GOVERNMENT
OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

REGULAR MEETING

+ + + + +

MONDAY

JUNE 29, 2020

+ + + + +

The Regular Meeting of the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened via Video Teleconference, pursuant to notice at 4:00 p.m. EDT, 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 PAUL YOUNG, Zoning Data Specialist

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

JENNIFER STEINGASSER, Deputy Director, Development Review & Historic Preservation STEPHEN COCHRAN

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PRESENT:

MAXIMILIAN TONDRO, ESQ. ALEXANDRA CAIN, ESQ.

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the

Regular meeting held on June 29, 2020.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Z.C. Case No. 16-11 (Park View Community Partners & the District of Columbia - Discussion of Next Steps re: DCCA Remand)	6
Z.C. Case No. 05-28Y (Parkside Residential, LLC - PUD Modification of Consequence @ Square 5056)	13
Z.C. Case No. 20-05 (Office of Planning - Text Amendment to Subtitle K, Chapter 8, to the Use Requirements of the Arts Zones)	17
Z.C. Case No. 66-68A (Enterprise Community Development, Inc PUD Modification of Significance @ Square 3630)	19
Z.C. Case No. 15-19 (411 New York Avenue Holdings, LLC - Request to Extinguish PUD)	30
Status Report - Office of Planning	32
Adjourn	50

1 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 2 4:03 P.M. 3 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Good afternoon, ladies and 4 gentlemen. We are convened and broadcasting this public 5 meeting by videoconferencing. My name is Anthony Hood. 6 Joining this evening Vice Chair Miller, are 7 Commissioner May, Commissioner Shapiro, Commissioner 8 Turnbull. We are also joined by the Office of Zoning 9 staff, Ms. Sharon Schellin, Mr. Paul Young controlling all 10 of our virtual components. 11 Copies of today's meeting agenda are available on the Office of Zoning's website. If you experience any 12 problems during this hearing, please dial (202) 727-5471. 13 Any problems, please dial (202) 727-5471. 14 15 For hearing action items, the only documents before us this evening are the applications, the ANC set 16 down report and the Office of Planning report. All other 17 documents in the record will be reviewed at the time of 18 19 the hearing. 2.0

Again, copies of today's meeting agenda are available on the Office of Zoning's website. With all that being said, does the staff have any preliminary matters?

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. We have one preliminary matter on the agenda. That is the only

21

22

23

24

1 preliminary matter the staff has, if the Commission wants 2 to proceed with that now? 3 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes. 4 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. That's Zoning Commission 5 16-11, Park View Community Partners and the 6 District of Columbia. If the Commission would have a 7 discussion on the next steps regarding the D.C. Court of 8 Appeals remand on this case. 9 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. 10 OAG Attorneys Max Tondro and MS. SCHELLIN: 11 Alexandra Cain are on this case. I don't know if the Commission would like for them to be brought up or no. 12 If so, then Mr. Young could bring them forward? 13 14 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, please bring both of them 15 I don't see Mr. Tondro. up. MS. SCHELLIN: He is there. 16 17 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, I see him now. All 18 right, again, Zoning Commission Case 16-11. This is the Park View Community Partners and the District of Columbia 19 2.0 discussion on the next steps of the remand. As everyone 21 knows, this has been remanded back to the Commission for 22 some additional information, some additional clarification 23 of our findings and some clarifications moving forward. 24 I think we have a procedural order and there

are some things that we've been asked to look at.

one, take into account the 90-foot height building due to
some neighborhood conservation area, take into account
that the areas adjacent to the western portion of the PUD
are designated moderate density residential, not medium
density residential. Three, take into account the 90-foot
high buildings and the 60-foot high buildings are
generally consistent with respectively the medium density
commercial and moderate density residential designations
in the FLUM. That's the Future Land Use Map. Either
identify record support for the statement that the senior
buildings limits many other apartment houses that have
been built as in-fill developments in the area of forego
reliance consideration. Five, independently analyze and
discuss whether the PUD is inconsistent with specific
policies or would have adverse effects timely identified
before the Commission. Number six, determine whether in
light of the Commission's conclusions of these issues the
Commission should grant or deny approval of the PUD and
explain the Commission's reasoning in granting or denying
approval.

I think this is very well teed up by counsel and I would like to turn it over to Mr. Tondro for anything he wants to add. And then I will open it up for discussion.

MR. TONDRO: Yes. Thank you, Chairman Hood.

OAG is recommending that the Commission give the parties to Zoning Commission Case No. 16-11 the opportunity to respond to these issues that were raised by the Court. These responses should be limited, OAG suggests, to the specific issues raised by the Court's opinion and not address other issues that were not raised before the Commission on the record. The responses should be limited already only to the record that exists in Zoning Commission Case No. 16-11 and should not add additional evidence.

The OAG also recommends that the record of the case be closed, remain closed except for these responses which would be filed by each of the parties and there would be no replies to any responses by another party. And that all of these responses be submitted by 3 p.m. on Friday, July 31, 2020.

Okay, up. Commissioner May, do you have any questions or comments? So I would just acknowledge COMMISSIONER MAY: it's unfortunate that the Court of Appeals has decided to vacate and remand this particular case and it delays an important development.

CHAIRMAN HOOD:

I do think that our rationale was for making a decision was very clear at the time, but apparently we fell short in explaining that. So I welcome the approach

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

25

let's

open

it

1	in doing essentially a request for further written
2	submissions that we can consider so that we can go back
3	and we can get these questions that the Court has raised
4	and determine whether what action we should take in
5	order to explain things further and approve again or have
6	another hearing or whatever we decide to do based on those
7	written submissions. So that makes sense to me. Thank
8	you.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, Commissioner Shapiro.
10	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
11	I'm fine with the procedural memo as described moving
12	forward in this way and I share Commissioner May's
13	concerns around this as well and the impact of this on the
14	residents.
15	So yes, I'm fine to more forward as described.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioner Turnbull?
17	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Thank you,
18	Mr. Chairman, I would agree with Commissioner Shapiro and
19	Commissioner May with their comments and especially
20	Commissioner May's analysis of where we thought we were
21	on this case and again, I feel it's sad that it's
22	affecting such a valuable case and people who are really
23	depending upon this to go through.
24	But I'm also totally in support of Mr. Tondro's
25	plan to with the seven questions relating to this case

on remand and look forward to those being answered promptly and we can get on with this.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Vice Chair Miller?

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Yes, I share the comments of my colleagues, but also the Attorney General, and I'm comfortable with the procedure that's been outlined and summarized by the chairman and by Max Tondro.

The two-to-one decision of the court remanding this case back to us is frustrating, obviously. We made that decision, I believe, over three years ago. And these public housing residents which this new community was going to assist, public housing residents at Park Morton three blocks away were going to get the opportunity to be in this build first replacement housing at Georgia and Park Road I believe it is.

So I think the Court identified the three members who were part of the majority. They identified the deficiencies that they felt was in our order. They set up a road map for us to address those deficiencies, mainly explicitly identifying all the potential adverse impacts that are in our record already and saying how they either aren't adverse impact because we don't agree or why they are being mitigated by other measures that are in the order.

2.0

And also a similar balancing that we've talked about a lot in other cases of explicitly acknowledging those comprehensive plans conflicting policies that may conflict with this particular development, but how they are outweighed in this case by other supportive comprehensive plan policies such as in this case affordable housing.

So I think we do have a road map forward that the Court and that OAG has recommended for us to address these issues and hopefully get this matter resolved as quickly as possible. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, I would concur. I think for me though we always talk about the comp plan and everything. I think for me it's all about making sure that residents have a quality of life and quality housing. And I think the upgrades are needed.

People are looking for a quality place to live and through all of that, that's what we're trying to get. That's what's so disheartening because it has already been mentioned people still have to wait to be able to have some quality housing upgrade and have something they can be proud of. And to me, that's what we're trying to get.

I appreciate the Court coming back on us, but to me, that's the bottom line, increasing the quality of life for the residents who need it and who it's for. I

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

think that's very important. We talk about affordable housing is key. All this is very key. And whatever it takes for us to get there and get there as soon as possible, then I'm all for it. So that's all I have to say on that.

It's not necessarily troubling to me, it's just that I thought we had done that. If we could expound some more, the sooner, the better, so we can get it back to the Court so they can do their checks and balances because I understand they have a job, too. But also, at the end of the day, it's about residents of the city and the quality of life.

Any other questions or comments? All right so, Mr. Tondro, Ms. Cain, I think we are ready to move forward as prescribed. I think we have a road map as the vice chair has mentioned with regard to moving forward in that fashion.

Anybody else? Okay, all right.

So with that, let's move to consent calendar modification item. have of consequences We and deliberations in Zoning Commission Case No. 05-28Y, Parkside Residential, Modification LLC PUD of Consequence at Square 5056.

And before Mr. -- Ms. Schellin, I'm going to ask Mr. Tondro something else.

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

1	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Exhibits I through 6D are
2	additional filings from the applicant. The applicant does
3	note that ANC 7D voted in support of the case and OZ staff
4	had communications with the SMD regarding sending a letter
5	from the full ANC and was told that they would that. This
6	was last week. However, as of earlier today, we had not
7	received an actual resolution from the ANC, just that the
8	SMD had notified us or had submitted a letter saying that,
9	but it's the full ANC that we need the letter from because
10	they're the ones who need to do the vote.
11	So the chair or vice chair, neither had
12	submitted the letter, but the SMD had said the chair
13	they were going to get the chair to submit the letter, but
14	we've not seen that and tonight is the night for the vote.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Can we bring Ms. Cain
16	back up? This is her case.
17	MS. CAIN: Yes.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Cain, you heard Ms. Schellin
19	mention about the conversations about the Single Member
20	District and the ANC, but I've not had anything
21	memorialized in the record from ANC. Is this still
22	permissible for us to move? We got word of mouth that ANC
23	was fine with it and approved. Is that still sufficient
24	for us to move forward?
25	MS. CAIN: I believe it is. You've satisfied

1 the requirements of Subtitle D 703.17, but you have 2 provided the parties an opportunity to respond. 3 At this point, it's obvious they have not 4 submitted something to record. It's sort of on them, and 5 I think the Commission is okay to move forward with making 6 a decision at this point. 7 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you very much. 8 All right, again, Commissioners in this case 9 05-28Y, there's a request, a modification request -- a 10 modification of consequence request for residential access 11 to the garages on parcel 8, 10, interior layout changes to accommodate the new access, reduction in parking spaces 12 13 from a range of 127 to 155 to 111, to 111 spaces. 14 change to the loading access and footprint of 15 building. 16 open it up for anv questions or 17 Let's start with Commissioner May. comments. 18 COMMISSIONER MAY: I'm sorry, I'm demonstrating my incompetence in operating the mouse. 19 I don't have any further comments on this. 2.0 21 Commissioner Shapiro? CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: No further comments, Mr. 22 23 Chair. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioner Turnbull? 24 25 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: No, I'm good with this.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: And Vice Chair Miller?

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, I'm comfortable with moving forward and I am appreciative of the applicant having worked with ANC 7D according to the applicant's own submission and negotiated a community benefit agreement package with the ANC.

As I understand it, this won't be necessarily part of the public benefits and amenities, but they will be conditioned in the order of this modification of consequence case and I think it's useful for the public record just to mention what those enhanced conditions are.

One, extend a green screen separating Parkside from the Pepco facility to the south of Parkside with additional plantings along Foote Street, N.E.; two, provide a community room of not less than 1,000 square feet at the retail level of one of the four buildings to constructed; three, for small business be reserve owners/minority-owned businesses at least 750 square feet space in one of the four buildings to be constructed; four, provide \$100,000 toward a scholarship residents fund for of the Parkside Mavfair Grove and five, work with members of the Parkside community; community and surrounding property owners to identify potential locations for an enclosed dog park if such a location can be secured to provide funds to build such a

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

2 So I understand these will be conditions to this modification of consequence order if we approve it. 3 The modification is very minor dealing with mostly compact 4 5 parking configuration and some minor design changes. 6 I'm very comfortable moving forward today. 7 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Vice Chair Okay. 8 for reading all that into the record. 9 So would somebody like to motion to approve? I don't have any additional comments. 10 I think what's 11 being asked for, I think what's being asked for in this modification of consequence we talked about as far as 12 13 what's being asked for and also additional public benefits that have been offered. 14 15 So Vice Chair, would you like to make a motion? 16 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I Sure. Commission 17 would that the Zoning move approve 18 modification of consequence in Case No. 05-28Y, Parkside 19 Residential, LLC, PUD Modification of Consequence at 2.0 Square 056 and ask for a second. 21 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Second. 22 it's been moved and CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, 23 properly seconded. Any further discussion? Not seeing 24 any, Ms. Schellin, would you do a roll call vote?

MS. SCHELLIN:

25

1

dog park.

Commissioner Miller?

	16
1	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.
2	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Turnbull?
3	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes.
4	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood?
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.
6	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner May?
7	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Yes.
8	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Shapiro?
9	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Yes.
10	MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is five to zero to zero
11	to approve final action, Zoning Commission Case No. 05-
12	28Y.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Let's move
14	right along to final action. Zoning Commission Case No.
15	20-05, Office of Planning Text Amendment to Subtitle K,
16	Chapter 8 to the Use Requirements of the Arts Zones. Ms.
17	Schellin.
18	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. In this case, the
19	proposed rulemaking was published May 15th. No comments
20	were received. The NCPC provided a notice of delegated
21	action at Exhibit 12 that it found the text amendment to
22	be not inconsistent with their comp plan and no adverse
23	effect on federal interest. So we'd ask the Commission
24	to consider final action this evening on this case.
25	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, and I'll look for a

1	second here. Does anyone have any questions or comments?
2	Okay, that saved us two seconds. I don't have
3	anything, so I'll go ahead and a make a motion. I think
4	this is pretty straight forward. I make a motion that we
5	approve Zoning Commission Case No. 20-05. This is an
6	Office of Planning text amendment to Subtitle K Chapter
7	8 of the Use Requirements of the Arts Zone. We have heard
8	that there is overwhelming support and no adverse impact.
9	There's no NCPC issues.
10	So with that, I ask for a second.
11	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Second.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, it's been moved and
13	properly seconded. Any further discussion?
14	Ms. Schellin, will do a roll call vote, please?
15	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood?
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.
17	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Shapiro?
18	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Yes.
19	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner May?
20	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
21	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller?
22	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.
23	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Turnbull?
24	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes.
25	MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is five to zero to zero

to approve final action on Zoning Commission Case No. 20-05.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, next hearing action,
Office of Planning -- Zoning Commission Case No. 66-68A.
Enterprise Community Development, Inc., PUD Modification
of Significance at Square 3630.

Mr. Cochran.

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

25

Good afternoon, Mr. Chair. MR. COCHRAN: I'm Steve Cochran and I'm representing OP in Case 66-68A. For there's slide. this case, let's see, the ΟP is recommending that the Commission set down this major modification to the existing 15 year old PUD. The PUD is on a 15-acre site. Okay, let's see.

I want to go back to this. The PUD is on a 15acre site north of Rhode Island Avenue. The metro is sort
of west of that, the Metro Station also. It's in the
Edgewood neighborhood of Northeast D.C. And you can see
on the bottom right of this slide is where the Rhode
Island Avenue Metro is and just below it is the site of
what was formerly a PUD that's being developed along Rhode
Island Avenue shopping center.

Currently, as you can see from the slide, the building has -- excuse me, the PUD has seven buildings. They range from 40 to 90 feet tall. They contain 792 income restricted residential units. That's almost 300

more affordable units than the PUD order requires. Some existing units for seniors earning up to 60 percent of the median family income along the site in the existing buildings.

The development now contains both surface and garage parking, playgrounds, extensive landscaping, and space for neighborhood oriented social services.

If you look down at the -- or left where that sort of oval is in red, the applicant wishes to add an eighth building at the southwest corner of the site which is near the 4th Street entrance to be developed.

The proposed building would be restricted to seniors earning no more than 60 percent of the median family income. This would be for age in place living and it would have more space for on-site senior supported services than there is in now that have been built.

Next slide. The building would be 90 feet tall like the building you can see to the right which is to the east. The building would contain 151 units and would have space on the first floor for resident oriented, medical, fitness, and cultural facilities. There would also be an adult daycare in the building and intends to be open to the neighborhood if space permits.

While five new parking spaces would be provided, the rest of the required spaces would be located

2.0

1 near the building on the PUD site among the surplus spaces 2 that exclude those that are now required for the existing development. 3 4 There would also be 28 long-term bicycle 5 spaces. Next slide. 6 7 The proposal would not be inconsistent with --8 excuse me, it would be not inconsistent with the 9 Comprehensive Plan. Particularly, the FLUM's high density residential designation for the site which you can see is 10 11 outlined in green. It's got brown underneath it on the 12 And particularly, with the policy FLUM map. maps neighborhood conservation designation. 13 14 Also, with the city wide housing, 15 environmental, urban design, community services elements, 16 and they're within the upper northeast area. 17 Next slide, please. 18 This is a view from the west with the Rhode 19 Island Avenue shopping center fully developed. 2.0 buildings' FAR, height, parking affordability and uses 21 will be consistent with the order governing the PUD. No 22 part of any PUD ordered maximums will be exceeded, nor 23 would a minimum requirement not be met. 24 The proposal would also be consistent with the 25 site's RA-4 Zone zone other than for two areas that have requested spaces. One is to provide 23 long-term bicycle parking spaces that are required by zoning and the other would be a request to serve 60 people at the adult daycare facility rather than the 25 that are permitted by right for such a facility.

OP supporters have set down, but we still have some concerns when we've asked the applicants to address prior to a hearing, as well as to provide some additional information after set down. All this is detailed in our report and it's summarized in Section 6 of our report.

The major concerns are -- next slide. Thanks -- of the desirability of providing additional outdoor space for residents beyond the community spaces adjacent to the first floor. What you see on this slide at the bottom is a typical floor plan. What's outlined in red is where communal spaces are on that frontage floor. It has a laundry and it also has a lounge area and some bathrooms. And that same stack is shown on the picture on the top with the red arrow.

So OP has suggested individually with the balconies in this area or at a minimum a larger balcony on each floor adjacent to the area that I just showed you, the lounge area and washing machines. But the absence of washing machines and dryers in these units is also a concern. The units aren't intended for assisted living,

2.0

so the senior residents would have to take their own laundry to communal facilities on each floor without the assistance of building attendants. OP always encourages developers of affordable units to make the units as consistent as possible with market rate standards, and washers and dryers actually is a market rate standard it says.

Next slide, please. Also, some are concerned about the loading but of course, we'll defer, you know, on this, after we wait for their input. The area that's outlined in red is where the loading is. It will be a little bit removed from and a little bit lower than the elevation of the actual building and the door that any loader would go in to get inside the rear of the building.

And finally, Paul, next slide. We're also just a little bit concerned about how the residents would get to the Metro for the earliest illustrations that the applicant presented shows connections to the Metro via the bridge is already there, but we want to be sure that there's a ramp that will allow anybody who has difficulty going down steps, such as walking generally to get access to the Metro.

Other than that, most of the concerns that we have are about design details and ensuring compatibility with up to date environmental standards. In other words,

2.0

1	it's serious enough to prevent our recommended zoning
2	fail. And that finishes our testimony. We'd be happy to
3	answer any questions.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Mr. Cochran. Let's
5	see if we have any follow up questions or comments.
6	Commissioner May?
7	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. Thank you, Mr.
8	Cochran, for the report. I agree with the concerns that
9	you have raised. I think that overall the project makes
10	sense. It's sort of an odd circumstance that there's that
11	large parcel within this overall development that never
12	got a building on it. I assume that at some point, there
13	was an intention to put a building on it and it didn't
14	happen. Do you know that?
15	MR. COCHRAN: I don't know that for sure
16	because it's a 55 year old PUD and nobody has been able
17	to find all of the records. I have not seen the original
18	site.
19	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.
20	MR. COCHRAN: They were supposed to build seven
21	buildings and they built seven buildings.
22	COMMISSIONER MAY: Oh, I see. Okay. Yes, I
23	mean it's just something odd about the way it is placed.
24	It looks like it's a platform waiting for a building.
25	So ves. I can see how that makes sense. I

think your concerns about the building all makes sense. I'd be interested to know why they were chosen -- choosing to do sort of a communal laundry approach and maybe that has something to do with how they expect the residents to live and interact and whether that's in fact something that is helpful for the residents to be able to be able to interact with their neighbors as opposed to staying in their apartment all the time. We'll see how that goes and I guess it's worth exploring and certainly bigger balconies, more balconies are worth exploring.

The building overall is kind of flat and dull and I'm sure you'll be working with the applicant to give it a little more presence than it has right now. I mean granted, the other buildings around it are not -- the existing buildings are really nothing that shout out in any dramatic fashion, so I'm not thinking that it really needs to be a super dramatic thing, but being able to see where the door is, not seeing large expanses of brick without windows in it and things like that that make a building a little bit more comfortable in the space that humans will be occupying I think is a good thing.

I look forward to seeing what it looks like when it comes before us for a hearing, so yes, I think that about covers my comments.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right, thank you,

2.0

1 Commissioner May. Let's go to Commissioner Shapiro. 2 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you, Mr. Cochran for the thorough report. 3 4 don't have a lot to add. I would look forward to, 5 assuming we set this down when it comes before us, to have 6 the applicant be clear about the intents and environmental 7 benefits that you've talked about in the report. So I 8 look forward to seeing that. That's all I have, Mr. 9 Chair. 10 Commissioner CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. 11 Turnbull. 12 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 13 I really can't add anything more to what Commissioner May 14 and Commissioner Shapiro have added. I think Mr. Cochran, 15 it was a well-written report, as usual, and I think the 16 laundry facility item will be a major point. I'm not sure 17 that communal facility laundries are the way to go on a 18 project like this, but I look forward to your help in working with the applicant and especially working on the 19 architecture of the building and try to get that into 2.0 21 But again, I don't think I can add anything more 22 to what's already been said. 23 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, Vice Chair Miller. 24 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, 25 and thank you, Mr. Cochran. I share all the comments that

my colleagues have made and I agree with every single recommendation that is in the Office of Planning's thorough report, including their request for information and clarifications in some cases, and in particular, the laundry and balcony concerns which have already been discussed. I would love more balconies and there aren't any balconies currently on this building, but I have always loved balconies on residential buildings.

I think the clarification about the amount and location of inclusionary zoning units that would be required after exploration of all the other -- very -- huge amount of affordable housing that's in this entire site and it has funding program related commitments and a commitment to no reduction in the number of affordable housing units in existing planned unit development after construction of the units in the proposed building, and a clarification of that connection to Metro to the adjacent property would be helpful also.

I'm prepared to set it down, as my colleagues are.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Yes, I, too, I don't have anything to add, but Mr. Cochran, I just want to -- you said this was 55 years old?

MR. COCHRAN: Well, I don't know whether I'm -- can you hear me, sir?

2.0

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, I can hear you.
2	MR. COCHRAN: Okay, it was approved in '67 and
3	it was built I think it was finished by '72. I think
4	some of the other buildings opened even before that.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Right. The reason I ask is
6	(Simultaneous speaking.)
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I kind of remember seeing that.
8	But very vaguely, very vaguely. So I was just wondering.
9	I don't have anything to add. I'm looking forward to the
10	hearing and I do share the concerns mentioned and always
11	hash all that out during the discussion. Any follow up
12	questions or comments?
13	All right, Mr. Cochran, thank you. Would
14	somebody like to make a motion to set this down?
15	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I would move
16	that the Zoning Commission set down Case No. 66-68A,
17	Enterprise Community Development, Inc., PUD Modification
18	of Significance to Square 3630 and ask for a second.
19	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Second.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: It's been moved and properly
21	seconded. Any further discussion?
22	All right, Ms. Schellin, would you take a roll
23	call vote, please?
24	MS. SCHELLIN: And I apologize. I did not hear
25	who made the motion. Was that Commissioner Miller?

	20
1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioner Miller.
2	MS. SCHELLIN: And who seconded?
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioner Turnbull.
4	MS. SCHELLIN: Turnbull. Okay, Commissioner
5	Miller?
6	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.
7	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Turnbull?
8	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes.
9	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood?
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.
11	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner May?
12	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
13	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Shapiro?
14	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Yes.
15	MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is five to zero to zero
16	to set down Zoning Commission Case No. 66-68A as a
17	contested case. That's it.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Schellin.
19	So I just wanted to remind my colleagues,
20	especially when you're not talking, if you can mute your
21	device and then unmute when you pick it up because you get
22	a some of us might have neighbors who work and some of
23	them at the start of hearing they started doing stuff in
24	the neighborhood with the lawn mowers and stuff, so those
25	kind of things go on and I understand that, so we want to

2 All right, so let's move right along. I think this is our last case -- this next case. And thank you, 3 4 Mr. Cochran. 5 Commission Zoning Case No. 15-19. Ms. Schellin. 6 7 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, and before I forget, while 8 this is the last case on the agenda, Jennifer Steingasser 9 will give the Commission an update for the OP status 10 report. 11 So on this case 15-19, the applicant has submitted a request to extinguish the PUD because it has 12 decided to pursue an alternative development for the 13 14 property and ask the Commission to consider that motion 15 before you at Exhibit 325 in the case record. And that's 16 all I have to say about this. 17 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, I believe -- let me look 18 at what counsel tells us how to deal with this. I know 19 there's different ways. 2.0 Okay, so I think we just make a motion --21 unless I hear something otherwise, we just make a motion 22 to extinguish, unless somebody accuses me that I need to 23 do more than that. I would move that we make the motion 24 to extinguish Zoning Commission Case No. 15-19, 411 New 25 York Avenue Holdings, LLC and ask for a second.

make sure we're not distracting each other.

1	COMMISSIONER MAY: Second.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Moved and properly seconded.
3	Any further discussion? Not seeing anyone or hearing
4	anyone.
5	Ms. Schellin, would you do a roll call vote?
6	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Commissioner Hood?
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.
8	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Shapiro?
9	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Yes.
10	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner May?
11	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
12	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller?
13	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.
14	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Turnbull?
15	Commissioner Turnbull?
16	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I'm sorry, I was muted.
17	Yes.
18	MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is five to zero to zero
19	to take final action to extinguish the PUD in Zoning
20	Commission Case No. 15-19 and I will contact the
21	applicant's attorney and ask him for a draft order to OAG.
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I know we have Ms.
23	Steingasser coming up.
24	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.
25	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioners, any comments or

questions before we go to Ms. Steingasser? Okay, so let's bring Ms. Steingasser. The floor is yours.

MS. STEINGASSER: Yes, Chairman Hood, Commissioners, I just wanted to give a quick update on the reopening university plans. Office of Planning has been asked by the Mayor's order to work with the Department of Health and the Deputy Mayor for Education on the reopening plans for the universities.

We've been working so far with five of the main universities and there may be a case where that would require an amendment to the campus plan. have We encouraged them to work within the boundaries of campus plan if they have to look at temporary use of some different facilities that might have otherwise been limited to graduate students or something along those They may be coming back with a request for an It would be for a temporary amendment to the amendment. campus plan. And we may, as a result be asking the Commission to schedule a special meeting to allow the universities to get that amended in time for them to open this fall. But I just wanted to give the Commission a heads up on it.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, thank you, Ms. Steingasser. I have a quick question following up. Will we hear one case for all of them or do we have to hear

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

them individually?

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

25

MS. STEINGASSER: I think we'd have to hear them individually. The conditions are so unique to the universities and we'd have to notify the ANCs separately so I think it would be required that they be heard separately. They could all be heard probably on one evening, depending on how they come in. Like I've said, we've encouraged them to work within the boundaries of the campus plan to keep them on pace. But that may be the case.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: So I'm wondering, and I would have to talk with my colleagues, I'm just throwing this out because -- think about it, like we did the tech We started in the morning to get it all done in I'm just throwing that out there. one day. I'm not saying that's the way -- I know we got other things to get That's something we can hit. That way we get through. them all done, hopefully, get them all done in one day. I think three eight-hour days and I know we probably can't do three, but at least if we can designate one day and I'm just calling this out, a full day and get started at 9:30 in the morning and finish at 6 with a lunch break. kind of hard if we do it on BZA, but I just threw that out.

Let me open it up. Commissioner May?

COMMISSIONER MAY: Well, certainly, if we need to do that, we could, but it doesn't sound to me like these are really substantial changes that are going to encounter significant opposition. If there's changes to existing facilities, it seems to me that most of them should be pretty straight forward.

But whatever we need to do to schedule them, I think that's fine. I do have a question about the timing. Given that we are in -- it's practically July and students start coming back in late August, mid-August sometimes. Wouldn't we have to hear these and make decisions on the night of in order to --

MS. STEINGASSER: We would have to -- yes, they know they're under a considerable time crunch. They would have to still notify the ANC and the APA procedures and have the hearings, but they would like to be able to, at least the universities we've work most closely with, to notify students within the next couple of weeks. And then they have to wait, obviously, to see whether students are accepting the notices. And then they can figure out how many are coming back and how it fits within their caps and the amount of residence hall space that they have.

Most of the universities that had plans for two students and in some cases four students to a suite, are now limiting it to one student per room, so it's kind of

2.0

pushed that out. There's all kinds of number movements going on as they try to estimate how much space they have, versus what conditions are in their campus plan.

whether it is possible for us to do a text amendment of some sort that would apply more broadly and that we could take up on an emergency basis at the next meeting. Because it's hard for me to imagine that people are going to oppose -- somebody's got a lot of noise going on over there. I don't know who's not muted, but I hear a lot of feedback or something.

Anyway, it seems to me that there might be an opportunity to do something with a relatively simple text amendment that would allow one year of flexibility with the allocation of students among the existing university facilities and have it applied broadly.

MS. STEINGASSER: We have been -- there's been outreach to OP from two ANCs that have expressed concern about amending the campus plans. So I don't expect them to be highly controversial, but I do think there is a lot of interest in what their universities are doing.

COMMISSIONER MAY: And I wouldn't suggest that there isn't going to be interest in it, but I'm just thinking that -- it just seems like it's a lot of -- I'm not sure, if we ask universities to have something

2.0

specific -- have to take each one of them up. I don't know. Maybe I'm just dreaming because I don't really understand the total complexity of it, but I would -- I mean this is an extraordinary time and I think so long as we are not taking up something that's going to increase the risk of exposure or exacerbate the problem with the pandemic as it affects students and then university neighborhoods, I would think that we could do something broad, flexible, and time limited.

MS. STEINGASSER: I'm happy to try to think about that, but some of the universities have very tight conditions on where the students live relative to the off-campus communities.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.

And that's where's going to MS. STEINGASSER: So if we start allowing -- you know, I just don't know the consequences of how the condition on one university might translate to a condition in a more That's why we've been encouraging them suburban context. to do everything they can to stay within the limits of their campus plan or to look at, not to change the requirements, residents' so it's more at the use of buildings.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, I mean I'm just concerned that it's -- you know, we're six weeks away from

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

students showing up on campus. In some cases, they're seven weeks. And it's not a whole lot of time to have a hearing and make a decision.

MS. STEINGASSER: Right. I understand. I'll do what I can.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Commissioner Shapiro.

COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. My questions were very much along the line of Commissioner May's, but it's not just some emergency action that we might take. I don't understand why some kind of emergency action, some health emergency could be in play as well that would allow the flexibility for this to happen within certain boundaries.

MS. STEINGASSER: Well, this is being covered -- the reopening plan itself is being covered by the -- it's under the umbrella of the Mayor's emergency action because of the pandemic. That allows a lot of movement, but the zoning order itself is not covered under that action, so when they start to then -- and I'm happy to work with OAG to double check this, but this was our original reading and we met with several of the other attorneys representing the universities and it really has to do mostly with student living. The rest of it, I think, is something that we can work with. But it's the

2.0

student living and how that interacts.

2.0

COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: I mean I'm with you. I live a stone's throw from AU and it's the buzz in the neighborhood, believe me. But you know, we're in the midst of a pandemic and there's a health emergency in place and it's just hard for me to imagine that some of that wouldn't supersede, but I understand that there's a lot of authorities in play who are having this discussion, but I would err on the side of -- to be blunt, I would err on the side of not worrying too much about the push back from the neighborhood given the situation that we're in right now.

MS. STEINGASSER: Right. And like I said, it would be a temporary one academic year. It would not be a continued scenario.

COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: That's all I have, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Commissioner Turnbull.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Thank you Mr. Chair.

Well, Ms. Steingasser, I can tell you what I imagine. The university going to one purview of proven -- unless they're virtual classes and a lot of kids aren't coming to university. It seems like it's going to be an incredible loss. I don't know how they do it. I don't know how you take care of that many students. Did you

1 hear me?

2.0

MS. STEINGASSER: Oh, I heard you. I didn't understand --

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I guess the question -if you're going from a suite, we have suite mates, two per
room, and you have four and suddenly go down to one per
suite, I mean you've got two per suite. Are they counting
on expecting a lot of students coming back to school?

MS. STEINGASSER: Each university is taking a different approach. Some of them are looking at yes, having virtual education for like one class of students so that maybe just freshmen and sophomores and juniors — those classes are virtual. Each university is looking very uniquely at their own scenario.

I know one university has already announced they will not be having students back. Gallaudet will be doing all virtual. And we're still waiting to hear from two others that are guiding through their --

So each one is different and it depends on how many, how much -- how much capacity they have on campus and then some have multiple campuses, so there's an opportunity to move students between the two campuses. So it's a matter of how do you move them between the campuses.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I think we've got to

do whatever we have to do. I think we have to have the flexibility or give them the flexibility to meet their needs and to operate. It would be a shame not to have the world-class universities able to function.

MS. STEINGASSER: Absolutely. I can tell you I'm already getting texts so the universities are listening. They're happy to hear.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay, great.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Vice Chair Miller.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and the comments that have been made by all of my colleagues and to the extent in terms of timing that Commissioner May brought up. I'm supportive of having a special public hearing and emergency rulemaking that puts this in place on a temporary basis to give the flexibility to the universities to the extent you can have conversations with OAG to figure out whether we could have a broad text type amendment that applies to, that gives that flexibility to all our universities without going into each community, each college's campus plan. I think this could be done more expeditiously than having that campus plan before us and all these issues being raised.

I want to have a public hearing where the ANCs and other neighbors can participate and then take the emergency action that we need to take so they can

2.0

function, but I feel that a lot of you had mentioned
this, you certainly did implicitly in the part that I
heard, but you may have mentioned it explicitly. I assume
that the biggest obstacle is the on campus housing
requirements which are pretty restrictive in terms of the
percentage of freshman, sophomore, juniors that have to
be on campus. And that's the one thing that if they're
only doing one per room, that's something that's where
the flexibility is needed on a temporary emergency basis
and there may be other uses of other buildings that are
designated for other uses as well, but it seems to me that
it complicates things to actually do each university. It
complicates and extends the time period to do things. But
you're looking at it a lot more carefully and involved
than I am you'll work with OAG as you said you would
to see if there's a way to do this in a more broadly
applicable way that doesn't get into necessarily each
university's campus plan which can take a long time for
us to have individual hearings on.

MS. STEINGASSER: I hear the will of the Commission. And I think I'll work with OAG to do it as much as we can do it, as quickly as we can.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let me just opine. Are you finished Vice Chair? I, too, agree a text amendment, I suppose on these various cases and I will tell you as

well. I really don't know with this COVID-19, people's lives are on the line. Everybody is nervous and the CDC changes. I really don't even know if they're even going back to school. You know I'm all for it like you all. This is going to be hard.

I can tell you right now, I don't even like going to the store. So I wouldn't want to put young folks in situations like that and I'm sure that the colleges are working on it and you all probably know much more than I do but there's a lot of people out there who are afraid. They don't want to catch it because it hurts, it hurts.

A text amendment made in one swoop and I think and I'm hoping neighbors, and I hope the neighborhoods are watching this because I'm hoping the neighborhoods is know what the young folks around stay --Ι in neighborhood are doing. They're going home and they've assured me that they're going to be going virtual. I'm not going to say what school it is because I don't want But they're going back to West to put that out there. They're going back home. We don't want to put Virginia. them in harm's way.

As my colleague has already said, this is a pandemic, and we have to do whatever we have to do during this pandemic. And I'm not saying anything that we don't already know. So I would hope that these communities are

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

with these campus plans. We want to be considered and we want to have a hearing, but at the end of the day for me, it's about people's lives.

So all the rest of the zoning, and all that, what the campus plan says, if I had to take the hit on that, then I will take the hit. I will take the hit. So that's where I am on that. And I'm sure that the colleges are going to come up with something, but we're talking about young folks' lives. I know I don't want to be in that situation.

That's enough said on that. I hope OAG will come back with the text amendment. So I applaud all the work you're doing, but again, it's about the young folks' lives. If we have to have a hearing with the communities, we'll do that, but I would like for them if they do -- if we do have a text amendment in the hearing, I would like for them to come down with some resolutions of how we can help, not the reverse of how we cannot help. So I'll leave it at that and I hope everybody takes my comments on that.

Proceed, Commissioner May.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I think there are two aspects of this. One is, of course, making sure that if the universities reopen that the students' safety is of primary importance and it fully interacts

2.0

But I think that what we with any actions that we take. will hear from the communities that surround the universities basically is a desire not to have numbers of students coming back into their communities because if you read the newspapers or whatever news source you use, there's a lot of reporting about young people being a bit more careless, about potential transmission of the disease and how they interact socially and you see it just walking down the street as well. And I think that's a big part of what people are concerned about.

They don't want to have -- particularly when you're talking about communities where there may be larger numbers of people who are at risk for age or for other health reasons. So they don't necessarily want to have lot of students coming in, particularly if they're coming in from out of state. Some states are experiencing significant surges in the number of cases and so do you want to have students coming in from some of those states and then, you know, perhaps not following all the CDC quidelines when they're out and about in the neighborhood. So I think we have to look at it both ways, but again, I think that the universities are developing responsible plans for this, I would be in favor of giving them the sort of short-term flexibility that may be needed and do this and do it safely. And you know, there's a bigger

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

1 public health question that I'm sure the Mayor and the 2 administration has to address. CHAIRMAN HOOD: 3 Okay, so I quess I do have a 4 follow-up question on what Commissioner May had mentioned, 5 Ms. Steingasser. So with the time frame, so I'm quessing 6 -- I'm just curious, what are the universities thinking? 7 Don't they usually go back to school in August? 8 MS. STEINGASSER: They do usually go back in 9 late August and they're aware that the time frame is tight. 10 They don't know how to judge until they start 11 getting acceptance letters back from the students. And 12 then they'll know whether they have a residence issue or 13 not. 14 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Okay. So I quess we'll 15 get a report from you soon. If we need to do something 16 special, I think we need to do that as well. 17 I say special, hear back from you at a regular hearing 18 date, we can take about 15 minutes prior to that hearing 19 and give notice or whatever we need to do. We can waive 2.0 it is as well. I think this is very important. 21 Any other questions or questions? Thank you, 22 Ms. Steingasser, for bringing that to our attention. 23 Hold on a sec, Vice Chair Miller? VICE CHAIR MILLER: No further comments on this 24 25 subject, but I did have a question for Ms. Steingasser

1 when it's appropriate to move on from the subject. 2 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Just go right ahead. So I 3 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay, so -- thanks. 4 just wanted an update on the inclusionary zoning plus roundtable that Office of Planning told us I think at our 5 6 -- one of our last meetings that they were going to have 7 a roundtable in order to expedite all of our hearing dates 8 were taken. Did that happen last week --9 MS. STEINGASSER: It did not. We got concerned 10 there wasn't sufficient time for notice, especially to the 11 Effectively, it was one week with a couple of days So we have advertised it and noticed 12 on either side. One is for July 15th, Wednesday, July 15th 13 everything. 14 at 4 o'clock. 15 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Thank you. That answers my second question. So I won't keep you too late 16 17 -- not as a panelist, that's your job at that type of 18 roundtable, but I want to attend in here and maybe, I 19 quess, testify, if I'm even allowed to do that. 2.0 Anyway, I wanted to hear -- July 15th at, what 21 time did you say? 22 Four o'clock. MS. STEINGASSER: 23 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okav. Thank you. 24 MS. STEINGASSER: We'll be willing to accept 25 testimony both orally and in writing. We don't expect

1	there to be a lot of back and forth since we don't have
2	actual text advertised yet. But we do hope to get
3	something filed very quickly after the roundtable.
4	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Great. Because I think all
5	of us have previously expressed interest in support for
6	this case and getting it right, but also getting it done
7	quickly.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other questions for Ms.
9	Steingasser?
10	Okay, thank you very much, Ms. Steingasser.
11	Ms. Schellin, let me ask, if you could tell us
12	when our next hearing date is? I didn't see one for two
13	weeks unless I missed something.
14	MS. SCHELLIN: Our next hearing date is on July
15	this is actually next week. It is July 6th, 7th, and
16	9th. You have the rest of this week off and we'll see you
17	back next week.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Have the links been sent out
19	yet?
20	MS. SCHELLIN: I have not sent them out. I
21	didn't want to confuse you. I just sent the month of June
22	out and I still confused some people.
23	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Okay, because I was
24	looking for these. But anyway, we have another hearing
25	July 6th.

1	MS. SCHELLIN: I will send out the links maybe
2	tomorrow, maybe just a week in advance. I haven't figured
3	out I sent out the whole month and I think I confused
4	a lot of people.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I think the way you have it now
6	to help those I'll admit, I'm one of them. I have a
7	system. So if you can send them all out and then like you
8	do every meeting.
9	MS. SCHELLIN: Send them all out and just do
10	a reminder? Absolutely. I can do that.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I think that will help all of
12	us. That would help Commissioner Shapiro.
13	(Laughter.)
14	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Shapiro or maybe
15	Commissioner May, I'm not sure which one was confused, but
16	it was one of those.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: It will help all of us
18	actually.
19	COMMISSIONER MAY: I was good. I knew we had
20	three hearings are next week. I write those down on the
21	calendar.
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right, so Ms. Schellin,
23	anything else?
24	MS. SCHELLIN: We have nothing else. I hope
25	you guys have a great 4th of July, even though it seems

1	like well, in my neck of the woods, there will be no
2	fireworks, unless some of the locals decide to do their
3	own which they did the past weekend, so I'm sure there
4	will be some this coming weekend.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, so with that, thank you,
6	Ms. Schellin, and others, and Commissioners and everyone,
7	be safe and we appreciate everything and we'll see you all
8	on Monday, four o'clock. Thanks. We're adjourned.
9	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off
10	the record at 5:08 p.m.)
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
ノトー	1

<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: Regular Meeting

Before: DC Zoning Commission

Date: 06-29-20

Place: Video Teleconference

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