GOVERNMENT
OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

SPECIAL PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

THURSDAY

SEPTEMBER 2, 2010

+ + + + +

The Special Meeting of the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened in Room 220 South, 441 4th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20001, pursuant to notice at 7:00 p.m., Anthony J. Hood, Chairman, presiding.

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

ANTHONY J. HOOD, Chairperson KONRAD SCHLATER, Vice Chairman PETER MAY, Commissioner (NPS) GREG SELFRIDGE, Commissioner MICHAEL G. TURNBULL, FAIA, Commissioner (AOC)

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

JAMISON WEINBAUM, Director SHARON S. SCHELLIN, Secretary DONNA HANOUSEK, Zoning Specialist

NEAL R. GROSS

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

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

JENNIFER STEINGASSER TRAVIS PARKER STEPHEN VARGA LAINE CIDLOWSKI

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PRESENT:

JACOB RITTIG, ESQ. LORI MONROE, ESQ.

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Special meeting held on September 2, 2010.

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

Motion to Put Back in Place the Setdown Rule for All Text Regarding the Zoning Rewrite or Review Process
Vote to Approve Motion (5-0-0)
Hearing Action Z.C. Case No. 08-06 Comprehensive Zoning Regulation Review: Use & Height Text
Office of Zoning Report Travis Parker
Vote to Approve the Structural Organization Hierarchy Demonstrated by the Office of Planning for the Proposed Future Regulations (5-0-0)
Vote to Set Down Zoning Commission Case No. 08-06 With Regard to Height, Option 3 (5-0-0)
Vote to Set Down Zoning Commission Case No. 08-06 With Regard to Uses (5-0-0) 90

1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	7:00 p.m.
3	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. We're
4	back. We'll go ahead and begin our special
5	public meeting.
6	Again, my name is Anthony Hood.
7	Joining me are Vice-Chairman Schlater,
8	Commissioners Selfridge and May and Turnbull.
9	We're also joined by the Office of Zoning
10	staff under the leadership of Director
11	Weinbaum, also Attorney General all the way to
12	my far left. And to my right the Office of
13	Planning staff under the leadership of Ms.
14	Steingasser.
15	Copies of today's meeting agenda
16	are available to you and are located in the
17	bin near the door.
18	We do not take any public
19	testimony at our meetings unless the
20	Commission requests someone to come forward.
21	Please be advised that this
22	proceeding is being recorded by a court

1	report. It is also webcast live.
2	Accordingly, we must ask you to refrain from
3	any disruptive noises or actions in the
4	hearing room. Please turn off all beepers and
5	cell phones.
6	Does the staff have any
7	preliminary matters?
8	MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir.
9	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. If not,
10	let us proceed with the agenda.
11	Preliminary matters, already said
12	by Ms. Schellin, we have none.
13	Before we go into our hearing
14	action, I would ask Mr. Rittig, our Attorney
15	General, to kind of give us a history of how
16	we got to set downs and not having set downs
17	as we go through this process.
18	So, Mr. Rittig?
19	MR. RITTIG: Sure, I'd be happy
20	to. At a public meeting on April 14th, 2008
21	the Commission approved a procedural motion
22	waiving its normal rules requiring a petition

setdown and supplemental filings for the zoning rewrite case. It specifically waived Zoning Regulations 30-10.1, 30-11 and 30-13. It authorized the Office of Planning to proceed without filing any further petitions requesting changes to the zoning text, authorized the Office of Zoning to advertise hearing notices submitted by OP without going through the normal setdown process so long as the text was first vetted by the Attorney General, and waived the required prehearing supplemental filings normally required from petitioners so that OP did not have to make the filings before the hearings were scheduled.

When it did so, it did it with a caveat that this was very early in the zoning rewrite process and that the Commission would revise its procedural rules and its motion as the process progressed and text was ready to be presented to the Commission. And now we are at the point where text is being presented

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	to the Commission, so it seems like an
2	appropriate time to revisit that procedural
3	motion.
4	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you very
5	much, Mr. Rittig. And I would just echo that
6	even when we started this process, the zoning
7	rewrite process, we went in front the Council.
8	And it was stated that we hadn't done one in
9	over 50 years, so we knew that there were
10	going to be some things that may change as we
11	go along the process. And I want to commend
12	the Commission for having the thought, the
13	wherewithal at the beginning to say let's
14	revisit this if we get to this point.
15	So, as already stated, I think
16	we're at this point, but let me open it up to
17	my colleagues for any comments or motions, or
18	however you'd like to proceed.
19	VICE-CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Mr.
20	Chairman?
21	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Vice-Chairman?
22	VICE-CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Well, I'm

1	glad we're revisiting this as well. I think
2	it's important that these text changes go
3	through the same process that we've instituted
4	for other text amendments, namely going
5	through the setdown process.
6	So, I move to amend the
7	Commission's procedural motion approved April
8	14, 2008 to restore the requirement that the
9	Office of Planning submit a setdown report to
10	the Commission containing its recommendations
11	ten days before the meeting and that the
12	Commission vote to set down the text contained
13	in the report before a public hearing notice
14	is published in the D.C. Register as required
15	by 11 DCMR 30-11.2 through 30-11.4.
16	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Great. Thank
17	you, Vice-Chairman.
18	It's been moved. Can I get a
19	second?
20	COMMISSIONER SELFRIDGE: Second.
21	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you,
22	Commissioner Selfridge.

1	Moved and properly seconded. Any
2	further discussion?
3	(No audible response.)
4	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Are you ready
5	for the question? All those in favor? Aye.
6	VICE-CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Aye.
7	COMMISSIONER MAY: Aye.
8	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Aye.
9	COMMISSIONER SELFRIDGE: Aye.
10	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Not hearing any
11	opposition, Ms. Schellin, would you please
12	record the vote?
13	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. Staff
14	would record the vote five to zero to zero to
15	put back in place the setdown rule for all
16	text regarding the zoning rewrite or review
17	process. Commissioner Schlater moving;
18	Commissioner Selfridge seconding;
19	Commissioners Hood, Turnbull and May in
20	support.
21	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you very
22	much, Ms. Schellin.

1	Let's move right along, hearing
2	action. Zoning Commission Case No. 08-06,
3	Comprehensive Zoning Regulations Review: Use
4	and Height Text.
5	Office of Planning, Mr. Parker?
6	MR. PARKER: Good evening, Mr.
7	Chairman. I'm Travis Parker with the D.C.
8	Office of Planning. To my right are Steve
9	Varga and Laine Cidlowski who are largely
10	responsible for much of the material you'll
11	see tonight, just as a heads up.
12	The first question I have for the
13	Commission is we seem to be short a large
14	screen. Are you all comfortable looking at
15	the three smaller screens?
16	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I think we are.
17	If not, we'll move closer.
18	MR. PARKER: All right. We've got
19	a use and height chapter to talk about
20	tonight, but before we get to that we wanted
21	to formally present to you what we've

presented to the task force; we've shown you

as well, the proposed code reorganization.

Wanted to formally present it to you tonight

and ask for your feedback and blessing on that

tonight.

I think everyone in the room has seen this document. We're proposing a restructuring of the regulations that takes all the general information from our regulations and puts it up front. We're proposing to add a new level of hierarchy of subtitles to our Title 11, so breaking information out into subtitles, the first three of which would be general and the next seven or more would be land use-specific. And I'll go through those briefly.

The first one, Subtitle A, called Administration Procedures, would include such things as, you know, the introduction to the code, the legal applicability. New to our code would be basically a how-to, a user's guide to the code, how to access the information in this code and use the code.

NEAL R. GROSS

This subtitle would contain the process for amending the code and rules for BZA and Zoning Commission.

Subtitle B is going to be the meat of the code. A lot of information here, a lot of bulk. This is the general rules, rules that apply city-wide, things like how to measure height, you know, how to require parking. And I don't know if you can or cannot read that, but things like the two chapters that we're going to look at tonight. Use and height are both in this general chapter and these are the regulations again that apply city-wide.

Subtitle C then is general processes. This is special exception, variance, PUD, campus plan, etcetera.

Depending on the formal format, this is where a lot of these process rules and regulations will go. There may be some still play between this and Subtitle A that remains to be seen.

And then finally on the bottom

NEAL R. GROSS

tier are the land use subtitles. So, right
now they number D through J. There's the
potential for one or two more. But these
contain all the zone information. These are
the equivalent to our chapters now; commercial
chapter, residential chapter. Right now they
number, you know, neighborhood residential,
apartment residential, transit residential,
mixed-use, mixed-use transit, downtown and
PDR, which is industrial. And within each of
those there will be a table for each zone that
contains the development standards, the
height, FAR, setbacks, etcetera. There will
be a use permission chart, and we're going to
go into that later when we talk about the use
chapter that contains the use permissions for
each zone within that subtitle. There will be
parking requirements for the subtitle and then
other rules that are specific either to that
group of zones or to individual zones within
that

So with that, I just wanted to

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1	give you that short background, what we are
2	asking from you tonight. This doesn't need
3	further setdown or public hearing. This is
4	not policy change, just a basic structural
5	organizational change. We'd like your
6	blessing to proceed with this structure
7	throughout the rest of the process and
8	chapters and subtitles that we bring forward
9	to you for text review will be in this format
10	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Commissioners
11	any comments on this format that's being
12	presented tonight?
13	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I just
14	have one.
15	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Commissioner
16	Turnbull?
17	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I notice
18	that under the general requirements you had
19	height.
20	MR. PARKER: Yes.
21	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: But then
22	again height comes up in the next row down,

1 too.

MR. PARKER: Let me explain that	•
Yes, absolutely. Height is actually one of	
the chapters we're reviewing tonight. And	
what you'll see in that general chapter is h	lOW
to measure height basically. So, the rules	
about how height is measured, where it	
applies, you know, that sort of thing is her	e.
When you go to your specific zones, there wi	.11
be a table and it will say the height for the	iis
zone is 40 feet or whatever. If I look at $\mathfrak m$	ıy
R-1-A Zone, I see that it's 40 feet. I go	
back to the general chapter if I don't know	
how to measure that, if I don't know where t	he
bottom elevation is and the top elevation,	
because how to measure it is universal acros	S
the code, rather than repeating that in ever	Э
chapter.	
COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.	

information there.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

MR. PARKER: So, that's the

1	MR. PARKER: Yes.
2	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Ms.
3	Schellin, I don't think we need a motion on
4	this.
5	MS. SCHELLIN: I believe that when
6	we spoke, if Ms. Monroe will clarify, I
7	believe that Mr. Bergstein thought that a
8	motion should be made to say that you were in
9	agreement with the structural organization, or
10	he suggested it.
11	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.
12	MS. SCHELLIN: Is that correct?
13	MS. MONROE: Yes, we discussed
14	this the other night.
15	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank
16	you.
17	Any other comments or questions?
18	(No audible response.)
19	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: If not, I would
20	move that we approve the proposed
21	organizational hierarchy presented tonight by
22	Office of Planning, Mr. Parker, and as for a

1	second.
2	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Second.
3	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: It's been moved
4	and properly seconded. Any further
5	discussion?
6	(No audible response.)
7	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All those in
8	favor? Aye.
9	VICE-CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Aye.
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: Aye.
11	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Aye.
12	COMMISSIONER SELFRIDGE: Aye.
13	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Any opposition?
14	(No audible response.)
15	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Not hearing
16	any, Ms. Schellin, would you record the vote?
17	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, staff would
18	record the vote five to zero to
19	approve the structural organization hierarchy
20	demonstrated this evening by the Office of
21	Planning for the proposed future regs.
22	Commissioner Hood moving; Commissioner

1	Turnbull seconding; Commissioners Schlater,
2	Selfridge and May in support.
3	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank
4	you.
5	Okay, Mr. Parker.
6	MR. PARKER: All right. With no
7	further ado, we'll get onto the first of our
8	general chapters in Subtitle B. We're going
9	to talk first about height.
10	The main issue when talking about
11	the height chapter is the two different types
12	of height regulations that we have in D.C. In
13	D.C. we regulate height by zone through
14	Zoning, and Congress has also instituted an
15	Height Act that controls height by the width
16	of the street. So, we have two different
17	limitations and both operate in different
18	ways.
19	When we addressed this issue at
20	our original guidance hearing, the discussion
21	was that there was a general desire to see as

much as possible in one place. So, if there

was a way to put both of these types of height restriction into zoning into one chapter, we should explore that. We have. We worked a lot with the working group, we worked a lot with the task force. And we really came across three options, three ways that we can present height regulation within the zoning code. I'm actually going to present what has been submitted to you as Option 1, but I'm going to explain the three variations that we've gone through and then I'll talk about what we've presented to you.

So, the first option is having in the height chapter both a zone height and street-based height. The street-base height would be the same as the Height Act height.

And the intent of this is to get everything as a zoning regulation in the same chapter, the thought being then if you have a street-based zone regulation, a developer or property owner doesn't need to go look at the Height Act.

One universal principle that would be

NEAL R. GROSS

with the Department of Consumer and Regulatory
Affairs and the Zoning Administrator to have
them publish their rules of interpretation of
the Height Act. That, when approved by DCRA,
would ultimately be codified within Title 11,
within a non-zoning portion of Title 11. So,
regardless of which option you choose, Height
Act interpretations will be somewhere in Title
11. In Option 1, we'd also have a zoning rule
in the height chapter that mirrored them.

Option 2, very similar. We would have a zoning rule for height and then we would have sections within the height chapter that directly copied the Height Act language from DCRA and said the Height Act limits are these. This offers the same advantage of having everything in one place. The disadvantage of Option 2 is that you have sections within the height chapter that are not zoning and are actually not subject to your change, and OAG has expressed some

NEAL R. GROSS

concerns with that.

Option 3 then, which has been
OAG's preference, is that we not try and put
Height Act regulations within the Zoning Code
or create a new zoning standard that
replicates them. Option 3 would just have
zoning within the height chapter and it would
have reference to where DCRA's Height Act
interpretations are elsewhere in the code.

So, the document in front of you tonight and in the public hearing notice represents one Option 1.

I'm going to walk quickly through what the sections are in that and what it would mean to try the different options.

There are eight sections. Really quickly, Section 400 is an introduction. This is going to be a common section throughout all the chapters in Subtitle B. It's going to give us the intent of regulating height, some general statements. And this is where there will also be the reference to the Height Act

saying whatever happens in this chapter, properties in the District of Columbia are still subject to the Height Act and the more restrictive applies.

Section 401 is also something that you're going to see in every chapter in Subtitle B. This is the relationship between this chapter and the land use subtitles, the residential/commercial chapters. It talks about how this chapter interacts with those, where you find the information in those chapters and how you relate it to this chapter, and it gives rules for how you will codify height. An example of that is, we propose a rule in Section 401 that says when you set height limits for a zone, they'll be divisible by five. So, you can set a height limit of 35 or 40 feet, but not 372 feet, for example.

Section 402 then starts getting into the meat. This is how to measure height. This section applies both to zoning height and

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

to Height Act height, and it talks about how you determine the bottom measuring point, that it's in the middle of the building, that it's from grade level and talks about what grade level is, how you determine the top measuring point. And that is actually something that differs between zone height and Height Act, whether you count the parapet or not.

Section 403 is strictly street-based and/or Height Act-related. This is when you're basing your height on the street, if you're on a residential block, it gives us a definition of residential block and it tells us what the maximum heights would be if you're under the street-based regulations on a residential block.

Section 404 is the same for business blocks. Again, definition of business block and what your street-based height regulation would be on a business block.

Section 405 again deals just with

NEAL R. GROSS

street-based interpretations and/or Height
Act. This is basically the miscellaneous
rules for determining your height based on the
street width. If you have multiple street
frontages, which do you use? If you have a
reservation across from you, you know, what
are the rules there? And actually this is
where the section on whether you are a single
building or multiple buildings belong. We
actually mis-codified it in the public hearing
notices 402.7, but it belongs with the Height
Act or the street-based interpretations in
Section 405, and we'll correct that.

Two more. Section 406 is the exception. This is roof structures, what's allowed above the height limit. And this section has rules for the required setbacks of roof structures, what types of structures are allowed, the height limit of those and the footprint limit of those.

And finally, Section 407 is special exception standards for height. This

NEAL R. GROSS

is strictly zoning. You can't get special exception from street-based and/or Height Act rules, but you can get special exception from zoning in terms of the roof structure setbacks or the roof structure footprint limit.

So, the version that you saw here looks something like this, and I apologize, you can't see it very well, but there are eight sections, three that deal strictly with zoning, Sections 400, 401, 402. Whatever option you choose, these three sections will appear in the height chapter.

There are three that deal specifically with Height Act issues; 403, 404, 405. If you choose Option 3, these will come out. These three sections will come out of the zoning code and will be strictly dealt with in DCRA's interpretations of the Height Act.

There are two sections then; 402 and 406, that are common between both. This is how to measure height and what you can do in

NEAL R. GROSS

terms of roof structures. These will be in
the zoning code, whatever choice you make, and
they will also be in DCRA's interpretations,
whatever you choice you make. So, the
difference for you is whether we keep section
403, 404 and 405 in the Zoning Regulations or
not.

And that's my presentation on

And that's my presentation on height and I'm open to questions and discussion.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Let me ask a question. Maybe this is for the Attorney General. We're being ask to set these down. Are we going to set them down individually, or are we doing them in block, if we set them down?

MS. MONROE: If you want me to answer this; I don't know if OP wants to weigh in, but you can even make a choice. You can set them all down in the alternative, or you can make a choice and pick which one you want to set down. I think that's what OP is after

NEAL R. GROSS

tonight.

MR. PARKER: Absolutely. We want three things tonight: We'd ask you to set this down on September 20th. At this point everybody's had a chance to weigh in. We've made our recommendation. The taskforce has had their crack at it. OAG has made their recommendation. We'd like your guidance on which one you want to see on September 20th. We will publish that version.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let me ask. What did the taskforce come back with?

MR. PARKER: The taskforce were all over the board. Every member thought something different, and often on different nights thought different things. So, we got lots of conflicting information from the taskforce.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Let me open it up. Commissioners, any questions, comments, options? Commissioner Turnbull?

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: just to

1	clarify, we're talking about process.
2	MR. PARKER: Yes.
3	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Are we
4	talking about tonight or looking at any of the
5	content of these?
6	MR. PARKER: Forgive me.
7	Absolutely. If you have questions or concerns
8	about the content, I'd love to hear those now.
9	We'll talk more about that on the 20th, but
10	certainly we want your questions and concerns
11	about the content as well.
12	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well, I
13	have one of the questions, one that's been
14	around for a long time and
15	COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Turnbull,
16	can I interrupt for just a second?
17	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Sure.
18	COMMISSIONER MAY: I was just
19	wondering if it might make sense to just
20	address the question of what we think we would
21	set down first.
22	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: First?

1	That's fine.
2	COMMISSIONER MAY: If we can. If
3	we can come to some conclusion about it. If
4	we can't, then I think we leap into the
5	individual questions.
6	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I think
7	your right.
8	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, because I
9	think it might save us some time.
10	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes,
11	that's fine.
12	COMMISSIONER MAY: I for one am in
13	favor of the third option, which is to only
14	reference the Height Act. And since it's in
15	the same chapter and since people will be
16	looking at these things online anyway, I think
17	it's handy enough. And I think that the real
18	difficulty of trying to integrate them is that
19	now you have the same regulations in two
20	places and it's just going to be a nightmare
21	making sure that they're in sync. And it's

NEAL R. GROSS

not just a nightmare in terms of like a

1	paperwork task, it's rule making by two
2	different agencies that would have to occur.
3	So, I think that the cleanest thing is to
4	simply make reference to it, make reference to
5	the fact that the most restrictive applies and
6	just set it down that way. I mean, that's the
7	cleanest thing from my perspective.
8	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Anybody
9	else like to comment on the options?
10	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Where
11	would you make reference to that the strictest
12	would apply?
13	COMMISSIONER MAY: I think in the
14	Zoning Regulations where it makes reference to
15	the Height Act. I think there actually is a
16	clause in here somewhere that when there's a
17	conflict between them, the strictest
18	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. The
19	most stringent applies?
20	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right, which is
21	a matter of law I think anyway. So, it's just
22	repeating something.

1 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Well,

Vice-Chairman?

VICE-CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: This is a question for OAG and maybe Ms. Monroe. As to what it means to reference Subtitle M in this case, would these regulations promulgated by DCRA be part of the Zoning Regulations that the Zoning Commission enforces?

MS. MONROE: That's a hard question, because we've had this before and there was a recent BZA decision. It was the Kalorama case, which was dealing with the Height Act and the BZA specifically said that because the Height Act was referenced in the Zoning Regulations the BZA felt that it had the authority to interpret the Height Act.

The case was appealed to the Court of Appeals but not on that issue. So, it wasn't actually decided by the Court of Appeals but it also wasn't brought up by the Court of Appeals as incorrect.

So, I think there's a question. I don't think I have an absolute answer for you, but I think there would be a question that if it were referred to in the Zoning Regulations it could be considered as within the Zoning Regulations.

On the other hand, the Height Act is is not a zoning regulation. The Height Act is a separate act that is implemented by DCRA, not by the Zoning Commission. So, the Zoning Commission doesn't have any authority to interpret it.

WICE-CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: I guess maybe what I'm concerned about is if you have an application that comes through either the Commission or BZA that's in clear violation of the Height Act. We could be putting ourselves in a situation where we're not even able to weigh in on that issue. And I think if we are able to weigh on that currently, I'd still like to be able to weigh in. And I understand that the Zoning Administrator has the final

NEAL R. GROSS

say over this, but you wouldn't want to be handcuffed in such a way that you couldn't even comment on it because it's outside of our purview. I think that would be a concern.

MS. MONROE: I think the way it's handled now; and Mr. Rittig can maybe talk about this because he does a lot of PUDs, but I guess in the PUDs the Zoning Commission will often say there's an ambiguity as to whether or not there is a Height Act violation here, and so therefore we not defer to the Zoning Administrator, but we'll leave it up to him to make this decision. I think that's the way it's handled now and that seems to be where we are.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: That's correct.

That's exactly how we handle it now. So, I

don't know. But that's what we do now, unless

it's a clear violation and we know. We

usually stop it up front, but normally we let

the Zoning Administrator make the

interpretation.

NEAL R. GROSS

COMMISSIONER MAY: I believe that

2 we have asked applicants to make their case

3 that they're not violating the Height Act just

4 | to demonstrate, because the last thing we want

5 to do is approve a PUD that's going to get

6 | lopped off because of Height Act concerns and

7 | they'd have to come back. So, we just want to

8 have some assurance that they're going to be

9 in compliance, and so we've gotten testimony

10 to that effect. It's not always been

11 perfectly resolved when they leave here.

12 There were definitely some open issues, and I

13 || can recall a few cases where there were open

14 | issues, but to my recollection none of those

15 have actually come back to us as a result.

I mean, the things I think of

17 immediately are things like the Department of

18 Transportation headquarters. There was a

19 Height Act issue there. And then there were

20 a few that I know NCPC made an issue of

21 | setbacks. Those issues were raised by others

in the course of our hearing and I know that

NCPC latched onto them and commented to us that there was a Height Act issue. And at that point we simply say it's the Zoning Administrator's job.

MS. MONROE: Let me say one thing: I don't want to pontificate about this; and OP should weigh on this, but the Height Act is interpreted and implemented by DCRA, but there have never been any written Height Act regulations put out by DCRA since 1910. And I think what OP has been -- and OAG's been working with DCRA is to put out their own independent Height Act regulations. So, maybe the Zoning Commission could step away from it at this point if DCRA's going to have its own regulations. And that is something again maybe Mr. Parker wants to address, because they've been working with the Zoning Administrator to come up with a set for DCRA. And then the set for the Zoning Commission could either include or not, and I think that's Option 3, is to not include what comes

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	up from DCRA.
2	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Parker, did
3	you want to comment on that?
4	MR. PARKER: Sorry, I've been
5	somewhat distracted here.
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: Can I just step
7	in for a second? I think what actually is
8	being proposed in Option 3 is that what gets
9	referred to is the DCRA regulations once they
10	are published, right? So, I mean, I don't
11	think that's going to substantively change
12	what happens in the course of PUDs. I think
13	that we're going to still wind up with Height
14	Act questions and we're going to ask
15	applicants to prove that they are in
16	compliance with the regulation and not the
17	Act, and they'll have to make that case. And
18	if we're satisfied, you know, it'll move on.
19	Anyway.
20	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Ms. Monroe,
21	because I forgot exactly now, could you repeat
22	what you were saying before you wanted

1 MS. MONROE: Oh, I'm sorry. 2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'm sorry. Basically I was just 3 MS. MONROE: saying, Mr. Parker, that there have never been 4 any written Height Act regulations put out by 5 6 DCRA since 1910. And so, now that OP and OAG 7 were working with DCRA to come up with their own set of Height Act regulations, it might 8 make the Zoning Commission feel more 9 comfortable not including everything in zoning 10 if you don't want to, because there will be 11 separate regulations. And that's what Mr. May 12 13 was saying. 14 To kind of answer your question, 15 if you don't reference the Act, you reference the DCRA Regs, then anybody who's building 16 anything and is worried about height is going 17 to go both sets of regs. 18 Right. 19 MR. PARKER: 20 MS. MONROE: And the Act doesn't come in the back door into the Zoning 21 Regulations that way. 22

1	Now, I'm not, you know, for or
2	against. I'm just saying that's the way it
3	would work.
4	MR. PARKER: And those regs will
5	be in the same title even, so easily
6	reference-able.
7	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So, I guess,
8	Commissioners, we're being asked and did
9	that take care of your concern, Commissioner?
10	VICE-CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Yes,
11	absolutely. I don't think it serves any good
12	purpose to have two dualing regulations and
13	the ambiguity that comes from that as those
14	regulations change over time. So, I think we
15	need to pick one place for those sections to
16	be, and it seems to make sense that since DCRA
17	is the final arbiter on Height Act issues,
18	that it should be in a title that they
19	control.
20	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. But I
21	think now we're being asked by the Office of

Planning to pick one of those three options.

1	So far I think I've heard Option 3, and I know
2	I'm in favor of Option 3. Option 3?
3	Let me ask this: Are you finished
4	with your presentation on height?
5	MR. PARKER: On height, yes.
6	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I guess
7	what we'll do, Commissioners, we're going to
8	go ahead and go with Option 3 unless I see
9	something else. Okay.
10	Let's make a motion to set this
11	down.
12	VICE-CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: I will
13	say that. So, Option 3, I agree with that.
14	I do have some comments on the text outside of
15	just which option we're going to go down.
16	MR. PARKER: Please.
17	VICE-CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: One is
18	that I realize that the Zoning Administrator
19	is promulgating the rules now if we go with
20	Option 3 for Sections 403 to 405.
21	MR. PARKER: Yes.
22	VICE-CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: I will

that I saw that was in the setdown report that I don't necessarily agree with. And so I don't want the Zoning Administrator to get the sense that the Zoning Commission is endorsing necessarily all of the recommendations within those sections. And specifically I would just highlight the meaningful connection, single building versus multiple buildings. I'm not 100 percent clear that that's in keeping with the current interpretation. Or, I've seen that issue come up on a few projects.

MR. PARKER: Right.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: And the way it's written right now does not seem entirely consistent with the way the Zoning Administrator has been interpreting it, and it's a little more strict. And I will say that we want to encourage breaking down the mass of buildings, and I'm worried that the way that language is currently written actually encourages super blocks. I think you

need to very careful in how that language gets done. I think we need to be able to break up the mass on these large blocks, because what's happening is you've got people trying to pull the height from one side of their square all the way to the other side of the square. And if they're forced to, they'll do it in one giant building just to take advantage of their density, but it's much preferable to have separate buildings that break down the massing of that square. It's an arcane issue. I've seen it play out though on numerous occasions and it's a big deal.

The other is on the fronting of these reservations. I think my sense is that it's inconsistent. The language that's written right now is not consistent with the way that's been interpreted in the last few years, at least as long as I've been watching it. And so I'd just have them take another look at that and just know that I don't entirely endorse that. Otherwise, I think the

NEAL R. GROSS

language looks great. I'm excited about the direction you're going in and just wanted to highlight those two things.

MR. PARKER: Great. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. Mr.

Turnbull?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I just had a question in 406. Four-oh-six we get into our favorite topics of spires, towers, domes, minarets, pinnacles, pergolas and similar architectural embellishments, chimneys and skylights. In 406.4, we say that space enclosed by walls on a roof is limited to 40 percent of the building's total footprint. Looking down the road with sustainable design, green roofs and a lot of other aspects. mean, to me that's just the penthouse proper or elevator shafts, the overruns. And what I look at then is how much more on the roof can be taken up with domes, pinnacles and pergolas? We've had some cases where a pergola runs the whole length. We've also had

1	some places where structures can be made into
2	tents on a roof and could be habitable, you
3	know, three-quarters of the year. And we want
4	to be creative and allow people to develop the
5	architecture that's exciting, but I wonder how
6	we structure the 40 percent limited to
7	penthouses and then suddenly have a dome, a
8	spire, a minaret, a pergola that could be
9	enclosed at some point, could be terraced.
10	I'm just wondering what kind of limitations
11	are you looking at when you look at it that
12	way?
13	MR. PARKER: Well, and actually if
14	you take a look at 406.4, this one
15	specifically stays away from penthouses. The
16	language here is space enclosed by walls, so
17	towers and domes would be included in that 40
18	percent.
19	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. But
20	a pergola, an open-framed
21	MR. PARKER: Pergola would not.
22	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL:

1	structure could possibly take up 40 percent of
2	the roof?
3	MR. PARKER: More.
4	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Or more.
5	MR. PARKER: That wouldn't be
6	subject to that limitation, just like now.
7	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Are we
8	comfortable with that? I'm just throwing that
9	out as to what we see on the roof now.
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: It would still
11	have to be set back, wouldn't it?
12	MR. PARKER: It would. It would.
13	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Still have
14	to be set back? Okay. I was just curious
15	about the visual character that you would see
16	now up on this, this potpourri of items that
17	suddenly may come out.
18	The other thing is on your
19	diagram; I don't know which one it is,
20	406.2(3), the roof structure setback from a
21	party wall where the building is higher, we're
22	saying that the penthouse could be built right

1	up to that structure?
2	MR. PARKER: We're saying there's
3	not a setback required in areas where you
4	couldn't see it, yes.
5	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
6	MR. PARKER: On a party wall.
7	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: All right.
8	Thank you.
9	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Anybody else?
10	Commissioner May?
11	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, is this
12	time for all my questions? Do you want to
13	start the clock? No.
14	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I probably
15	should, but no.
16	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, it's not a
17	hearing. We don't usually do it a meetings,
18	right?
19	I'll try to talk quickly. Four-
20	oh-two-point-three, there's a reference where
21	it says, "Except as provided in 102.4." Is
22	that correctly referenced?

1	MR. PARKER: No, it should be
2	402.4.
3	COMMISSIONER MAY: Four-oh-two-
4	point-four?
5	MR. PARKER: That's a typo.
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. So, at
7	402.4. So, is the exception to the maximum
8	height difference of 12 inches, or is the
9	exception to the midpoint of adjacent curb?
10	MR. PARKER: The exception is from
11	using the adjacent curb.
12	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. So, I
13	think that dependent phrase, the "except"
14	should be inserted immediately after "curb" so
15	it makes sense.
16	MR. PARKER: Can do.
17	COMMISSIONER MAY: On 402.4, since
18	it's not stated I'm assuming that there's no
19	actual order of preference among these items
20	and I wonder if there should be. And I'm not
21	asking necessarily for an answer. I just

think that this might be one of those things

1	you make note of because I may still have that
2	question when it comes time for the hearing.
3	So, give that some thought and if there's
4	anything to say.
5	MR. PARKER: I guess my immediate
6	question though is how would a preference
7	work? Like A always exists somewhere, so
8	would you never if the current order was
9	the order, would you not be able to do B or
10	I don't understand what you mean by set a
11	preference to.
12	COMMISSIONER MAY: Well, I mean,
13	there may not be a street frontage affected by
14	an artificial elevation, and so therefore you
15	go onto No. 2, or B.
16	MR. PARKER: I see.
17	COMMISSIONER MAY: I don't know.
18	I mean, again I'm not expecting to have all
19	these answered at this moment.
20	MR. PARKER: Okay.
21	COMMISSIONER MAY: I'm just sort
22	of raising the question.

1	Can wou toll me on C what
1	Can you tell me on C what
2	circumstances an elevation might have been
3	previously determined by the Zoning
4	Administrator?
5	MR. PARKER: L'Enfant Plaza.
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: Oh, okay. So,
7	is that the only one, or are there just a few
8	of those circumstances where they've
9	MR. PARKER: There are just a few.
10	I don't know of others off the top of my head,
11	but things like that.
12	COMMISSIONER MAY: If they're
13	actually small enough numbered a list, do we
14	know that?
15	MR. PARKER: I just don't know if
16	it would be exhaustive, but I can look into
17	it, yes.
18	COMMISSIONER MAY: Oh, well then,
19	I'm just concerned about what that would mean.
20	I don't know if it's a big issue or not, so I
21	don't really have a specific question on that
22	one.

1	MR. PARKER: Okay.
2	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. Height
3	limit exceptions. There's no height limits
4	set for these additional structures, right?
5	MR. PARKER: There are actually.
6	Four-oh-six-point-three.
7	COMMISSIONER MAY: Four-oh-six-
8	point-three? Oh, right. Okay. Nothing can
9	rise more than 20 feet. Well, a dome or a
10	pinnacle might be more than 20 feet.
11	MR. PARKER: Well, they can, A
12	through E. The 20 feet applies to F through
13	J.
14	COMMISSIONER MAY: All right. So,
15	okay. A pergola then therefore could be more
16	than 20 feet?
17	MR. PARKER: Ah, interesting
18	question. That should probably be moved lower
19	into the list.
20	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. Yes, I
21	mean, chimneys, smokestacks, domes, minarets,
22	pinnacles, towers, spires I could see

1	potentially no limit.
2	MR. PARKER: Right.
3	COMMISSIONER MAY: Or having some
4	process when it's above 20 feet, something
5	like that.
6	And the setbacks apply only on F
7	through J, but setbacks should apply to
8	pergolas as well?
9	MR. PARKER: Correct, we can fix
10	that.
11	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. Okay. I
12	like the idea that on the setback requirements
13	that you include an adjacent property's
14	existing or matter of right height and a wall
15	that abuts a lot line and that is taller than
16	the greater of the matter of right or the
17	existing. So, that means that if there's an
18	existing historic structure that's never going
19	to go to the matter or right height, you could
20	still have a
21	MR. PARKER: That is true.
22	COMMISSIONER MAY: penthouse

1	without a setback?
2	MR. PARKER: That is true.
3	COMMISSIONER MAY: I think that's
4	an issue.
5	MR. PARKER: Okay.
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: And you can
7	address that issue whatever way you want. I'm
8	just raising it, like I think I did at the
9	previous hearing.
10	All right. I think that's it for
11	my questions.
12	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Any other
13	questions or comments?
14	(No audible response.)
15	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: If we set this
16	down, when are we supposed to have this, the
17	20th? Okay.
18	All right. Any other comments,
19	Commissioners?
20	(No audible response.)
21	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I would
22	move that we set down 08-06, height text, with

1	Option 3. I think that's what you're going to
2	advertise, Option 3. And also to take under
3	consideration the comments that my colleagues
4	have mentioned. And I move that we set that
5	down and ask for a second.
6	VICE-CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Second.
7	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: It's been moved
8	and properly seconded. Thank you, Vice-
9	Chairman.
10	Moved and properly seconded. Any
11	further discussion?
12	MS. MONROE: Can I ask a question?
13	Was Option 3 the one that was in the public
14	hearing notice?
15	VICE-CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: It was
16	not.
17	MS. MONROE: It was not? I just
18	want you to know that. That's not the one
19	that was advertised, but that's okay. I mean,
20	you've chosen Option 3.
21	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Which one was
22	advertised?

1	MS. MONROE: I think Option 1. Am
2	I correct?
3	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, we'll issue a
4	new public hearing notice.
5	MS. MONROE: I just don't want to
6	cause confusion to people, hearing all that,
7	you know?
8	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'll be
9	perfectly honest, when I heard that the
10	taskforce was with all three, I was thinking
11	all three, but I said, no.
12	MS. MONROE: Option 1 is the one
13	that was in the hearing notice. But you've
14	chosen Option 3, so Option 3 is the one that
15	will be set down.
16	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Option
17	3.
18	MS. MONROE: With the comments.
19	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Right.
20	MR. PARKER: Could I ask, OAG, is
21	any special action required because of the
22	short the retroactive setdown approval?

1	MS. MONROE: No.
2	MR. PARKER: Okay.
3	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Did I
4	get a second.
5	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner
6	Schlater.
7	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. It's
8	been moved and properly seconded. Any further
9	discussion?
10	(No audible response.)
11	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All those in
12	favor? Aye.
13	VICE-CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Aye.
14	COMMISSIONER MAY: Aye.
15	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Aye.
16	COMMISSIONER SELFRIDGE: Aye.
17	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Not hearing any
18	opposition, Ms. Schellin, would you record the
19	vote?
20	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, staff records
21	the vote five to zero to zero to set down

1	to height, Option 3. Commissioner Hood moving
2	Commissioner Schlater seconding; Commissioners
3	Turnbull, Selfridge and May in support.
4	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Now,
5	we'll go to use. But let me ask this: Is use
6	going to be the same night, too, the 20th?
7	MS. SCHELLIN: If you set it down,
8	yes.
9	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. All
10	right. If set down.
11	Okay. Let's go to Mr. Parker for
12	use.
13	MR. PARKER: Absolutely. I'm
14	going to try and go quickly through this, but
15	there's a lot of information to cover here and
16	I want to make sure you're all familiar with
17	it.
18	Really quickly, we spent a lot of
19	time discussing with you and with a couple
20	different working groups a lot of the problems
21	with our current use system. You know,
22	there's nearly 650 discreet uses. We've got

a code now that if you want to know all the uses that are allowed in your zone, we have to go look at all the previous zones because the uses are nested. Some of the problems with use lists include, you know, they're constantly out of date, and I talk a little bit more about that on the next slide.

We don't define a lot of the uses listed in our code. Definitions, where they do exist, are scattered throughout and just a range of problems comes from permitting uses by a list of names rather than using a table with categories. And, you know, just the example that we show in all of our presentations is some of the dated uses that we have in our code, like telephone exchange and penny arcade. Lists call for constant, constant updating and changing in order to keep them current, and you can never stay on top of it.

So, what we've seen in other cities around the country is going away from

NEAL R. GROSS

lists and, you know, rating uses or organizing uses by their type and basically creating categories of uses. Right now, you know, D.C. has over 600. All of our other best practice cities have far fewer uses than us. You know, Portland and Miami down, you know, categories of 30 or 40 use types, all the way up to San Antonio which still has many hundred, but everybody is far below us. And the trend has been for the newer codes to go down to broader categories and to regulate them through conditions. And that's sort of what we're proposing and what we're going to talk about tonight.

The basic concept is taking things that are similar in their type and impact and creating a category. So, bookstore, drugstore, shoe store, they're all stores that people come in and buy products, so they're all retail business. You know, bank, tailor, bike repair, they're all people purchasing a service. And so, you know, using our

NEAL R. GROSS

knowledge of the impacts and characteristics of uses to start defining what are some categories of use that we can regulate.

Based on this and the work that
we've done throughout the process, we've
devised 29 different use categories and these
categories are based on, you know, again the
different activities and impacts that they
have. Particular ones come about because they
are particularly hard to characterize
elsewhere, things like marine uses or wasterelated. And then we do have some categories
that provide a distinct performance or policy
elements.

There are two real components to this system. The one that you're going to review tonight is in the general use chapter, is the use definitions. And so, every category that we propose has a definition and that definition is composed of, you know, the characteristics of the use, but also examples of that type of use and exemptions, things

NEAL R. GROSS

that clearly are not, that give a guide to the user of the code and ultimately to the Zoning Administrator of what these categories mean and what's in each one.

We're going to have a chance to talk about these categories, but the 29 are on the screen; and I'm sorry you can't read them from here, but you've got them in your packet as well. We've proposed 29 use categories. And you won't be able to read this on the screen either, but basically we've taken the multiple different uses from our current code and grouped them. And retail's the biggest one. There's, you know, one or two hundred different retail designations in our code. And then you get to, you know, service and office that have 20 or 24 different types of offices that are listed. And just going through the list. You know, we always have 10 or 12 of these uses that fit one of our categories. We had education, health care. Even antennas has six or seven different

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

listed uses. So, we want through this process of taking every use in our current code and categorizing them by their type.

One thing that I want to note is that this change involves a paradigm shift in the way that we think about uses. Right now a zone has a list of uses that are permitted and it's assumed that if a use is not listed in that list, that use is not permitted. this causes trouble when you have something like a yoga studio. Our code doesn't list yoga studio. So, the basic rule of zoning is that the yoga studio wouldn't be permitted. But in point of fact, it's a matter of the Zoning Administrator making a call that, well, it's actually kind of like public health spa or some of the old terms that are in our code. So, the existing system puts a lot of pressure on the Zoning Administrator.

The new system is designed around these categories. Every use of land that you can possibly imagine or do fits into one of

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

these categories or is intended to fit into one of these categories. My staff spent a lot of time thinking of things like heliports, and I can't name all the different ways we tried to break the system and make sure that everything that we could possibly do with a piece of property had a place in this system. So, unlike the existing system, there's nothing left out. Everything has a home and every category has a permission level; permitted, not permitted, etcetera.

organization is in two places. In the general chapter is the list of definitions and, you know, what the rules are, the general rules regulating use. Within each of the land use subtitles then there is a use permission chart. And you've seen an example of one of those in your report, in your setdown report. Attached to it was an example of a use permission chart and there's one on the screen that again it is kind of small, but basically

NEAL R. GROSS

across the top are listed the zones within that use category.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Down the side listed are 29 use categories. And in each box is a permission level. And there are five letters that can be in that box. P means that use is permitted, and you can do any type of that use that you want. N means that use is not permitted and you can't do anything related to that use category. The other three permission levels are C for conditional, or permitted with condition; S for permitted through special exception; and A permitted as accessory. And what that means is for example if I have a conditional use on service, the condition might be no more than 2,500 square feet of service, which means I can still build whatever building I'm allowed to do in that zone, but I can't have a service use larger than 2,500 square feet. Special exception, and example is, you know, CBRFs are allowed in some zone by special exception. We're going

to talk about CBRFs later, but that use category would have an S by it. And finally, accessory, if you have an A it just means that use is only permitted as an accessory use to another use and not permitted as a stand alone use. So, those are the five potential use permissions for each type of use.

So, the benefits of this type of system, A, it's easier to find your permission. All your permissions for, you know, your C-2-A Zone are listed in one place. You don't have to look at C-2-A and C-1 and R-5 and look back and forth. There's a lot more flexibility in customizing permissions to a local area. We're going to look at some examples later that show this, that show how it's easier to implement plans, it's easier to achieve specific planning policy. This system solves for the omissions and inaccuracies of a list system, it eliminates the redundancy in our current code of repeating conditions and it focuses our restrictions on the impacts of

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

uses rather than what name they fall under.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

So, I want to go through some The first example; and I'll tell examples. you what's on the screen is from the Macomb-Wisconsin Overlay. And we pulled some of the existing permitted uses from that overlay and three of them include self-service laundry up to 2,500 square feet, dry cleaning establishment up to 2,500 square feet and tailor or valet shop up to 2,500 square feet. So, we've got three different use permissions. All of these are service uses in our new code and this is another way that we can reduce a lot of text through this system by simply making services a conditional use in that overlay and the condition being cleaning, alteration or repair of clothing is limited to 2,500 square feet. We can allow all service uses that don't meet that definition. Services that are laundries or tailor or valet shops are limited to 2,500 square feet. it's a very simple and easy way to put

conditions on uses and make very clear what your permission levels are in a very little amount of text.

Another example is home occupations. Right now we have a list of a few things, like clergymen, academic, tax preparer and dressmaker that you can do from There's a lot of other things that you home. probably should be able to do from home and people probably do do from home that may not be on our 40-year-old list of home occupations. So, the easy way around this is these uses on our current list generally fall into two of our use categories; service and office. And the way that home occupations are solved for in this new code is service and office are allowed in residential zones as an accessory use. They have an A in their category. And the conditions that apply to them now are conditions on that accessory use. So, you have A. You have a section reference that points you to the conditions on doing

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

office or service uses in your home.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

And the final example I want to go through is about something that isn't even in zoning now, but how we would take a plan and implement it. The 2008 Deanwood Plan has a bunch of goals for their neighborhood including no carryouts, getting some new sitdown restaurants, a full-service grocery store, no liquor store, office supply store and adding some retail clothing stores. if we categorize those uses, the top two are within our food and alcohol service category and the bottom two are in retail. This area of Deanwood is currently in the C-1. are no retail requirements currently or conditions currently. It's just a permitted use in the C-1. And for food and alcohol there are some current conditions limiting fast foods. But simply by adding two new conditions we can limit carryouts. By adding a condition to food and alcohol service saying no more than 25 percent of food sales may be

off-premise consumption, we suddenly eliminated carryouts in Deanwood without having to have add carryout to a list or define what a carryout is.

For retail, you know, we can put a condition on retail saying no more than 15 percent of gross floor area may be used for the sale of liquor. Now, anything not involving liquor, that condition doesn't apply, so retail is unencumbered. But where liquor's involved, that condition kicks in. So again, a simple way to take to our plans and implement them easily in zoning.

Two more points to make on this system. There are some uses that become difficult to categorize. One is funeral home. It met both the definitions of service and of institutional. Uses like that, the best way for us to handle them is probably to -- and what we have done throughout the code is to determine which one they should be in and put them in the example of that so that the Zoning

Administrator can easily find that use doing a search, find which category that is.

Others like a cabaret or a dinner theater, cabaret or dinner theater falls into both food and alcohol service and performing arts, and it rightly so does because it has the impacts of both of those uses. So some uses like a dinner theater would fall into two categories and would have to meet the conditions of both categories because it has the impacts of both categories.

The final thing I want to talk
with you about is CBRFs. Right now there are
seven types of CBRFs and they're all heavily
restricted in residential zones. The city has
run into some legal issues on limiting some of
these in residential zones because they are
determined to be housing or homes for disabled
as that's legally defined. So, there are
three types of CBRFs as we define them
currently; community residents facility,
substance abuser's homes and youth residential

NEAL R. GROSS

care homes that legally cannot be limited anymore than the residential uses in those zones can be limited. So, where we have zones with unlimited residential, we can't limit these at all. Where we have zones with limited unit residential, we can limit the number of people in these facilities, but we can't put location restrictions on them because we don't put location restrictions on single-family homes.

But the other CBRFs can continue to be regulated. Rehabilitation homes for adults and youth, we've proposed that those be called community-based institutional facilities and would carry over the existing limitations on those. Emergency shelters and health care are now each their own categories of use.

So, that's my presentation. I've got on the screen there then the example of the use permission chart that's also in your packet. But basically what we're asking again

NEAL R. GROSS

1 is for your comments on this system, your thoughts on this system and hopefully for a 2 setdown to the 20th of September. 3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank 4 5 you, Mr. Parker. Let me start off, and help 6 me walk through this. Let's look at 206.13. 7 I see the definition, and I meant definitions. Any use providing 30 days or less of temporary 8 housing to indigent, needy, homeless, 9 transient individuals. Emergency shelter uses 10 may also provide ancillary such as counseling, 11 vocational training or similar social and 12 13 career assistance. 14 Now, when I look at that, then 15 it's got the exception. The term does not include uses which more precisely meet the 16 definition of residential. And with this new 17 undertaking would this emergency shelter be 18 permitted in a PDR, or how is that going to 19 20 work? MR. PARKER: Well, actually one 21

NEAL R. GROSS

thing I can answer is where these things are

permitted, because when we come forward with the PDR Zone, we'll have a table of which of these uses is permitted in the zone. All I can tell you now, or what I'm prepared to discuss now is, you know, whether this is the right definition for emergency shelter or whether we need to tweak that. Where it's permitted, we're going to maintain the same permission levels. Where those are permitted now they'll be permitted in the future. they're a special exception now, they'll be a special exception in the future. And when we bring those zones forward, it will have a use table with those permissions in it.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And I guess I'm asking is this a real life situation? So, basically you want to know about the definition and tweaking it 30 days?

MR. PARKER: Yes, if you have questions or concerns with the definition, we want to solve that, because, you know, when we come back with the PDR Zones, there will be a

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	table and it will say, you know, permitted or
2	not permitted or conditional. And by that
3	time we you know
4	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. May
5	probably could help. When I look at this it
6	says any use providing 30 days or less. We
7	might want to work with some of those who may
8	know a little more than I do about emergency
9	shelters, because I know it's much more than
10	30 days. So, we might want to work and find
11	out exactly what's real, what's really real,
12	what's really happening. And Mr. May may be
13	able to help us with that at some point.
14	Okay. Let me open it up. Did you
15	want to comment?
16	COMMISSIONER MAY: I'll start
17	there. Actually it was one of my questions.
18	I don't see a reference to a
19	longer term. Homeless shelters, is that what
20	you're referring to as a community residence
21	facility?
22	MR. PARKER: Yes, a longer term.

1	So, lease periods of more than a month would
2	be
3	COMMISSIONER MAY: I'm not talking
4	about lease periods because there are no
5	leases.
6	MR. PARKER: Well, actually yes,
7	stay periods, are they yes.
8	PARTICIPANT: (Off microphone.)
9	MR. PARKER: Right, right. When
10	that goes to 31 days. The intent here is,
11	yes, facilities where people commonly stay
12	more than 30 days are under the residential
13	category.
14	COMMISSIONER MAY: So, a community
15	residence facility; in other words a homeless
16	shelter where people would stay longer than 30
17	days will now be treated like any other
18	residential facility?
19	MR. PARKER: And limited to the
20	same number. So, in an R-1 Zone
21	COMMISSIONER MAY: You can only
22	have four unrelated people or six unrelated

1	people, whatever it is?
2	MR. PARKER: Right. Right.
3	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. Unless
4	it were actually an apartment building or
5	something like that. You couldn't have that
6	in R-1. You'd have to have that in R-5-D
7	MR. PARKER: Right. Right.
8	COMMISSIONER MAY: or the
9	equivalent.
10	MR. PARKER: Right.
11	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. Yes, I'm
12	not sure exactly what it is, but there might
13	be something to tweak in the definitions
14	because the way we define these forms of
15	shelters.
16	MR. PARKER: Okay.
17	COMMISSIONER MAY: And how the
18	mechanics of living there actually occur. The
19	ones who require that everybody leave in the
20	middle of the day
21	MR. PARKER: Right.
22	COMMISSIONER MAY: I mean, does

that mean if they come back to the same one every night does that mean that it's now an emergency shelter because they have to leave every day?

MR. PARKER: Right.

COMMISSIONER MAY: You know, I

don't know. I mean, there are rules -- or not

rules, but more customs I guess in the

operation of homeless shelters that we might

want to have a finer look at.

MR. PARKER: I think all of these though -- it's not a matter of people staying more than 30 days, because a hotel has the same 30-day cutoff. Basically if it's more than 30 days it's residential. If it's less than 30 days, it's, you know, either emergency shelter or a hotel. I can stay in a hotel for three months, but I'm making arrangements on a nightly or weekly basis. Same for emergency shelter. I may stay there for 90 days, but that's a day-to-day decision or a week-to-week decision. Does that make more sense?

NEAL R. GROSS

1	COMMISSIONER MAY: I think what
2	it's going to boil down to is where it will
3	now be possible to have such facilities. I
4	think that's when you're start dealing with
5	the land use sections that's when it's I think
6	going to get more complicated.
7	MR. PARKER: Yes.
8	COMMISSIONER MAY: So, I don't
9	think it really necessarily affects the
10	definition. Maybe it does. I don't know. I
11	just wanted to touch on that one.
12	I can continue with my other
13	questions if you'd like.
14	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'm glad you
15	did because I know you have more experience in
16	that than I do. Okay.
17	COMMISSIONER MAY: Would you like
18	me to continue with my other questions?
19	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.
20	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. Two-oh-
21	six-point-three. My question is; I'm a little
22	confused, if you have a garden in your yard

1	and you're growing vegetables, does that mean
2	that you have agriculture as an accessory use?
3	MR. PARKER: Well, we're talking
4	about things that would require a C of O
5	probably. So, I mean, if you're going to
6	build a barn for it or, you know
7	COMMISSIONER MAY: Not in my yard.
8	No, it just seems sort of like a basic common
9	sense question. Is this going to effect, you
10	know, the home garden?
11	MR. PARKER: More appropriately
12	this is intended to provide a home for things
13	like community gardens, like where you have
14	like a plot of land and, you know, we want to
15	ensure that this could be used for a community
16	garden or something like that. So, that's the
17	intent there.
18	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. Well,
19	and so the reference to examples including a
20	garden, I mean, you could read this with a
21	really fine point and say oh, my gosh, my

neighbor's got -- he's growing pumpkins. He's

1	got a garden and agriculture is not permitted
2	as an accessory use in my neighborhood.
3	MR. PARKER: Well, and I don't
4	know anywhere that it's not.
5	COMMISSIONER MAY: And you've got
6	rats that like to eat the pumpkin.
7	MS. CIDLOWSKI: It is intended to
8	be a clarification of the existing rules which
9	list truck garden, but not necessarily
10	something like a community garden at all in
11	our current regulations. So, we're just
12	giving the example of what it is now to help
13	people how the old code will translate.
14	MR. PARKER: And it is permitted.
15	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.
16	MR. PARKER: So, I think this is
17	to ensure that gardening is permitted in all
18	residential zones.
19	COMMISSIONER MAY: Well, but this
20	is just the agriculture definition. You're
21	going to have agriculture permitted in all

residential zones?

1	MR. PARKER: Yes.
2	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. The
3	individual solar panels or windmills that I'm
4	going to put on my roof, how is that allowed?
5	Is that an accessory use under basic
6	utilities?
7	MR. PARKER: I wouldn't even say
8	that those are an accessory use at all. Those
9	are a building function. Those are like a
10	heater.
11	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. Going to
12	206.9, commercial parking, storage of vehicles
13	made available to the public for a fee. I
14	mean, does that include a circumstance where
15	a single tenant takes the whole building,
16	leases the entire parking lot and gives it to
17	their employees?
18	MR. PARKER: No, this is parking
19	that's open to the public, or available to
20	the
21	COMMISSIONER MAY: Only open to
22	the public? Okay.

1	The education facilities, when it
2	comes to public schools versus private schools
3	is there going to be some sort of
4	differentiation in terms of what's going to
5	require special exception approval versus
6	MR. PARKER: It will be done
7	through a condition. So, education will be a
8	conditional use and the condition is, you
9	know, you're required to get a special
10	exception for particular types of this
11	category.
12	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. You
13	know, for some reason I'm thinking that maybe
14	that this idea that was apparent in your
15	presentation about adding the conditions
16	I'm not sure that that's coming across in just
1 17	
17	the language that we're seeing here. It
18	the language that we're seeing here. It raised a lot of questions for me about that.
18	raised a lot of questions for me about that.
18	raised a lot of questions for me about that. MR. PARKER: Yes.

1	shared, but
2	MR. PARKER: I'll certainly send
3	my presentation if that would help.
4	COMMISSIONER MAY: Well, not
5	necessarily to me.
6	MR. PARKER: Oh, yes.
7	COMMISSIONER MAY: I'm also
8	concerned about people in the general public,
9	that alarm bells that were going off for me as
10	I was reading this might be going off for
11	them.
12	MR. PARKER: Did you find the
13	sample table with the conditions attached
14	useful, or was that
15	COMMISSIONER MAY: Sort of.
16	MR. PARKER: Okay.
17	COMMISSIONER MAY: It was more
18	useful seeing it in the presentations.
19	MR. PARKER: Understood.
20	COMMISSIONER MAY: Long term
21	homeless shelters, we talked about.
22	I understand how nightclubs would

NEAL R. GROSS

1	work theoretically under 206.14. I'm sorry
2	206.16.
3	Okay. Yes, a lot of these have to
4	do with the conditions that would apply in
5	some of these circumstances.
6	We have some very interesting
7	examples. Under PDR we have very interesting
8	examples that I'm not sure will occur very
9	frequently. Smelting, acetylene gas
10	manufacturing. Maybe that happens; I don't
11	know. But we don't have concrete and asphalt
12	plants, which actually do occur I think. They
13	certainly have. We have concrete plants.
14	MR. PARKER: Okay.
15	COMMISSIONER MAY: We used to have
16	asphalt plants and it used to be a big issue
17	for DDoT to make sure that there was an
18	asphalt plant close to where they were making
19	roads.
20	MR. PARKER: We can add those to
21	the examples.
22	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. Where's a

1	large lumber yard like a Home Depot go in
2	this? Is that going to be PDR, or is it going
	to be retail?
3	to be retail?
4	MR. PARKER: Well, a Home Depot
5	itself would be in retail and would be
6	controlled by, you know, square footage
7	limits.
8	COMMISSIONER MAY: Square footage
9	conditions?
10	MR. PARKER: Yes.
11	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay.
12	MR. PARKER: Or outdoor storage as
13	well.
14	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. Just as
15	long as it's clear to the Home Depot what
16	they're subject to.
17	MR. PARKER: Right.
18	COMMISSIONER MAY: Transportation
19	infrastructure. So, Metro stations are only
20	going to be allowed in certain zones under
21	transportation infrastructure?
22	MR. PARKER: To the best of my

1	knowledge that would be permitted pretty much
2	across the board.
3	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. Okay.
4	All right. That was it for my questions.
5	Thank you. The presentation cleared up a lot
6	of my thinking.
7	MR. PARKER: All right.
8	COMMISSIONER MAY: And I would say
9	overall I think that what we got in the way of
10	language was really excellent and well written
11	and covered. I mean, it was very inclusive
12	even though I have a few nitpicky questions.
13	And I think that overall the structure and the
14	process is all coming together very well. So,
15	I think you all deserve a compliment. Thanks.
16	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Anybody else?
17	Commissioner Turnbull?
18	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr.
19	Parker, you mentioned that there could be uses
20	that could fall under two categories or
21	whatever.
22	MR. PARKER: Right.

1	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: What
2	governs, the most stringent of the two, or is
3	it kind of just
4	MR. PARKER: No, if the Zoning
5	Administrator determines that it falls into
6	both and there's conditions on both, they'd
7	have to meet the conditions of both.
8	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
9	MR. PARKER: So, yes.
10	MR. VARGA: Also, sir, they would
11	be cumulative. But in cases where you had two
12	conditions that spoke in the same terms, it
13	would be the more restrictive of the two. So
14	for instance, if you had a 2,500 square-foot
15	maximum on one case and a 2,000 square-foot
16	maximum on the other, you'd be subject to the
17	more restrictive for that portion.
18	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Do I have
19	a problem if I own a theater and I'm putting
20	on "Hair" or "Old Calcutta?" I'm just
21	throwing that out. I might have a problem

now. Or something along that line. I'm just

1	curious.
2	MR. PARKER: I think the answer to
3	that question is always yes.
4	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. I
5	mean, does the ZA got to decide then or
6	MR. PARKER: No, I think the only
7	time that theaters get in trouble is when they
8	actually become dinner theaters, when you have
9	a full food service establishment with
10	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: And you're
11	watching "Hair?"
12	MR. PARKER: Right.
13	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
14	MR. PARKER: That may be a health
15	code issue, yes.
16	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: All right.
17	Thank you.
18	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Anybody else?
19	Okay. Commissioner Selfridge?
20	COMMISSIONER SELFRIDGE: Yes.
21	Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just had one
22	question on temporary uses. Where does the

permission for that show up for the certain zones? Is anything potentially a temporary use that's allowed in any zone?

MR. PARKER: Yes, that's a good question. Right now in the code it's relatively undefined and we don't have a lot there now. It's very much Zoning

Administrator discretion in terms of temporary uses. We didn't have a lot of examples in other codes to go on on good rules for temporary uses, but we're open to suggestions.

MS. CIDLOWSKI: This is something that's come up increasingly over the past couple of years, especially with the state of the economy where projects have stalled.

People have wanted to do things with sites in the interim, so there's been demand for having restrictions about temporary uses. So, we've been talking with DCRA and the Zoning

Administrator about what those should be. And we just wanted to make sure that we codify it so that people are able to do things within

NEAL R. GROSS

1	properly set out restrictions. So, we don't
2	have a lot of precedent for what it should be,
3	but we want to set up a system to allow where
4	it should go.
5	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Is this
6	the right place to set that system up? It
7	just seems very broad. I'm sure the Zoning
8	Administrator would never allow this, but you
9	could put a firearm store in a residential
10	zone, I mean, as a temporary use in theory,
11	right?
12	MR. PARKER: Well, yes, the
13	question is whether you'd allow uses that
14	aren't otherwise allowed in that zone as a
15	temporary use.
16	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Why
17	wouldn't you just put it as an additional
18	permission category so you could exclude those
19	uses which would never be allowed, by
20	implication if it's not an allowed temporary
21	use?

NEAL R. GROSS

MR. PARKER: I don't follow you

1	exactly.
2	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well, I
3	guess should there be an exclusion? Something
4	cannot be a temporary use?
5	MR. PARKER: That makes good sense
6	that some of them could never you know,
7	rock quarrying for example could never be a
8	temporary use. Yes, that makes good sense
9	that some of them could not be. And, yes, we
10	can put that in the general instructions.
11	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: That was
12	my only question.
13	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Anybody else?
14	(No audible response.)
15	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank
16	you very much, Mr. Parker, and Office of
17	Planning staff.
18	We have a request, Commissioners,
19	to set down the use categories for a hearing.
20	What's your pleasure?
21	COMMISSIONER MAY: I would move
22	that we set down for a public hearing Case No.

1	08-06 with regard to uses as described in OP's
2	report. And that should be enough, right?
3	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: That's just
4	fine. Can I get a second?
5	(No audible response.)
6	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Second. Moved
7	and properly seconded. Any further
8	discussion?
9	(No audible response.)
10	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All those in
11	favor? Aye.
12	VICE-CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Aye.
13	COMMISSIONER MAY: Aye.
14	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Aye.
15	COMMISSIONER SELFRIDGE: Aye.
16	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Not hearing any
17	opposition, Ms. Schellin, would you record the
18	vote?
19	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Before I do,
20	I want to go back and say that the height was
21	set down as a rule making case, of course.
22	And this too will be set down as a

1	rule making case, Zoning Commission Case No.
2	08-06 with regard to use. Commissioner May
3	moving; Commissioner Hood seconding. By a
4	vote of five to zero to zero, Commissioners
5	Schlater, Turnbull and Selfridge in support.
6	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank
7	you, Ms. Schellin. Do we have anything else
8	before us tonight?
9	MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir.
10	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. I
11	want to thank everyone for their participation
12	in this special public meeting and appreciate
13	all the work and effort that went into this.
14	And this special public meeting is adjourned.
15	(Whereupon, the meeting was
16	adjourned at 8:16 p.m.)
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	