GOVERNMENT

OF

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

SPECIAL MEETING

+ + + +

JULY 27, 2009

+ + + + +

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

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

ANTHONY J. HOOD Chairman

WILLIAM W. KEATING Vice Chairman KONRAD SCHLATER Commissioner

PETER MAY Commissioner (NPS)

MICHAEL TURNBULL Commissioner FAIA, (AOC)

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

SHARON S. SCHELLIN Secretary
ESTHER BUSHMAN Gen. Counsel

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

JENNIFER STEINGASSER JOEL LAWSON MAXINE BROWN-ROBERTS PAUL GOLDSTEIN ARLOVA JACKSON

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PRESENT:

ALAN H. BERGSTEIN, ESQ. JACOB RITTING, ESQ.

This transcript constitutes the minutes from the Special Meeting held on July 27, 2009.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PRELIMINARY MATTERS:
Office of Zoning Director Selection6 Motion to Elect JAMISON WEINBAUM Director9 Vote to Approve JAMISON WEINBAUM Director9
CONSENT CALENDAR:
ZC CASE NO. 07-35A - SHERIDAN TERRACE REDEVELOPMENT, LLC & DCHA:
ZC CASE NO. 02-06 - NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL OVERLAY DISTRICT:
ZC CASE NO. 09-07 - SCOTT & KRISTEN FRANKLIN MAP AMENDMENT TO R-4 ZONE DISTRICT:
ZC CASE NO. 02-51C - CENTER FOR STRATEGIC & INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, INC.:
ZC CASE NOS. 06-43A - AMERICAN UNIVERSITY; 06-29A - WASHINGTON VALUE ADDED; 05-17C/05- 32C - BROADWAY ATLANTIC ONE; 06-31B - JOHN AKRIDGE DEVELOPMENT CO 2 YEAR PUDS: 30 Motion to Approve Extensions
PROPOSED ACTION: ZC CASE NO. 08-33 - CONFERENCE CENTER:39

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ZC CASE NO. 08-33 (Continued):
Exhibit 36 - Revised Roof Plan41
Exhibit 37 - DDOT Report41
Motion to Approve ZC 08-3348
Vote to Grant Motion to Approve49
The second industrial to 1-FF second in the second
ZC CASE NO. 08-21 - THE ATHENA GROUP:49
Motion/Vote to Reopen Record and Accept
Exhibits 91, 97 and 9850
Motion to Approve
Vote to Approve Motion W/Conditions83
vote to Approve Motion W/Conditions
LIEADING ACETON.
<u>HEARING ACTION</u> :
ZC CACE NO 00 10 OD HEYE AMENDMENTE TO
ZC CASE NO. 09-10 - OP - TEXT AMENDMENT TO
ALLOW ESTABLISHMENT OF WATER TOWER: 84
Arlova Jackson84
Motion to Approve Set Down99
Vote to Approve Motion99
ZC CASE NO. 09-11 - OP - TEXT AMENDMENT TO
PERMIT RETAIL & SERVICE IN SP-2 ZONE:100
Paul Goldstein100
Motion to Approve Set Down
Vote to Approve Motion106
ZC CASE NO. 09-13 - OP - TEXT AMENDMENT TO
ALLOW BZA CONSENT CALENDAR:
Jennifer Steingasser107
Motion to Approve Set Down113
Vote to Approve Motion114
STATUS REPORT:
Jennifer Steingasser115
-
ADJOURN:
Anthony Hood 118

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

6:48 p.m.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let me say good evening. We're ready to get started. This meeting will, please, come to order. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. This is the July 27th Public Meeting of the Zoning Commission of the District of Columbia.

My name is Anthony Hood. Joining me are Vice Chairman Keating, Commissioner Schlater, Commissioner May and Commissioner Turnbull.

We are also joined by the Office of Zoning staff, Office of Attorney General and the Office of Planning.

Copies of today's agenda are available to you and are located in the bin near the door. We do not take any public testimony at our meetings, unless the Commission requests someone to come forward.

Please, be advised that this proceeding is being recorded by a Court

1	Reporter and 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
5	and cell phones.
6	Does the staff have any preliminary
7	matters? If not, let us proceed with the
8	agenda.
9	MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir, staff has
10	nothing.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I do have two
12	preliminary matters. What I would like to do
13	this evening is kind of move the agenda around
14	for the sake of efficiency. Preliminary
15	matters we will take first and I do have a
16	preliminary matter. Consent calendar we will
17	take second. Final action we will take third.
18	Proposed action we will take fourth and
19	hearing action we will take fifth.
20	First under preliminary matters is
21	selection of Office of Zoning Director. As an

update on the status of the Director of the

Office of Zoning, we want to thank all of the applicants who applied for this important position. Something will be going out in the mail tomorrow.

Again, we're volunteers. We're doing the best we can, so if they hear it first from this webcast live, I apologize, but hopefully the United States Postal Service will get it to you as soon as possible.

We received applications from 8 candidates from all over the country. We have worked hard and diligently in filling this position. There has been a lot of give and take in getting to where we are today.

There has been a degree of controversy about the qualifications for the position and the overall selection process. We believe that we have carried out this process in a fair and balanced way.

The Office of Zoning is an awardwinning office and we are confident that this person will do everything in his power to make

NEAL R. GROSS

sure that it continues to remain so. We have chosen someone that we believe will continue the excellence of this independent agency.

I maintained all along, including my testimony at the City Council, that we had a process in place in fulfilling this position and we have completed that process. I am joined by my fellow Commissioners to announce that Mr. Jamison Weinbaum has been selected as the new Director of the Office of Zoning.

Mr. Weinbaum is scheduled to start his new position at the end of August. this time, I would like to thank Richard Nero for his role as Interim Director for the last 7 to 8 months or maybe even longer. Also, the Office of Zoning staff, also the Screening Panel which was put together and most of all I would like to thank the residents District of Columbia for giving us an opportunity to vet the process, make sure it was transparent.

And I will, at this time, open it

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 to my colleagues if they wanted to say
2	something. If not, we will do an official
3	action and it will just be the three Mayoral
4	comments can come from any one of my
5	colleagues, but the vote will come from the
6	three Mayoral Commissioners. Vice Chairman?
7	Commissioner May, did you
8	COMMISSIONER MAY: No thanks. I
9	always get excited at the opportunity to
10	comment, but I'll pass here. Thank you.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well, we
12	VICE CHAIRMAN KEATING: I'll make a
13	motion that we approve the selection of
14	Jamison Weinbaum for the position of Director
15	of the Office of Zoning.
16	COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Second.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Moved and properly
18	seconded. Any further discussion? Any
19	further discussion?
20	All those in favor?
21	ALL: Aye.
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Certainly not

hearing any opposition, there is only three of us and I heard everyone say aye, because they sit on the right and left side of me. Ms. Schellin, could you record the vote?

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Staff records the vote 3-0-0 to approve Jamison Weinbaum as the new Director of the Office of Zoning. Commissioner Keating making the motion, Commissioner Schlater seconding, Commissioner Hood in support and none opposed.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: And I will just say this, there was a lot of give and take, a lot of discussion. My two colleagues, I want to thank you both and I appreciate the opportunity to work with you on this and I think we have a win-win actually for us and for the District as a whole. So I want to thank you both and I appreciate it.

Okay. Moving right along with our agenda. Consent calendar, Zoning Commission Case No. 07-35A, Sheridan Terrace Redevelopment, LLC & DCHA - minor modification

NEAL R. GROSS

to PUD at Squares 5869 and 5872. Ms. Schellin?

MS. SCHELLIN: Staff has nothing further to add to this one other than to say that we did not receive a response from the ANCs in this case and I believe Commissioner Schlater has -- will not be participating in this case.

Okay. Thank you CHAIRMAN HOOD: very much. Colleagues, we have in front of us Exhibit 2, which is the formal action from the Interim Director of the Office of Zoning, Mr. Richard Nero. And I pay special attention to page 3 and their recommendation to us. It is recommended that the request for modification be granted as it is consistent with the intent the Commission to approve its original 07-35 and does not substantially Order No. impair the intent, purpose or integrity of the embodied Zone Plan as in the Zoning Regulations and Map Amendment.

Any further discussion? And we

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	also have Exhibit 1 and it talks about the
2	degrees of the modification. Apartment
3	building flex space modification. There is
4	one side yard adjustment. And a change in
5	Unit D-2.
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chairman?
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioner May?
8	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah. I have a
9	number of questions, because I'm rather
10	confused about the consistency of information.
11	There are three areas where the project will
12	change, albeit, I think, in minor ways, but I
13	think the record ought to be clear.
14	There was a decrease in parking
15	spaces. And what is written in the text is
16	that it would be reduced from 65 to 55, but
17	what shows up in the drawings is a reduction
18	of 8 spaces. So is it 8 or is it 10? And
19	that's one question I have.
20	Then I have a couple of others.
21	Maybe

NEAL R. GROSS

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I'm not sure

1	who there's always someone new at every
2	meeting. I'm not sure how we normally get the
3	response.
4	MS. SCHELLIN: Well, I'm sorry, I
5	didn't hear what his question was.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: The issue is the
7	parking spaces. We have conflicting
8	information.
9	COMMISSIONER MAY: Commissioner
10	Keating pointed out that it says 63 to 55, not
11	65 to 55. There was one document I have here
12	that says 65 to 55.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: One of them says 65
14	to 55 and the other one
15	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. And that
16	was the Office of Zoning summary, so all
17	right, I'll that clarifies that question.
18	Next is the reduction in side yard refers to
19	Lots 5 and 14. And I did check this in both
20	documents. And what shows up in the plans is
21	a reference to Lot No. 16, not 5 or 14. So I

-- and it's not clear that -- I mean, 16 could

1	actually be 14, but I don't see any indication
2	that 5 is changing.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Schellin, whose
4	case is this?
5	MS. SCHELLIN: Ms. Giordano's.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Giordano. I'm
7	going to do this, Ms. Giordano, if you can
8	come forward and give us some clarification on
9	the record? Yes, she's here.
10	Ms. Giordano, we hope that your
11	daughter is doing well. I don't want to put
12	all that out, but I was able to watch the
13	news.
14	MS. GIORDANO: She's fine. Thanks.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, good.
16	MS. GIORDANO: Thanks very much.
17	The correct is reduction in parking spaces is
18	63 to 55 spaces.
19	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. That one
20	was okay. It's the lots with the side yard
21	have been reduced.
22	MS. GIORDANO: It's only one lot

1	that is affected and
2	COMMISSIONER MAY: And it's Lot 16?
3	MS. GIORDANO: I believe so.
4	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. So all
5	right. And then the last question I had is
6	that, just so I'm clear on this, there are
7	actually going to be 14 units that are going
8	to be reduced in height by about 10 feet.
9	MS. GIORDANO: That's correct.
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. And what
11	we have is one of those elevations shows the
12	height after the reduction, but we don't see
13	all of the other ones where it has been
14	reduced.
15	MS. GIORDANO: I think it is one
16	basic model.
17	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah, but it
18	appears in a number of different locations in
19	the project.
20	MS. GIORDANO: That's correct.
21	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right?
22	MS. GIORDANO: Um-hum.

COMMISSIONER MAY: So it affects
potentially a number of those elevations of
all those townhouses?
MS. GIORDANO: Do you want to see
them all? I mean, we could submit them.
COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah. I don't
know if anybody else really wants to see that,
but 14 units and all of those elevations that
are very carefully composed, to me, is
something that I would to see what they all
look like. But I may be the only one who
wants to see them.
CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well, let me handle
it like this. I don't know what our
requirements are, but if it gives you cause or
pause, Commissioner May, we may be able to
deal with this for about 5 minutes on
Thursday.
MS. GIORDANO: Oh, that would be
helpful, because the applicant is trying to
pull the permit in early fall.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Would

2	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah, I would
3	just like to see the elevation before we vote
4	on it, just to know what it is going to look
5	like.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
7	COMMISSIONER MAY: I mean, it looks
8	reasonable enough in this circumstance,
9	because it happens at the end of a row of
10	similar buildings before you get to a very
11	different building and it looks like a fitting
12	kind of transition piece, but if it's in a row
13	of a bunch of other buildings that are exactly
14	the same, it's going to look like, you know,
15	broken
16	MS. GIORDANO: Right.
17	COMMISSIONER MAY: teeth or
18	something.
19	MS. GIORDANO: Can I introduce the
20	developer directly to
21	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, please.
22	MS. GIORDANO: respond? Matt

that --

1	Engel.
2	MR. ENGEL: Hi, Commissioner May.
3	COMMISSIONER MAY: Thank you.
4	MR. ENGEL: We actually that
5	form that you are looking at
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah.
7	MR. ENGEL: repeats itself 14
8	times.
9	COMMISSIONER MAY: That exact
LO	MR. ENGEL: That exact
11	COMMISSIONER MAY: so you've got
12	three buildings
L3	MR. ENGEL: point.
L4	COMMISSIONER MAY: of a similar
L5	kind of treatment and then one where it is
L6	going to drop town to two stories?
L7	MR. ENGEL: The only difference is
L8	in one case it goes to four buildings and then
L9	it drops down.
20	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay.
21	MR. ENGEL: But it's the same.
22	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. And are

1	these the ones that are sort of lined up
2	perpendicular to the parkway, the Sheridan
3	Place or whatever?
4	MR. ENGEL: They are perpendicular
5	to the parkway, that's correct.
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay.
7	MR. ENGEL: Yeah.
8	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. All
9	right. Well, that helps me a lot. I think
10	I'm okay with that. If it's going to be the
11	same essentially look the same here on all
12	of those circumstances
13	MR. ENGEL: Yeah. What I would do
14	is I would send you 14 copies of that, which
15	probably wouldn't be helpful to you.
16	COMMISSIONER MAY: No, I don't need
17	that. Thank you. All right. That's good.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Vice Chair
19	Keating?
20	VICE CHAIRMAN KEATING: I just
21	wanted to come back one second to this side
22	yard issue, because I guess I'm just still not

1	sure. The letter, which is our Exhibit 1,
2	dated June 29 th from Cynthia Giordano, No. 2
3	says Lots 5 and 14 both had side lots of 5
4	feet and now are proposing to reduce both
5	yards to 2.5 feet.
6	And then the picture here is Lot
7	16. Is Lot 5 being reduced or not?
8	MS. GIORDANO: Just the picture.
9	VICE CHAIRMAN KEATING: Just not
10	this?
11	MS. GIORDANO: Lot 16, right.
12	VICE CHAIRMAN KEATING: Okay. And
13	that's going to 2.5 feet, not the 2 feet in
14	the picture, because the picture says 2 feet.
15	MR. ENGEL: I believe it's 2.5
16	feet.
17	VICE CHAIRMAN KEATING: So it's a
18	combination of the picture and the letter?
19	MR. ENGEL: There seems to be some
20	discrepancy there.
21	VICE CHAIRMAN KEATING: Can we just
22	clarity that?

1 MR. ENGEL: It's one side yard. VICE CHAIRMAN KEATING: 2 Okay. And it's going from 5 MR. ENGEL: 3 to 2.5 feet. 4 5 VICE CHAIRMAN KEATING: Okay, okay, okay. 6 7 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Here's what we're going to do, colleagues, I think, unless, Mr. 8 Turnbull, you have something else you want to 9 I think what we'll do is we'll deal with 10 this Thursday at 6:20, this coming Thursday. 11 And I would move that we waive our regulation 12 13 of 3-005.3, which requires 4 days posting of a we can deal with meeting notice, 14 SO 15 clarification issues before we vote on this 16 and we'll do it this coming Thursday, because I think this coming Thursday is the last time 17 we'll be having a hearing until September. 18 19 VICE CHAIRMAN KEATING: Right. CHAIRMAN HOOD: So we will move in 20 that fashion. Ms. Giordano, will that meet 21

your --

1 MS. GIORDANO: That's fine, thank 2 you very much. COMMISSIONER MAY: May I suggest 3 that we get a letter clarifying that we don't 4 need to have the multiple 14 copies of the 5 same elevation. 6 7 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yeah, okay. COMMISSIONER MAY: Thanks. 8 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. 9 10 will deal with this on -- the announcement -we will deal with this Thursday at 6:20. 11 Final action. 12 Okav. Moving our 13 agenda around, we'll go to final action. Zoning Commission Case No. 02-06. This is the 14 15 Neighborhood Commercial Overlay District. 16 Schellin? MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, I believe Mr. 17 Bergstein will probably better lead into this, 18 19 the Neighborhood Commercial Overlay District. This is a case from the past and I think he 20 is probably better fit to lead in for this, 21 because, Chairman Hood, as you know, you are 22

the only one who was here other than Mr. May, who was here and wearing another hat actually.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Mr.

Bergstein?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. BERGSTEIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This case concerns a petition that was actually initiated by the Office of Zoning Notice in response DCRA to Interpretations way of calculating of the ground floor, linear street frontage of eating and drinking establishments.

And so the Commission advertised a proposed text and after several hearings and iterations, we still have this up for final But at the same time recently, the action. Commission held a hearing in Zoning Commission Case 08-06-05, which is part of the 7RR process that concerned Commercial Zones, but specifically looked at the type of zoning tool is, at this point, limited to Commercial Neighborhood Overlay, which is a limitation eating drinking on and

establishments.

And as part of the ZRR process, the working group is going to look to both refine that tool and apply it as a broader tool for neighborhoods that might need to limit that and other type of uses.

So since the topic is being revisited in a larger context, I wrote a memorandum to you recommending along with the Office of Planning that you consolidate this Case 02-06 with Case No. 08-06-5. And if there is any other questions, I would be happy to answer them.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you,
Mr. Bergstein. Any -- I guess we would need
to -- if we decide to do that, we'll need a
motion.

MR. BERGSTEIN: I would suggest a motion, sir.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, okay.

MR. BERGSTEIN: And just for the record, because this is purely procedural,

there is no limitation on participation based upon persons who did not appear, who did not hear the hearing or participated in the past meetings.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right.

Okay. We have before us a request or rather a recommendation from the OAG and I think they have been working collaboratively that we combine two cases which are primarily the same. And what I would like to do, at this time, let me just open it up for comments. Any comments?

Okay. I would move that we consolidate Case No. 02-06, Text Amendment to Neighborhood Commercial Overlay District, limitation for eating and drinking establishments with Zoning Commission Case 08-065, Comprehensive Zoning Regulations Rewrite, Commercial Zones, Mapping and Use Principles and ask for a second.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Second.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any further

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	discussion?
2	All those in favor?
3	ALL: Aye.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing no
5	objection, Ms. Schellin, would you, please,
6	record the vote?
7	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, staff records
8	the vote 5-0-0 to consolidate Zoning
9	Commission Case 02-06 with Zoning Commission
10	Case 08-06-5. Commissioner Hood moving,
11	Commissioner Turnbull seconding, Commissioners
12	Keating, May and Schlater in support.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let's move
14	right along.
15	Zoning Commission Case No. 09-07,
16	Scott and Kristen Franklin, Map Amendment to
17	R-4 Zone District at 2269 Cathedral Avenue,
18	N.W. Ms. Schellin?
19	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, this case is
20	before you for final action. We do have an
21	
	NCPC report that was received at Exhibit 27.

1	reported no adverse findings.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Also, Ms.
3	Schellin, I have an Office of Planning report
4	for June 9 th , Exhibit 22.
5	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right.
7	And I think we need to did we do this
8	already?
9	MS. SCHELLIN: Actually, that OP
LO	report was previously received. There was
11	just for some reason an extra copy added to
L2	your package this time. But you have already
L3	seen that report.
L4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So we have already
L5	done the waiving.
L6	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.
L7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let's move
L8	on. Let me open it up for comments from my
L9	colleagues. Okay. With that, and I think we
20	hashed a lot of this out, especially during
21	the proposed.

I would move that we approve Zoning

1 Commission Case No. 09-07 and ask 2 second. COMMISSIONER MAY: Second. 3 4 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Moved and properly seconded. Any further discussion? I'll just 5 so note as Ms. Schellin has already mentioned 6 7 the NCPC report, no adverse impact, Exhibit No. 27. 8 All those in favor? 9 10 ALL: Aye. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing 11 opposition, Ms. Schellin, would you record the 12 13 vote? MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Staff records 14 15 the vote 4-0-1 to approve Zoning Commission 16 Case No. 09-07. Commissioner Hood moving, seconding, Commissioner 17 Commissioner May Schlater and Turnbull in support, Commissioner 18 19 Keating not voting having not participated. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. 20 Next, Zoning Commission Case No. 02-51C, this is Center for 21 Strategic & International Studies, Inc., 22

1	Stage PUD at 1616 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W.
2	Ms. Schellin?
3	MS. SCHELLIN: Again, we have
4	received an NCPC report at Exhibit 26. This
5	report too was received on July 16 th and again,
6	they found no adverse findings.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let's open
8	it up for discussion. Any discussion?
9	If not, I will tell you the motion
LO	and we have already talked about NCPC report,
L1	which is in the packet.
L2	I would move approval of Zoning
L3	Commission Case No. 02-51C and ask for a
L4	second.
L5	COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Second.
L6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Moved and properly
L7	seconded, any further discussion?
L8	All those in favor?
L9	ALL: Aye.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing any
21	opposition, Ms. Schellin, would you record the
22	vote?

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, staff records
the vote 4-0-1 to approve Zoning Commission
Case No. 02-51C. Commissioner Hood moving,
Commissioner Schlater seconding, Commissioners
Keating and May in support, Commissioner
Turnbull not voting having not participated.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: What I would like
to do, colleagues, is that we move D, E, F and

All these are in block. 2 year time extensions and I would ask when we get to the discussion, colleagues, if you have of discussion on one those particular alphabets, that we raise the issue or concern then at that time.

So I would move Zoning Commission Case No. 06-43A, Zoning Commission Case No. 06-29A, Zoning Commission Case No. 05-17C/05-32C, Zoning Commission Case No. 06-31B, these are all 2 year time extensions, and I ask for a second.

MS. SCHELLIN: Excuse me, Chairman Hood, one of them is a 3 year, I believe -- 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

take that back. They are all 2 year time extensions. I take that back.

COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Second.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. It has been moved and properly seconded. Let's open it up. Any discussion? I would just say on the ANC -- well, I would -- you know what, I messed up.

We have -- this is the discussion.

We have an ANC letter that was submitted and

I think we have to waive our rules. Do we
have to open the record to accept it for the

ANC letter we got?

COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: 6-43A.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, 6-43A. So we're fine. Okay. All right. Well, anyway, we have a letter from ANC-3D. Also a letter—the vote was 6-2 for the time extension. And this is D. Also, we have from Single Member District Thomas M. Smith who cites his reasons in Exhibit 5, yeah, Exhibit 5, of why he thinks that we should not approve it or asking

NEAL R. GROSS

for further clarification or more time for the community to be able to weigh in.

I think that, from my standpoint, the ANC as a whole voted and more credence 6-2. I think that they would -- I would -- my vote is going to be in favor of the time extension, because of what is noted on Exhibit No. 4.

And basically, when I look at page 3, the inability to obtain sufficient project economic financing due to and market conditions beyond the applicant's reasonable control, as we have said in the past, we're starting to see a lot of that. The applicant is asking for the Commission to extend the period, time frame to construct their approved unprecedent project due to the negative economic circumstances. And I think that gets it for me.

Any other discussion on any of them?

COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chairman?

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioner May?

COMMISSIONER MAY: 06-43A, I would just note that the ANC's approval 6-2 did include a caveat that there be -- that the contribution of the increased traffic be included in the campus plan. I think that would result from this building being constructed.

And I think it is pretty reasonable to expect that all of the traffic implications of the campus will be addressed when the plan comes up for review in the future. I don't -- and I also don't think it is necessarily appropriate to make that some sort of a condition of whatever we decide today. But I certainly expect that we will delve into that issue deeply when it comes time to approve the campus plan.

With regard to one of the other cases where we have concerns addressed by the community, it is 06-31B, I think is the one. Forgive me while I fumble through and find the

NEAL R. GROSS

1	right piece of paper and I'm not sure I'm
2	finding it.
3	Oh, yeah, there was a concern that
4	the benefits package associated with it has
5	been more or less overtaken by events that it
6	was somewhat out of date. And I think that
7	that's while that is understandable, it may
8	need to be addressed at some point in the
9	future as the project moves forward. That's
10	not really what is before us today.
11	The question is whether the real
12	meat of the project has changed in any
13	substantive way, which it has not, and is
14	there a good reason for the extension and
15	there is. And so therefore, I'm comfortable
16	moving ahead.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. And also
18	on
19	COMMISSIONER MAY: Was that the
20	right one? That was the right one. Yeah, it
21	was the right project. Sorry.
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let me also add,

2	COMMISSIONER MAY: That was 06-31B.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, okay. Anyone
4	else? Anything else? I just wanted to
5	comment. We left out two items from the
6	Council Member of Ward 3, Council Member Cheh,
7	also endorsing the PUD extension for 06-31.
8	And also, we have a letter from Neighbors for
9	Liveable Community, they actually are
10	supporting one of the Commissioners who we
11	received a letter from who was in opposition
12	of this moving forward.
13	And with all of that, I would stand
14	on what I spoke about previously, which was
15	submitted by the applicant about the negative
16	economic impacts at this point in time.
17	Okay. Anything else?
18	COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: I have a
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioner
20	Schlater?
21	COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: quick
22	question of either the Secretary or OAG. How
	NEAL D. ODGGG

what number was that you were just doing?

far in advance before the expiration of the order can you ask for the time request? Is it as soon as it gets approval you can say there is economic hardship?

MR. BERGSTEIN: There's nothing in the regulations that governs that.

COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Because I just will note that some of these were just approved last year and still have another year of effectiveness under the orders. That may be something to think about in the future. I have no objection to granting the approvals right now.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: That's a very good But anyway, we will deal with that as point. we get to that point, but I would agree that they still have some more time typically, but I don't know. Just for me, the merits, Commissioner Schlater, the record was It's a very compelling story. complete. will tell you I have not always believed that, but here recently in the last few months or

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	so, I definitely believe the economic
2	hardships. Okay.
3	VICE CHAIRMAN KEATING: Can I just
4	get a point of clarification then, based on
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.
6	VICE CHAIRMAN KEATING: When does
7	the clock start ticking for the 2 year
8	extension? Is it today or is it from the time
9	in which their initial approval ends?
10	MR. BERGSTEIN: Well, the extension
11	is from the 2 year starts from the
12	effective date of the order, unless there is
13	an appeal, in which case the applicant could
14	choose to toll the 2 year period until the
15	completion of the appeal process. Is that the
16	question you are asking?
17	VICE CHAIRMAN KEATING: Yes.
18	MR. BERGSTEIN: And so the
19	extension is from the expiration date of the
20	order. It doesn't begin upon the vote.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Anything else?
22	Someone ready on this? Okay. It has been

discussion?
All those in favor on time
extensions on D, E, F and G? Okay. Any
further discussion on that? Okay.
All those in favor?
ALL: Aye.
CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing any
opposition, Ms. Schellin, would you record the
vote?
MS. SCHELLIN: The staff records
the vote 5-0-0 to approve the time extensions
requested in Zoning Commission Case Nos. 06-
43A, 06-29A, 05-17C/05-32C and 06-31B.
Commissioner Hood moving, Commissioner Keating
seconding, Commissioners May, Schlater and
Turnbull in support.
CHAIRMAN HOOD: I shouldn't expose
myself, but never come out and try to Chair a
hearing with three agendas with something

Let me go back to final action, ${\tt Ms.}$

1 Schellin. Did we -- when we recorded those 2 votes, there were some Commissioners that were not participating. I'm sure you picked all 3 4 that up? MS. SCHELLIN: 5 Yes. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Good. Thank 6 7 Okay. Let's go into proposed action. 8 As stated I'm going to move Zoning No. 08-33, which Commission is 9 Case 10 Conference Center first, and we will do Zoning Commission Case No. 08-21, the Athena Group, 11 second. 12 13 Zoning Commission Case No. 08 - 33,Conference Associates, 14 Center LLC, Consolidated PUD 1st Stage PUD and Related Map 15 16 Amendment in Parcels 121 and 31. Ms. Schellin? 17 SCHELLIN: Staff has nothing MS. 18 19 further to add to this one, other than to advise that Commissioner Keating did not 20 participate on this case. 21

NEAL R. GROSS

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Colleagues,

as you see, we have some submittals. We have Exhibit 35, 36 and 37 and I think, for me, while I know the applicant supplied us with some information that we asked, if we look at Exhibit 36, we will see some of the things that were requested possibly by us, some things that we needed further clarification from.

But let me just comment on the letter from Council Member Ward 5, who is again reiterating his support for the Conference Center. And after so many years, he is glad to see this moving forward, since 1986. The team has been working on this project since 1986.

Okay. Exhibit 36, I would like for just look at it. us to We have some in the applicant's submission, submittals revised roof plan, additional analysis regarding the proposed treatment of Michigan Avenue and also it comes with that 37, which is DDOT's report.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

of Discussion the applicant's commitment to satisfying applicable the Inclusionary Zoning requirements. I'm not sure who asked for what. And then an update discussion between applicant and on representatives of the Urban Forestry Administration.

Okay. With that, I'll open it up for comments. I will tell you that there are some things -- you know what, let me open it up for comments. Any comments?

COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chairman, I would just note that one of the issues that I had taken a particular interest in which was the configuration of the penthouse and how far it setback from the exterior walls, was particularly the walls facing on Michigan it looks like that Avenue and addressed relatively well.

We certainly see it in plan that it has been pushed back to a minimum of 17.6 inch setback over most of Michigan Avenue. And the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

height was reduced to 17.6. So it meets the 1 2 1:1 requirement, which I think is important. And then there is a small section 3 4 at the point where the two wings of building come together, sort of the T-shape, 5 where it narrows down to 10.6, but I think 6 7 that's probably not too bad a thing, although it's a little hard to tell without having a 8 new version of those beautiful renderings that 9 10 had been done. And so it might be worthwhile to 11 see that, depending on what other action the 12 13 Commission decides to take today. But I do see that there has been significant change on 14 that front. And that's what I would choose to 15 comment on. I think others have comments. 16 Okay. 17 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Is that an item that we could possibly look at for final? 18 19 COMMISSIONER MAY: Absolutely. would be comfortable just looking at that at 20 final or just seeing that rendering again. 21

NEAL R. GROSS

HOOD:

CHAIRMAN

22

Anybody

Okay.

1	else? Commissioner Turnbull?
2	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I would
3	just agree with Commissioner May. I think the
4	thing about the 10 foot 6 is that it's a pinch
5	point.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yeah.
7	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: And it has
8	a bigger area on one side and then it opens up
9	a bit, so it's I wouldn't that wouldn't
10	really bother me that much. But I can see the
11	concern about it though.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioner
13	Schlater?
14	COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Um, I would
15	say that I would reiterate my comments from
16	last time that I think this is an excellent
17	project for the neighborhood. I'm looking
18	forward to seeing it move forward.
19	I will say that there was one thing
20	that we're hoping to get maybe a little bit
21	more information on, and I'm not sure exactly
22	what we asked for at the time of the hearing,

but I seem to recollect asking for some new renderings of the Michigan Avenue facade of the structured parking garage.

And while I certainly support this PUD moving forward and want to see it move forward as quickly as possible, I would like to see, you know, a rendering of how they are planning to improve that facade and not just leave it up to the architect's devices as they move forward to construction drawings.

So I would make a recommendation that we move this PUD today and then when it comes back -- before it comes back for final action, maybe we could get proposed -- revised renderings.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I'll second that. So you moved and I'm going to second it. But further discussion? Let me just acknowledge the DDOT report and I'll call off a few issues.

And I think, if I remember correctly, Commissioner Schlater mentioned

NEAL R. GROSS

that some of this will be dealt with during the public review process -- Public Space. You actually mentioned that at the hearing, if I recall. See it was recent enough, we can remember.

But I will tell you that -- let's just look at Exhibit 37. Let's just kind of walk through this letter. I have a few places highlighted if anyone wants to comment or move on it or see what we need to do to further along the cause.

DDOT firmly believes that right-in, right-out restrictions for the Michigan Avenue point is the safest access and most appropriate vehicle turn movement for the proposed site. The restrictions be can building encompassed bу а cartway infrastructure to supporting the turn movements.

I'm not sure where my colleagues stand with that. I do know that we have a design or some type of design. I don't know

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

what -- it's the second page of Exhibit 37.

If it moves you, must speak up. These are some of the things that I highlighted.

The applicant's proposal is shown Exhibit B. Ιt does not meet DDOT's standards for intersection redesign and the use of stop signs at the signalized intersection as proposed is prohibited. And I know that the applicant is going to have to get some sign-offs, I think, later from DDOT.

The other one that -- the applicant has suggested that it can require the Washington Hospital Center employees who currently park at the existing parking lot to use the signalized Irving Street entrance once the traffic signal has been installed.

DDOT believes this is an action item that should be made part of our Zoning Order. I think we can actually condition that and we can do that if -- unless my colleagues object.

No, I'm sorry. And then DDOT

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

believes that key fob controlled entrance/exit near the Irving Street point of access will serve as the best means to gain access to the Washington Hospital Center employee parking. I'm not sure if that came up at the hearing. I would just ask that at least those four points that we have some kind of response from the applicant before we take final.

It seems as though everything that we have requested, I think we can get at final. And also, I would just -- yeah, before we get final, yeah.

COMMISSIONER MAY: I would agree I think that there has clearly with that. been some further discussions with DDOT to resolve what we think are some potentially problematic automobile movements and they are They just haven't quite making progress. finished it. There are certain things that we can incorporate in the order that we know about, at this point, but with a little bit work hopefully we it all more can get

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	finalized before it comes to us for final.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: And I think that
3	there is, obviously, still some ongoing
4	dialogue with the applicant. I think, yeah,
5	this is the right case. There is some ongoing
6	dialogue with the applicant and DDOT, even as
7	we sit here today. They are still having
8	discussions.
9	So unless there is anything else, I
10	would move that we approve Zoning Commission
11	Case No. 08-33, the Conference Center
12	Associates, LLC and ask for a second.
13	COMMISSIONER MAY: Second.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: And I would just
15	add to my motion that the things that we
16	discussed before final be given to us before
17	final action. Any further discussion?
18	All those in favor?
19	ALL: Aye.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing any
21	opposition, staff would you record the vote
22	with those who participated?

1	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Staff records
2	the vote 4-0-1 to approve the proposed action
3	in Zoning Commission Case No. 08-33 with the
4	items due by final action, as discussed on the
5	dias. Commissioner Hood moving, Commissioner
6	May seconding, Commissioners Schlater and
7	Turnbull in support, Commissioner Keating not
8	voting having not participated.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you,
10	Ms. Schellin. Let's move right along with the
11	agenda. Let's go to Zoning Commission Case
12	No. 08-21, The Athena Group, Consolidated PUD
13	and Related Map Amendment at 4460 MacArthur
14	Boulevard, N.W. Ms. Schellin?
15	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, a couple of
16	things. The first thing just to confirm on
17	the record that Commissioner Schlater was
18	provided with the full record of this case and
19	to confirm that he has read the record and
20	will be participating in this case.
21	COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: I have and

I will.

1	MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. And then we
2	did receive we have three exhibits that
3	were received after the record closed. If the
4	Commission desires to reopen the record to
5	accept them, they were Exhibits 91, 97 and 98.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I would move that
7	we open the record and accept Exhibits 91, 97
8	I mean, 97 and 98 and ask for a second.
9	COMMISSIONER MAY: Second.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Moved and properly
11	seconded. Further discussion?
12	All those in favor?
13	ALL: Aye.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing any
15	objection, Ms. Schellin, would you record the
16	vote?
17	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Staff records
18	the vote 5-0-0 to reopen the record to accept
19	Exhibits 91, 97 and 98. Commissioner Hood
20	moving, Commissioner May seconding,
21	Commissioners Keating, Schlater and Turnbull
22	in support.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Okay. We have -- we asked for a lot of refining. To go back, we asked the applicant to go back and look at a lot of things. I will tell you that even in some of the letters I saw, there was mention of significant changes. I'm not going to say improvement, but changes. I'm sure the applicant would probably say improvement and changes and the community will probably say we're getting there.

But I think it's evident that the applicant has been working. While they have not -- the community, from what I have reviewed, has not fully agreed with what is before us tonight. I think this applicant has done a lot to get at least closer to where my colleagues would like to be.

So with that, I would just say that we have asked for -- we have Exhibits 87 through 98 are some of the things we asked for through the tailend of the process. And what I would like to do is to open it up for any

NEAL R. GROSS

comments or concerns that you have and have they been addressed? Do we need further submissions from the applicant?

And I would just like to open it up and let's have a discussion. Commissioner May?

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. Mr. Chairman, I would like to echo that the --what you said before about the reports that we got in here that a number of letters cited the changes have been made to the project. In fact, when I read the very first one and it sounded so very positive, I was getting my hopes up really high and then by the second paragraph, I was a little disappointed again.

But I think it is significant, there has been, I think, some substantial improvement in the project. I think that the elimination of the fourth floor on one of the buildings was an improvement. And the changes to the affordable units is also a significant improvement.

NEAL R. GROSS

I think that the final -- oh, and the reduced -- the reduction of the number of units by another two units also an improvement. And I think this project has improved significantly.

I think the area where there -well, the biggest area where it doesn't seem
like we are going to reach a full conclusion
or a satisfactory conclusion for the
neighborhood is on the issue of the height and
the absolute need to reduce the heights of
buildings to three stories on every single
building.

I'm not sure I totally agree with that position, but I certainly understand where it is coming from.

There is, I think, however, another issue that I do feel does need to be addressed and I'm not sure how best to address it and that is the issue of the FAR and the -- you know, whether the private streets can be counted in the overall lot area when

NEAL R. GROSS

calculating the FAR.

And having studied this issue now since the last hearing and based on the submissions that we have gotten, I pretty firmly believe that we need to subtract the public -- or the public -- sorry, the private streets from the calculation of the total lot area, which effectively pushes the FAR over 1.0. We don't have an exact calculation of how far over it is.

As I understand it, based on some past cases, but also the sort of inherent logic of how shared driveways are treated in zoning cases, it is possible to treat the alleyway between Buildings 1 and 2 as part of the overall lot calculation, because shared driveways can be considered in that overall lot size.

But even with that calculation, it is still not likely to bring it down below 1.0. So I think there is still a little bit of -- well, first of all, we need to have a

NEAL R. GROSS

really firm calculation of what the numbers are. But also, I think it needs to get down to where we can approve it, which is 1.0 plus whatever flexibility we have under the PUD rules.

I don't think that we can -- that it is appropriate for us to grant flexibility in the area of how this is calculated. I think that how we calculate it has to be consistent for all projects. And it is just common sense that we shouldn't include the roadways in the overall lot area, even if they are privately owned. I just think it's nonsensical to me.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I would say this, Commissioner May, I think you bring up a good point and I know we have grappled in the past with that. I'm not sure exactly how we can proceed, but I would suggest that we deal with the other issues, because, for me, that is the sticking point, because if it's over that flexibility, then I think we are out of

NEAL R. GROSS

compliance with our own regulations and we can't do that.

I don't know whether I asked for a briefing. Now, I look to Mr. Bergstein on that issue, maybe we asked for the calculations on the briefing paper or whatever from the applicant. And I think we would have to give the parties a chance to do that. I'm not sure.

MR. BERGSTEIN: Well, the parties should opportunity to respond to get an whatever you asked the applicant to submit. But as I hear it, the question is what is the -- how is the FAR calculated for the 1.0 cap? Is it the FAR that excludes the streets, which is the 2516 standard or is it different calculation assuming that the 2516 standard is not complied with, but there is a degree of flexibility?

So what you would be asking for is for the applicant to provide the FAR computation for the record lot excluding 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

private streets, as if they were public streets. And then you could allow the opposition to respond to the accuracy of the calculation.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Bergstein, for helping me simplify that. That's one of the things, I think, that we will -- I don't know if we could get that before Thursday, but let me see what else we have on the docket. Let's see what else we have pertaining to that on the docket.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes?

COMMISSIONER MAY: I would also point out the way we request the calculation, that we have some very clear diagrams of what is included in the calculation and what is not, because there are some things like the parallel parking spaces which, you know, on a normal public street are part of the street, but maybe in this circumstance they are not really, because they are often in the private

NEAL R. GROSS

property.

I don't know, but I think that there ought to be -- it ought to be very clear what's in and what's out. And you know, I think that there may be some room for discussion about what should be in and what should be out, but I think the basic streets that are the public ways ought to be out of the calculation.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Commissioner Schlater?

COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: I just have a quick question of OAG. Mr. Bergstein, looking at the applicant's post-hearing submission, they reference their method of calculation for the FAR. And they say "This method was used by the Zoning Commission in St. Paul's College PUD, Stanton Square PUD, Fort Lincoln Townhouse PUD and the 6000 New Hampshire Avenue PUD, to name a few." Is that true?

MR. BERGSTEIN: I believe it likely

NEAL R. GROSS

is true. I read what I think in those cases, applicant did provide the the Zoning Commission numbers, but I think I found the cases that were all involved. And indeed, they all were applications like this involved theoretical lots brought under 2516, but none of the decisions, that I read when zoning flexibility was discussed, mentioned the inclusion of the private streets as the zoning flex -- as part of zoning flexibility sought.

therefore, the computation And occurred including the land or the streets without specifically calling it out. So there is nothing that I read in the orders that would make me think that the Zoning Commission that, in fact, was aware one of the prerequisites, one of the computational devices used in 2516 was not being used by the applicants in that case.

But I stand to be corrected, because all I did was briefly read the orders

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

and look at the zoning flexibility that was being requested.

COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: I wonder if at the same time if we do ask for this calculation of the applicant, whether the Office of Planning can go back and look at those referenced PUDs, find out what the FAR would have been relative to what they were allowed? If that other standard had been applied. Is that possible?

MS. STEINGASSER: It's certainly possible for us to go back and check and see how they were calculated. Whether we can actually recalculate an FAR, but we will give it our best shot. We will absolutely.

COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Well, I guess what just my concern is is that we are very late in the process here in analyzing this PUD. And we may be raising a standard that hasn't been applied to other cases and to some, that might be viewed as unfair.

I would like to know what -- I

NEAL R. GROSS

would like the information. I would like reliable information the on what actual calculations definitely are, I support so that Commissioner May in request. But likewise, I would just like to know how the standard has been applied in the past and I don't want to necessarily start new precedent with this case.

COMMISSIONER MAY: You know, think I appreciate that concern, but I also think that if we have made a mistake in the past, we shouldn't keep repeating it simply because we didn't notice it before. And so I think that there -- I mean, it would be interesting to know what has been done in the past, but I don't think that we should be afraid of looking at -- you know, trying to look at the regulations and determining ourselves what is the right way from this point forward and deciding it on that basis.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Chair,

I would go along with both Commissioner May

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

and Commissioner Schlater. I think we need to do this analysis. We need to develop a consistency, so that this Commission doesn't get stuck in the same position again. I think it would be good for us to know exactly what has been done in the past and what should be going ahead in the future.

I think at the applicant -- an applicant coming before this Commission needs to deal with consistency. Just like it does before the BZA. I think they have to know this is what is going to happen. We know they are going to look at it like this. So I would echo Commissioner May's concern, but also Commissioner Schlater, so excellent point on being late in the game here.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Uh, okay. So we will put that in the parking lot if there are enough spaces. We'll hold off on that. Let's see if there are some other issues that we had. And you know, I looked at some of the opposition and Mr. Tucker's letter really

NEAL R. GROSS

popped out at me, not that I didn't look at Palisades and the ANC, but he goes on to talk about this.

He seems to think with more time, he says "Time constraints have not allowed for full resolution and execution of a tentative agreement. The conclusion of a satisfactory agreement with Athena is an essential condition."

We don't get into the -- it's not our position to push agreements between the community and the applicant. But it looks like -- and I'm not sure if Mr. Tucker is also speaking for everyone in opposition or just for the president -- I mean, for the Canal View Homeowners Association. It looks like discussions are taking place.

It looks like the -- they are still working together from the way I read the submittal, unless somebody reads it differently. And it looks like that's an opportune time. But I will say from what I

NEAL R. GROSS

have reviewed and I said this early on, it looks like the applicant has made a lot of changes in trying to come closer to what the community has requested.

Are we going to get there fully?

I'm not sure. And I just wanted to know if

anyone wanted to encourage that, what was

written in Exhibit 93, that's another side

bar. I mean another parking lot issue.

Any other issues that -- so it would be predictable when Athena, the applicant and the community come back. And, Ms. Schellin, I will say that we cannot do Thursday, because after I thought about it, today is Monday and we want to make sure they get responses back for the FAR computations. So that's out of the question. That's not going to work. You know that's not going to work already.

Anything else?

COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Is it possible to get the computations and the

NEAL R. GROSS

analysis before final action, if we were to go that route?

can I respond to that? I think the thing that makes me uncomfortable there is that if the project as it exists right now can't be calculated at an FAR that is approvable, in other words 1.05 or less, you know, we don't really know what it is. And so potentially, we could be voting to approve something that we don't -- that is beyond our authority to approve.

So I think we need to know for sure that this -- we need to take a stand about how it is measured and then we need to know that it is 1.05 or less before we take a vote. That would be my take on the matter.

COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Um, I understand Commissioner May's position. I just think the case has been dragging on for a long time and I don't know. It's certainly not a new issue. And I would like to see if--

NEAL R. GROSS

well, I'll just say I have had the benefit of reading the record, the entire record fresh, seeing where it is -- where it began and where it ends.

I know there are concerns in the I know there community about height. are concerns in the community about density. But I think a lot of those concerns have been addressed over time. And I think overall when you look at the total context οf this development, it is a development that is going to be -- it's going to reflect very well upon the neighborhood. And it is going represent very high quality development and that's something we are certainly here to support.

And so reading the case, it has just been -- it has been well over a year since it started and it has been dragging along. So I would just look to the other Commissioners to see if there is any way to see if we can move it forward, because it is 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

case that -- assuming we can get through this one issue on the FAR limitation, that I would like to see move forward.

MR. BERGSTEIN: Can I just address a procedural issue? Proposed action, purpose of proposed action is really satisfy the charter requirement that when there is a proposed change in the Zoning Map, as is being requested here, it must be sent to NCPC for a period of review. That's why when you do special exceptions there is only one vote.

So when you take proposed action, you are not really approving the project in its entirety, but you are saying the project is at a point now where NCPC can provide us its advice concerning whether or not the proposed Map Amendment is consistent with the federal elements of the Comprehensive Plan.

It really has no other procedural or precedential effect than that. And I just wanted to share at least my view of what

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

proposed action is with you.

and hear from my other colleagues. Apparently we have two issues at hand. I just wanted to hear from -- what Commissioner May is saying is if we're over the FAR and we essentially approve something that we are not authorized even to approve anyway, because we go by flexibility, which is what .5 or whatever it is or .05.

But anyway, Commissioner Schlater and also Mr. Bergstein, I think, echoed a lot of that saying the proposed means not actually -- I have always thought that proposed meant you send a strong signal that you're getting ready to approve something.

Tonight I learned that proposed doesn't mean that. So like I say, it's always something different every night.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah, proposed now means good enough for NCPC is what it means.

NEAL R. GROSS

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yeah. So let me open it up to my other colleagues and see which -- before I give my position, I would like to hear from either Mr. Turnbull or Mr. Keating. If not, I think --

COMMISSIONER MAY: See, I think, I believe that in the course of trying to address the FAR issue, it is possible that the project might change in some substantive way. I mean, they might wind up having to reduce the size of some of the buildings and I'm -- I mean, I just don't know. I mean, if there is a real rush to do it today, because otherwise, you know, the world falls apart, I don't know.

I mean, we are dealing with all these other PUDs where they are asking for 2 more years, so that they can get financing. What's the -- you know, what is the urgency of doing it absolutely today? I don't know. I don't want to make it drag on any farther than it needs to, but I also want to know what we are voting on, frankly.

NEAL R. GROSS

CHAIRMAN HOOD: We are getting ready to close it down. Commissioner Schlater, did you want to add to it? I was looking for to either hear from Commissioner Turnbull or Vice Chair Keating.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well, I'm not opposed with going ahead and voting of this proposed approval in action getting everything that we need in final. FAR, I think, I have seen a calculation that shows that they are awfully close to this at 1.05, so I don't know if it's going to be that much of an egregious work for the applicant to produce that number.

I mean, I don't know how fine a calculation you get this down to. There is always a little wiggle room when you do these calculations, so I guess it depends upon how the applicant is measuring. I mean, actually, you know, I could do a calculation and Chairman Hood you could come back and it would be totally 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

So I guess there is going to be a fine point on this, but right now, I think the applicant, you know, going back, they had 41 units. They were all at 4 stories. Now, less than half the units are 4 stories. And they got all the rest are at 3 stories. They have cut back the gross floor area of the units from 120 back down to 108.

There has been significant movement here. I think the applicant is trying to create an environment that will fit in with the neighborhood and be compatible. We're not going to please everybody everywhere, but I think that they have made a significant contribution with this PUD.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioner Vice Chair?

VICE CHAIRMAN KEATING: Yeah, no, I would have to agree with that. I'm impressed with what I'm seeing here and saw before the meeting this evening. But I do think we need to get that question answered. And so I'm not

NEAL R. GROSS

opposed, if I'm understanding the process right, and I understand what proposed action is at this point, with moving forward and approving that, but also getting this question answered.

I understand OP can do their work pretty quickly and if we can do the rest of the other pieces, we need to do those before we get to final action, I'm okay with moving forward tonight. But I do want the -- I would like to get that question answered, because I do believe we need to be consistent and need to set a standard for ourselves in what we do.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I would concur 100 percent. And when we get to final action, if we don't like something, we don't have to approve it.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let me see if I can just go back. And I heard three of my colleagues say let's move forward with the proposal tonight. But let me just put this back on the table. One thing I try to do, I

NEAL R. GROSS

always try to give a full compliment of 5. I don't know how the Chairman of the Council gets 13, because sometimes it's hard to get 5.

But I will say that while I concur as Vice Chair Keating there with Commissioner May's comments, I wonder what really are we losing? Because for me, proposed actions means that basically with a little fine tuning or whatever, you pretty much endorse this project.

So I mean, what are we really losing? And I think it would be good -- you said it has been a year. I don't think it has been a year, but it might have been. Has it been a year? Oh, okay. My how time flies.

But I will tell you that I have to agree with Commissioner May, what is the rush? Again, they are closing the loop was from Mr. Tucker. Maybe that may continue to happen. And I think that if we set this for September, our first meeting in September, I really don't see -- you know, and I think we can make time

NEAL R. GROSS

up. But I really don't see the significance of us moving ahead with that FAR issue still out there and being brief and allowing time for both the opposing parties to briefly brief us on the issue with the FAR computation.

So I would just ask my colleagues, three who I think are ready to do proposal tonight, if we could just reconsider and do this in September with all the necessary information, so we can have a full compliment of Commissioners voting? Even though I know that is not the -- it's a democratic process. You know, everybody has a vote, but I just think that -- I would just like to see all -- we're not far off.

And I think if we move tonight and propose, I'm not sure what the outcome will be, but I would just think that a little more time is not going to hurt anything else. Is anybody open to that? Vice Chairman Keating?

VICE CHAIRMAN KEATING: Well, just my only concern would be I think we do lose 30

NEAL R. GROSS

days or so in the process, because if we come back in September we will be voting on proposed at that point and then it goes to NCPC for their review and then we get back to final sometime in October now, based on the calendar, as opposed we might be able to get the final in September. No, maybe, possibly? Okay.

MS. SCHELLIN: Yeah, if you take proposed tonight, you would have final in September, that's correct.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: So is --

VICE CHAIRMAN KEATING: That's what I was thinking. And given that, you know, just, you know, think about the economy, if they -- if we are moving forward here and it's -- you know, I don't know if we ever asked the question about financing in place on this project or not, but, you know, there is a risk that things change in 30 or 60 days or investors get cold feet or something changes.

I just feel like we kind of can

NEAL R. GROSS

move this thing forward.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Anyone else?

Did I change anybody else's mind? Ms.

Schellin, let me ask, is NCPC going to deal with this in August?

MS. SCHELLIN: No, they would take it up at their September $3^{\rm rd}$ meeting. September $3^{\rm rd}$.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. But what I would ask for is that some of the things that Commissioner May -- well, the main FAR computation would be briefly briefed by the applicant. We will work out a schedule for that.

Also, I would ask that -- taking what Mr. Tucker said in Exhibit 93 about how again -- and I know I don't want to put it all on the applicant, but the community has got to give some leeway, too, to try to come a little closer together and maybe the ANC and Palisades and the rest of the opposition groups can join in.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	And I'm only just asking. I'm not
2	directing. I can't do that. It's not within
3	my authority. But I'm only asking because at
4	the end of the day, I realize if the folks who
5	live in that ANC area and live in that Canal
6	View Park and Palisades, in those areas, are
7	the ones who are going to be affected. So the
8	closer you all can get together, I know you're
9	getting there, but let's continue to get
10	there.
11	It takes a little give and take on
12	both as I opened this meeting up when we were
13	talking about the hiring the director. But
14	anyway that's where we are.
15	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner?
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: What I'll do is
17	open it up for a motion. Ms. Schellin?
18	MS. SCHELLIN: Chairman Hood, could
19	we go ahead and set a schedule for the due
20	dates now, so that since the parties are

NEAL R. GROSS

Sure.

here, so they would have those dates?

CHAIRMAN HOOD:

21

MS. SCHELLIN: Allow the applicant two weeks and then the parties two weeks after that to file their responses. So the applicant would have until August $10^{\rm th}$ and the parties would then file their responses by August $24^{\rm th}$.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Okay. Is that fine? Everybody is fine with that? I will obtain a motion. Okay. You know what, I would move approval of Commission Case No. 08-21, The Athena Group, Consolidated PUD and Related Map Amendment for 4460 MacArthur Boulevard, N.W., and I would also put in my motion that this proposed approval is not to be any sign that final would be approved, also that Commissioner May's comments be incorporated in what the schedule was just set and we get that before final and also my comments about working with together again the community applicant trying to close the gap a little more to see how we can address the issues.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

And I will say on the record and also in my motion that I think the applicant has made that gap smaller. I would just ask that the community do the same thing, because at the end of the day, the community is going to be the one that lives there.

So anything else, Commissioner May,

So anything else, Commissioner May, you would like to add to that motion, even though I don't know where you -- which way you are going to come out on this?

COMMISSIONER MAY: No, I'm inclined to vote against it just on the principle that I would like to have it verified.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Do you want to put in -- but anything you want to put in that motion? Something you would like to say?

COMMISSIONER MAY: No, I think we've covered what we need to see. And it needs to be substantive. I think we're not looking for another explanation of why we don't need to worry about the streets issue or something like that. We're not looking for

NEAL R. GROSS

that kind of an explanation. We are looking for a solid calculation and something that shows on the plan what areas are calculated -- are included in which calculations and what the areas are of things like, you know, the streets and the driveways or to the extent they are involved. Those sorts of things.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: But you know, I have another question. What happens -- maybe I was just sitting here Mr. -- yeah, okay. thinking what happens if we find out that we are over and we have sent it to the NCPC? happens then? We will Then what be retracting. At some point, we're going to have to retract it.

MR. BERGSTEIN: No, because again, I view NCPC's role in the PUD process as more limited than what we normally get from NCPC, because really they are looking at it for the purposes of the Map Amendment only and not as

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

a project-specific issue. But certainly even when you send things to NCPC, the project might evolve between when you send it to them and final action.

You often see changes from proposed to final that doesn't require a resubmission. Again, this all comes down to the charter requirement that says that before the Zoning Commission may take any action to approve any amendment to the Text or Map, it shall, after hearing, send a proposed change to NCPC for a 30 day period of comment.

That is what you are doing. And unless you vote for a different Map Amendment or, frankly, I don't see any reason why you would need to revise your submittal if the project itself changes in some way in terms of its design or units or whatever.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Thank you, Mr. Bergstein. Okay. It has been moved and seconded.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Chair,

NEAL R. GROSS

1	I would just say that the applicant should,
2	for consistency sake, meet with the Office of
3	Planning and make sure that the calculation of
4	the FAR is exactly what we think it's going to
5	how it's going to be calculated.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I think they
7	heard you loud and clear, Mr. Turnbull. And I
8	hope some coordination, Mr. Feola, I think
9	that's your case, I didn't mean to call your
10	name, but I saw you. Okay, Mr. Feola, I hope
11	there's some coordination.
12	And also, I'm sure it's all served
13	on the ANC and all that stuff will happen.
14	Okay. Ms. Schellin, did you want to say
15	something?
16	MS. SCHELLIN: I did not hear
17	anyone second this. Did someone second that
18	motion?
19	COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: I will
20	second the motion.
21	MS. SCHELLIN: Okay.
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Any further

1	discussion?
2	All those in favor?
3	VICE CHAIRMAN KEATING: Aye.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Aye.
5	COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Aye.
6	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Aye.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any opposition?
8	Any
9	COMMISSIONER MAY: Opposed.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Ms.
11	Schellin, we have one person opposed. Could
12	you record the vote?
13	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Staff records
14	the vote 4-1-0 to approve Zoning Commission
15	Case No. 08-21 for proposed action with the
16	conditions as stated. Commissioner Hood
17	moving, Commissioner Schlater seconding,
18	Commissioners Keating and Turnbull in support,
19	Commissioner May opposed.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let's move right
21	along. Hearing action. Zoning Commission
22	Case No. 09-10. This is the Office of

Planning Text Amendment to allow the establishment of a water tower of the St. Elizabeth's Campus. Ms. Jackson? Take your time, Ms. Jackson. Good evening, Chair MS. JACKSON: Hood and Commissioners. For the record, my

8

7

1

2

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

name is Arlova Jackson and I'm a Development
Review Specialist in the D.C. Office of
Planning.

The case before you is a Text
Amendment brought forth by the Office of

Planning that would allow the establishment of a D.C. Water and Sewer Authority water tower on the east campus of St. Elizabeth's

The St. Elizabeth's site is a 336 acre area divided by Martin Luther King Drive and to its east and west campus is a designated Historic District and contains several contributing buildings.

The east campus which the District took control over in 1987 has now been

NEAL R. GROSS

Hospital.

subdivided into record lots and zoning is not in place for the majority of the area. WASA would like to install a new water tower onsite enabling them to improve fire protection, address poor water pressure, maintain existing water quality and support future development in the area.

Currently, this Zoning Regulations prohibit the issuance of a building permit for any property that does not have a Zone District or is not located on a lot of record. The proposed amendments to sections 106.7 and 3202 would allow the issuance of a building permit specifically for the establishment of a WASA water tower on the east campus of St. Elizabeth's.

The proposed new section 3206 allowed for an advisory review by the Office of Planning. This review would consist of an analysis of the proposed location and design for consistency with adopted plans for the site and provide time for communication

NEAL R. GROSS

between OP and the Zoning Administrator prior to the issuance of a building permit.

A similar process is currently used for antennas and for projects in the DD Overlay.

Additionally, a provision to refer projects to the BZA for review as a special exception request has been suggested by the Office of the Attorney General as a way to address the proposal that is found to be inconsistent with relevant planning policies and adopted plans.

The 2006 Comprehensive Plan the amendment particularly supports regard to the land use, urban design and infrastructure elements and the proposed amendment would also further a relevant policy of the Forest Southeast/Southwest Area Element by helping provide the infrastructure necessary to allow for the redevelopment of St. Elizabeth's East Campus.

The most recently adopted plan for

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the subject property, the St. Elizabeth's East Redevelopment Framework Plan anticipated the construction of a new water tower on-site both to support the future development envisioned in the plan as well as to meet the needs of existing residents.

The requested Text Amendment is not inconsistent with this plan or the 2006 Comprehensive Plan as it will allow for the immediate development of a water tower needed to serve the current and future residents of Ward 8.

OP recommends that the requested Text Amendment be set down for public hearing and will continue to work with the Office of the Attorney General on refining the text prior to the public hearing. Thank you and I'll take any questions you have, at this time.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very much, Ms. Jackson. Let's open it up. Any questions for Ms. Jackson? Commissioner May?

NEAL R. GROSS

1	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah. Um, I'm
2	just looking at the site plan for St.
3	Elizabeth's. I don't recall when the evidence
4	warehouse got zoned in or got was that a
5	modification of the UCC PUD that occurred some
6	time ago or what's that?
7	MS. JACKSON: That's simply a
8	proposed location that OPM was considering.
9	COMMISSIONER MAY: Oh, so it's not
10	been zoned?
11	MS. JACKSON: It has not been, no.
12	COMMISSIONER MAY: Oh, okay, okay.
13	MS. JACKSON: No.
14	COMMISSIONER MAY: I thought maybe
15	it had been. And is that going to be coming
16	some time or is that going to are we
17	waiting for the are we really actually
18	going to get the full plan and the Master Plan
19	of the zoning for the whole site before that
20	happens?
21	MS. JACKSON: Our intention is to
22	bring forward the Master Plan in zoning for

the site. However, we won't have the subdivisions and the street layouts in the lot of records for quite some time, depending on the development scenario.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. The -- I mean, the only hurdle that we can really clear though is the zoning itself. I mean, there are -- well, we will call it back. I guess I are sensitive to you the lingering concern that the Commission has had since the first PUDs were done for the hospital and for the UCC and there was a fair bit of angst about moving ahead with those as PUDs and not moving the whole campus.

So I personally would feel a lot more comfortable trying to move anything forward if we knew more about the direction that the overall plan for the development of the site was moving and the way the zoning might take shape. And are you going to try to do this sort of foreign-based zoning thing that happened on Reservation 13 or, you know,

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	any of those sorts of
2	MS. JACKSON: No.
3	COMMISSIONER MAY: any of that?
4	You're not going to do that again?
5	MS. JACKSON: No.
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay.
7	MS. JACKSON: We're happy at the
8	public hearing to give you a presentation and
9	a copy of the plan.
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay.
11	MS. JACKSON: The plan
12	COMMISSIONER MAY: I think that
13	would help a lot, because the angst about this
14	is that it could be happening more piecemeal
15	than we would like and we do want to make sure
16	that it happens in a comprehensive way.
17	I think that's about it for my
18	concerns.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you,
20	Commissioner May. Any others? Commissioner
21	Turnbull?
22	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Thank you,

1	Mr. Chair. Is the proposed location one that
2	has been fixed for a while? I mean, is that
3	in all the plans, future plans?
4	MS. JACKSON: The no, it has not
5	been fixed. There is a series of public input
6	that needs to go forward first, the section
7	106 under the National Historic Preservation
8	Act would be in play. That's been initiated
9	this month. But there are a couple of sites
10	that are being considered.
11	The fact that it's on St.
12	Elizabeth's has been pretty much determined,
13	but where on the site exactly has not been.
14	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. I
15	just is it because it is I mean, it sort
16	of looks like it's centralized on the map.
17	MS. JACKSON: That's its current
18	location. There is a little gray dot right in
19	the center.
20	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yeah,
21	right.
22	MS JACKSON: That's the current

1	location of it and that's the high ground, so
2	that's why they would like to be there.
3	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: But that's
4	basically replacing it in kind only bigger?
5	MS. JACKSON: Only bigger and it's
6	large enough and it's engineering is advanced
7	enough since the original that it can be
8	placed in other locations and they are looking
9	at another couple of sites over adjacent to
10	the mental health the new hospital to the
11	east.
12	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
13	Thank you.
14	COMMISSIONER MAY: I think it might
15	also be helpful to get some sense of just how
16	big this thing is going to be compared to the
17	existing one.
18	MS. JACKSON: Um-hum.
19	COMMISSIONER MAY: Is it going to
20	be bigger? I mean, the one right now, you
21	if you I mean, I have been there several
22	times and I know I have seen it and I still

1 can't remember anything about where it is or 2 where you can see it from. It's that sort of discrete in the way it is placed. 3 MS. JACKSON: Well, the section 106 4 look 5 process has begun to at these 6 alternatives and their impact on the historic 7 resources on the site. The site is covered by a Memorandum of Agreement with the Council. 8 COMMISSIONER MAY: Advisory Council 9 10 on Historic --Advisory Council on MS. JACKSON: 11 Historic Preservation. So all that will be 12 taken into consideration, those viewsheds and 13 its appearance will be resolved as part of 14 15 So we will be happy to have that presentation for you as well. 16 COMMISSIONER MAY: Thanks. 17 COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Quick 18 19 question. So I'm just looking at the Text Amendment itself and it says that, basically, 20 the Zoning Administrator 21 can approve

building permit until there has been a report

issued by the Director of Office of Planning.

MS. JACKSON: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Such report will contain criteria and information determine whether the tower is -- complies with the Comprehensive Plans, Small Area Plans or other adopted planning studies on the site. Is that typical? Is that something that we have seen before that structure? Do sometimes the structure come back the Zoning Commission to make that determination?

MS. JACKSON: It hasn't. The intent is that it not have to come back. This is the language that we have been working with OAG to refine and rephrase. They were concerned about the having specific criteria that is not enumerated in the text and also about what is the appeal.

In this case, what we have worked out with OAG is that should OP's report conclude that it is inconsistent with the Small Area Plan, that it would be referred to

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the BZA as a special exception.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. BERGSTEIN: Basically, in the other instances where this has happened, which is -- and 10 is in DD, those two regulatory schemes are so complex and technical that the idea was to, basically, have the Office of Planning come in as an expert to assist the Zoning Administrator and that was the purpose of their report.

Because the standard here is really a much broader standard that wouldn't actually allow the Zoning Administrator to building permit that is inconsistency with the planning of studies in the Comp Plan, he can deny a permit if it is too high or whatever, that was my suggestion that we have to have a consequence if the Office of Planning finds, in fact, it is the location or size or its relationship to our structures would inconsistent with the planning goals for E's.

At that point, it could say let's

NEAL R. GROSS

1	refer this for special exception and, in
2	essence, a design review. So that was my
3	suggestion as how we're going to adjust the
4	text accordingly.
5	COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: So it's not
6	coming back to the Zoning Commission because
7	the process is so complicated on the other
8	side?
9	MR. BERGSTEIN: Oh, it you can
10	have it. I mean, one is to make this as
11	COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: I'm sorry.
12	I mean, you call it easily
13	MR. BERGSTEIN: One option is to
14	make this a special exception and have like
15	you have in certain aspects of CG that
16	anything that gets built comes to you for
17	design review and for review consistency with
18	the purposes of the overlay and things like
19	that.
20	This is sort of a hybrid where
21	hopefully through the entire 106 process and
22	involvement, the right choice will be made and

OP will be able to say that in the report. But if something goes wrong, it's sort of a way of bringing it back. And one issue is does the Zoning Commission want to do that special exception or would it prefer to have the BZA and if you want to provide guidance to us on that, at this point, it's the BZA by default unless you say otherwise.

COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: My hazy recollection of this project from when I was back in Government was that this water tower is going to serve a large portion of east of the river.

MS. JACKSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: And it's located at one of the high points east of the river. And there is going to be a very prominent architectural feature of the redevelopment of St. E's. And there is a lot of interest in it. So I'll leave it up to my colleagues to decide whether it is something they wish to weigh in on, but it certainly is

NEAL R. GROSS

1 a big project. 2 CHAIRMAN HOOD: I didn't know all that information, but I will tell you that, 3 you know, I never have a problem with setting 4 anything down. But I do have -- I'm waiting 5 6 to hear some more discussion on 3206, 3206.1, 7 3206.2, 3206.3. I would just like to maybe -maybe my questions and answers will be evolved 8 or come to me as we have the hearing process. 9 10 I don't have any problems with setting this down. 11 What I do share some of what I 12 13 heard you say, I just -- to me, I need to investigate a little more and maybe hear some 14 15 of the people maybe coming to provide some 16 information you just gave me at the hearing. So let me open it up. Any other discussion? 17 think COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: 18 19 that that sounds good. CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. 20

NEAL R. GROSS

COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Sorry about

I move Zoning Commission Case No. 09-10

21

1	Text Amendment to allow establishment of a
2	water tower on the St. Elizabeth's Campus for
3	set down.
4	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Second.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. It has been
6	moved and properly seconded. Any further
7	discussion?
8	All those in favor?
9	ALL: Aye.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing any
11	opposition, Ms. Schellin, would you record the
12	vote?
13	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Staff records
14	the vote 5-0-0 to set down Zoning Commission
15	Case No. 09-10 as a rulemaking case.
16	Commissioner Schlater moving, Commissioner
17	Turnbull seconding, Commissioners Hood,
18	Keating and May in support.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let's
20	next is Zoning Commission Case No. 09-11, a
21	proposed Zoning Text Amendment to permit
22	retail and service uses by special exception

1	in SP-2 Districts. Hold on one second. Mr.
2	Goldstein?
3	MS. SCHELLIN: Good evening.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: It is Goldstein,
5	right?
6	MR. GOLDSTEIN: Yes, you got it.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. I
8	finally got something right.
9	MS. SCHELLIN: I was going I was
10	listening to Mr. Turnbull, so we got we
11	were going back and forth. I had to call him
12	out, because we were going back and forth.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, sorry.
14	MR. GOLDSTEIN: Oh, sure. Good
15	evening, Mr. Chairman and Members of the
16	Commission. For the record, my name is Paul
17	Goldstein and I'm a Development Review
18	Specialist with the Office of Planning.
19	The Office of Planning proposes a
20	text amendment to allow by special exception a
21	wider range of principal ground floor retail
22	and service uses in Special Purpose 2

Districts. The Amendment would apply exclusively to SP-2 Districts located south of M Street, N.W. and N.E., would allow by special exception certain uses permitted by right in C-1 neighborhood shopping districts.

As background, SP-2 Districts were crafted to be transition zones between commercial and residential areas among other intents. They are chiefly mapped on the periphery of the Central Business District in Northwest Washington.

A noble feature of SP Districts is they are near prohibition of active principal ground floor retail and service uses, which is a limitation that was adopted in the 1958 Zoning Regulations.

This constraint was recently highlighted in three requests for zoning relief, two of which have been approved, that sought to secure active ground floor retail uses in SP-2 Districts. The Amendment aims to permit ground floor retail and service uses in

NEAL R. GROSS

locations where their operation would not be harmful to neighboring properties.

The proposed Text Amendment has the following defining features: First, it is geographically limited to SP-2 Districts south of M Street, N.W. and N.E. The affected areas primarily include SP-2 Districts in Foggy Bottom, along 16th Street, in Judiciary Square and east of the Capitol.

The Amendment aims capture essentially properties that in are commercial and mixed-use areas. Additionally, nearly every SP-2 District property below M Street is located in an Historic District and areas subject to condition of fine arts review or both. And such, the design and as appearance of any proposed use will be subject to additional reviews.

Second, the proposal would allow only C-1 uses listed in section 701.1 through 701.5 to be located on or below a building's ground floor. Such uses would only be

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

permitted if they satisfy the conditions of the special exception test, meaning that they are shown to not be likely to become objectionable to neighboring properties because of noise, traffic or other conditions.

Although not raised in OP's report, to address possible parking issues, OP would propose an amendment to Chapter 21 that would include an appropriate parking standard to be included in the notification.

The proposed Text Amendment would be in harmony with several Comprehensive Plan policies, including the promotion of commercial centers, encouraging active street life, mixed use development and expanding the retail sector in central Washington.

At the same time, the Amendment seeks to respect Comprehensive Plan guidance through the uses of the special exception process to ensure that new development is in concert with its surroundings and these identified transition Districts.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	To conclude, the Text Amendment
2	would not be inconsistent with the
3	Comprehensive Plan. The Office of Planning
4	recommends that the proposed Text Amendment be
5	set down for public hearing and I am now
6	available for any additional questions. Thank
7	you.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Mr.
9	Goldstein. Any questions for Mr. Goldstein?
10	Commissioner May?
11	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah, what's
12	magic about M Street? Is that just to protect
13	the Dupont Circle area?
14	MR. GOLDSTEIN: In part. It seemed
15	to us to be a clean break between areas that
16	are essentially more commercial and mixed-use
17	from areas that are more predominately
18	residential, which is what you get into as you
19	head north of M Street.
20	COMMISSIONER MAY: Did you give any
21	consideration to sort of establishing a
22	southern limit on it, because it seems like

1	the only thing that is south of well, south
2	of M Street, S.E. and S.W., is the ARC. Is
3	that what that property is?
4	MR. GOLDSTEIN: Yes, I believe so.
5	And that would be an SP-1 Zoned area.
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay.
7	MR. GOLDSTEIN: It just wasn't
8	captured actually by the SP-2.
9	COMMISSIONER MAY: So it's not SP-
10	2. Got it. Okay. Got it. Okay. Just
11	because it shows up on the map, that's what
12	threw me. Okay. You know, I think I will
13	have some concerns about its application in
14	close proximity to the mall, the Elipse, the
15	river. Not that I'm predisposed against it,
16	but when we are that close to such prominent
17	national parkland, there is definitely going
18	to be more of a concern on our part.
19	I don't know what they all are, but
20	I'm I've got to look at it more carefully.
21	Thanks.

HOOD:

CHAIRMAN

22

Any other

1	questions? Okay. I would move that we set
2	down Zoning Commission Case No. 09-11 and ask
3	for a second.
4	COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Second.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Commissioner
6	Schlater seconded. Any further discussion?
7	All those in favor?
8	ALL: Aye.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing any
10	opposition, Ms. Schellin, would you record the
11	vote?
12	MS. SCHELLIN: Staff records the
13	vote 5-0-0 to set down Zoning Commission Case
14	No. 09-11 as a rulemaking case. Commissioner
15	Hood moving, Commissioner Schlater seconding,
16	Commissioners Keating, May and Turnbull in
17	support.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Next is
19	Zoning Commission Case No. 09-13, Office of
20	Planning Text Amendment to explicitly allow
21	for a BZA Consent Calendar. Ms. Steingasser?
22	MS. STEINGASSER: Mr. Chair,

Commissioners, Office of Planning is recommending this Text be set down. Ιt explicitly allows for a consent calendar for use by the Board of Zoning Adjustment, intent of which is to both reduce the flow of cases and backlog on hearings before the BZA and reduce the cost to the applicants of such a weight in having to have their architects lawyers attend hearings that and have opposition.

The consent calendar is called for both in the Zucker report, which is a report sponsored by the Office of Planning and paid for by the City Council. It was called for in the Comprehensive Plan to look at the option for a Planning Commission. As part of that, it also looked at the entire development process.

It is Recommendation 24 called for the use of the consent calendar by the BZA.

The Office of Zoning concurrently commissioned a plan -- a study that looked at 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

development processes through White and Smith,

LLC and they also concluded that the use of a

consent calendar would be efficient for moving

forward the BZA procedure.

have proposed that the cases We that are eligible for consent calendar be limited. Right now, we are proposing only sections 223, which make up, approximately, 24 of all BZA cases over the last 5 percent years. They are typically noncontroversial. They are a special exception that look only at limited amounts of relief in terms of occupancy, rear yard, front yard and yards and courts.

have also proposed that it include section 209.1, which allows for organizations, parks, playgrounds, private swimming pools and recreation facilities. tried to go through and choose those that we felt were the least controversial and would have the biggest bang for the buck with the calendar right now.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

As the -- as time moves forward, we add future sections to the consent can calendar, but we felt the calendar had to be limited. otherwise it would become just parallel log jam of people trying to request consent knowing that they wouldn't get it and then get just jumping to the front of line.

So we felt it was -- the best way to do it was to control it by what could be on there.

We think that the Text is not inconsistent with the Comp Plan. It updates land use controls. It minimizes the cost and time associated with housing. It allows for transparency in decisions and it continues to allow for public input and due diligence as any notified party or ANC may request its removal as well as a Board Member or the City Council.

We are working with the Office of Attorney General to refine the language for

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the public hearing notice. I believe they circulated that to you in a memo last week and that you got in your packet. And our language in the public hearing notice will reflect those changes.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Steingasser. I will say that I support this consent calendar. This is something that we talked about I know for a while. But one of the things that -- you know, some things that mind, Ι came across my was thinking well, why not wait until the ZRR, but that's not going to work.

Some of the ways that I thought that we already do things efficiently was to rest on the record. You know, I think this consent calendar idea, I think, will be more efficient in helping to move the processes along within the BZA.

It will give them a tool to kind of do like we did tonight. We moved things in block, even though we had a discussion to help

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

us get through some of the things that we had to discuss, especially if it's nothing to discuss.

So I will also -- and I'm glad to hear you say, Ms. Steingasser, that there were other type of case that eventually we're going to look at. I know the 223 is out there, but I know there is some other types of cases that we look at.

The only other question that I would ask and I will probably go to the Office of Zoning is to ask the Chair possibly of the BZA, and maybe we can ask one or two chairs, because I know we have -- other than maybe Mr. Turnbull, when you are in and out of BZA all the time, we would really like to hear their comments on what we're getting ready to move forward with, so I don't know if Chairperson-- Chairman Loud would be available.

I don't know, Mr. Bergstein, I think I can do that. I asked --

MR. BERGSTEIN: I forwarded the

NEAL R. GROSS

most recent Text to Mr. Moy and I assume that he forwarded it to the Board.

MS. BUSHMAN: I can speak to that.

I forwarded the language with Mr. Moy's assent to the Commission -- to the Board Members and I do believe that they will be taking a look at it and be very happy to provide comment.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very much. I want to make a formal request from the dias asking that if the time permits, they can come down and we will get them right in. We will treat them like Council Members. We'll get them right in and hear from them and get them out of here, because I know they spend a lot of time here on Tuesday and we appreciate all they do.

And they are the experts as far as I'm concerned. Even though we -- other than Mr. Turnbull, we are here every so often. He is usually every week. But so anyway, I'm glad to see this moving forward.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	I totally endorse it. We may have
2	to tweak it or do some fine tuning, but I'm
3	glad to see this moving forward.
4	MS. STEINGASSER: I believe, and
5	OAG can confirm, it's a rulemaking case and
6	not a contest case, so we can work with the
7	BZA prior to the hearing.
8	MR. BERGSTEIN: Oh, absolutely.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, well, I'll just
10	call them myself and tell them I expect to see
11	them here. Okay. Any other comments on this?
12	Any other comments, colleagues? Okay.
13	With that, I would move that we set
14	down Zoning Commission Case No. 09-13 and ask
15	for a second.
16	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Second.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Everybody must like
18	the consent calendar. I think I heard three
19	seconds.
20	MS. SCHELLIN: Keating and
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yeah, put them all
22	down as seconding. All right. It's moved and

1	properly seconded by three Members.
2	Ms. Schellin, put all three of them
3	down for seconding.
4	COMMISSIONER MAY: I think Mr.
5	Turnbull should have the privilege.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yeah, Mr. Turnbull,
7	could you second it?
8	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Second.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So Mr.
10	Turnbull seconded. Any further discussion?
11	All those in favor?
12	ALL: Aye.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing any
14	opposition, Ms. Schellin, would you record the
15	vote?
16	MS. SCHELLIN: Staff records the
17	vote 5-0-0 to set down Zoning Commission Case
18	No. 09-13 as a rulemaking case. Commissioner
19	Hood moving, Commissioner Turnbull seconding,
20	Commissioners Keating, May and Schlater in
21	support.
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Next, we

1	will do our status report. Ms. Steingasser?
2	MS. STEINGASSER: Chairman,
3	Commissioners, the status report is before
4	you. The one thing I wanted to point out to
5	you that you are going to see start coming
6	forward now are different Text Amendments that
7	are going to begin to implement part of the
8	zoning review recommendations.

The consent calendar is one. Part of moving that forward allows us, once it is complete, to help guide how we write future text that may be coming.

We are also going to be moving forward the Campus Plan Text Amendment. And the reason we are moving that one now is there are several Text Amendments— several Campus Plans, excuse me, that are going to be coming due in 2010 and we want to have the new regulations in place so that as they go through that process, they are working with the most current regs.

So you will be seeing that most

NEAL R. GROSS

1 likely in September. That will come to you 2 for set down. And that's all we have. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any questions of 3 4 Ms. Steingasser? Okay. Do we have anything else before us? 5 We have a hearing on Thursday, but 6 7 this is our last meeting. We get the whole month off, whoopty-do, but anyway, I want to 8 thank everyone for making my colleagues and I 9 very ready for these meetings and for the 10 hearings. 11 I appreciate the Office of Zoning 12 staff and our direct connection to the Office 13 of Zoning staff to Ms. Sharon Schellin. 14 Ι 15 think she does a fabulous job. And also with 16 the assistance of Ms. Bushman and all those who help her and Mr. Nero and everyone. 17 And also the Office of Attorney 18 19 General, we appreciate all the guidance and

And also the Office of Attorney General, we appreciate all the guidance and the legal advice that we get from the Office of Attorney General. They definitely help make our lives a lot easier.

NEAL R. GROSS

20

21

And also the reports that we get 1 2 from the Office of Planning. We appreciate the in depth research that goes into it to 3 help us make an educated and informed decision 4 for the best interest of the city. 5 And I do not want to forget all 6 7 those participants, the residents and also applicants who present cases and the citizens. 8 Sometimes we may not always agree or it may 9 not be the outcome, but we appreciate the 10 participation, because I will tell you, and I 11 think my colleagues would agree, the way we 12 13 grapple sometimes and try to balance things it's like trying to balance for a win/win for 14 all neighborhoods. 15 16 So that's all I have. With that, I hope everyone has a safe month off. But don't 17 forget to come back Thursday now. 18 19 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: 20 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Don't forget.

NEAL R. GROSS

don't forget to come back Thursday. We have a

hearing Thursday. And I think that will be

21

1	it. Okay. So with that, this meeting i
2	adjourned.
3	(Whereupon, the Special Meeting wa
4	concluded at 8:41 p.m.)
5	
6	
7	
8	
a	

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11