

GOVERNMENT  
OF  
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

THURSDAY

MARCH 31, 2022

+ + + + +

-----:  
IN THE MATTER OF: :  
: :  
Consolidation of PUD, Related : Case Nos.  
Planned Unit Development, and : Various  
Related Zoning Map Amendments :  
: :  
-----:

Thursday,  
March 31, 2022

Video Teleconference

The Public Meeting of Case Nos. 21-17, 22-03, 22-04,  
by the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened at 4:00  
p.m. EDT, Anthony J. Hood, Chairperson, presiding.

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

- ANTHONY J. HOOD, Chairperson
- ROBERT MILLER, Vice-Chair
- JOSEPH S. IMAMURA, Board Member
- PETER G. MAY, Board Member

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

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

RON BARRON, Secretary  
PAUL YOUNG, Zoning Data Specialist

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PRESENT:

HILLARY LOVICK, Esquire  
DENNIS LUI, Esquire

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the  
Regular Public Hearing held on March 31, 2022

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

Case No. 21-17 - Application of Congress Park Community  
Partners, LLC . . . . . 5

Case No. 22-03 - Application of WCP 1207 H Street, LLC . . . 13

Case No. 22-04 - Application of Hanover R.S. Limited  
Partnership . . . . . 20

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

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

(4:00 p.m.)

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. We are convening and broadcasting this public meeting by videoconferencing. My name is Anthony Hood. Joining me are Vice Chair Miller, Commissioner May, and Commissioner Imamura. We're also joined by the Office of Zoning Staff, Mr. Ron Barron as well as Mr. Paul Young who will be handling all of our virtual operations. We're also joined by the Office of Zoning Legal Division; Ms. Lovick and Mr. Lui.

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, and YouTube Live.

The video will be available on the Office of Zoning website after the meeting. Accordingly, all those listening on Webex or by phone will be muted during the meeting unless the Commission suggests otherwise.

For hearing action items, the only documents before us this evening are the application, the ANC sit-down 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 in our meetings unless the Commissioner requests someone to speak.

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

1           If you experience difficulty accessing Webex or with  
2 your telephone call-in then please call our OZ hotline number at  
3 202-72 -- hold on. 202, yeah, 727-0789 for Webex login or call-in  
4 instructions.

5           At this time, Mr. Barron, does the staff have any  
6 preliminary matters?

7           MR. BARRON: No preliminary matters, Mr. Chair.

8           CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, thank you. Let's go right into  
9 our agenda. We're going to take the agenda, as noted. Final  
10 Action Zoning Commission Case No. 21-17 Congress Park Community  
11 Partners, LLC - Map amendment and Square 5914.

12          Mr. Barron?

13          MR. BARRON: Yes, Mr. Chair. This case was considered  
14 for proposed action at the last meeting. We have some a few new  
15 exhibits that have been added since then. The Applicant's draft  
16 order has been submitted at Exhibit 98. The NCPC report was  
17 submitted yesterday at Exhibit 99, and there was a request by the  
18 Office of the Attorney General at Exhibit 100 to open the record  
19 so they could allow a submission of their comments on the case,  
20 which was approved by the Chair.

21          And with that, the case should be ready for the  
22 Commission to consider final action tonight.

23          CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Barron.

24          Yeah, we do have a request which was submitted yesterday

1 | by the Office of the Attorney General and it's -- and my  
2 | colleagues, I have opened the record which is within my authority,  
3 | so I open the record and I'm sure we have all reviewed it.

4 |           So what I'll do at this time is open it up. Any  
5 | questions, comments? We have the final action before us as noted  
6 | by Mr. Barron in Zoning Commission Case No. 21-17, Congress Park  
7 | Community Partners LLC and it has a plethora of support. I know  
8 | there are some other things we can add, but I will open it up to  
9 | my colleagues and I'll come back to my comments.

10 |           Commissioner May?

11 |           COMMISSIONER MAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So well, I  
12 | -- while I really appreciate hearing the opinion of the Office of  
13 | the Attorney General, I have to say I'm rather disappointed that  
14 | we are getting something from them at the very last minute, and it  
15 | required re-opening the record even to do it.

16 |           We often have to deal with organizations across the city  
17 | who are not necessarily as focused on these issues, or maybe  
18 | they're volunteer organizations, it might be ANCs, who have some  
19 | trouble meeting deadlines and we do, I think, extend every  
20 | courtesy to the groups like that to get their information in and  
21 | are willing to accept them.

22 |           But I really find it inexplicable for us to get, you  
23 | know, an 11th hour request like this from the Office Attorney  
24 | General. I mean, you know, they're, theoretically, the folks who

1 are working out in the OAG's office working on these issues aren't  
2 paying attention to these issues and they -- and, you know, if  
3 they choose to spend their time doing that, they should spend  
4 their time making sure that they meet deadlines. It just it's  
5 inexplicable.

6           Okay. So I'm going to stop ranting about that aspect of  
7 it, but I just -- I'm very disappointed to be getting this kind of  
8 information in this way. I will say that I do not find their  
9 comments to be particularly persuasive. I understand what they're  
10 trying to say. I mean, certainly we like to know IZ plus used as  
11 a tool when it's appropriate, when there are significant increases  
12 in the available development density for a particular project as a  
13 result of an upzoning.

14           That is the case in this circumstance. However, this is  
15 a, I think, a good case for not applying IZ plus as the Office of  
16 Planning has recommended that we not apply it. You know, we can.  
17 You know, even though the Office of Attorney General would  
18 discount it, we can rely on the fact that this is going to be a  
19 land disposition from the city government and we all know that  
20 those -- that requires a substantial affordability component in  
21 and of itself.

22           And I don't -- you know, I think the idea that naturally  
23 occurring affordable housing is something that we have to be  
24 protected against. I mean, I think in this particular

1 neighborhood, it's as much of a concern of the neighbors that  
2 there would be market-rate housing and that it not always be just  
3 affordable.

4           In this circumstance, it's going to wind up being an  
5 affordable building but they're not bending over backwards to get  
6 more affordable housing in every single opportunity because there  
7 is so much of the city's affordable housing stock actually is in  
8 Watergate. So there -- I mean, I've heard testimony from  
9 neighborhood leaders that what they want is market-rate housing.  
10 What they want is ownership opportunities and I don't think that -  
11 - I think that this insistence on the part of the OAG is  
12 particularly tone deaf, not to mention the fact that in this case,  
13 we have more than 70 letters of support. There's substantial  
14 community support, the ANC is in support. I mean, it just -- it  
15 doesn't make any sense, so I don't agree with.

16           CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

17           Commissioner Imamura?

18           COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

19           I think Commissioner May articulated the issues quite  
20 well. Certainly, it's an important issue, but don't want to give  
21 it any additional air time and will yield my time to the Vice  
22 Chair Miller.

23           VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Commissioner Imamura and  
24 Commissioner May whose comments -- all of whose comments I agree



1 with. You know, and I always appreciate hearing comments in the  
2 public record. Appreciate the Chairman opening the record at this  
3 late date for professional comments from the Office of Attorney  
4 General, which could have been provided at an earlier date as  
5 Commissioner May said.

6 I asked a question, I'm sure others did as well. It was  
7 discussed as well, and the OP, Office of Planning's presentation  
8 as to what would be the harm in mapping it as an IZ plus since  
9 it's obviously going to far exceed what IZ plus would -- could  
10 produce in terms of affordable housing on this site. Looking at  
11 the OP report, the existing zoning it's 24 units. With IZ plus  
12 it's 42 units.

13 With the Land Disposition Agreement that I think we can  
14 take note of that has already been granted, granted, by the  
15 District government to a developer, there will be a 180 all  
16 affordable unit ranging from 30 percent median family income all  
17 the way up to 80 percent. The majority are at 60 percent and a  
18 neighborhood learning center and space for the ANC 80, which  
19 supports this project, as does all of the neighbors, many, so  
20 many, neighbors who submitted comments into the record in a timely  
21 manner, I would add which we appreciate receiving.

22 So I think that Office of Planning gave a reasonable  
23 response to the question as to what would be the harm in mapping  
24 it as IZ plus since it's already going to provide more than four

1 times the amount of affordable housing that IZ plus provides.  
2 They get a reasonable response, I think, about the  
3 disproportionate level of -- the portion of the share that this  
4 part of the city already has of the affordable housing city-wide  
5 and that it might affect what was the financing or the agreements  
6 that have already been made in terms of the disposition which is  
7 going to provide, as I said, 180 units of all affordable housing  
8 and a great project.

9 So I'm ready to move forward with final action tonight.  
10 Mr. Chairman, thank you for bringing that to our attention.

11 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let me, first of all, thank my  
12 colleagues because everything you all have said tonight I agree  
13 with 100 percent. And as Commissioner May was talking about the  
14 market rate, I was wondering if he was standing by me when I was  
15 at an event. Some of the community folks who we see were getting  
16 on me about always pushing 0 to 30 percent and I thought I was  
17 doing what we needed to do.

18 And Commissioner May, you're exactly right. I'm sure  
19 we've heard it, but they too want some market-rate in the areas,  
20 and they made it clear to me. We weren't talking case-specific.  
21 They were just talking about how I'm always pushing one way and  
22 nobody's against affordable housing. We all want it. We're all  
23 for it. It's the big time. It's crucial, but it's finding that -  
24 - and it dawned on me, and it's ironic that Commissioner May just

1 spoke about that in his comments because that's exactly what the  
2 public, the people who live there, not the ones who live out of  
3 town and come in and write letters and send -- but the people who  
4 live there.

5 I've always said that. The people who live there are  
6 the ones who approach me and they weren't talking about a case.  
7 What they said to me was, "We want some market-rate too. We want  
8 a mixture." So I get it. I understand, and I heard it loud and  
9 clear. I'm not tone deaf. That was one of the ones of the words  
10 that was used. I'm very in tune to it and it's caused me, even  
11 this week, to start rethinking.

12 But when I look at this case, this is ideal and then  
13 everybody is in support of it. The ANC is excited about it a when  
14 I saw the amenities packet, where they do that at because it's  
15 really not required, but it's done. And my hat's off to the  
16 Applicant and all those involved in this case.

17 So I'm not going to muddy up anything. I really  
18 appreciate the way it was articulated in the discussion. I am  
19 ready to move forward as well. I won't belabor the point. I  
20 think the Office of Planning -- we stuck to that. I think I agree  
21 with them. While there are some areas which we need to relook at  
22 and push IZ plus and some other change that we need to do, but I  
23 don't think is applicable and applicable (sic) here. So that's  
24 where I am.

1           But I appreciate all the comments of my colleagues and I  
2 appreciate the community, the people who are most effective, who  
3 live there and who are the ones who are going to endure whatever  
4 decisions are made, and I appreciate the Applicant for working  
5 with the community. Job well done. That's all I'm going to say.

6           Would someone like to make a motion?

7           VICE CHAIR MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I would move that the  
8 Zoning Commission take final action on Case No. 21-17, Congress  
9 Park Community Partners, LLC - Map amendment and Square 5914, it's  
10 a portion of 1351 Alabama Avenue, S.E., changing it from A-1 to  
11 MU-8B and ask for a second?

12           COMMISSIONER MAY: Second.

13           CHAIRMAN HOOD: It's been moved and properly seconded.

14           I would also emphasize the Racial Equity Analysis and  
15 the lens that's been used. I think is very crucial, and I think  
16 this is exactly where we're going. While we have some other  
17 things planned for that, I've never heard from the council and  
18 from community that we really need to come up to speed on how we  
19 exercise that. We have some ideals and we will have some things  
20 coming very soon. So I want the public to know, but I think in  
21 this case, we meet that requirement.

22           So anyway, it's been moved and properly seconded. Any  
23 further discussion?

24           (No response.)

1 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing any, Mr. Barron, would you  
2 do a roll call vote, please?

3 MR. BARRON: Commissioner Miller?

4 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

5 MR. BARRON: Commissioner May?

6 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.

7 MR. BARRON: Commissioner Hood?

8 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.

9 MR. BARRON: Commissioner Imamura?

10 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.

11 MR. BARRON: The vote is 4-0-1 to approve final action.  
12 Third mayoral appointee position vacant, not voting.

13 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Next, we have a hearing action  
14 which is Zoning Commission Case No. 22-03, WCP 1207 H Street, LLC  
15 - Map amendment at Square 1004. We're going to Ms. Crystal  
16 Meyers.

17 MS. MEYERS: Good afternoon, Commissioners.

18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Good afternoon.

19 MS. MEYERS: Okay. Great. All right. So good  
20 afternoon again. I am here to introduce WCP 1207 H Street. It's  
21 map amendment Case 22-03. The subject site is that 1207 H Street,  
22 N.E., which is currently the location of an AutoZone store. Next  
23 slide, please?

24 This amendment would rezone Lot 342 in Square 1004 from

1 NC-14 to NC-15. The site is across the street from NC-17 zone  
2 properties. NC-17 goes up to FAR 4.2 with IZ, so the proposed NC-  
3 15 4.8 FAR with IZ would be character with these neighboring  
4 properties. Next slide, please?

5 Rezoning, the property to NC-15 would allow it up to 65  
6 feet in height, and again it would go up to 4.8 in FAR with  
7 inclusionary zoning. Next slide, please?

8 This amendment is not inconsistent with the  
9 Comprehensive Plan. It is not inconsistent with its Future Land  
10 Use Map designations of medium density residential and medium  
11 density commercial uses. It is also not inconsistent with the  
12 main street mixed-use quarter designation on the Generalized  
13 Policy Map. Next slide, please?

14 Reviewing this map amendment through a racial equity  
15 lens shows the proposed rezoning is for a retail store, so it  
16 would not displace any existing residents. The site is in the  
17 Capitol Hill planning area which has a predominantly white  
18 population. The median cost of housing in this area is higher  
19 than the District's median.

20 According to the 2019 Housing Equity Report, the area  
21 only has 3.5 percent of the District's total number of affordable  
22 housing units. OP recommends IZ plus for this map amendment area  
23 or for this map amendment. The site would have the potential to  
24 provide substantially more affordable housing units than if it

1 were developed by-right under the existing NC-14 zone.

2 As mixed-use zone, it would also encourage  
3 nonresidential uses on the site. This would allow for new transit  
4 oriented jobs to the area and increasing the amount of affordable  
5 housing and jobs to this area would likely allow for more racial  
6 and economic diversity.

7 Another consideration is that there is an environmental  
8 benefit. When the site redevelops, the new development would  
9 comply with today's environmental standards. So in conclusion,  
10 the Office of Planning recommends that the Zoning Commission sit-  
11 down the proposed map amendment for a public hearing. Thank you.

12

13 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Meyers. Report very well  
14 done. I appreciate your report. Let's see if we have any  
15 questions or comments.

16 Commissioner May?

17 COMMISSIONER MAY: I don't have any comments, but I was  
18 really fascinated by that last graphic and I assume that all that  
19 will go into the into the record for the case, and before we have  
20 a hearing I'll be looking at that more closely. But, you know,  
21 other than losing the ever so valuable AutoZone, this all sounds  
22 appropriate. I mean, you know, things change. So thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you.

24 Commissioner Imamura?

1 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2 I don't have any other questions and thank you, Ms.  
3 Meyers, for your report.

4 CHAIRMAN HOOD: And Vice Chair Miller?

5 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

6 Thank you, Mr. Meyers, for your report and for this  
7 recommendation for sit-down. My only question is the  
8 recommendation is that it be rezoned from NC-14 to NC-15 to be  
9 consistent with a Comp Plan which is what we're all about here in  
10 terms of a map amendment.

11 And so I realize the consistency there, but it's at the  
12 low end of the medium density. The council did take action, I  
13 think, with the case. This is a case where took action to --  
14 well, correct me. Well, answer my -- is this a case where they  
15 took action to change the designation from moderate to medium or  
16 it already was (indiscernible)?

17 MS. MEYERS: Yes, you are correct. This site was  
18 changed. The Land Use Map designation was changed to allow for, I  
19 think it was, perhaps neighborhood conservation. I'm just quickly  
20 checking and then it was changed to being mixed designation of  
21 medium density residential and medium density, commercial.

22 So, you know, yes, it is a -- you know what this would  
23 be would be on the lower end, but it is next to I believe it's a  
24 lower density zoning as well. So this would serve as sort of a



1 transition which is why, you know, we thought it would be an  
2 appropriate zone for this location or -- yeah. So next door, you  
3 have the single-family properties so we thought it would be an  
4 appropriate designation.

5 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Right. That's what I wanted to hear  
6 about because there's also -- it's also next door to, or across  
7 the street, or nearby NC-16 and 17 developments, or PUDs, or map  
8 amendments that we've approved that are at a higher, slightly  
9 higher, density and I just wanted to get your rationale for not  
10 recommending the higher density to get more affordable housing to  
11 meet more of the racial equity affordability concerns that your  
12 reports had been addressing, that our decisions have been  
13 addressing in recent months.

14 But given the -- so the transitional aspect with the  
15 single -- with lower density nearby, I can understand, but I'm  
16 just wondering for advertising purposes, was there any value in  
17 advertising at a -- well, what would be the difference between --  
18 I guess it would help me. So NC-15 is 4.8 with inclusionary  
19 zoning, 4.0 FAR, versus the existing zoning is 2.5 FAR with  
20 (indiscernible) inclusionary zoning.

21 I assume it would be higher, and maybe slightly higher  
22 if it was at the next -- if it just included the next NC level,  
23 16. What would be the difference if it was at 16 versus 15? And  
24 I'm just wondering if there's any value in advertising it in the

1 alternative or at the higher level so that I think we could always  
2 go to a lower level in terms of proposed action later on, but in  
3 terms of a proposed -- a hearing, we have to consider all the  
4 options that were -- that might be on the table.

5           So did you consider the 16 or 17 since they are in the  
6 immediate neighborhood as well?

7           MS. MEYERS: Well, two things I just want to give. I  
8 just want to correct something I said a little earlier. So the  
9 previous designation was moderate density residential and low  
10 density commercial. So this would -- you know, the new  
11 designation from moderate to medium density.

12           And the other thing is, this is a -- the owner's  
13 application, not an OP map amendment case so we did not do a  
14 review of the zoning in that respect because this is -- this was  
15 proposed to us and we thought it was an appropriate rezoning. It  
16 matched what the Future Land Use Map is recommending. But, you  
17 know, again, this was proposed by the owner of the property.

18           VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Well, I appreciate that  
19 response, I didn't -- I saw that there is the Petitioner in your  
20 report, but I didn't quite get that you didn't -- had not  
21 evaluated that, but we can get into that at a hearing if we have a  
22 hearing on this, which I support having a hearing on this.

23           Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

24           CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Again, I know that there

1 have already been comments from the racial equity lens. I would  
2 like for the Applicant to really expound on that. It sounds like  
3 we are -- I believe we will set this down and I want to thank Ms.  
4 Meyers for her report. I have no questions for -- of you, Ms.  
5 Meyers, but I do would like -- I do want the Applicant to come  
6 prepared to talk about the racial equity component of this case.

7 So anyway, Commissioners, moving forward again. Thank  
8 you, Ms. Meyers. Again moving forward, I think we have a request  
9 to set this case down and I think is right for us to sit-down and  
10 have a hearing. So with all that, unless there's an objection, I  
11 would move that we sit-down Zoning Commission Case No. 22-03, WPC  
12 1207 H Street, LLC - Map amendment at Square 1004.

13 And let me make sure I've covered everything. Okay. All  
14 right. And ask for a second?

15 COMMISSIONER MAY: Second.

16 I'm sorry, did you say setting down as a contested case?

17 CHAIRMAN HOOD: I will add that to it. Thank you.  
18 Setting down as a contested case. Thank you for that. I'll take  
19 that -- well, it's not a -- I learned last night I can't say  
20 "friendly," but I'll take that amendment. It's not friendly. At  
21 least that's what I learned last night at 10 o'clock. But anyway,  
22 I will take that amendment that we set this down as a contested  
23 case.

24 Is there, Commissioner May, a second, I believe?

1 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.

2 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any further discussion?

3 (No response.)

4 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So with that, Mr. Barron, could  
5 you do a roll call vote, please?

6 MR. BARRON: Commissioner Hood?

7 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.

8 MR. BARRON: Commissioner May?

9 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.

10 MR. BARRON: Commissioner Miller?

11 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

12 MR. BARRON: Commissioner Imamura?

13 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.

14 MR. BARRON: The vote is 4-0-1 to sit-down as a  
15 contested case. Third mayoral appointee position vacant, so no  
16 vote was taken.

17

18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Meyers, again.

19 So, and let me digress. In a meeting I was in last  
20 night, they said that you can't make a -- there's no such thing as  
21 a friendly amendment, so -- one of you scholars, and then they had  
22 -- they told me, they said, "Well, you do this." And I said, "I  
23 always heard friendly amendment," but apparently there's no such  
24 thing as a friendly amendment. I don't know. I digress, so

1 | forgive me.

2 |           All right. Well -- and see, that's what I hate,  
3 | digressing. Now, I don't know where I am. Let me see. Okay.  
4 | Here I am. Zoning Commission Case No. 22-04. This is the Hanover  
5 | R.S. Limited Partnership - Consolidated PUD and related map  
6 | amendment at 3841 and 3846.

7 |           Ms. Meyers again?

8 |           MS. MEYERS: Hello, again.

9 |           CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh. Okay. Go right ahead.

10 |           MS. MEYERS: Good afternoon, Commissioners. I am -- as  
11 | I said earlier, I am Crystal Meyers for the Office of Planning for  
12 | Case 22-04. I am sitting in for Anne Fothergill who is our  
13 | project manager on this case. Next slide, please?

14 |           On balance, the Office of Planning finds that the  
15 | proposed PUD and related map amendment are not inconsistent with  
16 | the Comprehensive Plan's elements and maps and are recommending  
17 | that the Commission set it down for public hearing. The Applicant  
18 | proposes a mixed-use development to be located south of Franklin  
19 | Street, N.E. to the east of the train tracks and just north of  
20 | Rhode Island Avenue Metro Station. The property is currently in  
21 | Zoned PDR-2 and is proposed to be rezoned MU-6A and MU-4 at the  
22 | northeast portion of the site.

23 |           The development would have 723 residential units, with a  
24 | mix of studios, one, two, and three-bedroom units. Fifteen

1 percent of the residential Gross Floor Area would be dedicated to  
2 affordable units, ranging from 30 to 80 percent MFI. There would  
3 be 18,000 square feet of PDR maker space on the ground floor of  
4 the Phase 2B and Phase 2A buildings along Reed Street and Franklin  
5 Street.

6 The project involves realignment of the Reed Street  
7 alley and the alley would be built to street standards. The  
8 development would be LEED gold and sustainable features including  
9 solar panels and green roofs would be included. Next slide,  
10 please?

11 In terms of the Comprehensive Plan maps and policy, the  
12 Future Land Use Map is striped for mixed-use with a PDR stripe for  
13 the whole site and high density residential to the west of the  
14 realigned Reed Street alley and moderate density residential on  
15 the northeast side of the site. The proposed MU-6A and MU-4 zones  
16 are not inconsistent with these designations.

17 The Generalized Policy Map shows the site in a  
18 neighborhood conservation area, and that designation does not  
19 preclude development, particularly to address city-wide housing  
20 needs. Without the proposed rezoning residential uses could not  
21 be located here. The proposed development would bring new  
22 housing, including affordable housing and makerspace retail uses  
23 to Franklin and Reed Streets northeast.

24 The Comprehensive Plan has many policies that support

1 additional housing and housing near transit. And while there may  
2 be conflicting policies related to retention and use of  
3 industrially zoned, the land on balance is mixed-use development  
4 with significant affordable housing in this location would  
5 generally not be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan's  
6 policies, as well as the guidance of a Small Area Plan. Next  
7 slide, please?

8           When viewed through an equity lens, according to the  
9 2019 Housing Equity Report and the State Data Center, the upper  
10 northeast planning area has a majority non-white population. The  
11 District's housing goal for this area is to create 6,900 new  
12 housing units and 1,350 new affordable housing units. The project  
13 would not displace any existing residents and would provide  
14 approximately 723 units of new housing with 15 percent of the  
15 units set aside as affordable housing. Development also would  
16 provide maker and retail jobs, access to transit, and  
17 environmental benefits.

18           In conclusion, OP recommends that the PUD be set down  
19 for a public hearing, and I'm happy for -- to take on any  
20 additional questions you may have. Thank you.

21           CHAIRMAN HOOD: Great. Thank you again, Ms. Meyers.

22           Let's see if we have any questions and comments.

23           Commissioner May?

24           COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah, I do. Well, questions,

1 | comments; I don't know. We'll see how it goes. First of all, in  
2 | many ways, this PUD for where we are right now, the sit-down  
3 | consideration, I think, is pretty well-developed. I mean, there's  
4 | a lot to this with the roadway reconfiguration and the complexity  
5 | of this overall PUD and the -- what seems to be the extent of  
6 | community outreach that's already occurred, which is reflected in  
7 | the Community Benefits Agreement and, you know, the IZ  
8 | calculation. And even then having, you know, receiving a  
9 | Construction Management Plan right up front, I mean, I think those  
10 | are all pretty positive things.

11 |           I will make note of the areas of additional information  
12 | that the Office of Planning has requested. So that's an area  
13 | where maybe it's not, you know, it's really does need some more  
14 | work. Those are all things that -- I mean, it seems like it's a  
15 | lot of calculations and a lot of, you know, sort of smaller scale  
16 | planning of, you know, where the IZ units will be, the breakdowns,  
17 | the number of bedrooms, the number of unit units by number of  
18 | bedrooms, and some of the other details about the makerspace and  
19 | signage, and so on.

20 |           So I mean, it's still a lot of stuff that I think has to  
21 | be done and I noted the OP's objection to the requested  
22 | flexibility of the number of IZ units, and I would agree with  
23 | that. We don't want anything to be reduced as a result of further  
24 | development of the design.



1           My own thoughts on this are, I think that the -- when it  
2 comes time for the hearing, I'll be very interested in  
3 understanding the -- I guess, the true impact of this on the  
4 adjacent neighborhood. And so even though this site, I mean, it's  
5 we have this is the -- you know, it's within a neighborhood  
6 conservation area. There's not really much about these properties  
7 in themselves that should be conserved, but it does mean that  
8 whatever is done on this site has to be has to be -- has to  
9 respect the surrounding neighborhood and the neighborhood  
10 immediately to the east is, you know, a row house neighborhood.

11           And so I'm very concerned that, you know, the folks who  
12 are most immediately impacted by this are well informed. Maybe  
13 that has happened. Maybe there's more outreach that's needed, but  
14 I'm concerned that that will happen. I do feel like we are not  
15 necessarily seeing the entire picture.

16           And so one of the things that I think we like to see in  
17 places like this, where we have a large development going in in  
18 proximity to our lower rise buildings or houses is getting some  
19 bird's eye views, some three-dimensional views from above so that  
20 we can see the relationship of the building heights and the extent  
21 to which this much larger building will -- you know, how it will  
22 interact with the row houses that are really not that far away, at  
23 least at certain points? So I think that would be helpful.

24           I am curious. Do you know what the type of

1 construction; is this going to be stick-built on top of concrete  
2 podium or is it all concrete? You know?

3 MS. MEYERS: I don't know off the top of my head, but we  
4 would definitely, you know --

5 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah.

6 MS. MEYERS: -- have that for you later.

7 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah, I expect that'll become part  
8 of the discussion. I was just curious about that because it's a  
9 pretty massive and substantial building. But sometimes when you  
10 get building -- you know, a building like this is done with the  
11 stick-built on podium, you lose some of the -- what's the right  
12 word for it? I don't know, but kind of the sturdiness of it.

13 It looks -- you know, sometimes buildings built like  
14 that wind up looking like they're just, you know, a -- kind of a  
15 box and you don't have much variation in the depth of the facade.  
16 You don't have the balconies and things like that you would get in  
17 a concrete building, so I think it's important.

18 And I don't even know, constructionally (sic), why  
19 that's really that important because I've seen some good  
20 conversions of that, some not so good. I think that's the bigger  
21 concern, is making sure that there is the kind of depth of facade  
22 and the sophistication and the development of it.

23 It seems, you know, just the images that we've seen so  
24 far, I think, are pretty promising, but I am concerned that, you

1 know, that it would be a really good, well-built building and one  
2 that's -- that looks solid like many of the other developments  
3 that have occurred in the area that I think we've seen images of.

4           Let's see. I am -- I did see discussion of the  
5 building, the measuring point, but I'm still a little bit confused  
6 by it. So I think some further explanation of that when it comes  
7 time at a hearing and understanding where the building is drawing  
8 its height from. Because if I saw a reference to Franklin Street  
9 has a building that measuring point.

10           Maybe that only applies for the phase -- the separate  
11 section -- now I've lost my sense of what's happening in which  
12 phase, but that little leg further to the east on the east side of  
13 Reed Street. Maybe that's the one that's measured from Franklin  
14 and the other is mentioned. It's not clear to me where it's  
15 measured from because the -- that height is like 137 feet, but  
16 that's not the height at Franklin. It's like the height of the  
17 mid-point of part of the facade on Reed and Reed's down the  
18 street. Reed's an alley.

19           So it's -- I'm just -- some video was on and the  
20 material that I read prove it. I didn't quite observe it so some  
21 explanation of that because you do wind up with a circumstance  
22 where, you know, there's like a story-and-a-half that's below the  
23 building height measuring point when you get to the southern  
24 portion of that and I think people need to understand how that

1 happens, how it is that we can call this an 84-foot building when  
2 it actually looks like it's a 100-foot building. So --

3 MS. MEYERS: Okay. We'll definitely provide more  
4 clarification on that.

5 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah. Okay. I appreciate that. I  
6 think that's it for my questions. I guess there is one other  
7 question which reminds me of a previous case from earlier today.  
8 The density that's actually being proposed under this PUD is about  
9 3.5 FAR below what the zone would allow if we approved the PUD and  
10 I'm wondering why that is the case.

11 I mean, if this is in an -- if this zone is appropriate  
12 and that -- and, you know, and the FAR is as much as, I don't  
13 know, 8.5 or something like that with IZ is appropriate, why are  
14 they only building up to like 5.5.? Do you have a sense of that?

15 MS. MEYERS: They may have, let's see. I think I'm  
16 hearing that it may be the result of conversations with the ANC --

17 COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay.

18 MS. MEYERS: -- but I don't -- you know, we'd have to  
19 follow up with you to give me more details, but that's my  
20 understanding at this point.

21 COMMISSIONER MAY: Right. So I mean, you know,  
22 sometimes we wind up in this circumstance where one of the  
23 attributes of a particular zone is what you are really striving  
24 for. So maybe it's just the -- you know, in order to get to the

1 height that they want, they have to go to this higher density  
2 zone, which allows much more FAR, but you're not going to take  
3 advantage of the FAR.

4           So maybe it's a case like that, but it also -- I mean, I  
5 don't know. I mean, is this is this really actually the right  
6 zone or not? Should it be a lower zone or should it be a bigger  
7 building, right? That's sort of the question. And I think  
8 understanding that and answering that I think would be  
9 enlightening. So that's it.

10           MS. MEYERS: We understand.

11           COMMISSIONER MAY: I don't have any other questions.

12           MS. MEYERS: We understand.

13           COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. Thank you.

14           CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

15           Commissioner Imamura?

16           COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

17           I think Commissioner May has raised a lot of important  
18 issues or important points and made some really good comments.  
19 Particularly, you know, let me go back to the bird's eye view and  
20 those perspectives. That'll be really important to see. This is  
21 certainly a substantial or a significant development complex, so  
22 there's going to be a lot of questions. So the Applicant, I'm  
23 sure, should and will be ready for our set of questions, detailed  
24 set of questions.

1 I know that Commissioner May touched on a couple of  
2 points that I had thought about too as well as, you know, some of  
3 the additional information that OP had requested from the  
4 Applicant, but I'd like to give you an opportunity, Ms. Meyers, to  
5 make -- emphasize one of your points and wanted to ask if you  
6 could elaborate a little bit more or go into little more detail  
7 about the argument that justifies the upzoning and the loss of the  
8 PDR space in a neighborhood conservation area.

9 You know, where I read that to mean sort of changes are  
10 modest in scale and, you know, new development should be  
11 compatible with sort of an existing character of the area, but I  
12 think your report had provided some additional insight about that  
13 and I wanted to give you an opportunity to reemphasize that point.

14 MS. MEYERS: Well, the neighborhood conservation  
15 designation, it is supportive of additional housing so it would --  
16 the proposal would include that. It would provide additional  
17 housing and I believe, just scrolling through to the actual  
18 language of the neighborhood conservation designation, but I  
19 believe it specifically says that housing -- to meet the housing  
20 or District's housing needs, is an appropriate new type of  
21 development in that in that designation. Just, I guess,  
22 paraphrasing. So it would not be inconsistent with that  
23 designation.

24 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Terrific. I wanted just have

1 that on the record to reconcile those sort of inconsistencies, and  
2 that it is not inconsistent. So with that, just thank you for  
3 your report and recommendation for set down and (indiscernible) my  
4 time to Vice Chair Miller.

5 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Commissioner Imamura and  
6 Commissioner May for your comments, all of which I can again say I  
7 concur with. And thank you, Ms. Meyers, for your set down report,  
8 your 32-page set down report, which has a racial equity analysis  
9 beginning on Page 23.

10 I would note for those who are interested in seeing it,  
11 and we will discuss that more at a hearing which I support setting  
12 down -- setting this down for a public hearing. This is a big  
13 project. Seven hundred and twenty-three housing units and 105 or  
14 110 of which 15 percent, I think, would be proposed to be  
15 affordable at all levels of affordability; 30, 50, 60 and 80  
16 percent AMI, median family income.

17 So that's all commendable and the LEED gold is  
18 commendable. The environmental LEED gold is commendable. The  
19 community benefits and the outreach that's been done so far is  
20 commendable. So I am supportive of a set-down. I agree with all  
21 of the recommendations for -- I mean, the requests for additional  
22 information that Office of Planning has requested of the Applicant  
23 at the time we get to a public hearing, if we get to a public  
24 hearing, including as Commissioner Imamura and May had pointed

1 out, that something from the -- more -- maybe more from the  
2 Applicant rather than OP, but both, as to how the benefits of this  
3 project, particularly the housing and affordable housing benefits  
4 balance against the -- both the conservation designation area for  
5 the site and the moderate density residential for just that  
6 northeastern portion of the site, which is adjacent to moderate  
7 density residential.

8           And there is a -- the recommendation is for a split zone  
9 and that lower density zone with setbacks and lower heights and is  
10 adjacent to that lower density zone, so I appreciate all of that,  
11 but I think we just need a better or just more comprehensive  
12 articulation of that balancing out the Comprehensive Plan policies  
13 so that we can justify this very worthwhile project going forward.

14           Of the requests that you've made, I would just emphasize  
15 that I also -- that I particularly support the request for  
16 additional three bedrooms, both at -- I don't know how many are  
17 being proposed market-rate. I saw that at least two would be  
18 affordable. That's commendable that there are three bedrooms, but  
19 I think a 723-unit project. We can get more than two affordable  
20 three bedroom units and have that -- those larger sized units both  
21 for market-rate, market-rate is important too, and so I want to  
22 see that breakdown of market-rate and affordable for all the sizes  
23 of the units.

24           I'm always interested in balconies, as you know and I



1 see there in the renderings that we have thus far, that there are  
2 balconies. I can't see that they're all usable. I see some are  
3 recessed and they look more usable, although that has its  
4 drawbacks because then there's light and light that gets affected  
5 into those units. But I guess I want more information on the  
6 percentage of units that are balconies that the outdoor space for  
7 residents is so important, particularly private outdoor space, as  
8 we've discovered during this wonderful two-year pandemic period.  
9 So I want to see that and I think that's about it. I guess that's  
10 about it.

11 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

12 CHAIRMAN HOOD: I thank my colleagues for their  
13 comments. I don't have many, but I think Commissioner May and  
14 others may have alluded. Continue to work -- I'm saying this to  
15 the Applicant not Ms. Meyers. I'm hoping they will continue to  
16 work with the community, especially the ANC Commission.

17 I'm familiar with the ANC Commission. They work very  
18 hard as all of our commissioners do so I'm looking forward to  
19 seeing more of their comments and see where they are, but I would  
20 ask them to continue to make sure that if -- whatever that the ANC  
21 and the community have are well-versed and well -- get all the  
22 information they need so they can make whatever decision they're  
23 going to make.

24 I didn't look at a whole lot of notes of what the ANC

1 has done. I don't even think I saw it, but either way, looking  
2 forward to having a hearing and a discussion on this. The racial  
3 equity lens, the same thing I said in the last case, same thing  
4 applies here. And a lot of people, the Office of Planning I know  
5 does a great job at doing -- starting off right by the racial  
6 equity lens, and I appreciate the Office of Planning doing this  
7 because we asked them to start doing it in their reports.

8 But I want to see Applicant's do more than just -- I'm  
9 not going to say copy it, but really say, "Well, oh, the Office of  
10 Planning covered it." So I want Applicants to start covering it  
11 too. I think at some point we're probably going to put in our  
12 regulations if the Commission agrees. But right now it's already  
13 in the Comp Plan, so we have to deal with it and that's a big  
14 piece in the city and actually, it's a big piece abroad, all over.  
15 So let's get that down packed. That's the goal. That's the  
16 striving point at least for myself and I'm sure others as well.

17 So anyway, I don't have any questions for you, Ms.  
18 Meyers. Again, thank you for your report.

19 Commissioner May, yes?

20 COMMISSIONER MAY: There was one thing I forgot, which  
21 is it would be helpful in a circumstance like this where we're  
22 going from, you know, essentially PR use across the site to was  
23 higher density residential use to understand how that would  
24 compare to an IZ plus map amendment.

1 I understand a PUD is not the same as an IZ plus map  
2 amendment and we can't expect the same percentages, but I would  
3 just be curious to understand that because it is a reasonable  
4 scale for trying to understand what's the appropriate level of  
5 affordable housing in a development when you're going from, you  
6 know, this much potential development to this much potential  
7 development. It's just it's a way of looking at it and getting  
8 some sort of comparison on it.

9 So I would appreciate understanding that, you know, not  
10 maybe exactly the way it's done for IZ plus map amendment cases,  
11 but just to get something that's some sense of the comparable that  
12 would be.

13 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I would echo that. Thank you. Thank  
14 you for bringing that up, Commissioner May. I meant to bring that  
15 up as well. And the other one I meant to bring up on -- is OP's  
16 point on the PDR space. There's significant industrial use on  
17 this -- PDR used on the site. There's 18,000 that's being  
18 proposed as part of this. I think 18,000 is the number of square  
19 feet, I might have that wrong, being proposed as part of this  
20 project, but -- makerspace, makerspace.

21 But OP's recommendations on working -- or the Applicant  
22 working with OP on really making that makerspace, that PDR space,  
23 usable and maybe because it's such a large site, it may be that  
24 you can put in spaces that aren't normally mixing in with

1 residential or not. But the loss of industrial zoning is a city-  
2 wide phenomenon, a nationwide phenomenon, and we need to  
3 accommodate those kinds of uses. And so to the extent they can be  
4 a kind of accommodated, increased, pursuant to OP's  
5 recommendations, I would encourage the applicant to bring that  
6 forward at the public hearing.

7 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

8 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you all.

9 Any further comments, or questions, or?

10 (No response.)

11 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right. So we're good. Thank  
12 you, Ms. Meyers again.

13 This seems -- would someone like to make a motion? I  
14 think this is ready to be set down from what I hear from the  
15 discussion.

16 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Mr. Chairman -

17 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Sure.

18 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: -- I move that the Zoning  
19 Commission set down Case No. 22-04, Hanover R.S. Limited  
20 Partnership - Consolidated PUD and related map amendment, Squares  
21 3841 and 3846.

22 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I'll second the motion.

23 It's been moved and properly seconded.

24 Any further discussion?

1 (No response.)

2 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing any, Mr. Barron, would you  
3 please do a roll call vote?

4 MR. BARRON: Commissioner Imamura?

5 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.

6 MR. BARRON: Commissioner Hood?

7 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.

8 MR. BARRON: Commissioner Miller?

9 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

10 MR. BARRON: Commissioner May?

11 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.

12 MR. BARRON: The vote is 4-0-1 to set down the case as a  
13 contested case. Third mayoral appointee position vacant.

14 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Barron, do we have anything else  
15 before us?

16 MR. BARRON: No, we do not, sir.

17 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I would like for --

18 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Mr. Chair?

19 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes?

20 VICE CHAIR MILLER: On the issue of friendly amendments,  
21 which you brought up earlier --

22 CHAIRMAN HOOD: You're going to give me some more?

23 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Well --

24 CHAIRMAN HOOD: I have enough of that last night.

1           VICE CHAIR MILLER:  --  I'll  give  you  some  more  
2  unsolicited  advice  since  you're  used  to  getting  unsolicited  
3  advice.  In  my  experience,  people  offer  it  and  if  the  maker  of  the  
4  motion  incorporates  that  amendment  as  part  of  their  motion,  which  
5  the  person  who's  offering  it  thinks  the  maker  will,  that's  what's  
6  considered  --  it  becomes  part  of  the  maker's  motion,  the  original  
7  maker's  motion.  They  offer  the  friendly  amendment  and  you  make  it  
8  part  of  yours  as  your  main  motion.  I  mean,  that's  my  experience  
9  at  27  years  of  the  council  for  whatever  it's  worth.

10           CHAIRMAN HOOD:  So,  Vice  Chair,  now  that  you  brought  
11  that  up,  now  we're  going  to  be  another  five  minutes.  But  the  
12  thing  about  it  was,  is  that  I  agree  with  you;  friendly  amendment.  
13  But  I  was  told  last  night,  and  I've  got  to  go  back  and  look  at  
14  Robert's  rules,  what  I  was  told  last  night,  there's  no  such  thing  
15  as  a  friendly  amendment.  I  mean  --

16           VICE CHAIR MILLER:  If  the  maker  incorporates  it  as  part  
17  of  their  motion,  that's  pretty  friendly.

18           CHAIRMAN HOOD:  I  thought  --  I've  also  said  "I  have  a  
19  friendly  amendment."  I've  used  that  over  the  years  because  --  
20  maybe  I  learned  it  from  the  council,  but  I  use  that  all  the  time.  
21  So  last  night  I'm  told  there's  no  such  thing  as  a  friendly  
22  amendment.

23           So  Archie,  is  it  a  friendly  amendment?

24           VICE CHAIR MILLER:  Archie,  is  it  friendly?  Say  hi.

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is it friendly?

2 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Hello, Archie.

3 COMMISSIONER MAY: Archie is friendly.

4 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Just woke up from his nap --

5 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh. Okay. He woke up just -- if he  
6 listens to us --

7 VICE CHAIR MILLER: -- so he doesn't have a lot to say.

8 CHAIRMAN HOOD: -- he'll go back to sleep.

9 VICE CHAIR MILLER: You should have seen him three hours  
10 ago.

11 CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. So before we go, I would  
12 like to bring up Ms. Lovick and Mr. Lui if they're available.

13 Ms. Lovick?

14 What I want to do is cover, and this is our meeting.  
15 What I want to do is publicly thank our Office of Zoning Legal  
16 Division because I've heard -- I'm in the community and I hear it.  
17 I appreciate the work you all have done to get us caught up on our  
18 orders. I am hearing it from residents, I'm hearing from  
19 Applicants, I'm hearing it from everyone. So I just want to know  
20 what work you all have done to bring us up to speed, makes --  
21 while it makes us look good like we're really on the ball, you all  
22 are the heroes.

23 So I wanted to say that and if you could pass it on to  
24 all your other colleagues as well. I know that you all came into

1 something that you -- that we were behind. And I'm not slighting  
2 anybody because everybody has different ways, but what I am doing  
3 is thanking you all publicly because I also heard that as well.

4           You know, when you're in the neighborhood like I am, you  
5 hear a lot of -- you hear a lot of good things. You hear a lot of  
6 things that are maybe not so good and you try to correct them.  
7 But I wanted to bring that to you all's attention. I wanted to  
8 say publicly, so I appreciate all the work you all do and it does  
9 not go unnoticed on the residents of the city.

10           So on behalf of all of them, thank you all for what  
11 you're doing and if you can take it back to your other colleagues  
12 as well.

13           Okay. So with that, anybody have any other additional  
14 comments and questions?

15           COMMISSIONER MAY: Well, yeah. On the agenda didn't we  
16 have a -- are we going to get any -- an OP status reporter or is  
17 there no status report today?

18           CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well, Ms. Steingasser?

19           Mr. Lawson?

20           I was going to skip that.

21           COMMISSIONER MAY: Well, I saw them here so that's what  
22 reminded me.

23           CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, maybe we do have a report. Maybe I  
24 missed something



1 MS. STEINGASSER: We had not planned on giving a formal  
2 update report. We will be giving one in -- next month in April  
3 with -- which we've done several months, like three months, back  
4 where we give you the sheet of all the pending cases, then the  
5 statuses then as when we'll be bringing them forward.

6 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

7 MS. STEINGASSER: Is that --

8 COMMISSIONER MAY: Sounds good.

9 MS. STEINGASSER: -- sufficient? Okay.

10 COMMISSIONER MAY: I just --

11 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yeah. Okay. So --

12 COMMISSIONER MAY: I was just looking at the agenda and  
13 it's an agenda item and I just like hate to skip over the Office  
14 of Planning if Ms. Steingasser had something to say.

15 MS. STEINGASSER: No. We appreciate that, but not  
16 tonight.

17 COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay.

18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So with that, let me -- Mr.  
19 Barron, you're going to have to make sure I'm correct because I  
20 don't want people to come back the wrong night. The Zoning  
21 Commission is not meeting again until April 11th, 2022, and that  
22 meeting is Zoning Commission -- well, one second. What did I say?  
23 April 11th. Right. That's correct.

24 Zoning Commission Case No. 21-22, this is from the

1 Office of the Attorney General for the District of Columbia. It  
2 says OAG's proposed tax amendment with incentivize the creation of  
3 affordable housing. That's what that topic is going to be. I'm  
4 looking forward to that night because that's what we've been  
5 talking about.

6 So with that, does anybody have anything else? And  
7 again, we're going to be on these same platforms and we start at 4  
8 p.m.

9 Anything else anybody?

10 (No response.)

11 CHAIRMAN HOOD: So with that, I want to thank you for  
12 your participation in the meeting tonight and with that, you all  
13 have a great time until we see each other again. Goodnight  
14 everyone.

15 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at  
16 4:56 p.m.)

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: 03/31/22

Place: Teleconference

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

---

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