GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

IN THE MATTER OF:

:

Parkside Residential, LLC : Case No. 05-28Z

Modification Of Consequence to

2nd-Stage PUD, Parcel 9,

Parkside Pl & Kenilworth Ter., NE (Square 5056, Lots 865-869)

Ward 7

:

Steuart Investment Company : Case No. 21-20

CG Design Review and Special :
Exception Relief from Penthouse :

Setback, S. Capitol St, north of : S St. SW (Sq. 662, Lot 801 & Sq. : 662F Lot 800) Ward 6

662E, Lot 800) Ward 6

Office of Planning - Text : Case No. 22-07

Amendment to Subtitles B & U to Create New Definition & Use

for WMATA Bus Facility

-----:

THURSDAY

FEBRUARY 24, 2022

+ + + + +

The Public Meeting of the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened via video conferencing, pursuant to notice at 4:00 P.M. EDT, Anthony Hood, Chairman, presiding.

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

ANTHONY HOOD, Chairperson ROBERT MILLER, Vice Chair PETER MAY, Commissioner JOSEPH IMAMURA, Commissioner

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

SHARON SCHELLIN, Secretary
PAUL YOUNG, Zoning Data Specialist

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

JENNIFER STEINGASSER

OFFICE OF ZONING LEGAL DIVISION STAFF PRESENT:

HILLARY LOVICK, ESQUIRE DENNIS LIU, ESQUIRE JACOB RITTIG, ESQUIRE

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Public Meeting held on February 24, 2022.

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

	G STATEMENT: nthony Hood	5
PRELMII	NARY MATTER:	
V	ote on Chairman and Vice Chairman	6
VOTE:		
	ommissioners	8
PRESEN'	TATION:	
Mo Pa	ase No. 05-28Z, Parkside Residential, LLC odification of consequence to 2nd-stage PUD, arcel 9, Parkside Pl. & Kenilworth Ter., NE Sq. 5056, Lots 865-869)) Ward 7	9
COMMEN'	TS AND QUESTIONS:	
		9
VOTE:		
Co	ommissioners	.0
Ca Ca pe	TATION: ase No. 21-20, Steuart Investment Company G design review and special exception relief from enthouse setback, S. Capitol St. north of S St. SW Sq. 662, Lot 801 and Sq. 662E, Lot 800) Ward 6 1	.1
	<u> </u>	
	TS AND QUESTIONS: ommissioners	. 2
VOTE:		
	ommissioners	.5
Ca	TATION: ase No. 22-07, Office of Planning - text amendment to o Subtitles B & U to create new definition and use fo MATA bus facility	r
	TS AND QUESTIONS: ommissioners	2
VOTE:	ommissioners	2
	HUNT REPORTING COMPANY	
	Court Reporting and Litigation Support	
	Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia	

410-766-HUNT (4868) 1-800-950-DEPO (3376)

CLOSING REMA Anthony			•	•	•	•		•	•		•		34
ADJOURNED:	,												0.5
∆nthonv	$H \cap \cap d$												36

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

2 (4:00 p.m.)

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. We are convening and broadcasting this public meeting by video conferencing. My name is Anthony Hood. Joining me are Vice-Chair Miller, Commissioner May, and Commissioner Imamura. We are also joined by the Office of Zoning staff, Ms. Sharon Schellin and Mr. Paul Young, who will be handling all of our virtual operations. Also, our Office of Zoning Legal Division, we have this evening joining us at separate times Ms. Lovick, Mr. Rittig, and Mr. Liu. I will ask others to introduce themselves at the appropriate time, if needed.

Copies of today's meeting agenda are available on the Office of Zoning's website. Please be advised that this proceeding is being recorded by a court reporter and is also webcast live, Webex or YouTube Live. The video will be available on the Office of Zoning's website after the meeting. Accordingly, all those listening on Webex or by phone, will be muted during the during the meeting unless the Commission suggests otherwise.

For hearing action items, the only documents before us this evening are the application, the ANC setdown report, and the Office of Planning report. All other documents in the record will be reviewed at the time of the hearing. Again, we do not take any public testimony at our meetings unless the Commission requests someone to speak.

If you experience difficulty accessing Webex or with your phone call in, then please call our OZ hotline number at 202-727-0789. Again, 202-727-0789 for additional log in or any issues you may have for call-in instructions.

2.4

Okay. Does the staff have any preliminary matters?

MS. SCHELLIN: We do have one preliminary matter on the agenda this evening. Other than that, staff has no others.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. We do have a preliminary matter, a vote on Commission Chairman and Vice-Chairman. Commissioners, it's time for us to vote. I will at this point note that all offices, proposed offices are vacant. We only have two, the Chair and the Vice-Chair. And let's have a discussion and talk about moving forward.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chairman, if I may.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Commissioner May.

COMMISSIONER MAY: I would just like to suggest that the Zoning Commission has been very well served by its current and long-standing Chairman, and its current and long-standing Vice-Chair, and would propose that we continue with that. And I won't make any suggestion that perhaps Rob Miller should be Vice-Chairman for life. But, you know, you have become the Chairman for life, I believe, so. But in all seriousness, I would make a motion that Anthony Hood serve as Chairman and Rob Miller serve as Vice-Chairman of the Commission.

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: I second.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. It's been moved, and I think Commissioner Imamura seconded. It's moved and properly second, that Anthony Hood will continue to serve as Chairman and Rob Miller, Robert Miller, continue to serve as Vice-Chair. Moved and properly second. Any further discussion?

VICE-CHAIR MILLER: I just wanted to thank Commissioner
May and Commissioner Imamura, our colleagues, for their
confidence in our leadership, which is mutually felt with your
participation and leadership on the Commission, so thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I was going to do that after the motion was carried, but I would also opine and echo --

VICE-CHAIR MILLER: I may retract that if the vote doesn't (audio interference).

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I would also echo what the Vice-Chair said with our colleagues. I think we work hard. Sometime it's not always agreed upon. Sometime we don't agree upon things ourselves. But I think we work hard in trying to carry out the mission for the City. So I appreciate the confidence from all of my colleagues to continue in this capacity, and I will continue to serve to the best of my ability. So it's been moved and properly second, and thank you again for the nomination and the confidence from both of us, I believe, I'm sure. It's been moved and properly second. Any further discussion? Not hearing any, Ms. Schellin, could you do a roll call vote, please?

MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood. I'm sorry,

Commissioner May.

1

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.

3 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Imamura.

4 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.

5 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood.

COMMISSIONER HOOD: Yes.

MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller.

8 VICE-CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is 4-0-1 to continue with Chairman Hood as the Chairman and Vice-Chair Miller as the Vice-Chairman. The minus one is the 3rd Mayoral Appointee position, which is vacant.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I do have an announcement. Thank you all. I do have an announcement for -- we had on our agenda a correspondence item. I want to make an announcement to the public right now. That correspondence item, we will take it at a subsequent meeting. There are some procedural issues that need to be rectified and the staff will handle those upon our direction. We're asking them to go through our proper procedures of how those things make it to our agenda, so that needs to be taken care of. All right. And then we will discuss them. All right. Let's move right along, unless I hear otherwise. Let's go to modification of consequence. This is under Zoning Commission Case No. 05-28Z, Parkside deliberation. Residential, LLC, modification of consequence to second-stage PUD

at Square 5056. Ms. Schellin.

2.4

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. At a previous meeting, the Commission considered this to be a modification of consequence and left the record open for the ANC to respond. They've done that at Exhibit 4. That's ANC 7D. They provided a resolution in support, so the case is ready for the Commission to consider final action this evening.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Schellin. I want to thank Commissioner Hasan, the Chair of ANC 7D, for submitting the letter in support. The vote was 5-0-1 to support the request, and some of the comments they made were very supportive, and I know they will continue to work with the Applicant as they continue to move on and making big impacts for the city in that area. So I want to thank the ANC for responding, which we always like to hear from our ANC's. In this case, they responded, so I want to thank them. I think that's why we held it open, but let me open it up for others. Any other questions or comments?

Okay. Not hearing or seeing any, would somebody like to make a motion? Okay. I will make a motion that the Zoning Commission, that we approve on the modification of consequence. I think I have everything covered. Modification of consequence on Zoning Commission Case No. 05-28Z, Parkside Residential, LLC, modification of consequence to second-stage PUD at Square 5056, and ask for a second.

VICE-CHAIR MILLER: Second.

1	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: It's been moved and properly second.
2	Any further discussion? Not hearing any, Ms. Schellin, would you
3	do a roll call vote, please?
4	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood.
5	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.
6	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller.
7	VICE-CHAIR MILLER: Yes.
8	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner May.
9	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
10	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Imamura.
11	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.
12	MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is 4-0-1 to approve final action
13	in Zoning Commission Case No. 05-28Z, and the minus one being the
14	3rd Mayoral Appointee position being vacant.
15	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So I know that I don't
16	know if anybody else, but Ms. Schellin sounded kind of muffled.
17	That time, I don't know. It speeded up real fast, and I know
18	the weather has a lot to do with it. So I am going to ask Ms.
19	Schellin to do, probably if you I don't know. It may be just
20	technology. So the public, I want to make sure the public hears
21	it, so if you slow down just a little bit, even though it might
22	not have been you, because you don't talk as fast as it came out.
23	So if you slow down just a little bit, maybe, I want to make sure
24	the public can hear. Okay. All right.

HUNT REPORTING COMPANY
Court Reporting and Litigation Support
Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia
410-766-HUNT (4868)
1-800-950-DEPO (3376)

Final action in Zoning Commission Case No. 21-20. This

25

is Steuart Investment Company, Capitol Gateway design review and special exception relief from penthouse setback at Square 662 and 662E. Ms. Schellin.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. SCHELLIN: I have no idea what was going on, but Exhibit 30 through 30B, we have the Applicant's post hearing submissions; Exhibit 31, the Applicant's draft order; Exhibit 32, ANC 6D's response to the Applicant's post hearing submission. And we ask that the Commission consider final action this evening.

And I heard most of that CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. that, but I will repeat most of what Ms. Schellin mentioned. said, we have 30 through 30B, the Applicant's post hearing submission;, Exhibit 31, Applicant's draft order; Exhibit 32, ANC 6D's response to the Applicant's post hearing submission; and I believe she said it's now for the consideration of the Commission, so I just want to clarify that. I think most people heard it, Ι wanted to make sure I repeated it.

Commissioners, let me open it up. Any questions or comments on this? This is final action. I know we've exhausted a lot. There are some things that may have been asked for, but (audio interference) see or recall. But anyway, let's open it up for questions or comments. Any questions or comments?

COMMISSIONER MAY: I think the Applicant submissions were responses to what we'd asked for. You know, I don't know that there's really anything else to discuss further. I appreciate the fact that they paid serious attention to our former

colleague's comments regarding solar panels, although it's too bad we couldn't go further than that. But I understand the complications, so.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I do know that we had some opposition. Some of the things within our opposition, some things that that I probably will expound upon again with the Office of Planning as we get to the staff report today in light of some of the comments I've heard, as well as at the oversight. But I do know that the one -- a couple of things about the affordable housing, about the D zones, some of this we've already had in the works for a while. The Office of Planning is doing an analysis, so I want the opposition to know there are some things that we are looking at that came up in this case, and we're looking at whether or not they should apply or should not apply, and the directive given this morning by the counsel, is to try to move quicker, sooner than later, and that's the direction I've taken away from that, and that's what I believe the Commission will try to do. But we want to make sure we are full-fledged and have all information needed so we can make an informed, intelligent decision that won't have unintended consequences. Any further questions or comments. Vice-Chair.

VICE-CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I concur with both your comments and Commissioner May's that the Applicant -- and the Applicant was responsive to the Commission's request regarding both the increase in the rooftop solar panels, even

though, as Commissioner May said, it couldn't get to as much as we wanted. But they did increase that solar array and the interim facade painting of the murals. And I think they moved a two-bedroom inclusionary zoning unit to the exterior facade from the interior, and on that point, I think their draft order might give — undermine that responsiveness by giving flexibility to change that along with other housing unit placement around. So I would ask our counsel to work with the Applicant's counsel to make sure that they just, that the draft order reflects the responsiveness that they're going to move that two-bedroom inclusionary zoning unit to the exterior facade, as they have indicated. And with that, I'm prepared to support final action, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. Commissioner Imamura, did you have any questions or comments?

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Nothing further to add, Mr. Chair. I appreciate the additional work for them to be responsive to questions and additions.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. And again, other government agencies have weighed in. I think we talked about this previously, DDOT, DACD, DOEE, DCF, and FEMS, the Office of Fire Marshal also. So we had a number of agencies to weigh in. And I want the opposition to know that some of the things that they did bring are not applied to what we're doing in this case because this is (audio interference) some of the things that the Commission is

1	looking at to move forward. So that did not go on deaf ears.
2	All right. So with that, I would move that we approve Zoning
3	Commission Case No. 21-20 with our comments and things asked for,
4	and I ask for a second.
5	VICE-CHAIR MILLER: Second.
6	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: It's been moved and properly second.
7	Any further discussion? Not hearing any, Ms. Schellin, would you
8	do a roll call vote, please?
9	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood.
10	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.
11	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller.
12	VICE-CHAIR MILLER: Yes.
13	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner May.
14	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
15	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Imamura.
16	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.
17	MS. SCHELLIN: So the vote is 4-0-1 to approve final
18	action in Zoning Commission Case No. 21-20, the minus one being
19	the 3rd Mayoral Appointee position vacant.
20	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Schellin. And
21	you definitely have fixed the voice, I mean, the sound problem,
22	so great job.
23	MS. SCHELLIN: I called in on my phone. That's why.
24	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I didn't say how you fixed it, but
25	you fixed it, so anyway.

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, by calling in on my phone. I don't know what's wrong with the computer, so.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Let's go with hearing action, Zoning Commission Case No. 22-07.

MS. SCHELLIN: Ms. Steingasser.

6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Ms. Steingasser. Okay. Ms. 7 Steingasser.

MS. STEINGASSER: Yes, sir. Chairman Hood, Commissioners, I'm Jennifer Steingasser with the D.C. Office of Planning, and I'm here representing this case this evening.

The Office of Planning is recommending that the Zoning Commission set down for a public hearing amendments to the zoning regulations to Subtitle B to add a new definition for a WMATA bus facility, and to Subtitle U to allow such a use as a matter of right with conditions. We feel overall that the proposed change to regulations would not be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The WMATA bus facility as a definition is very straightforward. It's a bus -- we're proposing a public transit bus facility operated by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority. It would provide that definition as a defined term within the regulations, which would help and assist the Zoning Administrator when they do future evaluations for this type of use and in the different zones.

In terms of the existing language of Subtitle B, the bus facilities do not comply with the use categories for mass

transit facilities because they're not part of the fixed rail right-of-way mass transit system, which is included in the definition of the mass transit facilities. So the bus garage does not fit within that definition. The Zoning Administrator, in looking further at the definition, could not determine that the bus facilities would fall under the other category, "Motor Vehicle-Related" use, since the service maintenance use is considered an accessory use to the primary use of the facility, which is a bus parking in a private garage. He did look further again at the facility and whether it would qualify as a public storage garage, which is a defined term. But it was a little difficult because of the maintenance requirement that the facility has and the limitation under the definition that it be an accessory use, being no more than 20 percent.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So we all agreed it would be beneficial to provide a definition for the WMATA bus facility in regulations. The use permission would allow the facility as a matter of right in the residential house zones, starting with our use group A, and consequently it would move through the existing RF and RA zones. It would also provide the consistency with the recent amendments to the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map and that definition of local public facilities. And that's important because the Council, after reviewing the proposal, added that stripe of local public facilities to a portion of property in Friendship Heights that includes moderate density

residential, and that combination of residential zone -- I mean, residential land use category and a local public facilities category created difficulty in how to how to accommodate those uses and how WMATA might fit within those categories, because there is no zone that that has an inherent combination of local public facilities to include the WMATA use specifically.

So we went back and did this evaluation to figure out how to permit the WMATA bus facility to go within the category of the local public facilities as anticipated by the council's affirmative act of putting that stripe on the residential zone.

When we looked at the land use definition of local public facilities, and it's in our report, you can see the first line states that it "Includes land use facilities occupied and used by the District of Columbia government and other local government agencies such as WMATA." So it specifically calls out WMATA as a government agency that would be permitted in this land use category.

So we did again, we went through the text amendment use permissions of the existing Subtitle U, in determination with the Zoning Administrator that the bus facility could first be permitted as a matter of right in the MU-Use Group D, and that's the mixed use groups, the commercial districts basically. It does not accommodate the portion of the Future Land Use Map that is identified for residential with that land use stripe. So we have to find a way to try to merge those two together.

We propose that the use be allowed as a matter of right, but we also recognize that its proximity to the residential uses, both within the mixed-use zones and within the R zones, could require a little bit of separation.

So first, we limited this facility, this definition as a use by right to those areas identified on the Future Land Use Map as mixed use, moderate density, residential and local public facilities. And that's going to be relevant in that there is only one such site in the District that has that combination, that meets that qualifying criteria. And we thought it was better to talk about it in a less specific context. But if the Commission is uncomfortable, we could also call out that specific square and lots. But it's important that this is not — this is not written so broadly that it could pop up by right across the city. It's a very defined and focused text amendment and use permission.

We also then added, borrowing from some of the other buffering requirements that are throughout the zoning regulations, we suggested that there be a 15-foot setback provided along all of the lot lines of the facility use that isn't already owned by WMATA, and that even if it abuts an alley that serves as a zone boundary line, and that it not just recognize residential zones, but that it recognizes also its proximity to residential uses within the mixed use zone. So if they're adjacent to, if this use were to be adjacent to a property

that's zoned for mixed use, but developed solely for residential, they would also need to recognize and provide this buffer.

And then there are conditions about landscaping the buffer and fencing the buffer and that that be, you know, a substantial material, and the landscaping be maintained in good cause.

So the Comprehensive Plan, the reason we felt this is not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan, both in terms of the double negative and in terms of the District Council taking affirmative action by putting that stripe on the site. There is a lot of narrative and policy and action statements that focus on WMATA in the public transit bus and facilities in the District. And it talks in many places directly to the need for additional improved bus storage, and the lack of modern bus garages in the District, and how it severely impedes bus service.

In the Comp Plan, we also talk to the fact that 55 percent of the bus riders live in D.C. They're D.C. residents. So there is a direct correlation between having these, this improved bus system. And there was also, we were anticipating there might be some concern about the proximity of one of those kind of uses being anywhere outside of an industrial zone, and what's important about that is WMATA's recent statements about their committed conversion to 100 percent zero-emissions fleet. And we've added a link in our report that takes you to the WMATA site where you can read all about their commitment. But they

have a commitment to 100 percent zero-emissions by the year 2045 and a commitment to begin a new fleet of 1,500 buses that would all be zero-emissions and that they would start that in the year 2023 when they start their next bus procurement.

So 2023, as we know, is very recent. And as those start to build by the end of 2030, all new busses entering the service will be either electric or some type of zero-emission technology, and so they will be moving forward to building new bus garages. As many of you may be aware, they've already got three other bus garages in the District that are currently under construction and modernization. So if the Commission sets this case down, which we are strongly recommending, we will provide a much further and much more robust analysis of the Comprehensive Plan as viewed through a racial equity lens and bring that back to the public hearing. I'm available for any questions.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you for your report, Ms. Steingasser. You know, when I looked at the submission and I heard your testimony, it took me back to, and I'm going to digress for a moment, what we went through in COVID. When Washington, I don't know if some of my colleagues may have been there or not, but when Washington Hospital Center came in front of the Commission about expanding space, Sibley Hospital came in front of the Commission about that extra floor. And the whole time COVID was going on -- I'm saying this for the public too, we had a lot of opposition about going either one. But we needed it

and things would have -- might have been a little less on some of us who had to use those services, that extra floor with Sibley and that extra space over at the Washington Hospital Center, when our friends and family members got COVID. Sometimes we don't realize what we're planning for until we realize we need it. And when I -- the reason I'm bringing this up, Ms. Steingasser and others, because when I thought about WMATA, if we don't make a way for this to work here in the city, we have a lot of residents who don't have vehicles, who depend upon WMATA. The more we send WMATA to Virginia and Maryland, the more it's going to cost us. So I think this is in line. I'm looking forward to the hearing, but these are the kind of things, and I want to commend all those who worked on this this to get us to this point, because sometime you don't know what the future holds, as we found out with COVID-So those are my comments, probably weren't germane, but I thought this was applicable for this situation here. Let me open it up for any questions or comments. Commissioner May.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER MAY: All right. Yeah, I thought I understood pretty well when I read the report, but then hearing your report, Ms. Steingasser, I got a little confused. You seem to be saying that this was really about a single site; is that right?

MS. STEINGASSER: Well, yes. This would allow for the facility to be on a very limited site, which is the first criteria of the text amendment. It's identified for moderate density,

mixed use residential with the public facilities. 1 2 COMMISSIONER MAY: It's the Wisconsin Avenue bus 3 garage, right? 4 MS. STEINGASSER: Lord and Taylor site, yes. 5 Right. And the idea is that that COMMISSIONER MAY: 6 would be -- that bus garage would be combined with an overall mix, a larger mixed use development, and that's what this will 7 8 allow. 9 MS. STEINGASSER: Yes. Uh-huh. 10 COMMISSIONER MAY: It also will allow other future bus 11 facilities, will it not? Only if the Council identifies them 12 MS. STEINGASSER: 13 similarly through a Future Land Use Map amendment. 14 COMMISSIONER MAY: But we're allowing the facility as 15 a matter of right with conditions in our R-Use Group A zones. 16 MS. STEINGASSER: Right. And the first one of those 17 conditions is that the property must be identified on the Future 18 Land Use Map. 19 COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. I'm going to have to study that more carefully, because I don't really understand how that 20 21 works. 22

MS. STEINGASSER: So when they would come in for a permit, they would have to they would have to show the Zoning Administrator or the building permit review official that the property is identified for moderate density residential with a

23

24

25

local public facilities stripe on the Future Land Use Map.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Can we do that? I mean, isn't that, in effect, delegating zoning to the City Council?

4 MS. STEINGASSER: I would have to refer to our land 5 use attorneys.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah. That's a legal question I think that we have to --

MS. STEINGASSER: And what makes the acrobats, you know, if the Commission is comfortable removing this text or advertising it in the alternative, that would be, I think, welcome, because it's a very -- it's a sliver of land next to the overall much bigger site. It's a split designated property.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah, yeah. I mean, I feel like this is a -- where there's a lot of sort of confusing, overlapping components of this that make it seem like it's going to be broadly applicable, because when I first read it, I thought it was going to be broadly applicable. And I was mostly concerned about, well, what if this, you know, what if there are locations that are proposed that are that the immediate neighbors have extreme concerns about? And wouldn't that mean that we should probably consider this as a special exception, you know, or go through a special exception process and set criteria and things like that for the locating, as we do for certain other facilities that can be objectionable when they are abut actual residential -- actual residences.

MS. STEINGASSER: This is not intended to be public, you know, to be -
COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah.

MS. STEINGASSER: -- easily applied across the city. And the reason we did not proceed with the special exception approach is, there are already so many of these type of uses that are allowed, of mass transit facilities, are allowed as a matter of right, starting in an R-1-A zone and moving through. And transportation -- yeah.

COMMISSIONER MAY: There's a really big difference between a bus garage and a Metro station, and especially in certain, you know, certain locations where Metro stations don't even involve any kind of parking. I mean, I can understand that approach, but it does feel sort of overly complicated, and, as I said, sort of open to the interpretation that it might, you know, bring a bus garage to a neighborhood near you. And I think that might be a concern for people, so.

MS. STEINGASSER: We could do a couple things. We could limit it to the square and lots that we know that this was looked at.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah.

MS. STEINGASSER: The other, you know, is, it would be directed through the planning, you know, the planning efforts and adoption of Future Land Use Maps and Comp Plans of the City Council.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.

MS. STEINGASSER: So there would always be that public.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Right. I mean, I think that, I mean, I personally would probably feel more comfortable if this were focused on those particular, on that particular site where we know there is this need. And then in the future, as the Council acts to, you know, adopt changes to the Future Land Use Map, to reflect, you know, a need, a desire, a decision by Council, to make that place available for that kind of facility, then we could act accordingly, right? The Office of Planning could bring us a text amendment or, you know, whatever is needed as soon as possible after that land use map change, and then we could act to, you know, to apply these conditions to that particular lot square.

I just feel like that then we're not, like, I mean, in that sense, we would be acting in a manner that is not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan as opposed to saying you have to look at the Comprehensive Plan and if it meets these conditions, then you can go ahead, because I feel like that's kind of the cart before the horse. And, as I said, I think there might be legal complications to that. So I've said enough. I do appreciate everything that you're trying to do. We certainly want to make these, you know, facilities like this. They need to be in the city, and they need to be proximate to the people who need to use it. And I certainly commend WMATA for their

desire to convert to an electric fleet or a cleaner fleet. I wish it would happen faster than 2045 to get it completed, because that seems like a really long ways away, and the need is quite urgent. But I am optimistic that they'll actually be able to move faster than that once they really get things moving.

MS. STEINGASSER: Could I ask that if the Commission votes to set this down and your fellow Commissioners agree with you, that you authorize OP to work with the Office of Zoning Land Use Legal Division to reframe the -- language.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah.

MS. STEINGASSER: -- language. Okay.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. I mean, I would absolutely, I mean, I'm in favor of setting it down, but I do feel like a little bit of tweaking and focusing on that site would be useful. It would keep folks from getting concerned about a bus garage coming to a neighborhood near you. All right. Thank you very much.

MS. STEINGASSER: Uh-huh.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay, thank you, Commissioner May. I would agree. I think that's a good way for us to move forward and we can bring in all the rest if need be at a later time. Let's see what others think. Commissioner Imamura.

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think Mr. May's strategy seems to make a lot of sense and certainly. I think, his phrase of, "A bus garage near you," makes me think of the effort that OP has put into creating the vegetative buffer

around and some of the specific language they used about evergreen trees. And so just from my point of view, different species have different sort of porosity in screening through that, so maybe if we're tweaking the language that we just tweak it in such a way that we discuss it as a dense, increased density vegetative screen with increased density, or something to that effect.

I know that it calls out a wood or metal fence and a brick or stone wall. A vegetative screen that's equally as dense might work. But I think calling out an eight-foot evergreen tree could be a little too specific, or at least maybe we adjust it in some way. But it's sort of a smaller issue compared to some of the matters that Commissioner May brought up. So, other than that, I'm going to support it for a setdown.

MS. STEINGASSER: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. Vice-Chair Miller.

VICE-CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Ms. Steingasser, for your report and recommendation, and the comments of my colleagues, which I generally agree with. And we've also seen in the public record comments from others. I don't know how appropriate -- you can cut me off, Mr. Chairman, if it's inappropriate -- it is a comment on a setdown hearing on public comments that we've received in the record from Kalorama Citizens Association, Committee of 100, not appropriate. I see a nix (indiscernible) from our Director.

There are comments I see in the public record from

various groups. I think they're there. I think they're legitimate. I would like, I appreciate OP's responsiveness to my colleagues' comments to provide -- to work with the OZLD, Office of Zoning Legal Division, on refining the language to maybe come up with alternative ways to publish a public hearing notice that maybe makes it site-specific or just accommodates.

It's obviously a city-wide need to have bus garages throughout the District of Columbia in a fair and equitable way distributed. And I appreciate Ms. Steingasser saying that at the time of a public hearing, if we set this down, she would, however it's set down or however many alternative forms it's set down, that they would provide a racial equity analysis because this would be a map amendment where zoning consistency and racial equity analysis needs to be evaluated.

And bus garages are always a flashpoint. I've seen the signs in my own neighborhood and other neighborhoods throughout the city, but it's a necessary part of our infrastructure, a critical part of our infrastructure and public service. So to the extent that it can be applied city-wide, I think it was a laudable goal. But there may need to be more opportunity for public input for such a non-residential use in a residential neighborhood, even if it is publicly facility designated on the Comp Plan as the Friendship Heights bus garage is now designated so. But, you know, these, well, like I say, these sites, as I said, these facilities are critical, critically that they be

equitably distributed throughout the city and there are opportunities for the mixed use development, particularly housing, particularly affordable housing development, as we've tried to encourage at all of our public transit stations and corridors. And it's been a long missed opportunity at this particular site in Friendship Heights.

So they can be done in a way, it's always developing in a way that's managed to mitigate it, that adverse effects are mitigated and buffered. But there are opportunities here where this could be a win-win situation throughout the city. And so I appreciate OP bringing this forward, working with OZLD going forward to refine it, address some of the concerns that have been raised in the public record as we go forward, if we go forward with a public hearing, including the racial equity analysis for such a map amendment. So thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. And, Ms. Steingasser, I don't have any other comments. Thank you. But, Ms. Steingasser, if you could stay for the next agenda item, I do have a request --

MS. STEINGASSER: Okay. Sure.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: -- that I want to present to you. Okay. Any other questions or comments of Ms. Steingasser? All right. So would somebody like to make a motion for us to set this down and how you want to set it down? Commissioner May, would you like to do that?

COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. So I would make a motion that the Zoning Commission set down Case No. 22-07, Office of Planning text amendment to Subtitles B and U to create new definition and use for WMATA bus facility. And would note that we'd like the Office of Planning and the Office of Zoning Legal Division to work together on refining that notice of setdown and consider inclusion of a specific site location where this would be applicable. And I think that probably covers it or, you know, whatever refinements are necessary to address all the considerations.

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: It has been moved. Can I get a 12 second?

VICE-CHAIR MILLER: I will second it.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR MILLER: No, I defer to you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I'll second it.

VICE-CHAIR MILLER: I'd like to ask, as part of the additional information that we've requested -- it doesn't have to be part of the motion -- but I meant to say the list, just in terms of understanding the context, a listing of all the existing and maybe potentially proposed bus garage sites throughout the city, at least the existing ones -- what the zoning is, what the land use map says. I think it would be useful for us and the public, everyone, to understand where they are located, what the zoning is, what the land use map is. And so we know maybe, you

1 know, what changes may need to be made in the future to accommodate this critical part of our infrastructure with the 2 appropriate buffering. 3 4 COMMISSIONER MAY: I agree with that. I want to see 5 where they are too. 6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Any further discussion? Not 7 hearing any, thank you all. 8 Ms. Schellin, would you do a roll call vote, please? 9 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner May. 10 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. 11 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood. 12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes. 13 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller. 14 VICE-CHAIR MILLER: Yes. 15 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Imamura. 16 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes. 17 MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is 4-0-1 to set down Zoning 18 Commission Case No. 22-07 as a rulemaking case, and the minus one being the 3rd Mayoral Appointee position, which is vacant. 19 20 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I don't think we have any 21 Ms. Steingasser, and everyone, I wanted Ms. other cases. 22 Steingasser to stay. Councilmember Lewis George today at our hearing asked for some things. There are some things that I need 23

HUNT REPORTING COMPANY
Court Reporting and Litigation Support
Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia
410-766-HUNT (4868)
1-800-950-DEPO (3376)

to follow up on with her. One thing I like to do is follow up.

I don't wait. I like to get it off my plate. So I've asked

24

25

staff -- and we have -- I've been working on it since then. I looked -- I think one of the gentlemen said that I said reverse discrimination, which is not in my vocabulary. I have not been able to find it. I don't think it's in the transcript as well, but we're getting that together. We're going to send that to the Council.

2.2

Also, the D zones, if I could find out what the status is with those, where we are. And there were some other things that I would ask Ms. Steingasser if OP could work with the Office of Zoning, Ms. Schellin, and others, and Ms. Barton, because I would like for that to be packaged, and I would like for us to send our response back, and I think we need your help on the D zones, kind of where we are. I forgot where we said we were. But I think she asked the same question. I think it's your oversight. I wasn't sure. But I would like to be able to send those responses back to her and don't let them linger long, because I like to do stuff sooner than later. So if you, I'm asking you for that assistance, not that you have to respond now, but I'm just asking for that assistance. So I want to get that back over to her sooner than later.

MS. STEINGASSER: I'm happy to respond now and we absolutely would be --.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Well, you can --

MS. STEINGASSER: -- helping them.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: -- respond now for the record. If

you can respond now, so people can hear, if you want to.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. STEINGASSER: Yeah. You had -- the Commissioners had asked us to prepare, you know, to begin analysis on the D zones and to bring something back in April. And so we are doing, you know, a new economic model and we will be bringing that back in April. And you had asked that the applicant supply also an economic analysis or some kind of financial analysis for us to comment on. And I think they were asked to provide that by March, mid-March. So we'll have that to you on schedule.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okav. Great. I appreciate that. I couldn't think of the dates. I'm not as young as I used to be, so I couldn't figure -- I knew we had asked for it. that we were in the progress process. But, Ms. Schellin, if you and Ms. Barton could send that over in the package, and if I need to call Ms. Barton, I will. But let's get that back over to Councilman Lewis George. And I'll say this publicly. I really appreciate her questions, because one thing about questions from hearing from the Chairman and other Councilmembers, and even from the public, it keeps you on your Ps and Os. It makes sure that we stay honest and stay true to our mission. And I think the record and the Zoning Commission will reflect not just Anthony Hood, but I think it will reflect that the Commissioners, and the staff, and everybody involved with zoning in the city, and the residents are true to the mission. And that's it. We're going to stay focused. That's my goal. Stay focused. All right. Any

other questions or comments? Thank you, Ms. Steingasser. Thank
you very much.
Okay, Ms. Schellin, do we have anything
else?

MS. SCHELLIN: I have one more thing. I want to wish you a happy birthday tomorrow.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Oh, okay.

MS. SCHELLIN: We're not in the office, so we could not bring you a cake, so we'll send you a virtual cake. How about that? So I hope you --

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: That sounds good.

MS. SCHELLIN: -- have a great day tomorrow.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. Thank you very much, and I appreciate all the things I've got on behalf of my sister's passing. You know, that was very dear. We were very close. That was very dear to me. But you know what? That's one way we all got to go. Just don't know when my date is. But I will tell you that there will be some thank yous coming out. My wife told me I still was in my etiquette time of proper etiquette, so I was rushing to do stuff, and she said, "Just slow down." And thank you for the happy birthday wishes. It feels good when you turning 25. I can't wait for 26.

All right. Thanks, everybody. With that, this meeting is adjourned, and see everybody later. Oh, the Zoning Commission meeting. I know when we're meeting again. I can get it right this time. We're not meeting again until March the 7th; is that

1	correct? Oh, I finally got that right. March the 7th, Zoning
2	Commission Case No. 21-28. This is George Washington University
3	on these same platforms at 4 p.m. With that, I want to thank
4	everyone. Have a great weekend and stay safe until the next time
5	we meet. Good night.
6	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the
7	record at 4:48 p.m.)
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
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 Meeting

Before: DCZC

DATE: 02/24/2022

PLACE: Teleconference

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

GARY EUELL