GOVERNMENT

OF

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

REGULAR MEETING

+ + + + +

MONDAY, MAY 23, 2011

+ + + + +

The Regular Meeting of the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened in Room 220 South, 441 $4^{\rm th}$ 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

KONRAD W. SCHLATER Vice Chairman

GREG SELFRIDGE Commissioner

PETER G. MAY Commissioner (NPS)

MICHAEL G. TURNBULL Commissioner FAIA,

(AOC)

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

SHARON S. SCHELLIN, Secretary DONNA HANOUSEK, Zoning Specialist

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 Board of Zoning Adjustment
District of Columbia
CASE NO.Transcript
EXHIBIT NO.null

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

JENNIFER STEINGASSER JOEL LAWSON

DAN EMERINE
TRAVIS PARKER
STEVEN COCHRAN

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PRESENT:

ALAN BERGSTEIN, ESQ. JACOB RITTING, ESQ.

This transcript constitutes the minutes from the Regular Meeting held on May 23, 2011.

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

WELCOME:
Anthony Hood, Chairman6
FINAL ACTION:
ZC Case No. 10-27 - 3050 R Street Partners -
Map Amendment & Special Exception: 10 Motion to Approve 11
Vote : 4-0-1 to Approve
ZC Case No. 10-19 - Office of Planning -
Map & Text Amendments - H Street Overlay: . 12
OP Request to Reopen Record
Motion to Defer Final Action
September 12, 2011
,
ZC Case No. 08-06 - Office of Planning -
Comprehensive Zoning Regulations Review: 17
Motion to Adopt PDR as Amended 21
Vote: 5-0-0 to Approve Adoption 22
ZC Case No. 06-40A - Gateway Market Center -
Two-Year PUD Time Extension: 22
Motion to Approve Two-Year Extension 25
Vote: 5-0-0 to Approve Extension 26
ZC Case No. 06-29B - Washington Value Added
I, LLC - Two-Year PUD Time Extension: 26
Motion to Grant Two-Year Extension 28
Vote: 5-0-0 to Grant Extension
70 Cago No. 08-24 - Contor Dlago
ZC Case No. 08-34 - Center Place Holdings - 1 st Stage PUD:
Office of Planning - Joel Lawson
Board Comments
Motion to Approve, as Amended 56
Vote: 5-0-0 to Approve, as Amended 57
HEARING ACTION:

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

ZC Case No. 11-09 - Duball Petworth, LLC -	
Consolidated PUD/Related Map Amendment: 5	
Office of Planning - Steven Cochran 58	
Board Questions 63	
Motion to Set Down Contested Hearing 7	
Vote: 5-0-0 to Set Down	
CORRESPONDENCE:	
ZC Case No. 05-28 - Parkside Residential, LL	C
ZA Letter RE: Notification 2 nd Stage Approval	
Not Necessary for Block D: 7	7
Board Discussion 78	8
Set Down for June 13 th Meeting 83	2
ZC Case No. 07-02 - Columbia Heights Ventures	s
Parcel 26, LLC - ZA Letter RE: ' 2409.8: 8	
Board Discussion 8	
Set Down for June 13 th Meeting 9	
5	
ZC Case No. 06-11D - George Washington	
Univ Request Waiver of ' 3125.3: 9	2
Issue Summary Order	3
•	
PROPOSED ACTION:	
ZC Case No. 11-01 - Office of Planning -	
Text Amendment at ' 2116:	3
Board Discussion 9	
Motion to Approve, as Amended 10	
Vote: 5-0-0 to Approve, as Amended 10	
The second of th	_
ZC Case No. 05-28E - Lano Parcel 12, LLC &	
D.C. Primary Care Association:	1
Board Discussion	
Phil Feola, Applicant Attorney 15:	
Motion to Approve CCDC & DCPCA Buildings	
Only in the 1 st Stage PUD	4
Vote: 4-0-1 to Approve Motion	
Motion to Deny Blocks G-1, G-2 & H 16	
Vote: 4-0-1 Grant Denial W/O Prejudice 165	
VOCC - I O I GLAME Demial W/O Flejuarce 10.	4

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

ZC Case No. 05-28B - D.C. Primary Care	
Association - 2 nd Stage PUD:	163
Motion to Approve	170
Vote: 4-0-1 to Approve Motion	170
ADJOURN:	
Anthony Hood, Chairman	171

6:33 p.m.

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

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Good evening,
ladies and gentlemen. This is the May 23,
Description of the District of Columbia.

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

We are also joined by the Office of Zoning staff, Ms. Sharon Schellin, Ms. Donna Hanousek; Office of Attorney General, Mr. Ritting and Mr. Bergstein; Office of Planning, Ms. Steingasser, Ms. Thomas, Mr. Goldstein and Mr. Jackson.

Copies of today's meeting agenda are available to you and are located in the bin near the door.

We do not take any public testimony in our meetings, unless the Commission requests someone to come forward.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	Please, be advised that this
2	proceeding is being recorded by a Court
3	Reporter and is also webcast live.
4	Accordingly, we must ask you to refrain from
5	any disruptive noises or actions in the
6	hearing room.
7	Please, turn off all beepers and
8	cell phones.
9	Does the staff have any
10	preliminary matters?
11	MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. If not, I
13	have two preliminary matters. I want to
14	announce today that the Zoning Commission will
15	continue its summer dress-down code, so after
16	today, I understand it's supposed to be about
17	90 degrees, this goes out to everyone, Office
18	of Attorney General, Office of Planning,
19	Office of Zoning, Zoning Commission,
20	naturally, and the audience.
21	When you come down to present in
22	front of us, if you don't have a tie on or a

jacket, we will understand from this point forward. So that will take place beginning actually Wednesday night for us. Tonight? That's fine with me.

But anyway, so that's what we will do. We will go ahead and institute that a week early. Typically, normally, our June 1st date, but I understand it's going to be pretty hot this week and we have, I think, two more hearings this week.

Okay. The other thing, I just want to remind for the record people not to contact or attempt to contact Zoning Commission Members. We have an integrity. We try to keep our integrity. And what we do down here, we try to make the best decision possible, so I would just encourage folks who are in the audience and who are listening, not to contact any of us by other means.

And whatever we deal with in these cases, we deal with it right here within the walls of this room. So I would ask that you,

NEAL R. GROSS

1	please, do not contact any Member of the
2	Zoning Commission.
3	And I think I'll probably repeat
4	that again later in the month or so.
5	Okay. Let's move right ahead.
6	Final Action. Also, let me do this, the Vice
7	Chairman is not participating on Proposed
8	Action. I recommend, Commissioners, that we
9	move the agenda and that we move everything up
10	and make Proposed Action last, so the Vice
11	Chairman can leave, if he would like, unless
12	you want to stay here with us. Okay. Okay.
13	And then we want to publicly
14	congratulate you on your newborn. Give us the
15	name. I tried to get the only part I could
16	get was Anthony. Give us the name of the
17	newborn.
18	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: That was
19	after you.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, yes, I
21	actually mentioned that, but I don't want to
22	take that for granted. So could you give us

1	the name?
2	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Theodore
3	Anthony Kabalan Schlater.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Great. So
5	we are going to move the agenda, so our Vice
6	Chairman will get home and do his duties,
7	especially since he didn't participate in the
8	Proposed Action.
9	Okay. Final Action. Ms.
LO	Schellin, I think the first case I will not be
11	participating, so I'll turn it over to the
L2	Vice Chairman, but, Ms. Schellin, if you could
L3	start us off?
L4	MS. SCHELLIN: Sure. At Exhibit
L5	36, we do have an NCPC report. They have said
L6	that there were no identified adverse effects
L7	to the federal interests and it would not be
L8	inconsistent with the Comp Plan for the
L9	national capital.
20	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Thank
21	you, Ms. Schellin. Does anyone have anything
22	further on this case? In that case I move

1	that we approve Zoning Case No. 10-27, 3050 R
2	Street Partners - Map Amendment and special
3	exception and variance at Square 1282.
4	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Second.
5	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Moved and
6	properly seconded. Let's call for the vote.
7	MS. SCHELLIN: Excuse me, if I
8	could, I think that the variance was actually
9	removed, so it is just the Map Amendment and
LO	special exception.
11	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Okay.
L2	Thank you. So noted and I'll amend my motion.
L3	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well, I
L4	don't know if I can amend my second, but I'll
L5	second again.
L6	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: With
L7	that, let's take the vote.
L8	All in favor say aye.
L9	ALL: Aye.
20	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: All in
21	favor. Ms. Schellin?
22	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.

1	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Would you
2	record the vote?
3	MS. SCHELLIN: Staff would record
4	the vote 4-0-1 to approve Final Action on
5	Zoning Commission Case No. 10-27.
6	Commissioner Schlater moving, Commissioner
7	Turnbull seconding, Commissioners May and
8	Selfridge in support. Commissioner Hood not
9	voting, having not participated.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you,
11	Mr. Vice Chairman.
12	Next, Zoning Commission Case No.
13	10-19. This is the Office of Planning Map and
14	Text Amendments - H Street Overlay - zoning
15	consistency at Square 1050, et al. Ms.
16	Schellin?
17	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. At
18	Exhibit 28, we do have a request from the
19	Office of Planning to reopen the record to
20	accept their report, which is a request from
21	them to defer action until our September 12 th
22	meeting.

1	And if the Commission is agreeable
2	to do that, then staff would set a date to
3	allow the Office of Planning and ANC-6A to
4	make a later submission based on what is in
5	the Office of Planning's report.
6	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Can I ask
7	the Office of Planning what the location of
8	that property is?
9	MR. LAWSON: Yes, the property is
10	located at the corner of 14 th and Maryland.
11	It's a fairly large piece of property and at
12	the northwest corner of that intersection.
13	It's not a right angle though. The two
14	streets don't meet at a right angle, but it is
15	kind of a bad intersection.
16	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Okay.
17	Thank you.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
19	Commissioners, as was stated, we have a
20	correspondence. First, we have to open the
21	record to allow the correspondence from the
22	Office of Planning and I think we can do that

1 by general consensus. 2 seeing any objections, it Not 3 basically states recently the owner of one of the large parcels in the area has requested 4 5 some additional time to discuss the possible 6 amendment to the zoning application. A representative of ANC advised OP 7 that they feel that that Final Action on this 8 case should be delayed to allow an opportunity 9 10 for the ANC to discuss this issues. OP 11 recommends to the Zoning concurs and Commission before taking Final Action. 12 13 They actually have a date here of September 12th. 14 That's the 15 MS. SCHELLIN: Right. 16 date of our September meeting. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. 17 We could put it on 18 MS. SCHELLIN: 19 agenda for that date. And if 20 Commission decides to do that, we could leave the record open until the Tuesday before say 21

The Tuesday before which would be the

3:00.

6th.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

MS. SCHELLIN: And allow, if the ANC and the Office of Planning would like to provide the Commission with something further based on whether they come to some type of agreement and allow for further submissions, since the record is closed, that way it would, them an opportunity provide something further.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

Commissioners, I would move that we accept the recommendation given to us by the Office of Planning. Any time we can better for further process, I think is good to let parties work on this. So I would move that we defer this until our September 12, 2011 meeting and ask for a second.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Second.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: It has been moved and properly seconded. Any further discussion? Are you ready for the question?

All those in favor?

1	ALL: Aye.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing any
3	opposition, Ms. Schellin, would you, please,
4	record the vote?
5	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, staff records
6	the vote 5-0-0 to defer Final Action to
7	September 12, 2011 in Zoning Commission Case
8	No. 10-19. Commissioner Hood moving,
9	Commissioner May seconding, Commissioners
10	Schlater, Selfridge and Turnbull in support.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.
12	Next, Zoning Commission Case No.
13	08-06, Office of Planning - Comprehensive
14	MS. SCHELLIN: I'm sorry, Chairman
15	Hood, and does that allow for the ANC and the
16	Office of Planning to reopen the record and to
17	allow for them to make that submission by
18	September 6 th ?
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.
20	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, okay.
	no. Bendeditive feet, oney.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, it does, yes.
21	

1	sure.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.
3	So, okay, that's enough time, I'm sure, for
4	them to make their submissions. Okay. Thank
5	you, Ms. Schellin.
6	Zoning Commission Case No. 08-06,
7	Office of Planning - Comprehensive Zoning
8	Regulations Review: Production, Distribution
9	and Repair Zones. Ms. Schellin?
10	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. In this
11	case, there is a submission made by, I
12	believe, the Office of Planning and as well as
13	Chris Collins and maybe one other, I'm trying
14	to find my notes here, on this actually, I
15	believe it was just the Office of Planning and
16	Chris Collins. And so we would ask the
17	Commission to consider Final Action on this.
18	Also, we do have an NCPC report at
19	Exhibit 144.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
21	Commissioners, if you will remember, this is
22	the one where we asked the Office of Planning

to go back, and I think it was Mr. Lawson. I think it was you. Okay. I'm sorry.

All right, Mr. Parker. I don't know why I thought it was Mr. Lawson. But anyway, Mr. Parker, if you could just, if the parties indulge me, tell us what you found, even though I know you have it written in Exhibit 146? If you could just kindly explain that to us in a nutshell, we would greatly appreciate it.

MR. PARKER: Sure. We did some work, at your request, to sort of corroborate Mr. Collins' pricing numbers and we found a lot of different price examples and they are attached as a table to our memo. You know, but the end result was, you know, what we found is that the saturated rate of a roof system is about nearly 7 pounds per square foot and that, you know, basically, agrees exactly with what Mr. Collins had said in his memo.

Pricing, we were able to get very

NEAL R. GROSS

little information. It is very contextual, very project-specific and so we weren't able to get any reliable data on the cost of these systems.

But, in general, you know, we ended up recommending that we have -- that we continue to have an exception down to 0.1 for the single-story warehouses, these purposebuilt buildings and everything else would be the originally proposed or subsequently proposed 0.3.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

Commissioners, we have -- thank you, Mr.

Parker. We have a number of issues here or a number of requests. I guess we can either take what was being proposed, what has been advertised, what has been recommended by Mr.

Collins or we can take the revision.

After what the Office of Planning has done, which is dated in their May 13th letter, or we can take what is recommended after they did the review for us as a revised

language and position in proceeding with 0.3 or 0.1 GAR.

So we have a number of options in front of us. Let's open it up for discussion.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioner May?

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, first of all, I want to thank the Office of Planning for the extensive research that they did. I appreciate seeing all of that information. And I agree there are some widely varying information, but -- with regard to the costs of such systems, but I do appreciate the extent of the research that you did.

I also think that the proposed change is a smart way to handle this. It was -- as I'm sure you recall, I wasn't enthusiastic about dropping the GAR number across the board and the idea that it would stay a .3 and an exception be granted for single-story warehouse buildings, I think is an acceptable compromise. So I'm in favor of

NEAL R. GROSS

moving ahead with the language as the Office of Planning proposes it be modified.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. And,

Commissioners, basically, that's, thank you,

that the last few sentences of their report,

Commissioner May, what they are proposing is

their supplemental report, which is Exhibit

8 No. 146. Okay. Would anyone else like to

9 comment?

1

2

3

4

5

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Okay. I would also agree with Commissioner May and I would make a motion that we move to adopt the revised language that the Office of Planning provided in their May 13, 2011 letter and ask for a second.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Second.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: It has been moved properly seconded. further and Any discussion? I have some discussion. sure if we mentioned that the National Capital Planning Commission said this would adversely affect any other identified federal interests. I'm if that not sure was

1	mentioned, but I wanted to make sure that was
2	on the record.
3	Any further discussion? Are you
4	ready for the question?
5	All those in favor, aye?
6	ALL: Aye.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing any
8	opposition, Ms. Schellin, would you, please,
9	record the vote?
10	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, staff records
11	the vote 5-0-0 to approve Final Action on
12	Zoning Commission Case No. 08-06 with regard
13	to PDR as amended per OP's final report.
14	Commissioner Hood moving, Commissioner May
15	seconding, Commissioners Schlater, Selfridge
16	and Turnbull in support.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you,
18	Ms. Schellin. Next, Zoning Commission Case
19	No. 06-40A. This is the Gateway Market
20	Center, Inc two-year PUD time extension at
21	Square 3587. Ms. Schellin?
22	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. As you

said, this is a request for a two-year PUD time extension. They are requesting this extension due to an inability to obtain financing and to find a lead tenant for the non-residential portion of the project.

At Exhibit 5, there is an OP report and at Exhibit 6, there is an ANC-6C letter in support.

Okay. Thank you, CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Schellin. Commissioners, we have before and if you look at the Office of us Planning report as well the applicant's as submission, and I'm not sure -- oh, okay, my ANC letter is in here. And we also have an affidavit of Mr. Choi. I knew the last name. The first name, I don't want to butcher it, so we also have an affidavit from Mr. Choi.

We have a letter as Mrs. Schellin has already mentioned, ANC-6C voted to support the initial application. No changes. So they also support the extension as well as the Office of Planning report as well as what the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	applicant has submitted, which, basically,
2	spells out the rationale and the reasoning,
3	litigation, some of the things we have heard
4	market conditions, a number of other issues
5	and that's found on page 2 and 3 of the report
6	of the Office of Planning, as well as within
7	the submission dated April the 8 th from the
8	applicant.
9	S, Commissioners, any discussion?
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chairman?
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. May?
12	COMMISSIONER MAY: I missed the
12 13	COMMISSIONER MAY: I missed the affidavit. Can you point me to it?
13	affidavit. Can you point me to it?
13 14	affidavit. Can you point me to it? COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: It's
13 14 15	affidavit. Can you point me to it? COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: It's Exhibit 4.
13 14 15 16	affidavit. Can you point me to it? COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: It's Exhibit 4. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. If not,
13 14 15 16 17	affidavit. Can you point me to it? COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: It's Exhibit 4. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. If not, I'll share my copy with you. Do you need to
13 14 15 16 17	affidavit. Can you point me to it? COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: It's Exhibit 4. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. If not, I'll share my copy with you. Do you need to see it?
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	affidavit. Can you point me to it? COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: It's Exhibit 4. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. If not, I'll share my copy with you. Do you need to see it? COMMISSIONER MAY: I don't have an

1	D.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
3	COMMISSIONER MAY: It's part of
4	this? Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Any further
6	discussion? Okay. I would
7	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Chair,
8	I was just going to say I think Exhibits 1, 4,
9	5, and 6 clearly explain the situation of the
10	applicant and in that situation, I would be in
11	favor of granting.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right.
13	Anybody else? Okay. They didn't have time
14	certain. It's just a two-year extension.
15	Okay. Then we will leave whatever whenever
16	that is, we'll leave that up to staff and the
17	applicant and OAG.
18	Anyway, I would move that we
19	approve the two-year time extension request
20	for Zoning Commission Case No. 06-40A, Gateway
21	Market Center, Inc. and ask for a second.

NEAL R. GROSS

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL:

22

Second.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: It has been moved
2	and properly seconded. Any further
3	discussion? Are you ready for the question?
4	All those in favor, aye?
5	ALL: Aye.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing any
7	opposition, Ms. Schellin, would you, please,
8	record the vote?
9	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, staff records
10	the vote 5-0-0 to approve Final Action in
11	Zoning Commission Case No. 06-40A.
12	Commissioner Hood moving, Commissioner
13	Turnbull seconding, Commissioners May,
14	Schlater and Selfridge in support.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Next is
16	Zoning Commission Case No. 06-29B. This is
17	the Washington Value Added I, LLC, two-year
18	PUD time extension at Square 72. Ms.
19	Schellin?
20	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. This is
21	their second request for a two-year time
22	extension. They are requesting this extension

1	because they have been unable to obtain
2	sufficient project funding and due to the
3	hotel market slow recovery.
4	At Exhibit 4, there is an OP
5	report.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you,
7	Ms. Schellin. You know, again, this is
8	another request. Some years ago, we used to
9	get these kind of requests and I didn't
10	believe them then, but now with the market
11	conditions the way things changed, so now I'm
12	starting to think about all those ones that
13	were before that, that was back when Mr. Herb
14	Franklin was here, so that tells you how long
15	ago it has been.
16	But if you look at Ms.
17	Schellin, is that Exhibit 4?
18	MS. SCHELLIN: The
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Office of
20	Planning's report.
21	MS. SCHELLIN: Office of
22	Planning's report is at Exhibit 4, yes.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. If you look
2	at Exhibit 4 in the last page, it talks about
3	exactly what Ms. Schellin said. And what we
4	know now to be a custom of exactly what
5	happens. The applicant has been unable to
6	obtain sufficient project financing. In
7	addition, the hotel market has slow recovery,
8	as a result of the recent financial crisis.
9	And it just goes on.
10	And it also talks about what is in
11	Exhibit C for us to review. So I would be in
12	favor, Commissioners, of granting this two-
13	year time extension as well. And let me open
14	it up for discussion. Any discussion?
15	Anybody?
16	Okay. So with that I would move
17	that we grant the two-year time extension for
18	Zoning Commission Case No. 06-29B and ask for
19	a second.
20	COMMISSIONER MAY: Second.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: It has been moved
22	and properly seconded.

1	All those in favor, aye?
2	ALL: Aye.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing any
4	opposition, Ms. Schellin, would you, please,
5	record the vote?
6	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, staff records
7	the vote 5-0-0 to grant the two-year time
8	extension in Zoning Commission Case No. 06-
9	29B. Commissioner Hood moving, Commissioner
10	May seconding, Commissioners Schlater,
11	Selfridge and Turnbull in support.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Next is
13	Zoning Commission Case No. 08-34. This is
14	Center Place Holdings - 1 st Stage PUD and
15	Related Map Amendment and Consolidated PUD at
16	Squares 564, 566 and 568. Ms. Schellin?
17	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. Staff
18	has two preliminary matters on this case.
19	First, the Office of Planning would like to
20	address the Commission before you go into
21	deliberations. And second, the applicant has
22	requested the Commission to reopen the record

1	to accept a complete set of conforming plans.
2	If the Commission would do so, the
3	applicant is prepared to hand those in this
4	evening.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
6	Commissioners, first, let's deal with the
7	reopening of the record, so we can get a
8	complete set of plans from the applicant who
9	is ready to present that to us this evening.
10	I would ask do we need a
11	motion? Do we need a motion? Okay. Can we
12	just, Commissioners, agree to open the record
13	for the complete set of plans? Okay. So we
14	will do that. They can bring those up.
15	And also, the Office of Planning
16	would like to address us, so, at this time,
17	Mr. Lawson?
18	MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Chairman
19	Hood.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Do we need the
21	plans in front of us?
22	MR. LAWSON: You do not.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. LAWSON: Although, eventually, it may be helpful. We would just like to thank the applicant again for being responsive so many of the issues to and discussions and we, of course, remain, you know, incredibly supportive of this application.

When we were looking through the order, we noticed one final issue that we had discussed at some length and had reached agreement with the applicant regarding -- but that had not been placed in the order.

And so we contacted the applicant and suggested that we raise this issue with the Zoning Commission for it to be added to the order, at this time. So if the Commission would like, I could read out what that -- it's a fairly minor change, but I can read out what that change that we are proposing would be. And this would be due the final order.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Give me one

second. Okay. Commissioners, Mr. Lawson is going to read to us what now has been proposed and the applicant also is in agreement? Okay. Could you turn your mike on?

MR. LAWSON: They are. So it's a fairly minor change, but it's really just a clarification to reflect some of the discussions that we had had earlier. And it has to do with the pedestrian way down the center of the north block, so it only applies to that one section.

that And the language we discussed with the applicant is that there will be no gate or fence restricting entry to pedestrian between Massachusetts the way Avenue and G Street, which shall remain open public all times, to the at except association with a special event for short periods.

Now, the reason this was important to us is we wanted to make sure that that central pedestrian way does remain open to the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

public and that's certainly clearly the intent of the applicant as well, that it remain open to the public.

also allows for But it the possibility for that space to be closed off if there is а special event that is being organized for the area and we think that is entirely appropriate as well.

So that's the only change that we are proposing, at this time.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Lawson. Commissioners, I think, at least, the Office of Planning and the applicant have agreed upon that and I actually would also like to see that happen. But let me just open it up to any comments or discussions? Do we want to accept what the Office of Planning and the applicant has already worked out? Okay. So we will do that.

Okay. Let's open it up for comments. I'm sure there are some questions and comments on this. Vice Chairman Schlater?

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. At Proposed Action, I had asked for clarification on a few items, including further development and explanation of the four story building that is connecting the two buildings in the north block.

And I looked at those plans and thought they were, you know, very high quality materials and it was a plan that made sense to me. I'm happy the applicant provided that information. It was helpful to me.

They also indicated that they will be providing a through lobby between the pedestrian way and 2^{nd} Street on the eastern building on the north block and I think that is very good for the project as well.

And then there was a discussion of retail heights that was very helpful in understanding what retail heights were being proposed and the change in grade between the ground level and the actual retail space itself and also had a good discussion of, you

know, the design with respect to the retail and how it was going to, you know, be good retail design.

I was persuaded that ultimately those retail spaces are good spaces and it will be a good ground-level experience for people walking by the project.

And I think I asked for some information on the light columns included in the project and they provided that as well. So I too would just like to second the notion that I thought the applicant was very good about responding to all the issues that were raised at the hearing and I think it is a better project than the one that was submitted before us. And I'm happy to support it here tonight.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Anything else, Commissioners? Commissioner Turnbull?

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes, Mr.
Chairman. The other thing I want to point
out, we do have a report from NCPC. They are,

NEAL R. GROSS

1 basically, in favor of going ahead, but they 2 do have a couple of comments in their -- I 3 don't know if you want to highlight those? 4 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, if you could 5 help, me? 6 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well, one 7 of them was "Staff recommends that the $1^{\rm st}$ Commission find that the Stage 8 PUD/ Consolidated PUD and a PUD-related Zoning 9 10 Amendment for development within the air-11 rights above the Center Leg Freeway I-395 in 12 564, 566 568 and would not be 13 inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan for the national capital nor adversely affect any 14 15 other identified federal interest." they do talk about further 16 discussions with DC 17 on G Street, the having both vehicular 18 possibility of and 19 pedestrian. So from their standpoint, they 20 are still hoping that the applicant will work with DC on looking at that. 21

there

was

thought

22

something

1	else, too. I think that was the thing that
2	stood out in my mind.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Yes. I
4	actually was aware of that and I figured,
5	hopefully, what I heard from Mr. Lawson
6	tonight, maybe there are discussions still to
7	be had, because we already are leaving it open
8	for pedestrians. I think the NCPC had a
9	request.
10	I'm not sure how much of that is
11	within our jurisdiction, but I think they will
12	still continue to have the talk with DDOT.
13	So I'm glad you brought that up.
14	I think there were one or two more
15	issues that they also raised, but I'm not sure
16	if they were and I do recall reading this,
17	but I'm not sure if they are all within our
18	jurisdiction. So but it's good that we
19	brought it, at least for the record.
20	Okay. Thank you, Mr. Turnbull.
21	Anybody else?
22	COMMISSIONER MAY: I would just

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioner May?
2	COMMISSIONER MAY: I was just
3	going to note that the reason G Street is
4	the reopening of G Street is so complicated is
5	because of the building that is in it, which
6	is a federal building, and I think that fact
7	was pointed out to NCPC.
8	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: No, I
9	know. That is a serious issue.
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: So I mean, it's
11	something that hopefully is now on their
12	agenda to address as well, because they
13	provide guidance to GSA and others who build
14	federal buildings.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Anything
16	else? Let's take our time. You know, I'm not
17	really sure, the applicant has removed and
18	maybe I'll go to Mr. Ritting to help me. The
19	applicant is removing some of the 2 nd Stage
20	application issues that involve the center and
21	the south blocks.

But I think they are removing it,

I guess, with the assumption that we will deal with it at the 2nd Stage, but I think our regulations allow for us to deal with it at 1st Stage. And I guess I don't know, maybe it's a question for the applicant why are we removing it? Mr. Ritting?

MR. RITTING: Well, it's slightly different than that. And they are requesting consolidated review of a little bit more than what you typically approve in a 1st Stage PUD. And what they are specifically asking for is laid out in Findings-of-Fact 55 and 58 of their draft order.

They are asking for, in addition to the approval of the entire platform and base infrastructure, also, the mix of uses, the height and density of each building in the site plan for the overall project in the consolidated aspect of the PUD.

And, basically, it's slightly different than your usual PUD procedures, but there is really no reason that you couldn't

NEAL R. GROSS

1	approve it this way, if that's the way they
2	want to do it. And given the amount of
3	investment that they are putting in the
4	infrastructure itself, it seems appropriate.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Would that give us
6	another chance at the 2 nd Stage to revisit
7	those issues? I guess it will. We will still
8	have an opportunity to revisit?
9	MR. RITTING: Well, I mean, the
10	reason they are asking for you to approve it
11	now is they don't want you to revisit it.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: They don't want to
13	hear it again.
14	MR. RITTING: But if you have
15	examined those issues and you are comfortable
16	with approving it now, there is no reason that
17	you couldn't do that.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Okay. I
19	just wanted to mention that. Anything else,
20	Commissioners?
21	I would take Mr. Ritting's
22	suggestion well, not his suggestion, but I

1	would follow it that we would go ahead and
2	proceed, at this point. Mr. Turnbull?
3	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes, I
4	think the only thing, we had some design
5	issues specifically with the south block. I
6	think that was on our table to look at. And
7	that would come with the 2 nd Stage, but we had
8	some serious issues with that.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, the design.
10	We will be able to look at that, I'm sure, at
11	the 2 nd Stage.
12	MR. RITTING: That isn't included
13	in the aspect of the project that they are
14	asking for for approval now.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
16	Commissioners, anything else on this? I do
17	want to commend the applicant for being
18	responsive. Let's just get it done this time.
19	I think I have been around, maybe it was a
20	different person who had it some years ago,
21	but let's get it done.
22	Okay. With that, unless there is

	anything eise: Mr. May:
2	COMMISSIONER MAY: I'm sorry, I'm
3	just a little slow catching up. The issue of
4	the $1^{ m st}$ Stage and $2^{ m nd}$ Stage review of the south
5	blocks, center and south blocks, we are not
6	taking anything off the table to that review
7	in the language that we are planning to adopt?
8	Is that right? Are we simply blessing the
9	exact height and density of the plan for the
10	center and south blocks?
11	MR. RITTING: That's correct. And
12	you will still have the architectural review
13	element in the 2 nd Stage for the south block.
14	COMMISSIONER MAY: Only the
15	architectural review in the 2 nd Stage? So we
16	are approving the full density regardless?
17	MR. RITTING: I'm going to have
18	to
19	COMMISSIONER MAY: I'm not sure,
20	maybe I misunderstood what the issue is. I
21	may have got it twisted in my head. Would you
22	mind walking me through it again?

MR. RITTING: Sure. Give me a moment to sort of get myself acclimated before I -
COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. Sure.

_

MR. RITTING: -- start speaking.

The applicant has proposed Finding-of-Fact 55 states that "The applicant includes a request for a Consolidated PUD for the following elements of the overall project:

The construction of the entire platform and base infrastructure. The mix of The height and density of each building and the site plan for the overall project, which would include the south building. The north block, the construction of all belowgrade parking concourse and service levels and proposed landscaping and the streetscape project for the overall project."

Finding-of-Fact 58 states that "The Consolidated PUD includes the mix of uses, height and density of each building and the site plan for the overall project. The

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

project requires a fully designed platform known for the project to commence. This construction is complex and expensive and incorporates significant risks and obligations not normally associated with the development in the District.

Therefore, the uses, height and density, as well as the site plan, must be finally determined prior to construction of the platform and the base infrastructure. The 2nd Stage review of the buildings in the center and south blocks will focus on architectural design."

So to the extent your question asked whether you were going to revisit the density of the center and south blocks -- can you hear me now? I feel like the Verizon guy.

So to the extent that you want to revisit the density and height of the south block, that is off the table.

VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Does that mean it's off the table for the applicant to

NEAL R. GROSS

revisit the height and density as well? 1 2 MR. RITTING: No. 3 COMMISSIONER MAY: Right. I mean, that was my question, because I think one of 4 5 the things I struggled with with the south 6 block, in particular, was their ability to 7 build that density and wind up with a good looking building. 8 And, you know, I mean, we did push 9 10 back a bit on that and tried to see some of the density moved around, but in the long run, 11 12 if they can't come up with a building that is 13 acceptable architecturally, at that full density, they may be forced to reexamine the 14 15 density of the project. And they could do 16 that if we are not willing to approve what they put before us. 17 18 MR. RITTING: That's true, yes. 19 COMMISSIONER MAY: All right. 20 I just don't like CHAIRMAN HOOD: the way that that was just worded. 21 The applicant -- unless I'm missing something, we 22

1 are pushing ourselves up against the wall. 2 But the applicant has the flexibility to make 3 a change in height, but we don't. I don't --4 MR. RITTING: Well --5 6 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Did I state that 7 correctly? COMMISSIONER MAY: I don't know. 8 I always thought that if we have -- if an 9 10 issue is decided, it means that it doesn't start out on the table, but I would think that 11 any 2nd Stage review we 12 could things decided in the 1st 13 Stage discretion. Could we not? 14 15 MR. RITTING: I'm not so sure you 16 can revisit them if they are in an order that you already issued. I mean, the question 17 would be whether you would approve the 2nd 18 19 Stage application that was before you and if 20 you found it unacceptable for some reason,

NEAL R. GROSS

COMMISSIONER MAY:

such as the design, then you could deny it.

21

22

Okay.

Well, I

1	mean, in just looking at the language the way
2	it is written here, the only thing that really
3	gives me any heartburn is the statement that
4	2 nd Stage review of the buildings in the
5	center and south blocks will focus on
6	architectural design.
7	I mean, that kind of goes without
8	saying, so I would just as soon not say it.
9	MR. RITTING: That's true.
10	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well, I
11	would like to know if that limits us to
12	setbacks or wanting more setbacks or just the
13	design?
14	MR. RITTING: You know, I mean, I
15	think that the, as we have sort of fleshed out
16	here, applicant has to prove that they can
17	build a building of that density and make it a
18	good looking building. And it has to be good
19	looking enough to get our approval.
20	If they do not do that and we
21	resist approving it, they will come back and
22	point to this order and say well, you are

really only focusing on the architectural design and, therefore, you should not be pushing back on something that would actually affect density.

So I mean, I would rather not have that sentence in there and everyone, I think, here knows that they will have to pass mustard with the Commission the second time, at the 2nd Stage and we will be looking for a very good building. And if they can do it and get their density, great. And if they can't, then they need to be thinking about all their options.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: So the sentence that we are looking at that we would like to have removed is the mix of uses, the height and density of each building? Is that the sentence?

COMMISSIONER MAY: No. It's the 2nd Stage review of the buildings in the center and south blocks will focus on architectural design.

NEAL R. GROSS

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Which findings?
COMMISSIONER MAY: It's at the
very end of 58.
CHAIRMAN HOOD: Therefore, the
use, height and density is this "Therefore,
the use, height and density, as well as the
site plan must be finally returned prior to
construction or platform or base
infrastructure. The $2^{ m nd}$ Stage review of the
buildings in the center and south blocks will
focus on architectural design."
COMMISSIONER MAY: Just that last
sentence there.
COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes.
Commissioner May, I mean, my feeling is we
still need to give this a comprehensive review
when it comes before us. I think you have got
a good point there. I'm just I just don't
want to get us I think you are right. I
don't think we should be locked in to just one
item.

the

Zoning

I

think

22

Commission

needs to perform its due diligence and review the next stage as we normally would.

COMMISSIONER MAY: I agree. And agree that that the -- with also, Ι applicant's intent, which is that they need to have certainty to be able to move forward and invest in that entire infrastructure, so I think that Ι mean, that's comfortable with the sentence before it, because, you know, they need to make -- they do need to make certain determinations in order to move forward.

But they also, I mean, I think at this point, should be well-aware of the concerns that the Commission had about the overall density. And while, you know, we are giving them the ability to try to build it out completely, they still need to come back for that 2nd Stage review and it's not to say that we are going to explicitly reserve the right to reduce the density at the 2nd Stage review.

It may be one of the few tools

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	that the applicant has to work with in order
2	to get the final approval. Anyway, for me it
3	all boils down to that one last sentence. I
4	would be happier just striking that last
5	sentence.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: And I'm not sure
7	if we you know, maybe I'm reading it too
8	much, because I have actually read it a few
9	times. I'm not sure if we exactly are we
10	achieving what we are trying to get by just
11	taking out that last sentence?
12	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I would
13	like to ask, OAG, what's your feeling on our
14	position with this?
15	MR. RITTING: Well, I mean, if you
16	strike that last sentence, you are still
17	leaving in all of Finding-of-Fact 55, which
18	includes the approval of a mix of uses, the
19	height and density of each building and the
20	site plan for the overall project, which is in
21	keeping with what 1 st Stage approval is.

mean,

it

seems

I

22

perfectly

1	appropriate to include that in there. If you
2	just strike that last sentence, I don't really
3	see it having much of a significance at all
4	really.
5	I mean, if it gives you pause,
6	then I would be happy to strike it.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I mean, let's be
8	realistic. What are we doing? Nothing. I
9	mean, we can strike it.
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: Well, I mean,
11	the alternative is for us to say in the order
12	what we have just said on the dias, which is
13	that it is while this density has been
14	approved by this order, the, you know,
15	applicant may choose to reduce the density in
16	order to effect a more successful design in
17	the 2 nd Stage review.
18	MR. RITTING: I think that would
19	be appropriate to include and would be
20	completely legally sufficient to do so.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: What did you say?
22	I'm sorry.

1	COMMISSIONER MAY: I don't know,
2	what did I say?
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I was still
4	reading the sentence again.
5	MR. RITTING: Hopefully the Court
6	Reporter is still recording this and I'll be
7	happy to review it before I issue it.
8	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. I mean,
9	the gist of it was that the applicant you
10	know, while the Zoning Commission was
11	approving the maximum or approving this
12	specific density, the applicant has the
13	flexibility to use less density in order to
14	create a more effective design for the
15	building in order to get the approval at the
16	2 nd Stage.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
18	COMMISSIONER MAY: So just stating
19	specifically that they can make it a little
20	bit smaller and do setbacks and things like
21	that to make the design approvable.
22	MR. RITTING: Is this limited to

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	the south block or does it include the center
2	block?
3	COMMISSIONER MAY: The center and
4	south, I would say.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So are we still
6	striking the sentence that doesn't really do
7	anything or are we going to leave that in?
8	MR. RITTING: Yes. I would strike
9	the one which limits our review to
10	architectural design.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I'll go
12	along with that, but I'm not sure if I agree
13	whole in totality, but let's see what
14	happens.
15	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Chair,
16	are you unsure of the strength of the language
17	in the orders?
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I just think that
19	I just don't like to be backed up against
20	the wall. And I go by something I heard by
21	you, Mr. Turnbull, even though you probably
22	think I don't listen, is he is telling us that

somebody is going to come in here and try to lower the density.

And as you stated previously, you know, it might not have even been in this case, everybody always comes in with the maximum, with the most and I don't know. I'll just wait and see, you know.

commissioner may: Well, I fully expect them to come in with something that is the maximum density, but, again, it has to be a good building. And if they can't get to the good building without shaving off a little bit more here or there, then, you know, so be it. I think it needs to be explicit that we think that that's still on the table for the applicant.

But, you know, they, I'm sure, will hire very talented people and will come up with a very good design no matter what.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Which kind of goes back to what the Vice Chairman said a while back. I think -- does that -- I don't want to

NEAL R. GROSS

1	put words in your mouth, but you were talking
2	about the density design and being able to
3	build to the maximum point.
4	I think that kind of goes back to
5	what you I know you guys don't think I pay
6	you all attention, but I actually do.
7	Okay. So I don't know where we
8	are. I guess are you going to try to put
9	something together for us, Mr. Ritting?
10	MR. RITTING: Yes, I'll revise the
11	draft order and circulate to you before we
12	send it out.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: But you know what
14	we want? I think we can still go ahead and
15	move forward, unless somebody has some
16	unreadiness. Is there anything else?
17	Anything else? Okay. Would somebody like to
18	make a motion? I'm not going to touch this
19	one.
20	Okay. I would move approval of
21	Zoning Commission Case No. 08-34, Center Place
22	Holdings, 1 st Stage PUD and Related Map

1	Amendment and Consolidated PUD at Squares 564,
2	566 and 568, taking into consideration our
3	discussion that was just happening on the dias
4	and ask for a second.
5	COMMISSIONER MAY: Second.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: It has been moved
7	and properly seconded. Any further
8	discussion? Are you ready for the question?
9	All those in favor, aye?
10	ALL: Aye.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing any
12	opposition, Ms. Schellin, would you, please
13	record the vote?
14	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, staff would
15	record the vote 5-0-0 to approve Final Action
16	in Zoning Commission Case No. 08-34 as
17	amended. Commissioner Hood moving,
18	Commissioner May seconding, Commissioners
19	Schlater, Selfridge and Turnbull in support.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. We are
21	going to go over we are going to skip
22	Proposed Action for the time and we will go to

1	Hearing Action. Yes, Hearing Action, Zoning
2	Commission Case No. 11-09, Duball Petworth,
3	LLC, Consolidated PUD and Related Map
4	Amendment at Square 2905. Mr. Cochran?
5	MR. COCHRAN: Good evening, Mr.
6	Chair and Members of the Commission. Duball
7	Petworth has applied for approval of a PUD and
8	Related Map Amendment on the west side of
9	Georgia Avenue between Quincy and Randolph
10	Streets, N.W.
11	The location is about a block
12	north of the Georgia Avenue-Petworth Metro
13	Station on Metro's Green and Yellow Lines.
14	The site is Zoned Georgia Avenue
15	Overlay, C-3-A, along the Georgia Avenue
16	portion of it. Towards the interior of the
17	block, beginning with part of the alley for
18	which the applicant has filed a closure
19	request, the land is Zoned R-4.
20	The applicant has requested a
21	chance in the R-4 Zoning as part of the PUD,
22	so that the entire acre and a half site would

be Zoned Georgia Avenue, C-3-A.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Right now, the site contains a 23,000 square foot Safeway, a parking lot and a short section of alley. If it were developed as a matter-of-right, the section fronting Georgia Avenue could be developed to a full .0 FAR and 90 feet in height.

The interlock section could not be developed for its R-4 Zone uses without zoning relief, due to alley dwelling restrictions.

The proposed PUD would be 306,000 square foot 4.5 FAR mixed-use building rising 80 feet on Georgia Avenue and 21 feet in the interior. It would contain a 63,000 foot Safeway, that's about 40,000 square square feet bigger than the one there now, with 220 apartments above it and underground parking and loading.

The relief requested includes the rezoning of the R-4 portion and relief from retail parking requirements, open court width, numbers and setbacks of penthouses and

features of the Georgia Avenue Overlay, including those governing the average distance between exterior doors and the height of the back of house areas ceiling.

The proposal is not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The Future Land Use Map shows the Georgia Avenue C-3-A portion of the site as appropriate for moderate density commercial and medium density residential uses.

The Generalized Policy Map shows the entire site, including the portion now zoned R-4 as part of the Georgia Avenue Main Street Mixed-Use Corridor.

OP's report describes how the project would not be inconsistent with written elements in the Comprehensive Plan. The project would also be congruent with the objectives of the PUD Regulations. It would further transit-oriented development being located a block from a Metro Station.

Its design is superior. The

NEAL R. GROSS

requested relief is not, obviously, out of
line with the projects benefits, which would
include one of special value to the
neighborhood, the Safeway, one which Chapter
24 highlights as a public benefit, the
additional housing, and the first source, but
not an LSDBE agreement.
So far, Petworth residents have
been generally favorable. OP, the ANC and the
applicant would work on refinements to the
benefits package should the application be set
down.
Speaking of which, OP recommends
the Commission set down this PUD for a public
hearing. That concludes the testimony.
CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Mr.
Cochran. Commissioners, any questions of the
Office of Planning?
COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes, Mr.
Chair?
CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Turnbull?
COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Thank you.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Mr. Cochran, I just had looking at page G-09, the turning radiuses in the alley for the trucks, I would like to see them develop a bigger, more accurate -- it looks like on the one on the right hand side, that it really -- maybe the way it is -- again, maybe it's an element of the drawing, it does come very close to the end of the wall there.

I would like guess, to see something a little bit clearer as to exactly how it is really going to work. I'm also concerned about whether -- I would like to see them have either -- some kind of a dock management plan. We have gone through this before with a large grocery store and trucks I'm concerned about coming in and noise, exhaust from the trucks, idling trucks out in the alley right by this apartment complex.

Do you have --

MR. COCHRAN: Mr. Chair, I just want to point out that all of that would occur below-grade. It's all underground.

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	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well, they
2	are going in on the alley though, right, from
3	what I'm seeing? The trucks are going in on
4	the alley off the
5	MR. COCHRAN: They go in off of an
6	alley and down a ramp, yes.
7	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: But I'm
8	just wondering if there is a wait and they
9	have trucks waiting up in the alley
10	MR. COCHRAN: I know.
11	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: idling.
12	MR. COCHRAN: I'll certainly take
13	that to the applicant.
14	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes. I'm
15	just concerned. We had this before on another
16	one and just concerned about how they are
17	going to we don't want trucks idling out
18	there 10 minutes before somebody opens the
19	door and a truck goes down for 20 minutes.
20	But I would like to see a better
21	picture on how that really works and what they
22	how they plan to manage this.

I would also like to see some better elevations of those sections on the alleys where the garage is, I believe, where they have grills. I think there is grills. I can't tell. I would like to know what those grills look like.

much light will be spilling out from behind them? Are there going to be something to diminish the effect on the neighborhood? So I would like to see a little bit more of the characteristics architecturally of how they are planning to deal with these open grills on the garages.

I mean, it appears to me that there is brick all around the first floor, first two floors. It looks like brick is the material that I'm seeing. But I would like to see some -- on those areas where -- the drawings we have now are very small. I would like to see a blow-up of how they are going to articulate that brick.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	Is there going to be any relief to
2	it? Is it just a brick wall? Something on
3	it? But I know you are working with them on
4	that.
5	MR. COCHRAN: Yes.
6	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. The
7	roof plan, it looks like it's just a white
8	roof membrane. I couldn't really tell from
9	the except on the second floor.
10	MR. COCHRAN: Correct. It is not
11	a green roof, per se. It's a reflective roof.
12	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
13	MR. COCHRAN: They call it a cool
14	roof.
15	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Cool roof.
16	But it's still LEED? Okay. The sixth floor
17	terrace, I'm not sure what that was. I saw a
18	little box designating a sixth floor terrace.
19	I don't know what is going on there. Just a
20	place to come out, I'm assuming.
21	Just to remind them about resumes
22	for their expert witnesses that they carefully

document the experience, so we don't have to rehash it up here.

MR. COCHRAN: Okay.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I guess I thought that some of the amenities might be a little light, other than -- I mean, from what they are proffering. I mean, the city is closing -- is going to close an alley if this thing goes ahead. I was just looking for maybe a little bit more from them on that.

I would like to see a perspective or some kind of a view of the cafe area just off of Georgia looking down the street, at what that really is going to look like.

I think I might be interested also in a shadow study showing the impact of the height of the building on the adjacent buildings, what kind of a -- what that would really look like.

There is also a -- in the plan, there shows a garage exhaust shaft. And it doesn't seem to go up to the roof, it just

NEAL R. GROSS

sort of seems like it ends and it looks like 1 2 one of the alleys. I'm 3 about exhaust, garage concerned exhaust emptying out into the alley with people going 4 I need a little -- I think we need a 5 by. 6 little bit more information on that. And I think those are most of my 7 8 questions. Thank you. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, 9 10 Turnbull. Any other questions of the Office of Planning? Vice Chairman? 11 12 VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Thank 13 Mr. Chairman. I think this is an you, exciting project. It will be great 14 15 Georgia Ave. to have a new Safeway and to have 16 the residential above it. There are a few things that we are going to have to work 17 through as we go through the process. 18 19 The portion of the building that 20 concerns me from a design standpoint is the tongue in the back. I don't know what that --21

if you want to call that the loading area.

seems like with the change in grade on the site, that that loading area actually gets pretty tall as it backs up to the adjacent townhomes.

And it is right now designed as a blank brick wall. So I guess one of my first concerns is what you have got there now is a parking lot, surface lot. And if I go to one of the sections, it looks like that tongue goes up, you know, 2.5 stories almost.

So I think some attention needs to be paid to that. And also on that area, there is the mechanical penthouse for the grocery store and I know that, you know, with all the refrigeration that goes on and all the cooking that goes on in grocery stores these days, that those can be very loud units and they can create a lot of smells as well. And that is located very close to the apartment building, right across what looks to be a 20 foot public alley.

And I know that if I had an

NEAL R. GROSS

apartment, I wouldn't want, you know, the mechanical equipment of a Safeway 20 feet away. It is entirely possible that, you know, it is better than the current situation out there as well.

So I think we will be willing to explore that further, but it would be certainly a concern of mine is the proximity of that mechanical equipment.

And then one of the waivers that for is is being asked on the court And I just don't know if there requirements. is much to be done here. And we. have discussed these court requirements in the ZRR And this particular court process. going to be impacting anybody else's light and air, but I do note that it is a closed court and it is less than 40 feet wide. That seems like it would be pretty well closed in.

I don't know if there is much the applicant can do about it. But I also would note that the -- in the benefits and amenity

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	section, we have got this portable housing
2	proffered here and in our regulations,
3	affordable housing is actually required in
4	this zone.
5	And I don't think the applicant is
6	doing anything to exceed those requirements.
7	So, from my standpoint, I would scratch that
8	for my consideration of the balancing test. I
9	think that's it for now. Thank you.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Anything
11	else? Commissioner May?
12	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, just a
13	couple of quick things. I appreciate the Vice
14	Chairman and Commissioner Turnbull's questions
15	and I look forward to seeing the answers or
16	hearing the answers to a lot of that when the
17	hearing comes around.
18	And most of my questions I'll save
19	for the hearing, because, for the most part,
20	this is, I think, a project that is off to a
21	good start.

I do have a concern though.

22

Ιt

seems from the drawings that I see that there is -- I don't know if I'm understanding the drawings correctly, but the base masonry at the front of the building, which is -- which alternates between a smooth course and a rough course, rough-textured course, it looks like it's some sort of concrete block, according to the image that we have here.

And I would be very, very concerned if this building, the base of this building, were just a concrete block of some sort, no matter how good you make the concrete block look, it's not going to look very good.

I mean, if it were precast or something like that and I'm just reading it incorrectly, that would be a different thing.

And then the other concern I have with regard to materials is the use of fiber cement panels in the upper floors of the main building in the fronts. I'm not convinced that that's such a great idea.

I mean, it's primarily a brick

NEAL R. GROSS

1	building, maybe it will look fine as an
2	offsetting color, I don't know, or offsetting
3	material, but I understand completely fiber
4	cement panels in the courtyard basis, but on
5	the main facade of the building where
6	everything else is masonry, you've got precast
7	and brick and hopefully a handsome block or
8	handsome masonry unit at the lower levels.
9	The fiber cement panels in the
10	upper level seem kind of out of place. But I
11	just note that as a question and the applicant
12	can try to make the case or consider
13	alternatives. Thanks.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
15	Commissioner Selfridge?
16	COMMISSIONER SELFRIDGE: Thank
17	you, Mr. Chairman. I would agree with what
18	Vice Chairman Schlater said about an exciting
19	project. Certainly, the neighborhood will
20	benefit from the new Safeway, something that
21	is more modern and updated.

But

I did have a couple of the

same concerns of Mr. Turnbull. One would be the benefits and amenities packages, as well, thought that little bit was а light, particularly in light of what the Vice Chairman says about affordable housing. then how that new 80 foot building will relate to the existing rowhouses and some shadow studies to maybe understand that a little bit That would be all for me. better.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let me just ask this, Mr. Cochran, is the, and this goes back to Vice Chairman Schlater mentioning about what is required in the affordable housing, applicant proffering or intent on doing more than what is required?

MR. COCHRAN: If the --

MS. STEINGASSER: I just want to set a context and maybe a work session amongst us all, so that we understand how we are all looking at this affordable housing issue would be advantageous in a non-case-specific type of discussion.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

The PUDs require a comparison of matter-of-right versus the PUD product. So when we look at the affordable housing issues, we look at what is required as a matter-of-right. And if the PUD enables more housing or more affordable housing, we consider that a benefit, not necessarily a proffer, but a benefit.

So there is a distinction made between both the matter-of-right, the benefits and the amenities. And historically, the Commission has accepted that realm in cases like this where you are in a Commercial Zone when they use density that could otherwise be used for non-residential, we also consider that a benefit and that's the case here.

So there is a delta of affordable housing that is in excess of what would be required as a matter-of-right. And that's why we checked it both as a benefit and as required.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: And I think we

NEAL R. GROSS

1	have been down that road before and I hear
2	what you are saying. Okay. Let me just ask
3	this. This is probably I'm not going to
4	say it's not appropriate, I just want to ask,
5	is this Safeway the one that came from Ward 5
6	or was already up there in that area? I'm
7	just curious.
8	MR. COCHRAN: The Safeway is
9	already there.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Good.
11	Okay. All right. Any other questions? All
12	right. Would somebody like to make a motion?
13	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Chair,
14	I would make a motion that we set down Zoning
15	Commission Case No. 11-09, Consolidated PUD
16	and Related Map Amendment at Square 2905, 3830
17	Georgia Avenue, N.W., and ask for a second.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'll second it.
19	Okay. It has been moved and properly
20	seconded. Any further discussion?
21	All those in favor, aye?
22	ALL: Aye.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing any
2	opposition, Ms. Schellin, would you, please,
3	record the vote?
4	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, staff records
5	the vote 5-0-0 to set down Zoning Commission
6	Case No. 11-09 as a contested case.
7	Commissioner Turnbull moving, Commissioner
8	Hood seconding, Commissioners May, Schlater
9	and Selfridge in support.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Schellin, I
11	also would like to ask that for our training
12	sessions that what Ms. Steingasser just
13	mentioned about a work group, maybe that be
	mentioned about a work group, maybe that be added to the training session. Okay. So
13 14 15	
14	added to the training session. Okay. So
14 15	added to the training session. Okay. So keeping in context.
14 15 16	added to the training session. Okay. So keeping in context. MS. STEINGASSER: And that OP
14 15 16 17	added to the training session. Okay. So keeping in context. MS. STEINGASSER: And that OP would be invited.
14 15 16 17	added to the training session. Okay. So keeping in context. MS. STEINGASSER: And that OP would be invited. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Huh?
114 115 116 117 118	added to the training session. Okay. So keeping in context. MS. STEINGASSER: And that OP would be invited. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Huh? MS. STEINGASSER: And that OP

1	meeting. So we can just make sure we
2	understand it within the context and anyone
3	else. Okay.
4	MS. SCHELLIN: Are you referring
5	to the Zoning Commission BZA training?
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Wherever we can
7	fit it in, yes.
8	MS. SCHELLIN: Okay.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.
10	MS. STEINGASSER: Okay.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Just for that,
12	wherever we can fit it in, yes. Okay. Where
13	am I? Oh, Correspondence, we need to do that
14	before you leave. Okay.
15	Zoning Commission Case No. 05-28,
16	Parkside Residential, LLC - letter from Zoning
17	Administrator re: Notification 2 nd Stage
18	approval not necessary for Block D. Ms.
19	Schellin?
20	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir, this was
21	just a letter from the ZA advising of action
22	that they took in this case. It does not

1	require any action from the Commission.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. No action
3	requested. Any questions?
4	COMMISSIONER MAY: Well, I was
5	hoping we might have some discussion. I'm not
6	so sure that I agree. You know, the idea that
7	there shouldn't be 2 nd Stage review of a
8	landscaped area simply because there is no
9	structure on it, I mean, I know there are
10	other subtleties to the order and so on, but
11	I'm I don't know.
12	I would prefer that we see
13	something like this than let it simply go on a
14	1 st Stage alone. Now, maybe what that means
15	is that when we get a 1 st Stage and it
16	includes a landscaped area, that there be an
17	explicit sort of 2 nd Stage approval of the
18	landscape and I think that has been done.
19	That may have been what we just did with
20	Center Place Holdings.
21	MR. RITTING: That was a
22	discussion of the site plan of the PUD which

1	includes the landscaping, but also includes	
2	its relationship to buildings.	
3	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.	
4	MR. RITTING: Which is a possible	
5	distinction you could make between	
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.	
7	MR. RITTING: them.	
8	COMMISSIONER MAY: I just think,	
9	you know, we need to well, like I said, I	
10	think that our 2 nd Stage review should apply	
11	to landscape spaces and not simply buildings.	
12	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: I tend to	
13	agree. I also wonder whether the landscape	
14	plans in this case were different from what	
15	was on the plans that were originally put	
16	forward in front of the Commission?	
17	MR. RITTING: I'm not sure. I	
18	haven't really had a chance to review it. I	
19	just saw this letter coming in today. I	
20	haven't compared them, but I could report back	
21	to you at a date certain, if that's what you	

are interested in.

1	COMMISSIONER MAY: Well, I think
2	that is certainly one of the issues. I mean,
3	if what the plan has to be built-out varies at
4	all from what was approved, you know, that's
5	one issue. But I think that it would be
6	well, what I would like to see is that we
7	write a letter back to the Zoning
8	Administrator saying that we believe 2 nd Stage
9	approvals are necessary for landscape spaces,
10	unless the 1 st Stage explicitly gives a final
11	approval of some sort. That's my thought.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Does anybody else
13	agree with well, either way, I think we
14	still should respond back, because he is
15	exercising his flexibility here, I believe, at
16	least from what I gather.
17	So, I guess, what are we trying to
18	do? Further clarification? What is it?
19	COMMISSIONER MAY: I'm not seeking
20	clarification nor am I seeking that, at this
21	point, his decision be reversed in any way. I

just think that it should be clarified to the

1 Zoning Administrator that absence of 2 the mere fact that there 3 structures on the site does not mean that it should not be seen for 2nd Stage approval. 4 5 that it is possible And for something to go forward after a 1st Stage 6 review only if the Zoning Commission states in 7 the order from the 1st Stage approval that the 8 in effect, a 2nd landscapes have, 9 10 approval. Okay. 11 CHAIRMAN HOOD: So don't we do this? As Mr. Ritting said, you 12 would look at this a little more? 13 Yes, I really 14 MR. RITTING: 15 haven't studied the issue in a detailed way to 16 be able to give you an answer right now about whether landscaping alone requires a 2nd Stage 17 approval. I just haven't considered that. 18 19 COMMISSIONER MAY: Well, and, Ι I think there is an understandable, 20 think, kind of technical argument as to why a 21

2nd Stage approval was not necessary.

don't view this as a technical matter. I view 1 2 this as more of a matter of principle that we 3 should, you know, see the final version of the landscape plan. 4 And maybe we did at the 1st Stage, 5 6 but if we did, the approval should be 7 explicit. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well, let's do 8 this, Commissioner May and Mr. Ritting, let's 9 10 let Mr. Ritting have some time. I would ask Ms. Schellin to put, even though we are not 11 seeking clarification, but we still want some 12 clarification, this on our June, the first 13 meeting in June, 13th? 14 MS. SCHELLIN: June 13th. 15 16 CHAIRMAN HOOD: That way that will give Mr. Ritting some time to be able to 17 expound and articulate more to us to see which 18 19 path or direction we should proceed. Is that 20 okay, Mr. Ritting? 21 MR. RITTING: Yes. 22 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Okay.

1	Let's see, okay, the next correspondence is
2	Zoning Commission Case No. 07-02, Columbia
3	Heights Ventures Parcel 26, LLC - letter from
4	the Zoning Administrator pursuant to ' 2409.8.
5	Ms. Schellin?
6	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. This was also
7	a letter from the ZA and I'm afraid to say
8	that no action is required, so I'm going to
9	leave that up to you guys.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, this is the
11	one I was thinking about. Okay. Okay. Any
12	questions? Vice Chairman Schlater?
13	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: This one
14	raises a couple of questions. Most
15	importantly, we just had the case before us, I
16	want to say, time flies up here, but it was a
17	couple of months back, and I feel like it was
18	after these plans are date the plans
19	that the Zoning Administrator is basing this
20	opinion on are dated January 10, 2011.
21	I believe that the case, I could
22	be wrong about this, but I think, that we had

1	on this building, Phase 2 of Highland Park,
2	was after January 10, 2011.
3	COMMISSIONER MAY: Where are you
4	getting January? I see March.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: March 2 nd .
6	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Oh, I see
7	in the paragraph before that. "After
8	reviewing the new elevation drawings by GTM
9	Architects, dated 1/10/2011, I find that the
10	revisions do not change any of the zoning
11	parameters for the project."
12	So I don't know. I don't have
13	any
14	COMMISSIONER MAY: So it's between
15	January 10 th and March 2 nd it changed?
16	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Okay.
17	However, it just seems odd that, you know,
18	they had the plans in front of us recently. I
19	don't have any problem with the Zoning
20	Administrator using his
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Flexibility.
22	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER:

authority to approve the flexibility in the 1 2 It seems like an odd fact there. 3 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Do we want further clarification on that one, too? 4 5 COMMISSIONER MAY: would Т 6 actually like to speak to the issue of what 7 was approved. You know, I don't recall this design, in particular, but the idea that a 8 project had Juliet balconies on a couple of 9 10 floors before and they added them on the rest of the building, I'm not sure that that is 11 12 really the right decision. And, you know, we do get into the 13 weeds on these things and look at the design 14 15 of the building very carefully. And, you 16 know, I'm not sure that this is really within t.he realm of the Zoning Administrator's 17 flexibility. 18 19 I mean, the flexibility that the 20 Zoning Administrator has, isn't that defined by the order that we write? Because I don't 21 you know, having any discussion 22 remember,

about how many Juliet balconies there would be.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I thought we gave them the option to do all of that.

VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER:

COMMISSIONER MAY: Well, I don't know, maybe we did. If we did do that, then I'm wrong and I take it back. But I just, you know, don't know. I want to be fairly particular when we approve something as a PUD when it comes to the architecture. And I think that we will grant flexibility on things like color of brick within a certain range or what have you.

But the idea of adding, you know, physical features like balconies, I'm not sure that we would necessarily --

MR. RITTING: Yes, if I could interject here? There is a regulation. If you have your regulations in front of you, it's 2409.6, which provides what the Zoning Administrator's authority is in granting

NEAL R. GROSS

flexibility. And it mentions four things.

It doesn't explicitly mention changing balconies, that's for sure. There is another section after that, which is what the Zoning Administrator relied on in his letter, he cited in his letter, which refers to that earlier section.

So there is at least an argument that his authority is limited to just those four things. They are, generally speaking, change in height, lot occupancy and gross floor area, changing the number of residential units or gross floor area to be used for commercial or accessory uses, change not to exceed 2 percent of the number of parking or loading spaces, the relocation of any building within 5 feet of its approved location in order to retain flexibility of design for reasons of unforeseen subsoil conditions or adverse topography.

So none of them really speak to the types of design changes that are in play

NEAL R. GROSS

1 here. 2 VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Wouldn't 3 we have to reference the order though, where we also usually have a few lines in the order 4 5 that speak to the flexibility? 6 MR. RITTING: That's also true. And I don't know what this particular order 7 says about that. 8 Well, this may COMMISSIONER MAY: 9 10 well be within the range of things that were defined in the order, in terms of flexibility, 11 and if so, then I'm perfectly fine with this. 12 13 But. Т think we need to know that more specifically, and I would appreciate it if we 14 could just get that clarified. 15 16 And if it is, in fact, beyond what was specified in the order, then I think a 17 response would be in order. 18 19 CHAIRMAN HOOD: And I would agree, 20 because when I look at the regulations, Mr.

they changed the color of the brick.

Ritting, I don't see where it says I think

21

know that's not a major issue, but we look at materials. And we look at how the character of that building or facade of it is going to mix into the character of the rest of the neighborhood.

And when I look at the regulation you cited, I don't see that in his flexibility, unless I'm overlooking it, but I don't see it. So I think this is another one that we need to go back to.

MR. RITTING: Okay. What Ι propose to do is I would review the order that has been issued and T'll review the regulations and report back to you about what I think the interplay is between the changes that they requesting here and the are giving the Zoning Administrator regulations the authority to make changes in that that is contained within the order and get back to you in time --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

MR. RITTING: -- for a date that

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	you will tell me, I assume, now.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Is that we
3	might as well do all of them. If we can do
4	all of them at our next meeting, is that too
5	much?
6	MR. RITTING: No.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So we will
8	do that. We will follow suit with that.
9	Thank you. All right.
10	Let's move right along with the
11	agenda.
12	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Mr.
13	Chairman, I just want to thank you for
14	restructuring the agenda tonight.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: We have one more.
16	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Oh, do we
17	have?
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, we have one
19	more Correspondence.
20	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: We do?
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I know you are
22	ready to cut out.

1	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: I'm out.	
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: But this won't	
3	take but a second.	
4	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Okay.	
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Unless you are	
6	out? Okay.	
7	MS. SCHELLIN: I think he's out.	
8	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: I	
9	actually didn't attend that hearing, so	
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, well, no	
11	wonder.	
12	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: I	
13	may	
14	MS. SCHELLIN: Did you do the	
15	first Proposed Action item? Were you not on	
16	that first case?	
17	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: I might	
18	have been there, but not after that.	
19	MS. SCHELLIN: The first one, yes.	
20	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Fair	
21	enough.	
22	MS. SCHELLIN: I spoiled it for	

1	you.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: We're going to get
3	you right out of here. Okay.
4	Next, we have a request,
5	Commissioners, this is Exhibit No. 14, in
6	consideration of a lack of objection to the
7	above-matter, this is a meeting we had on,
8	actually, last Thursday.
9	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.
LO	CHAIRMAN HOOD: The waiver.
11	Asking that we waive, the Commission waive,
L2	the requirements of ' 3125.3 the Findings of
L3	Fact and Conclusions of Law and they are
L4	asking for a summary order. Do we need a vote
L5	on that?
L6	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, or at least
L7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: The case that only
L8	lasted us about
L9	MS. SCHELLIN: by consensus.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: two minutes.
21	MS. SCHELLIN: Right. They just
22	forgot to ask at the end of the hearing and so

1 without the Commission agreeing or 2 authorizing it, they can't do it. 3 CHAIRMAN HOOD: I think with the way that that case went with no objection, 4 5 everybody was able to go do something else 6 that evening, it had plenty of support, 7 especially with this case, George Washington, it had plenty of support, so you know all the 8 Is were dotted and Ts were crossed. 9 I don't think we -- I don't see a 10 11 problem us granting a summary order. Any 12 objection? Okay. Ms. Schellin, no objection 13 to a summary order. MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. 14 Next, so we 15 can get the Vice Chairman out of here. 16 in Proposed Action, Zoning Commission Case No. 11-01, Office of Planning - Text Amendment at 17 ' 2116, the location of parking spaces. 18 19 Schellin? 20 sir. MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, OP provided some supplemental information that 21 22 the Commission requested that is at Exhibit

1	14
2	
3	Co
4	al
5	se
6	3D
7	re

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

Commissioners, we have in front of us -- we also have a letter from ANC-3 -- give me a second. We also have a submission from ANC-3D, which actually coincides with what was relayed to us by Mrs. Gates representing the Committee of 100. And I think as a result of that, and let me just ask -- who is that, Mr. Mordfin? Is that your case?

MS. SCHELLIN: Mr. Emerine.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Emerine, okay.

Okay. So, Mr. Emerine, has the Committee of

100 and the ANC had a chance to look at what
has been proposed, the new language?

MR. EMERINE: The supplemental memo that we sent was sent to the Committee of 100 and everyone else who testified at the hearing that night. I don't know if the ANC-3D has seen it or not.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Do you know what the response was from the Committee of

NEAL R. GROSS

100?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. EMERINE: We haven't received a formal response from the Committee of 100. We did have some discussions and I believe, I don't want to speak for them, but, we talked in particular about the clarification of the private garage issue and Ι think addressed the concern that they had on that But that's kind of the extent of what issue. we were able to resolve in conversation with them.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Because as a result, which was expressed to us, what we had written first before what you had revised, would impact the whole neighborhood and would cause some difficulties. But, Commissioners, there has been revision as Mr. Emerine has mentioned that he has tried to deal with, at least the issue, that I remember, that was given from the Committee of 100.

And even that, it depends on how we move, there is still a 30 day comment

NEAL R. GROSS

1	period in which we would still be able to
2	receive comments. People would still have a
3	chance to comment to the Committee. We would
4	be able to find out exactly where we are with
5	this in that 30 day comment period.
6	Let me open it up for discussion.
7	Any further discussion? Mr. Selfridge?
8	COMMISSIONER SELFRIDGE: Mr.
9	Chairman, I think it would be interesting to
10	hear from the Committee of 100 what their take
11	on this new language is, but, as you
12	mentioned, there is an opportunity to do it
13	between Proposed and Final Action, so, you
14	know, I think that would allow us to discuss
15	in a little greater detail at Final Action, so
16	we'll look forward to receiving that.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Anybody else?
18	Commissioner May?
19	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, I just had
20	a question regarding the ANC-3D letter. And,
21	I mean, basically, it sounds like the concern,

just so I understand this, I thought we had

1	some discussion of this at the hearing, is it
2	seems that they want to be able to preserve a
3	right that does not now exist when it comes to
4	driveways. Is that correct?
5	MR. EMERINE: I haven't had a
6	chance to see the 3D letter, but
7	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. And so
8	many homes within ANC-3D have driveways in the
9	side yard that are used by homeowners for
10	parking.
11	MR. EMERINE: Yes.
12	COMMISSIONER MAY: The proposed
13	Text Amendment would limit the ability of
14	residents to replace their driveways and
15	garages in the future or construct space in a
16	side yard for parking. I mean, well, I guess
17	I don't know whether this regulation changes
18	that.
19	MR. EMERINE: It doesn't. Only
20	with respect to corner lots.
21	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
22	MR. EMERINE: You know, there is

1	sort of an issue on corner lots if you are						
2	defining, you know, both yards that abut the						
3	streets as two front yards or a front yard and						
4	a side yard.						
5	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.						
6	MR. EMERINE: And there is a lack						
7	of clarity right now, which this Text						
8	Amendment is trying to provide clarity to. So						
9	I don't know if that is the specific issue						
10	that is						
11	COMMISSIONER MAY: Well, if there						
12	were a side yard in a corner lot						
13	MR. EMERINE: Yes.						
14	COMMISSIONER MAY: under the						
15	current regulations, you might actually be						
16	able to have a driveway, add a driveway?						
17	MR. EMERINE: It's actually						
18	unclear.						
19	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay.						
20	MR. EMERINE: But I think under						
21	certain interpretations, that could be						
22	possible.						

1	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. And the						
2	scene that was described at the hearing where						
3	someone might have a driveway that is to the						
4	side of the house						
5	MR. EMERINE: Yes.						
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: but actually						
7	ends before it gets to the side of the house						
8	MR. EMERINE: Yes.						
9	COMMISSIONER MAY: and so the						
10	actual parking is occurring in that front yard						
11	space, that's not legal now.						
12	MR. EMERINE: That's correct.						
13	COMMISSIONER MAY: And where it						
14	exists, it is grandfathered?						
15	MR. EMERINE: That's right.						
16	COMMISSIONER MAY: And this						
17	regulation would have no change, have no						
18	affect on that?						
19	MR. EMERINE: That's my						
20	understanding, yes.						
21	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right. Okay.						
22	Okay. I look forward to hearing further						

1	comments when we take action.						
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other						
3	questions? Well, since we have another						
4	comment period, Commissioners, I would move						
5	that we approve with the amendments as revised						
6	by the Office of Planning in Zoning Commission						
7	Case No. 11-01, taking a note that we are						
8	looking for comments, if we receive comments						
9	in this next 30 day comment period, and ask						
10	for a second.						
11	COMMISSIONER SELFRIDGE: Second.						
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: It has been moved						
13	and properly seconded. Any further						
14	discussion?						
15	All those in favor?						
16	ALL: Aye.						
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing any						
18	opposition, Ms. Schellin, would you, please						
19	record the vote?						
20	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, staff records						
21	the vote 5-0-0 to approve Proposed Action in						
22	Zoning Commission Case No. 11-01, as amended.						

1	Commissioner Hood moving, Commissioner						
2	Selfridge seconding, Commissioners May,						
3	Schlater and Turnbull in support.						
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Mr. Vice						
5	Chairman, thank you.						
6	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Thank						
7	you.						
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Have a nice						
9	evening. Okay. Next we have Proposed Action						
10	in Zoning Commission Case No. 05-28E, Lano						
11	Parcel 12, LLC and D.C. Primary Care						
12	Association - PUD Modification at Square 5055.						
13	Ms. Schellin?						
14	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. If you						
15	will recall, we deferred action from this						
16	case, I believe it was our last meeting to						
17	tonight, so staff would just ask the						
18	Commission to consider Proposed Action on this						
19	case.						
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you,						
21	Ms. Schellin. Commissioners, I know some of						
22	these cases may run altogether, because we had						

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

55E, B and C. Was it B and C? But anyway, tonight right now we are dealing with 55E, which is a request by the applicant to modify an existing 1st Stage PUD to convert a portion of the approved residential use of an office and institutional uses.

We would also modify permitted building heights as well. Also, we are looking at youth substitute or health center for a residential building and substitute a university building for a residential -- from a residential building.

So that's putting it in context. I believe that the -- for me, and I wasn't sure, because, you know, some of these cases all ran together for me, but when I look at -- you know, I was trying to consider, for me, the use for a health center and I listened to the argument from residential, from a university building, from a residential.

And, for me, I was trying to figure out impacts. And that's one of the

NEAL R. GROSS

things that we are governed to look at. And also, in Chapter 24 in our 1st Stage proceedings, it tells us -- it really guides us in the way we should proceed.

For example, let's see, and I understand there are certain things that we should look for in the 1st Stage. Hold on one second. In the report, the suitability, the compatibility to the community and consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, you know, as far as when I first looked -- and I'm just trying to get the discussion started, because what we do in this case will affect the other two cases.

I believe that, you know, when I looked at it, I think that the use that is going from the -- and actually, I went both ways on this. The use that's going from the health center to the residential, earlier I was thinking that the health center would be more of an impact use and I was trying to figure out why the community was so much

NEAL R. GROSS

against the health center.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

then, I thought But the residential would be less impact on that community, at first. But then I reversed it, the residential, I believe, would be impacted versus the health center, because I think the issue for me was, what I heard from traffic, the community was, the transitness, the coming in and going out, which, as we know, basically, is not easy.

I mean, something is going to be built there. But I think the use is an important piece of it. I'm just -- you know, let's kind of get the ball rolling, but I want to hear from my colleagues what they think about especially the change in the uses in the 1st Stage. And then we will talk about building height next. Commissioner May?

COMMISSIONER MAY: Well, I knew what I was going to say until you said at the end there we will talk about building height next.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. You want to
2	start with building height?
3	COMMISSIONER MAY: Well, there
4	needs to be they are connected for me.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: The
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: They are
8	connected.
9	COMMISSIONER MAY: I think that
10	the idea of changing some of the residential
11	use to the university use makes a lot of sense
12	in a lot of ways. And the density is similar.
13	And I think in terms of the impact, it is
14	very difficult to say that, you know, in light
15	of all the testimony that we heard, it's very
16	difficult for me to come to a solid conclusion
17	that it is going to that that change of use
18	and tweaking of the building mass and so on
19	would really result in an objectionable
20	condition for the neighbors.
21	I mean, there is definitely still
22	some open questions about that, because of the

uncertainty in the reporting that we got from DDOT. I mean, even today, the latest report that we have from them does not give me great certainty that the traffic situation there is going to be resolved.

It's not a report we are seeing today, but it's the one that we are looking at in our hands today. It was in our package. The health care facility, I think, is a misfit in terms of the plan of the development. You know, the massing of it doesn't fit.

The use of it, I can see fitting and, frankly, you know, the thing that would make sense to me is if this were on the first couple of floors of a bigger building and then you would see the whole plan built-out.

I understand that's not in the cards, so, you know, I'm not going to keep hoping for that.

And then the last thing about this that makes me rather uncomfortable is the idea that well, now that we are trimming off some

NEAL R. GROSS

of the density at the north end of the site, and so, you know, you are pushing that down and the other end of the block is popping up.

And it is popping up to a level that the Office of Planning did not recommend initially, you know, the 130 feet. And I, frankly, have to agree with that. I think that that's too tall.

So I think that -- I mean, to sort of sum things up, the change university, I think I'm comfortable with. The change to the health care, to have the health care facility, I think I can see my way clear It's not great, because it is to that one. like it's building not even а great architecturally.

I mean, it has gotten to the point where it is okay, but it's not a real star. And then there is the, I think, additional density, much of which is actually commercial density and I think that has impact. So they are losing a lot of residential as a result of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

	all	oİ	this	changing	and	they	are	getting	а
lot more commercial.									

So I think all things considered, it is not a great -- it is certainly not an improvement on the previous plan and, in many ways, it is -- it does damage to the original plan. Like I said, the specific projects for which we are going to be voting on 2nd Stage applications, I could probably see my way clear on both of those. But the resulting increase in density on the balance of the site, I'm not sold on.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Any other comments? Commissioner Turnbull?

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chair. I would agree with Commissioner May's comments. I think when we heard the presentation about the impacts and the traffic, I really don't think there would be any greater impact by either of these two facilities being on the site.

I think traffic would still be or

NEAL R. GROSS

probably be more of an impact maybe with the residential. I'm not really sure. I think there was a toss-up on that, I mean, if there is underground parking for both of them.

But. don't think there is Т greater impact by having either of these two facilities. I mean, there are lot impassioned comments made by a lot of people who were opposed and I think they had misunderstood about people parking think neighborhood and Ι there was some confusion about where people would go.

And I think that is -- I'm not sure if they got it right. I think they were just so impassioned about it. And again, the ones who were more impassioned were further down in the next neighborhood. And there is still going to be an issue. There still will be an issue with people getting in and out. I think that's going to be a problem that this project has to still, at some point, come to deal with.

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	But I don't think these two
2	buildings, in any way, impact the current
3	relationship to such an effect, to such an
4	area where we would reject it.
5	I do agree with Commissioner May
6	also that the other end of the project suffers
7	now from this imbalance with higher structures
8	and it just makes it look a little strange
9	from an urban planning standpoint.
10	But I think the biggest issue we
11	are going to have is to people getting in and
12	out of the project and getting to where they
13	want to go.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioner
15	Selfridge, do you want to add something?
16	COMMISSIONER SELFRIDGE: Mr.
17	Chairman, I would just echo Commissioner
18	Turnbull's comments. I think overall traffic
19	is going to be an issue at this site. I don't
20	know that changing the use and the way that
21	this modification is set up is going to

actually have a major impact for what has been

approved already.

So I think it is going to be problematic period. And whether they are stuck with residential or move to the health center, I'm not sure that that is going to have a huge impact on that.

I was reviewing my notes and maybe I heard somebody wrong, but I think the density remains the same. The FAR remains the same on the site, regardless, so I don't think we have additional density. So I think, in that respect, that is not going to have a major impact.

So, I guess, I don't think that the change in use is going to have a lot of overall impact, but overall, I remain concerned with the traffic, but I don't believe that we are able to address that. That may have been part of the initial PUD.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: And I think aren't we changing the height? Isn't it a height request also in front of us on the 1st Stage?

NEAL R. GROSS

Okay. So we are changing the height. We're going from, what is it? We're coming from 110 to 130, am I correct? Right? Okay.

I just, you know, believe, and it was stated, I think, in the Office of Planning report, these uses are very important, I think, to that community. But I will tell you, I question the effort and I know that they presented -- what they presented to UDC, everybody in this city is trying to get the community college in some form or fashion.

I question that. While I think that the DCPA is a legitimate use, for me, if I had to lesser the impact or deal with the impact, it would be for something of that nature. I just question it. I have a serious reservation.

Even though we got a letter from the university, I have a serious reservation whether that is even going to happen or not.

And I don't know if it's appropriate for me to ask that at the hearing Wednesday, but I just

-- you know, I think the community -- even though I heard the testimony of Ms. Thornhill, I heard the testimony of -- and I also received a letter, Mr. Feola and the applicant submitted a letter.

But I really question, and I will ask that of the Campus Plan of UDC and I'll tell you why. Because everybody is trying to do that and the community college is not going to be able to go everywhere.

We are going to end up making an approval of something that -- even though we got a letter, and that's all it was was a letter, but anyway, that's where I am.

And the other thing for me is I know something has got to go there, but, at some point in time, the citizens got to lighten the burden and then it's not within our jurisdiction, but as the Zoning Commission, do we just continue to put adverse impacts on a community because we are stuck, because there is no other way out?

NEAL R. GROSS

1	That's just the way I got out of
2	that and witnessing myself. Yes, the
3	university would be a good use. I have heard
4	all those arguments, but at the end of the
5	day, I'm not there going through it.
6	So I just don't know. I will tell
7	you, I have been around and about on this,
8	back and forth. I came in one time and I
9	said, Mark, we need to move one way, but I've
10	just been going back and forth. So I just
11	don't know.
12	Is it right to continue to put a
13	burden on the community because we have no
14	other alternative? That's where I am, you
15	know.
16	COMMISSIONER MAY: Chairman Hood,
17	obviously, I'm interested to hear that
18	comment, because I really didn't regard the
19	Community College of the District as a burden
20	the way many other facilities that we deal
21	with, you know, would be regarded as a burden.

I

Ι

mean,

22

certainly understand

questioning the -- you know, is the use appropriate or does the use have unacceptable impact or something like that, but I would never sort of thought of the project as a whole as a burden.

You know, I, certainly, would be more comfortable if what we were looking at was the Community College of the District of Columbia as one of the commercial buildings in this development, rather than as, you know, displacing one of the residential buildings. It certainly would fit within the original PUD, if that's what we were talking about.

It would also, you know, fit for me if what we saw in the overall development was maybe, you know, some offsetting loss, you know, maybe not -- maybe the universe or sort of the community college needed to go into -- if it couldn't go into one of the buildings that was slated to be commercial, if it was going to go into the blocks that was going to be residential, then maybe one of the

commercial blocks needed to go residential to offset that.

Because, you know, the use as a community college in that location seemed, to me, to be fairly compatible with the overall mixed-use nature of that development. You know, maybe there was an issue of balance that there was going to be too much commercial and the university at the same time, but I thought that the mix was, in principle, okay.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let me clarify, Commissioner May. When I saw a burden by the college, I'm not necessarily saying the college. I think the residential piece, which was in the 1st Stage PUD would have been more of an impact.

What I'm saying is we're getting ready to approve or disapprove, we are getting ready to put something in place for some uses.

And I will tell you, I'm just not confident.

And I know the letter was -- I'm just not confident that the community college is going

NEAL R. GROSS

to even materialize. And, for me, that's what I would be approving and I'll tell you why.

Because most people go to the community -- most not all, who go to the community college are younger people, that's why I think the community was talking about the bridge and everything accessing, because those people are going to probably use public transportation.

Whereas, DCPA will be driving. I'm not going to catch the subway if I'm not feeling good. I can guarantee you I'm going to drive to the site and try to find somewhere to park and even if it's in the neighborhood. And I think that's what the community was concerned about.

So I'm not saying it's a burden in that respect. I'm saying it's a burden in respect because of the infrastructure, which is not really within our jurisdiction, is a problem. It's a problem over there and I just don't know if it's right to just compound a

1	problem on top of a problem because we are in
2	that situation.
3	And I don't like having my back up
4	against the wall. I never have.
5	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, I
6	understand that. You know, one of the things
7	that makes me uncomfortable is the notion
8	though that we might that any uncertainty
9	about the community college being built there
10	would actually be, you know, a factor in the
11	decision making.
12	I mean, we really you know, if
13	it has been represented to us that the
14	University of the District of Columbia intends
15	to put the community college here, I'm not
16	sure what you know, how we can disregard
17	that. And I also don't know that that is
18	enough basis for me to say I don't want to
19	vote for it.
20	I think I want to vote for it on
21	the hope that it actually is realized there.
22	And it is important to some of the other

1	aspects of the development of this, this
2	portion of the community, the continuum of
3	schools that the developer and the community
4	have been trying to develop here, you know, I
5	think that's an important part of this.
6	And I'm willing to take the chance
7	that the community college will be realized.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'm actually not.
9	So I will go out on the DCPA property, but
10	unless I hear another persuasion, I will be
11	that's why I will probably do this vote in
12	part. I will be voting against in part.
13	I will be voting for DCPA and
14	voting against the university piece. Let me
15	hear what others have to say.
16	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Do you
17	think that the community college is not going
18	to go ahead then, that there is not going to
19	be the money or the funding for it?
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I just didn't see
21	and that's why I asked for the letter. I
22	just didn't see a whole lot. And I know Ms.

1	Thornhill and I know Mr. Feola then presented
2	the letter, but I just didn't see something
3	is not right with that with me. And it's I
4	don't know what it is.
5	COMMISSIONER SELFRIDGE: Mr.
6	Chairman, wouldn't they have to come back to
7	the Commission anyway to change the use again
8	down the road? So if we were to approve a
9	community college and for whatever reason that
10	didn't materialize and they went back to
11	residential or office, which would be a
12	particularly heavy lift, I think, in this
13	site, wouldn't they have to come back to the
14	Commission for approval anyway?
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I think that
16	well, we are going to be dealing with that in
17	the next, in the very next, case, if I'm not
18	mistaken. C, whatever it is, C.
19	MR. RITTING: I'm not sure about
20	that, but to answer Mr. Selfridge's question,
21	if they are going to change the use in such a

that would

major

way,

22

PUD

require a

1	modification, yes.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: You said in a
3	major way. So it could be a minor
4	modification? It could be institutional use.
5	It doesn't have to be the community college.
6	It could be Burke School, because it's still
7	the same institutional use.
8	MR. RITTING: Well, I mean, I
9	think you are approving a certain set of uses
10	with the 1 st Stage PUD. If they are changing
11	that use in a non-minor way, as is defined in
12	the Chapter 30 of your Regulations, which
13	means a use of literal or no consequence or
14	something similar like that, I would say that
15	a drastic change in use would be more than a
16	minor modification and would require a PUD
17	modification application, yes.
18	COMMISSIONER SELFRIDGE: And we
19	would have to approve a minor modification as
20	well, correct?
21	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Minor

$\mathsf{NEAL}\ \mathsf{R}.\ \mathsf{GROSS}$

modification --

MR. RITTING: If your question is do you have to approve a minor modification, in general, yes. Whether this case would be a minor modification, it would depend on what the request is. But --

COMMISSIONER SELFRIDGE: It sounds like we would see it either way, I guess, is my point.

MR. RITTING: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: But the issue though for me, Commissioner Selfridge, is how do you see it? If you are -- and I'm not being hard on the university, I'm a -- well, a graduate of the university, so I'm not being hard. I just think that there needs to be some predictability.

If the -- I have heard the community loud and clear and, actually, I don't even think I'm taking the same course as the community, because I think a lot of them may have been against the DCPA part. But I

NEAL R. GROSS

think that's a vital use of that community and, to me, that is a risk of the impacts, which we heard.

I'm just talking about the university -- well, the community college of the university is what I'm looking at. And if they come back and say they want to put charter schools in there, Mr. Ritting, I think if the -- the way we are going to view it and look at it is going to be similar, because it's the community college.

Because it's still the same type of use. It's an institution.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chairman, I would disagree. I mean, changing from a community college to any kind of, you know, high school, middle school and any other kind of school is going to be a different set of impacts, because you are talking about students who have to be transported to school versus students who can make their own way there.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	And it is a completely different
2	set of impacts. And I am pretty confident
3	that we would never regard that as a minor
4	modification. And there would be a hearing
5	and all that sort.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So do my
7	colleagues feel as though that what is
8	proposed I'm not going to belabor it and,
9	you know what, at this point, I'm not going to
10	even vote against it. If everybody is I'm
11	going to go with it.
12	If I'm here when it comes back,
13	then we will deal with it at that point. I
14	just have strong reservations. I just don't
15	feel good about that.
16	COMMISSIONER SELFRIDGE: Well, I
17	think that we are going to see E and B today,
18	correct? 05-28E and B?
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: E.
20	MS. SCHELLIN: E and B.
21	COMMISSIONER SELFRIDGE: So we are
22	still going to take we are still going to

1	deal with community college at another
2	meeting, so I think that we could approve 05-
3	28E today, so stop me if I'm getting my
4	letters wrong, but still revisit this
5	community college issue, which I think is, you
6	know, a very important issue and could be
7	handled at a later date, but still move
8	forward on 05-28E.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, actually, if
10	we deal with E today and it's up, we vote it
11	up, we would also be dealing with B, which I
12	actually don't have a problem with. I'm just
13	trying to figure out how to get from E to B.
14	But I think
15	COMMISSIONER SELFRIDGE: But C can
16	be which is community college can still be
17	addressed separate from DCPA in whichever
18	meeting that comes before us.
19	COMMISSIONER MAY: But the use as
20	the community college will have been decided
21	in the 1 st Stage?

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Right. Because

1	that's why I'm raising the issue now.
2	COMMISSIONER MAY: All right.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Because by that
4	time
5	COMMISSIONER SELFRIDGE: Yes.
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: Can I ask
7	another question of Mr. Ritting? We may have
8	enough comfort to proceed on the change to the
9	health care facility and we may have enough
10	comfort to proceed with the change to the
11	university building from residential, I still
12	have great anxiety about the change in height.
13	Can we take an action that, in a
14	sense, accepts part of what is being proposed,
15	but not all of it?
16	MR. RITTING: Well, it depends on
17	how you break it up into parts. I think the
18	1 st Stage approval does include both height
19	and use. And if you are trying to break up
20	your 1 st Stage approval into just a use and
21	not a height, I don't think that is
22	permissible.

1	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.
2	MR. RITTING: However, if you
3	wanted to break up the 1st Stage approval into
4	different parts, into different parcels, if
5	you will
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
7	MR. RITTING: say approve the
8	health care facility piece of the 1 st Stage
9	application and not approve some other piece,
10	that would be acceptable.
11	COMMISSIONER MAY: Could we take
12	an action that would, essentially, say we are
13	okay with those two building use changes, but
14	we want to limit the height to 110 feet?
15	MR. RITTING: If you are talking
16	about just this particular parcel and only
17	approving the use, but not the height, no, you
18	can't do that. I think you have to vote the
19	1 st Stage application up or down, one way or
20	the other.
21	If you believe that the height is
22	excessive, but you want to give the applicant

1	an opportunity to reevaluate the project
2	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
3	MR. RITTING: in light of your
4	comments, it would be acceptable to state that
5	and to defer that aspect of the 1st Stage
6	application.
7	COMMISSIONER MAY: So we could, in
8	theory, lop off these couple of blocks where
9	we have the DCPCA and the CCDC buildings and
10	say, okay, we will approve these changes in
11	uses and massing density or whatever for these
12	two blocks and the applicant will have to come
13	back to us to revisit any other changes?
14	MR. RITTING: Yes, that's right.
15	I think that's okay.
16	COMMISSIONER MAY: We wouldn't
17	necessarily even have to vote on both of those
18	changes of use tonight? We could handle just
19	the one?
20	MR. RITTING: If you are talking
21	about dividing it up into the DCPA and the
22	COMMISSIONER MAY: CCDC.

1	MR. RITTING: community yes.
2	You could choose to take action on one and
3	not the other, yes.
4	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So if you did
6	that, wouldn't you have to, because it's
7	together, they came in together, in part
8	approve one and deny the other part? You have
9	to approve one part and deny the other part of
10	it, because they are together.
11	But you know what, that's not even
12	an issue no more. So I'll go along with my
13	colleagues.
14	MR. RITTING: I don't see any
15	reason that that would be a problem. If you
16	want to approve the 1 st Stage application for
17	the health care facility and take no action or
18	defer some other portion of the 1 st Stage
19	application, that would be fine.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. May, you got
21	something you want to read?
22	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.

1	COMMISSIONER SELFRIDGE: Mike.
2	COMMISSIONER MAY: Paragraph
3	2407.8 in the Regulations, "The Commission
4	shall either approve, deny or modify the
5	application." And this is with regard to
6	processing a 1 st Stage PUD application.
7	So we have the authority to modify
8	the application.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: You are dealing
10	with just the height. You don't have a
11	problem with the use?
12	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, the height
13	I have anxiety over. And going with that, I
14	mean, the height is driven by the need to
15	maintain a certain amount of density. And
16	much of that density is now becoming
17	commercial, rather than residential as a
18	result.
19	So there is a requisite increase
20	in commercial as a proportion of the whole
21	project that goes with it. And I'm not
22	comfortable with that, either. I mean, I

1	could probably go along with that if we were
2	dealing with only 110 feet.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: You are having a
4	problem with, is it, H? I'm sorry, what is it
5	I-2 or whatever that is? What is that? Oh,
6	you're having a problem with H?
7	COMMISSIONER MAY: I don't
8	remember. Is that are you talking about a
9	block number?
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well, they call
11	those the blocks.
12	COMMISSIONER SELFRIDGE: I think
13	it was the center two office towers that were
14	now proposed to be 130 feet.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes. So H, so you
16	don't have a problem with the height of the
17	DCPA and the community college? The community
18	college, I think, is 130, too, isn't it?
19	Okay. It's 110. All right.
20	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: What is
21	the community college?
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: 110.

1	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: 110 now?
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Right. Well, yes,
3	what is being proposed 110 and DCPA is 42, I
4	believe, correct?
5	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Or at least
7	that's the handout that was given to us.
8	Okay. Commissioners?
9	COMMISSIONER SELFRIDGE: Mr.
10	Chairman, I guess I would just weigh in on the
11	use, leaving the height issue aside. I think
12	D.C. Community College is an appropriate use
13	on this site. I think it is near the Metro,
14	which is what we want to encourage. Whether
15	it gets built or not, I think is beyond our
16	control.
17	I do think we have established
18	that in the event that there is a proposed
19	change of use, whether it be minor or major,
20	Commissioner May thought any change in use
21	would be major, it will come before this

Commission again and need our approval.

So, in that respect, I think that I'm comfortable moving forward with the change of use for the Community College of D.C. and I think if it does end up in this neighborhood, and hopefully it does, I think it will be a great benefit to the area.

So I just want to be clear on that from a use standpoint.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, and I just want to add, for me, because I noted the area is already under lockdown at certain points in time, and I -- you know, while I noted the people who were closer, basically, to the site were more supportive, including the ANC Commissioner.

But I also know what the residents of Eastland Garden and others have mentioned. To me, that bridge and those other factors are going to be very important to the success, I believe, of this. And I just hate to sit here and create something, create a problem, because the charge that I took when I was

NEAL R. GROSS

sworn in was to protect the residents of the District of Columbia, which -- well, you and I both took that.

I don't think you federal guys had to do that, but, maybe that's why it's easy, I still just think that there are just so many uncertainties, but, you know what, I probably, if I could predict that, what is going to happen, wouldn't be here, because I would hit the number.

So after hearing my colleagues, you know, and hearing that we will have another bite at the apple, I'm not going to belabor it. If somebody wants to make a motion, I will reluctantly --

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I just want to clarify. I thought that on Kenilworth Place, and I don't have the -- any of my plans in front of me, I thought the applicant was trying to maintain 110 foot line. There were some setbacks that went up to 130, but the initial impact was 110 feet along Kenilworth

1	Place. I thought they were trying to maintain
2	that.
3	Now, we still may have some angst
4	about the 130 feet and maybe at the end of the
5	block, some issues about how that really works
6	out, but I thought they were trying to
7	maintain 110 feet that would match up with the
8	college, community college.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I think you are
10	exactly right. I'm looking here, I don't know
11	what page this is, but I think you are exactly
12	right, it was 110 on the Kenilworth side. So,
13	apparently, it must be you're right.
14	There is a setback. Commissioner May, did you
15	see that on the Kenilworth side?
16	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. I'm aware
17	there was a setback.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right.
19	So anything else, Commissioners?
20	COMMISSIONER MAY: Well, are you
21	prepared to make a motion about this?
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, no, I'm not,

1	no. No, I'm not.
2	COMMISSIONER MAY: Anybody else
3	got a motion formulated? Because I certainly
4	don't, at this point.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I've got one if
6	you want it. No, I'm
7	COMMISSIONER SELFRIDGE: Are we
8	still working on the height issue?
9	COMMISSIONER MAY: Well, I mean,
LO	does anybody else share my anxiety about 130
11	feet?
L2	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: The 130
L3	feet for where?
L4	COMMISSIONER MAY: Anywhere.
L5	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well, no,
L6	I under
L7	COMMISSIONER MAY: 110 maximum is
L8	what I'm feeling.
L9	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: But even
20	with a setback and then bumping up. So even
21	you are concerned totally about the extra 20
22	feet?

1	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
2	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Whether it
3	is setback or not?
4	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Feola must
6	know we're getting ready to turn him down,
7	because he wants to speak. The only time you
8	can speak
9	COMMISSIONER MAY: You know, if
10	Mr. Feola has any suggestions that might help
11	us through our deliberations, I would be
12	interested in hearing them.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I don't think we
14	usually have the applicant while deliberating.
15	Is there a specific question?
16	COMMISSIONER MAY: Well, I'm
17	COMMISSIONER SELFRIDGE: I think
18	that's a good point. If there is something
19	factually that we have missed up here, it
20	certainly would be helpful to have it
21	clarified. But I'm not sure that we would
22	want to open it back up for further

1	deliberation or arguing at this point. So
2	unless we are factually wrong on something
3	COMMISSIONER MAY: I'm not looking
4	for a debate, but, you know, maybe there is a
5	fact we are missing.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I think if
7	something would be missing, I think it should
8	be in the record, because if we open that back
9	up, we may have to open other things back up
10	and have a small narrow scope of a hearing.
11	And I have been through that once before and I
12	don't want to go through that again.
13	COMMISSIONER SELFRIDGE: You know,
14	I think, just to go ahead and prime the
15	conversation on height with the setback and
16	just in my short time as Commissioner, I have
17	seen this approved 130 feet in height. So I'm
18	okay with it. I think that to some degree, we
19	have seen the shadow studies and I don't think
20	there is a major impact.
21	I think we have the applicant
22	has tried to address it with the setback. And

1	I'm okay with 130 feet the way that it is
2	designed.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: You know what,
4	just knowing about it being near a Metro
5	Station, the Metro is across the highway. I
6	mean, come on. I mean, that's, you know, just
7	why, you know, we're talking about building
8	more density around Metro Stations and I know
9	that there is probably some book out there
10	with transit ordered development what
11	considers being around a Metro Station, but
12	that's why I think that those bridges that run
13	across 295 are very important.
14	And it's just so many more things
15	to this equation. While I too if I'm going
16	to do this community college piece, I don't
17	necessarily have a problem with the height.
18	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well, the
19	community college is at 110.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.
21	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: We have
22	established that.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'm saying if I'm
2	going to agree to that piece, I don't have a
3	problem with the 130. I don't have a problem
4	with the rest of it.
5	COMMISSIONER SELFRIDGE: Or being
6	asked to approve the increase in height as
7	well, correct?
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, that's part
9	of it, yes. And Commissioner May's issue is
10	he has an issue with the Block H, I believe.
11	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Does anybody have
13	does anybody else have an issue with Block
14	H?
15	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well, I
16	think when we first saw it, I would agree,
17	too, that it looks when you look at this
18	whole project, it looks a little top heavy
19	down at the far end. It just doesn't seem to
20	be a balance to the plan. You've got the
21	other mid-rise building across the street, I

think.

1	I know they stepped down. I think
2	they may have stepped down twice. I can't
3	remember. But I can't say without having
4	those drawings in front of me, it's hard for
5	me to remember. But it seems to me they made
6	the step from 130 to 110 and then I think
7	there was another step down.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So, Commissioner
9	Turnbull, I guess, not to put you on the spot,
10	you have a problem with the 130?
11	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I don't
12	have. I just would like to see it handled a
13	little more gracefully. And I think those
14	buildings need to be designed somehow I
15	mean, I think your comment was I was
16	reading that the other day about the Atlantic
17	City look along Kenilworth. And I think
18	that's a great deal and I think the applicant
19	mentioned that the architecture needs work and
20	they were going to work on it.
21	So I think that is a great aspect
22	of this case. I mean, that there is some work

to be done on these other buildings.

COMMISSIONER SELFRIDGE: You know, we just had a discussion about an earlier case today where, although we are approving height or density, there is still a 2nd Stage. And so there is an opportunity for the Commission to weigh in. And they still need to get Commission approval down the road.

And I don't think that this is the last word on this. Whether you agree with 130 or not, it's a separate issue. But this idea that it is gone and we will never see it again, I just don't buy that. I mean, it's not true.

COMMISSIONER MAY: See, you know, we have the specific issues of these couple of changes in buildings. The UDC building or the CCDC building, the DCPCA, but again going along with that, there is this overall change in the amount of commercial development.

I mean, it used to be that there were, basically, two commercial buildings in

NEAL R. GROSS

the H Block and then two large residential buildings. And the way they are pictured, they are large apartment buildings. And, you know, just going from the images that we have in the Stage 1 application.

And now, we are talking about the H-1 buildings being a little bit tighter and being taller. And then there is another building squeezed in just to the south that is going to be all office use. And I don't know whether that is driven by market forces or rethinking the project or the fact that they are stuck with a footprint that only works with office space. I don't know what is driving that in particular.

And then you have got at the end one remaining residential building. So it was a situation where, I don't know, 60 or 70 percent of that whole block was residential and now, you know, maybe 20 percent of it is going to be residential.

And, you know, I mean, I'm picking

NEAL R. GROSS

on the height, in particular, but I think it is also, you know, with that is that swing of residential. And I have been sort of fumbling around trying to find the exact numbers on the change of, you know, how much the percentage of office building changed, because it grew tremendously with all of these changes.

You know, I think the most telling thing about this project and if you look at it and think about it, it may help us understand why we had neighborhood groups who were fervent supporters of this project at Stage 1.

Have they now become opposition?

And it is -- a lot of it just has to do with the look of these buildings. mean, if you look at the approved Stage 1 PUD, of what. we have are sort grand looking apartment buildings with pitched roofs and brick facades and columns and balconies and all of that stuff and it evokes an image of the city, you know, other parts of Connecticut Avenue with the grand apartment

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

buildings.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

And then next to that, even the commercial office building has got some articulation to it. I mean, granted this is just Stage 1 and we weren't expecting the architecture to be exactly this, but even the commercial buildings had some touch and feel to them.

And then the north block where we are now talking about UDC and DCPCA, you had another set of these grand apartment And instead, what we have is a buildings. very square modern downtown-like feel and know, we kept seeing these that's -you references to а mini-New York City something like that.

It didn't have to do with the height, I realize now, it had to do with the feel of these, you know, hard-edged glass boxes. And that's what we are seeing here. And there is no reason why -- I mean, you can say that the architecture is going to come to

us in the 2nd Stage and we are going to get a better look at it then, but, you know what, the architecture that we are seeing in the 2nd Stage, for the two sites right now, are both very modern and very different from the character of what is there.

So, you know, this difference that is shown on this one slide, I think, sort of sums up why we have opposition from the neighborhood, as much as anything else. It is --

Thev CHAIRMAN HOOD: also mentioned, and I would agree with you, but also what we heard, and I looked, reviewing some of what I had up here, they also had issues with how this how this was applicant, I guess, didn't spend as much time as was done previously. And that came over in shining colors.

But, you know what, looking at this, it's ironic, Commissioner May, you and I happen to be on the same page, I looked down

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

looking what was
what was
now.
ound the
we can
did you
course
ng in my
ike the
food in
I was
nts, but
ard the
were
at they
be too

looking. And that they wanted something lower

in scale.

They had no problem with the old buildings, the old residential buildings at 110 and the office buildings at 110. I think they felt that at 130, rightfully or wrong, I mean, again, a lot of this is just personal perception from they, it was getting to be way too high, way too commercial and being to look like, as Commissioner May said, something from downtown, even though it's by a Metro.

I mean, I think there might be a way to handle it, but I think that my idea of setbacks and stepping down by the time you get down to it, there might not be anything left then of that. It may not make sense to go up to 130 feet by the time you step back enough.

You get a floor plate up there that is really -- can't be sold.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: So what do we want? It seems like nobody is going along with my idea, so let's go with Commissioner May. Still you never know what I might do,

NEAL R. GROSS

but, Commissioner May, the height is an issue. Would you rather for the applicant to revisit that 1st Stage PUD height or do you want to go ahead and propose a motion or what do you all propose?

COMMISSIONER MAY: You know, honestly, I don't know. I mean, looking at this project, I was willing to go so far as to making the change for the DCPCA and the CCDC buildings. But beyond that, I'm not convinced of the proposed changes. And it has to do with height. It has to do with change of use as well.

Ι don't that getting know an approval of those two development sites as they are is sufficient for the applicant or I would actually be interested in asking not. that, would they rather have an approval of those two sites as they have been presented with no further changes to the PUD, would that be preferable to them or to not get approval?

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	CHAIRMAN HOOD: And you know what,
2	Commissioner May, I think that was something I
3	thought about also. And I can go along with
4	that.
5	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I can go along
7	with that.
8	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. And I
9	think that the applicant would still be free
10	to come back and suggest further modifications
11	to the Stage 1, you know. Yes, further
12	modifications to the Stage 1 as they deal with
13	Block H and G, but I just can't buy into the
14	whole thing yet.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I can agree
16	with that. Mr. Ritting, let me ask you a
17	question. If I call the applicant up, at this
18	point, I'm going to ask you just bluntly, do I
19	have to have another hearing?
20	MR. RITTING: I think if you are
21	just asking him a procedural question and a
22	matter of process, which I think is Mr. May's

question, there is no need to reopen a
hearing.
CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
COMMISSIONER SELFRIDGE: Mr.
Chairman, before we go there, I just want to
make sure we get everything on the table. So
is it the additional change of use further
down the if we is it an option for the
applicant to accept 110 feet and get an
approval of the whole site or do we want to
just lop off the two parcels under
consideration for CCDC and DCPCA, because I
wonder if the 130 feet is critical to this
project as well or if
COMMISSIONER MAY: Well, it may
well be.
COMMISSIONER SELFRIDGE: they
have that option as well?
COMMISSIONER MAY: 130 feet may
well be critical, that's why we need to ask
the applicant the question. But, you know,
again, all I'm suggesting is that we approve

1	the modification to allow these two particular
2	developments and that, you know, we not take
3	any action with regard to a change of height
4	or change of use for the balance of the
5	project.
6	And there are changes of use
7	associated with the balance of the project.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: And also something
9	else that we don't I don't mean to lose
10	sight, when I think about the traffic impacts,
11	previously in the 1 st Stage PUD, one of the
12	tenants that were being offered, and I asked
13	this at the hearing, was the Government
14	Printing Office and I know they have quite a
15	bit of traffic.
16	But anyway, let me ask Mr. Feola
17	or whoever can respond, if you could come up?
18	You have heard the discussion and what we are
19	proposing.
20	MR. FEOLA: Thank you, Mr.
21	Chairman. For the record, Phil Feola,

Goulston and Storrs for the applicant.

1	The applicant can accept a partial
2	approval of the 1 st Stage application before
3	you that approves only the DCPCA piece and the
4	CCDC piece, as it has been proposed and hold
5	in abeyance for a future application for the
6	remainder of Parcel 12.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
8	Commissioners, do we have
9	COMMISSIONER MAY: I would be
10	inclined to move in that direction.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I will join you.
12	I feel better that way. May we can try to sum
13	this up, is everybody on board?
14	All right. In that case, let's
15	see how I'm going to do this. I will move
16	approval of, I think, is this I2? I1 and I2,
17	which is the DCPCA and the CCDC, Community
18	College of the District of Columbia, in Case
19	05-28E, as a 1 st Stage application as proposed
20	with the heights.
21	COMMISSIONER MAY: All I'm
22	suggesting all I was suggesting was that we

1	approve those two sites with no I mean, as
2	they have been approved. I mean, as they have
3	been proposed.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Previously
5	COMMISSIONER MAY: As they have
6	been proposed with no further modifications to
7	Block H or Block G.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Right. But are we
9	approving
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, the height
11	of the CCDC building and the height of the
12	DCPCA building.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So with that, I
14	would approve I would move approval of the
15	CCDC and the DCPCA buildings as proposed only
16	in the 1st Stage PUD and ask for a second.
17	COMMISSIONER MAY: Second.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. It has been
19	moved and properly seconded. Any further
20	discussion?
21	COMMISSIONER MAY: I just have a
22	question. This is a modification of a PUD.

1	There is only a single vote on this, right, or
2	are there two?
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Two.
4	COMMISSIONER MAY: There are two
5	votes. Okay.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Ritting?
7	MR. RITTING: There is two votes.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Was that motion
9	adequate?
10	MR. RITTING: As I heard it, yes,
11	it was.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. It has been
13	moved
14	MR. RITTING: There is one
15	question that I would like to ask after you
16	have considered the question and voted.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Tell me now?
18	MR. RITTING: No.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. It has been
20	moved and properly seconded. Any further
21	discussion?
22	All those in favor?

NEAL R. GROSS

1	ALL: Aye.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing any
3	opposition, Ms. Schellin, would you, please,
4	record the vote?
5	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, staff records
6	the vote 4-0-1 to approve Zoning Commission
7	Case No. 05-28E with regard to DCPA and CCDC
8	only. Commissioner Hood moving, Commissioner
9	May seconding, Commissioners Selfridge and
10	Turnbull in support. Commissioner Schlater
11	not voting having recused himself.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Mr.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Mr. Ritting, you had a question?
13	Ritting, you had a question?
13 14	Ritting, you had a question? MR. RITTING: Yes. I was just
13 14 15	Ritting, you had a question? MR. RITTING: Yes. I was just going to ask what process do you suggest that
13 14 15 16	Ritting, you had a question? MR. RITTING: Yes. I was just going to ask what process do you suggest that the applicant follow for the remainder of the
13 14 15 16	Ritting, you had a question? MR. RITTING: Yes. I was just going to ask what process do you suggest that the applicant follow for the remainder of the 1st Stage modification? What do you have in
13 14 15 16 17	Ritting, you had a question? MR. RITTING: Yes. I was just going to ask what process do you suggest that the applicant follow for the remainder of the 1st Stage modification? What do you have in mind?
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Ritting, you had a question? MR. RITTING: Yes. I was just going to ask what process do you suggest that the applicant follow for the remainder of the 1st Stage modification? What do you have in mind? CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well, I know

it would be helpful, I think, to the applicant to tell them what you have in mind for further process.

COMMISSIONER MAY: I have my own personal thoughts on this, which is that I think that the applicant should do a little bit more outreach with the community and try to recapture some of the attraction of that first PUD that, you know, persuaded the groups who are now in opposition to support it.

And I think that it is possible. for think that there may be ways applicant to get the density that they are looking for. But again, I think that there was -- something was lost in the heart of this PUD that I think can be recaptured if there is little bit. discussion with more the community and maybe a little bit -- you know, maybe they need to do another design charrette and talk about how to further modify this.

I'm not sure what the right process is, but I believe that, you know, the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	developer was quite successful in bringing
2	this to an approval at the 1 st Stage. I would
3	think that they could go back and kind of work
4	their way through it a second time around.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I would just
6	concur with what I heard. The applicant go
7	back and engage the community for the second
8	part.
9	Before I move any further with
10	comments, well, it's not really a second part,
11	because it's a part that was not approved.
12	Do we need to do a motion for the
13	part that was not approved?
14	MR. RITTING: If you are simply
15	deferring it, I think that the fact that you
16	broke that part out and you have stated that
17	you are deferring your action on that, that's
18	sufficient.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Okay. And
20	I just want to associate myself with the
21	comments of Commissioner May, the applicant
22	engage and see what kind of avenue we can go

1	down to try to lessen the impacts of things
2	that we have heard that the community felt
3	like it and I know it's like 50/50, but see
4	if we can look at ways to lessen impact,
5	because the first 1 st Stage you came in with
6	overwhelming support.
7	The 2 nd Stage, you came in with a
8	whole lot of opposition, even though you had
9	some support in certain areas. But see if you
10	can get people engaged, find out what is the
11	less impact and stuff that they don't want to
12	have to endure.
13	I just think that's what needs to
14	happen over there. But that's where I am.
15	Anybody else? Any other comments? Okay.
16	All right. So next, so we're
17	straight? Did you record the vote?
18	MS. SCHELLIN: I did. We're just
19	just for clarification, you guys are
20	deferring action on the other part or were you
21	denying it? Were you expecting them to come

back later with a whole new case or bring in

1	this same case back?
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not like not in
3	the same form.
4	MS. SCHELLIN: So you are
5	expecting them to file a whole new case?
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So we
7	MS. SCHELLIN: So therefore, you
8	do need to deny the other portion, yes.
9	MR. RITTING: Yes, I misunderstood
10	your motion.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well
12	MS. SCHELLIN: You need another
13	vote.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: We're asking them
15	I don't know.
16	MS. SCHELLIN: Because this case
17	is going to have an order. And we need to
18	finalize everything they asked for, so we need
19	to have another vote for the rest of this
20	case.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Even if we ask
22	them to rework and revisit? But that's what

1	is being told.
2	MS. SCHELLIN: We're going to
3	issue an order on this case.
4	MR. RITTING: Yes, I think that
5	is
6	MS. SCHELLIN: So we need to
7	finalize everything.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So I would
9	move that we deny well, let me find out.
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: Portions.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: portions of the
12	1 st Stage PUD, consisting of Blocks H and G-1
13	and G-2. Is it G-1? G-1, G-2 and H and ask
14	for a second.
15	COMMISSIONER MAY: Second.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: It has been moved
17	and properly seconded. Did we cover
18	everything?
19	MS. SCHELLIN: I'm not keeping
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: And anything I
21	left out.
22	MS. SCHELLIN: I'm watching the

1	applicant. They are shaking yes and if they
2	agree, then I agree.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not that I don't
4	trust Mr. Feola, but anything I left out that
5	we deny, G-1, G-2 and the office, H. And ask
6	for a second.
7	COMMISSIONER MAY: Second.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Moved and properly
9	seconded. Any further discussion? Any
10	MR. RITTING: I have a question.
11	I just want to clarify. You are denying this
12	without prejudice to allow them to refile at
13	any time. Is that correct?
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, yes. Yes,
15	that's fine. Thank you, Mr. Ritting. Okay.
16	It has been moved and properly seconded. Any
17	further discussion?
18	All those in favor?
19	ALL: Aye.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing any
21	opposition, Ms. Schellin, would you, please,
22	record the vote?

1	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, staff records
2	the vote 4-0-1 to deny without prejudice
3	Blocks H, G-1 and G-2 of Zoning Commission
4	Case No. 05-28E. Commissioner Hood moving,
5	Commissioner May seconding, Commissioners
6	Selfridge and Turnbull in support. And
7	Commissioner Schlater not voting having
8	recused himself.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Next,
10	Zoning Commission Case No. 05-28B, D.C.
11	Primary Care Association - 2 nd Stage PUD and
12	Related Map Amendment at Square 5055. Ms.
13	Schellin?
14	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. This one
15	is just ready for you guys to consider
16	Proposed Action on. And if you do proceed
17	with Proposed Action, staff does have a
18	procedural order to issue this evening.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
20	Commissioners, any comments on the 2 nd Stage
21	PUD of D.C. Primary Care Association, 2 nd
22	Stage? Any comments? Commissioner May?

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. You know, I think we have had extensive conversation on this one and I am -- you know, while I'm still not quite a big fan of the architecture of the building, it has improved and I think it is approvable as it is.

I did have a question and that had to do, and I think this applies to the previous case, and I'm hoping maybe we, between now and Final Action in both cases, could get further information from DDOT on this. But we did receive a report from DDOT dated April 18th, which is inconclusive.

It went to the issue of the signal timings and the, you know, loops that were in the roadway, you know, pavement markings, etcetera, etcetera, etcetera.

The final sentence of it says "The ongoing work associated with the signal timing changes, new signs and new intersection pavement markings will demand time for review by the DDOT Operations staff."

NEAL R. GROSS

1	And I would like to hear from them
2	and know that what the result of this is
3	and whether, in fact, they can make some of
4	the improvements that the applicant's traffic
5	expert believed could be realized.
6	Does anybody agree?
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I wasn't paying
8	you any attention. I was reading something.
9	Could you repeat that?
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. I was
11	concerned about the DDOT report that we had.
12	I mentioned this earlier tonight. This
13	affects the case we just approved. But it has
14	to do with unfinished, I guess, analysis by
15	DDOT.
16	You know, I'll jump straight to
17	the conclusion which says "The ongoing work
18	associated with the signal timing changes, new
19	signs and new intersection pavement markings
20	will demand time for review by DDOT Operations
21	staff."

So I'm hoping that maybe between

1	now and Final, we can get an additional report
2	from DDOT that shows the results of their
3	review by the operation staff to know that, in
4	fact, we are going to see some of the
5	improvements that the applicant's traffic
6	expert believed were possible.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let me ask you
8	this, was that in E or was that in this
9	particular one?
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: It was
11	submitted in E.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: E, okay.
13	COMMISSIONER MAY: But it affects
14	everything.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, it affects
16	the whole thing. Okay. I think that's an
17	appropriate request. Hopefully we can notify
18	DDOT that we would like to see that before
19	Final Action.
20	Okay. Anything else?
21	COMMISSIONER SELFRIDGE: Mr.
22	Chairman?

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioner Selfridge?

about the parking lot over at DCPCA. And one of the things I had a lot of trouble with was the ratio of parking spaces for the employees. It seemed counter-intuitive that the employees would need all the parking and the patients would be expected to find other modes of transportation.

I think by the time we got to the end, there had been a supplement where they agreed to allocate 10 of the 69 spaces, which I still think is too low, so I would like to examine getting more of those spaces for the patients. I think that would be appropriate and I remain concerned that people are going to be driving around that block looking for parking or for drop-offs and I just didn't like the way that was set up. So I don't know if anyone else felt that way.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: So let me ask.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	You want to see that before we deal with it at
2	Final or
3	COMMISSIONER SELFRIDGE: Maybe
4	before we see the final, that's fine.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Unless you
6	want did you want to you didn't want to
7	hold up?
8	COMMISSIONER SELFRIDGE: I don't
9	think I want to hold it up, but I would like
10	to have it addressed in some way or another.
11	I personally I would like to hear what the
12	other Commissioners think. I know there is a
13	robust discussion about it, but I personally
14	didn't think 10 spaces was enough.
15	And, you know, I think there were
16	examples. There is a Ward 1 facility. And I
17	found it difficult to believe they could tell
18	us the exact proportion of people who were
19	going to drive as patients to the facility
20	that is not yet built, but the one that is in
21	existence, they had no idea.

So in that respect, I wasn't sure

1	that I bought the argument. So maybe that's
2	something that we could revisit between now
3	and Final Action, and see if we can get to a
4	ratio that is maybe a little bit more
5	equitable. I think that would be appropriate,
6	but that's just me.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I don't see
8	a problem with that.
9	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I would
10	back Commissioner Selfridge's comments on
11	that.
12	COMMISSIONER MAY: I agree.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So we will
14	ask for that. Commissioner May, did you want
15	to weigh in?
16	COMMISSIONER MAY: No, I agree.
17	That's it.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Sounds good. I
19	would echo it. Okay. Any other issues with
20	DCPA, B?
21	Would somebody like to propose a
22	motion?

1	COMMISSIONER MAY: I would move
2	approval of Zoning Commission Case No. 05-28B,
3	D.C. Primary Care Association, 2 nd Stage PUD
4	and Map Amendment at Square 5055.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: It has been moved.
6	Can we get a second?
7	COMMISSIONER SELFRIDGE: Second.
8	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Second.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: It has been moved
10	and properly seconded. Any further
11	discussion?
12	All those in favor?
13	ALL: Aye.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing any
15	opposition, Ms. Schellin, would you, please,
16	record the vote?
17	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, staff records
18	the vote 4-0-1 to approve Proposed Action in
19	Zoning Commission Case No. 05-28B.
20	Commissioner May moving, Commissioner
21	Selfridge seconding, Commissioners Hood and
22	Turnbull in favor. Commissioner Schlater not

1	voting having recused himself.
2	And I'll have the procedural order
3	in a few minutes. We are waiting for the
4	copier to wake up.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Schellin, do
6	we have anything else before us?
7	MS. SCHELLIN: That's it.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Office of
9	Planning, a status report?
10	MS. STEINGASSER: No.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. I want
12	to thank everyone for their participation
13	tonight. Remember, Commissioners, we do have
14	a meeting Wednesday at 6:30.
15	And also, our summer attire is in
16	progress, in process at this point.
17	Okay. Anything else? With that,
18	this meeting is adjourned.
19	(Whereupon, the Regular Meeting
20	was concluded at 9:05 p.m.)
21	