GOVERNMENT

OF

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

REGULAR MEETING 1168th MEETING SESSION (12th OF 2004)

+ + + + +

MONDAY SEPTEMBER 13, 2004

+ + + + +

The Regular Public Meeting of the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened at 6:30 p.m. in the Office of Zoning Hearing Room at 441 4th Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20001, Carol J. Mitten, Chairperson, presiding.

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

CAROL J. MITTEN

ANTHONY J. HOOD

KEVIN L. HILDEBRAND

GREGORY N. JEFFRIES

JOHN G. PARSONS

Chairperson

Vice Chairperson

Commissioner

Commissioner

Commissioner

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

ALBERTO P. BASTIDA, Secretary SHARON SCHELLIN, Office of Zoning

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

ELLEN McCARTHY

MAXINE BROWN-ROBERTS,
JENNIFER STEINGASSER,
JOEL LAWSON,
STEPHEN MORDFIN

Deputy Director
Office of Planning
Office of Planning
Office of Planning

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL STAFF PRESENT:

ALAN BERGSTEIN, ESQ.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

This transcript constitutes the minutes from the public meeting held on Monday, September 13, 2004

I-N-D-E-X

Z.C. Case No.	04-19	(WASA)	6
Z.C. Case No.	04-13	(Logan Phase II)	23
Z.C. Case No.	04-14	(Florida Rock)	30
Z.C. Case No.	04-08A	(St. Elizabeths)	40
Z.C. Case No.	02-22	(Square 754)	43
Z.C. Case No.	04-07	(WASA)	45
Status Report	by Off	ice of Planning	52
Action on Minu	ıtes		64

1 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S (6:39 p.m.)2 Good evening, ladies 3 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: This is the public meeting of the 4 and gentlemen. Zoning Commission of the District of Columbia for 5 Monday, September 13, 2004. 6 7 My name is Carol Mitten, and joining me 8 this evening are Vice Chairman Anthony Hood, Commissioners Kevin Hildebrand, John Parsons, and Greq 9 10 Jeffries. 11 The copies of our agenda for this evening 12 are available to you. They're in the wall bins near 13 And before we get started, I'm going to change a few things around. So if you have an agenda, 14 15 please follow along. 16 17 18

We will put off action on the Minutes and the Status Report from the Office of Planning until the end. We will begin with Hearing Action, and under Hearing Action we'll take the third case first, which is 04-19, which is a very exciting thing about egg digesters and -- or egg-shaped digesters.

(Laughter.)

then, we'll pick up the Consent Calendar item and go through the rest of the agenda from there.

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

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

5
Under Proposed Action, both of the cases
for Proposed Action, which Capital Gateway II in
Forest Hills will not be decided this evening. The
Capital Gateway II, the supplemental report that we
had asked for from the Office of Planning is not yet
finished, and I believe October is you can meet the
timeframe for our October meeting. If that's correct,
that will be on in October.
And then, in the Forest Hills transcope
overlay case we have two Commissioners who have a very
large volume of record to digest, speaking of
digestion, and we're going to give a couple more

And then, under Final Action, the Case 91-2, which is proposed for dismissal, we will also take up in October. And we're adding a case for Final Action, which is Case Number 04-12, which is the Carnegie Institute case.

time.

tentatively planned for decisionmaking in November.

that

So

will

So hopefully everybody got all that down, and we will ask Mr. Bastida if there are any preliminary matters before we begin.

SECRETARY BASTIDA: Madam Chairman, the staff has no preliminary matters. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. And I

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of

additional

would just remind everyone that we're being webcast live and recorded by a Court Reporter. So I'd just ask if everyone can turn off their beepers and cell phones, so that we don't have any disruptive noises. And just -- unless we ask you to come forward, we don't take any public testimony at these meetings. So just keep your seats.

All right. So we'll move to Hearing Action, and the first case will be 04-19, which is the WASA application for egg-shaped digesters at Blue Plains. And I'll turn to Ms. McCarthy.

DEP. DIR. McCARTHY: Thank you, Madam The Office of Planning wants to communicate Chair. our strong support of the project that is proposed. Ιt is project that will have substantial environmental and financial benefits to the District of Columbia and to the ratepayers of WASA, will reduce the number of trucks rumbling through the area around Blue Plains with sludge, because it will further digest that and digest that sludge in an enclosed environment, which will contain odors and other noxious -- potentially noxious byproducts of the process.

And so with that as the prelude, let me introduce Maxine Brown-Roberts, who will take us

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

through the specifics of what the Office of Planning is recommending with regard to setdown of that case.

Thank you.

MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Good evening, Madam Chairman, and members of the Commission. I am Maxine

Brown-Roberts for the record.

The subject property is part of a 159-acre Blue Plain Advance Water Treatment Plant in Southwest Washington, D.C. The facility is developed with a number of buildings and facilities that are used in wastewater treatment and processing.

This facility will consist of eight 145feet digesters, 44 feet of which is buried. On top of
each digester is a gas stone structure to support
mechanical equipment and provide access to the
interior of the digester for maintenance and
inspection.

The digesters are connected by above-ground walkways, with three or four 180-foot towers between the digesters to provide access from the ground to the walkways. The walkways are at 101-foot level.

Based on the information provided, the applicant is proposing height relief and having multiple buildings on a lot. Regarding the multiple

NEAL R. GROSS

buildings, the applicant has requested flexibility by the Commission to have more than one principal structure on a single lot.

Section 2517 permits more than one principal building on a principal lot, as a matter of right, if the applicant meets the criteria for this section. OP, in fact, believes that that is what the applicant is requesting. Regarding the height, the subject property is in the CM-3 district that allows a height of up to 90 feet, and the PUD regulation allows the Commission to grant an increase in height of up to five percent.

In the case of the elevator tower, the applicant has applied the five percent to the top of the structure, as well as another five percent to the area classified as a roof structure. We are concerned that there is not sufficient flexibility in the PUD process to permit this and the height necessary for the structures.

In order to minimize the relief needed for height, the applicant has created an empty lot that extends to the height elevation of the Anacostia Freeway. That is approximately 6.6 feet higher than the grade in front of the structures.

The only publicly-dedicated right of way

NEAL R. GROSS

for this site is I-295. However, we are concerned about using I-295 as a measuring point for the in because it is conflict with the digesters, definition of building height and the recently-adopted text amendment that defines natural grade, and, if granted, could set a precedent for other projects to try and follow.

In order for the applicant to obtain the requested heights, the Commission would review the variance simultaneously with the PUD, if the applicant files a variance request with the BZA for the excess height and demonstrates how the property meets the variance test.

The applicant's representatives have also suggested that the Zoning Commission approval of the project as a whole could include any unspecified relief that be identified by Zoning may the Administrator during permit review. ΟP does believe that any time would be saved by pursuing this assumption.

If the Commission decides to continue with the case as a PUD, we strongly recommend that the variance be considered simultaneously with the PUD to avoid the unnecessary interpretation regarding how the heights of the structures are measured.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

	Inank you, Madam Charrman.
2	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Ms. Brown-
3	Roberts.
4	I'd like to just begin by asking a
5	question, just to clarify. In your report, when you
6	talk about multiple buildings on a lot, that's the
7	theoretical lot provision, which can be accomplished
8	in 2517 as a matter of right for commercial use. But
9	my understanding is that the Blue Plains the
10	entirety of Blue Plains, there is not a record lot for
11	there's no record lot of any kind. So it itself is
12	a theoretical lot or something, or maybe it's just so
13	old that it, you know, predates all that.
14	But am I correct that there's not a record
15	lot?
16	DEP. DIR. McCARTHY: Right. It's
17	apparently a something.
18	(Laughter.)
19	And
20	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: That's good to know.
21	DEP. DIR. McCARTHY: And what kind of
22	something it is is not entirely clear, which is when
23	we became aware of just how irregular that situation
24	was, that's why the Office of Planning would not be
25	opposed to hearing this as a DIID with the variance

appropriate relief for height, but with the other 2 3 flexibility being considered as part of a planned unit 4 development. 5 And our assumption is that when the -when WASA submits its fuller application, it will, at 6 in the prehearing statement, 7 point in time 8 explain more completely the relief that's necessary, and in the meantime may go to the surveyor's office 9 10 and ask for a lot of record, if that is part of 11 helping to clarify that. 12 So at this point in time, given that it's somewhat indeterminant, it would make sense to hear it 13 as a PUD and with the height relief being a variance 14 15 and the rest of the flexibility that's sought being 16 sought through the PUD mechanism. 17 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Т have another 18 question. I'm just looking for the part. 19 MEMBER HILDEBRAND: Am I understanding 20 correctly that you're recommending that it -- the PUD process is the correct process for this? 21 22 DEP. DIR. McCARTHY: The PUD process is 23 not the correct relief for the height, because of the reasons that we explained in the report. But the PUD 24 25 -- but the Zoning Commission is empowered to grant a

being requested from the Zoning Commission as

variance, and it can do that as part of a PUD hearing.

So given the other kinds of relief that may be necessary with regard to more than one principal structure on the lot, and the area requirements, and the fact that there is no record lot at this point in time, the Office of Planning would not be opposed to setting it down as a PUD and a variance within that PUD.

And it seems like that's the way, as we've discussed this with the Office of the Attorney General -- and maybe they would like to weigh in as well -- but as we've discussed it with them, it seems like that would be the best way of providing both kinds of relief that are necessary.

MR. BERGSTEIN: If I could just --

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Please.

MR. BERGSTEIN: -- I think it's not so much that if you decided, in fact, to agree with the Office of Planning in terms of height measurement methodology that the variance would be a relief within the PUD. You'd had two applications. You would have a PUD application that deals with those matters of zoning flexibility, apart from height unless you felt that you could also hear height up to 90 percent plus the 5 percent.

13 And then, there would be а separate application that would be heard at the same hearing to relief. grant height So it's separate two applications that would be consolidated within a single hearing, but would require two separate votes, two separate approvals. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Let me just ask you as much about for -- this is for future reference. you have a -- am I correct in this statement?

have a variance request that's part of the PUD, the burden of proof is different. Is that correct?

MR. BERGSTEIN: Well, again, Ι don't consider that part of the PUD as being done simultaneous with the PUD as а matter of administrative efficiencies, if the PUD process can take care of several aspects of zoning flexibility.

But, one, it cannot, because there is a limit with respect to the amount of zoning flexibility that you can be given with respect to height. Then, both would be heard at the same time, separately considered.

The zoning flexibility under the PUD standard would require a showing that what is being built is more -- becomes something more than could be through matter of accomplished right, that the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

flexibility provides a superior project, either the project itself or the amenities that flow from the project. And that's the standard that will go to the zoning flexibility requested under the PUD.

With respect to the variance, it's the traditional variance standard -- that there must be something unique and exceptional about the property or flowing from the property. And that, as a result of that exceptional condition, there's a practicable difficulty in complying with the zoning regulations. But there are two separate tests, two separate applications, two separate votes.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. So unlike what we would normally -- if we just roll in the variance with other relief requested, and we don't go through the three-prong test -- in this case, because it would be a separate application, it would stand on its own. They would have to go -- they would have to address the three-prong test for the height.

MR. BERGSTEIN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Okay. I think
I have wrapped my brain around that. One of the
things that concerns me is that the idea that -- that
the approval of a project would include unspecified
relief, I'm very uncomfortable with that. I believe

1 that that is the practice, that if a project gets past the Zoning Commission and various things have not been 2 called out that the Zoning Administrator might see, 3 that it just keeps -- it keeps going, because it's 4 5 considered to be approved. But it has never been my intention that if 6 there's any relief that hasn't been called out that we 7 8 don't call it out, if we see it, and that that shouldn't be part of the degree of relief being 9 10 requested. So the idea that it's just kind of like, 11 well, whatever else we need is included in that, we --12 I think we really need to know, to the extent 13 possible, what is the degree of relief being 14 requested. 15 So we would need to have more analysis 16 done, and it's a question of, you know, how to get 17 that done most efficiently. Anyone else have questions or comments? 18 Okay. I guess what I would suggest -- did 19 20 you have something? 21 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: No. 22 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. What I would 23 suggest is that we -- I think we can set this down. But before it could be advertised and then the clock 24

would start ticking for the hearing, is we really need

1 to know what the degree of relief being requested is. So we need to clarify that, so that the 2 3 public has ample opportunity to understand what the real -- what relief is being requested and what will 4 5 have to be provided as amenities and benefits to weigh against that. 6 7 So I think we can -- unless Mr. Bergstein 8 jumps on his microphone, I think we can set it down with the proviso that the full extent of the relief 9 10 being requested would be submitted to the Commission, 11 to the Secretary for the Commission, before the case 12 will be advertised for public hearing, and that that 13 would include information regarding the balance of the 14 Blue Plains project. 15 Whether that needs to be constituted as a 16 record lot or just as a larger theoretical lot, 17 know about density issues think we need to whatever other issues might result from drawing 18 19 theoretical lots that affect the balance the 20 project. And I would so move. 21 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I would second --22 MR. BERGSTEIN: Okay. Let me -- this is 23 where I'm going to jump in.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Oh, he's jumping in

now.

Okay.

24

1 MR. BERGSTEIN: I don't know if you are going to reach the issue of variance later. But if a 2 3 variance is going to be heard --4 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. 5 MR. BERGSTEIN: -- it would need to be advertised as well, and you can either make the 6 7 determination that you agree with the Office 8 Planning and indicate that a variance will be needed, 9 or whether or not you want to, in essence, advertise 10 it as an as-needed basis. 11 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Well, thank 12 Thank you for clarifying that. So I will add to 13 my motion that we would advertise the variance for 14 And then, to the extent that we want to height. 15 debate that later, about whether it's actually needed, 16 we can do that. 17 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'll second that, 18 Madam Chair. But I want to ask a question. Now, are we saying that we're going to handle -- the Zoning 19 20 Commission is going to handle both instances -- the height issue and the PUD? Or -- I'm confused on 21 22 exactly how we're going to proceed. 23 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, and I don't --VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Is the BZA going 24

to come into play?

1	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: No.
2	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.
3	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: No.
4	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: That's all I
5	wanted to know.
6	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And just from a
7	technical perspective also, Mr. Bergstein, we have an
8	application, and it's for a PUD. Now, are you saying
9	we're going to need a separate application?
10	MR. BERGSTEIN: Well, I think you are,
11	because
12	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
13	MR. BERGSTEIN: in essence, you can't
14	foist an application or relief upon the applicant.
15	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
16	MR. BERGSTEIN: So they would need to also
17	indicate that they, in fact, are seeking variance
18	relief.
19	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. So I guess you
20	all can work that out. But
21	MR. BERGSTEIN: In essence, you are
22	authorizing the advertisement of that relief if
23	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Pending receipt.
24	MR. BERGSTEIN: an application is
25	submitted.

1	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Okay.
2	SECRETARY BASTIDA: Madam Chairman, may I?
3	On your motion, you include for the staff to
4	accelerate the process and that way waive the 20 days'
5	requirement after they submit the prehearing
6	statement? That is a rule of the Commission, that the
7	Commission can waive the other 30 working days is
8	an action by the Council, and the Commission cannot
9	waive that.
LO	So, still, the community will have ample
L1	time of notice, because it will be it amounts to
L2	about 45 calendar days
L3	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
L4	SECRETARY BASTIDA: that it will be
L5	advertised, so
L6	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. So well,
L7	let's have that as a separate issue.
L8	SECRETARY BASTIDA: Okay, fine. Thank
L9	you.
20	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. So, did you
21	second it? Did we get the second in?
22	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes, I think I
23	did. Second.
24	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Mr. Hood has
25	seconded it at least once. Any discussion on the
1	1

motion? Okay. All those in favor of setting this case down, as well as the variance application, should the applicant submit one, please say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

I believe we have none opposed. Ms. Schellin?

MS. SCHELLIN: Staff will record the vote

MS. SCHELLIN: Staff will record the vote five to zero to zero, to approve Case Number 04-19 for setdown. Commissioner Mitten moving, Commissioner Hood seconding, Commissioners Hildebrand, Jeffries, and Parsons in favor.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I'm sorry. I did have one question. Admittedly, we just got this over the weekend here, but one of the statements in the applicant's request has to do with the fact that they will be able to use some of this gas to generate electricity. And on the plan it -- I'm looking at sheet -- it's called General Plan, Digester Area. It says, "Future Co-generation Building, or Co-gen Building," which seems to be outside this request.

But I wondered if there were other things we should be dealing with, and I'm not sure the Office of Planning can answer that. But is there something yet to come that hasn't been designed? To me, this is a major urban design issue, and I think this

Τ	organization has done a real line job of designing
2	this.
3	But if there's something directly in front
4	of it that we haven't yet seen, I'm wondering about
5	that. Maybe it's a very small building. Maybe it's
6	two stories. But do you know?
7	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: The application did
8	not contain anything. It just
9	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Well, maybe that
10	could
11	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: It just stated that it
12	was going to be a future building.
13	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Good question.
14	All right. Then, to the issue of the
15	waiver of the notice period.
16	SECRETARY BASTIDA: The Commission
17	requirement for the waiting of 20 days after receiving
18	the prehearing statement, that means that you are
19	authorized to expedite the hearing, which, in fact,
20	will eliminate those 20 days that is part of the
21	zoning regulations.
22	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Does anyone
23	have any do we need to take a vote, or can we just
24	have a consensus? I think we can just have a
25	consensus. Consensus?

	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Madam Chair, now
2	many days in total will the ANC and the community have
3	to have input on this case?
4	SECRETARY BASTIDA: It will have the usual
5	45 days, because we do not send that out until the 20
6	days. That's what the regulations require, that we
7	hold that in the office for 20 days and then advertise
8	it. So the community will not be impacted because you
9	forfeit those 20 days. They
10	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So they'll still
11	have 45 days to comment.
12	SECRETARY BASTIDA: Right. Correct.
13	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. I have
14	no problem.
15	SECRETARY BASTIDA: Thank you.
16	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Can I ask, Mr.
17	Bastida, make sure a notice is sent to the National
18	Capital Planning Commission.
19	SECRETARY BASTIDA: Yes. We
20	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I know you do that
21	routinely.
22	SECRETARY BASTIDA: Yes, right. But we
23	will make sure that
24	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Thank you.
25	SECRETARY BASTIDA: it is done. Thank

	you.
2	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes, thank you. So
3	we have no objection to accelerating the hearing.
4	Okay. No objection. All right.
5	SECRETARY BASTIDA: Thank you, Madam
6	Chairman.
7	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr.
8	Bastida.
9	Okay. Then, we'll take up the next case
10	for hearing action, which is Case Number 04-13, which
11	is the PUD and map amendment for 1200 R Street. And
12	if you'll remember, this is one that we took up in
13	July and did not set down because we requested some
14	changes from the applicant.
15	So maybe I'll just turn briefly to the
16	Office of Planning, if you have any little summary you
17	wanted to give, or we can go directly into anybody
18	want to say anything down there?
19	MR. MORDFIN: Good evening, yes, Chairman.
20	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mr. Mordfin?
21	MR. MORDFIN: Yes. Good evening, Chair,
22	and members of the Commission. I'm Stephen Mordfin
23	with the Office of Planning.
24	And since this application was last before
25	the Commission, the applicant has significantly

revised the application based on the concerns based -- expressed by the Commission at the July meeting.

Lot 45, the only lot within the subject property that is located within the Greater 14th Street Historic District, is now proposed to be rezoned to the R-5-B zone, along with the rest of the subject property. The total area of the subject property is now 23,252 square feet, or 53 percent of the minimum required.

However, the Commission is empowered to reduce the area of a PUD by up to 50 percent if it exhibits exceptional merit and at least 80 percent residential gross floor area. The residential gross floor area is approximately 94 percent, and the project is of exceptional merit in that it will have a green roof, which will reduce storm water runoff, positively affect the heat island effect, and is something that could not otherwise be required on this building.

The architecture of the building now positively relates to the existing architecture in the neighborhood, while reflecting the greater importance of avenues over streets within the city. Tree boxes surrounding the site are proposed to be increased in size, which will have a positive effect on the life

and survival of the trees planted within them. And this, combined with the green roof, will result in a more environmentally sensitive development, which is in the best interest of the city.

And amenity package has also been revised, and these amenities will not be required if the applicant chose to construct a buy-right building, and that package now includes three affordable housing units, consisting of the large units within the building only, which are the ones that are the most likely to attract families.

They've clarified some of the uses within the community room. A substantial redesign exterior of the building, creating a more interesting visual experience reflecting the architecture of traditional Washington houses, and reflecting the greater importance of avenues over streets in Washington.

The rear of the building will now be articulated, including the use of different materials, and will include balconies. A detailed landscape plan that includes the planting of shade trees within -- in large tree boxes within the public space, and the planting of ornamental and evergreen trees together with shrubs, significantly will improve the appearance of this corner.

The green roof will consist of approximately 50 percent of the roof of the building, which is a superior architectural amenity, and the number of historic district signs that are proposed have increased from three to 20. And the applicant will also make a \$20,000 contribution to DDOT's 11th landscape plan in place of contribution to the skate park that was previously part of the amenity package, and also 20 offstreet parking spaces for sale within the community.

The use of the community room is limited to two days per month, with the additional times to be worked out with the church. Therefore, the value of this amenity still needs to be determined, and the same applies to the 20 offstreet parking spaces, because they will be sold to the community.

And also, the layout of the community room must also -- must also be finalized before the total number of parking spaces available to the community can be determined, and the proposed church programs proposed are permitted only by special exception within the R-5-B district pursuant to Section 216 of the zoning regs.

However, the Office of Planning believes that these issues can be worked out prior to the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 public hearing. Therefore, the Office of Planning recommends setdown of the proposed planned unit 2 3 development and map amendment to assign the R-5-B zoning district to 1200 R Street, Northwest. 4 5 And that concludes the Office of Planning's presentation. 6 7 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank Mr. you, 8 Mordfin. Questions or comments? Mr. Hildebrand? 9 10 MEMBER HILDEBRAND: In looking through the 11 it is clear that the development team has 12 long way in improving the architectural come 13 appearance of the project. There is -- one thing that 14 does cause me just a little bit of concern, though, 15 and that's in Elevation Drawing A-11, they've made an 16 effort to tie in the entrance, and to create this 17 sense of pediment over the central entrance piece, 18 which I think is a good step. 19 But, still, it seems to be floating a bit, 20 almost like an eyebrow that's disconnected from the rest of the structure. It would be nice to see if 21 22 they could potentially continue to tweak that a little 23 bit to -- to sort of give it a sense of really being positioned. 24

But I thought that the -- overall, it was

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

1 nice to see that they had listened to our comments before and had taken some positive steps with the 2 3 architecture. 4 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Yes, I 5 agree with you. I mean, we're definitely moving in the right direction here. 6 7 Mr. Parsons? 8 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I would agree, and I would just move that we set this down for hearing. 9 10 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. I'll second. 11 Any further discussion? 12 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Madam Chair, I 13 just wanted to put on record I appreciate 14 explanation about the community room, but I still have 15 a concern -- and I'm sure this project is set down --16 but about this parking space issue. While I know we did it with another case, I'm going to be looking to 17 hear more on that in this case. 18 19 And also, if the Office of Planning can 20 let us know how that piece is working, or is about to 21 work, in the other case at the time of this hearing, 22 so we'll know whether or not we can keep proceeding in 23 And I'm speaking of the 20 parking this fashion. spaces that are being sold to people in the two-block 24

radius.

1	Thank you, Madam Chair.
2	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. Hood.
3	I think there's sort of a managerial component to
4	that that we need to understand, too. How's that
5	going to be handled in perpetuity, or at least for the
6	life of the project?
7	All right. Any further discussion? Mr.
8	Hildebrand?
9	MEMBER HILDEBRAND: I did have one
10	question. I noticed in the roof plan that there was a
11	significant number of condensing units on the roof of
12	the penthouse. Has the Office of Planning looked at
13	those? Are those all below the required four-foot
14	height that require no screening in any way? They
15	don't show up on the elevations. We might want to
16	clarify that as part of
17	MR. MORDFIN: We will have the applicant
18	clarify that for us.
19	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Anyone
20	else? All those in favor of setting down Case
21	Number 04-13, please say aye.
22	(Chorus of ayes.)
23	MS. SCHELLIN: Staff will record the vote
24	five to zero to zero, to set down Case Number 04-13.
25	Commissioner Parsons moving, Commissioner Mitten

1 seconding. Commissioners Hildebrand, Hood, and Jeffries in favor. 2 And just to confirm, this, too, will be a 3 4 contested case. 5 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes. Thank you. All right. Next, under Hearing Action 6 04-14, Florida Rock. Mr. Lawson is up next. 7 8 MR. LAWSON: Madam Chair, members of the Commission, my name is Joel Lawson. I'm with the D.C. 9 10 Office of Planning. The case before you right now is 11 Case Number 04-14, which is a second-stage planned 12 unit development application for the 5.8-acre Florida 13 Rock property located on the Anacostia River. The applicant is seeking second-stage PUD 14 15 approval for the construction of a mixed use 16 development of just over a million square feet in Development will include two office buildings 17 on Potomac Avenue, a hotel, and a residential building 18 19 located closer to the waterfront. Another important feature is a 75-foot minimum width Riverwalk Promenade 20 21 segregated by pedestrian pathways, seating, 22 planted areas. 23 12th meeting, or at your its June June 12th meeting, the Zoning Commission considered 24

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

setting down this application for a public meeting --

_	public ficaling.
2	Prior to doing so, the Commission
3	requested additional information regarding the
4	proposed design and materials, the proposed
5	development would how that would address the
6	potential bridge location, conformance to the AWI
7	plan, design and aesthetics that are proposed by
8	retention areas, and economic benefits to the
9	District.
10	The Office of Planning believes that the
11	information submitted by the applicant is sufficient
12	to address these concerns, and certainly for setting
13	down the application at this time.
14	And I think, with that, I'll leave it at
15	that. Thank you very much.
16	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr.
17	Lawson.
18	Questions or comments? Has Florida Rock's
19	time come?
20	(Laughter.)
21	After all their hard work here for us?
22	Mr. Hildebrand?
23	MEMBER HILDEBRAND: I'm just curious, in
24	response to the potential movement of the bridge,
25	there was no material change in the building. Is that

exist on the site? 2 3 MR. LAWSON: The applicant is actually proposing changes to the building, if and when the 4 5 bridge moves. The building is being designed with, for example, knockout panels, which will allow that 6 facade to open up to a greater degree to what would be 7 8 -- anticipated to be a green space. In addition, they have situated the -- the 9 10 portion of the building directly adjacent to where the 11 bridge would be is hotel. They've anticipated that a 12 restaurant would be located at the -- essentially the 13 prowl of that building, and that that restaurant would 14 be able to open up as well onto the green space to 15 kind of integrate the green space better into the park 16 space along the waterfront. Mr. 17 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Anyone else? 18 Parsons? 19 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Last time I asked 20 for some statement regarding the Anacostia Waterfront 21 Initiative plan -- and you've done that on page 3, 22 number 3, first paragraph, where you say at the end, 23 two sentences, "The target area plan of last Chapter 6 shows proposed development on the FRP site." 24 25 Other less site-specific chapters include

because of certain easements that would continue to

more conceptual drawings that indicate new green space and access to the waterfront are to be created in the area which the FRP proposal provides. Could you elaborate on that?

MR. LAWSON: Absolutely. The Anacostia Waterfront Initiative fairly consistently, in its detailed planning sections, shows development on the Florida Rock property site as being a privately-held property in which development is anticipated. Florida Rock has responded to the AWI concerns and guidelines and criteria by providing fairly significant access through the site to the waterfront, as well as along the waterfront through a linear park, a segregated bikeway, as well as the creation of new green areas, both along the waterfront and along Potomac Avenue.

If the bridges moves, as I said, it is anticipated that an additional green space would be created on the portion of the land below the bridge which is Florida Rock Properties land. Not all the land below where the bridge is now is Florida Rock property. Some of it is in road right of way, etcetera, and that would be assumed to be converted to green space as well.

So we feel that they have responded to -OP feels that they have responded to the guidelines of

_	the Awr by providing this access and by providing this
2	green space, as well as by providing an important
3	influx of development at this location in Buzzard
4	Point.
5	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: So, to your
6	knowledge, there are no documents in the Anacostia
7	Waterfront Initiative that shows this property is open
8	space?
9	MR. LAWSON: No. I think I say in our
10	report that there are a number of conceptual drawings
11	that do show a green space in this location. The more
12	detailed drawings, both in the AWI and in the near
13	southeast plan, show the Florida Rock property site as
14	development. Some of the more conceptual drawings in
15	the more general areas of the plan do show this as
16	green space. It's the sections that are dealing with
17	the southeast area and with development in specific
18	that show this as a development site.
19	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: So has the City
20	Council adopted any of these plans?
21	MR. LAWSON: I don't believe that the plan
22	is being adopted by Council. Council is certainly
23	aware of the plans, but I don't think they're being
24	officially adopted.
25	COMMISSIONED DARSONS. Well maybe we

_	could have some charming of that at the hearing,
2	as to what the status of those plans are. Okay?
3	MR. LAWSON: Absolutely. I'd be happy to
4	provide that.
5	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Now, I'm referring
6	to we have so much paper, and I'm sure there will
7	be more to come.
8	(Laughter.)
9	I'm actually look at a book of May 20th.
LO	Do you have that? It's the lightest one, so I chose
L1	it. It's this one. No? It's not over there? Well,
L2	let me find another one.
L3	I'm trying to determine
L4	MR. LAWSON: I'm sorry. Actually, I do
L5	have that
L6	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Do you? Good,
L7	okay. Page 7 or circle 7. And we dealt with this
L8	last time, but it becomes more important now I think.
L9	There is some property shown under the bridge. It's
20	kind of stippled or remember Zipatone? Do you
21	remember that stuff?
	remember that stuff? MEMBER JEFFRIES: Yes.
21 22 23	
22	MEMBER JEFFRIES: Yes.
22	MEMBER JEFFRIES: Yes. COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Do you?

Τ	old as I thought.
2	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes, you are.
3	(Laughter.)
4	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: That property
5	underneath the bridge Florida Rock has some interest
6	in, or claims ownership to, or something.
7	MR. LAWSON: My understanding is that
8	Florida Rock Properties owns that piece of land.
9	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Yes.
10	MR. LAWSON: They own additional land in
11	the southeast area as well.
12	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: So knowing that the
13	bridge is going away, or we we certainly are
14	encouraged of the news that that will happen, is this
15	part of the PUD? Is this something that could be
16	considered as part of the park in the future? In
17	other words, that this would be donated to any any
18	park that might occur in the future as a public
19	amenity? Is that something we could explore?
20	MR. LAWSON: Yes. Again, I think our
21	anticipation is that it would certainly be enhanced as
22	publicly accessible landscaped green area. We could
23	certainly have additional discussions with the
24	applicant on the detailed design of what that area
	1

might be prior to the public hearing.

1 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Well, I'm not interested in the design of it, which I think would be 2 taken care of by others --3 4 MR. LAWSON: Okay. 5 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: the in development of a major park here, if that's to occur, 6 7 but it certainly should not remain here as something 8 that would be potential FAR in the future to add to the hotel. I just -- I mean, if your statement about 9 10 the park of the future is here at this edge, then we 11 should recognize that I think. 12 And I have one other --13 DEP. DIR. McCARTHY: Right. I think also 14 that, clearly, the applicant would need to come back to the Commission with a modification of the PUD if 15 16 they plan to do anything different than what was 17 contained in the application. 18 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Okay. I'm just trying to discourage that. 19 20 (Laughter.) 21 DEP. DIR. McCARTHY: Okay. 22 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Ι know this 23 probably was in the part of the first stage, and you probably don't know the answer to this. But, again, 24 25 just to clarify it for the hearing, they've proposed

1	to adopt Reservation 247 or to enhance it with a
2	stormwater retention system that will collect
3	stormwater off the streets. And I think that's a good
4	idea, whether it's five years or perpetuity. I'm glad
5	you pointed that out.
6	But there was a companion Reservation
7	across the street. It's actually underneath the west
8	office tower Number 246, which isn't shown in any
9	of the documentation before us today. And I just
10	as I understand it, that was transferred along with
11	247 to the District of Columbia in 1944, and somehow I
12	guess Florida Rock has come to gain control of that in
13	some fashion. So I'd just like to see if we could
14	clarify how they came to own that.
15	MR. LAWSON: I'll certainly clarify the
16	status on 246, you know, and make sure figure out
17	exactly where it is
18	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: All right.
19	MR. LAWSON: and the exact status of
20	it.
21	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Thank you.
22	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Anyone else? Mr.
23	Jeffries?
24	MEMBER JEFFRIES: Yes. I just wanted to
25	know if it's customary, as it relates to economic

1	benefits tied to PUD projects, that there could be
2	some major this is typical, I don't know. Whether
3	there could be some delta that sort of determines what
4	the benefits would be under sort of a matter of right,
5	and then what those increased benefits, economic
6	benefits, would be upon a PUD.
7	Can we get something is that typical?
8	Can we get something like that here?
9	DEP. DIR. McCARTHY: Yes, Mr. Jeffries.
10	That would definitely be part of our report for the
11	hearing. In the prehearing statement, the applicant
12	will outline specifically the areas of flexibility and
13	then what it is providing in the way of benefits and
14	amenities that would not have been the case were the
15	project to be processed as a matter of right project.
16	MEMBER JEFFRIES: So in terms of benefits,
17	employee
18	DEP. DIR. McCARTHY: Right, right.
19	MEMBER JEFFRIES: All right. Thank you.
20	DEP. DIR. McCARTHY: Right.
21	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Anyone else? All
22	right. Then, I would move that we set down Case
23	Number 04-14, which is the second-stage PUD for
24	Florida Rock. And I would ask for a second.

MEMBER HILDEBRAND: Second.

1 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Any further discussion? All those in favor, please say aye. 2 3 (Chorus of ayes.) 4 We have none opposed, Ms. Schellin. 5 MS. SCHELLIN: Staff will record the vote five to zero to zero, to set down Case Number 04-14. 6 7 Commissioner Mitten moving, Commissioner Hildebrand 8 seconding. Commissioners Hood, Jeffries, and Parsons in favor. Again, a contested case. 9 10 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes, thank you. 11 All right. Now we'll jump back on the 12 original sequence, and I will ask Mr. Hood to take over briefly for the consent calendar item. I have to 13 14 recuse myself, because of my current role as 15 Director of the Office of Property Management, and 16 this affects a Government agency. 17 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Madam Chair. 18 Colleagues, we have in front of us on the 19 20 consent calendar Zoning Commission Case Number 04-08A, St. St. Elizabeths PUD. They're asking for minor 21 modification. Mr. Bastida? 22 23 SECRETARY BASTIDA: Mr. Vice Chairman, the applicant, at the request of the Office of Planning, 24 25 has proposed to increase the property size by 5.19

1 acres, and that portion will be dedicated to 2 roadway point of access to the hospital, the 3 gatehouse, and open space to the overall site, which 4 increased the property to 54.59 acres. 5 The Office of Planning has proposed you with a review of this as requested -- as required by 6 the Zoning Commission by the zoning regulations, and 7 8 find no objectionable conditions regarding that and recommend that the Commission approves the proposed 9 10 minor modification. 11 The only party involved in this hearing 12 was ANC-A6. They did not provide any written comments 13 on this matter, but in a telephone conversation that I had with the Secretary, the ANC expressed no objection 14 15 to the proposal. On the contrary, they seem to be in 16 favor of it. That concludes the presentation of the 17 Office of Zoning. If you have any questions, I will 18 try to answer them. 19 20 Thank you. 21 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Bastida. 22 23 in front of Colleagues, we have request for minor modification. Any comments? Ιf 24

not, I'll entertain a motion.

1 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Well, I would move that we grant this request. It's certainly important 2 3 that a roadway get to the property. 4 (Laughter.) 5 I hope in this statement we -- it talks about open space along Alabama Avenue. I hope there 6 7 will be a landscape plan or something to accompany 8 this to show how it's going to be treated. That's good frontage on Alabama Avenue. I think it's a good 9 10 addition. 11 SECRETARY BASTIDA: Mr. Parsons, that will 12 be --13 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: We have a motion, 14 Mr. Bastida, on the table. 15 SECRETARY BASTIDA: Sorry. 16 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let me obtain a 17 second, and then we'll -- if you have something you 18 can add, you can do it at that time. With that, I'll 19 second it. 20 Mr. Bastida, you wanted to add something? SECRETARY BASTIDA: Yes. 21 This is a minor 22 modification to the first stage. On the second stage, 23 they will have to address all of the points that Mr. Parsons has made. 24

VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Right.

1	SECRETARY BASTIDA: Thank you.
2	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you for that
3	clarification.
4	It has been moved and properly seconded.
5	All those in favor?
6	(Chorus of ayes.)
7	Any opposition?
8	(No response.)
9	So ordered. Staff, would you record the
10	vote?
11	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Staff will record the
12	vote four to zero to one, to approve the request in
13	Case Number 04-08A. Commissioner Parsons moving,
14	Commissioner Hood seconding. Commissioners Hildebrand
15	and Jeffries in favor; Commissioner Mitten not voting,
16	having recused herself.
17	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Now I will turn it
18	back over to the Chair.
19	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. Hood.
20	All right. We postponed the decisions on
21	the proposed action items, so we'll move to the final
22	action for Case Number 02-22, which is a map amendment
23	in Square 754. And I'll just begin by asking
24	Commissioners Hildebrand and Jeffries whether they
25	have read the record and plan to participate in the

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	vote.
2	MEMBER HILDEBRAND: Yes, Madam Chair, I
3	have read the record.
4	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.
5	MEMBER JEFFRIES: I have not read the
6	record.
7	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. All right. So
8	this has been kicking around for a little while. This
9	is a rezoning of a few lots along 2nd Street, if you
10	all will remember, and we have the draft order before
11	us. And I would move approval of the map amendment
12	for Square the specified lots in Square 754,
13	Lots 103 through 106 and 109.
14	MEMBER HILDEBRAND: I would second.
15	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.
16	And I have a few editorial changes, but no
17	substantive changes for the order. Does anyone have
18	any substantive changes for the order?
19	All right. Then, I will ask for all those
20	in favor, please say aye.
21	(Chorus of ayes.)
22	Ms. Schellin, we have none opposed.
23	MS. SCHELLIN: Staff will record the vote
24	four to zero to one, to approve Case Number 02-22.
25	Commissioner Mitten moving, Commissioner Hildebrand

	seconding. Commissioners hood and Parsons in Lavor;
2	and Commissioner Jeffries not voting, having not
3	participated.
4	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.
5	All right. Next regards Case Number
6	04-07, and this is a request from WASA to withdraw,
7	without prejudice, their request for a special
8	exception that we heard and took proposed action on
9	regarding their facility the Maine and O Street
10	pumping stations.
11	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Do we need a
12	motion, or can we just do it by general consensus?
13	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I think we probably
14	need a motion, because this is sort of an official
15	action.
16	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Sure. I would
17	move that we grant WASA the request for withdrawal of
18	Zoning Commission Case 04-07, pumping station.
19	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Second. Is there any
20	discussion? All those in favor, please say aye.
21	(Chorus of ayes.)
22	Those opposed, please say no.
23	(No response.)
24	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Abstaining. I
25	didn't participate in the case.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Schellin?

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Staff will record the vote four to zero to one, to approve withdrawal in Case Number 04-07. Commissioner Hood moving, Commissioner Mitten seconding. Commissioners Hildebrand and Jeffries in favor; Commissioner Parsons not voting, have not participated.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.

And as I said at the beginning, we're postponing the decision on the dismissal of Case Number 91-2. And now we will take up final action for an item that was not on the agenda until we commenced, which is Case Number 04-12, which is the Carnegie Institute case that we had taken up. We had a public hearing and had a -- took proposed action as a bench decision.

So what's left outstanding here is that we just need to settle on what the conditions will actually be, because we had the conditions from the Office of Planning, and the applicant was in support of those. But we also intended to incorporate any other conditions from the prior order that were relevant, but we really didn't' specify what those were. So we just need, at this point, to clarify what

the conditions will be.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Madam Chair, I've looked at these and find that very few of them have any relevance to what we just decided. I think the --many of them can be included in the findings of fact, you know, what the maximum floor area ratio will be and how many parking spaces, and so forth, and the maximum floor area ratio -- well, I'm being redundant, because I'm reading two. I'm reading this and the prior order.

I think it would be well if we included the campus population, which shall not exceed 99 persons. Although we have included an approval for a 100-seat or a 110-seat auditorium, I don't think that goes to increasing the campus population. I mean, it's a facility that will be used for purposes beyond that. So I don't think that's in conflict with that.

And it goes on to say there should be no more than 34 students or fellows, there should be no more than 30 faculty, technical -- 15 technical support and 20 administrative. So I think that condition bears repeating and inclusion in our order. But the others that have been suggested or have been reviewed, I guess we could say existing landscaping should be maintained in a healthy state. I think

1	that's something that the community was interested in.
2	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: But not include the
3	second sentence of that.
4	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Yes, because there
5	was no
6	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
7	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: plan. It was
8	the existing landscaping.
9	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
-0	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: And I think that
L1	would accommodate the need.
.2	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. I guess we did
.3	have the a condition that was one of the OP
L4	conditions that I think is probably unnecessary, which
_5	was that excavation and construction well, this is
L6	this was a variation of what had been in a prior
7	order, I think, which was that it was going to be on
L8	weekdays.
_9	But what Office of Planning had proposed
20	was that excavation and construction shall occur on
21	days and during hours that are required by other codes
22	and regulations of the District. We typically don't
23	have to call that out as a separate condition. We
24	take that for granted.
5	So could we just run them down?

Construction shall be in accordance with the plans 1 submitted into the record, and we could say "at 2 Exhibit blank." 3 4 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I wasn't even going 5 to include those. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You weren't? Oh, 6 Well, I think typically we do. 7 8 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: All right. 9 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And including the 10 condition about the maximum floor area shall 11 exceed .882, and then the condition regarding the 12 campus population shall not exceed 99 persons, and the 13 other provisions below that that you stated. 14 perhaps we should say that 99 persons, and then in 15 paren "not including attendees at the auditorium," or 16 something like that --17 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Yes, I quess that 18 would be --19 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: for the 20 clarification. And then the paragraph about the use of the campus that would then include the auditorium 21 22 seating approximately 120 people. I think we do 23 typically have the parking spaces called out, too, so a minimum of 67 offstreet parking spaces shall be 24

provided. And then that would be it, I think.

25

And

_	the existing randscaping sharr be marintained in a
2	healthy state, I think.
3	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I guess now that
4	I've reviewed number 7, I don't see any objection to
5	that. I just if the community is asking for that
6	kind of support, maybe we should give it to them.
7	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
8	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: The applicant shall
9	make every effort to facilitate an orderly phasing of
10	the construction to minimize any impacts on the
11	neighborhood.
12	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
13	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: All right. You've
14	persuaded me to expand significantly.
15	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, sorry.
16	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: That's all right.
17	So that's a motion.
18	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Is that sufficiently
19	clear? Thanks. That's your motion. Is that your
20	motion?
21	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Yes.
22	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: With a little help.
23	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Sounds like it.
24	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Since Mr.
25	Parsons kindly moved, I will kindly second. And is

1	there any discussion on the proposed conditions? And
2	this is a final action with the conditions that we
3	just outlined. All those in favor, please say aye.
4	(Chorus of ayes.)
5	None opposed, Ms. Schellin.
6	MS. SCHELLIN: Staff will record the vote
7	five to zero to zero, to approve Case Number 04-12,
8	with the conditions discussed.
9	MEMBER HILDEBRAND: One correction.
10	MS. SCHELLIN: I'm sorry.
11	MEMBER HILDEBRAND: I wasn't
12	MS. SCHELLIN: Four to zero to one.
13	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I'm sorry. Mr.
14	Hildebrand was not in attendance that night.
15	MS. SCHELLIN: That's right.
16	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: My mistake.
17	MS. SCHELLIN: Four to zero to one.
18	Commissioner Mitten excuse me, Commissioner Parsons
19	moving, Commissioner Mitten seconding. Commissioners
20	Hood and Jeffries in favor; Commissioner Hildebrand
21	not voting, having not participated.
22	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.
23	I'll make one note about the
24	correspondence before we move ahead to the minutes.
25	That we have a letter from the Park Service basically
	I and the second

1 asking that the letter that they submitted be included in the public file. 2 And unless there's an objection, I would 3 just suggest that the letter be included in the file, 4 5 but that it be stamped to make it clear that it's not part of the public record, just so that anyone reading 6 it would understand that. 7 8 Is there any objection? All right. Then, let's head back up to --9 Okay. 10 let's let the Office of Planning go next, 11 because the minutes -- the minutes can wait. Who is 12 going to make the report. Ms. McCarthy? 13 DEP. DIR. McCARTHY: Thank you, Madam 14 Chair. 15 Let me skip down to the fourth item on the 16 list, since we've dealt with the first three. Capital 17 Children's would ask that Museum PUD, we the 18 Commission, because there were some legal problems with them getting their application in, but this 19 20 project and its related new construction in southwest 21 are important projects for the city. 22 We would like to keep expediting that, and 23 would ask the Commission if it could possibly schedule a consideration of setting this down at their 24 25 hearing at the end of the month on September 30th.

1	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So just before you go
2	off of that, so the request is for a public meeting on
3	the 30th to
4	DEP. DIR. McCARTHY: Yes, Madam Chair.
5	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Okay. So that
6	would I think okay. If we could schedule a public
7	meeting for 6:00 p.m. on the 30th, because I don't
8	think there's going to be I don't think it will
9	take more than 30 minutes to decide the setdown.
10	So when Mr. Bastida comes back, we can
11	inform him that unless there's a I will not be in
12	attendance at the St. Elizabeths Hospital PUD. I will
13	recuse myself on that. But is there any problem?
14	Will people be able will we be able to get a quorum
15	for that?
16	MEMBER JEFFRIES: The 30th?
17	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: The 30th at 6:00 p.m.
18	MEMBER JEFFRIES: No problem.
19	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Mr. Bastida,
20	we scheduled a public meeting, special public meeting,
21	for Thursday, the 30th of September at 6:00 p.m. to
22	consider the setdown of a case number that I don't
23	have, the Capital Children's Museum.
24	SECRETARY BASTIDA: Yes. That has not
25	been filed yet. As soon as I it's filed, I will

2	set it for the 6:00 time of that prior to the hearing.
3	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right.
4	SECRETARY BASTIDA: And I would like a
5	little flexibility, just in case it's a little more
6	complex than it appears, maybe to start a little
7	earlier if if we determine that it's needed to
8	start a little before 6:00. Or would you rather
9	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, how many days
10	ahead of time do you have to advertise that?
11	SECRETARY BASTIDA: I need to advertise it
12	four days.
13	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Okay. Well,
14	we can talk about that if it seems more complicated.
15	SECRETARY BASTIDA: Okay.
16	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Thank you.
17	SECRETARY BASTIDA: You're welcome.
18	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I'm sorry to
19	interrupt. We just wanted to handle that.
20	DEP. DIR. McCARTHY: Oh, no problem.
21	Thank you, Madam Chair, and members of the Commission.
22	The H Street plan has been adopted by the
23	City Council. It proposed some changes in zoning, so
24	the Office of Planning expects to bring to the
25	Commission for consideration in October a new overlay

advise the Commissioners of that, and we'll, you know,

and some map amendments to implement the recommendations of the H Street plan.

Diplomatic Overly Text Amendment The relates to changes in the diplomatic overlay that have been recommended as part of the Foreign Missions Task Force and the foreign missions -- the new foreign missions element of the federal elements comprehensive plan. And we expect to bring a text and the Commission map amendment to in October to implement those changes.

The next two, the DMV facility text amendment and the Fire Department text amendment, relate to the fact that 10 years ago the regulations were changed to require D.C. Government facilities to have zoning, but there is no use in the zoning regulations that relate to these two uses. So we have text amendments that create use categories for both of those that we will bring to the Commission in October.

The Dorchester Apartment PUD is a major addition to the Dorchester. But we had been expecting to bring that in October, however, the application has not yet been filed. So unless it's filed in the next few days, we won't have sufficient -- we won't have enough time to get a setdown report written. So that may -- you may or may not see that in October.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The Rhode Island Avenue WMATA site planned unit development, that also has not yet been filed, so that also may or may not be in October.

200 With regard to the PUD extension and modification, we have asked the -- the applicant filed modification applicant а application, but it was missing a considerable amount of information, which we have requested in writing from the applicant. And inasmuch as this modification has been kind of in abeyance for quite a while, we would hope to bring a finalized version of that application and a setdown report on it, or setdown recommendation on it, to the Commission in October.

And then, the Stewart Investment -Stewart Investment had filed a separate request for a
map amendment for Square 483, actually that is, and
515, but the Commission incorporated that in the
overlay on Mount Vernon Triangle. So that has really
been superseded by the Commission's action on Mount
Vernon Triangle, and we're not expecting to provide
the Commission with a setdown report on that.

And, last, as Ms. Steingasser indicated earlier, we do expect to get back to the Commission with the final language on the Capital Gateway II map amendment at the October meeting of the Commission.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Can I just ask you to refresh my memory about 200 K Street? Because I remember that that came to us, and perhaps we -- it was the extension request. I'm just trying to remember what -- we did something with it, but I don't remember what it was.

DEP. DIR. McCARTHY: It had come to the Commission quite some time ago as an extension of the time limit on the PUD, except that when the Office of Planning reviewed the application for time extension we discovered that there were some substantial modifications of the PUD as approved. So we notified the applicant that they were going to have to modify the PUD, not simply extend the time limit.

At that point, the applicant decided that they -- the PUD originally included a substantial office building and two apartment towers, and the applicant then decided that the market for an office tower wasn't there, but the market for residential had strengthened considerably.

So they wanted originally to do an all residential project; then they changed and indicated maybe they still wanted some commercial as part of it.

And we've had many, many meetings with the applicant on the design of Stage I of that. There are also

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	issues with regard to alley closings and others. So
2	we've worked with the applicant for a considerable
3	period of time on modifying the PUD.
4	And all of that, then, was a prelude to
5	them having finally filed the application for the PUD
6	modification, where we then notified them they were
7	still missing several pieces of that application.
8	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So you're confident
9	that that's going to get finalized and come to us?
10	Because, I mean, it seems to have been hanging out
11	there for quite a while.
12	DEP. DIR. McCARTHY: Confident
13	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: No, not confident.
14	Okay.
15	DEP. DIR. McCARTHY: We're hopeful. We're
16	hopeful.
17	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Because, I
18	mean, having an extension request just sort of
19	pending, if they're not serious, then we should just
20	find that out and vote it up or down. Okay.
21	DEP. DIR. McCARTHY: We'd be happy to
22	communicate that to the applicant, that the Commission
23	would like to see a definite action one way or the
24	other within by October?
25	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes, that's that

1 would be fair to say. Before my memory fades completely, I want to --2 3 (Laughter.) Okay. Any questions for the Office of 4 5 Planning? VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: The only other 6 7 thing, Madam Chair, we have a roundtable coming up on 8 September 23rd. And I was just wondering -- I don't know whether this goes to Mr. Bastida or Office of 9 10 Planning. What the response has been from the people 11 who have been invited -- are we getting a good 12 response, no response, or it seems to be empty that 13 night, or what? 14 MS. STEINGASSER: I don't expect it will 15 be empty. We've gotten a good response from the city 16 agencies that want to speak and make their case, and help the Commission understand what they're trying to 17 18 achieve. I've not gotten any comments from anyone 19 else, but that's not to say they're not out there. 20 They may have contacted Office of Zoning. 21 DEP. DIR. McCARTHY: Right. Because the 22 invitation does come from the Office of Zoning, 23 they probably have heard more up-to-date responses than we have. 24

VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Bastida, can

you help me with that?

SECRETARY BASTIDA: Yes. We have had three requests for testifying.

VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: My concern is if we -- well, if we don't respond now, we will respond later. So we want to do everything we can to get the people in here on the 23rd. I don't even know if that means send out another invitation. Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Fortunately, we have some representatives from the press in the audience, so perhaps they can let their readers know that this is really an important roundtable on changes in the zoning regulations to accommodate community-based residential facilities in industrial zones, and that the Commission would really like to have a widespread response and commentary from the public to give guidance to them on -- and to the Office of Planning on formulating a text amendment, to consider that in the future.

VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And one other question -- thank you. One other question, Madam Chair. On the Fort Totten case, which I think is coming up on the 14th, does it look like that case is going to go ahead? Is there any sign that it may be postponed?

DEP. DIR. McCARTHY: The Rocky Gorge
application?
VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Is that no, I
was
DEP. DIR. McCARTHY: In Fort Totten? Are
you talking about oh, you're talking about the
DPW
VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes, DPW. Right.
It's been around for a while.
DEP. DIR. McCARTHY: Yes. DPW has not
indicated to us that they've changed their plans at
all, but we still don't have a final application or
final design from them on that project.
VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you.
Thank you, Madam Chair.
DEP. DIR. McCARTHY: Oh, I'm sorry. Ms.
Steingasser corrects me. We did just receive one on
Friday.
VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Oh, okay. Good.
Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Anyone else? Mr.
CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Anyone else? Mr. Parsons?
Parsons?

1	members who have not participated and enjoyed the fun
2	and trauma of this case.
3	I was wondering if you could assist them
4	and all of us, and have an analysis or an evaluation
5	of kind of a side by side of what the Forest Hill
6	citizens are proposing, what the ANC is proposing, and
7	what the Office of Planning is proposing. I don't
8	mean in an extensive way, but I think it would be
9	MS. STEINGASSER: We do have
10	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: And maybe even the
11	existing overlay that's in place on the community as a
12	fourth I'm not proposing it as an option, but
13	something to help them through this.
14	MS. STEINGASSER: We have that exact
15	thing, because we needed it to
16	(Laughter.)
17	do our hearings, as to where we were
18	and which elements were still in play. And it is all
19	four. It starts with the it's an
20	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Oh, good.
21	MS. STEINGASSER: it's printed in
22	color, and we will make sure that you have a copy of
23	that. We have copies here tonight in case you needed
24	it, and we'll make sure
25	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Oh.

1	MS. STEINGASSER: well in advance,
2	because
3	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Yes. Well in
4	advance, please.
5	MS. STEINGASSER: We all share the
6	confusion the complexities of what's been
7	MEMBER HILDEBRAND: It might even help us
8	in reading the record, too, if we had it in advance.
9	MS. STEINGASSER: Okay.
10	MEMBER HILDEBRAND: At least we could
11	it might eliminate some confusion as we're reading
12	through it.
13	MS. STEINGASSER: Okay.
14	MEMBER HILDEBRAND: In some of the
15	hearings.
16	MS. STEINGASSER: We can e-mail a copy to
17	you tomorrow, and then we can get you a paper copy as
18	well.
19	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Do you have one that
20	shows the changing positions of each party as the case
21	has progressed?
22	(Laughter.)
23	Because that will really be show the
24	DEP. DIR. McCARTHY: That would be a four-
25	dimensional matrix.

(Laug	ghter.)
-------	---------

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. One question about Trenton Terrace PUD. That's another one that's been kind of hanging around a while. Is that really going to go forward, do you know, or is that something that we should be pursuing a dismissal of?

DEP. DIR. McCARTHY: We'll check with the applicant and see what their plans are at this time.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And maybe Eastgate would be in that category as well.

DEP. DIR. McCARTHY: Right. We know when Eastqate was originally filed with us it was being submitted as an application for HOPE VI Department of Housing and Urban Development. unsuccessful that round, but it was just selected on the last round. So I believe it will be coming back, but we will be happy to check with the Housing Authority on both of those and update the Commission in next month's status report.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Thank you.

Anybody else, questions for Office of Planning?

All right. Now we're ready to take up those pesky minutes. Let me just see -- okay. We have -- we can take these in two batches, I think.

NEAL R. GROSS

1 The April 12th meeting minutes and the May meeting minutes -- we had full attendance, so we're 2 3 all in a position to vote. And I would move approval of the April 12th and May 10th meeting minutes, 4 5 subject to any editorial changes. VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Second. 6 7 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Any substantive 8 changes, comments? All right. Then, all those in favor, please say aye. 9 10 (Chorus of ayes.) 11 We have none opposed, Ms. Schellin. 12 MS. SCHELLIN: Staff will record the vote 13 five to zero to zero, to approve Zoning Commission meeting minutes of April 12, 2004, and May 10, 2004. 14 15 Commissioner Mitten moving, Commissioner Hood 16 seconding. Commissioners Hildebrand, Jeffries, and Parsons in favor. 17 18 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. And then we have the minutes -- if they are correct, we have the 19 20 minutes of the June 14th public meeting, the June 17th special public meeting, and the July 12th public 21 22 meeting, which had all of us in attendance except Mr. 23 Jeffries, and so you would not be eligible to vote, if that's correct. 24

MEMBER JEFFRIES: I recall the 14th

1	Monday
2	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Would you turn on
3	your microphone, please?
4	MEMBER JEFFRIES: I recall Monday,
5	June 14th. I just Thursday, June 17th is escaping
6	me. Not present, not voting. Okay.
7	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Actually, it looks
8	like, as I read through the minutes, now that I've
9	lumped them in these categories, on July 12th it shows
10	it shows you voting, and not by absentee ballot.
11	So I'm thinking that the attendance part of that is
12	not correct.
13	So let's take the June 14th and June 17th
14	minutes together, and then, Mr. Jeffries, you can vote
15	on the last one, because it looks like you were
16	actually there.
17	MEMBER JEFFRIES: Okay.
18	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right?
19	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Madam Chair, I
20	would move approval of our June 14th minutes and our
21	June 17th minutes, with any necessary corrections.
22	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. I'll
23	second.
24	Anyone have any substantive corrections?
25	All those in favor, then, please say aye.

1	(Chorus of ayes.)
2	And then, Ms. Schellin, Mr. Jeffries did
3	not attend, so he didn't vote on those. If you'd
4	record the vote.
5	MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. Staff will record
6	the vote four to zero to one, to approve Zoning
7	Commission meeting minutes of June 15, 2004, and
8	June 17, 2004. Commissioner Hood moving, Commissioner
9	Mitten seconding. Commissioners Hildebrand and
10	Parsons in favor; Commissioner Jeffries not voting,
11	having not participated.
12	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.
13	And then we have our editorial change for
14	the July 12th minutes, which is that Mr. Jeffries was
15	in attendance. And I would move approval of the July
16	12th minutes, with any necessary corrections. And I
17	would love it if someone would second it.
18	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Second.
19	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: The Vice Chairman
20	has taken up the role of seconding
21	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Is that
22	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: for the past two
23	or three months, and I just thought it
24	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Oh, okay.
25	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.

1	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Just trying to
2	it's about 8:00. There's 9:00 Monday Night Football.
3	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Oh, okay. Then, all
4	those in favor, please say aye.
5	(Chorus of ayes.)
6	Ms. Schellin?
7	MS. SCHELLIN: Staff will record the vote
8	five to zero to zero, to approve Zoning Commission
9	meeting minutes of July 12, 2004. Commissioner Mitten
10	moving, Commissioner Hood seconding. Commissioners
11	Hildebrand, Jeffries, and Parsons in favor.
12	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.
13	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: With the
14	correction.
15	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: With the correction,
16	which she will pick those up on the back side.
17	All right. Anything else, Mr. Bastida,
18	that you think we need to do today?
19	SECRETARY BASTIDA: No, Madam Chairman.
20	The staff has no other matters. Thank you.
21	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right. Thank
22	you, all, and we are now adjourned.
23	(Whereupon, at 7:56 p.m., the proceedings
24	in the foregoing matter were adjourned.)