GOVERNMENT
OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

-----:

IN THE MATTER OF:

Poplar point RBBR, LLC d/b/a : Case No. Columbian Quarter Holdings - : 18-19

Zoning Map Amendment @ Squares 5860 & 5861

Thursday, June 6, 2019

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

The Public Hearing of Case No. 18-19 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 MICHAEL G. TURNBULL, FAIA, Commissioner (AOC) PETER G. MAY, Commissioner (NPS) PETER SHAPIRO, Commissioner

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

SHARON S. SCHELLIN, Secretary

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

JENNIFER STEINGASSER, Deputy Director, Development Review & Historic Preservation

MATT JESICK JOEL LAWSON

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PRESENT:

HILLARY LOVICK, ESQ.

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Public Hearing held on June 6, 2019.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

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

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. We're ready to get started.

6:30 p.m.

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. This is a public hearing of the Zoning Commission for the District of Columbia. Today's date is June the 6th, 2019. My name is Anthony Hood. We're located in the Jerrily R. Kress Memorial Hearing Room. Joining me are Vice Chair Miller, Commissioner Shapiro, Commissioner May, and Commissioner Turnbull. We're also joined by the Office of Zoning staff Ms. Sharon Schellin, Office of Attorney General Ms. Hillary Lovick, Office of Planning staff Ms. Steingasser, Mr. Jesick, and Mr.

This proceeding is being recorded by a court reporter and is also webcast live. Notice of today's hearing was published in the *D.C. Register* and copies of that announcement are available to my left on the wall near the door.

The hearing will be conducted in accordance with provisions of 11-Z DCMR, Chapter 5 as follows: Preliminary matters, presentation by the Petitioner, Reports of other government agencies, report of the Office of Planning, report of the ANCs, organizations and persons in support, organizations and persons in opposition, organizations and persons who are undeclared.

2.0

Lawson.

The Petitioners and the Office of Planning also have up to 60 minutes; organizations 5 minutes; individuals 3 minutes. All persons wishing to testify before the Commission this evening's hearing I ask to register at the witness kiosk. The staff will be available throughout the hearing to discuss procedural questions. Please turn off all electronic devices at this time so as not to disrupt these proceedings.

At this time the Commission will consider any preliminary matters. Does the staff have any preliminary matters?

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. Even though this is a map amendment, the Petitioner has proffered an expert in architecture even though the Commission doesn't typically hear about a project for a map amendment case. So I don't know if you want to take that up or not. It's Mr. Hellmuth who's been before the Commission before accepted, so if the Commission wants to consider an expert in architecture or not.

MS. HOTTEL-COX: If I could just add a point of clarification, we are proffering Mr. Hellmuth as an expert in planning --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Could you identify yourself?

MS. HOTTEL-COX: -- for this case.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Some people may not know you.

2.0

MS. HOTTEL-COX: Sorry. I'm Meghan Hottel-Cox with Goulston & Storrs, counsel for the Petitioner.

We are proffering Mr. Hellmuth as an expert in planning in this case. While he has been accepted by the Commission as an expert in architecture before, his background is also as an expert in planning, and so we are him in planning to discuss offering as an expert the consistency of the map amendment with the Comprehensive Plan. I just wanted to provide that clarification.

MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. So we only have him -- the Commission accepting him as an expert in architecture, so if you want to reconsider or also consider him in planning.

I would like to put that CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. in abevance. And let me just again open it up to my colleagues first as a path going forward. Right now, as we mentioned, this is a rulemaking. Let's see if there's any interest of changing our previous decision of making this a rulemaking. I know this might be a surprise to some, but I know we have grappled with this in the past. So let me see if anyone's interested in changing our setdown before we go too far into this rulemaking case.

Commissioners, any questions or comments?

COMMISSIONER MAY: So, Mr. Chairman, so I actually I think at this point would be inclined to set this down again as a contested case. I know that can be seen as yet

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

another delay, but I think actually it will work better in the long run that we consider it in this fashion given all of the circumstances of the case. I don't want to have to go through every aspect of it, but I just -- I would agree with the question posed by the Chairman that we should set this down once again as a contested case.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Any other comments on that? Vice Chair Miller?

VICE-CHAIR MILLER: I can see that --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Turn your mic on.

VICE-CHAIR MILLER: Oh, sorry. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think we have discretion to set it down, and we did set it down as a rulemaking. We also had discretion to set it down as a contested case. We had initially heard some opposition to the fact that it was not set down as a contested case by the opposition that's no longer in opposition to the map amendment.

And so I actually -- and because this has been planned for so long and there have been so many delays, while I can see the value of being cautious in setting it down as a contested case, I'm not aware of any opposition at this stage. I think we're at a good stage. I'm worried that if we proceed later that we won't be at this final -- finally good stage that we're at.

There are broader public policies that are in play

2.0

here that are -- for the Howard Road Development Opportunity Area, which is why a customized zone -- we think a customized zone is a good idea and why I think a rulemaking hearing on the map amendment could be appropriate because broader public policies for a very large area -- policies which are set forth in the Comp Plan.

So I would prefer that we just have the hearing and get to the proposed map amendment as -- not as quickly as possible, because this thing has been nothing but -- been nowhere no quick. So I would just pause and be -- I'd be comfortable with going forward. I guess I'd be comfortable with setting it down, but I just -- the three-month delay is a matter of concern with me since we're at a good stage where the community, the Office of Planning, the Applicant and the Zoning Commission all seem to be on the same page, and I'm worried about that page turning over a long hot summer.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioner Shapiro?

COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm Actually the position where Vice Chair Miller is. I get where he's coming from. And I think if it were just this one case in isolation that it would make sense to me. And I agree for the concerns as he's shared that there's been a lot of work that's put into this and we're in a good place with it.

I think in this case though I think there is an

2.0

1 issue around precedent, and I think this will set a tone for how we go forward in similar situations. 2 And for that reason I think even though it may not feel as comfortable 3 focused on this case, I think for the broader issues that we 4 take up as a commission I think it does make sense to move 5 forward to have this be taken up as a -- re-advertised as a 6 7 contested case. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okav. Commissioner Turnbull? 8 Thank you, Mr. Chair. 9 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Ι would -- I think the Vice Chair brings up a lot of good 10 11 I mean, ANCs are both in favor of this and it's got a lot of positive aspects, but -- and I don't know if OAG 12 wants to weigh in, but I think the other option is from a 13 14 legal technical standpoint. We may be on safer grounds or 15 on better grounds for hearing this case as a contested case. 16 I don't know if Ms. Lovick has any comments she'd like to add 17 onto that. 18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Lovick, let me comment. (Laughter.) 19 I think -- so she can tell me I'm 2.0 CHAIRMAN HOOD: 21 wrong. (Laughter.) 22 But let me just say this: 23 CHAIRMAN HOOD: 24 appreciate all the work that has been done. I think that

we're doing everyone -- we're looking out for

25

the best

interests of everyone in this city with the process that we're moving forward by making this a contested case, because for me all of our stuff has been challenged elsewhere. And I know we work very hard down here. So while the Applicant and those residents may not see this as a positive step moving forward, we're trying to take out that element.

And I'm not going to sugarcoat it. We're trying to take out that element that goes -- and after all the work the communities and residents do and we're trying to take out that element where people go down and challenge and hold up everything and stopping a lot of progress in this city.

So I think this is a wise caution move. Yes, we pushed it off and pushed it off because we're trying to get it right, but we also have some other folks how look over our shoulders as well. And they've been looking for a while. And it's not the best feeling. I've even talked to one of the judges. But I'll just tell you this: We want to make sure we do this right. WE don't want to have to come back down here or get held up again. Even though I know people have said, oh, we're withdrawing this right now, but we have other things that we have to do as well. We want to make sure we do stuff correct and we're -- the path going I think we have a good tool. forward. I think it's a I'm hoping things don't change because I think it's win/win. a very -- a good win/win for the residents in that area, and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

for the city as well. While there may be an inconvenience now, I think in the long run we'll be better served.

And I know the two gentlemen on the front row are probably tired of seeing me. And I'm not going to say likewise, but I know they're tired of seeing me. But I know they want to move forward. I know the support they have in the back.

The reality is there's another element. And I think if you stop and look at it, I think this commission is moving cautious because we have to make sure we do stuff with due process and do it right, while it's inconvenient and I know we're costing people money, and I hate all that, but I also hate when I turn the news on and hear that the Zoning Commission down here -- and I see a long line of everything that we've worked and we spent many nights on -- somebody else has now become the court of zoning, and that becomes an issue.

So I want to make sure we try to make sure that we're moving properly and correct, and I think things are in line. And I agree with the Vice Chair and all of my colleagues. We want to make sure that our process is done correctly. Even though I didn't think anything was wrong, the way we're moving to some extent, but I think that it —I think we all would be better advised and it would be a better way for the city so we won't get other things held up

2.0

2.3

with all the affordable housing that's being held up right 1 2 now in the city. I think -- moving this way I think is better. 3 So I would ask that we just take a step for this 4 little time we're going to take again to hold off and let's 5 make sure we move it forward as a contested case, even though 6 7 I know the opposition pulled away for now, but I think it will be better served when we're able to hear this. 8 not understand it now, but I think we'll appreciate it later, 9 10 all of us, the city as a whole appreciate it later. 11 don't know if that's any comfort, but I feel better about moving forward in that direction. 12 Ms. Lovick, since they called on you, do you have 13 14 anything you want to add? Was I incorrect? 15 MS. LOVICK: I don't have any additional comments. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Commissioner May? 16 17 I just have a question for Ms. COMMISSIONER MAY: Schellin. 18 If we set it down again, what's the period that it has to be advertised? 19 2.0 MS. SCHELLIN: Forty days. 21 COMMISSIONER MAY: Forty days? So that's going 22 to push us deep into July. CHAIRMAN HOOD: 23 So can we --COMMISSIONER MAY: So it would be --24 25 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, September.

1	COMMISSIONER MAY: early September no matter
2	what.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So can we let me ask this: Can
4	we waive that?
5	MS. SCHELLIN: To maybe
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'm asking Ms. Lovick now. I was
7	always told we can do
8	COMMISSIONER MAY: Waive it or reduce it?
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, maybe reduce it. Yes, maybe
10	we could do that.
11	COMMISSIONER MAY: And it wouldn't even I mean,
12	if we could possibly get it in before the end of July
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: That would be I think that
14	would take some of the impact off if we can get it off our
15	plate.
16	MS. LOVICK: I mean, you could reduce the time to
17	30 days, but in this situation based on the timing I don't
18	think that that would get it on the schedule prior to
19	September.
20	COMMISSIONER MAY: So is there I mean, if we
21	can reduce it, can we reduce it more than 30 days?
22	MS. LOVICK: No.
23	COMMISSIONER MAY: Why not?
24	MS. LOVICK: Yes
25	CHAIRMAN HOOD: You would advise no, but we can

1	reduce it
2	MS. LOVICK: Oh
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: 10 days.
4	MS. LOVICK: Ms. Schellin is saying because of
5	the ANC Act. Yes, I'm drawing a blank right now. I but
6	I know it's 30 days. I would just need to like check to
7	figure out what that is, but it's maybe it is the ANC Act.
8	I'm not sure.
9	MS. SCHELLIN: Or the Administrative
10	(Simultaneous speaking.)
11	VICE-CHAIR MILLER: Mr. Chairman
12	(Simultaneous speaking.)
13	MS. LOVICK: Or maybe yes, maybe it's the APA.
14	It could be
15	(Simultaneous speaking.)
16	VICE-CHAIR MILLER: When was this map amendment
17	first when was the map amendment hearing first I mean,
18	when was this yes, when was the map amendment first step
19	advertised?
20	MS. SCHELLIN: I don't know, but it was advertised
21	as a rulemaking, so it may step down.
22	VICE-CHAIR MILLER: I know. I know. I'm know.
23	I'm just saying a lot of people have known for a long time
24	that this hearing was going to happen.
25	MS. SCHELLIN: But it wasn't but it was sent

1	to a different it
2	VICE-CHAIR MILLER: I understand, and they all
3	know it.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. I know we have one
5	representative from the ANC, and we try to move do we have
6	the other two here?
7	(No audible response.)
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right.
9	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Mr. Chair, if we were to
10	take this up in 30 days, would Ms. Schellin, would we have
11	enough time to hear this by the end of July?
12	MS. SCHELLIN: No, there's nothing available in
13	July unless you guys want to come in on
14	(Simultaneous speaking.)
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: If we do a special day, I mean,
16	for we'll do it Wednesday. What day does Commissioner May
17	play volleyball? That's the day we'll do it. No, I'm just
18	I shouldn't have did that.
19	COMMISSIONER MAY: Every night.
20	(Laughter.)
21	COMMISSIONER MAY: Every night in the summer.
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So what day what other we
23	can do a different day.
24	VICE-CHAIR MILLER: Well, we could do I mean,
25	we could do Wednesday, July 31st.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, well, that is the last day
2	of the month.
3	VICE-CHAIR MILLER: It is the last day. And we
4	could also do it August 1st because it's still we're going
5	to be meeting earlier that week. I mean, nobody likes to
6	have a meeting in August.
7	PARTICIPANT: On principle.
8	VICE-CHAIR MILLER: On principle. Right.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let's do the 31st, and let's make
10	it work for the 31st. I'm not going to ask Commissioner
11	Austin to speak for the other ANCs because I don't want to
12	get nobody in trouble.
13	VICE-CHAIR MILLER: Yes, I mean, how quickly could
14	it get into the Register, Ms. Schellin?
15	MS. SCHELLIN: As soon as they they need to
16	send us a public hearing notice, the Applicant.
17	VICE-CHAIR MILLER: So I mean, if we get it
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Can you do it tomorrow?
19	VICE-CHAIR MILLER: in a couple of days
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
21	VICE-CHAIR MILLER: we could take it up on July
22	31st?
23	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So you can do it tomorrow by
24	10:00?
25	Okay. She'll have it by 10:00. And I made sure

I asked in front of her client. She can do it tomorrow by 1 10:00. 2 VICE-CHAIR MILLER: She was planning on being here 3 4 for a couple more hours, so she could just go back to the office now and get it -- bang it out. 5 CHAIRMAN HOOD: We're having fun, but actually we 6 7 are trying to accommodate because we understand where we are. Why don't you ask her? 8 PARTICIPANT: So, okay. 9 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, Ms. Hottel-Cox, Is it helpful for us to do this in 10 if you want to -- true. 11 July, because if not, we can push to September. Yes, I mean, I think we would 12 MS. HOTTEL-COX: state for the record that we do believe that the rulemaking 13 14 would have been the appropriate course of action given all 15 the reasons we stated in our filing in Exhibit 49 given the 16 extensive size of the site and, as Commissioner Miller noted, the significant policy considerations. 17 18 I did also just want to note given the change on the IZ component of the text amendment, which also obviously 19 has a very strong implication on the map amendment, our 2.0 understanding from the Office of Planning's report was that 21 they were not recommending the increase in IZ from 10 percent 22 23 to 15 percent. 24 And understanding that any increase in affordable 25 either through an increase in the level of housing

1	affordability or square footage serves various policies of
2	the district, this text amendment without the 15 percent
3	increase already has significant IZ enhancements including
4	the 10 percent set aside, the quarter set aside required at
5	50 percent MFI where it otherwise wouldn't be required, a
6	significant number of three-bedrooms, as well as the text
7	amendment that got pulled into 18
8	VICE-CHAIR MILLER: I'm sorry, are you trying to
9	reargue the case that we just decided?
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So here's what I was going to do:
11	I was going to let her finish.
12	VICE-CHAIR MILLER: Okay.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, I was going to let her finish
14	because I asked her specific question, and that was so we can
15	move forward. But don't just cut it off.
16	MS. HOTTEL-COX: I apologize. I wasn't
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: We appreciate what you said about
18	the rulemaking. You heard that discussion that we need to
19	do that. All we asked was could you accommodate so we can
20	accommodate your client July 31st. But if you want us to,
21	we can do it in September.
22	MS. HOTTEL-COX: July 31st works.
23	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So can we go back to my
24	first question? We forgot? I forgot now because I what

was it? What was I asking her?

1	MS. SCHELLIN: Just did July 31st
2	(Simultaneous speaking.)
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Did July 31st work for you all?
4	MS. HOTTEL-COX: Yes.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. That was it. Thank you.
6	MS. HOTTEL-COX: Thank you.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So all those other points you can
8	argue in a submission for your regular case. And about
9	whether something applies or not, you can work with the
10	Office of Planning on that. You have time. Okay?
11	MS. HOTTEL-COX: Thank you.
12	MS. SCHELLIN: Chairman Hood, OAG did confirm that
13	it's the charter that requires a minimum of 30 days. So it
14	can be no less than 30.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So 30 days will work for us,
16	right?
17	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. And we will come in here
19	on the
20	MS. SCHELLIN: According to my calculations. I
21	did do pretty good in math in school.
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Good. Did you check and
23	validate with Ms. Lovick that it was correct?
24	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.
25	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Now I'm going to have fun

1	with that one for a while. So the 31st is the date?
2	MS. SCHELLIN: It will be.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
4	MS. SCHELLIN: I'll miss church that night, but
5	I guess I can be here.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
7	MS. SCHELLIN: Wouldn't be the first time.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Hottel-Cox, you want to add
9	anything else?
10	MS. HOTTEL-COX: No, thank you.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: The 31st is good? Is the 31st
12	good for everybody who wants to come back?
13	(No audible response.)
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. And I would ask my fellow
15	Commissioner if he could maybe mention to the other
16	Commissioners as well. Okay.
17	All right. Anything else, Ms. Schellin?
18	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, you guys need to vote to set
19	it down, if that's what you want to do.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, that's important. We'll come
21	back on the 31st and do that
22	MS. SCHELLIN: That's right.
23	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So I would move that we set
24	down Zoning Commission Case No. 18-19 as a contested case and
25	ask for a second.

1	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Second.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: It's been moved and properly
3	seconded. Any further discussion?
4	(No audible response.)
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All in favor?
6	(Chorus of aye.)
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any opposition?
8	(No audible response.)
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing any, Ms. Schellin
10	VICE-CHAIR MILLER: I'll abstain.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Abstain?
12	Ms. Schellin, would you please record the vote?
13	MS. SCHELLIN: Chairman Hood, before I do that,
14	are you guys taking out the text amendments that were
15	included in this case and moving them to is that part of
16	you guys had that discussion.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: What are we doing, Commissioner
18	Shapiro? You were right?
19	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: I got it wrong. You'll
20	have to ask the Chair.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, right. Okay.
22	MS. SCHELLIN: You're removing those that you
23	incorporated into 18-18, is that correct?
24	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Yes.
25	MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. So staff records the vote
Į	ı

1	4 to 0 to 1 to set down Zoning Commission Case No. 18-19 as
2	a contested case. Commissioner Hood moving; Commissioner
3	Turnbull seconding, Commissioners May and Shapiro in support,
4	and Commissioner Miller abstaining.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Ms. Schellin, we have
6	anything else?
7	MS. SCHELLIN: That's it.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Again I want to apologize
9	for the inconvenience, but as stated by my colleagues and
10	myself I think this is the better path forward.
11	So, with that, this hearing is adjourned.
12	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the
13	record at 6:50 p.m.)
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

<u>C E R T I F I C A T E</u>

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Public Hearing

Before: DCZC

Date: 06-06-19

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

near aus 9