

GOVERNMENT
OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

-----:

IN THE MATTER OF: :

:

Text Amendment to Subtitles : Case No.

A, B, C, D, E, F, K, and U : 17-23

re: Changes to Definitions :

and Rules of Measurement :

Pertaining to Side Yards :

-----:

Monday,

October 15, 2018

Hearing Room 220 South

441 4th Street, N.W.

Washington, D.C.

The Public Hearing of Case No. 15-27 by the

District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened at 6:30

p.m. in the Jerrily R. Kress Memorial Hearing Room at 441

4th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20001, Anthony J.

Hood, Chairman, presiding.

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

- ANTHONY J. HOOD, Chairperson
- ROBERT MILLER, Vice Chairperson
- PETER G. MAY, Commissioner (NPS)
- PETER SHAPIRO, Commissioner

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

SHARON S. SCHELLIN, Secretary

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

JOEL LAWSON
ELISA VITALE

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PRESENT:

HILLARY LOVICK, ESQ.

The transcript constitutes the minutes from
the Public Hearing held on October 15, 2018.

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

(6:00 p.m.)

1
2
3 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Good evening, ladies and
4 gentlemen. This is public hearing of the Zoning Commission
5 for the District of Columbia. Today's date is October the
6 15th, 2018. We're located at Jerrily R. Kress Memorial
7 Hearing room. My name is Anthony Hood. Joining me are Vice
8 Chairman Miller, Commissioner Shapiro, and Commissioner May.
9 We're also joined by the Office of Zoning staff, Ms. Sharon
10 Schellin, as well as the Office of Attorney General, Ms.
11 Lovick, Office of Planning Staff, Mr. Lawson and Ms. Vitale.

12 Notice of today's hearing was published in the
13 D.C. Register, and copies of that announcement are available
14 to my left on the wall near the door. The hearing will be
15 conducted in accordance with provisions of 11 DCMR, Chapter
16 5 as follows: Preliminary matters presentation tonight by
17 the Office of Planning, report of other government agencies,
18 report of ANCs, organizations in support, organizations in
19 opposition, organizations and persons who are undeclared.

20 The Petitioner has up to 60 minutes. I'm sure,
21 Ms. Vitale, we don't need 60 minutes unless something's going
22 on with this case tonight that I'm not aware of.
23 Organizations five minutes. Individuals three minutes. The
24 staff will be available throughout the hearing to discuss
25 procedural questions.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Please turn off all electronic devices at this
2 time. Does the Commission --- does the --- at this time the
3 Commission will consider preliminary matters. Does the staff
4 have any preliminary matters?

5 MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir.

6 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let's go right to Ms.
7 Vitale.

8 MS. VITALE: Good evening, Mr. Chair, and members
9 of the Commission. Elisa Vitale, with the Office of
10 Planning. This is the second public hearing for Case 17-23,
11 and this is related to Side Yard requirements in the R, RF
12 and RA zones. A policy shift was implemented through the
13 2016 Zoning Regulations update, which revised the definitions
14 in Side Yard development standards. This change reinforced
15 the lot line to lot line buildings that did not share a
16 common division wall must provide a Side Yard. After a year
17 of working with the new regulations, the Zoning
18 Administrator, DCRA and OP, we all noted that this change and
19 this new policy to define a building by the existing
20 construction on adjacent lots really created some challenges
21 for infill buildings when they could not attach to another
22 building in a row, or in a semi-detached block.

23 So OP brought forward a text amendment in December
24 of 2017, which the Commission sat down. This text amendment
25 focused on bringing the regulations more in line with the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 1958 interpretations for Side Yard while maintaining some
2 other positive changes that had been adopted in 2016, such
3 as the provision that would not allow a property owner to
4 gain additional density on a property through the
5 construction of an addition.

6 We talked about this at the previous hearing, the
7 example being if someone had a detached building, your
8 maximum lot occupancy would be 40 percent. You could put an
9 addition on that building that would make it go lot line to
10 lot line. It would then be considered an attached building,
11 and you could increase the lot occupancy to 60 percent. So
12 this was something that we corrected for. We brought that
13 forward in the proposed text amendment in 2017, and we're
14 keeping that as we move forward, hopefully tonight.

15 So an initial public hearing was held in April of
16 2018. At this hearing the Commission took public testimony.
17 There was a fairly detailed discussion actually with the
18 individuals that were providing testimony that evening. And
19 the Commission directed OP to explore some alternatives based
20 on that evening's discussion.

21 OP brought forward revised text in July of this
22 year. This revised text reflects some items from that
23 initial hearing including a change in terminology. We're
24 proposing to go from attached building to row building. And
25 so that change shows up in a number of places, so you'll see

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 that in the text before you tonight. We're also proposing
2 to allow for new construction of row buildings in those zones
3 where they are permitted, allowing them to go lot line to lot
4 line without a shared common division wall. So, again, this
5 is going back to the 1958 interpretation. And we're also
6 requiring that existing Side Yards not be reduced or
7 eliminated.

8 The Commission sat down this revised text on July
9 20th. Since that hearing OP made minor modifications to the
10 text based on ongoing discussions with OAG and the Office of
11 the Zoning Administrator. These aren't substantive
12 revisions. They're really intended to clarify the
13 regulations. I mean, you can see those in red, bold,
14 underlined text in the OP report dated October 5th.

15 This concludes my presentation. I'm happy to
16 answer any questions that you might have this evening. Thank
17 you.

18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. First, I notice we have some
19 people in the audience, and I've been --- I was trying to
20 skip over my opening statement. But if you plan to testify
21 you need to sign up on the kiosk. So forgive me, I should
22 have mentioned that. Just trying to move through. Let me
23 ask, who's here in support of this --- these amendments.

24 (No audible response.)

25 Who's here in opposition of them?

1 (No audible response.)

2 Oh, okay, okay. I can rest a little bit. All
3 right. Yes, because we actually went through this very
4 thoroughly. That's why I was just wondering. Do you all
5 plan to testify?

6 (No audible response.)

7 Okay. Okay. All right, I'm just curious. Okay.
8 All right, Commissioners, do we want to go one by one, or do
9 we want to hit the highlights, or --- I have a few, but I
10 don't know if we want to start with the way it was presented
11 to us in the report, and we can just ask Ms. Vitale, or do
12 we have specific questions? I'm just trying to see what's
13 your pleasure. What's everybody's pleasure? I can go either
14 way.

15 COMMISSIONER MAY: You know, I have about ten
16 questions spread out across --- well, maybe not even that
17 many, six or seven.

18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Are they in a different categories?

19 COMMISSIONER MAY: Different, yes, different --

20 (Simultaneous speaking.)

21 CHAIRMAN HOOD: So, Ms. Vitale, why don't we look
22 at your report, and let's just go --- let's talk about, like,
23 I think the first one is the 10 foot setback, and it talks
24 about the, I guess, vesting, or whatever it is. Whatever the
25 date was. I don't --- let me pull it up. But why don't we

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 start there.

2 MS. VITALE: Sure.

3 CHAIRMAN HOOD: I think that's the first one, am
4 I correct?

5 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.

6 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let's start there, and let's
7 just take each one and we can go that way.

8 301.14, does any --- well, that's my first
9 question. Does anybody have anything prior to that?

10 COMMISSIONER MAY: No.

11 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let me just ask this, under
12 301 under permits, I think I wrote this down. Do we know how
13 many that we may have that fall into this category, because
14 to me it goes back to the same question I had from the very
15 beginning about substantive. Something that's, you know,
16 things that are in the pipeline and substantial completion.
17 I think that's the words that we used again.

18 MS. VITALE: There are certainly pending cases.
19 There are applications that are pending before the Board of
20 Zoning Adjustment requesting relief that would technically
21 go away should the Commission approve these revisions this
22 evening. But this would be --- the proposed revisions would
23 generally be a loosening, so it wouldn't create new non-
24 conformities on this. And the only change that we're
25 proposing in 301.14 this just has to do with terminology and

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 the shift from using attached building to row building.

2 CHAIRMAN HOOD: So the only thing that changes is
3 row.

4 MS. VITALE: So this is just a clean up. Yes, this
5 is just a clean up for terminology.

6 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right. So that answers
7 my question. I just didn't want us to open that whole
8 discussion back up again about how many --- what's
9 substantial and all that, so I see now. Okay. So that
10 answers actually --- okay. That takes care of that for me.

11 Any issues on the definition? I think, you know,
12 the term row dwelling and row house still have the same
13 meaning. Any questions Commissioner May?

14 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, I think there's something
15 still odd about the terminology, because the --- let me just
16 pull up the language. Give me one sec. (Pause.) So the
17 definition is for a row building, but then it clarifies the
18 term row dwelling and row house shall have the same meaning.
19 But neither of them were actually defined in that definition.
20 So we use three different terms, row building, row dwelling
21 and row house.

22 MS. VITALE: We included the new language that
23 wraps in row dwelling and row house with row building. I
24 think that was out of an abundance of caution in case those
25 terms were used elsewhere in the regulations, so that it's

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 ---

2 COMMISSIONER MAY: And I agree with that it's just
3 that the way it's phrased the first sentence doesn't have,
4 I mean, that sentence doesn't have anything to do with the
5 actual definition. So if you were to say the terms row
6 dwelling and row house shall have the same meaning as row
7 building then that's clear.

8 MS. VITALE: Right. And, yes, we're happy to add
9 that.

10 COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. And that --- I assume
11 that the same kind of terminology would apply in detached and
12 semi-detached as well. Do we need to add that same sentence
13 to detached and semi-detached, or is that really ---

14 MS. VITALE: We can certainly take a look at that.
15 I think row ---

16 COMMISSIONER MAY: You don't have the same ---

17 MS. VITALE: --- row building is the one that
18 showed up most frequently as row house, and with these slight
19 variations.

20 COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. Okay. Well, only what's
21 necessary. All right. Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, anything else on that?

23 (No audible response.)

24 All right. I think the next one is rules of
25 measurement for Side Yards. Any questions or comments?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 (No audible response.)

2 Okay. Um, Three --- 320, 320.

3 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, I mean, 320.2 I am sure
4 we've been over this, but can you explain to me again why we
5 actually can delete that?

6 MS. VITALE: That appears elsewhere in the ---
7 rather than putting that regulation in the rule of
8 measurement it's now captured in the actual development
9 standards.

10 COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. And is that the same
11 language?

12 MS. VITALE: No, I believe it's slightly different.

13 COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. But it's --- the
14 principal is the same, that you can't take an existing
15 detached or semi-detached and then build an addition that
16 takes it to the lot line and make it into a row house.

17 MS. VITALE: That's correct.

18 COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay.

19 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Anything else Mr. May?

20 COMMISSIONER MAY: Do you know --- do you happen
21 to know where that is, the ---

22 MS. VITALE: That's --- I was trying to find it
23 right now as we were ---

24 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, okay. Well, you know, if
25 you find it before our hearing is over just so I know.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MS. VITALE: Okay.

2 COMMISSIONER MAY: All right, thanks.

3 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let's go to Chapter 7,
4 vehicle parking. Ms. Vitale, help me understand 702.3A. I
5 see the changes, and I'm trying to figure out what's the
6 difference in what we've already --- what we used to do. Are
7 we just simplifying the language here, or is that something
8 substantive?

9 MS. VITALE: This is just a clarification, and it
10 was an attempt to make sure that the parking requirements are
11 use based, so if it's a single-family residential dwelling,
12 a flat of an apartment building, a multi-family dwelling.
13 So I think here we were just trying to make sure we were
14 capturing the use versus the building form. So this was
15 really trying to clarify the language, but is not intended
16 to change the requirement in any way.

17 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Because we do this now. We're just
18 trying to --- I guess trying to simply the explanation.

19 MS. VITALE: Correct.

20 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Now, these zones are an RF. I
21 don't --- this is not proposed for us. We're not changing
22 those like RF. Is that in our proposal to change the hearing
23 that we have coming up? Mr. Lawson or Ms. Vitale?

24 MS. VITALE: Well, in the hearing that you have
25 coming up that's --- the R and RF would still remain the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 first kind of the identifying letters for the zone, so that
2 shouldn't change. Any changes that would result from that
3 upcoming hearing we would go back through and clean up the
4 language and make sure that everything was up to date and
5 correct.

6 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Right, so if it's a change here,
7 like RF may go away, or may not, I'm not sure, but if the
8 change happens here we'll go back, like you said, and clean
9 it up. Okay.

10 MS. VITALE: That's correct.

11 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Because we don't want this to be
12 more confusing than what it already is. So, okay, anything
13 else from -- ?

14 (No audible response.)

15 All right. I think we're ready for Chapter 10.
16 Inclusionary zoning, any comments?

17 (No audible response.)

18 Okay. Let's go down to --- Well, lot occupancy
19 has been deleted. Let's go down to Side Yard, 206.2, 206.3,
20 206.4, 5, 6, 7 --- no, well, 5 and 6 and 7.

21 COMMISSIONER MAY: So I would like to clarify
22 something here. On 206.7, so basically in order to eliminate
23 a non-conforming Side Yard you'd need a variance.

24 MS. VITALE: It would be a special exception,
25 because it would be an existing building and relief ---

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay.

2 MS. VITALE: --- from the development standards for
3 existing buildings by special exception.

4 COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. What if it's a conforming
5 Side Yard, and you want to eliminate it?

6 MS. VITALE: It would be the same thing.

7 COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. So where is that covered?

8 MS. VITALE: 206.6.

9 COMMISSIONER MAY: Oh, got it. Okay. Amazing, I
10 just read that and I lost it completely. Okay. All right.
11 That's it. Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Vitale, 206.5, I mean, that's
13 the case now, right? Yes, I'm just asking.

14 MS. VITALE: No, 206.5 is really the crux of the
15 issue. It was that now for under the 2016 zoning regulations
16 if you could not attach to another building, and you weren't
17 sharing a common division wall then a Side Yard is required
18 even if you're going lot line to lot line. And, you know,
19 you would look like a row building essentially if you weren't
20 attaching and sharing a common division wall you would need
21 to provide a Side Yard. So 206.5, again, is our attempt to
22 clarify that we would permit the construction of a row
23 building, a building that goes from lot line to lot line
24 without requiring a Side Yard even if it wasn't able to
25 attach and share a common division wall with the building on

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 an adjoining property.

2 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, I think I --- I thought
3 that's what we were doing now, but I guess because it's been
4 a while since we've dealt with this type. I'm just trying
5 to remember.

6 MS. VITALE: That is what we're doing now, and
7 through this revision. So the intent is that no Side Yard
8 would be required for a row building.

9 CHAIRMAN HOOD: So basically in essence what we're
10 doing is just stating what past practice has always been.

11 MS. VITALE: That's correct.

12 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I just wanted to make sure.
13 Okay, thank you. All right, Commissioner Shapiro.

14 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Just a quick question. So
15 if you built that building, lot line to lot line, then the
16 window or door if it were even allowed would be at risk.

17 MS. VITALE: A window would definitely be at risk,
18 and, yes, I don't think you'd do a door.

19 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: And you wouldn't do a door,
20 right, right. Okay. All right, thank you, Mr. Chair.

21 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I have some.

22 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Vice Chair.

23 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So
24 just following up on Commissioner May's question, just in
25 terms of clarity, on 206.6 and 206.7 where it says,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Conforming Side Yards may not be reduced to a non-conforming
2 width or eliminated into 206.6. And then in 206.7 it says
3 the width of the existing Side Yards in the case of non-
4 conforming Side Yards shall not be reduced or eliminated.
5 Would it --- wouldn't it be clearer if we said except by
6 special exception, or some --- pursuant to whatever
7 provisions so people know right there that it's not --- it
8 is in a variance that you have to go for, or is it clearer
9 because it's somewhere close by that ---

10 MS. VITALE: It's clear in each subtitle that
11 relief from the development standard ---

12 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Is special.

13 MS. VITALE: --- is available by special exception.

14 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay.

15 MS. VITALE: So I don't think it's necessary here.

16 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. That's fine.

17 MS. VITALE: And then I think once it's all ---
18 once you see it integrated into the ---

19 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Right. Okay.

20 MS. VITALE: --- into the subtitle it would be
21 clear.

22 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Thanks.

23 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any further questions on 206, that
24 section?

25 (No audible response.)

1 Okay. What about 302, density and lot dimensions?
2 302.1, we're adding the word row as opposed to attached. Any
3 questions or comments on any of that?

4 (No audible response.)

5 What about 304.1, the same?

6 (No audible response.)

7 307? Looks like ---

8 COMMISSIONER MAY: So, ---

9 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes,

10 COMMISSIONER MAY: Can I ask about this?

11 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Sure.

12 COMMISSIONER MAY: 307, 407, 507, et cetera, these
13 are all rendered moot by the text that's now in 206, is that
14 right?

15 MS. VITALE: That's correct.

16 COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay.

17 MS. VITALE: We had repeated the Side Yard ---

18 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.

19 MS. VITALE: --- regulations multiple times, so
20 we're just trying to say it once.

21 COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. Thanks.

22 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So we're good. Yes, I see.
23 Anything on 407?

24 (No audible response.)

25 607?

1 (No audible response.)

2 700?

3 (No audible response.)

4 704?

5 (No audible response.)

6 Yes, I'm going to skip on down now to 807. I
7 think the same.

8 (No audible response.)

9 907?

10 (No audible response.)

11 1004 lot occupancy? I think that's the same, it's
12 continuing.

13 (No audible response.)

14 Page 11? Vice Chair Miller.

15 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, yes,
16 on 1006 the Rear Yard, so this is similar to my previous
17 question about the Side Yard. So we say in 1006.2 that a
18 rear wall of a row of a semi-detached not to be constructed
19 to extend farther than 10 feet.

20 And then the very next section says it may be
21 extended through --- constructed to extend farther than 10
22 feet if it meets certain criteria in another section. I
23 guess I --- I guess this is the way that this whole zoning
24 regulations are constructed. So in 1006.2 you don't need to
25 make a reference to -- there's an exception to that outright

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 prohibition that's there, that's in the very next section,
2 or you don't need the --- you don't need it because it's in
3 the very next section.

4 MS. VITALE: You don't need it there in --- it's
5 there in 106.3, because this is the relief. This section
6 speaks to how you get relief if you don't meet the
7 requirement. In here for the 10 foot rule there are specific
8 evaluation criteria that we look at when we evaluate those
9 special exception applications, and that's why they're very
10 specific references here for the criteria.

11 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Right.

12 MS. VITALE: That need to be addressed rather than
13 just the general special exception criteria that would apply
14 for any special exception relief from the general development
15 standards.

16 VICE CHAIR MILLER: So you don't need to say in
17 1006.2 --- notwithstanding 1006.1, but you don't need to add
18 an, except as provided in the very next section.

19 MS. VITALE: No, I don't believe it's necessary
20 there.

21 VICE CHAIR MILLER: All right, thanks.

22 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Vitale, do you know, or Mr.
23 Lawson, are we still looking at reviewing some of those
24 special --- that special exception criteria that we talked
25 about, are we still looking at that?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. LAWSON: We are. That's definitely on our list
2 of things to look at. We've heard the Commission and the
3 Board, frankly, loud and clear, that you'd like us to look
4 at that again as well as many member of the community. So
5 that's something we're looking at now.

6 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well, I appreciate it, because I
7 can tell you that's not a easy fix.

8 MR. LAWSON: We've definitely discovered that, yes.

9 CHAIRMAN HOOD: But I know you all can get it done.
10 All right. Any other questions?

11 (No audible response.)

12 All right. Let's see here. 1200?

13 (No audible response.)

14 Let me just do this. Page 11?

15 (No audible response.)

16 If I go too fast let me know. Page 12?

17 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, so page 12. 1204.2. So
18 here that language that was previously deleted is put back
19 in. Is that simply because we are --- why is it here and
20 it's not elsewhere?

21 MS. VITALE: It's here because the Side Yard
22 standards in these two in the R-19 and R-20 zones were
23 slightly different than elsewhere. So the language --- we
24 kept the language here in this section. And I think it
25 appears new because I think we were --- I think it was moved

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 potentially from another location. I think it was there
2 already. It may not --- it just may not have been in that,
3 you know, that specific section. But it stays as it is here
4 because the R-19 and R-20 zones were slightly different.

5 COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay.

6 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Page --- anything else on Page 12?

7 (No audible response.)

8 Page 13?

9 (No audible response.)

10 Page 14?

11 (No audible response.)

12 Page 15?

13 (No audible response.)

14 Page 16?

15 (No audible response.)

16 17?

17 (No audible response.)

18 18?

19 (No audible response.)

20 19?

21 (No audible response.)

22 20?

23 (No audible response.)

24 And 21?

25 (No audible response.)

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 I think the reason those other pages -- some of
2 them were already answered previously, so I think that's why
3 we were able to move past them, unless somebody else want to
4 go back to them. All right. Ms. Schellin do we have a list
5 of --- do we have any ANCs that are present and would like
6 to speak at this time. No, let's go by our list.

7 MS. SCHELLIN: I have one name, Robert Covington.

8 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Looks like it's four names up there
9 now.

10 MS. SCHELLIN: Those were people that signed up
11 back in April, and they did not appear.

12 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let me just --

13 MS. SCHELLIN: They didn't testify.

14 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let me just --- anybody who wants
15 to testify you can come forward at this time.

16 (No audible response.)

17 Okay. Anybody who's --- let me just do it like
18 this, anybody who's here in support?

19 (No audible response.)

20 Anybody who's here in opposition?

21 (No audible response.)

22 Anybody who's undeclared?

23 (No audible response.)

24 All right, so with that we will close this
25 proceeding. Commissioner, anything else that we would like

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 to do? I think this is, like, our second time or third. But
2 I do want to thank the Office of Planning and Office of
3 Attorney General as well, and our staff for getting us to
4 this point.

5 Ms. Schellin, how many votes? Is this one vote?

6 Two?

7 (No audible response.)

8 Commissioner, what is your pleasure for this
9 evening?

10 CHAIRMAN HOOD: You're ready.

11 (No audible response.)

12 Okay. Would someone like to make a motion?

13 (No audible response.)

14 And this is a two vote case.

15 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I would move that
16 the Zoning Commission take proposed action to approve Case
17 Number 17-23, Office of Planning's proposed text amendment
18 to sub-titles A, B, C, D, E, F, K and U regarding changes to
19 definitions and rules of measurement pertaining to Side Yards
20 and ask for a second.

21 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Second.

22 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, it's been moved and properly
23 seconded. Any further discussion?

24 (No audible response.)

25 All in favor, aye.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 (Chorus of aye.)

2 Any opposition?

3 (No audible response.)

4 So ordered. Ms. Schellin, would you please record
5 the vote?

6 MS. SCHELLIN: The staff records the vote 4 to 0
7 to 1 to approve proposed actions on Zoning Commission Case
8 Number 17-23. Commissioner Miller moving, Commissioner
9 Shapiro second, Commissioners May and Hood in support,
10 Commissioner Turnbull not present, not voting.

11 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Ms. Schellin, do we have
12 anything else before us?

13 MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir.

14 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I want to thank everyone for
15 their participation tonight and all the work put into this,
16 and with that this hearing is adjourned.

17 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off
18 the record at 7:02 p.m.)

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

C E R T I F I C A T E

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Public Hearing

Before: DCZC

Date: 10-15-18

Place: Washington, DC

was duly recorded and accurately transcribed under my direction; further, that said transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.



Court Reporter

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701