GOVERNMENT

OF

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

REGULAR PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

MONDAY

SEPTEMBER 29, 2014

+ + + + +

The Regular Meeting of the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened in the Jerrily R. Kress Memorial Hearing Room, Room 220 South, 441 4th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20001, pursuant to notice at 6:30 p.m., Anthony J. Hood, Chairman, presiding.

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

ANTHONY J. HOOD, Chairman MARCIE COHEN, Vice Chair MICHAEL G. TURNBULL, FAIA,

Commissioner (AOC)

PETER G. MAY, Commissioner (NPS) ROBERT MILLER, Commissioner

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

SARA BENJAMIN BARDIN, Director SHARON S. SCHELLIN, Secretary DONNA HANOUSEK, Zoning Specialist ESTHER BUSHMAN, General Counsel STEPHEN RICE, Zoning Specialist

NEAL R. GROSS

OFFICE OF ZONING (CONT'D)

STEPHEN VARGA, Zoning Specialist PAUL YOUNG, Zoning Data Specialist

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

JENNIFER STEINGASSER, Deputy Director, Development Review & Historic Preservation

MAXINE BROWN-ROBERTS
MATT JESICK
KAREN THOMAS
JOEL LAWSON

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PRESENT:

ALAN BERGSTEIN, ESQ. JACOB RITTING, ESQ.

DISTRICT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION STAFF PRESENT:

SAM ZIMBABWE JONATHAN ROGERS

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the regular meeting held on September 29, 2014.

Table of Contents

Final Action, Z.C. Case
Proposed Action. Z.C. Case
Vote Failed Two to Three 49
Re-vote to Approve Proposed Action 59 Approved Five to Zero to Zero
Z.C. Case Number 13-14
Vote - Approved First Stage PUD 91 Four to Zero to One
Hearing Action on Z.C. Case
Office of Planning Report - Ms. Thomas 96

2.C. Case Number 14-16
Office of Planning Text and Map
Amendment to Create a New C2B1 Zone District.
Office of Planning - Matt Jesick 110
Vote to Set Down - Approved
Zoning Commission Case 12-18,

1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	6:39 p.m.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioners, are
4	we ready?
5	Okay. This meeting will please
6	come to order. Good evening ladies and
7	gentlemen. This is a Public Meeting of the
8	Zoning Commission for the District of Columbia.
9	My name is Anthony Hood, Chairperson. And I
10	think what I'm going to do is ask my
11	Commissioners to introduce themselves first
12	and then I'll start from my left all the way down
13	for the sake of those who may be here for their
14	first time.
15	Vice Chair, if you could start off.
16	VICE CHAIR COHEN: My name is Marcie
17	Cohen and I'm a Mayoral appointee and I am Vice
18	Chair.
19	COMMISSIONER MAY: Peter May
20	representing the National Park Service.
21	COMMISSIONER MILLER: Rob Miller,
22	Mayoral appointee.

1	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Michael
2	Turnbull, representing the Architect of the
3	Capital.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. We'll go to
5	Mr. Bergstein.
6	MR. BERGSTEIN: My name is Alan
7	Bergstein with the Office of the Attorney
8	General for the District of Columbia.
9	MR. RITTING: My name is Jacob
10	Ritting. I am also an Assistant Attorney
11	General representing the Office of the Attorney
12	General.
13	SECRETARY SCHELLIN: Sharon
14	Schellin, Secretary to the Zoning Commission
15	with the Office of Zoning.
16	MS. STEINGASSER: Jennifer
17	Steingasser with the Office of Planning.
18	MR. LAWSON: Joel Lawson with the
19	Office of Planning.
20	MS. THOMAS: Karen Thomas with the
21	Office of Planning.
22	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Maxine Brown

1	Roberts, the Office of Planning.	
2	MR. ZIMBABWE: Sam Zimbabwe,	
3	District Department of Transportation.	
4	MR. ROGERS: District Department of	
5	Transportation.	
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let me thank	
7	everyone for introducing themselves.	
8	Copies of today's meeting agenda	
9	are available to you and are located in the bin	
10	near the door.	
11	We do not take any public testimony	
12	at our meetings unless the Commission requests	
13	someone to come forward.	Please be adv
14	digruptive reiges or estions in the bearing	
	disruptive noises or actions in the hearing	
15	room including a display of any signs or	
16	room including a display of any signs or	
15 16 17 18	room including a display of any signs or objects.	
16 17 18	room including a display of any signs or objects. Please turn off all beepers and	
16 17 18	room including a display of any signs or objects. Please turn off all beepers and cell phones at this time.	
16 17	room including a display of any signs or objects. Please turn off all beepers and cell phones at this time. Does the staff have any preliminary	
16 17 18 19 20	room including a display of any signs or objects. Please turn off all beepers and cell phones at this time. Does the staff have any preliminary matters?	

let's proceed with our agenda. And I'm going to ask everyone to indulge the Commission. I think this is our first time using our iPADs so we want to make sure that we bring our cases up. We have now went green. So, we're going our best. Sometime, you know, our technology sometime it may show up and sometime it may not. So, we're working on this.

I'm reminded, Mr. Richard Nero retired I think about a week or so ago and I just wanted to say a word about him.

In my 16 years of being on the Zoning Commission Mr. Nero had a lot to do with the effectiveness and efficiency of how you see this office running. He will be sorely missed but when you retire and you're in good health that's a blessing. So, we want to send our thank yous to Mr. Nero for all the work he's done in helping to maintain this award-winning Office of Zoning. So, with that, I just read no demonstrations but I would ask those present to give him a round of applause.

1	Thank you very much for being so
2	kind.
3	Okay. Ms. Schellin, Final Action,
4	Zoning Commission Case Number 13-18, WBJ
5	Willard Road, LLC, Consolidated PUD and Related
6	Map Amendment at Square 5925.
7	Ms. Schellin.
8	SECRETARY SCHELLIN: Yes, sir.
9	There's several submissions that
10	have come in.
11	Exhibits 40 through 40(D) and 43
12	are the Applicant's post-hearing submission.
13	Exhibit 41 is the OP Supplemental
14	Report.
15	Exhibit 42, ANC 8E's response to
16	the post-hearing submission.
17	Exhibit 44 was the request to
18	reopen the record from the Applicant to accept
19	the filing from ANC S and D, Commissioner 8E06
20	which was accepted at Exhibit 45.
21	Exhibit 46 was the request to
22	reopen the record from Sandra Seegers which was

1	accepted at Exhibit 48.
2	Exhibit 47 was ANC 8E's response to
3	the letter from SMD Commissioner 8E06.
4	Exhibit 49 was the request to
5	reopen the record from Skyler Pawn-Dexter Moore
6	which was denied.
7	We ask the Commission to consider
8	Final Action on this case this evening.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you,
10	Ms. Schellin.
11	Again, colleagues, you have heard
12	the run down of the post submissions. What I'd
13	like to first start off, let's deal with the
14	ANC's Chairperson's letter and the ANC's Single
15	Member District's letter.
16	I really believe that there are
17	some deficiencies in the letter from the ANC,
18	especially from the Chairperson. And one of
19	the things we always want to do is make sure that
20	we allow our community and those that volunteer
21	in our community to be able to get it right.

What I would suggest and we can open

this up for comment is that we shoot it back to
ANC 8E and let me work it out and get it right.
And some of the deficiencies are the quorum, the
date of the vote and everything that's tied into
allowing the ANC great weight because the way
it stands now, we will not be able to give the
ANC any great weight and we do a disservice. I
think we need to allow this Commission an
opportunity to be able to get it right, to weigh
in and then they can work out the other issues
that was presented us and we don't need to work
those our ourselves. Let them work it out,
come down with a letter, quorum present, the
date the vote was taken, whether it's in support
or opposition or whatever the case may be.
So, let me open it up to any
comments.
Commissioner Miller.
COMMISSIONER MILLER: Mr. Chairman,
I would agree with you. I think that's a good
approach to take but in addition to their letter

indicating the date and documenting the quorum

1	and the actual vote, it would be helpful. They
2	don't have to do it this way but it would be
3	helpful if they vote on a resolution that's also
4	submitted so we know exactly what it is that is
5	being supported in the project or not
6	supported. So, that's the only comment I would
7	make on the ANC issue.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Anybody else
9	want to add anything? Good point. Anybody
10	else?
11	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Chair,
12	I would just agree with Commissioner Miller. I
13	think if we could have something that's on point
14	I think it would really help clarify the issues.
15	Strengthens the ANC's part in all this.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Do we have
17	any other issues in this case?
18	Commissioner May?
19	COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chairman, so
20	going back on the various issues, you know. We
21	received a submission from the Applicant to try
22	to address some of the ongoing concerns, you

know. I still think that there is room for substantial improvement on this project but I'm not going to keep pushing on some of these points. I do prefer the color scheme. In the very least darkens the color of the penthouse level. The rest of the color scheme I don't feel as concerned about.

And in terms of the trash I do not agree with the argument that the Applicant made in this case. Ι think they're misunderstanding, you know, the building But, again, I won't keep pushing on I do think that having two trash that issue. rooms in this project is better because it makes it less likely if they're going to be carting around a lot of trash in the alley by all the cars and all that sort of stuff. So, I just wanted to get those couple of things on there. So, the issue that remains open essentially is just the ANC Report and coming to some agreement with the ANC about this project.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. We also had

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	an agreement between the ANC and I think the			
2	Applicant. Well, the ANC and the Applicant if			
3	I remember correctly. Those are not			
4	enforceable. What we would do if we get to that			
5	point in this order, I will recommend that we			
6	just point to it and say it is an agreement			
7	because that agreement cannot be enforced			
8	through the zoning order. And I think in the			
9	past what we've done is just acknowledge that			
10	there is an agreement. But it's not			
11	enforceable through the zoning order.	So, I	want	to
12	the Applicant. But anyway, again, so we don't			
13	really get into that because it's not			
14	enforceable through the zoning order.			
15	Anything else?			
16	Okay. So, do we have to come up			
17	with a date or we need to find out when the ANC			
18	meets and we want to do it shortly after that			
19	when the ANC has their next meeting.			
20	So, why don't we just leave that up			
21	to staff and Ms. Schellin can work with ANC 8E,			

the chairperson, and find out when the next

1	meeting is and we can take it from there. Is
2	that agreeable?
3	SECRETARY SCHELLIN: Yes.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Anything else, Mr.
5	Bergstein from a legal standpoint?
6	MR. BERGSTEIN: No, sir.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let's move
8	on.
9	Proposed Action. Zoning
10	Commission Case Number 14-04, Professional
11	Associates and IFC Consolidated PUD at Square
12	74.
13	Ms. Schellin.
14	SECRETARY SCHELLIN: Yes, sir.
15	At Exhibit 32 through 34 we have the
16	Applicant's post-hearing submission.
17	Exhibit 35 was the request to reopen
18	the record from DDOT for a late filing which was
19	approved.
20	And we have DDOT's supplemental
21	report at 36.
22	We'd ask the Commission to consider

1	Proposed Action.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
3	Commissioners, we have in front of us some
4	outstanding issues in this particular case.
5	One is how to calculate the housing linkage and
6	we have a set of conditions. The Applicant has
7	asked for flexibility of some design
8	conditions.
9	Let me open it up for any comments.
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: Shall we take on
11	the easy stuff first or the hard stuff.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'm actually waiting
13	for my okay. There it is. I was waiting for
14	my file to open.
15	If you want to get us started. By
16	the way, congratulations, Mr. May, on your
17	well-written article.
18	COMMISSIONER MAY: Oh, thank you. I
19	thought you were going to talk about my cast.
20	No, the cartoon should be a large cast. Anyway,
21	thank you.
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I didn't see a change

1 in that, but maybe I didn't look. Okay. Congratulations on that too. 2 Congratulate COMMISSIONER MAY: 3 4 me when I start playing volleyball again, how about that? 5 6 CHAIRMAN HOOD: We'll have hearings 7 those nights. COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. 8 9 So, there were several issues that 10 were outstanding on this just in terms of the 11 project itself. You know, we were concerned about the loading scheme and the parking and the 12 13 curb cuts and so on. And they did produce further studies think demonstrate 14 that Ι somewhat that it's not -- that what they've come 15 16 up with is acceptable and DDOT has indicated that it's acceptable to them, you know. 17 Istill don't think it's ideal but, you know, it's not 18 19 our job to completely redesign it, just to push 20 to see if they can come out with something better and so I think they've done what they can.

The Applicant is now proposing the

21

"embellishment" and I think that certainly is a solution to the issue and I think it's better than having the embellishment. I'll leave it at that.

Then I think the remaining issues are the conditions that were suggested and I think there were several conditions in there which go far beyond what we have previously allowed as, I'm sorry, areas of flexibility, not conditions but areas of flexibility and they go well beyond what we've done in the past, specifically, the green roof provision, the ability to vary heights of roof structures, some of the street scape stuff. I think there was one more, I'm not looking at my notes at the moment. But, I mean, all those things need to be tightened up and addressed.

Oh, the signage one I think goes beyond what is normally allowed in terms of flexibility and I think we need to get this back closer to what we would normally permit. And if there were specific things that there needs

to variability such as on the height of roof structures we need to put some bounds on that. that there Doesn't can't be mean some flexibility but it just needs to be figured out a little more than just saying, oh, yes, we need some flexibility to vary those things. Because the goal is not to, you know, minimize heights of these structures. It's to comply with the zoning regulations which goes to more than just minimizing height, for example.

Then that leads us to the hard one which is the zoning linkage question but I think before we get into that I would just ask if anybody has comments on those items that I mentioned.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, I think we all do. I want to go back and start off with the embellishment and as you all can see on page 2 -- and I wasn't sure. I know Commissioner Miller -- I was in agreeance with Commissioner Miller and his proposal. And, obviously, I don't know, at least if I didn't understand it

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 correctly, I don't think they came back with --I will tell you I'm very disappointed. 2 know, Commissioner May, if I agree with you on 3 4 the proposed design with no roof embellishment but I don't want to -- I kind of like the 5 6 embellishment but I like what Commissioner 7 Miller had mentioned about the -- I think you said two sided and I that would really help this 8 facade or this side architecturally on that 9 10 corner. But anyway, I'll open up since it was 11 your idea, let me open it up and see if you have 12 13 any comments on that. I can't make them go. 14 It's proposed in front of us but I thought -sorry that the Applicant didn't consider what 15 16 Commissioner Miller had mentioned. COMMISSIONER MILLER: Well, thank 17 Chairman, but I don't have any 18 you, Mr. 19 architecturally degree so that suggestion was 20 probably given the great weight that

No, the suggestion was to have that

deserved.

21

1	on both sides and then maybe open up the surface
2	so that did not have the glass. Have it just
3	op9en to the air so that it doesn't look like
4	it's a continuation of the facade above the
5	roof. But I would concur with Commissioner May
6	that the elimination of the roof top
7	embellishment, I'm comfortable with that issue.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other comments on
9	the architecture?
10	VICE CHAIR COHEN: No, I just want to
11	clarify because the view from the intersection
12	of 21st and L Street, I actually prefer the
13	alternative design of July 10th as opposed to
14	this September design. I think that to me is
15	a softer design and it's not as hard and I think
16	that it's not as visible from a distance as the
17	July. I don't know my colleagues feel.
18	COMMISSIONER MAY: If I could talk to
19	that a little bit.
20	
21	One of the things that I'm concerned
22	about is simply showing a continuation of a

facade over what appears to be the entirety of
the building and trying to call that an
embellishment. I don't have any problems with,
you know, some of the other things that done on
roof tops to make them more interesting and we
did talk about some of those ideas I think when
we considered it last. But, you know, in
effect, this is raising the perceived height of
the building along that facade. And it is not,
you know, it might be different if it were part
of a larger composition but it's not. It's
essentially a single glass box even though it's
going to be connected to the rest of the building
and there is some relationship in terms of the
modulation and so on between that building and
the rest of the block. I mean it does not read
as being part of that overall building so I don't
see how you can sort of read this as if it were
a tower for things that we would normally
consider an embellishment. And I am concerned
because, you know, I've been seeing a few things
around town that are perhaps being approved as

a matter of right where they're calling these things embellishments and, in fact, they're just extensions of the facade that make a 130 foot building look more like a 145 building. And I think that's the approach. Embellishments and towers and spires and things like that are certainly welcome and help the skyline of Washington but just extending the facade up I don't think is the right solution.

You know, I'd be happy to see other solutions to this. I wasn't pushing to get rid of it entirely but, you know, I'm comfortable with what they've proposed.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Visually I think 2100 K on the north elevation of K Street, again, the roof embellishment on the September design looks more boxy and I thought the alternative design again was softer and didn't actually looks like a blank roof top design. So, I just want to express my opinion. I'm not an architect either but sometimes that's a good

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

thing.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I don't think in this business we have to always be qualified as an architect to give an opinion and I think again the roof with no embellishment to me looks kind of flat. And it doesn't -- I was told sometime We started when John Parsons was here. We talked at embellishments and someone came down and I haven't forgot. It's been years ago and I think this goes to it. They told me this was the new architecture and I think as long as don't exceed the height limitations I think the design of it is part of the new architecture as opposed to what's being proposed here as a flat roof embellishment proposed design with no roof embellishment but I don't know.

You pick and choose your battles. I just think that we are doing this side a disservice by not going with what we had. Even I agree with you, Vice Chair, with the design. I think it's better than what I see in the proposed designs. Anyway.

Commissioner Miller?

COMMISSIONER MILLER: I just wanted
to say in response to the Vice Chair's comments.
I can see looking at this rendering why she
thinks the July rendering is softer than the
latest September rendering. I think part of
that is because they showed the mechanical
penthouse in the July rendering and in a darker
color than the lighter version they showed in
the September which may have been purposeful
maybe wanting us to go back to an embellishment.
But that also goes to Commissioner Mays points
about that he repeatedly made about the
darker penthouse color being actually somehow
fades away more than a lighter, brighter
penthouse. I think that that last rendering
with the flat roof had the same color as the July
rendering it might have the same softness that
she was seeking.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Mr. Turnbull, any comments?

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Thank you,

Mr. Chair.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

I would, if you look at the three designs on page 2 of the architect's submittal the rendering, I think that the proposed design with no roof embellishment is a very elegant proposal. It's clean. There is sort of a synthesis with the rest of the street wall.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: What exhibit are you on?

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I'm looking at the three renderings and I think if you look at those there it is in the context with the rest of the street scape there is a -- there is a nice balance between the rest of the buildings and the cavern that's presented, the little insert, is actually even more striking. It's at a nice It's got a nice presentation to it. scale. Ιt just reads and with the revised removal on the ground floor of the center column, I think they've got a really elegant building. I think it's a really -- it just fits in very well with the street scape on both streets.

The angled roof I think is a stretch
for me. It's like, well, let's have an option.
Well, let's have it high and then low. I don't
think that does anything. In fact, it looks
more out of place and it looks more awkward than
anything else. I think what they've done is
achieved a great balance with the whole street
scape. And I think we go down a dangerous road.
When you look at a parapet wall it is supposed
to be about three and a half feet. If you now
say that you can raise that parapet wall up a
whole elevation, say 10, 12 feet and say it's
an embellishment I think you're opening up to
a lot of strange interpretations of the zoning
regulations and you don't give any direction to
architects as to what they can or cannot do.
And I think by leaving this wide open like this
and allowing I think you would set up a very
huge precedent by allowing the facade to go to
whatever height it wants to typically, when
we've read an embellishment it's either man,
if you look at the regulations they are now it

1 was either a tower, minaret but it was usually a corner feature, was something striking about 2 the building that either identified it as a 3 4 corner piece and that's what is often done and that's what we've approved in most instances. 5 6 I think by saying that a whole elevation, the 7 whole street scape, the whole wall is an elevation, unless you're going to redo the 8 9 zoning regs and start changing the language, I 10 don't think you want to go down that road. I think what you have here and, 11 myself, 12 again, I'm repeating is 13 classically designed, it is a very elegant building for that corner. 14 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Turnbull, you 15 16 were talking about the proposed design with no roof embellishment? 17 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: The proposed 18 19 design with no roof embellishment is -- if you 20 look at that and you look at the others it just is a classic design. The inset with that 21

better.

reads

they've

got

22

It's

1 proportionately better than all of the other two schemes and it just is more pleasing to the eye. 2 VICE CHAIR COHEN: I just want to, you 3 4 know, I'm not going to continue this argument but I just felt that it would have been a great 5 6 addition to a very boring street. 7 I walk down K Street a great deal and, you know, I'm still seeing everything 8 looking alike and that's why I thought the 9 10 alternative design of July would have at least brought some differentiation on that block and 11 an interest -- a striking interest. 12 I mean, I'm 13 not as seasoned to understand the implications for the future of, you know, the zoning and 14 architectural discussion but I do believe that 15 16 we need to be as creative as possible and I think this particular architect has done it. 17 But. I'll go along just so that this project moves 18 19 forward. 20 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Commissioner May, you want to add something? 21 COMMISSIONER MAY: No, I think it's 22

all pretty much been said and I appreciate the comments of Mr. Turnbull and Commissioner Miller Ι appreciate, know, the and you alternative point of view. I'm just trying to look at this strictly in terms of zoning regulations and the Height Act and how we perceive height and, you know, I think the extension of the facade is really what is the most troubling about this. I'm not against embellishments at all. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. And I would agree with the Vice Chair. I think, again, this new architectural statement, I guess we need to come up to par. But this is not a show-stopper It looks like the numbers belong with

18

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

I find myself now walking up, looking up when I'm downtown. So, anyway, let's move on to the other issue.

no embellishment but I think we need to start

being creative as long as we don't violate the

22 | VICE CHAIR COHEN: I think you're

Height Act.

talking about the linkage?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, I want to go to the linkage. But I did want to say something about the DDOT Report.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Exhibit 36. And I made myself a note. I'm going to read this paragraph. "The Applicant cited 2100 K Street, is adjacent to the existing alley. The Applicant proposed vehicle access from a separate curb cut which we often do not support Zoning Commission 21st Street. The additional parking study to requested an eliminate the proposed curb cut along 21st DDOT understands that this site is Street. uniquely constrained due to the grade change. Therefore, DDOT worked with the Applicant to minimize the impact of the vehicle and loading access to the site. The originally proposed design while not idea ultimately meets DDOT's standards for the curb cuts."

And I don't typically do this but I

1 am going to go to DDOT. I guess in your discussion what made it -- did you get to a point 2 because that's all I have unless there was 3 4 something else on the report, Mr. Zimbabwe, but made it now suitable when at first it was not 5 6 within DDOT's standards? Now it's suitable. 7 Is it that you found that there was no other way to do this? I just didn't understand this 8 9 paragraph. MR. ZIMBABWE: Yes, I mean, I think 10 11 they've been able to mitigate the concerns that we had acceptably and understanding it's a 12 13 challenging site to do that in. 14 CHAIRMAN HOOD: So, after you reviewed it a little more you found out, okay, 15 16 well, maybe the Applicant does have a point. Is that -- I'm just trying to figure out how we got 17 here when we were so far away from this. 18 19 MR. ZIMBABWE: Yes, I have to admit I'm hearing for the next discussion in case 20 there are questions, I'm not sure that I have 21

all the details on this one.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well, I'll wait for
2	the next time.
3	MR. ZIMBABWE: But I can I'll try
4	to have an answer by the next time.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. What is
6	this?
7	MR. ZIMBABWE: Not the next but
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Actually,
9	yes, by the time we do Final?
10	MR. ZIMBABWE: Yes.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you,
12	Mr. Zimbabwe, appreciate it. Okay.
13	What other issues, Commissioners?
14	Anyone want to start off with the housing
15	linkage?
16	VICE CHAIR COHEN: I just simply want
17	to state that I support the OP calculation
18	because OP has based it on prior precedent with
19	regard to street closings and I don't think I
20	need to elaborate anymore but there seems to
21	have been a rationale that is reasonable.
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Anyone else?

Commissioner May?

COMMISSIONER MAY: Just to clarify. I mean, you were saying that OP's calculation on all counts and I guess what I'm wondering is what do you think about the -- do you agree with OP's calculation, the Applicant has asked whether we'd be willing to grant the flexibility of the extra five percent of FAR and whether you have an opinion on that as well?

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Yes, I would go for the extra flexibility.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Would go for it?

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MAY: See, I'm inclined to go with the Office of Planning on their calculation and also not go for the additional flexibility. I mean, I hate to take a hard line about it but, you know, I looked at the argument that was raised by the Applicant and I just can't get there on any of those points. I mean, you know, I understand that it may be difficult. May make it very difficult to do this project

1 but I just don't see how the rules, you know, there's too many kinds of small exceptions to 2 the rules and exceptions to how we've done past 3 4 calculations to be able to get there for me. course, you know, I'm certainly willing to be 5 6 convinced by other members of the Commission who 7 see it differently. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Any other 8 9 comments? 10 Commissioner Miller. COMMISSIONER MILLER: Let me just try 11 12 understand Mr. May's concern. 13 concerned with the flexibility to allow them to go from 10.0 FAR to 10.49 FAR. You think it's 14 15 16 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, I mean, I don't think that there's a clear path to be able 17 to do that, you know, based on what I've read 18 19 here and, you know, the advice we received from 20 the Office of the Attorney General. And I'm concerned that that's the difficult precedent 21

because typically this is used to bump from an

8.0 1 to 8.5. That's explicit in the regulations. But to apply it here, again, it's 2 just kind of another stretch. 3 4 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Any other 5 comments? 6 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well, Ι 7 would agree with Commissioner May. I think I agree with the OP's assessment of how you come 8 up with the calculation. 9 I think there's 10 precedent. That's what we've done before. 11 With the .48 FAR I'm not sure and maybe the Office of the Attorney General can help us weigh 12 13 I'm just confused on how that calculation in. 14 or how we apply that. MR. BERGSTEIN: The provision that's 15 16 being relied upon by the Applicant says that the Zoning Commission can grant an additional five 17 percent and the question is, is it five percent 18 19 off of what? The relevant section 2405.2 says the floor ratio of the building shall not exceed 20 the aggregate of the floor area ratio permitted 21

in the overall zoned districts.

22

But then

points to .3 that you can do an extra five
percent. So, the question is, what do you mean
by the overall zone district? 2405.2 is
followed by a list of zone districts and as each
zone district there are PUD maximums and 4C3C
the PUD maximum is 8 and if you take five percent
of that it's 8.5. What the Applicant is saying
is that phrase is how I read their argument.
That phrase, the overall zone districts,
includes any matter of right zone district
that's above 8. In this case because in the TDR
Zone is they purchase TDRs which they can do as
a matter of right they can go to 6.5 to 10. So,
they say our matter of right FAR is 10. You
there can grant us five percent off of that.
And that would be the precedent. I don't know
if the precedent would ever come up again but
it will be, we're not just talking about five
percent off those zone district PUD maximums.
You're talking five percent off of any zoned
district that may be above those PUD maximums
as a result of TDRs, perhaps other forms of bonus

density and that as a PUD you can grant five percent on top of that. That's the issue. And I don't take any position as to that one way or the other. I can make an interpretation either way. It's your interpretation to make.

COMMISSIONER MAY: See, that's where I feel like it's just, you know, it's another kind of stretch and I'm not saying that that stretch is wrong necessarily. But I would be much happier if it were more explicitly considered in the zoning regulations and we had, you know, and the Zoning Commission had taken this question up explicitly and decided, yes, the five percent applies to the maximum no matter how you get to the maximum. doesn't say that so it's, you know, again, I'm not saying that this is wrong. It's just another stretch. They are trying to, you know, stretch the rules, you know, in a couple of different places and I can't do all that stretching at this moment.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: But what would be

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

other than stretching rules, what is the actual physical downside of allowing that? Is there one?

COMMISSIONER MAY: It does open the door for future cases where we would be asked for that five percent, you know, no matter how they reach the maximum. I mean, it may not come up that often. Maybe it's not that much.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: And I think though and I would associate myself now that I've already thought that the Office of Planning's calculation because that's how we proceeded in the past. But I think at some point because of the beatings that we take, we need to stop zoning on the fly and I would agree with -- that's Anthony Hood's take on it. I'm not saying anybody else. But I think we need to stop zoning on the fly.

I think Commissioner May is exactly right. Maybe this is something we need to take up. You know, where do we take the five percent from? Those are the kind of things moving

1 forward that we need to make sure that we nail down and stop just doing it on the fly because 2 while we say, oh, we might not see this again. 3 4 But you'll see it again in another form or So, I would support Commissioner May 5 fashion. 6 and I think Commissioner Turnbull and all those 7 who support the say of doing things with this housing linkage. Any other comments? 8 9 VICE CHAIR COHEN: Yes, I guess --10 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Vice Chair? VICE CHAIR COHEN: Oh, thank you, Mr. 11 Chairman. 12 13 Ι bought Ι into the quess flexibility that would be requested. 14 I thought I understood the argument made by the Applicant 15 16 and I thought it was not an unreasonable argument, again, I just believe that it will 17 make this project and the design of the project 18 19 now that we've all agreed that we're going to 20 go with the September alternative, you know, more feasible and so I don't see why we're 21

arguing for not allowing that when we have the

ability to be -- that's why we exist too to make these kinds of balances and these decisions.

So, I felt -- maybe I was just splitting the difference.

COMMISSIONER MAY: And I don't think that this is a question of whether or not they can get to the design that they want. It's whether they have to pay for additional TDRs to get there. And, I mean, that's the crux of the matter whether they have to pay for that additional FAR.

There's no doubt in my mind that the building is the right building at this point, that they have the right density and that it's appropriate for it to be as big as it is proposed. It's a question of whether, you know, how do we get to that? And I don't think, you know, any argument they're making is, you know, a ridiculous argument. I think they're all reasonably good arguments. It's just that I can't quite buy into all of them to get to where they want to be in terms of how much it's going

1 cost.

2 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Commissioner

3 | Miller?

4 COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

5

I think it's important to remember where we started out on this which was that the Applicant said that housing linkage didn't apply at all and I think that this Commission, I speak for myself, thinks it should apply and it does apply but there is ambiguity in the zoning regulations as written because of the downtown development. The TDR provisions are there to support the downtown development overlay district and it just simply isn't quite explicit and there's an exemption from housing linkage for the downtown development district. So, the Applicant has said that they would make the housing linkage requirement -- have a linkage contribution if it was required and I think it is required. And, I guess, I agree

with the Vice Chair. I mean, we're already
making interpretations about whether the TDR
receding zone is exempt or not from housing
linkage. We're saying it's not exempt. So,
that's what we're for. I agree with the Vice
Chair. That's what we're here for on a
case-by-case basis to use our discretion based
on all the evidence that we have in the record.
So, I would agree that the five percent
flexibility should apply to the maximum amount
which is 10.0 FAR in this case so they get to
the 10.49 as this building is designed which
nobody seems to have a problem with that
particular design. So, I might not have the
majority but that's why there's five of us here.
CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let me just
ask. Do we accept the Office of Planning's
calculation based on prior cases? Do we all
agree on that?
COMMISSIONER MILLER: Assuming that
there is prior cases. We have referenced
statements to that effect. I think the

1	Applicant has had an argument to make that they
2	should be getting the full credit of the TDR as
3	an offset of the payment that they're making.
4	But assuming that that's the precedent that the
5	Office of Planning has recommended in both the
6	zoning cases and in the street or alley closing
7	cases I would
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
9	COMMISSIONER MAY: I mean, we don't
10	have a precedent for the calculation the way it
11	was proposed by the Applicant though.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: But we have one for
13	the
14	COMMISSIONER MAY: But we have one
15	from the Office of Planning, right.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So, are we on
17	agreeance of that?
18	COMMISSIONER MAY: Well, we agree
19	that there's a precedent but, I mean, if there
20	is a different precedent that the Applicant can
21	cite then that would be another way to, you know,
22	I mean that could put that issue back on the

1	table from my perspective.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So, do we want
3	to ask the Applicant to provide something where
4	we've done that or this Commission has done that
5	previously in their calculation?
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, if they can
7	do it.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: They said no.
9	COMMISSIONER MAY: They can't do it.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I don't look in the
11	audience so I
12	COMMISSIONER MAY: Well, I kind of
13	thought that if they could do it they would have
14	done it by now. But
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So, back to my
16	original question. Are we all in agreeance
17	with the Office of Planning's calculation?
18	Okay. Do I need to call for a vote on that?
19	Okay.
20	Now, the granting of the well, in
21	this case I think they asked for 4.8 percent but
22	in the grant of 5 percent. Would someone like

1	to put that up for a motion?
2	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Chair,
3	not to sound more confused than this already is,
4	isn't the .48 FAR already included in the
5	building, in the design we're looking at?
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.
7	COMMISSIONER MAY: It is included.
8	It's in the building. It's a question of
9	whether they have to buy TDRs to do it or we grant
10	them
11	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. I
12	just want to clarify that. In the calculations
13	what we've got is already included in it.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Point. Okay. I
15	lost my point.
16	VICE CHAIR COHEN: You asked for a
17	motion.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, I was asking for
19	a motion to include the increased up to five
20	percent, I think 2405.3 which our regulations
21	say that we can go up to 5 percent. I think I
22	heard at least two of my colleagues in favor of

1	the additional FAR. So, I was asking for a
2	motion from pro or con.
3	VICE CHAIR COHEN: Then, Mr.
4	Chairman, I would move to approve allowing the
5	additional .48 FAR under Section 2405.3.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. It's been
7	moved and properly seconded. Any further
8	discussion?
9	All those in favor?
10	(AYES)
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any opposed?
12	COMMISSIONER MAY: Opposed, no.
13	Opposed.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Ms. Schellin,
15	record the vote.
16	SECRETARY SCHELLIN: The motion
17	fails. Two to three.
18	Commissioner Cohen moving,
19	Commissioner Miller seconding. Commissioners
20	May, Hood and Turnbull opposed.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Any other
22	issues?

1	COMMISSIONER MAY: Well, I don't have
2	any guidance to do it the other way then. I mean
3	
4	VICE CHAIR COHEN: You need
5	another
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, I need a
7	motion in the other direction. All I know is
8	that you well, okay. Well, I guess that's
9	true. I guess that's true.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: You already know
11	COMMISSIONER MAY: You voted to
12	well, they're asking for something and now
13	okay. Do I read it that you denied it. Never
14	mind, I withdraw my comment. But we could not
15	take proposed action tonight to approve it
16	because we don't have we're not willing to
17	grant them what they've asked for.
18	MR. BERGSTEIN: That means that
19	because you agreed with the OP calculation and
20	you voted to not permit them to get the 5 percent
21	flexibility it means that they are going to have
22	to spend \$2.9 million to get up to 10.48 instead

of \$2.6. That's the only -- that's not the only consequence but that is the consequence of -
COMMISSIONER MAY: But that's not what they've actually proposed so -
MR. BERGSTEIN: Well, but in other words --

COMMISSIONER MAY: Action today --

MR. BERGSTEIN: The order is going to have to say or should say what the formula is for housing linkage and what the order will basically say based upon the numbers is that the housing linkage contribution is going to be approximately \$2.3 million. That's what they're going to have to pay. If they want to get the TDRs, they're going to have to buy \$600,000 worth of TDRs. But we don't need to mention that in the order. The only issue is were you going to calculate it so that the housing linkage contribution was \$2 million or You've just indicated it's \$2.3 and that means to buy the TDRs to get to .48 their total cost is going to be \$2.9 but we don't have to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

say that in the order. We just need to say that
in terms of doing the calculation you're going
to have to take the sum total of the assessed
value, minus the TDRs, divide that by two and
then that's I want to determine we got that
right. There are so many different ways of
doing it. You're going to take the, under the
OP calculation, you're going to take the total
assessed value minus the TDR credit, take that
net figure and divide it by two and that will
be what they'll have to pay which is
approximately \$2.3 million. Okay.
COMMISSIONER MAY: So, today though
we can take proposed action
MR. BERGSTEIN: Yes.
COMMISSIONER MAY: to approve
this
MR. BERGSTEIN: Yes.
COMMISSIONER MAY: under the
assumption that all that will happen?
MR. BERGSTEIN: Yes. Well, that
will be in the order.

1	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right. That
2	would be the way the order would read?
3	MR. BERGSTEIN: Yes.
4	COMMISSIONER MAY: All right. Mr.
5	Chairman, I would make a motion.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Do we need a motion?
7	COMMISSIONER MAY: We haven't take
8	a motion to approve the case.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well, we haven't
10	finished.
11	COMMISSIONER MAY: Oh, okay.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: That was just on that
13	piece.
14	COMMISSIONER MAY: I thought we were
15	trying to move it on.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: No. I thought Mr.
17	Bergstein was asking for a motion in opposite
18	of the motion that was proposed.
19	COMMISSIONER MAY: No, but I decided
20	you basically denied the request by the failure
21	of the motion and that's basically how I read
22	it. I don't think you need a motion the other

1 way. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I'm in 2 agreeance but I think we need to talk about the 3 4 conditions. Don't we have some conditions. VICE CHAIR COHEN: I think we have 5 6 some TDM measures that were omitted from the draft order. 7 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Well, let's 8 9 do that and then we can go talk about the 10 Commission's because they asked for 11 flexibility and I want to make sure we don't have any problem from A through H of the flexibility 12 13 that's being requested. Vice Chair. 14 VICE CHAIR COHEN: Okay. On the TDM 15 16 measures what was not included in the draft was the TDM coordinator who has to organize and 17 market the TDM plan. And we have to provide 18 19 parking spaces for car pools and provide website 20 links to commuter connections. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. And you want 21 that to be added? 22

1	VICE CHAIR COHEN: Yes, please.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Any
3	objections? Not hearing any.
4	All right. Then let's talk about
5	the flexibility for the design. Any issues
6	because we have a laundry list of things their
7	asking for. The Applicant has a flexibility of
8	design in the PUD in the following areas and they
9	list them. I'm not going to read them.
10	They're in front of us. Any issues?
11	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, Mr.
12	Chairman, I mentioned at the very beginning. I
13	think that they were asking for too much in terms
14	of the letter "C", vary the final street scape
15	design. I mean, I can see having some
16	flexibility there but it's really very wide open
17	and I don't think we want to grant that much
18	flexibility.
19	And then F, G and H are also
20	problematic. The building signage again too
21	broad. Locating a green roof on the existing

1	project, I guess I can understand flexibility
2	to incorporate on the roof of the project but
3	I don't get the, you know, why in this order we
4	would be doing anything that affects the
5	existing IFC headquarters.
6	And then varying the roof
7	structures, again, I don't mind having some
8	flexibility but there has to be some sort of
9	balance, you know, because we don't want to
10	have, you know, 10 different roof structures
11	heights just because we've allowed this
12	flexibility.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Bergstein, can I
14	ask a question. Does the five percent that the
15	Zoning Administrator has as far as allowing
16	flexibility does that apply here?
17	MR. BERGSTEIN: I'm sorry, I'd have
18	to look
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Your mic is
20	not on but
21	MR. BERGSTEIN: I'm sorry. I'd have
22	to look at the regulations under what the PUD

flexibility that's granted.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Because, Commissioners, well the ones as as that Commission May noted I look at D and E. know if there are some issues there because I know that's always a tickler what I hear up here all the time. So, you know, to make minor refinements to exterior details and dimensions including balcony enclosures, bell courses, facility bases, cornices, railings, trim, so, you know, again, I think that goes in line with the bounds unless somebody else feels any different.

COMMISSIONER MAY: I guess I'd have to look at those compared to past ones but a lot of that language seems very similar to what we've allowed in the past. And the same with varying the final number, size, location of retail entrances. I mean that's, again, there's a little bit of customization that goes on with retail entrances, but I think these are things that are standard. There's a certain

1	language that we use that's standard and I would
2	just want this to be consistent with that
3	standard.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So, C, F, G
5	and H you say
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: Those are the ones
7	that struck me as being out of bounds.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
9	COMMISSIONER MAY: The other ones, I
10	think, ought to be reviewed for consistency with
11	what we've done in the past.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right.
13	I will withdraw my comments. Thank
14	you, Mr. Bergstein. A lot of it is written.
15	It's not actually applied. It depends on what
16	it is. A lot of it is two percent. Thank you.
17	Okay. I don't really have any
18	concerns of any of this from the regulations I
19	just saw.
20	Any other comments? All right.
21	So, taking note of Commission May's issues on
22	the ones he had the issues on the conditions.

1	anyone else have any? Okay.
2	I think there's some bounds there
3	and I think it's spelled out in the regulations.
4	Thank you, Mr. Bergstein.
5	Okay. Somebody like to make a
6	motion.
7	COMMISSIONER MAY: I would make a
8	motion to approve Zoning Commission Case Number
9	14-04, Professional Associates International
10	Finance Corporation Consolidated PUD at Square
11	74.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. It's been
13	moved and properly seconded. Any further
14	discussion?
15	Are you ready for the question? All
16	those in favor?
17	(AYES)
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing any
19	opposition.
20	VICE CHAIR COHEN: I'm opposing based
21	on what our discussion. I'm not opposing the
22	project. I don't know if that's an appropriate

1	I just want to
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let me just say this,
3	Vice Chair. We already know you were opposed
4	when I singled them out. So, basically
5	VICE CHAIR COHEN: Oh, okay.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: what you're
7	saying now is you're opposed to the whole we
8	already know you're opposed to the linkage part.
9	VICE CHAIR COHEN: All right. No,
10	I'm not opposed to the project though.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So, you vote again.
12	VICE CHAIR COHEN: I'm voting in
13	favor then.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. That was the
15	easiest time I got you to switch over. Okay.
16	Ms. Schellin, if you're not confused
17	could you record the vote? Oh, did I call for
18	the vote?
19	SECRETARY SCHELLIN: I didn't hear it
20	then.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I said all those in
22	favor.

Т	SECRETARY SCHELLING ORay. Yes.
2	Staff records the vote five to zero
3	to zero to approve proposed action on Zoning
4	Commission Case Number 14-04. Commissioner
5	May moving, Commissioner Miller seconding,
6	Commissioners Cohen, Hood and Turnbull in
7	support. And we'd ask the Applicant to provide
8	the list of public benefits and draft conditions
9	pursuant to Chapter 24.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Are we ready
11	to move on?
12	Let's go to Zoning Commission Case
13	Number 13-14. This Division Macmillan
14	Partners, LLC. First Stage PUD Related Map
15	Amendment and Consolidate PUD at Square 3128.
16	Ms. Schellin.
17	SECRETARY SCHELLIN: Yes. At
18	Exhibit 847 through 849(g) we have the
19	Applicant's post-hearing submission.
20	Exhibit 850 is an NCPC submission.
21	Exhibit 851 is the DDOT Supplemental
22	Report.

1	Exhibit 852 is ANC 5 E's response.
2	Exhibit 853 was the request from the
3	Applicant to reopen the record to submit revised
4	plans that responded to NCPC which was approved
5	and that submission is at Exhibit 856 through
6	856(b).
7	At Exhibits 854 and 855 we gave OP's
8	Supplemental Report.
9	Exhibit 857 was the Applicant's
10	response to the NCPC letter.
11	And then Exhibit 858 is Friends of
12	McMillan's response to the Applicant's second
13	post-hearing submission.
14	We'd ask the Commission to consider
15	proposed action on this case.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
17	Commissioners.
18	VICE CHAIR COHEN: Thank you, Mr.
19	Chairman. I just want to remind the Commission
20	that I did not sit on this project.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let's go
22	ahead and get started. I actually am having an

issue with reviewing the NCPC staff comments again. They would open it earlier but anyway.

As Ms. Schellin has mentioned we had a number of responses and a number of responses to the responses. Let's open it up.

Any comments. Who would like to get it started?

You know what. Let me start us off.

For me a lot of it was the DDOT mitigation and, Mr. Zimbabwe, since you're here for this case, as soon as I get your supplemental report to open. To me and I know you alluded to a lot of things you're still working on and one of the reasons I actually held it up to this point is because I wanted to see some more finality and I know we have a second stage and we said this at the very onset that the transportation was going to be a part of even the second stage which is, I think, somebody phased it "second bit of the apple." Maybe it was the opposition but I know there will be a

third bite and probably a fourth bite and a fifth
bite. But I'm just not comfortable again with
the mitigations that we're talking about. Is
it that it's too general and we're going to get
more specific as we get the second stage or what?
Because a lot of this was saying we 're still
working on this and we're still working on this.
I was looking for a little more specificity as
far as the transportation and working with the
Applicant on some of the mitigation methods as
opposed to we didn't disagree or we didn't agree
on this. Can we nail it down a little bit more?
And I'm not an expert in transportation. All
I do is sit in traffic and I understand what that
community is going to be going through. So, I'm
an expert when I'm sitting here thinking about
the Zoning Commission and what I hear down here
about how everything is a level of service A.
And I'm sitting there for 30 minutes. So, I
think this neighborhood has a valid point.
I guess my question is, are we

getting it now or is that going to happen second

1 stage and I will be very reluctant to move forward with what I have in front of me tonight. 2 So, I'll stop rambling and ask you 3 4 to respond. MR. ZIMBABWE: Sure. So, I think 5 6 this is obviously a large and complex project. 7 I think what the Applicant has committed to in terms of providing transit seats is what we feel 8 like we needed in terms of a commitment 9 10 the Applicant. planning, 11 Transit Ι think, is different than what we are usually here talking 12 13 about which are roadway improvements which are a bit easier to define and I think by and large 14 what the Applicant has proposed in terms of 15 16 roadway improvements we are in agreement with and we will work with them on the final design 17 of that during the -- I mean, that's really the 18 19 permitting process of the actual dimensions and 20 all that. But the components of that are we've agreed to. 21

I think transit planning, again, is

something that's very different because it's hard for the Applicant to commit to running circulator service or WMATA bus service or anything and it's hard for us two or three years out from the delivery of the first buildings that are part of this to commit to operating transit service and exactly what type of transit service that is.

So, from our perspective, the commitments that they've made in terms of providing transit seats gives everybody the certainty that there will be the capacity to meet the demand on transit and it gives us the opportunity to figure out the best and most efficient way to do that prior to the opening of the first building.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Also, even calculating that whole discussion around -- the whole discussion around the street car. So we've been factoring that in, the circular bus, the bicycle racks, I mean, I thought that was a far stretch at this point. And I'm not going

to say anything because also said M Street will take a long time to get developed and here it is, it's there now in Southwest. So, I mean, we're factoring in street cars and, you know, I just thought that that was relatively a long way off, at least the way I see it. It may not be.

But let's use street cars for example. Do you think that would be a main part of -- is that just a portion of the equation of solving the traffic issues in that because if it is that's not something that's going to be immediate?

MR. ZIMBABWE: That's right. Α street car would not be immediate for this. That's a really mid- to long-term solution. Ι don't think that street car service is essential for the development to function and to work with the neighborhood as far transportation а I think something like a circulator bus is a more short term. That's a matter of procuring buses to run and have the operating

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

budget to run it. And then, you know, Metro is already providing a fair amount of, I mean, a large amount of transit service on the H Lines and has done some studies on how to improve that service. Some of that is what's called Regional Service that each of the member jurisdictions pay for it. So, if it's local service that DDOT pays for or the District pays for over and above the Regional Service. there's enhancements to that that are possible. There's the potential of circulator service. There's the potential for private shuttles to be added to make the capacity available on buses to meet the demand that we see.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. And, again, I just want to say for the record -- thank you, Mr. Zimbabwe.

I want to say for the record though that even with the second stage transportation is going to be a piece that if we get to the second stage. I'm not sure how this discussion is going to go tonight but if we get there I want

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	to make sure that I don't want to hear that
2	we at least as long as I'm here that oh, you've
3	already made the decision on the
4	transportation. Because I think we said at the
5	very onset anything goes. We can go back to
6	transportation depending upon as that site is
7	phased in if it is developed in this fashion.
8	Okay. So, with that, let me open it
9	up to the colleagues. Who would like to start
10	us off on any issues that they have? I have a
11	few more but anybody like to start us off?
12	Mr. Turnbull.
13	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Thank you,
14	Commissioner. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
15	Getting back to the transportation
16	issue, the Applicant's submission, Mr.
17	Zimbabwe, it sort of sounds like they pointed
18	the finger at you to take the lead for
19	transportation and that you're committed to
20	enhancing public transit and that you're the one
21	that's really going to help get the buses

rolling and everything else. I mean, that's

1	the implied, but there's nothing in your
2	submission that says you're going to do that,
3	just that you have an interest. You know
4	there's issues but there's really no anything
5	definitive that we can point our finger on that
6	says DDOT is putting it on the line here and this
7	is what's going to happen, when it's going to
8	happen, how many buses and what's the proposal
9	to do that. I don't see that myself. I don't
10	see anything in the language.
11	MR. ZIMBABWE: So, I think the way
12	that the Applicant has committed in their
13	post-hearing submission I guess it is, they have
14	committed to increase the peak house transit
15	capacity by 1,100 passengers per hour through
16	some combination of private shuttles or DDOT and
17	WMATA service.
18	From our perspective
19	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: But, again,
20	their committed that you're going to do that.
21	MR. ZIMBABWE: Well, private

shuttles would not be. Would not be the

1	District.
2	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: But the
3	WMATA and the Department of Transportation
4	you've got some numbers in mind. You know how
5	many buses you're going to be having to put on
6	the streets?
7	MR. ZIMBABWE: We do. I mean,
8	generally
9	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I mean, can
10	you put that in a submission to us that we could
11	have something? Do we have anything that
12	actually documents that that a couple of years
13	down the road if the residents come back and say,
14	we've only got half the number of buses that were
15	promised?
16	MR. ZIMBABWE: Well, I think
17	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I'd like to
18	see that.
19	MR. ZIMBABWE: I'm not trying to be
20	non-committal on this.
21	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: But you see,
22	that's just it. The neighborhood wants

commitment and in order for us, I mean, people are very concerned in the neighborhood about number of cars, the increase in people. already have a level of service of that at certain intersections. They don't have enough buses. And so they're looking for us to sort of weigh in on this and take all the bits and pieces and say we've analyzed it and before we can push the green button, I think we really need to know those kinds of numbers as to what's going to happen so that the people out there can look at us and say, yes, the Zoning Commission has got something to work with and they're making the right choice when they say, yes, we're going to go ahead with this.

MR. ZIMBABWE: So, what the level of commitment that the Applicant has made in terms of increasing capacity is equivalent to about eight to thirteen round trips. And this is in their submission. So, round trip bus trips during the peak hour. That can be accomplished in a number of ways and they've detailed this

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	commitment in there. That can happen through
2	increases in WMATA bus service which already
3	exists and could be enhanced.
4	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Could be?
5	Okay.
6	MR. ZIMBABWE: That's right.
7	There's several options for how to accomplish
8	this goal or this commitment over all of
9	increasing the transit capacity serving the
10	site and connecting to other destinations.
11	There's WMATA service. There's a
12	potential for circulator service and there's
13	private shuttles. The District has a six-year
14	capital program which includes purchase of
15	buses. We budget for operating transit on an
16	annual basis.
17	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: How much for
18	this area? Did you specify?
19	MR. ZIMBABWE: City wide?
20	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: It's
21	city-wide.
22	MR. ZIMBABWE: City-wide. So, I

1	can't sit here and commit to FY 17 an operating
2	budget that's subject to the District's budget
3	process that has Congressional approval over
4	the District process. I'm not able to sit here
5	and commit that. That's why the Applicant has
6	committed that in the event that there is not
7	service from the District that they will provide
8	that in terms of private shuttle service.
9	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: So, if you
10	don't get funding, we don't get buses, you have
11	no Plan B?
12	MR. ZIMBABWE: The private shuttle
13	service
14	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: It's the
15	private shuttle that's going to make it up and
16	they're just showing another half million
17	dollars on the table to say, you know, we're
18	willing to do that. That's it. I'm just
19	asking the question. Someone has got to ask it.
20	You have no Plan B if you have no funding.
21	MR. ZIMBABWE: There's a Plan A which
22	is to provide transit capacity. The Plan B is

1	the Applicant's commitment of providing private
2	
3	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: You didn't
4	answer my question. There is no Plan B from
5	DDOT?
6	The Applicant also mentions in this
7	letter that they're doing the infrastructure
8	although in the Deputy Mayor's letter it
9	definitely says that D.C. is doing the
10	infrastructure in the roadways. Do you know
11	who is doing the roadways, the internal
12	roadways? Is the Applicant doing that or is the
13	city doing that?
14	MR. ZIMBABWE: My understanding is
15	that the internal roadways will be private and
16	will be will not be part of the DDOT roadway
17	network and DDOT maintenance
18	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
19	Well, I just want to I mean, the first point
20	of the Deputy Mayor's letter is that "Within two
21	years after the effective date of the PUD
22	approval order the District will commence

1	construction of the site infrastructure and
2	internal roadways." Right or wrong?
3	MR. ZIMBABWE: Right. My
4	understanding is that it's correct.
5	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: So, D.C.
6	will be doing the internal roadways?
7	MR. ZIMBABWE: The District will.
8	That does not mean that DDOT will.
9	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. But
10	D.C. will do the internal roadways, not the
11	Applicant?
12	MR. ZIMBABWE: That's my
13	understanding but that's not part of my report.
14	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. I
15	mean, they're a co-applicant. The city is a
16	co-applicant, I understand that. But I'm just
17	to separate the responsibility as to who is
18	doing what. I mean, it sounds like I'm getting
19	I mean, unless there's just a blanket when
20	we say applicant it's whoever is going to do it.
21	But I just wanted to draw some finality to that
22	so that we had an answer.

1	In the Applicant's statement they
2	talk about they're going to talk about the
3	review of what they're doing and "When
4	conditions are consistent with the requirements
5	for two successive periods the Applicant will
6	be released from the monetary requirement". I
7	take it you're going to review that?
8	MR. ZIMBABWE: That's correct.
9	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Chair, I
10	will relinquish my questions for right now.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Any other
12	actually, I started it but we're doing
13	deliberations. So, forgive me for doing that,
14	but this is too important. If we need to go to
15	OP DDOT, we'll just do that.
16	Okay. Commissioner Miller?
17	COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thank you, Mr.
18	Chairman.
19	I just wanted to express my
20	appreciation to the Applicant for addressing
21	the concerns that many of us expressed at the
22	July 28th Public Meeting. And we requested the

re-study or additional information on the height of the health care facility. That has been addressed and one floor has been removed from one of the wings of that health care facility.

We expressed concern about the loading facilities for the multi-family grocery store on Parcel 4. And that has been addressed in a way with keeping with a large format grocery store as best it can be. And we did ask for more specific comprehensive transportation traffic mitigation matters. That is, I think, everybody's overwhelming concern. And I think there has been a lot more tightening up of the transportation plan since our July meeting.

The Applicant has committed to fund and fill any and all transit demand gaps that are not met by enhanced public transportation that DDOT and WMATA are pursuing. That's a commitment. The Applicant commits to fund a private shuttle service regardless of cost. Yes, their budget only has -- was only increased

as Commissioner Turnbull said by half a million dollars from the previous iteration. But the statement of the Applicant is that regardless of cost they will insure that any transit demands are met through private shuttle service, major road improvements, bike and pedestrian enhancements as detailed in the most recent submission.

It's in the Applicant's interest, both the private developers and the District for this transportation network to work for this project to work. And it's going to have to be done through public and private resources but the Applicant has committed to fill any and all transit demands not met by enhanced public transportation that DDOT and WMATA are pursuing.

So, I think there has been a lot of movement since our July meeting. We've also asked for a much more details and timing on the community benefits, all of the dollars amounts and commitments to specific activities and tied

to specific measurements such as Certificate of Occupancy or Building Permit and I think all of those largely have been met. So, I think there's a lot here that wasn't here in July that a lot of work has gone into and I think we should acknowledge that. And, obviously, there will still need to be continuous work if we went forward with first stage as we move through other stages of this project in the future.

So, those are the comments I just ant to make initially, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right.

Any other comments, Commissioners?

I will say that apparently and I think there's a letter. I'm still getting used to these exhibits. Actually, this is pretty fast here. But anyway NCPC staff I noticed went in front of the Commission yet but NCPC staff and the Applicant, according to the Applicant in the letter here from NCPC have reached an agreement about the views from the Capitol even though unless I looked at the wrong picture.

Maybe the picture was not meant to show me the view of the Capitol because I couldn't see it from the picture that was given to us but, anyway, I don't know if that was the intended purpose of giving me that photograph. But, anyway, apparently that is Exhibit 856(b). There's an agreement between the staff of NCPC as well as the Applicant.

I have one other point but let me go to someone else.

Commissioner May.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. So, I would tend to align my comments with those of Commissioner Miller. I think that there's been significant progress in the project since we saw it last in terms of reduction of the height of the building and even moving the building in response to you're moving the west wall of the building a bit to the east in order to address NCPC staff concerns, as well as getting more information and more detail on the transit and on the delivery of the project and delivery of

certain components of the project including historic preservation elements. There's been I wouldn't say that it's completely progress. there. Ι think there's a little bit of tightening that still needs to be done certainly in the transportation arena as has been highlighted by some of the discussion tonight and in the community benefits, that whole I think it's helpful seeing it that schedule. way but I think there are a few things there that are a little bit out of the norm for what we would normally do in terms of when those payments are done and what they're tied to. So, I think a little bit of tightening up on that has to be done but I don't think we need to go into great deal here.

I was very concerned when I read the NCPC staff report. I mean getting 45 pages worth of concerns about, you know, the view it impacts and then we get, you know, a submission from the Applicant saying, oh, it's all good. We satisfied them. I mean, that was pretty

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

quick turnaround. And so that leaves me a little bit wanting. I think I kind would like to see since the simulations that were shown in the NCPC submission were so, you know, obviously problematic from NCPC's perspective and, you know, the way the views to the Capitol would so clearly be blocked by the medical office building. I kind of want to see those a little bit better. I don't think we got, you know, what we received actually does sort of address I think we see sight line drawings and that. things like that that show it out of the way but we don't see the view from the Scott Statue or whatever it was.

So, you know, I kind of would like to see a little bit more about that. I think there was also some back and forth about exactly what the right method is for calculating heights of buildings and so on. And I think that just a little bit more information there would make me feel most comfortable about it because I am concerned about views from the Armed Forces

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Retirement Home toward the Capitol because of its, the historic nature of that particular property.

Otherwise, you know, the other improvements that Commissioner Miller cited, the loading for the grocery areas, the grocery store has improved. Not idea. We've certainly seen things that are a lot better on some other projects that were quite frankly smaller. But I guess good enough to go along.

And I would also say that I was quite encouraged to the whole construction see phasing plan as aggressive as it is. I think sometimes we see some big projects in here and even some projects that are a lot smaller than this come in with like 10-year plans or 12-year plans and to see something that comes in the door with, you know, essentially, a 5-year plan, I mean, that's pretty impressive to have that information. I know there are things that are a bit uncertain in that but still I was pleased to see that overall.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I will say
that there have been some improvements since our
last time of having this discussion so I'm not
going to go against the comments I've heard.
And also from what I see in the file but, again,
I want to try to get now stuff down as close as
possible and I know that's what I started my
statement with the second stage PUD because as
Commissioner Miller so eloquently talked about
in the DDOT report where it says the Applicant
will fill in the gaps. If I was to read that
the way I read it, okay, well, if the streetcar
doesn't work for the city the Applicant is going
to take care of it and make sure the streetcar
goes. It's always how we interpret that. And
I'm sure that's not the case. So, that's just
where I am but I think a lot of work has been
done. I think we owe it to this community to
make sure we try to get it right.

So, you know, I think a lot of stuff has been resolved. Well, not resolved by given to us a lot better than what it is. What I realize

depending upon how we move is I looked at the
Michigan Avenue. It seems to be something
different from the Michigan Avenue perspective
going east or west than what I had previously
and I know, photography you can always do a shot
a little different to give you a different
appearance. So, I want to make sure that again
I'm looking east and west. And I saw the one
rendering in the submission that was submitted
with the reduction in the floor of the health
facility but I want to make sure that the that
I'm getting the same view because I really want
to see the relationship again on Michigan Avenue
and I know it's been set back more. The floor
now is reduced but I still want to see how it's
going to look to me when I go east or west on
Michigan Avenue. And I think the Applicant
provided it for us the last time before we had
our first deliberation. I'd like to see that
either at Final. I mean, before Final or either
prior to whatever ever action we take tonight
depending upon how this proceeds.

The other things is, I think there's
a request for a two-year typically our term
for the first stage approval lasts for one year.
The Applicant has asked for two years. This
project is running around for 25 years so I don't
think two years is asking for too much for a
25-year project. And let me say this. A lot
of times these projects have been in the
pipeline for a long time and folks want to get
upset with the Commission and even though it's
been out there for 25 years they get mad with
us because we can't get it taken care of for two
weeks. Sometime we have issues. We might not
always be in agreement but we try to do the best
we can to make it more conducive in things. You
know, I hear in the street, not necessarily this
case that we always rubber stamp. We don't
rubber stamp anything. If you pay attention to
us we always, I think, for the most part put our
independence into this and do what's required
in front of this Commission and do the best we
can for it. So, if it's been out there for 25

1	years, if we take a couple of months, give us
2	that time. Don't rush us. Let us try to get
3	it right, too, just like the folks in the
4	community try to get it right and the Applicant
5	trying to get it right.
6	So, anyway, enough said on my soap
7	box.
8	Commissioner Miller?
9	Any other comments?
10	COMMISSIONER MILLER: Mr. Chairman,
11	I just wanted to share with you
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: That's the one I'm
13	talking about that I looked at.
14	COMMISSIONER MILLER: Okay.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: And to me if you look
16	at that one and the one we had previously it's
17	a different angle for me. I like the previous
18	angle.
19	COMMISSIONER MILLER: We're talking
20	about Michigan Avenue?
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Michigan Avenue,
22	yes. Yes. I figured you was going to point

1	that out to me.
2	COMMISSIONER MILLER: But I didn't
3	know if it showed up as well on your beautiful
4	screen as it did in the
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: We'll actually look
6	at both. I specifically yesterday, since the
7	Giants weren't playing
8	COMMISSIONER MILLER: You had to
9	bring that up.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: They did beat the
11	Redskins but since they weren't playing
12	yesterday I looked at both. I had time to look
13	at both and I can tell you that I looked for that
14	specifically. I want that same exactly angle
15	with what's being proposed now with the floor.
16	Okay.
17	All right. Anything else?
18	All right. Who would like to make
19	a motion? I would move that we approve the
20	First Stage PUD, Zoning Commission Case 13-14,
21	the Vision Macmillan Partners, LLC, First Stage
22	PUD for a term of I really don't.

1	Does anyone agree with the two-year
2	term that's asked for by the Applicant? We all
3	agree? Okay. I was just thinking that would
4	move things along if we gave them one year, but
5	it may not. So, let's go ahead and accept that.
6	My colleagues agree.
7	I move that we approve Zoning
8	Commission Case Number 13-14, Vision Macmillan
9	Partners, LLC, First Stage PUD for a two-year
10	first stage approval.
11	COMMISSIONER MILLER: Second.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. It's moved
13	and properly seconded. Any further
14	discussion?
15	All those in favor?
16	(AYES)
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any opposition? Not
18	hearing none, Ms. Schellin, would you record the
19	vote.
20	SECRETARY SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. And
21	after we record it are we going to set some dates
22	for the additional documents that you want in.

1	Okay.
2	Staff will record the vote four to
3	zero to one to approve Proposed Action on Zoning
4	Commission Case Number 13-14. Commissioner
5	Hood moving, Commissioner Miller seconding.
6	Commissioners May and Turnbull in support.
7	Commissioner Cohen not voting having not
8	participated.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let me just state
10	though. Transportation and other issues are
11	open throughout this whole process. Because
12	once before we did that
13	SECRETARY SCHELLIN: Right.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: we were told you
15	all had already approved it. Transportation is
16	open.
17	SECRETARY SCHELLIN: Right. But I
18	heard that you wanted a view from Michigan
19	Avenue and there were a couple other items that
20	sounded like you wanted prior to Final Action.
21	Am I correct or is there nothing else?
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Right. Do we have

1	some other things that we want prior to Final
2	Action, I think, Commissioner May?
3	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. I wanted a
4	little bit more information on the viewshed
5	studies.
6	SECRETARY SCHELLIN: Right.
7	COMMISSIONER MAY: Not just the
8	SECRETARY SCHELLIN: And did you want
9	that from NCPC or from the Applicant?
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: No, I don't really
11	care who produced it so long as it's
12	SECRETARY SCHELLIN: So, you'll work
13	together?
14	COMMISSIONER MAY: agrees on
15	what it is that's being shown because
16	SECRETARY SCHELLIN: We don't
17	want
18	COMMISSIONER MAY: the last
19	version I saw of this was that the building was
20	going to completely block the view of the
21	Capitol and I think there's a view that we
22	haven't seen it would seem to me.

SECRETARY SCHELLIN: Okay. So, look into the Applicant --

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well, Chair, the other thing, although the Transportation Plan has improved significantly from what we had before I think that before Final it ought to be tweaked a little bit more and some final items ought to be added as looking at DDOT, working with the Applicant to tighten some of these things about, I mean, this was a big issue for the neighborhood and I just want to before I say yes on this. I want to see a little bit more work done that we give a little bit more comfort to the neighborhood that everything is going to fall in place.

I understand there's a lot of unknowns out there but the neighborhood's got a big concern. And I just think that DDOT and the Applicant need to really tweak this a little bit more with this Transportation Management Plan and just fill in some of the gaps that we talked about tonight.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. I would Thank you, Mr. Turnbull. 2 Anything else? 3 4 COMMISSIONER MAY: I think there were some concerns that we had about the amenities 5 6 packages and the time of delivery and what 7 they're tied to and so on. And I think that's something that the Office of the Attorney 8 General can work with the Applicant to resolve. 9 10 MR. RITTING: Yes, as part of the 11 typical PUD proffers and conditions process, I plan to do that. 12 13 SECRETARY SCHELLIN: Okay. So, if we could have those submission and that submission 14 will only come from the Applicant by 3:00 p.m. 15 16 on October 20th and then the parties would be able to respond only to that submission by 3:00 17 p.m. October 27th. And Final Action will be 18 19 taken up at the November 10th meeting and, of 20 course, the Applicant needs to make its filing pursuant to Chapter 24 with regard to the list 21

of public benefits and draft conditions.

22

Those

1	dates are based on the regulation. Thank you.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Anything else
3	on this case?
4	Okay. Let's go to I think next is
5	Hearing Action. Hearing Action on Zoning
6	Commission Case Number 14-14, Jemal's CDC, LLC,
7	Consolidated PUD & Related Map Amendment @
8	Square 833.
9	It sounds like they've already
10	started working on Macmillan. Yes, they really
11	started quickly. Okay.
12	Let's go to the Office of Planning.
13	Ms. Thomas.
14	MS. THOMAS: Yes, good evening, Mr.
15	Chair, members of he Commission. The Office of
16	Planning is recommending setdown of the
17	Consolidated PUD and Related Map Amendment
18	requested by Hemal CDC LLC to enable
19	redevelopment of the property at 501 8th Street,
20	Northeast which is either the 8th Street
21	Overlay.
22	The PUD Related Map Amendment from

the underlying C2A to the C2B Zone would allow the replacement of the existing one-story office building with a six-story above grade mixed use building of approximately 32 residential units above retail uses on the first, second and floor level. You'd notice that the number of units have been adjusted and this has been at the request of the Applicant. They informed us that there would be instead os 26 units as originally proposed it would be approximately between 30 and 32 units.

The proposed overall 4.4 FAR and the nonresidential 1.37 FAR are within the maximum permitted under the CTB part.

The proposal conforms to the Comprehensive Plan, policy objectives for the Capitol Hill policy focus area which supports the 8th Street Corridor urban living district between 2nd and 7th Street, Northeast. The site is within a main mixed street, mixed use corridor identified in the Comprehensive Plan future land use map where it is anticipated that

1 redevelopment supports transit use as proposed with this project. 2 Based on the site constraints, the 3 4 Applicant is requesting flexibility from the 8th Street Overlay requirements with a maximum 5 6 retail FAR and the minimum area requirement for 7 a PUD within the overlay. Flexibility is also requested from 8 the general requirements for parking, loading 9 10 and rear yard. Applicant 11 OP requested the provide additional architectural details and 12 13 perspectives of the project's relationship with existing development including the street level 14 We also request that they provide or 15 16 improve delivery for the project and refine an amenities package commensurate for 17 the requested flexibility. 18 19 The proposed PUD is not inconsistent

recommending

with the elements of the Comprehensive Plan,

application be set down for a Public Hearing.

are

therefore,

we

20

21

22

that

1	And at this point I'm available for any
2	questions. Thank you.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you,
4	Ms. Thomas.
5	Colleagues, any questions of the
6	Office of Planning?
7	Vice Chair Cohen?
8	VICE CHAIR COHEN: Thank you, Mr.
9	Chairman.
10	I would suggest that we get more
11	information on the inclusionary zoning. I do
12	not believe it's an amenity. I believe that we
13	would have gotten more affordability if we do
14	not approve the map amendment. The map
15	amendment under CTB does not require as deep
16	affordability. So, I don't think it's an
17	amenity. I think we lost some affordable units
18	if we do approve the map amendment.
19	In addition, I have some concerns
20	about the design. Maybe during the Public
21	Hearing if I could see the Materials Board, I
22	could see the there might be more texture to

1	the building. But right now it looks very flat
2	and not terrible exciting. And I think one of
3	the things I like about H Street is there is a
4	differentiation of building pop outs and other
5	embellishments.
6	Anyway, I really feel we need to take
7	a look at it. I think the second floor window
8	I mean, there is obviously an attempt at being
9	very, you know, consistent but maybe that's not
10	what we need here consistency.
11	So, those are my I think those are
12	my major comments. I'm learning how to use that
13	pen so I don't really find that I I can't read
14	all my notes. So, I'll just defer to somebody
15	and maybe come back to me.
16	Thank you.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Anybody else?
18	Commissioner Miller.
19	COMMISSIONER MILLER: Yes, thank
20	you, Mr. Chairman.
21	Yes, I would concur with the Vice
22	Chair that the Applicant needs to confirm

whether or not it is proffering compliance with the inclusionary zoning set aside requirement of Section 2603 and if it is, then it needs to identify the amount of additional inclusionary zoning that result from the map amendment, the number of inclusionary zoning units for low income houses that will be lost which Vice Chair Cohen was referring to and to balance the net gain in affordable housing overall against the low income units.

Also agree with all of the Office of Planning's requests for additional information including something that I think they didn't refer to here tonight but it's in their report which is that the LEED rating needs to try to get closer to Silver. That's basically what we've been -- that's basically the minimum that we've been accepting in the PUD or that OP has been accepting and that we have agreed with in PUD applications.

I'd also like to see a rendering if it isn't already in the file by the time of

hearing on how the building looks from the residential rowhouse neighborhood to the south. There are lot of good step downs and setbacks in this project to try to make it compatible with the lower rise neighborhood to the south. But I'd like to just see a rendering that just shows that.

And the Vice Chair's comment about the flatness, some of the renderings show a little bit more articulation but maybe additional elements could be added. Maybe additional balconies could be added beyond the one floor that's there. So, I think those were my major -- oh, I think on the parking. This is one that is providing eighth surface parking lots -- eight surface parking spaces which is not the most efficient use of land. I quess I want more information as to why it isn't feasible to do underground parking on this site. I realize it's a small site, less than 10,000 square feet which is one of the things they're asking for flexibility under the PUD standards

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that we consider. But I just want more
information on whether underground parking
could be feasible for both the spaces it is
providing and maybe for additional spaces. I
think the retail that's being provided here is
going to be very attractive and I realize this
is a very transit, rich and soon to be streetcar
rich zone, within close walking distance of
Metro Rail and Metro Bus right out front. But
I just want something on the feasibility of
I didn't see it addressed as to why it can't be
done underground parking there.
CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Any other
comments?
COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr.
Chairman, I'd just like to thank Ms. Thomas for
an excellent report.
I just would agree with my
colleagues. I guess my only concern is that,
I think, we'll have to wait for the ANC to weigh
in and the neighborhood on their requirements

1	of the 8th Street Overlay. I think that's going
2	to be in the I mean, the overlays were set
3	up for certain characteristics and to want
4	relief I think we have to weigh that very
5	carefully with what they're trying to do. So,
6	it will interesting to see how the ANC weighs
7	in with this and what their reactions are.
8	Thank you.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Anybody else?
10	Commissioner May?
11	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, first of all
12	I've heard everything that's been said so far,
13	it's the advantage, I guess, to speaking last,
14	mention less.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I haven't spoken yet.
16	COMMISSIONER MAY: I know and now I
17	know why you go last.
18	No, I would I would want to echo
19	a little bit about the architecture. I mean,
20	it certainly is interesting but I just find it
21	really odd that it's so strongly sort of
22	neoclassical. It's very different and I didn't

see, I mean, maybe there's a reason for it and a log for it and, you know, it seems to be, you know, generally coherent as a design of that style. But there are some things that are a little bit, you know, odd. Again, just the style of it does it really fit with the neighborhood? Is it the right thing to do? I mean, you know, very pronounced coins on the corner just very different, not the sort of thing I'd expect to see.

And there are a some things that are a bit contradictory about it. I mean, you have this very traditional looking kind of heavy feeling, masonry building but then, you know, the corner at 5th where the Mango Republic is shown in the renderings, there's not a column in there. It's like all this masonry is just floating above the very airy, glassy retail space. Now, I know this is just a rendering. But it still is -- it's kind of missing something. With that much heavy masonry I want to have something that is made of masonry that

comes down at the corner and joins it to the ground. But, I mean, I would just question overall the style of the building. I think it's -- I don't think it absolutely has to change but I need to understand why it's driven in this direction and is that really the right way to go. Maybe it is. I don't know. It's almost like a design philosophy question, I quess.

And I agree that parking would be a concern because I know it's an area where it's difficult to get parking right now and even with transit coming in it's still destination and it may just be, you know, part of the broader issue of how you deal with intra-zone parking with all the people who live, you know, south of here who are still in Zone 6 who want to drive up there and park. I would never do that, of course. Actually, I do it all Anyway, but I think parking is a bit the time. of a concern and I think it's something you'll have to address with the neighbors and the ANC along with some of the others that have been

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	mentioned like the 8th Street Overlay. So,
2	thank you.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Any other
4	comments?
5	The reason I go last is because I
6	think that's the proper thing to do as the
7	Chairman, right, Commissioner Miller?
8	COMMISSIONER MAY: I've never been
9	Chairman.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I actually learned
11	that from the City Council and the leadership
12	of the chairs and also Commissioner Miller when
13	he was at the Council. So, Mr. Mayor, if you
14	want to know why I do that, sometime I don't but
15	most of the time I do.
16	Anyway. All right. Any other
17	comments. I don't have any on this. I'm
18	looking forward to
19	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Chair?
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Turnbull?
21	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: It's your
22	prerogative as the Chair to do whatever you

1	want. You have that right.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: My head is big
3	enough. No, my head is not big.
4	No, actually, I just always learned
5	that way from watching the City Council so,
6	council members, something does watch you,
7	believe me. I watched them do that. Okay.
8	VICE CHAIR COHEN: I do have
9	something.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.
11	VICE CHAIR COHEN: I finally found
12	the note that I couldn't ever find.
13	I believe Commissioner Turnbull
14	said that we needed more elaboration on why we
15	needed the flexibility of the 8th Street Overlay
16	District, I think you did say that. Okay.
17	Thank you.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Somebody like
19	to make a motion?
20	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes, Mr.
21	Chair, I would move that we approve Jemal's CDC
22	LLC Consolidated PUD and Related Map Amendment

1	at Square I would move that we set down, let
2	me correct that, at Square 833 and look for a
3	second.
4	VICE CHAIR COHEN: Second.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. It's been
6	moved and properly seconded. Any further
7	discussion?
8	All those in favor?
9	(AYES)
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any opposition? So
11	ordered. Staff, would you record the vote?
12	SECRETARY SCHELLIN: Yes, Staff
13	records the vote five to zero to zero to set down
14	Zoning Commission Case Number 14-14 as a
15	contested case. Commissioner Miller moving,
16	Commissioner Cohen seconding, Commissioners
17	Hood, May and Miller in support of set down.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Next Zoning
19	Commission Case Number 14-16. The is the
20	Office of Planning Text and Map Amendment to
21	create a new C2B1 Zone District.
22	Mr. Jesick.

1 MR. JESICK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission. 2 Recent changes to D.C.'s building 3 4 code have made it possible to construct taller buildings with a wood frame on top of a concrete 5 6 pedestal. Buildings can now be built up to 85 7 feet tall with five floors of wood frame construction on top of a one-story concrete 8 9 base. 10 In order to accommodate the new 11 construction type the Office of Planning 12 proposes a new zone, C2B1, that would allow 75 13 feet as a matter of right but have the same FAR 14 and other development parameters as the existing C2B Zone. 15 16 In addition to the text amendment the Office of Planning proposes to map the new 17 zone on a parcel of land bound roughly by New 18 19 York Avenue, Montana Avenue and Bladensburg 20 Road, Northeast. The height permitted under the new 21

zone would facilitate development of this site

that has long been an underutilized gateway into the city and has been the subject of a number of past failed development proposals.

The contract purchaser of the site has approached the Office of Planning with preliminary development proposal that would utilize the higher height of 5 feet but would need no more than the C2B matter of right density. So, a new zone might be an appropriate mechanism for that development scenario.

Plan policies support that site's redevelopment and the proposed zone is not inconsistent with the mixed-use, medium-density residential and moderate density commercial designation on the future In fact, the future land use map land use map. in was changed 2006, specifically, to facilitate and encourage development of that site.

Also, the Mayor and Office of Planning has recently completed industrial land transformation study calls for this site to be

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	a gateway into the city and to Ward 5. And the
2	Office of Planning, therefore, recommends that
3	the Zoning Commission set down for a Public
4	Hearing the proposed text and map amendments.
5	If the case is set down, the Office of Planning
6	will provide text prior to a public hearing with
7	the only substantive change from the C2B Zone
8	being the change to the allowable height.
9	I'd be happy to take any questions.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Now, I'm going to
11	contradict everything I just said about what I
12	learned. No, I think I won't. I think I won't.
13	Let me continue with that.
14	Commissioner May.
15	COMMISSIONER MAY: All right. I get
16	to go first.
17	So, I just have a few questions and
18	I'm not looking for answers right now but I'm
19	interested in seeing how this zone would mesh
20	with the new zones as proposed in the zoning
21	reg rewrite. I'm interested in seeing how this
22	messes with IZ. Is this actually going to

increase affordability because we're getting more stick-built stuff and we can go to 10 percent rather than 8 percent? I just want to understand if there's any relationship at all.

Are there other areas where the Office of Planning would actually consider mapping this zone is another question that I have?

And the last thing I have is, again, a philosophical thing maybe which is that, you know, we're doing this in response to the fact that it is possible to build in a slightly different way and I understand that there are probably benefits to builders and developers to build in that fashion, but I wonder whether it, in fact, is a better method overall. I mean, particularly, in terms of sustainability. Are we better off building, you know, stick-built buildings to higher heights? I mean, I know what I read in the architecture magazines about how wonderful it is building things with wood

but, you know, that's all done by the Wood Manufacturers Association so I don't know how, you know, how straightforward it is. And this may have already been, you know, considered in the provision of the building codes and I don't want to go into great detail about it. I just would like to understand a little bit more about the context and whether there is, you know, whether it's actually a beneficial thing in ways other than simply getting, you know, more height for the same density which is essentially what it's allowing. You can answer that one right there?

MR. JESICK: Well, I was just going to ask if you could elaborate on that question just a little bit more.

COMMISSIONER MAY: When this question was taken up as a building code question did they look at the question of sustainability and are there arguments to be made along those lines? I'm not asking for a lot of new original research about, you know,

what the sustainability is but maybe it's something that's easily understood. It's a question I have because I would hate to be doing something that, you know, people who are in the sustainability business are railing against because it's, you know, massibly wasteful of resources or something like that. And we're promoting it in the zoning regs just because it's cheaper for builders to build that way.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Vice Chair Cohen?

VICE CHAIR COHEN: I'd like to thank
Commissioner May because he channeled most of
my questions for me. But n the sustainability
issue because it came up in my list of questions.
I think the U.S. Green Building Council can give
you some really great insight into that issue.

I mean this is just, you know, not a great deal of height but I would like to see it in the context of the neighborhood. So, if there can be some drawings or visuals to help understand that. That's the only thing that he left out. I guess he got tired. You did a

1 great job. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other questions 2 3 or comments? 4 Okay. I would agree to see the visual thing. 5 6 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: No, I'm 7 sorry, Mr. Chair. I don't mean to cut you off. CHAIRMAN HOOD: No, that's all right. 8 I always go last. 9 10 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I just want to follow up. I guess what -- I'm not opposed 11 to setting this down but I guess what bothers 12 13 me is that we're sort of backing into this. 14 mean, normally when we do zoning we look at the Comp Plan, the Future Land Map. We look at the 15 16 Small Area Plan and a multitude of other things and we come together, we say, this is what this 17 area of land needs to be zoned as. Here we're 18 19 coming in with a construction technique and 20 says, let's make a piece of property that we can I mean, let's just say I have -- I'm 21 build on.

an applicant. Commissioner Miller has just got

1	Glebe Site approved by the building department.
2	Glebe Site is four inches thick. It can span
3	250 feet and carry a dead load of 500 square feet
4	and it's cheap. It's made from bird guano.
5	It's compressed and it is extremely it's
6	amazing. We're able to re-utilize some stuff.
7	How about a site. I think I can do a lot of stuff
8	with this. I just don't like the idea. I guess
9	what bothers me is looking at a building
10	construction and saying what can we do with the
11	site now.
12	MS. STEINGASSER: I'm happy to
13	respond to that, Commissioner Turnbull, because
14	we don't consider this equivalent to bird guano.
15	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Oh, it's
16	very sustainable. It's very energy efficient
17	if you can do it and it's clean and it's
18	MS. STEINGASSER: We're seeing these
19	projects and we have been seeing these projects
20	with this type of building for the last five,
20	with this type of building for the last five, ten years. This is not new building code.

building code. And the burden and delay that's put on development because they have to go through PUDs to get an addition five to ten feet when they're not requesting any increase in density whatsoever.

This site in particular has been studied to death. It's part of a land use -- industrial land use study that was done in 2006, I think. It's been studied through the land use -- the industrial land use transformation recently. It's been changed the on Comprehensive Plan. It's been through a PUD that had at one point eight buildings at 130 and It then came back because that 110 feet. enormous height and density didn't work. came back as a matter of right tilt up big box where we had absolutely no residential. supposed to be a three-story parking garage. They said it was surrounded by retail but that surround was a wall of signage. And we had absolutely no recourse to require any kind of value capture for residential or way to get at

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that.

	We've	been	working	with	the
developer.	He has	not pro	vided an a	applicat	ion.
But we do fee	elit's d	consist	ent with t	he Comp	Plan
and we star	ted loo	king at	the amou	int of c	ases
we're seeing	g where	develo	pers are i	really g	joing
through this	s enormo	ous bur	den to ge	t this e	extra
five or ten	feet tha	at the b	uilding c	ode has	long
anticipated	. So, v	we're sa	aying it'	s relati	vely
new. It's	relative	ely new	in our re	cogniti	on of
a by-right	scenar	rio but	it's b	een in	the
building co	ode.	And so	we tho	ught, l	.et's
propose it.	It's	consi	stent wit	th the	Comp
Plan. We t	ried to	call	it out di	rectly.	We
weren't try	ing to h	ide the	fact that	we have	e bee
looking at t	the site	e with t	his part:	icular c	wner
and that i	t would	d come	forward	both a	as a
rule-making	both in	n terms	of its ma	ap amend	lment
as a Comp Pl	an cons	istency	case and	as a zo	ning
case.					

 $\label{thm:commissioner} \mbox{COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I appreciate} \\ \mbox{that and I'm being a little sarcastic and a} \\$

little facetious. All I'm saying is don't go down the road of construction techniques. The building is going -- if you're looking at the site and from the standpoint of zoning and the Comprehensive Plan and what is best for the site, talk about the site and talk about the abilities of what we can do with the site and what makes sense from an urban planning standpoint. That's good urban planning.

It would let the contractor then have the ability to build it whatever way he can. If this new method is the way to go, he's going to use it. But to me coming out straightforward and saying the building code says you can this is to me is backward. I'd rather say, there's opportunities in certain areas of the city that underutilized are and by meeting the Comprehensive Plan we think these out to be re-zoned for the following reasons. And just as you stated, but I wouldn't start off talking about construction. To me that's -- it's going to get built however it gets built.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I understand you recognize this new technique and that's fine, but to me that's not the way to go into urban planning and talk about a design. I would rather base it upon planning principles and why this make sense. That's all I'm saying.

MS. STEINGASSER: Yes, sir, and I apologize for the order of our report because all that planning study and that Comp Plan and all those maps are indeed attached.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: And I But what I want to do is put an that. "X" through the first page or so and just say, why even go down that road? I would say, if it needs to be C2B2 or whatever and for the following reasons let's do it. If it makes good urban planning and it meets the comp Plan and everything else we're going to do that. I just could care less about reading about all the construction techniques because a builder is going to build it the way he wants to build it. What makes sense, what's economical and how it's

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	going to work. That's all.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Now, any other
3	comments? Great.
4	Ms. Steingasser, and I'm not sure if
5	Mr. Jesick or either one, I think mentioned
6	this. Will this zone apply to any other
7	property in the city or just this triangle?
8	MS. STEINGASSER: It would certainly
9	be available for any other site in the city that
10	would meet the conditions but right now we're
11	proposing it only on this particular site.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. If somebody
13	else suited their needs they would be able to
14	use this zone, C2B1. Correct?
15	MS. STEINGASSER: They would be
16	available to petition the Commission for a
17	re-zoning.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes. Okay.
19	I will tell you this Commission
20	I've been here for most of them. We started
21	with the bowling alley, the Harris Teeters.
22	I've been around for all of it. Well, at least

this will probably be the fifth time, I think, something, that I've done been Commission with this site. And I figure when that was acquired what came on down would be done and there were some things. But you know, I can tell you that and I would agree with the vice Chair and the viewing but one thing about this site it sits kind of -- if you're up on the hillside, it's just kind of down. It's down in a valley like so I think the additional height shouldn't be a problem. But I'm not on the arboretum side so I'm not sure what those neighbors would say.

But anyway, I think it's a long time coming. It's a gateway to the city. Something needs to be done and I know we're only doing a text amendment and map amendment now but I'm just curious because there's something even the Office of Planning is not aware of it but there's something in the pipeline. There's something that somebody is thinking about doing here. And I'm actually going to ask that question at

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 the hearing. I'm just curious. I know we don't get into projects but there's something 2 in the pipeline. 3 4 I can tell you there's been a lot of dreams that I can tell you community members 5 6 have been looking forward to and I forgot who 7 said it that have never happened. So, right now what we have is a fill with a gate around it so 8 9 being interesting to see how this develops and 10 hopefully this time, the fifth time will be a 11 charm. Okay. 12 Any other comments? COMMISSIONER MILLER: Mr. Chairman? 13 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioner Miller. 14 COMMISSIONER MILLER: I concur with 15 16 all of your comments and I would like to move that the Zoning Commission set down Zoning 17 Commission Case Number 14-16 from the Office of 18 19 Planning Proposed Text Amendments to Create a new C2B1 Zone District and ask for a second. 20 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Second. 21 We're going 22 to give Commissioner Turnbull the second. Vice

1	Chair Cohen seconds everything. If you look at
2	the record I've been noticing. Her name is down
3	for seconding everything and I think if we put
4	a pole up.
5	VICE CHAIR COHEN: Isn't that what a
6	Vice Chair does? Isn't that in my
7	COMMISSIONER MILLER: Oh, second.
8	VICE CHAIR COHEN: Yes.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I don't
10	remember that.
11	VICE CHAIR COHEN: Second in command.
12	Second to the second.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So, if the Vice Chair
14	don't mind we'll give that to Commissioner
15	Turnbull. I will withdraw my second and give
16	it to Commissioner Turnbull. We'll give that
17	to Commissioner Turnbull.
18	SECRETARY SCHELLIN: Yes.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So, it's been moved
20	and properly seconded. Any further
21	discussion?
22	All those in favor?

1	(AYES)
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing any
3	opposition, Ms. Schellin, would you record the
4	vote?
5	SECRETARY SCHELLIN: Yes. Staff
6	records the vote five to zero to zero to set down
7	Zoning Commission Case Number 14-16 as a
8	rule-making case. Commissioner Miller moving,
9	Commissioner Turnbull seconding, Commissioners
10	Cohen, Hood and May in support of set down.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Next on the
12	agenda is a correspondence item. Zoning
13	Commission Case 12-18, US AC H Street, LLC,
14	Letter from the Zoning Administrator, pursuant
15	to 249.8.
16	Ms. Schellin.
17	SECRETARY SCHELLIN: Yes, this case
18	was deferred from the Commissioner September
19	15th to allow OP to weigh in.
20	Exhibit 62 is a memo from OP and
21	would ask the Commissioner to consider this
22	case.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
2	Commissioners, we have the letter from the ZA
3	and I'm not sure who asked for the Office of
4	Planning to do a supplement but that's our
5	Exhibit 62. It's before us.
6	Any question on the ZA's actions?
7	Any comments?
8	COMMISSIONER MAY: I would just
9	comment that I'm very happy that OP has weighed
LO	in and that there are no issues with this. It's
L1	hard to tell from the information we have from
L2	the ZA and I appreciate the Office of Planning
L3	taking the time to review it to provide us their
L4	insight on it.
L5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Anyone else?
L6	Okay. We don't need to do anything
L7	with this? That was just an acknowledgment.
L8	SECRETARY SCHELLIN: No.
L9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right.
20	Do we have anything else on the
21	agenda?
22	Okay I want to thank everyone else

1	for their listening to this meeting. This
2	meeting is adjourned.
3	(Whereupon, the above-entitled
4	matter went off the record at 8:38 p.m.)
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
LO	
L1	
L2	
L3	
L4	
L5	
L6	
L7	
L8	
L9	
20	
21	
22	