tonight, so that we
18 can ask questions and make sure that we have
19 a full understanding of what direction to
20 take?

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: That's exactly
22 the direction we want to move in.

1 MS. BROWN: Okay. Good. I just
2 wanted to make sure that we weren't deferring
3 that.

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: But again, I'm
5 going on notice that we're not designing this
6 project.

7 MS. BROWN: Absolutely. We don't
8 anticipate. We just want to make sure that we
9 have a full appreciation for the comments and
10 what direction to take it. Because we want --
11 we absolutely want to make sure that we cover
12 everything and understand the comments
13 perfectly and succinctly, so we don't have to
14 draw this process out.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: That's the
16 intent. And if Mr. Baranes wants to come up
17 to the table, if he's unsure, then he can
18 respond. Unless you want to respond?

19 MS. BROWN: I think it would be
20 helpful if he -- if we did go through the
21 design and, as we receive your comments, to
22 get more specifications. And he could bring

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 up certain elevations to help promote that
2 dialogues.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. All
4 right. Thank you. We're going to start off,
5 and this is rather unusual, but we're going to
6 start off. One of my colleagues, if you want
7 to start off with it, let's go for it.

8 VICE-CHAIRPERSON JEFFRIES: Okay.
9 Well first of all, Ms. Brown, I'm commenting
10 to your concern. I mean, you're absolutely
11 right. I mean, normally when this Commission
12 feels somewhat comfortable with the design but
13 has a few tweaks and a few things that it
14 would like the Applicant to reconsider, most
15 definitely it could sort of happen at another
16 hearing. But I think some of the concerns
17 that the Commission might have about the
18 design are somewhat substantial. And so, to
19 that end, I just think that it's probably best
20 that we really spend tonight just really
21 focusing on some of the design issues. And
22 I'm very happy to have a dialogue with -- or

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 at least to hear from Mr. Baranes as it
2 relates to design.

3 I have historically been very
4 happy with many of the designs that have come
5 before this Commission, as composed by Mr.
6 Baranes. But I do have some concerns here.
7 And so I'll just -- I have three, in
8 particular. The first one is that I'm
9 somewhat concerned about the heavy use of
10 aluminum panels as a backdrop to the Randall
11 School. I feel the panels are just rather
12 cold and somewhat flat. And I'm not certain
13 that it's a very complimentary material behind
14 a very warm historic building. I'm open to
15 hearing your comments on that. But, you know,
16 look around the city and, where there's sort
17 of stand alone aluminum panel buildings, in
18 fact, they're building at 14th and W, sort of
19 a stand alone building, you know, I think it's
20 perfectly acceptable and quite nice. But I'm
21 having some difficulty with sort of the
22 marriage between the historic warm building in

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 front, and then what I consider something
2 somewhat sort of cold and flat sort of
3 materials behind it. So I think, for me, I
4 just find that it's just an excessive use of
5 the metals behind the actual school.

6 I also hope that, you know, the
7 Applicant could consider perhaps more masonry
8 or perhaps more glazing behind the brick. And
9 obviously there's many examples in the city
10 of, you know, well articulated brick patterns
11 and designs. There's a building on
12 Massachusetts Avenue, I think, done by Esikov
13 (phonetic). I think that we might want to
14 move in that direction. Again, it's really
15 tied to materials, for me, in terms of as a
16 backdrop to the school.

17 My second issue is, you know, when
18 I look at this perspective here, I see three
19 different sort of architectural designs or
20 vocabulary. You know, this comes off as a
21 very modern piece, which actually is quite
22 nice if you just, you know, block out

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 everything else. But then, I think, when it
2 sits in the context of these other buildings,
3 it just seems like there's three different
4 vocabularies here. You have the historic.
5 You have what's behind, which is somewhat
6 contemporary. And this is, you know, rather
7 contemporary, to me. So there's just
8 something that's not very cohesive about the
9 overall design of this building.

10 And then finally, my third issue
11 is that this building is somewhat in a field.
12 It's not a contextual building. It's really
13 a building that, you know, has a field on the
14 north end. And I'm concerned about that
15 elevation -- that north elevation. It almost
16 looks like it's the back -- it's like the back
17 elevation. And I'm just concerned that this
18 building is somewhat more circular in fashion
19 and that there needs to be a lot more
20 attention paid to how that north elevation
21 looks. Because it will be visible from, you
22 know, the field, from the expressway. So I'm

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 just concerned about making certain that this
2 building is a figural building and not just a
3 contextual one, where I might not be as, you
4 know, focused on what that north elevation
5 looks like.

6 So again, the first one is
7 materials. The second one is just, you know,
8 varied architectural vocabulary at the front.
9 And then just really making certain that the
10 north elevation is treated such that it will
11 be viewed from all angles. Because I don't
12 think this building -- this building sits in
13 a field.

14 So those are my comments, Mr.
15 Chair.

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you,
17 Commissioner Jeffries. Any other comments?
18 Commissioner Parsons.

19 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I wanted to
20 follow up with Mr. Jeffries because I don't
21 understand what he said. Could we go to page
22 A-8?

1 VICE-CHAIRPERSON JEFFRIES: A-8?

2 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Yes. This
3 is an elevation of the school; the south
4 elevation, if you will.

5 VICE-CHAIRPERSON JEFFRIES: Yes?

6 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: And you
7 were commenting on the entrance to the
8 Corcoran on the left or west side?

9 VICE-CHAIRPERSON JEFFRIES: Yes.

10 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: And the
11 entrance to the residence on the right side or
12 east side --

13 VICE-CHAIRPERSON JEFFRIES: Yes?

14 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Seems to be
15 a different vocabulary as well. Were you
16 commenting on both of these, or just the one
17 on the other end?

18 VICE-CHAIRPERSON JEFFRIES: Both
19 of them. I look at them as bookends.

20 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Okay.

21 VICE-CHAIRPERSON JEFFRIES: You
22 know, so really the vocabulary of -- I call

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 them the bookends -- that flank the actual
2 school and then, you know, that are
3 foreground, as well, to the residential
4 building behind it.

5 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Fine.
6 Thank you.

7 VICE-CHAIRPERSON JEFFRIES: Yes.
8 So it all just seemed to take on different
9 vocabularies.

10 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: All right.
11 Mr. Chairman, I wanted to talk. I agree with
12 Mr. Jeffries remarks. But I wanted to talk
13 about the penthouse on the north wall. We've
14 talked about this before. It essentially
15 extends the height of the building another 18
16 1/2 feet. I notice the Office of Planning is
17 asking him to set it back. Ms. Steingasser,
18 did you mean setting it back -- to set it back
19 one on one, as a normal penthouse would be?

20 MR. JESICK: Good evening,
21 Commissioners. My name is Matt Jesick. As
22 part of their application, the Applicant has

1 requested relief from the set back
2 requirement. And we feel that that is
3 probably justified, given the need to push the
4 penthouse away from the historic building, and
5 also the unusual ventilation needs of the --
6 of the Corcoran's design space. So I don't
7 think we would be expecting a one to one set
8 back. But we would want to somehow visually
9 break where the penthouse begins and have it
10 at least set back a few feet.

11 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: A few feet?

12 MR. JESICK: We were open.

13 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: That
14 suggests about three.

15 MR. JESICK: I think three would
16 be what we were looking for.

17 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Well, I
18 guess I disagree with that.

19 MR. JESICK: Okay.

20 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: And how
21 about the decoration on it?

22 MR. JESICK: We're not totally

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 objecting to some sort of ornamentation at the
2 penthouse level. We do want it to be tasteful
3 because we know it will be visible from many
4 angles and great distances.

5 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Okay.
6 Well, maybe we could talk to Mr. Baranes about
7 this too.

8 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Okay.
9 Thanks.

10 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr.
11 Jesick, let me just go back to Mr. Parsons'
12 question about the penthouse. Why was it you
13 said the relief should be given? Because of
14 the what?

15 MR. JESICK: There are two reasons
16 really. One is the desire for historic
17 preservation reasons to move the mass of the
18 building to the north, including the
19 penthouse. And then two is for the Corcoran
20 College, for their design spaces, sculptural
21 spaces, all their art activities, they need
22 special ventilation equipment.

1 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: But this
2 is the residential penthouse. This is not the
3 school penthouse, this is the residential
4 penthouse.

5 MR. JESICK: The penthouse
6 contains equipment for both the school and the
7 residential building. And I believe on the
8 western wing, the penthouse is pulled away
9 from I Street. So the entire penthouse is
10 squeezed, if you will, towards the north.

11 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well I
12 guess we'll have to have Mr. Baranes go
13 through it, because there's also a penthouse
14 over the other parts too. So I think the need
15 for this is a little confusing. I'd like to
16 just go back to -- and I'd like to say that we
17 obviously do respect Mr. Baranes' design
18 ability. We've often looked very favorably
19 and we know his design talents. I'm thinking
20 of that one particular building across from
21 Rock Creek Park. And I thought --

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: 21st and West

1 Union?

2 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right. I
3 thought the Commission -- I thought we thought
4 that was an incredible design and I thought we
5 were -- I think, in this particular case, I
6 think we're a little bit concerned. And, as
7 Mr. Jeffries had noted, the sort of backdrop
8 to the school. And it just seemed a little
9 bit harsh, at times, to see the school
10 structure and then the rather -- I see more of
11 a continental flare, with the panels on the
12 yellow brick. And it just seemed, in one way,
13 you can get a feeling for what you're trying
14 to do. But I'm just wondering if it's maybe
15 just a little bit too harsh of a brick
16 backdrop and it might need to somehow reflect
17 a more sensitive context to what it is. And
18 I think that's what Mr. Jeffries is struggling
19 with, that -- and although we know that the
20 design trend nowadays too is that a building
21 can change as it goes around the corner and
22 everything, I think his frustration is that

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 maybe it's a little bit too much change in
2 context with what you were trying to preserve.
3 And I think he feels it's a little bit harsh,
4 at times.

5 And I think, from the overall
6 standpoint, we understand what you're trying
7 to accomplish in this rather complicated
8 little building here -- it's not a little
9 building, it's a big building -- but I guess
10 I just -- and I'm just echoing my
11 interpretation of this as I see it, a little
12 bit, is the sensitivity of how the building
13 meets the original historic structure. And
14 those are mine.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Any
16 other comments? Mr. Baranes, is there
17 something that you may need clarified? But
18 let me just say, I do associate myself with
19 the comments of Mr. Jeffries about the views
20 all the way around. And I'm not sure if he
21 said this. I was talking. But the views all
22 the way around and being able to see it from

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 the highway and other areas, and I think it
2 should be reflective as such. It almost looks
3 like we're looking, so some degree, as a back.

4 But anyway, that's all I have to
5 say about the architecture. So is there
6 anything that's unclear?

7 MR. BARANES: No. I think your
8 comments are very clear this time around and
9 I think I understand exactly what you're
10 saying. I'm wondering, may I take this
11 opportunity to respond to some of them, or --
12 it's not clear to me whether I can do that
13 here or whether we're going to wait until the
14 next hearing.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes. But give
16 us the brief version, because we're going to
17 wind up having three hearings on this whole
18 business.

19 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Yes. But I
20 think it's important. I mean, it's very
21 seldom, on this panel, that we tackle a
22 project that's been through HPRB and you've

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 been through a lot and you come forward with
2 a project and we disagree with it.

3 MR. BARANES: Right.

4 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: And that's
5 -- so you're caught in the middle. So that's
6 the need for a dialogue.

7 VICE-CHAIRPERSON JEFFRIES: Yes.
8 And it's a rather large building. This is --
9 I mean, it is going to be somewhat catalytic
10 in nature. I mean, it's going to be there for
11 many, many decades. And so I just think it
12 deserves a discussion.

13 MR. BARANES: Yes. You know, your
14 comments actually touch on some very, very
15 fundamental issues that we've had extensive
16 conversations on with the HPRB, both the staff
17 and the Commissioners -- not the
18 Commissioners, the Board Members.

19 And I think what I am seeing is
20 that you really have, as a group here, a very
21 different viewpoint about how an historic
22 structure can be expanded than what we have

1 been through with the Review Board. I'll give
2 you an example. If, for example, we look at
3 this very early rendering that we did. This
4 is a very early watercolor. It's a little bit
5 different than our current scheme, but very,
6 very close. Our intent here was to treat the
7 residential mass, not as an addition to the
8 historic building, but as an adjacent
9 neighborly. It's not meant to be understood
10 as an addition. And that leads you to very
11 different ways of thinking about the
12 architecture than if the building were, in
13 fact, an addition. And I can show you many
14 examples of that, obviously.

15 What makes the ensemble of the
16 historic buildings, I think, very special --
17 very unique as a group, is the fact that
18 they're strung along the street. They have a
19 very strong horizontal linear expression.
20 They're different from each other. Each one
21 has a very different character. They don't
22 have a static quality, which is very different

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 than what you would typically see with a neo-
2 classical grouping of buildings. And our
3 intent was really to build on that character,
4 on that variety that you see in the historic
5 composition there, by adding two more
6 pavilions. One is the entrance to the -- to
7 the residential building on the east side.
8 And the other one is the entrance to the
9 Corcoran on the west side. And essentially,
10 to create a necklace along the street there of
11 individual buildings, all of which have a
12 fairly small scale, two stories, three stories.
13 And, in a sense, to disassociate those from
14 what's behind them.

15 So, you know, your comment about
16 the incongruity of the corner pavilion, the
17 entrance to the Corcoran, with the residential
18 building was really very, very intentional on
19 our part. I mean, it's a very clear
20 underpinning of the design. You know, we --
21 we want to have that horizontal string of low
22 scale building relate to each other, but not

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 to the building behind. So that's where we're
2 coming from on that particular issue.

3 Now, on the issue of the character
4 of the residential building itself, again,
5 there are a lot of things we've done with that
6 design that are a direct reference. You know,
7 sometimes we try to be sympathetic. Other
8 time we try to contrast with the historic
9 buildings. But here, we've done both. And
10 actually, I'd like to take just a minute to
11 explain that.

12 Well, let's see. There's -- one
13 of the, I would say, most significant issues
14 we discussed as we've gone through the design
15 review process over the last 18 months has
16 been, you know, what is the nature of this
17 residential building behind the historic
18 buildings? Are we talking about a situation
19 here where you have a series of low buildings
20 that front a street, and then behind them you
21 have another building that also fronts the
22 street? It's almost like an echo of the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 original of what's in front. So essentially
2 you have a double layer of buildings. Or is
3 it a situation where this should just be a
4 very neutral backdrop for -- for the historic
5 buildings?

6 And I think that's a very
7 complicated question. And I think we're
8 walking a very fine line here. We don't want
9 these buildings -- this residential building,
10 to look like it's fronting on the street,
11 because there already is a very strong front
12 with the historic buildings. But we want it
13 to look like a completed secondary elevation
14 of the primary long elevation of the
15 residential buildings. These residential
16 buildings have primary elevations which face
17 east and west. And the intent here was to
18 take those elevations, which are very
19 residential in character and they're very much
20 in the character of Washington buildings --
21 they have bays; they have balconies; they have
22 a masonry volume on which we clip on these

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 very light metal bays -- and the intent here
2 was to take that vocabulary and basically just
3 wrap it very gently around the corner, in
4 order to create a fairly active composition
5 that brings your eye up and down and across
6 the site in the same way that the varying roof
7 lines of the historic buildings do that.
8 Those historic buildings really -- they
9 undulate; they're very fluid as they move
10 across the site. And it's that character that
11 we are trying to pick up with the varying
12 elevations of these metal bays on the ends of
13 the three legs of the E.

14 We very conscientiously did not
15 make them symmetrical. We made all three of
16 them different. The one in the middle is
17 very low. It has an angular bay on it that
18 leads your eye into the courtyard, and it
19 almost disappears when you look at it. It is
20 ten feet lower than the other two ends. The
21 other two ends are somewhat difference, in
22 that they are trying to turn a corner to the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 primary residential elevations and they're
2 also trying to lead your eye into the center
3 courtyard, this very large open space.

4 And personally, I mean, I feel --
5 and I think we -- we have some consistent
6 views on this from some other folks who've
7 reviewed this -- that -- that the way we've
8 developed these ends really goes a long way in
9 terms of capturing some of the historic
10 character of -- of the existing building. The
11 other point I would make about these ends is
12 that, in order to contrast them -- really make
13 a very clear contrast from the -- from the
14 historic buildings, we developed them with a
15 very vertical character. You can see the
16 historic buildings are very -- as I said,
17 they're very horizontal. They're very linear
18 in nature. And, as a foil against that, we
19 developed the ends of these three legs to have
20 these very narrow, vertical bays which read as
21 a series of exclamation points and have a
22 fairly abstract compositional quality in

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 relationship to each other. And, as I said,
2 contrast to everything in front of them.

3 So again, you know, think of this
4 residential building as a neighbor, not as an
5 addition to the historic building. And, when
6 you think of it that way, you know, it starts
7 to feel like the rest of the city. It starts
8 to feel like buildings on, you know, any
9 interesting street in the city where you --
10 where one architect paid some attention to the
11 architect next door, but didn't necessarily
12 try to do a building that was sympathetic, in
13 terms of its architectural character.

14 So -- so that was our approach
15 here. The only other thing I would say is,
16 you know, we have several buildings that we've
17 completed in town here that take on this exact
18 same philosophic attitude. And what I want to
19 note here is how different, in the end, the
20 characters of these buildings are. For
21 example, here in Georgetown, where we did have
22 an historic building, the incinerator that you

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 see there on the right, a masonry building,
2 you know, the addition that we did -- this is
3 the hotel -- is much more abstract. It's very
4 different. It really contrasts. It doesn't
5 begin to take on the level of detail that the
6 incinerator has, you know, with these very
7 highly detailed windows, the masonry piers,
8 all this gothic like decoration. We extracted
9 everything and simplified it, and again, used
10 that as a foil. And here, as in the Corcoran,
11 we have a masonry volume with the metal
12 clipped on. And I would ask you to note how
13 flat the metal is. And that was a very
14 conscious move on our part. On the other
15 side, where we have residential units instead
16 of hotel units, there's a little more variety
17 with the bays. And again, the fairly flat
18 metal bays that you see there. And here's
19 another place where they're used. And I think
20 the overall combination of these different
21 materials really lends -- lends a richness
22 that's sufficient without having to add a lot

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 of detail to the metal itself.

2 Let's see, this is a project that
3 you saw here a couple of years ago, the Ritz
4 Carleton. It's a PUD in the West End. And
5 again, it was a very similar approach here;
6 there was some masonry volume with these
7 clipped on metal bays -- very light, very
8 transparent. And, of course, here, of course,
9 there is no historic building that we're
10 relating to. And I think, Mr. Jeffries, this
11 is the building you might have been referring
12 to at 14th and U. And here, you can see that
13 the quality of the metal is very, very
14 different than in the other projects that I
15 showed you.

16 VICE-CHAIRPERSON JEFFRIES: It's
17 V. It's V.

18 MR. BARANES: 14th and V, right.
19 Here, we were not trying to create a very flat
20 surface that contrasted with anything. Here,
21 we let the brick be very flat and the metal
22 take on more of the -- of an indented quality,

1 more of a detailed quality.

2 Now certainly, we could do this at
3 the Corcoran. I think this would probably be
4 fairly responsive to the comments we've heard
5 from you. I -- my preference would be not to
6 do this. I like the flat better and I think
7 it works. It's a better marriage with the
8 taut skins that you see on the historic
9 buildings.

10 And I want to show you a couple of
11 other things. Here, at the Columbia Hospital,
12 again, a very, very similar approach where --
13 let's see, I should go back one.

14 VICE-CHAIRPERSON JEFFRIES: Excuse
15 me. What is -- can you go back to one of the
16 bays; maybe the incinerator, where you -- was
17 the metal bay -- what color was that?

18 MR. BARANES: Black.

19 VICE-CHAIRPERSON JEFFRIES: It was
20 black?

21 MR. BARANES: Yes.

22 VICE-CHAIRPERSON JEFFRIES: Okay.

1 I'm sorry.

2 MR. BARANES: At Columbia, it's
3 more of a -- as you can see, it's a much
4 lighter blue/green quality -- color. But I
5 just wanted to point out here, also, that you
6 could see here's a historic building, and then
7 here -- you know, a very classical building.
8 And here we added these two, very large
9 elements on either side. And again, we used,
10 you know, a brick vocabulary with a lot of
11 metal detailing -- a lot of metal skin. And
12 the percentage of metal to brick on this
13 building is very similar to what we're
14 proposing on -- on the Corcoran. And, you
15 know, I think it would be useful to walk
16 around this site. I think it's been a very
17 successful marriage. These are all
18 construction shots. Here, this is a better
19 shot. But again, I would suggest that we feel
20 it's a very successful marriage between this
21 kind of detail and this kind of use of metal
22 with the original hospital itself, which also

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 has windows which were -- start to suggest the
2 use of that metal, a little bit, although it's
3 quite different.

4 And then I just want to show you
5 -- I guess I'll skip this one -- this one. I
6 think, in a lot of ways, this is the most
7 similar to what we're proposing here. This
8 is, of course, the Spy Museum downtown. Here,
9 we had a whole series of very articulated
10 historic buildings and we did a very large,
11 very major addition behind that. And here we
12 went even -- we were even, I think, more
13 radical than we are proposing to be with the
14 Corcoran, in that the massing of what we built
15 here does not at all follow the massing -- the
16 orthogonal massing of the historic buildings.
17 What we did here is we built a very large
18 masonry volume. And, rather than picking up
19 the angle of all the buildings on the street,
20 we picked up the angle of Pennsylvania Avenue
21 to the south. And then again, against that,
22 we clipped all of the -- we attached -- we

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 clipped on all of these metal -- glass and
2 metal bays, which really, again, are a foil
3 for, you know, the more solid masonry
4 buildings below. And you see that combination
5 there. And again, there's more glass there
6 than we have at the Corcoran, but the
7 contrast, I think, is quite successful. And
8 again, this is a strategy that we have used
9 over and over and over on our buildings, I
10 think, with very different kinds of results in
11 terms of their character. And it's a strategy
12 we would like -- we would like to pursue here,
13 in lieu of doing a heavier masonry building.

14 VICE-CHAIRPERSON JEFFRIES: So why
15 am I responding -- I mean, I'm familiar with
16 many of these buildings that you've put here.
17 And I'm just somehow having difficulty
18 visualizing.

19 MR. BARANES: Maybe you should let
20 us build it first, and then --

21 VICE-CHAIRPERSON JEFFRIES: Yes.
22 Is that how it works? Okay.

1 MR. BARANES: Let's see, I can --
2 oh, maybe we can talk about the penthouse also
3 here. There's a set back on the penthouse.
4 And our feeling here was that we were dealing
5 with a different scale. I mean, first of all,
6 I very much agree with what you said, that
7 this is a figural building -- it's a building
8 in the round. It has no back. Everything is
9 a front. And so, you know, we really -- I
10 mean, this may feel like a back, compared to
11 all the articulation we have in the front.
12 But if you think of this as a facade on a
13 street downtown, it has as much articulation
14 as any building downtown.

15 VICE-CHAIRPERSON JEFFRIES: You're
16 trying to tell me that this perspective -- I
17 mean, for everything you've shown us, you
18 think this stands up along side anything else
19 you've shown us?

20 MR. BARANES: I -- we're trying to
21 do something quite different. But I think, in
22 terms of character and in terms of its success

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 in relating to its site and the historic
2 buildings, absolutely yes.

3 VICE-CHAIRPERSON JEFFRIES: And if
4 you had an open-ended budget, would this
5 building look like this?

6 MR. BARANES: Well, you know,
7 quite frankly, I hope we can afford to do
8 this. The metal on this building is one of
9 the most expensive skins we can use. It's
10 much more expensive than the brick.

11 VICE-CHAIRPERSON JEFFRIES: Yes?

12 MR. BARANES: And you know, we've
13 seen that from all of our other projects where
14 we've used metal.

15 VICE-CHAIRPERSON JEFFRIES: Right.

16 MR. BARANES: So, you know,
17 typically on a project like this, as we move
18 forward, our concern is that we're allowed to
19 use the kind of metal that you're seeing here
20 in the photograph, in the rendering, as
21 opposed to metals, for example, that have
22 exposed fasteners, exposed joints, very

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 different kind of detailing which gives you a
2 very different effect. That would be my only
3 concern in any project like this.

4 VICE-CHAIRPERSON JEFFRIES: What
5 about if you were looking at a darker metal?
6 I mean, what impact would that have?

7 MR. BARANES: We could look at a
8 darker metal. I mean, you know, the material
9 colors you see here -- the brick, the metal --
10 I think still need further study. I would
11 have no problem, I think, if we went to a
12 slightly darker metal. Obviously, we would
13 change the color of the brick a little bit
14 also. I think the brick would go a little bit
15 darker and I think that's okay. I'd be
16 concerned about not letting the brick go so
17 dark that it would start to match the historic
18 buildings.

19 You know, on the issue of the
20 penthouse, the scale here on the north side of
21 the building, relates to the highway. It
22 relates to the recreational fields. This is

1 really seen from 1000 feet away. And it has
2 a very different quality than the south side
3 of the project. And we did look at --
4 actually we actually did a -- we redid this
5 rendering and we set the penthouse back. And
6 we decided not to show it to anybody. What it
7 does is, when you take this penthouse and you
8 set it back a few feet, it introduces too much
9 complexity, I think, in the massing. It
10 introduces one more element up on top there.
11 And so, having this rise vertically, without
12 having an additional set back here where this
13 becomes a separate volume, but letting this
14 come around and then spill down, and then
15 having this read almost like an abstract
16 cornice on top of the building, is really the
17 effect we were after here. You know, as
18 opposed to articulating another volume on the
19 roof of the building. It also creates, I
20 think, a very strong spine on which the three
21 legs of the E are attached. You know, I think
22 there's a hierarchy here between the tall

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 piece on the back and the smaller pieces
2 clipped on to the front. And I'm a little
3 concerned we would start to lose some of that
4 reading if we set the penthouse back.

5 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Well, did
6 you give notice to the Office of Planning or
7 to your attorneys that this violates the
8 Heights Act?

9 MR. BARANES: You know, we were
10 talking about this the other day. We have --
11 in my office, I know of at least two projects
12 that we've taken to BZA and gotten approval
13 and built the projects where we got a zero lot
14 line approval. One is 816 Connecticut Avenue,
15 right near the White House. And the other
16 building is the Southern Building, where we
17 took the exterior wall adjacent --
18 perpendicular to the street, and took the
19 penthouse straight up with a zero lot line.
20 That was approved by BZA. So I -- I -- I'm
21 not -- I'm not sure what the legalities are.

22 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I guess I

1 wasn't there that day.

2 MR. BARANES: Both days. Yes.
3 And you know, on 816 Connecticut, we did it --
4 we built the penthouse a lot like the --

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: May I ask you
6 who sat on the case. I hope it wasn't me.

7 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: None of us
8 were there.

9 MR. BARANES: But that was the
10 interpretation at the time, which seems to be
11 different than the interpretation today.

12 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Well, I
13 don't know how we can do something that
14 violates the Height Act. I don't understand
15 that.

16 MS. BROWN: Mr. Parsons, maybe I
17 can respond to that. What we have here is not
18 a continuing wall of the building that goes
19 up. What we have is the penthouse wall, which
20 is permitted to go above the Height Act
21 limitation. It is not a parapet.

22 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: No, this is

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 a parapet, not a penthouse.

2 MS. BROWN: No, it is not. Well,
3 I believe it is not a parapet. It's more of
4 a penthouse wall. A parapet, I think we had
5 this discussion on the 1000 Connecticut Avenue
6 case, and that really was a parapet like
7 embellishment that was not engaged with the
8 penthouse that actually was set back from the
9 street. This is the rear wall of the
10 penthouse. And I think that's the distinction
11 that we have drawn.

12 MR. BARANES: Carolyn, I would say
13 a parapet is essentially a wall with open air
14 on both sides. Whereas, what we have here is
15 a wall that encloses space. It's a wall of a
16 room. And so --

17 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: So, to
18 follow your logic, we'd pull all the
19 penthouses out to the edge of the building
20 line, right?

21 MR. BARANES: Well, that would
22 require --

1 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: -- and
2 articulate them this way, and decorate them,
3 and essentially increase the heights of the
4 buildings in this city by 18 and a half feet,
5 wouldn't we?

6 MR. BARANES: Well, that would --
7 that would -- that, in each instance, that
8 would require a variance.

9 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Right.
10 But, I mean, the precedent is what I'm worried
11 about. And it's all about light and air in
12 the street, not in this project, but the next
13 one. And that's the purpose of the Heights in
14 Buildings Act. And the reason we step back
15 penthouses is for light and air on the street.
16 And so I'm worried about precedent here.
17 That's -- and you've already given me two
18 other cases. See?

19 MR. BARANES: Well, we have and,
20 you know, I could probably find a dozen other
21 buildings downtown that we didn't do that do
22 this, that have variances for the penthouse.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Right.

2 Well, anyway, thank you very much for the
3 dialogue.

4 MS. BROWN: If I could just point
5 out, for the record too, I think there's only
6 -- I think the delta is six feet that would be
7 above the Height Act under your view of the
8 interpretation.

9 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: This time.

10 MS. BROWN: Correct.

11 MR. BARANES: But what's six feet
12 between friends?

13 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Any
14 other dialogue needed?

15 MR. BARANES: Well, I would just
16 ask you, I mean, having heard, I guess, some
17 of my explanation, would you still like us
18 basically to go back and make this building
19 more of a masonry building, you know, less --
20 have less combination of materials here, not
21 use the metals? I mean, that would lead to a
22 very different kind of building. The

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 materials are probably the primary things.
2 And then there's also the question of the
3 pavilions. Do you buy our logic on the two
4 pavilions on the street, next to the historic
5 buildings and being -- being different than
6 the rest of the building? You know, we would
7 like to address these issues before coming
8 back, if in fact they still are issues.

9 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well,
10 maybe I can -- I mean, I guess in looking at
11 the different -- we all know that renderings
12 are renderings. And depending upon the color
13 rendition of what it is, they change from what
14 they really look like. I mean, if I look at
15 the rendering on the screen back there, it's
16 a lot -- the color of the brick is a lot
17 different than the more yellowish, washed out
18 on the screen on the side here. And maybe
19 your option before to go back and look at the
20 skin -- the color of the skin and the brick is
21 one option we might want to pursue. In other
22 words, not changing and going to all brick,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 but at least looking at whether it's going --
2 we'll leave that option to you as to what
3 color, but maybe looking at some options as
4 how that foil -- how that color scheme really
5 works out.

6 MR. BARANES: Okay. I mean, I
7 could -- I could look at that.

8 VICE-CHAIRPERSON JEFFRIES: Yes.
9 I would agree. I mean, if we could just
10 revisit, you know, the shade of the aluminum
11 panels and perhaps look at a different color
12 and see what you come up with, as well as the
13 brick. Because, you know -- the pavilions,
14 again, I love the pavilions as little stand
15 alone things. It's just hard to get
16 comfortable next to the school.

17 MR. BARANES: Mr. Jeffries, you're
18 concerned that they're not sympathetic to the
19 school, that they should feel a little bit
20 more like the historic buildings?

21 VICE-CHAIRPERSON JEFFRIES: You
22 know, I understand. I was looking at your

1 axonometric or the one where you're really
2 trying to disengage the residential building
3 from the school. And I think that's great.
4 But I think everybody's going to look at this
5 -- you're going to experience this from this
6 angle, from this worm's eye view. And, you
7 know, it just again, it -- I really do like
8 the pavilions. I'm just having some real
9 difficulty with it being right next to the
10 school. And what did the Historic
11 Preservation, what were their comments?

12 MR. BARANES: On the pavilions?

13 VICE-CHAIRPERSON JEFFRIES: Yes.
14 Next to the school.

15 MR. BARANES: They liked them. I
16 mean, they very, very much liked them.

17 VICE-CHAIRPERSON JEFFRIES: Oh.
18 Okay.

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: John, do you
20 have any comments?

21 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well, I
22 guess the only other issue then, and Mr.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Parsons brought that up, is the penthouse and
2 the Height Act issue and how we want to deal
3 with that.

4 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Well,
5 you've got to turn around and look at the back
6 wall, because it's a totally different
7 project. Well, it's the color of the brick.
8 It's not yellow. And somehow that feel more
9 compatible to me with the school, than this
10 image over here on the wall, which is clearly
11 yellow brick. I don't know what the
12 difference is, whether we -- or what the real
13 image in your office is. But the ones in the
14 book here are yellow.

15 MR. BARANES: Yes. Yes.

16 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I don't
17 have problems with the entrance to the school.

18 VICE-CHAIRPERSON JEFFRIES: Oh,
19 no. No. I love that.

20 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I have
21 problems with the residential entrance, but I
22 can see why it's yellow brick.

1 MR. BARANES: Just primarily the
2 colors and the textures?

3 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Yes, for
4 me.

5 MR. BARANES: Absolutely, we can
6 look at that and come back to you. It's not
7 a problem at all.

8 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: And I'll
9 just continue to disagree with both of you on
10 the penthouse. And hang on to my colleagues
11 over here from the Office of Planning.

12 VICE-CHAIRPERSON JEFFRIES: Yes.
13 So I think, Commissioner Turnbull's
14 recommendation is a good one. You now,
15 perhaps you can just sort of revisit, in terms
16 of the panels, you know, just give us a couple
17 -- you can just look at a couple of options
18 and just see, you know, how -- because I think
19 we were both commenting here, you know, wow,
20 this looks very different from here to there.
21 And, you know, so much of this is marketing
22 and packaging, right? So -- and I'm happy to

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 know that a lot of your decisions were
2 absolutely deliberate. And so, you succeeded.
3 But yes, I think it would be helpful if you'd
4 just, you know, in terms of some of the
5 materials, you know, maybe look at a darker
6 metal, just to see what it looks like. You
7 know, it would help.

8 MR. BARANES: We'll do that.
9 Absolutely.

10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I think
11 we've had plenty of dialogue. I think we're
12 all on the same page. Ms. Schellin, do we
13 have any dates?

14 MS. SCHELLIN: Well, did you want
15 to take five minutes to discuss it with the
16 Commissioners to see what works for them
17 first?

18 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes. Let me do
19 that. Give us five minutes. Give me five
20 minutes. Give us five minutes.

21 (Whereupon, off the record from
22 7:57 p.m. until 8:01 p.m.)

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Let's
2 reconvene. First, I would like to take up the
3 party status. Through all of that design
4 dialogue, I was able to read. Colleagues, we
5 have a request from the party status on behalf
6 of Square 643 Associates, who's represented by
7 Arlen Porter and Ms. Cynthia Giordano. We
8 have a request for party status from the
9 Associates Square 643. This is not timely.
10 And also, in reading this, he's obtained a
11 traffic consultant because of some issues, and
12 there's some support, with reservations. And
13 I believe that we can -- that can be expressed
14 in testimony, as opposed to party status. So
15 I would move to deny party status to Square
16 643 Associates. And I ask for a second.

17 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Second.

18 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Moved and
19 properly seconded. Any discussion?

20 VICE-CHAIRPERSON JEFFRIES: My
21 only comment is, you know, in terms of it not
22 being timely, I mean, you know, this case is

1 -- the application has been around for quite
2 a while. So I'm not -- I'm certain that she
3 will come up and speak, Ms. Giordano. But,
4 you know, obviously, you know, it doesn't make
5 me very sympathetic towards sort of waiving.
6 So again, I just wanted to put that on the
7 record.

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Before I call
9 for the final vote, I'm going to do something
10 a little out of order. I'm going to ask Ms.
11 Giordano to come up -- it's moving to be
12 denied, Ms. Giordano. And I just can't
13 remember whether we do it before or after. So
14 I'm going to bring you up in between.

15 MS. GIORDANO: Yes. I appreciate
16 that. And, on the timeliness aspect, we
17 weren't sure whether some of these issues were
18 going to be addressed in the DDOT report or
19 not. And we got the DDOT report, basically,
20 today. And that really prompted this request.
21 But the primary objective is not to have a
22 right to cross examine, but to have more than

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 three minutes to present a report that the
2 client spent, you know, some substantial sums
3 on, the consultant spent some time on. And so
4 that -- that was really the intent, that it
5 just -- it really can't be done in three
6 minutes.

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: The DDOT report
8 you got today. And, in all consideration,
9 unless I'm -- and I don't go against -- not
10 necessarily against the procedure, but I don't
11 believe that -- five minutes is enough?

12 MS. BROWN: I'll settle for that.
13 Yes. Thank you.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Ms.
15 Brown, do you have a problem with five
16 minutes?

17 MS. BROWN: No problem at all.

18 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And if they get
19 six, you don't have a problem with that?

20 MS. BROWN: I'll close my eyes.
21 Right.

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Just

1 stop the clock and then start it back up.
2 Okay. So we'll deal with that. And remind us
3 that we mentioned five minutes.

4 MS. GIORDANO: Okay. Thank you.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. That's
6 taken care of. Oh, all those in favor, aye.
7 Any opposition? So Staff, would you record
8 the vote?

9 MS. SCHELLIN: Staff records the
10 vote four to zero to one to deny party status
11 to Square 643 Associates, Commissioner Hood
12 moving; Commissioner Parsons seconding;
13 Commissioners Jeffries and Turnbull in favor;
14 Commissioner Etherly not present and not
15 voting.

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So
17 hopefully, this next part doesn't take as long
18 as the dialogue. But do we have some dates?

19 MS. SCHELLIN: The first option is
20 December 6th -- I'm sorry, December 3rd.

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And I'm asking
22 Mr. Sobelsohn, the ANC, and everyone do they

1 have a problem with December 3rd?

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Sobelsohn,
3 can you come to the mike please and identify
4 yourself?

5 MR. SOBELSOHN: David Sobelsohn,
6 ANC 6D. I believe we have an ANC meeting on
7 December 3rd.

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: You have an ANC
9 meeting December 3rd? Okay. The next is --

10 MS. SCHELLIN: December 6th.

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: -- December
12 6th?

13 MR. SOBELSOHN: We don't have
14 anything on that date. So we're available.
15 Right.

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Is everyone
17 okay with December 6th?

18 MS. BROWN: Yes. We're fine with
19 that. Yes.

20 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Going
21 once. Going twice. Okay. It sounds like
22 December 6th at 6:30 p.m. And that's the only

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 case we have that night.

2 MS. SCHELLIN: Correct.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Well, I
4 thank everybody for their participation
5 tonight. And what I will do is just close
6 this hearing. And we will reconvene on
7 December 6th at 6:30 p.m. Thank you and good
8 night.

9 (Whereupon, the hearing was
10 adjourned at 8:06 p.m.)

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22