GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING 1226 th MEETING SESSION (6 $^{\rm th}$ of 2007)

+ + + + +

MONDAY

MARCH 12, 2007

+ + + + +

The Public Meeting of the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened in Room 220 South, 441 4th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20001, pursuant to notice, at 6:30 p.m., Carol J. Mitten, Chairperson, presiding.

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

CAROL J. MITTEN Chairperson
ANTHONY J. HOOD Vice-Chairperson
GREGORY JEFFRIES Commissioner
JOHN PARSONS Commissioner (NPS)
MICHAEL G. TURNBULL Commissioner

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

SHARON S. SCHELLIN Secretary
DONNA HANOUSEK Zoning Specialist
ESTHER BUSHMAN General Counsel

NEAL R. GROSS

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

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

HARRIET TREGONIG
MAXINE BROWN-ROBERTS
STEVE COCHRAN
JOEL LAWSON
TRAVIS BARKER
JENNIFER STEINGASSER
KAREN THOMAS
DOUGLAS WOODS

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL:

ALAN BERGSTEIN, ESQ.

This transcript constitutes the minutes from the Public Meeting held on March 12, 2007.

C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

AGENDA ITEM

| | PAGE |
|---|----------|
| CALL TO ORDER: | |
| Chairperson Mitten | 4 |
| Z.C. CASE NO. 03-12D/03-13D: | 5 |
| Z.C. CASE NO. 07-01: | 10 15 |
| VOIE ON MOTION TO SET DOWN | 13 |
| Z.C. CASE NO. 07-05: | 16 19 |
| Z.C. CASE NO. 05-38: | 20 |
| VOTE ON MOTION TO APPROVE: | 39 |
| VOTE TO REOPEN THE RECORD: | 41 |
| | |
| Z.C. CASE NO. 05-42: | 42 |
| Z.C. CASE NO. 04-24A: | 61 |
| VOTE ON MOTION TO APPROVE: | 68 |
| Z C CACE NO OF 04: | 69 |
| Z.C. CASE NO. 95-04: VOTE ON MOTION TO APPROVE TECHNICAL | 69 |
| CORRECTION: | 69 |
| Z.C. CASE NOS. 06-11 and 06-12: | 70 |
| VOTE ON MOTION TO APPROVE FOR FINAL | |
| ACTION IN CASE NO. 06-12, AND TO APPROVE | |
| THE CAMPUS PLAN IN CASE NO. 06-11: | 125 |
| VOTE TO REOPEN THE RECORD: VOTE TO TAKE SUA SPONTE REVIEW | 129 |
| OF BZA CASE NUMBER 17553: | 141 |
| VOTE TO STAY ORDER: | 142 |
| VOTE TO APPROVE MINUTES FROM | |
| JANUARY 8 AND JANUARY 17, 2007: | 146 |
| OFFICE OF PLANNING REPORT: | 147 |
| ADJOURN: | |
| Chairperson Mitten | 151 |

NEAL R. GROSS

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

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

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN:

2007, public meeting of the Zoning Commission

joining me this evening are Vice Chairman

Anthony Hood, and Commissioners Mike Turnbull,

ladies and gentlemen.

of the District of Columbia.

name

2

1

(6:48 p.m.)

Good evening,

This is the March 12,

specifically request

So that's to save

is Carol Mitten,

Copies of our meeting agenda are

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

available to you, and they're in the wall bin by the door.

I'd just like to remind folks that we don't take any public testimony at our

unless

someone to come forward.

John Parsons, and Greg Jeffries.

I'd like to remind you that we're being recorded by the Court Reporter, and we're also being webcast live, so I ask you to

anyone a trip to the table when they're not

we

NEAL R. GROSS

meetings

invited.

refrain from making any disruptive noises in the hearing room, so as not to disrupt the proceedings. And I'd ask you to turn off your beepers and cell phones for the same reason.

All right. Mrs. Schellin, any preliminary matters?

SECRETARY SCHELLIN: No.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Then, the only thing that I want to change on the agenda is that we will put the first item under Proposed Action, which is Case Number 06-33, on the agenda of a Special Meeting, the date for which is to be determined. But we had some late submissions, and we need a little bit more time to digest that.

So with that one change, then we will move to the consent calendar item, which is in Case Number 03-12D and 03-13D, which is the Capper/Carrollsburg series of PUDs that we have.

Mrs. Schellin, did you want to tee

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that up for us?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

SECRETARY SCHELLIN: Yes. This is a request for a minor modification from the The Office of Planning has filed a applicant. report, and since that report was filed we also received another letter from the applicant trying to clarify some issues. But it's my understanding that the Office of Planning stands by their earlier submission that they would like for it to go forward with a hearing.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. And I should just note that I skipped over the minutes and the status report from the Office of Planning. But since we have a fairly full agenda, we'll take those up at the end.

So, first, are there any questions for the Office of Planning before we proceed?

And is there a concern about this being on the consent calendar? Mr. Hood, did you --

VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: No. You asked were there any questions for the Office

| 1 | of Planning. |
|----|--|
| 2 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes. Did you |
| 3 | have any questions? |
| 4 | VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: On this |
| 5 | first, we Madam Chair, let me just I'm |
| 6 | trying a procedural matter, trying to |
| 7 | remember. We need to decide whether it's |
| 8 | properly before us on the consent calendar |
| 9 | first, right? |
| 10 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes. And I |
| 11 | just want to remind folks that all it takes is |
| 12 | one Commission to decide that it's not |
| 13 | appropriate for the consent calendar and it |
| 14 | comes off. |
| 15 | VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Oh. Well, |
| 16 | maybe I'd better be quiet for a few moments, |
| 17 | because I think it's before us properly. |
| 18 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Is |
| 19 | there any concern about this item being a |
| 20 | minor modification on the consent calendar, |
| 21 | which is a concern of the Office of Planning? |
| 22 | VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Well, I |

guess I will ask the Office of Planning, and receiving their report I had a chance to glance over it, basically, what's going to come out of this -- saying that we're going to have a hearing? What's going to come out of it? Why is it just not simple enough to know that the applicant has said that they've already satisfied the requirement for the first senior building.

The second senior building has not been done apparently, and they don't have the demand for the second senior building. But seniors who were not able to get in the first senior building have first opt to be able to get into the second senior building. So I guess, what is the significance of having another hearing on this?

MS. STEINGASSER: Well, it's not necessarily that we are interested in holding another hearing. We'd like to have time to analyze what the proposal means. Seniors have different parking standards, and we're not

NEAL R. GROSS

| 1 | aware of what that does to the parking ratio |
|----|--|
| 2 | of the building and the site. |
| 3 | The two senior buildings were |
| 4 | proffered together as part of the overall |
| 5 | housing mix, and we want to make sure we |
| 6 | understand what that does to the housing mix |
| 7 | collectively on the site. And we just want to |
| 8 | be able to meet with the Housing Authority |
| 9 | prior to action being taken, and at least |
| 10 | discuss that and figure out what the |
| 11 | implications are to the PUD as a whole. |
| 12 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So for the |
| 13 | moment, you are really asking us to defer |
| 14 | consideration of this at all, because you may |
| 15 | not be recommending a hearing. |
| 16 | MS. STEINGASSER: We may not. We |
| 17 | did not get an advance copy, so we were unable |
| 18 | to really analyze the |
| 19 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So you didn't |
| 20 | get this on the 26th of February? |
| 21 | MS. STEINGASSER: No. |
| 22 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Why |

don't we do this, then -- put that on agenda for our special public meeting on the 26th, I believe it is, of March. And we'll take up whether or not -- if you all think you can have it analyzed by then, then it may actually be -- you may be comfortable as a consent calendar item. If not, we'll deal with whatever concerns you raise at that time, and make that decision. Okay, great. Thanks. we'll defer that until the 26th. Okay.

So for now

Under Hearing Act, the first item is Zoning Commission Case Number 07-01, which is a map amendment for the property at 208 Massachusetts Avenue, N.E. And we have a new face.

Good evening, Madam MR. WOODS: Chair, members of the Commission. My name is Douglas Woods. I'm with the Office Planning.

The Office of Planning recommends setdown the proposed map amendment on

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

| 1 | change the zoning for the back portion of the |
|----|--|
| 2 | property located at 208 Massachusetts Avenue, |
| 3 | N.E. to CAPCHC C-2-A. The property is |
| 4 | improved with an eight-story building, which |
| 5 | was constructed in 1929. The back portion of |
| 6 | the property is in the R-4 zoning district, |
| 7 | but most of the property, approximately three- |
| 8 | quarters of the site, is in the C-2-A |
| 9 | district. |
| 10 | The proposed map amendment would |
| 11 | allow for the zoning to be consistent with the |
| 12 | comprehensive plan as amended. |
| 13 | This concludes our testimony, and |
| 14 | OP is available for questions. |
| 15 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. |
| 16 | Any questions for Mr. Woods? Any questions |
| 17 | from the Commission for Mr. Woods? |
| 18 | (No response.) |
| 19 | Have you, in making this |
| 20 | recommendation, given thought to the fact that |
| 21 | Lot 849, which is located at 214 Massachusetts |

Avenue -- and I, frankly, don't know what is

on page 3 of your report it shows that that is also a split zone lot. And I think that it -- it's probably in the same sort of abstract extension of the generalized land use map that exists that you -- that would apply if you apply a soft edge to the subject property in this case, the Lot 3. But I'm wondering if you gave any thought, since we have a similar condition at Lot 849.

MR. WOODS: That did not enter into the analysis, simply because in the amended comprehensive plan this particular site, 208 Massachusetts Avenue -- let's see here. Oh, actually, it did. It states Massachusetts Avenue between Union Station and Stanten Park as areas -- I'm looking for the particular statement.

It seemed to call out this particular site as one where a map change would be relevant. In this case, the zoning line goes through the building, the back third

NEAL R. GROSS

1 portion. 2 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, that's what I'm wondering. I don't -- as I said, I 3 4 don't know what improvements there are to But if it's a similar condition, I'd 5 Lot 849. want to deal with them both at the same time. 6 7 MR. LAWSON: Madam Chair? CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: 8 MR. LAWSON: Good evening. 9 10 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Hi. MR. LAWSON: We're just looking at 11 information 12 of the survey that 13 provided by the applicant. We actually think that it's not entirely clear on the map that 14 15 was attached to the OP report, but Lot 837 16 faces onto the avenue that's zoned C-2-A. The lot in behind that -- if we're looking at the 17 same lot as you, it's actually a separate lot, 18 19 which is in the R-4 district. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So the --20 MR. LAWSON: There's actually one 21

lot facing onto 3rd Street, there's a property

1 line separating the two, and then the 2 facing onto C-2-A. We think they're separate lots. 3 4 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. According 5 MR. LAWSON: to the survey plan. 6 7 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Let me just --Well, let me tell 8 okay. you, it's combination of -- if you look at Exhibit B 9 10 from the applicant, it looks like what you described, which is that 837 is a separate lot 11 old base plat, and 12 that whatever 13 extension onto 3rd Street in the old base plat looks like a separate lot. 14 15 But that's not what it looks like 16 on your plat on page 3. It looks like 837 was combined with several lots fronting on 3rd to 17 now be Lot 849. And I just don't know what 18 19 the back of that looks like now. I just don't remember. 20 We'll double-MS. STEINGASSER: 21

check the lot configurations and confirm this.

| 1 | If it needs additional setdown, we'll bring |
|----|--|
| 2 | that to you at the special meeting on the 26th |
| 3 | |
| 4 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. |
| 5 | MS. STEINGASSER: as well, so |
| 6 | that they can be advertised together. |
| 7 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes. |
| 8 | MS. STEINGASSER: But I'm pretty |
| 9 | sure the properties along 3rd Street are |
| 10 | properly developed as an R-4. |
| 11 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Any |
| 12 | other questions? |
| 13 | (No response.) |
| 14 | I just want to have one hearing on |
| 15 | this, if we're going to do more than one, |
| 16 | that's all. |
| 17 | Okay. Then, we have a |
| 18 | recommendation from the Office of Planning to |
| 19 | set down Case Number 07-01, and I would so |
| 20 | move. |
| 21 | VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Second. |
| 22 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. |
| | |

| 1 | Hood. Any discussion? |
|----|--|
| 2 | (No response.) |
| 3 | All those in favor, please say aye. |
| 4 | (Chorus of ayes.) |
| 5 | Those opposed, please say no. |
| 6 | (No response.) |
| 7 | Mrs. Schellin. |
| 8 | SECRETARY SCHELLIN: The staff |
| 9 | would record the vote five to zero to |
| 10 | set down Zoning Commission Case Number 07-01. |
| 11 | Commissioner Mitten moving, Commissioner Hood |
| 12 | seconding, Commissioners Jeffries, Parsons, |
| 13 | and Turnbull in favor. And this will be set |
| 14 | down as a contested case? |
| 15 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes. |
| 16 | Next, we have Case Number 07-05, |
| 17 | and this is a proposed text amendment to |
| 18 | Section 2116 by the Office of Planning. |
| 19 | Ms. Brown-Roberts? |
| 20 | MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Good evening, |
| 21 | Madam Chairman, and members of the Commission. |
| 22 | This application was submitted on behalf of |

the Anacostia Waterfront Corporation.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

As you know, the public reservation, which is also known as Hill East, is guided by a master plan that was approved by the District of Columbia City Council in October of 2002. Sometime a few years ago the Office of Planning also submitted a setdown report for the zoning on this property. However, we are still working on that plan.

In the meantime, AWC proceed with getting information the on relocation or the construction of some of the streets, particularly Massachusetts Avenue and some of the other streets, such as Burke Street, C Street, 21st Street, that proposed to go through the site.

Currently, there are no streets or lots and blocks on the site. And what they are proposing to do -- and as you know also, the site is also developed with the District of Columbia Correctional Facilities. In addition, there are other District uses that

go on on the site.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

order to facilitate the In extension of these streets through the site, these facilities now have their parking on the site also, and the parking lots currently cross over some of the areas where the streets are proposed to be located. And, therefore, what we are proposing is that an amendment be made to Section 2116 of the zoning regulations that they can construct facilitate parking lots to the temporary extension of these streets through the site.

Thank you, Madam Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Ι also had posed a question earlier to Mr. Bergstein, and we determined that we need to add this language to some that says, "Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 106.7, that the following provisions of 2116 would apply," because 106.7 requires that a zoned in order to obtain property be building permit. And the property is not

1 zoned and won't be for some time, 2 suggested. So are there any questions for Ms. 3 Brown-Roberts? 4 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: 5 Yes. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mr. Hood? 6 7 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Chair, I wanted to -- Ms. Brown-Roberts, I 8 usually, noticed in the 9 report and 10 typically in the OP reports we usually talk about community comments. I know that we are 11 just getting out there and discussing this, 12 13 but I want to know what is the community comment, because I didn't see the report. 14 15 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: AWC has had a 16 number of community meetings with -- both with the ANC and the wider community, and they were 17 made aware of this. And recently, we also 18 19 sent out e-mails to a few of the community leaders to advise them of this, and we haven't 20 gotten any negative feedback. 21

NEAL R. GROSS

VICE-CHAIRPERSON

22

Good.

HOOD:

| 1 | Thank you. |
|----|--|
| 2 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Anyone else? |
| 3 | (No response.) |
| 4 | We have a recommendation from the |
| 5 | Office of Planning to set down Case Number 07- |
| 6 | 05, and I would so move and ask for a second. |
| 7 | COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Second. |
| 8 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. |
| 9 | Turnbull. Any discussion? |
| 10 | (No response.) |
| 11 | All those in favor, please say aye. |
| 12 | (Chorus of ayes.) |
| 13 | Those opposed, please say no. |
| 14 | (No response.) |
| 15 | Mrs. Schellin. |
| 16 | SECRETARY SCHELLIN: Staff will |
| 17 | record the vote five to zero to set |
| 18 | down Zoning Commission Case Number 07-05. |
| 19 | Commissioner Mitten moving, Commissioner |
| 20 | Turnbull seconding, Commissioners Hood, |
| 21 | Jeffries, and Parsons in favor. And this is |
| | |

NEAL R. GROSS

being set down as a rulemaking case.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes, thank you.

Now, the first item for us under proposed action, since 06-33 is being set off, is Case Number 05-39. And this is the PUD and related map amendment at 116 T Street, N.E., which is the request from Catholic Charities, if you'll recall, and St. Martins.

I just want to recap a few things about the application, and then open it up for discussion, which, if you recall, the request in this case is to rezone a parcel of land that is currently zoned R-4 to R-5-B, and build a five-story apartment building with 2.6 FAR, 178 units, and between 120 and parking spaces, and flexibility is being requested for the -- from the 55-foot loading berth, that they would provide a loading berth, that there would be two principal buildings on a single lot, and that the parking will be made available to other users, benefits and amenities and the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

principally is housing, affordable housing.

If you recall, 50 units were going to be made available to folks that make 30 percent of the AMI or less, and most of those would be formerly homeless individuals, and the balance of the project, 128 units, would be made available to individuals making 60 percent or less of the area median income.

And some of the excess parking, to the extent it's available, would be made available for lease to local residents and the faculty and staff of adjacent schools, some of whom are using the surface parking lot that currently exists on the site.

We had a party in opposition, Eckington Citizens for Responsible Development, and also we had the Eckington Civic Association in opposition. The ANC was in support of the project.

Some of the issues that I'll just mention -- and this is not meant to be a detailed recital, but the design issue --

NEAL R. GROSS

there were design issues related to the scale of the project, that it was too dense and too tall for this -- what was considered by the opponents to be predominantly rowhouse neighborhood, that it's unnecessarily an complex facade, and there was a concern about the use of inferior materials, and we had an additional submission on the hardy plank -- or not the hardy plank, the vinyl that was being proposed and the quality of the vinyl that was being proposed. Hardy plank is another case.

That the project was too inwardly focused. If you recall, there are interior courtyards that would not be made available to the general public.

There was concern about the loading and whether the shorter berth would force residents to use a driveway and block public space. And the use -- the provision for loading for City Lights School, which will be altered because of the development of the site.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

| 1 | Fairly significant concerns about |
|----|--|
| 2 | traffic, and the fact that there is at |
| 3 | certain times of day there is an immense |
| 4 | amount immense volume of traffic because of |
| 5 | children being dropped off for Hyde and |
| 6 | McKinley and the City Lights School on the |
| 7 | subject property. |
| 8 | And there was also an issue about |
| 9 | historic preservation and the relocation of |
| 10 | the convent currently on the site to another |
| 11 | portion of the site. |
| 12 | We also heard about concerns |
| 13 | regarding excavation and construction |
| 14 | management, which is really outside the |
| 15 | purview of the Commission. So with that |
| 16 | overview, I'd ask for comments from the |
| 17 | Commission on the proposal. |
| 18 | VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Madam |
| 19 | Chair, I |
| 20 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mr. Hood, |
| 21 | thank you. |
| 22 | VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'm not |

going to comment on the architecture as of yet, but I will tell you that this project for me is one that will -- especially when we're dealing with the IZ of trying to reach a certain percentage of AMI, when I was asking that question at the IZ hearings, I was told it could not be done.

Well, I know this may be a different vehicle, different motor, but this is something I think this city has been trying to accomplish, and I believe we're getting to those -- reaching down to those folks, not down, but reaching to folks who make in the \$16,000 to I think maybe \$22,000 range as far as annual income.

And this is something that especially during the IZ hearings that I was pushing for, and I'm glad to see this project come. Now, I know it needs some tweaks and some fine-tuning, especially when it comes to land use and maybe traffic mitigation measures that we may need to fine tune, and maybe some

NEAL R. GROSS

1 architectural issues. 2 But with those adjustments, glad to see this in front of us. If that can 3 start the conversation. 4 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. 5 Hood. I mean, I think -- I think you're 6 7 right. This is one of the things that at least -- first of all, we struggled with IZ 8 about the fact that, you know, we're not being 9 -- we're not able to go as deep as we would 10 11 like, and certainly not as deep as the need 12 is. 13 And also, you know, we did express through IZ our willingness to grant additional 14 15 height and density in exchange for affordable 16 housing. And I think that's part of what has been captured in this application. 17 Any other thoughts, concerns? 18 19 (No response.) I think as to the design, I mean, I 20 -- I don't have any strong feelings about the 21

NEAL R. GROSS

design, although I do understand what

22

the

opponents are expressing in terms of having a sort of busy facade. And in doing that I think that by addressing the building this way they're really trying to -- the applicant is trying to be responsive to the fact that they do face row dwellings, and so those are larger -- those are smaller divisions of buildings than if you have a large structure.

But I just would remind folks that they're not proffering high-quality design as an amenity. So, you know, I think the standard is somewhat more what's typical in the neighborhood as opposed to what might be typical for a planned unit development.

I am generally in support of the project. There is a few things that I would like to have studied further, and I'm willing to go forward on proposed action and have these items dealt with for final action. And they relate to a couple of issues that the opponents raised, and I want to make sure that I make it clear which elements I'm focusing on

NEAL R. GROSS

and some that I think were not appropriately assigned to the applicant to deal with.

So what I think they need to do a better job with is that we had some additional submissions from the opponents about actual use of the City Lights School and that there may be a lot of coming and going at the City Lights School, and the parking need that is being addressed by the applicant for the City Lights School is really based on they queried the school and said, "What do you need in terms of faculty and staff parking?" but I think there is reason to believe that that's not the entire need of the school.

And particularly in light of the fact that the City Lights School is part of the PUD site, we really need to look at the operation of the school to make sure that the operation in its entirety is dealt with from a parking standpoint.

So I'd like the applicant's traffic expert to actually analyze the operation of

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the City Lights School to make sure that the traffic that's generated by the PUD site, notwithstanding the fact that they have a -- that they don't have a legal parking requirement, because it's grandfathered, that we understand what that operation is and that the need is met.

Also, I'd like them to revisit their assumption that the formerly homeless residents who would occupy the 50 units don't drive cars, because we had testimony -- and I don't think it was disputed -- that the 17 individuals who were formerly homeless who reside in -- I think in the convent building now, at least a handful of them drive, so I think we need to make sure that the needs of the operation of the site are met, before we make other parking available.

And I think we need to ensure that there -- that that will be met, you know, for the City Lights School, that that's being met with parking that they either don't pay for or

NEAL R. GROSS

are willing to pay whatever the rate is. But like I said, I think that's something that could be dealt with on an additional submission before final action.

Anyone else?

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Madam

Chair?

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mr. Turnbull.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I'm generally in favor of the project. I think -the only thing I think that still sort of is a
little bit light is I think -- is the amount
of vinyl in that courtyard area. I just think
it's -- although it's not "affecting the
neighborhood," I think it's affecting the
neighborhood of the building, the people that
are going to be living there.

I just -- I think on some of those bays I think if they had introduced some brick to offset the sort of monotonous feeling of the vinyl in the courtyard, I think it would -- might have alleviated or given some

character to the space.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

But I think in general I'm in favor of it; I just think that it's a little short on some architectural elements that could have enhanced the project a little bit. And as you say, architecture high design was not being proffered, but I think there could have been a couple little more elements added into it.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Anyone else?

VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Also, Madam Chair, and I don't see it right here in front of me, but I -- does anybody recall seeing a picture on Todd Street with snow on it and --

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes.

VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Ι know I wasn't dreaming then. So I want to make sure that it -- it depends on how this is going to move, that we revisit the analysis coming off of Todd Street. think think it opposition Ι came from the opposition submitted some pictures ___ were very compelling dealing with -- okay,

there it is. Okay, thank you. Which were very compelling about traffic back on Todd Street, and I think they even went as far as to mention how people had to put their windows in.

So there's a tight piece, and I'm sure that the traffic consultant had looked at that, but I would ask, depending upon how this moves forward, that we revisit that.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: What specifically would you like to have revisited on Todd Place?

VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Well, from looking at what I see here, how the impact is --because I think the testimony -- and I may be incorrect, and if I'm incorrect I stand to be corrected. The testimony said that there would not be any impact, but from looking at a visualization of this picture -- and I'm not sure what the count was, but it looks like that we're proposing -- or we may run into some issues, and what kind of mitigation

NEAL R. GROSS

efforts from what has been submitted can we put in place.

And also, the \$45 -- I'm concerned about if we're trying to meet the 30 percent -- I know I'm jumping all over the place, but if we're trying to meet the 30 percent of the AMI, and they're going to be charging \$45 a space, do you have that option? I believe you have an option to either purchase space, or do you not have the option, or do you have to purchase a space?

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Let me just go back to the Todd Place for a second, which is -- I think maybe your concern with Todd Place is related to the operation of the City Lights School, because the project -- the new development has its access points from T.

But then, we raised the issue about the -- how will the loading and trash removal for City Lights be handled, and they said that they were going to be accessing that from Todd Place, I believe. Let me just find that. And

NEAL R. GROSS

| 1 | I think maybe to be more specific, that's |
|----------------------------------|---|
| 2 | where your concern is. |
| 3 | VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I thought |
| 4 | that again, I stand to be corrected, this |
| 5 | is a voluminous record. I thought that |
| 6 | someone was recommending the entrance be off |
| 7 | of what was it, Todd Place, or has that |
| 8 | been pulled back? |
| 9 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: That was |
| 10 | pulled back. The |
| 11 | VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. |
| | |
| 12 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: DDOT was |
| 12 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: DDOT was concerned about the access to the parking |
| | |
| 13 | concerned about the access to the parking |
| 13 | concerned about the access to the parking garage on T near the Hyde School. |
| 13 14 15 | concerned about the access to the parking garage on T near the Hyde School. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So the |
| 13 14 15 16 | concerned about the access to the parking garage on T near the Hyde School. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So the issue on T Street, then, was I think the kids |
| 13 14 15 16 17 | concerned about the access to the parking garage on T near the Hyde School. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So the issue on T Street, then, was I think the kids and, what, between three and okay. |
| 13 14 15 16 17 | concerned about the access to the parking garage on T near the Hyde School. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So the issue on T Street, then, was I think the kids and, what, between three and okay. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: At the pickup |
| 13 14 15 16 17 18 | concerned about the access to the parking garage on T near the Hyde School. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So the issue on T Street, then, was I think the kids and, what, between three and okay. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: At the pickup and dropoff times. |

anymore.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Anyone else? Mr. Jeffries.

COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Well, probably if you'd look over the transcript, I probably had a number of concerns initially around the development program in general. But I think I've taken a second look and just really looked at really the deep level of affordability and just -- not just that portion but the overall project.

I think that that proffer alone is just -- I think just outweighs all of the concerns that I have, and also some of the compelling arguments that I thought the Eckington Citizens Association made. I thought they put -- they put forward a very good case as to their concerns about this development.

But I think at the end of the day, in totality, it just couldn't really take on this whole notion of the development program

that I think is absolutely needed in the District, not just in this area but in the District.

In addition to the deep levels of affordability that's being achieved, it's also some of the supportive aspects of the program that I think are noteworthy, and I think some of that really drives the overall site plan design, or just the overall design of the building.

I think that sort of drives the concern that it's like a fortress. I think, you know, there needs to be some inward aspects of it, because there are going to be populations within this development that will need some more supportive services and things of that sort. So it's a different animal of sorts.

So I am willing to go forward with this. And also, Commissioner Turnbull, I, too, had those concerns about the vinyl until the applicant, you know, in their Attachment B

NEAL R. GROSS

took us through all of the projects that had, 1 2 you know, fairly significant vinyl. And in these projects -- they are 3 all -- you know, I think a good deal -- a 4 great deal of them, you know, have either 100 5 percent affordability or close to. I think it 6 7 just sort of comes part and parcel of just --I mean, the development program I think is 8 really driving that decision. 9 So, anyway, so 10 I am supportive. Thank you, Mr. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: 11 Jeffries. 12 13 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: With that, Madam Chair, I will move approval of Zoning 14 15 Commission Case Number 05-39, with the 16 comments so noted. 17 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. And I'll second that. And I just wanted to 18 19 address a couple more things. The first is I -- I'm going to take 20 the liberty of presuming that I know something 21 that's in your mind that didn't get expressed, 22

so tell me if I'm wrong when I say this, which is the Commission has a very strong desire to support affordable housing, and we're not willing to do that inappropriately.

But while this may be -- you know, this may be a struggle for some in the community to accept in terms of height and hasn't crossed the line density, it excessive, so that there is a limit. You know, it's not that we'll do anything to get affordable housing. It's that, you know, this that they have attempted, and I successfully, to fit the context, even though it's not specifically a rowhouse project facing rowhouses across the street.

And I think the PUD is an appropriate vehicle for getting in this kind of affordable housing, as opposed to other vehicles, because the affordability can be ensured through a PUD condition, which brings me to another point that I think we need to have clarified.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

And if you recall, we had testimony from the -- I forget the gentleman's name now, the applicant's representative, and he was talking about how they operate these sorts of projects and then showed us in the interior and showed -- and talked to us about the supportive services, and so on, and then I asked -- I said, "Well, you know, what are you going to do to ensure that the affordability reaches the right people?" and all this.

And we didn't really get a good on that, and that's item that I'd like to have addressed in an additional submission between now and final action, which is, how will the affordability be administered in terms of making the units affordable to the individuals in question? And then, the services that are being provided that, you know, there is -- there is density being provide these services. occupied to assurance do we have in the long term that they will be provided?

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

So I think we need more than we got additional submission from on the the applicant about the ongoing operation, whether it's Catholic Charities operating it or some other entity. So those are the two items that I would just like to add, so dealing with the parking onsite, both for City Lights and the project, revisiting the aspect related to the formerly homeless individuals, and then the -just the operation of the facility and how will these units be made affordable and how will these services be provided in the long term.

COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Madam Chair, actually, I appreciate you -- you're right. You knew what was in my mind. it, Ι do think didn't express but it's important that the development community and their attorneys that, you note know, affordable housing -- just to say "affordable housing" is going always not to showstopper. I mean, there are other --

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Right. 1 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: 2 -- policy initiatives that important 3 are the to District, important to this Commission. 4 We can't have a situation where, you know, our 5 zone plan is being compromised, because we 6 7 have to get 100 percent affordability. might not be the appropriate location. 8 I do think this applicant has done 9 10 fairly good job, given all of programmatic requirements of this project, in 11 12 of trying to address some 13 concerns of how it sits within the context of this neighborhood. But I just -- you know, I 14 15 do not want my comments to mean that, you bring forward 100 percent 16 know, you affordability, and, you know --17 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Have at it. 18 19 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Yes, have That is not the case. 20 at it. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: That's what I

NEAL R. GROSS

thought, so I'm glad we got that clarified.

21

| 1 | All right. Any other discussion? |
|----|--|
| 2 | Any further discussion? |
| 3 | (No response.) |
| 4 | Okay. So all those in favor of |
| 5 | approving Case Number 05-39 with the |
| 6 | additional items requested, please say aye. |
| 7 | (Chorus of ayes.) |
| 8 | Those opposed, please say no. |
| 9 | (No response.) |
| 10 | Mrs. Schellin. |
| 11 | SECRETARY SCHELLIN: The staff will |
| 12 | record the vote five to zero to zero to |
| 13 | approve proposed action in Zoning Commission |
| 14 | Case Number 05-39. Commissioner Hood moving, |
| 15 | Commissioner Mitten seconding, Commissioners |
| 16 | Jeffries, Parsons, and Turnbull approving. |
| 17 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. |
| 18 | SECRETARY SCHELLIN: And I just |
| 19 | wanted to ask, did you want to set a schedule |
| 20 | for when these documents are due, or will that |
| 21 | |
| 22 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I was just |

| 1 | going to move to reopen the record to |
|----|---|
| 2 | SECRETARY SCHELLIN: Okay. |
| 3 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: accept the |
| 4 | additional documents. So can you give me a |
| 5 | date that's two weeks out? Is that the 26th? |
| 6 | SECRETARY SCHELLIN: Yes. Well, |
| 7 | wait a second. Two weeks, 26th. |
| 8 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. So I |
| 9 | move that we reopen the record in Case Number |
| 10 | 05-39 to accept the requested items from the |
| 11 | applicant, and then to allow for a week for |
| 12 | comment. |
| 13 | SECRETARY SCHELLIN: April 2nd. |
| 14 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: April 2nd. So |
| 15 | comments from the party in opposition, the |
| 16 | ANC, and the Office of Planning, should they |
| 17 | choose to weigh in. |
| 18 | VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Second. |
| 19 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. |
| 20 | Hood. Any discussion on reopening the record? |
| 21 | (No response.) |
| 22 | Then, all those in favor, please |

1 say aye. 2 (Chorus of ayes.) Those opposed, please say no. 3 4 (No response.) Mrs. Schellin. 5 SECRETARY SCHELLIN: Staff will 6 record the vote five to zero to zero to reopen 7 the record to accept the requested documents 8 on March 26th, with responses being due April 9 10 Commissioner Mitten moving, Commissioner Commissioners Hood seconding, Jeffries, 11 Parsons, and Turnbull in favor. 12 13 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Next case for proposed action is Case Number 14 05-42, and this is the PUD and related map 15 16 amendment for Sibley Hospital. you remember, the request in 17 this case is for a PUD-related map amendment 18 19 to rezone the site for a medical office building from R-5-A to SP-1, and there is also 20

NEAL R. GROSS

a parking garage that would be built as part

project overall, and the

this

21

garage would contain five levels and have 750 spaces.

The overall FAR of the project is 2.15 FAR. The height requested is 77 feet, four inches, which exceeds the PUD guideline for the SP-1 zone by two feet, four inches. Lot occupancy of 62 percent is requested.

addition to the flexibility regarding height, the applicant is requesting special exception approval for office parking in SP-1 multiple uses zone and structures on a single record lot.

represented by the applicant, benefits amenities include the and their willingness to pay for 100 percent redesign and reconstruction of the Loft-Burroughdale-Carlia intersection, including the provision area; of bus layover transportation а management plan that includes, among other things, routing -- providing signage to route the traffic to the Sibley Hospital campus on Little Falls Road; the provision of a shuttle

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

| 1 | bus to the Metro; incentives for carpooling; |
|----|---|
| 2 | and so on. |
| 3 | In this case, they are proffering |
| 4 | high quality design and enhanced landscaping, |
| 5 | increased among the benefits are increased |
| 6 | quality of ambulatory care, and they believe |
| 7 | that the medical office building will help |
| 8 | draw and retain physicians. They have |
| 9 | proffered a \$140,000 donation to Iona Senior |
| 10 | Services for is it just the three of us? |
| 11 | PARTICIPANT: Four. |
| 12 | VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I think |
| 13 | I'll leave, and then it will be two. |
| 14 | (Laughter.) |
| 15 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. |
| 16 | SECRETARY SCHELLIN: Only Mr. |
| 17 | Parsons is not participating. |
| 18 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Okay. |
| 19 | A \$140,000 donation to Iona Senior Services |
| 20 | for transportation for seniors. And some low |
| 21 | impact design features. |
| 22 | Now, in this case, we have |

objections from two parties. The ANC objects to certain aspects of the project and has proposed a compromise that would involve reducing the height and just general size of the medical office building, but they're not opposed in principle to the medical office building.

the And then, we have Sibley Neighbors for Responsible Growth that opposed in principle to the rezoning and the medical office building. Among the concerns that they raise are that the SP zone is not appropriate in this case because it's not for -- it doesn't further the purposes of the SP zone, including being a buffer to -- between residential and other commercial uses.

They're concerned about the speculative nature of the medical office building, that there are mitigation measures that have been represented by Sibley that they would pursue in other cases that they have not pursued, and that includes rerouting the bus

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

behind the hospital. And they have significant concerns about traffic and the volume of traffic that would be generated by this proposed use.

There is an existing concern about cut-through traffic in the neighborhood that they believe would be exacerbated, and there is I think a certain degree of skepticism about the effectiveness of the proposed transportation management plan.

So with that as background, then I would just take note that Mr. Parsons is not participating in this case. I'd open it up for discussion. Mr. Jeffries?

COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: I think I was struck with just the intensity of the office use at this location. Being somewhat familiar with the area, and recognizing that it is adjacent to an R-2 zone, and recognizing that use could clearly, you know, be part of the zone but I've always had concerns about the intensity of the office use in this

NEAL R. GROSS

location.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

I'm concerned about the cut-through traffic. Some of the testimony that received -- I thought the Sibley Neighborhood Neighbors for Responsible Growth, I think they made a number of compelling arguments as to really making а case for why should we probably reject this outright.

I am not at that place, but I am probably in favor of taking this building down some. So I'd probably like to hear from my fellow Commissioners and see where they are.

I am always very supportive of an institution being able to sustain itself, and so forth, and to remain competitive. So I will certainly tip my hat to that.

But, again, we're back at that same place where, you know, it has to make sense in the context. You know, we have to maintain, you know, the zone plan as it sits. So if we can hear from other Commissioners.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr.

NEAL R. GROSS

Jeffries.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Anyone else want to wade in right now? Mr. Turnbull?

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes. Thank you, Madam Chair. I agree with Commissioner Jeffries. I think that we're all -- that there's a lot of pluses to the medical building being built, but I think -- I mean, I'm troubled by the whole way it is gone about, and I think there is something that is missing from -- that the community is not being listened to.

The simple -- I mean, I thought it was a very -- the idea of the bus route, getting rid of the helipad from the street, seemed to be very practical ideas that the community were looking for. I think that kind of a gesture would have gone a long way, I think, in helping mitigate some of their concerns.

The height issue I'm not sure. The height issue is problematic. You know, when

NEAL R. GROSS

does it -- when do you sort of hit the balance as to when it's going to be successful, when it can -- when it's going to work and when it's not.

So while I'm just concerned that the applicant really didn't come back and listen to some of the comments the And I think that's troubling to community. I'm not ready to reject it, but I think me. that there needs to be something else done for of their the community to address some concerns, which I don't see happening right now.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.

Mr. Hood?

VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I would agree with both of my colleagues, Madam Chair, and we have much discussion with doctors, and I think we have a variety -- a cadre of different people coming in to speak on the subject.

But when I was looking at this --

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

reviewing this case this weekend, I said my point of start for this was the ANC compromise. And I don't know how much more I can elaborate what my other two colleagues have said, but that was my point of start for me was the ANC compromise.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.

I don't disagree with anything that I've heard so far, and I think Mr. Jeffries captured it best, which is, you know -- it's kind of peculiar for me to be saying this, but I'm going to say it anyway. The density of the project doesn't trouble me, and the height of the project doesn't trouble me. But the use and the intensity that is associated with this use, the intensity of the use, is what troubles me.

And it was interesting because the neighbors contrasted the -- I think it's the Grand Oaks -- the retirement community or the -- whatever, the assisted living part of it, and that's a use that you can -- you know, you

NEAL R. GROSS

can create the zoning box, and you can put a not intense use in that box, or you could put a very intense use in that box.

And I find this to be too intense for the box. So there's different ways to deal with that. One is to reject it outright, which I'm not prepared to do, and I'll speak a little bit more about that in a second. But I don't know any other way to reduce the intensity, other than to scale back the box.

So if somebody has other ideas, I'm open to them. But I'm -- but I just want to be clear, I'm not uncomfortable with the height that's being proposed. And I think that, you know, in siting it at the back of the lot it certainly does -- it certainly does produce the least visual intrusion on the community.

I think Mr. Turnbull made a very good point about, you know, we can't tell Metro where to put the bus, but there are some things that Sibley could do to make that

NEAL R. GROSS

decision very easy for Metro. And one would be to upgrade the road back there, which is what we were told was a prerequisite for the bus route to go there, and also just to do the simple thing of relocating the helipad.

And I'd like to see those things done, because I think in the long run -- and I believe we're going to see more from Sibley because we were told that there was a master plan that they were developing, and this is, you know, the first component of it -- that, you know, this is an ongoing issue and good faith is required in these kinds of circumstances.

But I do want to address the issue about the SP zone not being appropriate here, because the -- I think that if -- in the context of a PUD, if one focuses too much on the purpose of a given zone, as if we were mapping it, just straight up mapping it, and then it's -- you care very much about the purposes of a zone in terms of buffering, and

NEAL R. GROSS

so on.

But in the context of a PUD I think we are a little more pragmatic about the zones that we select, because they are -- in the context of a PUD, they tend to be a means to an end. So they're a means to accommodating certain uses, and they're a means to getting a certain height, and they're a means to getting a certain density. But all of the extra -- what do I want to say? Purposes of that zone don't necessarily apply in the context of a PUD, and I think that the opposition was getting distracted by that.

And so I'm not troubled by the -by zoning the SP as long as whatever we put in
that -- as long as whatever we're providing
for is not -- doesn't overwhelm the community.
So I think that can be done, and, as I said,
I think the intensity needs to be scaled back.

I also wanted to comment on the fact that a number of the benefits and amenities that were proffered by the applicant

NEAL R. GROSS

in my mind are mitigation of the traffic issues that would be generated. So, for instance, the transportation management plan — quite a bit of that is to deal with the volume of traffic that is being generated, and so I wouldn't count that as an amenity. And the shuttle bus is in that category.

And then, you know, they talked about the provision of ample parking. Well, unless you're going to provide extra parking that someone would be able to use, all they're doing is satisfying their parking demand.

So I think they need to revisit this from a couple of angles, and that would be that those really need to be treated as mitigation measures. And depending on what they come back with, there may need to be additional benefits or amenities. But this needs to be -- the intensity of this needs to be scaled back. And if the ANC compromises something that people can be comfortable with, you know, that's fine.

NEAL R. GROSS

The applicant -- I was a little bit disappointed when the applicant said that the project is not feasible if it's smaller, but then they really didn't say why. And even when I asked some specific questions, they never really explained that.

So on land -- and I know that they have -- you know, they have certain things they have to do. They have to relocate certain uses out of other buildings and demolish other buildings. But presumably that would all be part of a longer range plan. So to weigh that against the economics of this building is probably not appropriate to do.

So I think they have to make a choice, and we'll see what choice they make.

But I don't want to deny this outright tonight. I want to give them a chance to come back. Mr. Jeffries?

COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: And, Madam Chair, thank you for bringing up this whole notion of proffers, because I think I had

NEAL R. GROSS

| 1 | written that down somewhere. I called it |
|----|--|
| 2 | mitigance. But it seemed as if all of the |
| 3 | things that were being proffered were just |
| 4 | sort of to address, you know, traffic issues |
| 5 | and it seemed to, you know, really not go |
| 6 | well beyond that. |
| 7 | So I would echo and just for the |
| 8 | applicant in earshot to understand that that's |
| 9 | also a concern of mine, and that if they |
| 10 | choose to come back that they really should |
| 11 | look at beefing up their amenities package. |
| 12 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. So |
| 13 | we will defer |
| 14 | COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Madam |
| 15 | Chair? |
| 16 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes. Oh, I'm |
| 17 | sorry. |
| 18 | COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I just |
| 19 | wanted to get in on your with your question |
| 20 | of intensity. Not only the office building, |
| 21 | but I'm assuming you're carrying it over with |
| 22 | the parking structure also, or no? Or is that |

| 1 | a separate facet? |
|----|---|
| 2 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, the |
| 3 | intensity is really the intensity of the use |
| 4 | of the site. So it's the medical office |
| 5 | building that is drawing all |
| 6 | COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right. |
| 7 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: that is |
| 8 | causing all of this activity. And the parking |
| 9 | is just to satisfy that demand. If they want |
| 10 | to build a parking structure of that size |
| 11 | because they want to accommodate the need of |
| 12 | future buildings that they might build, I |
| 13 | don't have an issue with that myself. |
| 14 | COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: So you're |
| 15 | not opposed to the intensity of the garage. |
| 16 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: No, I'm not. |
| 17 | COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. |
| 18 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I'm not I |
| 19 | personally am not. |
| 20 | COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. |
| 21 | COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: I do think |
| 22 | it's it works hand in hand with the office. |

| 1 | COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: If you |
|----|--|
| 2 | build it, they will come. |
| 3 | COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Yes. I |
| 4 | mean, it all works around just, you know, the |
| 5 | intensity of that type of operation. |
| 6 | COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes. |
| 7 | COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: You know, |
| 8 | so the garage I mean, everything is |
| 9 | interconnected. So |
| 10 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mr. Hood? |
| 11 | VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'm not |
| 12 | understanding something, Madam Chair. We |
| 13 | talked about the intensity, and you said you |
| 14 | didn't have a problem with the height, you |
| 15 | didn't have a problem with the density, but |
| 16 | you said within the box and I probably |
| 17 | should wait until the submittal, I don't want |
| 18 | to question you, put you on the witness stand. |
| 19 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: No, that's |
| 20 | okay. I'll try to explain it if you'd like. |
| 21 | VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: But within |
| 22 | the box yes, I just don't want us to get to |

1 that point and then we may have a problem. 2 Within the box, it's what's being used in the box. 3 Right. 4 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Ι 5 let me give you an extreme example. mean, 6 Remember when we did the electronic equipment facilities and --7 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Don't 8 mention that. 9 10 (Laughter.) But it's not CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: 11 an intense use, because nobody goes there. 12 13 was just for equipment. So it's a box that doesn't have an intense amount of activity 14 generated as a result of it. 15 So that's at one 16 extreme. And at the other extreme is something like a medical office building where 17 there's people coming and going all the time. 18 19 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So I'm I understand this extreme to that still --20 21 extreme.

NEAL R. GROSS

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN:

22

Right.

| 1 | VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: But I still |
|----|--|
| 2 | don't understand where you were going. What |
| 3 | |
| 4 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, where |
| 5 | I'm going is so I said there is a very |
| 6 | intense use that's going to go on in the box, |
| 7 | so I would be comfortable with something that |
| 8 | was less intense. Well, the use itself is |
| 9 | that intense, so how do we make it less |
| 10 | intense is you make the box smaller, so that |
| 11 | |
| 12 | VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Right. So |
| 13 | we cut down the height, we cut down the square |
| 14 | footage. |
| 15 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Right. |
| 16 | COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: I mean, |
| 17 | Madam Chair, what you're if it were |
| 18 | residential or something, you would in a |
| 19 | larger box where the box is the size that it |
| 20 | is might be fine because that means a certain |
| 21 | kind of activity use of that particular box. |
| 22 | And I think by default, because I |

| don't know how else the applicant can do it |
|---|
| by default, I guess what we're saying is that |
| the box has to go down, although for Madam |
| Chair, I sort of think that the box needs to |
| go down no matter what. |
| But I think for Madam Chair it's |
| more an issue of she's more focused on the |
| intensity of the office piece. And I have a |
| concern about the office I mean the |
| intensity of the office use as well. So I |
| think at the end of the day this applicant |
| probably needs to bring this building down. |
| CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Right. I |
| think that's the |
| COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: That's it. |
| CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes, we all |
| come at that from different |
| VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. |
| CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: directions, |
| but yes. |
| VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. |
| Thank you. |

| 1 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay? So |
|----|--|
| 2 | we'll allow the applicant to revisit this, and |
| 3 | we'll just accept their filing whenever it |
| 4 | comes in and put it on the schedule. |
| 5 | SECRETARY SCHELLIN: Are we going |
| 6 | to allow the parties to respond to |
| 7 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Oh, |
| 8 | absolutely. And so we'll just have to |
| 9 | schedule |
| 10 | SECRETARY SCHELLIN: Another week |
| 11 | for them? |
| 12 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: that. Yes. |
| 13 | SECRETARY SCHELLIN: Okay. |
| 14 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Whenever that |
| 15 | comes in. |
| 16 | Okay. Next is Case Number 04-24A, |
| 17 | and this is the second stage PUD application |
| 18 | for the Mid-City Urban Project at Rhode Island |
| 19 | Avenue. |
| 20 | And I have a little summary of |
| 21 | that, too. |
| 22 | COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: I thought |

that Vice Chair Hood was going to do that.

VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Well, give me summaries.

(Laughter.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Well, just to remind folks, when we approved the first stage, we approved a PUD-related map amendment for this site to C-2-B, and now in the second stage we have a proposal from the applicant to build 274 apartment units and roughly 320,000 square feet, and there would 70,000 square feet of retail space, percent of which would be reserved for local businesses. The density is 1.52 FAR, there is two parking garages, if you remember, one on each side of the main street, and they contain -- they collectively contain a total of 469 spaces.

And among the benefits are that this is -- you know, this is transit-oriented development at the Rhode Island Avenue Metro, and that there is an affordable housing

NEAL R. GROSS

proffer in this application for 20 percent of the units would be reserved for 20 years for individuals making 50 percent or less of the area median income.

And then, we have -- in addition to just providing a fairly significant amount of retail near the Metro, we do have the set-aside for the local businesses that are maybe not credit tenants. And then, there's green building elements included and the memorial for the Harmony Cemetery, and then the first source and LSDBE requirements that have also been proffered.

And we -- the principal concern in -- there wasn't any significant opposition, but the principal concern had to do with the adequacy of the parking that was being required. And if you remember, this applicant was being as creative as any that we've seen in trying to not overpark the site and yet accommodate this mix of uses. And it was quite something. So a side benefit is they're

NEAL R. GROSS

studying a new standard for transit-oriented development and parking.

So with that, I'll open it up for Commission discussion. Mr. Hood.

would VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Т say, Madam Chair, as I said at the hearing, this project has come a long, long way. know there have been some tweaks and some adjustments, but I appreciate the applicant listening to the dias and I believe working hard with the community and making sure that this -- well, at first I -- frankly, to be honest, I didn't think this was an appropriate site for a TOD, in the way it was being proposed.

But there have been many, many changes to make the adjustment to make this suitable for that particular area, because, you know, for example in some areas of the city you can walk right out of the top and there are homes right there. But this site I believe is unique. The majority of people who

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

go to this area who use the Home Depot and the Giant usually drive, and they usually come from other areas blocks and blocks away, which you normally wouldn't walk to.

And even the ones in the neighborhood, it's not -- it's like right on the outside of the outskirts of a Metro. It takes some effort to get there, and most of the people who use this usually drive. And I know we're trying to make areas around Metro stations to the point where, you know, they are TODs, but this site I think was unique.

I think with the efforts of the applicant and tweaking it, and what comments came from the dias, I think it really made this a suitable site to move forward with this project, at least I will be voting in support of it. And that -- hopefully, that takes care of -- Commissioner Jeffries wanted me to expound on that.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. Hood. Anyone else?

NEAL R. GROSS

1 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I'm going to 2 comment on Mr. Hood's support, because it has been a long time coming. 3 (Laughter.) 4 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: It sure has. 5 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: But, 6 you 7 know, this is five years of work and effort that they have put into this, as I recall, and 8 you're absolutely right, Madam Chairman, about 9 10 the creativity of solving this 11 problem. And I sure hope it works, but I quess we're all familiar with those garages 12 13 that are technologically advanced today that tell you where spaces are, and they work. 14 15 They work, you know? And so I would urge 16 approval of this. Thank 17 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: you. Anyone else? Mr. Jeffries? 18 19 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Hardy plank. 20 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Hardy plank. 21 22 (Laughter.)

NEAL R. GROSS

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I saw it, yes. I saw it. I saw hardy plank, hardy plank, hardy plank. Yes, I'm fine.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.

(Laughter.)

Okay. Well, I mean, I think that certainly this is an appropriate use at a Metro station, and I think our biggest concerns had to do with parking -- well, they were traffic-related, they were parking and traffic-related, and I think the applicant, after they kind of started to understand where we were coming from, was very accommodating of the concerns that we raised.

And this really will set a new standard for how we handle -- how we manage the -- you know, sort of these -- in a mixed use project how we possibly can manage parking in the most efficient way. And I'm really looking forward to watching them execute this.

So I would like to move approval of

NEAL R. GROSS

Case Number 04-24A, and request that a few things come into the record in order to -- for us to take final action. And those would be I think we need to get a submission, not unlike we did in the Case Number 05-39 on exactly how these units will be made affordable to the target population, we don't have that per se.

The applicant in their proposed order condition number 10 included a condition that we hadn't discussed at the hearing, which is that the project may be developed in phases. I think we need more information about what they have in mind. And I think we need to add the commitment to building the memorial for Harmony -- the former Harmony Cemetery as a condition.

And I'd also like to add a condition that reflects the applicant's agreement to a question that I posed at the hearing, which was that only trucks shall be permitted to exit garage number 2 at Main Street, and all other traffic from garage

NEAL R. GROSS

| 1 | number 2 has to exit to the at the west |
|----|--|
| 2 | exit. And that's a long motion, but that's |
| 3 | it. |
| 4 | VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'll second |
| 5 | it. |
| 6 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. |
| 7 | Hood. Is there any further discussion? |
| 8 | (No response.) |
| 9 | Then, all those in favor please say |
| 10 | aye. |
| 11 | (Chorus of ayes.) |
| 12 | Those opposed, please say no. |
| 13 | (No response.) |
| 14 | Mrs. Schellin. |
| 15 | SECRETARY SCHELLIN: Staff will |
| 16 | record the vote four to zero to one, to |
| 17 | approve proposed action in Zoning Commission |
| 18 | Case Number 04-24A. Commissioner Mitten |
| 19 | moving, Commissioner Hood seconding, |
| 20 | Commissioners Jeffries and Parsons in favor, |
| 21 | Commissioner Turnbull not voting, having not |
| 22 | participated. |

| 1 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. |
|----|---|
| 2 | Now we're ready for final action, |
| 3 | and the first case is a technical correction |
| 4 | in Case Number 95-04. There were a few lot |
| 5 | references that needed to be amended in the |
| 6 | Union Station area rezoning. |
| 7 | And, Mrs. Schellin, did you have |
| 8 | anything that you wanted to share with us, or |
| 9 | should we just |
| 10 | SECRETARY SCHELLIN: No. It was |
| 11 | more or less just a technical correction |
| 12 | listing the corrects lot. |
| 13 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Are |
| 14 | there any questions? |
| 15 | (No response.) |
| 16 | Then, I would move approval of the |
| 17 | technical correction in Case Number 95-04. |
| 18 | COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Second. |
| 19 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. |
| 20 | Turnbull. Any discussion? |
| 21 | (No response.) |
| 22 | All those in favor, please say aye. |

1 (Chorus of ayes.) 2 Those opposed, please say no. (No response.) 3 Mrs. Schellin. 4 Staff SECRETARY SCHELLIN: 5 Yes. 6 will record the vote five to zero to zero to 7 approve final action in Zoning Commission Case Number 95-04. Commissioner Mitten moving, 8 Commissioner Turnbull seconding, Commissioners 9 10 Hood, Jeffries, and Parsons in favor. 11 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Now, I think we will just 12 Okav. 13 talk about the next two together as we have from time to time, which is Case Number 06-12, 14 which is the PUD and related -- first stage 15 16 PUD and related map amendment for the GW 17 campus, and then we have the campus plan, which is Case Number 06-11. 18 19 And if you remember, because of the procedural differences, 20 we took proposed action in the first stage 21 PUD and

because there's only a single vote required

for the campus plan, we didn't take that up yet. And there are a series of conditions that have been proposed for the campus plan.

But the first thing I want to deal with is the fact that we have received a request to reopen the record from a party represented -- or some folks represented by Holland & Knight, and it's related to the historic district.

And I just would note that we have received that piece of correspondence that the folks that are represented by Holland & Knight are not a party, and so I'm just going to ask, is there anyone on the Commission who would like to vote to reopen the record, or to move to reopen the record?

(No response.)

Okay. Then, we'll just proceed to discuss the first stage PUD and the campus plan together. So if you remember, in approving the -- taking proposed action on the first stage PUD, we said we were comfortable

NEAL R. GROSS

with the rezonings that were -- the PUDrelated map amendments that were proposed, the
heights, the densities, and so on. And there
are a series of conditions that were proffered
as a part of that, and I'm not going to go
through all that again, but I'll just touch on
a few.

there's series of That а development sites that have been identified and only those would be eligible for second stage approval with -- under this existing first stage; that there will be an Advisory Committee, you know, involving the university and the neighborhood; that there is a there's been a proffer of -- a series of proffers, and among them are removing various undergraduate students from university-owned properties that are not within the campus boundaries; that the applicant -- the university has proposed to pay for the preparation of individual landmark applications and a historic district landmark

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

application; and then to maintain their historic buildings within that defined area in accordance with guidelines that will be established by the -- with the Office of Planning.

They have proffered a streetscape plan. They have proffered a retail corridor along I Street, which we asked them for a little bit more -- to make that a little bit more concrete, which they have done in terms of the uses that would be permitted, and also that there would be minimum street frontage requirements for that retail, so we would be assured that we would achieve the critical mass of retail.

And then, they have also proffered to meet certain minimum number of lead points in new construction. And I guess those are basically the proffered conditions, and so now, before we move into the discussion of conditions for the campus plan, which I think we might not have expressly indicated our

NEAL R. GROSS

willingness to take up the campus plan as proposed, the new campus plan, but I think in approving the first stage PUD we certainly implied that that was our intention, if we didn't state it explicitly.

So I think it's fair to say that we intend to approve a new campus plan with certain conditions. And if you remember, the general intent was to have the campus plan and the -- the campus plan extend until 2025, so that will be a 20-year plan, and that the PUD should basically be coterminous with that, because they are wedded together.

So I wanted to start this evening with a discussion about the length of the plan that's being proffered. And, you know, we did have -- we had testimony from -- I distinctly remember the testimony from West End Citizens Association regarding, you know, that we hadn't approved any other PUDs with that length of time, although the waterfront PUD certainly extends for 17 years, or something

NEAL R. GROSS

like that.

And also, you know, what guarantees does the community have that the university won't amend the PUD or amend the campus plan?

And, you know, I mean, the fact is there are no guarantees, so -- but I think what it does is it establishes -- a longer term establishes that there was a consensus on the part of the Commission, the Office of Planning, the university at a point in time that this was a direction that we all agreed was appropriate.

And I think it does more to give certainty to the community than a shorter term plan that doesn't sort of in a more concrete way express what the long-term buildout of the campus might look like. So I would be in favor of the 20-year team, 20 or so years at this point I guess to expire June 30, 2025, which is not really 20 years anymore, but I'd be in favor of that, and I would be interested in hearing what my colleagues have to say.

Mr. Parsons?

NEAL R. GROSS

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Well, I would concur. I think this is a new day for campus plans, and I hope we can, frankly, establish this as a precedent for how we're going to proceed with others in the future.

Somehow the 10-year proviso that we've been working under has been clumsy and unpredictable. And if we can deal with the development that's going to take 20 and maybe even more years in this fashion, I think it's hopefully something we can be doing in the future for other campuses. So this is technicality. Are we talking about 2025, or are we talking about 2026?

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I think that what -- at least the Office of the Attorney General has suggested that we have -- rather than say what -- that we have a date on which it will expire as opposed to saying 20 years and what's being suggested is June 30, 2025.

MR. BERGSTEIN: Can I just clarify that?

NEAL R. GROSS

| 1 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes, I'm |
|----|---|
| 2 | sorry. |
| 3 | MR. BERGSTEIN: The applicant, for |
| 4 | its campus plan, used a date certain. |
| 5 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. |
| 6 | MR. BERGSTEIN: For the first stage |
| 7 | PUD it used 20 years. |
| 8 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. |
| 9 | MR. BERGSTEIN: I chose |
| 10 | specificity, but you could do either way. I |
| 11 | just wanted both to end on the same date, |
| 12 | whatever that might be. |
| 13 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. |
| 14 | Bergstein. So if you feel like you want to |
| 15 | cross out that 2025 and put 2026, I don't |
| 16 | think |
| 17 | COMMISSIONER PARSONS: How about |
| 18 | 2027? |
| 19 | (Laughter.) |
| 20 | I don't know. I mean, it's a 20- |
| 21 | year plan. Ought to be 20 years from the date |
| 22 | we take action, shouldn't it? |

| 1 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: We can do |
|----|--|
| 2 | that. |
| 3 | MR. BERGSTEIN: If it's 20 years |
| 4 | is 20 years from the effective date of the |
| 5 | order. That's how |
| 6 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. That's |
| 7 | fine, 20 years from the effective date of the |
| 8 | order. |
| 9 | VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let me just |
| 10 | comment, Madam Chair. Early on I was |
| 11 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. |
| 12 | VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: not in |
| 13 | favor of this amount of time. But I'm going |
| 14 | to have to go along and yield to Mr. Parsons, |
| 15 | because 2027, in those years he'll be the only |
| 16 | one still here on this Commission. |
| 17 | (Laughter.) |
| 18 | So he'll have to deal with that. |
| 19 | But I will tell you I was I was not in |
| 20 | favor of I really was not in favor of a 20- |
| 21 | year plan. And I'm just joking, Mr. Parsons. |
| 22 | I was really just not I was not in favor |

of the 20-year plan. But as Mr. Parsons stated, and I look at the first stage PUD and this new precedent that's being set on campus plans, I will have to yield to his comments and agree to it.

But early on, I grappled with that 20 years or whatever -- how many years you all -- we put into it, because I didn't think that it gave any predictability to the neighborhood. But then, when I revisited it and looked at the first stage PUD, I think it does. And maybe this is a new era, and maybe this will accomplish some things that have not been accomplished in that neighborhood.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mr. Jeffries?

COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Yes. I think there is just general practicality around, you know, a campus plan term that's 20 years plus or so. I mean, with the vision of the university set forth, I mean, that's going to require a lot of thoughtfulness in terms

NEAL R. GROSS

of, you know, planning that -- I mean, executing on that vision, particularly in the context of, you know, a neighborhood.

And with all the other constraints that will be upon GW, I think it really makes sense that, you know, they be afforded, you know, enough time in which to sort of, you know, work through this pretty bold plan that, again, is in the context of a neighborhood. It's not in a field where you can just build. I mean, there's lots of things that bear down on being able to execute something that's bold, so --

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Anyone else?
Mr. Turnbull?

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes, Madam Chair. I would agree with all the other -- with all the rest of the Commissioners. I think when you look at a business plan for a campus and what they have to do, by the time you've programmed a building -- first of all, you have to have the endowment, you have to

NEAL R. GROSS

have the money there to build it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

But you have to have -- you have to do the programming, you have to do the design work, and then you're getting construction, and before long -- it could take three or four years before you've got something, if that sometimes.

think by the time they've planned two or three buildings, 10 years will have gone by. So depending upon -- I think it rational approach gives how on to strategically do their mission and build a significant program. And I'm going to be looking forward to the greening of their campus.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.

Okay. So I think we have -- we have a consensus about 20 years, that it will be -- the approval will be for 20 years from the effective date of the order.

Okay. So now we have a series of conditions, and I'm just going to walk us

NEAL R. GROSS

through, starting on page 16 of the draft that we have in front of us.

And that this will replace the existing campus plan, and the -- we'll have to modify the first campus plan condition, just to reflect the 20 years. And then --

MR. BERGSTEIN: Just so the audience isn't confused, the draft you're working from is a draft I provide to you, which is a confidential document, so page 16 has no reference to anything that the audience might have.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Then,
I'll try and tie it to something that they
might have.

Okay. So this the first condition relates proffered to what was condition number 1 by the applicant, which relates to just the duration of the plan. Then, the second condition that was proffered by the applicant was that they would not litigation challenging the initiate

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Commission action.

And while I would just as soon they not do that, I don't think we want to be incorporating -- I don't think we want to be giving the appearance of trading our approvals for a lack of -- or, you know, a willingness not to litigate.

So, you know, bring it on, whatever you've got.

So we'll eliminate condition number 2. The boundary would remain unchanged from that that is specified in the existing campus plan. That's condition number 3, and there's no change proposed there.

What had been proffered as the applicant -- by the applicant as condition number 4 has now been incorporated into the PUD portion of the approval, which relates to any development or redevelopment other than a minor change or a project that's being done to conform with the building code, or one that does not affect a building's size. Any new

NEAL R. GROSS

development would come back as a second stage PUD and only for those designated development sites.

Condition number 5 has to do with -- again, with redevelopment, and it has been incorporated as a condition of the PUD, and it is basically giving adequate notice to the parties that would be affected of an intent to redevelop a specific site on the campus. So that is now becoming a PUD condition.

What was proffered as condition number 6, which relates to the submission for a second stage PUD, has also been incorporated into the PUD conditions.

condition What was number 7 proposed by the applicant, which has to do with compliance, sort of checking in compliance upon submission of a second stage approval is being dealt with now as condition of the PUD, and it incorporates the provisions proffered by that were applicant.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

What had been proffered condition number 8 by the applicant is now dealt with in condition number 1 of the PUD, which relates to the university, because it's proffer as opposed campus to а plan condition, which relates to their proffer not to purchase additional residentially zoned properties outside of the campus, if you recall that.

And then, we get to condition number 9, which has to do with the campus population. And that's on page 19 for us now, and it's -- it was condition number 9 proposed by the applicant. It's now C10 on your list and -- oh, I take it back, that's not right. That's not right. I'm sorry. The Advisory Committee is number 9, I'm sorry. It's still number 10.

The Advisory Committee is now a PUD condition, and condition number 10 is now condition number 10 on page 19. And that --

VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I have a

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

| 1 | question. |
|----|--|
| 2 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes, sir. |
| 3 | VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Did we deal |
| 4 | with that at the when we approved the first |
| 5 | stage PUD? We dealt with that, didn't we, the |
| 6 | Advisory Committee? |
| 7 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes, I believe |
| 8 | we did. |
| 9 | VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. |
| 10 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: It was |
| 11 | proffered. It was proffered as a condition, |
| 12 | so that they would form this. We can't make |
| 13 | them form it. They're proffering that they |
| 14 | will create this. They can't compel these |
| 15 | other groups to participate or anything. |
| 16 | VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Right, I |
| 17 | understand that. But at least the intent |
| 18 | at least from the Commission, the direction is |
| 19 | that this will be at least there will be a |
| 20 | good faith effort to make this happen. |
| 21 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes. |

NEAL R. GROSS

HOOD:

VICE-CHAIRPERSON

22

That's

okay.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes.

 $\label{thm:person} \mbox{VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD:} \qquad \mbox{And I'm} \\ \mbox{sure we hashed it out during the first stage} \\ \mbox{PUD. Thank you.} \\$

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So now we're to condition number 10, and this has to do with campus population. And I think -- and this is being preserved from the existing campus plan, and I don't think there are any changes that are being suggested, apart from one minor thing that was suggested by the West End Citizens Association in C.

And it says -- in C it talks about the audit, and it -- about halfway through it says "by a firm previously approved by the Zoning Administrator and the Advisory Committee" is what it says in the condition. And the West End Citizens Association said the Zoning Administrator and the D.C. Inspector General.

So I don't know about that. I

NEAL R. GROSS

assume it's the same. I don't know that we can compel the Inspector General, but the Zoning Administrator is somebody that we do deal with, so I don't think there's anything to be gained by adding the Inspector General there. So I would advise against that addition.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: So you would leave it in and report it to the Advisory Committee.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Condition number 11 deals with the faculty and staff head counts. Now, in this condition -- and these are unchanged from the existing campus plan. The difference for West End Citizens Association is they want the faculty and staff head counts to be separated, and which there are numbers that exist.

But I think, you know, we had some
-- we had a fair amount of testimony on some

NEAL R. GROSS

sort of fine tuning of trying to calculate the number of employees in different categories. And my concern is that I think the impact on campus -- at least the testimony that we have, there is no -- there has been no distinction made about the impact of faculty versus staff.

And I think that by -- if we separate them out, that makes -- potentially makes for more area of contention, so between how did you count faculty and how did you count staff, that it serves no purpose if in the aggregate they haven't exceeded the number.

So I don't -- I wanted to remind folks that West End Citizens had suggested that we separate it out. I don't advocate for that myself, so I just wanted to see if there's any support for separating those out.

Okay. Then, there's a litany in 11A of what the faculty and staff head count will include, and to that list the West End Citizens had suggested that we add after the

NEAL R. GROSS

last item, which is visiting instructional and research faculty, "and contracted employees providing services within the campus plan boundaries."

Now, I don't know exactly what a contracted employee would be in this context, because we have -- in the next sentence we're not including the last -- the last set of individuals, wouldn't include we our contractors that provide ancillary campusfunctions service related who are not employees of the university.

So I don't know what a contract employee is exactly and whether or not we wouldn't have captured them elsewhere. I'm just a little leery about including that one, because I don't know what it means.

And also, we had from the -- I think it was from the university that they had suggested that if these folks aren't employees but they're employees of contractors that they really -- it's very difficult for them to

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

track these numbers. So from an administrative standpoint, I'm not sure that that's going to be beneficial, but I'd like to know what the consensus of the group is.

VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Madam Chair, where did we cite you believe that we've already captured that about the contract employees?

Well, I just CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: don't know -- well, if we run through -- we have regular full-time faculty and staff, staff, regular part-time faculty and account staff that are not Foggy Bottom temporary part-time faculty, students, visiting instructional and research faculty. I don't know what a contract employee is that have been captured above. Τf would not they're an employee, wouldn't they have been captured?

VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Well, they may be contracted for a special project for a certain amount of time. You may have a

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

contract employee -- and I know you know this. You probably know it better than I do. You may have a contract employee who was not employed by GW who may come on site and may be under a contract to do some kind of -- I'm not sure what type of work, and they may be contracted for a year.

And I think that's where they're going -- West End was going. And that means that would be more I guess intensity use or more people coming to the site.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, actually, maybe what it is -- maybe what it is is like say it's cleaning or something, and so they have -- they hire -- they say, you know, Joe's Cleaning Company cleans the campus, and those are not employees of the university, but they're employees of a contractor.

VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Right.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: But I think the problem for the university is they find it difficult to find out, well, how many

NEAL R. GROSS

| 1 | employees do you have? And that could change |
|----|--|
| 2 | from time to time. They've contracted for a |
| 3 | service, not necessarily a specific number of |
| 4 | bodies to provide the service. So I just |
| 5 | I'm just concerned about the |
| 6 | COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I had a |
| 7 | different take on this. |
| 8 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. |
| 9 | COMMISSIONER PARSONS: And maybe |
| 10 | our confusion is apparent here. But I didn't |
| 11 | think these were contractors who were |
| 12 | providing services. |
| 13 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. |
| 14 | COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Rather, an |
| 15 | employee who is under contract to the |
| 16 | university to teach a certain class as opposed |
| 17 | to a full-time employee. That's what I |
| 18 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: But we |
| 19 | COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I didn't |
| 20 | sense that there were significant enough |
| 21 | numbers to even worry about it. |
| 22 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, the |

| 1 | thing is it says regular full what's |
|----|--|
| 2 | already included, regular full-time faculty, |
| 3 | regular part-time faculty and staff. So I |
| 4 | think we've captured it. I don't does |
| 5 | anyone feel strongly about adding it? |
| 6 | COMMISSIONER PARSONS: No. |
| 7 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Because |
| 8 | otherwise |
| 9 | VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Does it |
| 10 | hurt? |
| 11 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I don't |
| 12 | see, that's my concern is that the without |
| 13 | really knowing what it is, if we put if we |
| 14 | tell the university, okay, you've got to keep |
| 15 | track of this, and it's something that we |
| 16 | don't even know exactly what it is, that's not |
| 17 | |
| 18 | VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. |
| 19 | Thank you. |
| 20 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: that's not |
| 21 | fair. |
| 22 | Okay. And then, we also had |

| 1 | let's see, along the same lines, we also have |
|----|--|
| 2 | the another addition that would be at the |
| 3 | end, and maybe this helps to clarify what was |
| 4 | intended by those words. "The annual report |
| 5 | shall indicate each company with a contract to |
| 6 | provide services in whole or in part within |
| 7 | the campus plan boundaries and the number of |
| 8 | employees providing services associated with |
| 9 | each contractor." |
| 10 | So that maybe that's what that |
| 11 | was intended to capture, but this is exactly |
| 12 | what the university in their response had said |
| 13 | that they find it hard to administer or to |
| 14 | track. |
| 15 | So I need |
| 16 | COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I was not |
| 17 | persuaded that contractors should be included, |
| 18 | if that's what you want. |
| 19 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Anybody |
| 20 | else feel strongly about that? |
| 21 | (No response.) |

Okay. 11B is unchanged. And then,

condition number 12, which has to do with the of beds provided within the number university-controlled beds provided within the campus plan. That was so important to the last campus plan, that's unchanged. And condition number 13 is also unchanged. That requires freshman and sophomore students to reside in housing within the campus boundary.

Condition number 14, which has to do with housing where the university was proffering that they would bring undergraduate students back on campus out of university-controlled properties that were off campus. That's now a PUD condition.

Condition number 15, which relates to advising students who are eligible to live off campus with information about housing opportunities that are outside of Foggy Bottom West End, so the -- with the intent that they wouldn't be concentrating students who could live off campus in the immediate neighborhood.

And then, there was a proposal by

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

West End Citizens that we should add the following language. "The university shall not collect referral fees for properties in which it holds a direct or indirect financial interest." And, frankly, I think that's beyond our purview, so I don't recommend adding that.

Condition number 16 relates disciplinary matters, and the West End Citizens Association has -- okay, first, it that the university shall says use interventions for disciplinary acts of misconduct by students living off campus in the Foggy Bottom West End area, even if the students are in properties owned not controlled by the university.

Then, West End Citizens suggested that we add, "The university shall maintain records for each such event for a minimum of five years, regardless of the disposition." I don't --

COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Regardless

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 of disposition, what does that mean? 2 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Whether or not there was any action taken. 3 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: 4 Oh. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: 5 I mean, Ι think, you know, if there's a requirement for 6 7 them to report in this annual reporting that But unless it's that requirement be met. 8 otherwise required by the zoning order, 9 10 wouldn't -- I don't think we should require a separate maintenance of incidents that 11 haven't expressed an interest in elsewhere in 12 the order. 13 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: 14 I agree. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I'm relying on 15 you guys to speak up if you disagree. 16 And then, we just would want to 17 change I think to clarify -- and this is a 18 19 suggestion that West End Citizens made where it says that the university shall act on 20

incident reports by residents, and so on, and

And I think, just to clarify, that

police.

21

would be Metropolitan Police Department.

Condition 17 relates to the university maintaining a hotline, and then a log of the calls that come into the hotline, and so on. And then, near the end, prior to the last sentence, the West End Citizens has suggested that this process shall be fully described, so it's the reporting process -- reporting of incidents.

This process shall be fully described on the university website, published catalogues, and student handbooks. I think that's an acceptable suggestion, so that it's clear to folks what the process is and how they can avail themselves of that.

Condition number 18, which has to do with a program for students that they have to participate in called the good -- you know, where they explain good neighbor issues and how to be a good neighbor I guess.

The West End Citizens has suggested that in the middle of that condition that it's

NEAL R. GROSS

a -- this program will especially emphasize objectionable noise, both inside and outside of buildings, restricted parking in the Foggy Bottom West End area, illegal underage drinking, and respect for personal and real the property of residential and private business communities. So that's sort getting at what constitutes good neighbor issues, which I think is fine clarification.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay?

Condition number 19, there's no suggestions for that one. That has to do with the university maintaining local -- a list of local addresses.

Conditions number 20 and 21, which relate to the historic preservation proffer and the streetscape proffer have now been moved to the PUD section, as I discussed earlier. Then, we have the transportation measures, minimized adverse impacts associated with parking and traffic. And I don't think

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

there are any suggestions until we get to D, which is student vehicles.

there's the proffer Now, there's the proposed condition that you see on D that includes, I would note, "In particular, freshmen and sophomores who are not exempted from the Foggy Bottom campus housing requirement are prohibited from bringing vehicles other to the campus than exceptional circumstances," and then it goes on.

We have a proposal from West End Citizens that would sort of turn the condition around and model it on other campus plans, including Mount Vernon and Georgetown. And so this is what they've proffered as a sort of lead-in to condition number 22.

The university shall prohibit freshmen and sophomores from bringing cars to the Foggy Bottom West End area. Notice of this restriction will be included in at least one written document -- for example, the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

college catalogue mailed to parents of prospective freshmen and returning sophomores.

In addition, each freshman and sophomore must provide a signature to indicate he or she has read and understands this parking policy, regardless of whether he or she drives to school or is eligible to have a car on campus. And there's a note that AU's parking policy includes this provision.

Failure to comply is a violation. The university shall appropriately sanction any discovered violators and keep a full accounting of all violations and sanctions. In addition, the university shall notify all undergraduate and graduate students that parking is prohibited on the streets adjacent to and surrounding the Foggy Bottom campus.

So this is a more -- I guess it's a more aggressive policy that's being proposed, as opposed to -- it's just a more aggressive expression of it, and it requires some overaction on the part of the university to

NEAL R. GROSS

| 1 | sort of say to the student not just it's |
|----|---|
| 2 | prohibited, but here's a document that you |
| 3 | have to sign that says you understand this. |
| 4 | So what's the pleasure of the |
| 5 | Commission on that point? |
| 6 | COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: It sounds a |
| 7 | bit prescriptive to me, but I'm willing to go |
| 8 | along with it. |
| 9 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: It's been used |
| 10 | before, and also I think it's adding it's |
| 11 | not that the adverse impact hasn't been |
| 12 | acknowledged by the condition that exists. |
| 13 | It's just I think an improvement to the |
| 14 | condition, so if there's a consensus that |
| 15 | that's |
| 16 | COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Is that |
| 17 | eliminating the sentence about exceptional |
| 18 | circumstances? |
| 19 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Just a second. |
| 20 | It would. It does. |
| 21 | COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I |
| 22 | personally think that ought to still be in |
| | |

there. I mean, there are times when someone
-- when a student may need, just like it says
here, you know, for a health condition or
whatever, for his family, her family, or
whatever.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I would say that the exceptional circumstances ought to remain in there.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Let's -- okay, so we can do a hybrid. We can add what -- there's another section that West End Citizens suggested, so we can add the section that I read, and then we can retain from the condition "other than in exceptional circumstances," and then what goes on to describe exceptional circumstances and how that can be invoked.

Then, we had -- another part of D was this notion of the university maintaining a record of license plate numbers and that the university directs students to register their

NEAL R. GROSS

vehicles. And the West End Citizens suggested that after the sentence "or obtain reciprocity sticker" that it says, "Further, the university shall require documentation for licenses, inspection stickers, current Failure to vehicular insurance. register student vehicles in the District or to obtain reciprocity stickers shall constitute violation of the Code of Student Conduct."

And I guess that was contained elsewhere. Let me just doublecheck that.

(Pause.)

Mr. Hood is pointing out to me that there is already language in the proposed condition that says that any violation of this policy shall be grounds for discipline under the university's Code of Student Conduct. So I guess we've actually captured most of that. But the difference is that this goes further and has -- basically has the university enforcing District law, which -- I think that's a little over the top myself.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Let me just see how this reads.

(Pause.)

I think -- I mean, I think I can go along with everything that West End Citizens suggested, with the exception of basically putting the university in the shoes of the government and saying that if you don't follow the District law as it relates to documenting your vehicle that you violated the Code of Student Conduct.

I would hope the student -- Code of Student Conduct would already say that violations of District law are violations of the Code of Conduct, and so we don't need to get into the -- sort of the fine tuning of it. That's me, but what do other people think?

confused. You said this was stated earlier?

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: This -- what's the "this"? I'm sorry. I was looking -- it says here in a note that it was currently already in another condition, but I did not

COMMISSIONER PARSONS:

NEAL R. GROSS

I'm a little

| 1 | find it when I looked. |
|----|--|
| 2 | COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Oh, okay. |
| 3 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So |
| 4 | COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Well, I |
| 5 | certainly wouldn't want to pull it out of one |
| 6 | and leave it in another. |
| 7 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Right. So |
| 8 | right now we have that the university |
| 9 | prohibits freshmen and sophomores driving to |
| 10 | campus. They are put on notice of that, and |
| 11 | they're required to sign a they're required |
| 12 | to acknowledge their understanding of the |
| 13 | parking policy. |
| 14 | And the university will notify all |
| 15 | undergraduate and graduate students that |
| 16 | parking is prohibited on the streets adjacent |
| 17 | to and surrounding the Foggy Bottom campus. I |
| 18 | think I really want to on that one, I |
| 19 | mean, I really want to review the other orders |
| 20 | that are being referenced to get that right. |
| 21 | COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Do you mean |
| 22 | with regard to the disciplinary action? |

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, I mean, if you can park at a two-hour meter and put money in it, I mean, I don't know that -- if you're a student that your -- all of a sudden your right to park at a two-hour meter has somehow been abridged because of the campus plan.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Yes. Well, let's take it out.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. So I'd also like to take out, then, what's being suggested. "Further, the university shall require documentation for current licenses, inspection stickers, and vehicular insurance," because that puts them in -- I mean, then they're in the business of enforcing all that, and I don't think that that's their role, because that implies they're going to enforce on that. Okay? That wasn't an addition that was suggested by West End Citizens.

So anything else on the student vehicles?

NEAL R. GROSS

| 1 | MR. BERGSTEIN: Can I just clarify |
|----|--|
| 2 | that you're, in essence, expanding the |
| 3 | condition so that it applies both to |
| 4 | sophomores and freshmen who are required to |
| 5 | live on campus, but also applies to sophomores |
| 6 | and freshmen who are exempt from that |
| 7 | requirement because they're commuters, |
| 8 | married, etcetera, because that was the carve- |
| 9 | out that the university had proposed in terms |
| 10 | of its prohibition. |
| 11 | So apart from how you're stating |
| 12 | the requirement, you're also applying it not |
| 13 | just to students who are living on campus in |
| 14 | terms of bringing vehicles into the campus but |
| 15 | also saying, in essence, the only way you can |
| 16 | commute is by means other than vehicular |
| 17 | transportation. |
| 18 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes, I think |
| 19 | right. |
| 20 | MR. BERGSTEIN: Okay. |
| 21 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And then, but |
| 22 | we then, we do have the provision where |

they can -- if there's an exceptional circumstance, that they can make application for an exception.

Condition number 23. Okay. Under 23B, the condition that has been proposed is okay. These are provisions of the transportation management plan, and it includes the following provisions. So provision B is "measures to discourage travel by private automobile and encourage travel by public transportation."

And then, it says -- so West End Citizens is just expanding that, which I think is actually redundant with condition number 22, but I'll mention it anyway -- measures to restrict freshmen and sophomores from bringing cars to the Foggy Bottom West End area and to discourage travel by private automobile by upper classmen, graduate students, and university faculty and staff, and encourage travel by public transportation.

I think that B captures all of

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that, and that just adds more specificity. But if the specificity isn't in -- I mean, it's already in condition number 22, so I don't know that adding it really adds anything.

Condition number 24 has to do with the periodic reporting that's required, and there's a couple of suggestions. One is -- oh, I'm sorry. Sorry. Oh, I think the reporting -- oh, the reporting requirements are in R25. It's on page 31. It was proffered as -- yes, it was proposed as 24, and now it's R25.

So the first thing is that West End wanted the distinction between faculty and staff reported in B, which we're aggregating those, so we don't -- we need not make that change.

Under C, they were saying that under C, little I, that full-time Foggy Bottom undergraduate students shall be defined as the number of students in the Foggy Bottom Mount

NEAL R. GROSS

| 1 | Vernon campus total student body, minus |
|----|---|
| 2 | graduate students, first professionals |
| 3 | which are J.D.s and M.D.s and here's the |
| 4 | part where there's a change proposed |
| 5 | undergraduates taking fewer than 12 credit |
| 6 | hours at the Foggy Bottom campus. |
| 7 | And we have a suggestion from West |
| 8 | End that we change the 12 to 9. And I'm I |
| 9 | guess I'm not comfortable with that, just |
| 10 | because that I don't recall testimony or |
| 11 | the distinction between 12 versus 9, and I |
| 12 | think if that's what the university thinks is |
| 13 | a full credit load, then if 12 is a full |
| 14 | credit load |
| 15 | COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Absolutely. |
| 16 | I don't recall any testimony about this at |
| 17 | all. |
| 18 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Does |
| 19 | anybody want to change the 12 to a 9? |
| 20 | (No response.) |
| 21 | Okay. Okay. So now we're still in |
| 22 | the minus category, and they've they want |

to delete from the -- from what's subtracted
-- West End Citizens wants to delete
"undergraduate continuous enrollment students
and full-time undergraduate students that
reside at the Mount Vernon campus."

Okay. So keep in mind that this section is about calculating the on-campus undergraduate student housing requirement. So people that are living at Mount Vernon, I don't know why you would count them in the Foggy Bottom campus housing requirement.

And the undergraduate continuous enrollment students, my recollection is those were people that they were going to -- they really had finished all of their credits, but they were going to graduate later, so they were really not attending school. Do you remember that? Mr. Bergstein, do you remember that, what -- no.

I'm pretty sure that they were people that were no longer actually actively attending classes. So I don't know why they

NEAL R. GROSS

would be counted either.

So I think we -- I'm not in favor of making the deletions that are recommended by West End Citizens to that section.

And then, at the end of that -- at the end of letter C, so here's the data for the campus housing requirement -- oh, it's after that. It's after -- this has to do with the first sentence that's not lettered, but it's still in C. It says, "All data shall be reported for each individual semester, and also as an average." Okay?

And West End Citizens wants us to put the period -- and then it goes on to talk about averaging, and West End Citizens wants us to put a period after "all data shall be reported for each individual semester."

So we confronted this, if you recall, when we -- when we did -- we took something up, some case up related to Georgetown where the applicant was using -- this was in a further processing case. The

NEAL R. GROSS

applicant was using averaging, and we said that that wasn't -- that's not what we would advocate for, and then they went back and had the BZA take the opposite position from what we had said. But that notwithstanding.

So the proposed condition says that the data is reported for each individual semester and then also as an average. it says compliance with the on-campus undergraduate student housing requirement set forth in condition 12 shall be based on the reported fall of the and semesters until the fall 2010 semester, or until the completion and occupancy of the next GW residence hall project proposed in accordance with the Foggy Bottom or Vernon campus plans, whichever occurs first.

And, again, we didn't hear any testimony about that. So I'm in favor -- I'm not in favor of averaging, and I'm in favor of putting the period where West End Citizens has suggested that we just end it and we don't

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

| 1 | accommodate the averaging |
|----|--|
| 2 | VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So what |
| 3 | would it read, Madam Chair? |
| 4 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: It would just |
| 5 | read at the end of C, so after that long list, |
| 6 | "All data shall be reported for each |
| 7 | individual semester." |
| 8 | COMMISSIONER PARSONS: So you'll |
| 9 | get a different count in the fall than you |
| 10 | will in the spring. |
| 11 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Right. But |
| 12 | that the requirement is not to exceed the |
| 13 | requirement is to be in compliance without |
| 14 | averaging I guess, and I guess the we did |
| 15 | not and, Mr. Bergstein, correct me if I'm |
| 16 | wrong, but we did not allow averaging up to |
| 17 | this point in the GW campus plan. |
| 18 | MR. BERGSTEIN: That's correct, but |
| 19 | there was a condition in a former plan that |
| 20 | indicated the date upon which the actual |
| 21 | number would be based upon, which I think was |
| 22 | in the compliance reports that were due in |

August.

And I can't remember when the -whatever six months from that was, and I don't
know if there's a -- my question to you was
what, then, will compliance be based upon if
not averaging? Is it going to be based upon
enrollment as of a date certain? And then,
what is that date?

And I can't recall if there is a provision in here -- OP has a better recollection than I do -- that indicates that there is a date -- a particular compliance report that would specify what that particular date would be. Otherwise, there is an issue of when do you actually -- what date do you select.

I remember the university feeling that the August date was too early, because their enrollment did not solidify until later into the fall semester.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.

MR. BERGSTEIN: And there was

NEAL R. GROSS

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

| 1 | probably a similar consideration with respect |
|----|--|
| 2 | to the spring semester. So if you're not |
| 3 | going to use averaging, then I think you need |
| 4 | to determine what would be the date upon which |
| 5 | an actual number would be judged. |
| 6 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Well, |
| 7 | see, here it goes on and I'm not |
| 8 | disputing your point. Your point is a fine |
| 9 | point. It is a very good point. But at the |
| 10 | end, after they say because they want an |
| 11 | average until fall of 2010, or until they |
| 12 | build a new residence hall. |
| 13 | But then they say, "After the |
| 14 | occurrence of the aforementioned event, and |
| 15 | for the remainder of the term of this plan, |
| 16 | compliance with the on-campus undergraduate |
| 17 | student housing requirement shall be based on |
| 18 | the data reported for each individual |
| 19 | semester." No date no date specified. |
| 20 | Mr. Parker, do you have anything |
| 21 | you want to add? |

Yes.

MR. PARKER:

22

I was involved

| 1 | with creating the averaging for the next three |
|----|--|
| 2 | years, and what we've done with these we've |
| 3 | changed the definitions of a lot of things in |
| 4 | here that changes the head count requirement |
| 5 | and the bed requirement from the current plan. |
| 6 | And right now they have produced |
| 7 | beds based on the current campus plan |
| 8 | requirement. This change would put them out |
| | |
| 9 | of compliance until they have another dorm. |
| 10 | So this was based this new counting was |
| 11 | based on the next dorm or this new way of |
| 12 | requiring residency on campus. So |
| 13 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Would you say |
| 14 | one more time what would what is the thing |
| 15 | that puts them out of compliance now? |
| 16 | MR. PARKER: We have changed how |
| 17 | students are counted on campus or on and |
| 18 | it's what would be required. Let me see |
| 19 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: In what way? |
| 20 | MR. PARKER: That's an excellent |
| 21 | question. One minute. |
| 22 | I don't have the old data in front |

| 1 | of me. I'd have to get back to you on that. |
|----|--|
| 2 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So let me just |
| 3 | try and get at it this way, which is, are you |
| 4 | saying that we are relative to the existing |
| 5 | campus plan that what is proposed here is that |
| 6 | we're counting a group that we didn't formerly |
| 7 | count? |
| 8 | MR. PARKER: I believe so, yes. |
| 9 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I mean, I |
| 10 | would rather say that they don't count those |
| 11 | people until 2010 than average, to be honest |
| 12 | with you, because I don't want |
| 13 | MR. PARKER: We can do that. |
| 14 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: averaging |
| 15 | to averaging is bad. I think it's bad. |
| 16 | MR. PARKER: We can absolutely do |
| 17 | that. |
| 18 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. But we |
| 19 | still have the open question of what is that |
| 20 | group. |
| 21 | MR. PARKER: I believe it has to do |
| 22 | with we've taken some of the Mount Vernon |
| | |

| 1 | campus we've changed how Mount Vernon |
|----|--|
| 2 | campus students are counted. Under the |
| 3 | existing plan, they're not counted at all. |
| 4 | And under this plan, we're counting any that |
| 5 | take some classes, take a certain percentage |
| 6 | of the classes on |
| 7 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I see. |
| 8 | MR. PARKER: Foggy Bottom, to |
| 9 | the best of my recollection. |
| 10 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mr. Bergstein? |
| 11 | MR. BERGSTEIN: It has been pointed |
| 12 | out to me that the current condition you're |
| 13 | looking at indicates that the information at |
| 14 | the end of the introductory paragraph to 25 is |
| 15 | based upon a Census date, which is defined in |
| 16 | the footnote. |
| 17 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: It's the date |
| 18 | that the report is due. Where is the Census |
| 19 | date? Oh, I see, Census date. Oh, I'm sorry. |
| 20 | MR. BERGSTEIN: As of the Census |
| 21 | date, so that is the date that any firm |
| | |

numbers --

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Okay.

So we've got that nailed down, so now we have

MR. PARKER: As you were saying, we could certainly have a provision to have the existing 2000 campus plan counts completed on an individual semester basis until 2010, or until the first storm.

this other issue about what is this new group.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So I'm just trying to not leave this open issue, Bergstein. So can we do it this way, can we say that whatever -- as Mr. Parker said, and you'll change the phraseology but not meaning, which is we will count undergraduate students, or the on-campus students for the housing requirement the same way as we do now until fall of 2010 or until the completion and occupancy of the next GW residence hall proposed in accordance with the Foggy Bottom or Mount Vernon campus plans, after which time we'll count them as we're saying here, and that will all be written nicely.

NEAL R. GROSS

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

| 1 | MR. BERGSTEIN: And I'll work with |
|----|--|
| 2 | OP to get more specifics in terms of how we do |
| 3 | now, so we can write that in, too. |
| 4 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Great. Okay. |
| 5 | MR. BERGSTEIN: Okay. |
| 6 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Is everybody |
| 7 | okay with that? |
| 8 | (No response.) |
| 9 | I just don't want to get into the |
| 10 | averaging thing, because I think it's fraught |
| 11 | with problems. |
| 12 | Okay. Then, I think the only thing |
| 13 | left is that we I just want the Commission |
| 14 | to know that West End Citizens also proposed |
| 15 | condition number 26 and 27. And 26 has to do |
| 16 | with the compliance with the D.C. |
| 17 | Environmental Policy Act and submission of an |
| 18 | environmental impact statement, which we've |
| 19 | said repeatedly is beyond our purview. So I'm |
| 20 | not advocating that that be incorporated. |
| 21 | And then, there was also another |
| 22 | condition, number 27, that they had proposed |

that is short enough that I'll just read it. "The university shall fully comply with each federal cross-cutting requirement that federal conditions receipt of funds, including, but not limited to, the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. ADA compliance shall include elevator and bathroom access before any further use of the Lisner Downstage space."

And, again, you know, that is Building Code compliance type stuff, and other -- compliance with other requirements that are not within the control of the Commission. So I would not advocate adding that either.

So is there anything else that you feel that I have -- Mr. Bergstein, is there anything that you think I've overlooked?

MR. BERGSTEIN: I just want to confirm with you that I added the provision for the Human Rights Act, which because there are two separate applications I wanted to

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

| 1 | repeat it in each set of conditions. |
|----|--|
| 2 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: That's fine, |
| 3 | and that's standard condition for us, right? |
| 4 | MR. BERGSTEIN: That's it, Madam |
| 5 | Chair. |
| 6 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. So with |
| 7 | those changes, which I have documented in my |
| 8 | notes, Mr. Bergstein and Mrs. Schellin, if you |
| 9 | need so with the changes to those proposed |
| 10 | conditions, I would move approval of Zoning |
| 11 | Commission Cases Number 06-11 and 06-12. |
| 12 | COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Second. |
| 13 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: There's a lot |
| 14 | of eagerness there. Thank you, Mr. Parsons. |
| 15 | Any further discussion? |
| 16 | VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes, I just |
| 17 | have a question. Why are we doing 06-11? |
| 18 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All the |
| 19 | provisions that we just went through are the |
| 20 | provisions for the case. |
| 21 | VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: No, wait. |
| 22 | Okay. We're doing 11 and 12? |

| 1 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes, together. |
|----|--|
| 2 | They have now become wedded. We just went |
| 3 | through the campus plan conditions when we did |
| 4 | the first |
| 5 | VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Right. |
| 6 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: stage. |
| 7 | VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. |
| 8 | Well, I know why we're doing 11, then. |
| 9 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. |
| 10 | VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I guess my |
| 11 | question is, why are we doing 12? We've |
| 12 | already done that? |
| 13 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: We have to |
| 14 | take final action on the PUD, so that's now |
| 15 | part and parcel of this. |
| 16 | VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So we're |
| 17 | doing 06 for the special exception, the campus |
| 18 | plan, and 06-12 is now final action. |
| 19 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes. |
| 20 | VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: The first |
| 21 | stage. |
| 22 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes. |

NEAL R. GROSS

| 1 | VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I |
|----|--|
| 2 | didn't hear that in the motion, but that's |
| 3 | fine, Madam Chair. |
| 4 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: No, it |
| 5 | VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Maybe it's |
| 6 | getting late. |
| 7 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I did not |
| 8 | clarify that. So the approval in 06-12 is |
| 9 | final action for the first stage PUD. So |
| 10 | thank you for clarifying that. Any further |
| 11 | discussion? |
| 12 | (No response.) |
| 13 | All those in favor, please say aye. |
| 14 | (Chorus of ayes.) |
| 15 | Those opposed, please say no. |
| 16 | (No response.) |
| 17 | Mrs. Schellin? |
| 18 | SECRETARY SCHELLIN: Staff will |
| 19 | record the vote five to zero to zero to |
| 20 | approve Zoning Commission Case Number 06-12 |
| 21 | for final action and the campus plan case in |
| 22 | 06-11. Commissioner Mitten moving. |

| 1 | Commissioner Parsons seconding, Commissioners |
|----|--|
| 2 | Hood, Jeffries, and Turnbull in favor. |
| 3 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. |
| 4 | Okay. We have several pieces of |
| 5 | correspondence. First is from Holland & |
| 6 | Knight on behalf of Florida Rock, which is |
| 7 | Case Number 04-14C. And they listened to our |
| 8 | conversation at our February 12th meeting, and |
| 9 | I'm sure they heard the need for, what was it, |
| 10 | major surgery on their proposal, and they're |
| 11 | asking if in their letter have they captured |
| 12 | the issues that adequately captured the |
| 13 | issues that they heard from the Commission. |
| 14 | And so I'd just ask, is there |
| 15 | anything anyone would like to add to what they |
| 16 | have articulated in the letter, or do you |
| 17 | think the letter captures |
| 18 | COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I think they |
| 19 | did an excellent job of consolidating our |
| 20 | remarks. |
| 21 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. |
| 22 | COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: And in some |

| 1 | places probably a better job of |
|----|---|
| 2 | (Laughter.) |
| 3 | articulating. So thank you. |
| 4 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. |
| 5 | COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: But, yes, I |
| 6 | think it's not necessary to have a meeting or |
| 7 | anything. I mean, I think we're set. |
| 8 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. |
| 9 | COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: So |
| 10 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Anybody |
| 11 | else? |
| 12 | (No response.) |
| 13 | All right. Then, we have a letter |
| 14 | from Holland & Knight. This was a there's |
| 15 | a modification request for the project at |
| 16 | 100 M Street, S.E., and they're requesting to |
| 17 | be put on the meeting agenda for March 26th |
| 18 | special public meeting. Is there any |
| 19 | objection to doing that? |
| 20 | (No response.) |
| 21 | That's going to be a long special |
| 22 | public meeting. And I appreciate the fact |

that the Commission is sensitive to trying to 1 2 get as much done while all of us who have participated in these cases are still 3 attendance. 4 So we have another request, then, 5 for -- related to Square 54, which is to put 6 7 that on, since we now have a submission in response to our discussion on Square 54, to 8 put that on the agenda for our special public 9 10 meeting on the 26th. Does anyone have any objection to that? 11 12 (No response.) 13 Okay, great. Then, I think before we go to the action on the minutes and the 14 15 Office of Planning report, I'd like to give 16 Mr. Jeffries an opportunity to take up the sua sponte review under other business of the BZA 17 Case 17553. 18 19 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Thank you, Madam Chair. 20

NEAL R. GROSS

Mitten, before we

SCHELLIN:

SECRETARY

Chairman

21

22

me.

the

Excuse

on,

move

| 1 | attorney for WECA has asked when they can |
|----|--|
| 2 | respond to the filing in Case Number 06-27, |
| 3 | the Square 54 case. They would like to be |
| 4 | able to respond to what they have submitted. |
| 5 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Oh. Okay. |
| 6 | Didn't we set a schedule for that? Oh, we |
| 7 | probably didn't because we |
| 8 | SECRETARY SCHELLIN: No, because it |
| 9 | was done when you talked about I mean, a |
| 10 | week want to do a week from today? |
| 11 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: A week, yes. |
| 12 | SECRETARY SCHELLIN: Okay. That |
| 13 | would make it the 19th. |
| 14 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. So |
| 15 | SECRETARY SCHELLIN: March 19th. |
| 16 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So just to be |
| 17 | clear, why don't I just why don't we |
| 18 | formalize this, which is that we'll reopen the |
| 19 | record in Case Number 06-27, to accept the |
| 20 | filing from that we requested from the |
| 21 | applicant as well as the responses from West |

End Citizens Association, I guess Foggy Bottom

| 1 | |
|----|---|
| 2 | SECRETARY SCHELLIN: And ANC. |
| 3 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: and the ANC |
| 4 | by |
| 5 | SECRETARY SCHELLIN: That would be |
| 6 | March 19th. |
| 7 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: By March 19th, |
| 8 | okay. Is there you have to direct your |
| 9 | inquiry through the staff, so I would ask for |
| 10 | a second. Is there a second to reopen the |
| 11 | record? |
| 12 | COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Second. |
| 13 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Any |
| 14 | discussion? |
| 15 | (No response.) |
| 16 | All those in favor, please say aye. |
| 17 | (Chorus of ayes.) |
| 18 | Those opposed, please say no. |
| 19 | (No response.) |
| 20 | And Mrs. Schellin can record that |
| 21 | vote later. |
| 22 | Okay. Mr. Jeffries, you have the |

NEAL R. GROSS

floor.

COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Thank you, Madam Chair, and members of the Commission. I'm proposing that the Commission take sua sponte review of BZA Case 17553, Segovia. The application involves an existing three-story, 20-unit apartment building located on the north side of the 1300 block of Euclid Street, N.W., in Columbia Heights.

The applicant was seeking variance approval to increase the height of the building from I believe 41 feet, which is three stories, to 59 feet, which is six stories including the penthouse, in an R-4 residential zone.

BZA voted three to two to grant variance relief, with myself and NCPC's representative voting to deny. The Office of Planning submitted two memos strongly encouraging the BZA to deny the application.

While the development program set forth by the applicant is noteworthy -- and by

NEAL R. GROSS

that I mean setting aside seven of the units out of 34 for some of the existing low-income families, I strongly feel the applicant did not clear any of the variance test hurdles. Namely, the applicant did not make a compelling case to assert an extraordinary or exceptional condition at the site.

applicant did not The provide enough evidence establish to practical а difficulty related to an extraordinary condition at the site. And, finally, I just think granting this variance relief to the applicant would be very much in opposition or the intent of the contrary to R-4residentially zoned district, and absolutely inconsistent with the character of the neighborhood.

And I have passed out a pictorial elevation that was submitted by the applicant showing the north side and the south side of the 1300 block of Euclid. And if you look at the bottom, you see the three-story, three and

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

a half story, 1327 Euclid Street, and you see the dashed representation of what is to be.

So it just speaks to me sort of the character of the neighborhood. I think the existing building is not immediately adjacent to the C-2-B district, but, as you can see, it's more to the center of the block.

As a Zoning Commissioner, I am very appreciative and respectful of the hard work and dedication of the BZA board members. However, in this instance, I feel compelled to have the Zoning Commission weigh in on this very important matter.

As you all know, this Commission recently took up proposed action on Zoning Case Number 06-26, which was a map amendment in Ward 1, which is in the area that this particular site is located. Different issues in that in that case there was clearly concern about the medium density developments encroaching on the R-4 zone, but I think it's really incumbent upon this Commission to

NEAL R. GROSS

1 continue to protect the R-4 zone, which is 2 what I think the end result will be as relates to this Commission taking a look at 3 4 this particular case. So that's it. I am -- you know, 5 any questions? But I really do feel strongly 6 7 that this is something that we really should take up. I think the sua sponte review is a 8 very serious matter, and it's something that I 9 10 certainly don't take lightly. But I think we need to protect -- I mean, it's our job to 11 protect the zone plan, and this is what the 12 13 Zoning Commission has to do. I'm really concerned -- I look at 14 this and I think of the King's Creek case and 15 16 some different issues. But I'm just concerned about if this was to go through, the impact it 17 would have on this R-4 district. 18 19 Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr.

Jeffries. Questions or comments for Mr.

Jeffries?

NEAL R. GROSS

20

21

| 1 | COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. |
|----|---|
| 2 | Jeffries, the top of the page, what is that |
| 3 | showing? That's the other side of the street? |
| 4 | COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Yes, |
| 5 | absolutely. That's across the street on the |
| 6 | south side of the street. |
| 7 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: What is the |
| 8 | south side zoned? |
| 9 | COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: It's R-5-B. |
| 10 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. |
| 11 | COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: So it's |
| 12 | split right down the street, then. |
| 13 | COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Absolutely. |
| 14 | COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. |
| 15 | Thank you. |
| 16 | COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: But you can |
| 17 | see just between the two street I mean, |
| 18 | what's on one side versus the other side. |
| 19 | COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well, I |
| 20 | note at the right end of the top elevation |
| 21 | there is a rather substantial building. |
| 22 | COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: And, you |

know, if you look to your -- at the top, to the right, that is actually a C-2 -- I think that's a C-2-B district, which is facing on 14th Street.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. You know, I'm very glad that you brought this to us, because, you know, one of the things that -- first of all, the variance test is very important, and, you know, if there -- if the variance test hasn't been met, then this is a non-starter from the word "go."

But there is also -- there is also a point at which even if the variance test is being met, that the BZA exceeds its authority when the relief that's granted is tantamount to a rezoning, which is what you're expressing about protecting the zone plan.

And, you know, it's just not appropriate to do, especially when it sounds like part of the argument was because of the degree of affordability, which in a variance case is not even guaranteed. I mean, at least

NEAL R. GROSS

| _ | In the context of a rob like we were tarking |
|----|---|
| 2 | about in several cases earlier, that is a |
| 3 | condition. |
| 4 | But that condition there is no |
| 5 | requirement that that condition even be |
| 6 | preserved in a case like this, so I I |
| 7 | support your concerns and I would be happy to |
| 8 | second a motion to take this up on sua sponte |
| 9 | review, if you care to make that motion. |
| 10 | VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: |
| L1 | Commissioner Jeffries, I just wanted to ask |
| L2 | you, what height is this? We have a diagram. |
| L3 | What is that height? |
| 14 | COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: It is to be |
| 15 | about 59 feet. |
| 16 | VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Fifty-nine |
| 17 | feet. |
| 18 | COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Including |
| 19 | that penthouse, yes. |
| 20 | VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And an R-4, |
| 21 | what is it, 40? |
| 22 | COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Forty. |

VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Forty feet.

COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: So it just -- you know, it leaps a zone effectively. And so it is -- it looks almost like de facto rezoning of the site, you know, and I think this sheet that we have here just sort of captured it for me. I'm like, wow, so --

When I look at the gray house next door, and I know that has nothing to do with the case -- I'm just curious as to the house next door, and I don't have enough information to even really talk intelligently, but I'm going to talk anyway. The gray house next door, was that ever discussed?

absolutely. That was part of what -- their feeling was that that building, you know, being adjacent to the referenced property, gave them some comfort that the character of the block was not being at all altered in that.

NEAL R. GROSS

But personally, I think -- and this is something that one of the Commissioners is always saying about the R-4 zone is that so much -- so many of the buildings are already non-conforming, the peaks and different things that go above, but Ι just think this particular building goes just a bit too far beyond, because I think if you look at these buildings they're all somewhere between 45, 43, 45 feet.

But 59 feet -- it just seems like there's a problem with proportionality, in terms of what is being -- what is being requested in terms of relief, it just seems the end result is just beyond -- well beyond what has been requested.

VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let me just ask this, and I know this is not a PUD or in line with the Chair's remarks, the seven affordability homes that were being -- apartments that were being -- apartments, condos, or whatever this is, what was the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

| 1 | percentage of the AMI? And I know this |
|----|---|
| 2 | doesn't the issue is whether they meet the |
| 3 | variance test. That's the issue. But I was |
| 4 | just curious. |
| 5 | COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: I want to |
| 6 | say I think I have this here. |
| 7 | VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: If you |
| 8 | don't know right off, was it like 30? Were we |
| 9 | getting down to those depths? |
| 10 | COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: No. No, I |
| 11 | don't think it was that. I want to say 60, |
| 12 | but hold it. Let me see. |
| 13 | (Pause.) |
| 14 | VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: That's |
| 15 | okay. |
| 16 | COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: If I come |
| 17 | across it, I'll let you know. |
| 18 | VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Yes, |
| 19 | just let me know. Okay. Thank you. |
| 20 | COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: But I |
| 21 | didn't but, again, as Madam Chair has said, |
| 22 | I mean, you know at some point I mean, |

again, the development program is absolutely
-- you know, I mean, it's laudable. I don't
-- I just don't know if this is the
appropriate location for it, you know, I mean,
in terms of what they're trying to do in an R4 zone. And that's my concern.

And, again, I think, you know, we'll get the information, we'll look -- review it, and we'll be able to, you know, discuss the merits or lack of. So --

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You know, you made another point that I think bears discussion is -- which is when we -- when -- the Office of Planning in recent years has been especially sensitive to this, but I think they've always been sensitive to it.

But in mapping any zone, we seek to minimize the number of non-conformities. And so there is clearly non-conformities here in the R-4 zone. But in seeking to minimize the number of non-conformities we don't intend that the non-conformities actually then work

NEAL R. GROSS

| 1 | to undermine the underlying zone. I mean, it |
|----|--|
| 2 | was put in consciously. |
| 3 | So I think that's another point |
| 4 | that our colleagues should be aware of. |
| 5 | So if you would like to |
| 6 | COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: So I make a |
| 7 | motion that we take sua sponte review of BZA |
| 8 | Case oh, I just had it here 17553, |
| 9 | Segovia. |
| 10 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And I second |
| 11 | that motion. Any further discussion on it? |
| 12 | (No response.) |
| 13 | All those in favor, please say aye. |
| 14 | (Chorus of ayes.) |
| 15 | Those opposed, please say no. |
| 16 | (No response.) |
| 17 | Mrs. Schellin. |
| 18 | SECRETARY SCHELLIN: Yes. Staff |
| 19 | will record the vote five to zero to zero to |
| 20 | take sua sponte review of BZA Case Number |
| 21 | 17553. Commissioner Jeffries moving, |
| 22 | Commissioner Mitten seconding, Commissioners |

| 1 | Hood, Parsons, and Turnbull in favor. |
|----|--|
| 2 | And since this will be under the |
| 3 | Zoning Commission review, I'm going to assign |
| 4 | Zoning Commission Case Number 07-06. |
| 5 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. |
| 6 | MR. BERGSTEIN: May I ask this |
| 7 | question of the Commission? It's not |
| 8 | expressly stated whether or not a decision to |
| 9 | take sua sponte review stays the BZA order, |
| 10 | although it's sort of implicit because the BZA |
| 11 | order becomes final upon filing, doesn't |
| 12 | become effective for 10 days, which is the sua |
| 13 | sponte period for the Commission. |
| 14 | But I would ask the Commission |
| 15 | whether or not it's its intent that the BZA |
| 16 | order be stayed pending the Commission's sua |
| 17 | sponte review. |
| 18 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I would say |
| 19 | absolutely. And if you do you want that |
| 20 | expressed in a motion? |
| 21 | MR. BERGSTEIN: I would prefer it, |
| 22 | yes, ma'am. |

| 1 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Then, I |
|----|--|
| 2 | move that we stay the effectiveness of BZA |
| 3 | Order 17553 pending our |
| 4 | COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Second. |
| 5 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: sua sponte |
| 6 | review. |
| 7 | COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Second. |
| 8 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. |
| 9 | All those in favor, please say aye. |
| 10 | (Chorus of ayes.) |
| 11 | Those opposed, please say no. |
| 12 | (No response.) |
| 13 | Mrs. Schellin. |
| 14 | SECRETARY SCHELLIN: Staff will |
| 15 | record the vote five to zero to stay |
| 16 | the provisions of BZA Order Number 17553. |
| 17 | Commissioner Mitten moving, Commissioner |
| 18 | Jeffries seconding, Commissioners Hood, |
| 19 | Parsons, and Turnbull in favor. |
| 20 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. |
| 21 | And thank you, Mr. Bergstein. |
| 22 | Okay. We have action on the |

| 1 | minutes. We have two sets of minutes in front |
|----|---|
| 2 | of us. We have the regular public meeting |
| 3 | minutes of January 8, 2007, and the special |
| 4 | public meeting minutes of January 17, 2007. |
| 5 | And I would move approval. |
| 6 | COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Second. |
| 7 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Any |
| 8 | discussion? |
| 9 | VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Madam |
| 10 | Chair, again |
| 11 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mr. Hood? |
| 12 | VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'm |
| 13 | going to say this until eventually I figure |
| 14 | out how we can how to do this with staff, |
| 15 | and that is to do away with the minutes. |
| 16 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Absolutely. |
| 17 | (Laughter.) |
| 18 | VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I don't |
| 19 | know what else to do. Are we working on it? |
| 20 | I know we're swamped. Do I need to write out |
| 21 | a line or something, or what do I need to do? |
| 22 | Again, I know we've mentioned this at every |

| 1 | meeting, about doing away with the minutes. |
|----|--|
| 2 | MS. BUSHMAN: Staff is still in |
| 3 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Can we put |
| 4 | that on the record, please? |
| 5 | MS. BUSHMAN: Staff is still in the |
| 6 | process of studying this issue, and we'll get |
| 7 | back to you shortly. |
| 8 | VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Oh, okay. |
| 9 | I thought it was something that we just needed |
| 10 | to do here. Okay. Thank you. |
| 11 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, just to |
| 12 | clarify, it's not that you're studying this in |
| 13 | isolation, because this is a very simple |
| 14 | issue. You're doing something broader than |
| 15 | that, is that not true? |
| 16 | SECRETARY SCHELLIN: The whole |
| 17 | section. |
| 18 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Right. |
| 19 | SECRETARY SCHELLIN: I believe it's |
| 20 | 33 |
| 21 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: We don't want |
| 22 | it to appear that you guys have to study |
| | |

| 1 | whether or not |
|----|--|
| 2 | SECRETARY SCHELLIN: No, no, no. |
| 3 | It's much more than that, because there are |
| 4 | some other issues. We thought we'd hit them |
| 5 | all at once. |
| 6 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. |
| 7 | VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. |
| 8 | And I will not ask that question anymore. |
| 9 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right. |
| 10 | Then, last but not least, the status report |
| 11 | from the Office of Planning. |
| 12 | SECRETARY SCHELLIN: Chairman |
| 13 | Mitten, I'm sorry. We only got the motion and |
| 14 | the second. We didn't vote on that yet. |
| 15 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Oh, we didn't? |
| 16 | SECRETARY SCHELLIN: No, you didn't |
| 17 | call for all in favor. |
| 18 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Oh, yes, |
| 19 | that's right. I'm sorry. Just one second. |
| 20 | All those in favor of approval of the minutes, |
| 21 | please say aye. |

NEAL R. GROSS

(Chorus of ayes.)

| 1 | Any opposed? |
|----|--|
| 2 | (No response.) |
| 3 | SECRETARY SCHELLIN: Staff will |
| 4 | record the vote five to zero to zero to |
| 5 | approve the Zoning Commission minutes from |
| 6 | January 8th and January 17th. Commissioner |
| 7 | Mitten moving, Commissioner Parsons seconding, |
| 8 | Commissioners Hood, Jeffries, and Turnbull in |
| 9 | favor. |
| 10 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. |
| L1 | Now, Ms. Tregonig, we're ready for the |
| L2 | exciting report from the Office of Planning. |
| L3 | MS. TREGONIG: Thank you, Madam |
| L4 | Chairwoman. I'm Harriet Tregonig, Office of |
| L5 | Planning, and the status report is before you. |
| 16 | The only other thing I wanted to |
| L7 | mention is that I know the Commission has been |
| L8 | concerned about issues of traffic and parking, |
| L9 | and how difficult it is to address these |
| 20 | issues in the context of a single given |
| 21 | development or PUD. |

So I want to propose some work

| 1 | sessions that I would schedule with the Office |
|----|--|
| 2 | of Zoning to kind of go over some policy |
| 3 | program engineering tools that might help us |
| 4 | to better address these issues, whether they |
| 5 | come up in the context of a PUD or a map |
| 6 | amendment or in other contexts. |
| 7 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Did you intend |
| 8 | to include DDOT in those conversations? |
| 9 | Because that's where it turns; it turns on |
| 10 | DDOT. |
| 11 | MS. TREGONIG: Yes, of course. |
| 12 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Thanks. |
| 13 | COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Madam Chair, |
| 14 | I'm aware, of course you are as well, that the |
| 15 | Planning Commission is taking a look at the |
| 16 | issue of what I'll call horizontal |
| 17 | embellishments on the tops of buildings. And |
| 18 | they have now taken that study a little |
| 19 | further into talking about the Heights of |
| 20 | Buildings Act. |
| 21 | And I want to make sure that our |
| 22 | staff here is working with them and not |

| 1 | waiting for their report, but it what |
|----|--|
| 2 | circumstance are we under? Not that it would |
| 3 | be in this sheet, but is there camaraderie |
| 4 | here? |
| 5 | MS. STEINGASSER: Yes, there is. |
| 6 | COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Oh, good. |
| 7 | MS. STEINGASSER: Yes, we've |
| 8 | reviewed the questions that they're asking the |
| 9 | consultants to look at. We've given them some |
| 10 | ideas, and we plan to work in partnership on |
| 11 | that question. |
| 12 | COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Okay. |
| 13 | Thanks. |
| 14 | The Planning Commission Mr. Mann |
| 15 | has been assigned the task. |
| 16 | MS. STEINGASSER: Yes. |
| 17 | COMMISSIONER PARSONS: So at least |
| 18 | he knows, you know, how to get here and those |
| 19 | kinds of things. I don't mean that |
| 20 | sarcastically, but this has got to be a joint |
| 21 | effort. |

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Anyone else?

| 2 | Question? Mr. Hood? |
|----|--|
| 3 | VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Madam |
| 4 | Chair, I don't know, this may have already |
| 5 | been done, but I wanted to welcome Ms. |
| 6 | Tregonig and looking forward to working with |
| 7 | her and the Office of Planning. The Office of |
| 8 | Planning has definitely been an instrument to |
| 9 | us in helping us. We might not always agree |
| 10 | with them, but they definitely provide us |
| 11 | they do great, detailed work to make sure that |
| 12 | we can make a good and informed decision. And |
| 13 | I wanted to welcome you. |
| 14 | And I don't need any brownie |
| 15 | points. So if anybody thinks I'm up here |
| 16 | getting brownie points, I was not doing that. |
| 17 | Okay. Thank you. |
| 18 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: We're not |
| 19 | giving you any brownie points. |
| 20 | (Laughter.) |
| 21 | VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Somebody |
| 22 | would say, "Yes, why is he doing that? He's |
| | NEAL R. GROSS |

| 1 | being political." But no, that's not it. |
|----|--|
| 2 | COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Well, |
| 3 | Commissioner Parsons and I had not heard the |
| 4 | term "brownie points" in a long time. |
| 5 | (Laughter.) |
| 6 | VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Oh, you |
| 7 | haven't? |
| 8 | COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: No. |
| 9 | VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: That's |
| 10 | dating me. |
| 11 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Does anybody |
| 12 | else have any questions on the Office of |
| 13 | Planning |
| 14 | VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Shows who I |
| 15 | hang around with. It's getting late, too. |
| 16 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: report? |
| 17 | Any questions or comments on the Office of |
| 18 | Planning report? |
| 19 | (No response.) |
| 20 | Okay. Thank you very much. |
| 21 | MS. TREGONIG: Thank you, Madam |
| 22 | Chair. |

| 1 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And I think |
|----|--|
| 2 | if we don't have any more business before us |
| 3 | we are adjourned. |
| 4 | Thank you. |
| 5 | (Whereupon, at 9:20 p.m., the proceedings were |
| 6 | adjourned.) |
| 7 | |
| 8 | |
| 9 | |
| 10 | |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |