GOVERNMENT
OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

REGULAR MEETING

+ + + + +

MONDAY, DECEMBER 17, 2018

+ + + + +

The Regular Meeting of the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened at 6:34 p.m. in the Jerrily R. Kress Memorial Hearing Room at 441 4th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20001, Anthony J. Hood, Chairman, presiding.

### ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

ANTHONY J. HOOD, Chairperson ROBERT MILLER, Vice Chairperson MICHAEL G. TURNBULL, FAIA, Commissioner (AOC) PETER G. MAY, Commissioner (NPS)

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

SHARON S. SCHELLIN, Secretary

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

JENNIFER STEINGASSER, Deputy Director, Development Review & Historic Preservation STEPHEN COCHRAN ANNE FOTHERGILL JOEL LAWSON

# D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PRESENT:

HILLARY LOVICK, ESQ.
MAX TUNDRA, ESQ.
JACOB RITTING, ESQ.

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Regular meeting held on December 17, 2018.

# C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

Advanced Party Status Case No. 17-21, As You Like IT, LLC
Case No. 03-12W/03-13W, DCHA
Case No. 03-12W/03-13W, DCHA
Case No. 16-02A, D.C. Stadium, LLC
Case No. 08-34H, Jewish Historical Society of Greater Washington 9 Case No. 18-08, BSPREP II Dupont Circle, LLC
Society of Greater Washington 9 Case No. 18-08, BSPREP II  Dupont Circle, LLC
Case No. 18-08, BSPREP II  Dupont Circle, LLC
Dupont Circle, LLC
Case No. 18-03, Dancing Crab Properties, LLC
Properties, LLC
Case No. 18-15, Square 656 Owner, LLC 19
Proposed Action
Case No. 18-16, Office of Planning 22
Hearing Action
Case No. 07-08C, DCHA 26
Case No. 18-21, Hanover R.S. Limited
Partnership
Correspondence
Case No. 08-07C, Four Points
Adjourn

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

	FROCEEDINGS
2	6:34 p.m.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: This meeting will please come to
4	order. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. This is a public
5	meeting of the Zoning Commission for the District of
6	Columbia. Today's date is Monday, December the 17th, 2018.
7	My name is Anthony Hood. Joining me are Vice
8	Chair Miller, Commissioner May, and Commissioner Turnbull.
9	We're also joined by the Office of Zoning staff, Ms. Sharon
10	Schellin, as well as the Office of Attorney General, Mr.
11	Ritting, Ms. Lovick, and Mr. Tundra, as well as the Office
12	of Planning, Ms. Steingasser, Mr. Lawson, Mr. Cochran, and
13	Ms. Fothergill.
14	Copies of today's meeting agenda are available to
15	you and are located on the bin near the door.
16	We do not take any public testimony at our
17	meetings unless the Commission requests someone to come
18	forward.
19	Please turn off all electronic devices at this
20	time. Be mindful that these proceedings are being recorded
21	by a court reporter who's also webcast live.
22	Does the staff have any preliminary matters?
23	MS. SCHELLIN: No sir.
24	CHAIRMAN HOOD: If not, let us go right into our
25	agenda. But before I get started, I'd like to wish everyone

a happy holiday, however you celebrate. I figured I'd do that at the beginning. I usually do it at the end and there's nobody here but empty seats and us up here. So I figured I do this at the very beginning.

All right. Let's go to advanced party status, Zoning Commission Case 17-21, As You Like IT, LLC. Ms. Schellin?

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, first I'd like to find out if Mr. Eicher is in the audience. Okay. So he is present. And Exhibits 21 through 21D, there's a request from the United Neighbors of Southwest for advanced party in status opposition. There was no opposition received from the applicant nor the ANC. So I'd ask the Commission to consider this advanced party status request since Mr. Eicher is present.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okav. Thank you, Ms. Schellin. the opposition of the United Neighbors stated, Southwest, Mr. Eicher has proven to be present. And I think -- from our standpoint, I think since -- what I appreciate this application is that it looks like they about collaborated and everybody is working on one accord. don't have various parties, 12 or 13 different applications. And I think that they probably meet the test We have one. But let me hear from others. to be a party in this case. Vice Chair Miller?

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

I concur, Mr. Chairman. 1 VICE CHAIRMAN MILLER: 2 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I would support that, Mr. Chair. 3 Commissioner May? 4 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Chairman, I would agree. 5 COMMISSIONER MAY: 6 I do have one comment on the material that was submitted 7 which is that there was information that suggests that part of the line of argument will have to do with the tax exempt 9 status of the applicant or something like that. 10 And I would just want to make sure that whatever 11 is presented to us is actually relevant to the zoning and the 12 argument for the zoning and the criteria by which the Commission bases its decision. And hopefully, you understand 13 what I'm talking about. Just need to be focused on the 15 zoning issues because sometimes we can get caught up in extraneous matters that don't help the Zoning Commission make 16 a decision. So thanks. 17 18 CHAIRMAN All right. HOOD: Thank you, 19 Commissioner May. Ι would agree wholeheartedly with 2.0 Commissioner May's comments. As I was reading, I had to kind 21 ao through to decipher what relevant was to our And I would hope that as we come down, 22 proceedings. arque your cases as Commissioner May mentioned that we would 23 24 make sure we stay on target.

that,

I

would

move

So

with

25

any

other

1	discussion? I would move that we give in opposition a party
2	status in Zoning Commission Case No. 17-21 United Neighbors
3	of Southwest and ask for a second.
4	VICE CHAIRMAN MILLER: Second.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: It's been moved and properly
6	seconded. Any further discussion? All in favor?
7	(Chorus of aye.)
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any opposition? Not hearing any,
9	Ms. Schellin, would you please record the vote.
10	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, staff records the vote four
11	to zero to one to grant advanced party status to the United
12	Neighbors Southwest in opposition the Zoning Commission Case
13	No. 17-21. Commissioner Hood moving, Commissioner Miller
14	seconding, Commissioners May and Turnbull in support.
15	Commissioner Shapiro not present, not voting.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Next, let's go
17	to consent calendar item, minor modification and technical
18	corrections, Zoning Commission Case No. 03-12W/03-13W. Ms.
19	Schellin?
20	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Are you also going to call
21	up the hearing action with this one, the case that's
22	associated with this, 07-08C?
23	CHAIRMAN HOOD: 07-08C?
24	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes sir. So if you set that case
25	down, then you'll hold this one.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: We're going to wait.
2	MS. SCHELLIN: You're going to wait on this?
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, we're going to wait.
4	MS. SCHELLIN: Okay.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, we could do them. But I
6	think we'll just wait. Must be some more going on with that.
7	Okay.
8	MS. SCHELLIN: So you want to go ahead and take
9	this one up?
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: No, we're going to
11	MS. SCHELLIN: Or are you going to wait on this
12	one?
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, we're going to wait. We're
14	going to wait till we get the hearing action. All right.
15	Let's see where I'm at. Okay.
16	Modification of Consequence, deliberations on a
17	Commission Case No. 16-02A, D.C. Stadium, LLC, PUD
18	Modification of Consequence at Square 665. Ms. Schellin?
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, and Exhibit 7, there's a
20	letter from the applicant proposing a condition of approval
21	per their meeting with the ANC. And Exhibit A, ANC 6D's
22	report in support of that proposed condition. I would ask
23	the Commission to consider final action this evening.
24	
<b>4 T</b>	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I appreciate all the time

1 reluctance and they have a lot of things that they were 2 looking at in this. But I think that overall they support 3 it with those other things that they were looking at. I think that's so noted. But let me open it up. Any further 5 discussion? Not hearing any, would someone like to make a 6 motion? 7 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, I would move that the Zoning Commission approve -- now I've lost my place 8 here -- Zoning Commission Case No. 16-02A, D.C. Stadium, LLC, PUD Modification of Consequence at Square 665 with the ANC 10 11 condition that was proposed. COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: 12 Second. 13 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. It's been properly seconded. Any further discussion? All in favor? 15 (Chorus of aye.) CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any opposition? Not hearing any, 16 Ms. Schellin, would you please record the vote. 17 MS. SCHELLIN: Staff records the vote four to zero 18 to one to approve final action Zoning Commission Case No. 16-19 Commissioner Miller moving, Commissioner Turnbull 2.0 02A. 21 seconding, Commissioners Hood and May in support, Commissioner Shapiro not present, not voting. 22 23 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Next final action. Commission Case No. 08-34H, Jewish Historical Society of 24

Second-Stage PUD at Square 568.

Greater Washington,

25

Ms.

Schellin?

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

MS. SCHELLIN: On this one, at Exhibits 28 through 28A, we have a letter from the applicant providing a copy of the lead scorecard and revised language for certain of its request for flexibility that the Commission asked them to take a look at. So we ask the Commission to consider final action on this case.

Thank you, Ms. Schellin. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. we held this up was for think the only reason flexibility language which I think is presented to us. see if there are any problems. I think it was two major ones that we were discussing, and I think that's been refined. Any questions or concerns or problems or we accept they are? COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I don't have any major problems. Ι just wanted to Item No. 7, as Ι on understand, to construct the rooftop terrace shown on the plans at a later date than the construction of the rest of the project. Such date will be determined upon once the applicant progresses its development and commences construction of the project.

So they're going to hold off doing the rooftop terrace till a later date. But at a later date, they're going to do the plan that shown on the drawings. So if there's any changes, then there would be a modification to us at that time. That's my understanding of how that would

1	work. Is everybody in concurrence with that?
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So are you thinking the way it's
3	saying is it explains exactly how that's supposed to work or
4	do you think we need to fine tune it?
5	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: That's my reading of what
6	the language says and that's how I feel. And I'm okay with
7	that if that's
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, okay.
9	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: everyone else's
10	understanding. Okay. Then I have no objections.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Anything else? All right.
12	Would someone like to make a motion to approve as stated?
13	VICE CHAIRMAN MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I would move
14	that the Zoning Commission take final action on Case No. 08-
15	34H, Jewish Historical Society of Greater Washington, Second-
16	Stage PUD at Square 568 with the refinements that were made
17	in the latest submissions and ask for a second.
18	COMMISSIONER MAY: Second.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. It's been moved and
20	properly seconded. Any further discussion? All in favor?
21	(Chorus of aye.)
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing any, Ms. Schellin,
23	would you please record the vote.
24	MS. SCHELLIN: The staff records the vote four to
25	zero to one to approve final action Zoning Commission Case

1	No. 08-34H. Commissioner Miller moving, Commissioner May
2	seconding, Commissioners Hood and Turnbull in support,
3	Commissioner Shapiro not present, not voting.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: You know when I notice whenever
5	we finish a case, I can always tell whose case it is because
6	they get up and leave. They don't want to stay with us the
7	rest of the evening. I'm just breaking the monotony. I
8	would leave to. Believe me.
9	Okay. Thank you, Ms. Schellin. Zoning Commission
10	Case No. 18-08, BSREP II Dupont Circle, LLC, Map Amendment
11	at Square 72. Ms. Schellin?
12	MS. SCHELLIN: At Exhibits 29 and 29A, the
13	applicant's draft order, Exhibit 30, NCPC report finding that
14	the map amendment would not be inconsistent with the federal
15	elements of the comp plan for the national capitol nor would
16	it adversely affect any other identified federal interests.
17	I'd ask the Commission to take final action this evening.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Schellin, teeing
19	this up for us. Any questions or comments? Any additions?
20	Okay. So in that case, I would move approval of Zoning
21	Commission Case No. 18-08 and ask for a second.
22	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Second.
23	CHAIRMAN HOOD: It's been moved and properly
24	seconded. Any further discussion? All in favor?
25	(Chorus of aye.)

1 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any opposition? Not hearing any, 2 Ms. Schellin, would you please -- do we have any proxies? 3 MS. SCHELLIN: No. 4 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. MS. SCHELLIN: Staff records the vote four to zero 5 6 to one to approve final action Zoning Commission Case No. 18-7 Commissioner 08. Hood moving, Commissioner Turnbull Commissioners seconding, May and Miller in support, 9 Commissioner Shapiro not present, not voting. CHAIRMAN 10 HOOD: Okay. Next we have Zoning 11 Commission Case No. 18-03, Dancing Crab Properties, 12 Consolidated PUD and Related Map Amendment at Square 1769. Ms. Schellin? 13 14 MS. SCHELLIN: Exhibit 38 is an OP supplemental IZcalculations. Exhibit 39 15 regarding is the report applicant's proffers and conditions. 16 Exhibit 40 is Marilyn Simon's response to the applicant's submission. Exhibit 34, 17 18 an OP supplemental report at Exhibit 38. Exhibits 41 through 41B and 42 is the applicant's post-hearing submissions. 19 Exhibit 43 is the letter from NCPC advising that their staff 2.0 has determined that the project is exempt from their review. 21 I would ask the Commission to consider final action on this 22 case also. 23 24 Okay. Commissioners, let me open CHAIRMAN HOOD: 25 Any discussion? Any further discussion? it up. Yes, this

1	the one where we have the use of the bar on the roof and
2	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, so I mean, I think this
3	is one where some of the issues that came up during the
4	hearing or during previous decision making no, sorry.
5	Yes, during the previous decision making that it resolved.
6	I mean, I think I'm satisfied on the question about the IZ
7	component. But I'm still I have concerns about the
8	conditions related to the rooftop bar restaurant bar.
9	And I do not agree with the applicant's
10	conditions. I don't think that's adequate to address the
11	concerns that we would have about a rooftop bar operation.
12	We are not accustomed to simply leaving the hours of
13	operation to ABRA. I mean, it may be redundant at a certain
14	level, but it is a zoning issue. It's part of what we look
15	at. Live music, same way. Lights, same way.
16	And so I don't know. I don't know what the rest
17	of the Commission thinks, but I'm more inclined to agree with
18	the conditions suggested by Office of Planning.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I grapple with this one. Let me
20	hear from others first, whether the Office of Planning or the
21	applicant wanted to make some more changes. I think
22	Commissioner May is more in line with the Office of
23	Planning's requirements well, conditions. Commissioner
24	Miller Vice Chairman?
25	VICE CHAIRMAN MILLER: I actually was okay with

the applicant's conditions. I think the ANC was okay with those. I think there's another. But I'm not going to make a big issue about it. If the majority of the Commission is more comfortable with OP's recommending conditions, then I'm fine with that. But I personally prefer the -- I think the applicant's conditions are sufficient and ABRA is certainly capable of dealing with the issues that are in its regulatory authority as well.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Mr. Turnbull, do you have any comments on this?

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well, I think we struggled with this when we had the hearing. And I think at the time some of us were agreed with the office of planning about the language. And I think it was sort of left in abeyance just when the hearing and I think we were hoping we'd get a better -- I mean, I would concur with Commissioner May I guess that I could see something a little bit in the language.

But I'm not saying that ABRA can't do a good job and we're going to be fine. But I think for the Zoning Commission, I think OP has been fairly straightforward in putting that language in the way it does. So I would go along with seeing the language a little bit more rigid following the OP guideline.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: So I guess from what I'm hearing, we're fine with the bar on the roof. It's just that we would

2.0

accept the conditions -- and let me know if I'm saying something -- accept the conditions from the Office of Planning which I had to think about. Because on those nice nights, but then again, we have to look at the impacts. So on those nice nights on the roof, if you aren't playing no music, I'm not coming.

VICE CHAIRMAN MILLER: Yes, and the residents really next door. They're across the street and aren't Wisconsin Avenue, six-lane highway across а or I quess there are residents below. And as you thoroughfare. recall from the hearing, it currently has -- the existing restaurant has an outdoor terrace to the hours that the applicant was recommending and with the kind of music that it's recommending.

So the existing conditions were what basically it was proposing as the conditions for our zoning order. And they'll still have to get an ABC license which may impose even more restrictive ones. But again, I will go along with the majority of my commissioners. And it's mostly adjacent -- isn't it mostly adjacent to your park? Not your park, but I don't know if there's anybody in that park at 1:00 a.m.

COMMISSIONER MAY: It is close to Fort Reno, and that's not really what the concern is, though.

VICE CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay.

COMMISSIONER MAY: It's mostly about the impact

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

on other -- I think other residents in the area and the -
VICE CHAIRMAN MILLER: I think the traffic on

Wisconsin is more impactful.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, but I mean, I think even at the height of the buildings there, I think there's a likelihood that there's going to be a fair amount of sound traveling.

VICE CHAIRMAN MILLER: I haven't been to that bar, but I hear that it has it now and we heard testimony that it does.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: So I think with the study and the consideration that was given by Office of Planning. And also when we look at the adverse impacts, I don't want to be selfish and think about what I would do. I have to think about what's good for that neighborhood. So I would err on the side of caution and I would go along with those as well as Commissioner May and the rest. I would go along with the Office of Planning's conditions. So anything else we need to consider?

COMMISSIONER MAY: I mean, I do think we need to clarify that the -- again, it's not a -- it's mentioned as a condition in OP's language. But the ground for restaurant space and rooftop restaurant lounge should not be considered a proffered benefit. And I think that is just a matter of how it's phrased in the order.

2.0

1 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I have no objection to 2 Any objections? All right. Anything else? 3 VICE CHAIRMAN MILLER: I would just say that I 4 think the ANC, as I recall, wanted a restaurant that was not a fast food restaurant and not they had specific retail types 5 6 that they did not want. So I would think that it actually 7 is a benefit if it's the kind of restaurant that they asked But I'll leave it to OAG to figure that out. 9 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So are we ready? Μy 10 biggest thing in this case was the conditions. I could've 11 probably flipped either way. But I better move on the side 12 of caution as I mentioned. Anything else? All right. Not hearing anything, somebody like to make a motion? 13 call on someone. I could make all of them, but I don't want my name to be down as the one who made the motion for 15 everything. 16 17 COMMISSIONER MAY: I would move approval of Zoning Commission Case No. 18-03, Dancing Crab Properties, LLC, 18 Consolidated PUD and Map Amendments, Square 1769 with the 19 conditions as proposed by the Office of Planning for the use 2.0 21 of the rooftop restaurant and bar. 22 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Second. 23 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okav. It's been moved and properly seconded. Any further discussion? All in favor? 24 25 (Chorus of aye.)

1 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any opposition? Not hearing any, 2 Ms. Schellin, would you please record the vote. MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, staff records the vote four 3 4 to zero to one. As discussed this evening, to approve final 5 action Zoning Commission Case No. 18-03. Commissioner May moving, Commissioner Turnbull seconding, Commissioners Hood 6 7 and Miller in support, Commissioner Shapiro not present, not 8 voting. 9 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let's go to Zoning 10 Commission Case No. 18-15. This is Square 656 Owner, LLC, 11 Design Review at Square 656. Ms. Schellin? 12 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. For this one, 18-15, Exhibits 13 through 29E2, you have the applicant's post-hearing submissions. Exhibit 30, ANC 6D letter authorizing Ms. Hamilton to speak on its behalf. Exhibit 31 is ANC 6D's 15 comments on the project. I'd ask the Commissioner 16 consider final action. 17 18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Give me one moment. Somebody like to get it started? 19 Give me one moment. 2.0 So Mr. Chairman, I think that COMMISSIONER MAY: 21 since we had the hearing in this case, the applicant has addressed the concerns that were raised fairly well. 22 They submitted the lead scorecard that had been requested. 23 They did make some refinements to the tower element. 24 And I was 25 skeptical that it really needed any refinement. But Ι

actually like what was most recently submitted. So I'm happy with that as it is now proposed.

And I think they did a good job of addressing what would happen if they attempted to put in a floor of parking below grade because I think it would have pretty damaging effects on the building and still would require relief in the end. So I don't think that's a -- I think that's been well addressed. So I'm okay with moving forward tonight.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: One of the things I wanted to revisit. This letter that came in from Ms. Hamilton to speak. Typically, we don't have anyone come speak at our meetings. But I'm going to ask Ms. Hamilton to tell you, Ms. Schellin, if this letter that came from the Commission is what she was wanted -- what she was going to speak about.

Ms. Hamilton, if you just go up and explain to Ms. Schellin because typically we don't have speaking at our meetings. So I want to just know if this is a concern that I see here about the illumination. Is this what you were going to speak about. And if you can just tell Ms. Schellin.

(Pause.)

MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. So what I understand is that their biggest concern is the digital signage because there are several in the area that are wanting to have -- other developers wanting to have very bright signage in the area. And so the residents are concerned about that. So that's the

2.0

biggest concern.

2.0

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So that's the same thing talking about the illumination in the letter. And I don't remember. I think didn't we discuss this?

about the signage and the lighting and the back lighting. I thought it was going to be light, but it's not active lighting. It's static, just regular lighting that you would normally see. And they've provided several sheets of drawings in the packet on that. And I feel fine with it.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I thought we did. But I want to also encourage this applicant to make sure they look in our record which is Exhibit 31, I believe. That's what the -- so this applicant to look and see some of the concerns so we can make sure. Because as Commissioner Turnbull mentioned, I feel confident. But I think I want to make sure we keep that relationship.

And actually, the Commission hopes to develop, upholds the values and appeal of this residential community for current residents to live on the block as well as the future residents of the 1st and Q Street. And it talks about the illumination. So I think this letter will help you understand about the glaring impacts. And I thought we had discussed a lot of that. So we want to make sure that their concern doesn't fall off the radar. Anything else? Okay.

1	Would someone like to make a motion?
2	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Chair, I would move
3	that we approve Zoning Case No. 18-15, Square 656 Owner, LLC,
4	Design Review of Square 656.
5	VICE CHAIRMAN MILLER: Second.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. It's been moved and
7	properly seconded, noted Exhibit 31. All in favor?
8	(Chorus of aye.)
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any opposition? Not hearing any,
10	Ms. Schellin, would you please record the vote?
11	MS. SCHELLIN: Staff records the vote four to zero
12	to one to approve final action Zoning Commission Case No. 18-
13	15. Commissioner Turnbull moving, Commissioner Miller
14	seconding, Commissioners Hood and May in support,
15	Commissioner Shapiro not present, not voting.
16	And I will note that the applicant did nod in
17	agreement to the statement that Commissioner Turnbull made
18	about the lighting the signage, I'm sorry, and the
19	lighting. So what you stated, they did nod in agreement to
20	that.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, good. All right. So the
22	nod is on the transcript is on the record. Okay, great.
23	Let's go to proposed action, Zoning Commission Case No. 18-
24	16, Office of Planning, Text and Map Amendments to Change

25 Certain Zone Names and Mapping Phase. Ms. Schellin?

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. There were no new exhibits provided for this. So I would ask the Commission to consider the proposed action.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Commissioners, let me start off with this one on whole issue about overlays. And that came up from Ms. Gates' testimony. And I took the liberty of asking for a little homework to be done. And looking through the regulations, I noticed that it's a one for one, like in the 58 regulation. I'll just take 16-1565.3, the CBUT overlay district.

It says, applies to the area bounded on the south of MacArthur Boulevard and the east of Battery Kemble and it goes on. And then you look under ZR16-1300.2, the R-21 zone says the exact same thing, applies to the area bounded on the south of MacArthur Boulevard.

So for me, the way I interpret this is that the only thing that's missing is the word "overlay". But we still have the same intent. We still have the same actions. It's just the word "overlay". And I feel confident in moving forward without the word "overlay" because as we stated, because as you noticed during the ZR16, I kept talking about the overlay. And it looks to me like it's there.

And I don't think we're missing anything other than the word. And I will stand to be corrected. Let me go to Ms. Steingasser. Is that a fair assessment?

2.0

1 MS. STEINGASSER: Yes sir, that's exactly correct. 2 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. All right. it's there. You can look at it. 3 It's in the regulation. It's 1536.3 and then you ZR16-1300.2. The language is there. 5 And there are others on and on and on. Exact squares and everything, it's there. It's a one for one the way I see it. 6 7 Okay. Anything else on this? 8 VICE CHAIRMAN MILLER: I would concur with you, 9 Mr. Chairman. And I think that these name changes help make the zoning code more understandable to all of us. 10 So I'm 11 ready to move forward. CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. So with that, unless 12 something else, I would move that we take the 13 proposed action of Zoning Commission Case No. 18-16, Office of Planning text and map amendments to change certain zone 15 names and mapping phase and ask for a second. 16 17 VICE CHAIRMAN MILLER: Second. 18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: It's been moved and properly Any further discussion? 19 2.0 MS. LOVICK: Excuse me. I just wanted to point out there were some additional amendments that the Office of 21 Planning included to remove the dashes. 22 There were two 23 dashes in the zone names. And can you just please include in your motion that those additional amendments are included 24 25 in your action?

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Does anyone believe there's a
2	motion on the table that's moved and seconded. Does anyone
3	have any issues with any of that?
4	COMMISSIONER MAY: No, and I mean, I assumed it
5	was inclusive of the changes in the hyphens and so on.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Right. Yes, but if I need to
7	spell it out, I will. But I just want to make sure there's
8	no problems and we didn't deliberate. So this would be
9	inclusive of everything?
10	MS. LOVICK: I just wanted you to clarify. That's
11	all. Thank you.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So that's inclusive of
13	everything. Okay. It's been moved and properly seconded.
14	Any further discussion? All in favor?
15	(Chorus of aye.)
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any opposition? Not hearing any,
17	Ms. Schellin, would you please record the vote.
18	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Staff records the vote four
19	to zero to one to approve proposed action Zoning Commission
20	Case No. 18-16 which includes the removal of the second
21	hyphen per OP's supplemental report. Commissioner Hood
22	moving, Commissioner Miller seconding, Commissioners May and
23	Turnbull in support, Commissioner Shapiro not present, not
24	voting.
25	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let's go to hearing action,

Office of Planning Zoning Commission -- okay, let me call -- I'm going to call both of these together. Let me call it minor modification and technical corrections, Zoning Commission Case No. 03-12W/03-13W. And I will call the case on the hearing action as well with Zoning Commission Case No. 07-08C, District of Columbia Housing Authority text amendment to Subtitle 718.1, 718.3, 718.7(a), extension of temporary surface parking lots in Square 767, 768, and 882. And let's go to Mr. Cochran.

MR. COCHRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Both the proposed minor modification or modification of consequence and the petition deal with the same squares near the baseball stadium ballpark. They're Square 767, Lots 44 to 47, 768, Lots 19 to 22, and Square 882, Lots 77.

The proposed modification of consequence deals with Condition 30 and what was originally Order 03-12/03-13 which was the Capper-Carrollsburg PUD. The other one deals with the text in Subtitle C, Chapter 7 that specifically addresses temporary parking lots near the ballpark.

The petitioner for the text amendment has asked that the termination date for possible certificates of occupancy for those parking lots be extended to April 2nd, 2023 and the changes that have been requested in the PUD order basically do the same thing. It's just they're in both places. So OP recommends that you set down the text

2.0

1	amendment or the petition for the text change and that at
2	whatever time you think appropriate that you approve the
3	proposed modification of consequence.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let me make sure I
5	understand something. Thank you, Mr. Cochran. Let me ask
6	OAG. Are we saying that your recommendation to us is to keep
7	this as a minor modification? Mr. Tundra?
8	MR. TUNDRA: Yes, Chairman. I believe that in
9	this particular case, the time to consider the modification
10	would be only after the Commission makes the decision and
11	final action approves the rule change because the
12	modification would require that the rule change take effect
13	first.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So we will set it down, then we
15	would everybody all right? Okay. So we need to set it
16	down and then we need to wait until we deal with that part
17	of a hearing in a case. And then we need to do scheduling?
18	MS. SCHELLIN: Come back, we'll take that case up
19	after
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: But then we have to do scheduling
21	
22	MS. SCHELLIN: the rulemaking cases.
23	CHAIRMAN HOOD: termination of scheduling and
24	all of that?
25	MS SCHELLIN: Just defer action on the other case

2 the course. So I would think that we could 3 COMMISSIONER MAY: or once we've made a decision on the text amendment that we could take up this change to the PUD as a 5 minor modification because we've already heard from the party 6 7 in the case that is the ANC. And they support it. They have issues with the rest of the PUD and the timing. But they've So I think we have discretion to 9 been supportive of this. We can still call it a modification of 10 consider it. consequence but act on it when the final decision is made on 11 12 the text amendment. 13 CHAIRMAN HOOD: I quess what I was getting to, I was making sure we don't have to do the termination of scheduling? 15 MS. SCHELLIN: Not tonight. 16 17 CHAIRMAN HOOD: No, I know not tonight. But I mean, even if they can finish. That's what I'm saying. 18 19 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, I don't think we have to do it at all. 2.0 21 CHAIRMAN HOOD: I was just trying to figure out the path going forward because if we approve it, then we have 22 to take the modification of consequence, then we have to do 23 the termination of scheduling. And I was making sure we can 24 25 cut a step out. Okay. I think we're on the same page.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, I'm just trying to figure out

Let's see. Any questions of Mr. Cochran? Any questions? All right. So we have both requests before us. Okay. Well, we have the hearing action before us. All right. Somebody like to make a motion?

COMMISSIONER MAY: Well, so I'm not ready to make a motion just yet. I just want to acknowledge the concerns that were voiced by the ANC. And I think it would not be unreasonable for me to suggest that the whole Commission shares that concern about how long it has taken to deliver the entirety of this PUD since it has been going on for a very long time.

And that being said, there isn't really that much that we can do about it. I mean, it's not like we drive the schedule when it comes to delivering on a PUD. It is unfortunate that it has taken this long, and our options are to approve this change or not approve this change. And I don't see how not approving this change makes anything happen any faster. So I would just say that I'm sympathetic to the concerns of ANC and agree that we should move forward, set this down, and try to move forward with the text amendment.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I would agree because we knew going into this that we were changing a whole area. But I agree. It has been going on for a while. I think I've been here for most of it. So anyway, we are where we are. But like I say, it doesn't do any good to not continue to try

2.0

to get this done.

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

And hopefully those families that may have been removed or maybe they are still. And hopefully they have a list because I've said this in other cases that we can continue to call them, give them an opportunity to be able to come back. So I'm sure all that's being done. I'm sure all that's being done. And I said all that for a reason. So anything else? Vice Chair Miller?

VICE CHAIRMAN MILLER: Thank you. I concur with the comments of both my colleagues and appreciate the Office of Planning's presentation. I don't know if this is a fair question to you, Mr. Cochran. But how confident are you that this development will proceed in the next five years? Are you able to make any kind of assessment of your sister agency's partnership with the private --

MR. COCHRAN: It doesn't involve just the sister agency. It has to do with the entire economy. And I wouldn't want to make any prediction.

VICE CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Did somebody make a motion?

VICE CHAIRMAN MILLER: Not yet.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Would somebody like to make one?

VICE CHAIRMAN MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

would move that the Zoning Commission set down for a hearing

25 | Case No. 07-08C, D.C. Housing Authority text amendment to

1 Subtitle C, Section 718.1 to 718.3 and 718.7(a), extension 2 of temporary service parking lots in Squares 767, 768, and 3 882 and ask for a second. 4 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Second. 5 CHAIRMAN HOOD: It's been moved and properly 6 seconded by Mr. Turnbull. Any further discussion? All in 7 favor? 8 (Chorus of aye.) 9 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any opposition? Not hearing any, Ms. Schellin, would you please record the vote. 10 11 MS. SCHELLIN: Staff records the vote four to zero to one to set down Zoning Commission Case No. 07-08C as a 12 Commissioner Miller moving, Commissioner 13 rulemaking case. Turnbull seconding, Commissioners Hood and May in support, Commissioner Shapiro not present, not voting. 15 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. And thank you, Mr. Cochran, 16 Let's go to Zoning Commission Case No. 18-17 for that report. 21, Hanover R.S. Limited Partnership, Consolidated PUD and 18 19 Map Amendment at Square 3832 and 3835. Ms. 2.0 Fothergill? 21 MS. FOTHERGILL: Good evening, Chairman Hood and of the Commission. 22 members For the record, Fothergill with the Office of Planning. 23 24 OP recommends that the Zoning Commission set down 25 Hanover R.S. Limited Partnership's request for a PUD and related zoning map amendment for the properties located at 3201 and 3135 H Street Northeast which are on the east side of 8th Street between Kearney and Irving Streets. The site is a third of a mile from the Brookland Metro Station.

This site is currently zoned PDR and the proposed zoning is MU-4 which is intended to permit moderate density mixed use development and be located in low and moderate density residential areas.

The PUD consists of a residential building with 375 units in two separate buildings with a plaza between the buildings. It would be 65 feet tall with six stories and an FAR of 3.6. There would be 186 below grade parking spaces accessed off of new curb cut and driveway at the north end of the site.

In terms of the comprehensive plan's future land use map, this site is appropriate for low density commercial and moderate density residential uses. The generalized policy map denotes it at a neighborhood conservation area. The proposal is consistent with the 2009 Brookland-CUA Metro Station small area plan's guidance for this area as well as policies from various elements from the comprehensive plan, including the upper northeast area element.

Flexibility is needed to allow the GAR requirements to be satisfied based on the entire site. For public benefits and amenities, 12 percent of the units would

2.0

be designated as IZ units at a deeper level of affordability than required including 6 percent at 30 percent MFI. The building would be LEED Gold and have green roofs and solar panels.

The applicant will work with DDOT on improvements to the Metropolitan Branch Trail along 8th Street. OP will continue to work with the applicant on issues raised in our report including offering more three bedroom units in the two buildings and providing additional information on the proffered benefits and amenity package including financial contributions and the location of the IZ units and additional plans for the plaza, lighting, and signage.

The proposal is not inconsistent with the proposed zoning district and the comprehensive plan maps and the Office of Planning recommends that the Hanover R.S. Limited Partnership applicant be set down for public hearing. And I'm happy to take any questions.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Fothergill. Let's see if we have any questions or comments up here.

COMMISSIONER MAY: I just had a comment which is I'm just a little bit concerned about the proposed materials for the building. I mean, the design of it seems to be okay. It seems to be like a lot of other apartment buildings of its approximate massing and so on. But there seems to be extensive use of cementitious panels, particularly on the

2.0

street side and then also vinyl windows.

2.0

And I mean, any project with vinyl windows sets off alarm bells for me. So I'm just very concerned about the quality of the construction. I just have never known vinyl windows to last very long, and they don't look very good after a while. So I would just -- like I said, I'd be concerned about the quality of construction. I think the design is generally okay, but it's the material choices.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Displeasure has been noted.

Anything else? Commissioners, what is your pleasure as far as the request of setting this down? Vice Chair Miller?

VICE CHAIRMAN MILLER: I support setting down this case for a hearing. I appreciate the Office of Planning's report. I agree with its recommendations in terms of trying to maybe have an additional three bedroom units in the mix. The LEED Gold is certainly to be commended. I always love the balconies on the residential buildings.

And I don't know as much about vinyl windows as Commissioner May, but I think the applicant will take that into -- hope they'll take that into consideration when they come back for the hearing. Otherwise, I think the materials and the facade is very attractive for this neighborhood. So I'm ready to move forward.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Commissioner Turnbull?

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

1	No, I think the project for the most part is ready for set
2	down. I would agree that the applicant will probably need
3	to look at the windows the vinyl windows. But Ms.
4	Fothergill, they're going for LEED Gold. Do you know if it's
5	going to be certified or is it just trying to reach the LEED
6	Gold criteria?
7	MS. FOTHERGILL: I believe at this point, it says,
8	designed to LEED Gold standards.
9	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: But no certification as
10	yet?
11	MS. FOTHERGILL: I can clarify that with the
12	applicant.
13	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: All right. Thank you.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So with that and the comments
15	noted, I would move that we set down Zoning Commission Case
16	No. 18-21 with the comments noted and ask for a second.
17	VICE CHAIRMAN MILLER: Second.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: It's been moved and properly
19	seconded. Any further discussion? All in favor?
20	(Chorus of aye.)
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any opposition? Not hearing any,
22	Ms. Schellin, would you please record the vote.
23	MS. SCHELLIN: Staff records the vote four to zero
24	to one to set down Zoning Commission Case No. 18-21 as a
25	contested case. Commissioner Hood moving, Commissioner

Miller seconding, Commissioners May and Turnbull in support, Commissioner Shapiro not present, not voting.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Next we have Zoning Commission Case No. -- under correspondence Zoning Commission Case No. 08-07C, Four Points, Second-Stage PUD at Square 5784. Ms. Schellin?

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Exhibit 50, there's a request from CARE to waive the requirement that only parties may file a motion for reconsideration. At Exhibit 51, you have the applicant's opposition to the waiver request and also a motion to strike the attachments to the motion that was filed by CARE. So I would ask the Commission to consider the waiver request from CARE, the applicant's opposition thereto and the motion from the applicant to strike the attachments.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Commissioners, we have a request from CARE first of all to waive a requirement that only parties can file a motion for reconsideration. Since CARE was not a party in underlying second-stage PUD, it has requested that the Commission waive the rule. I think that's the first action.

I typically am not in favor -- it has to be for a good cause. I'm not in favor of waiving this rule and as the applicant has mentioned in this submission as well. I understand it has to say that it provides the Commission we can do that with good cause. I don't think in the exhibit,

2.0

1	this is Exhibit 50, I didn't see where it was good cause that
2	was presented.
3	So again, I'm not in favor of waiving the rule.
4	But our rules do say we can do it for good cause. But I
5	don't think good cause was exhibited in this particular
6	instance. But anyway, let me open it up for others. Any other
7	comments? Okay. Let me make a motion that we not okay.
8	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, please make a motion to deny
9	if that's what you want to do.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So I'm going to make a
11	motion that we deny the waiver request from CARE in Zoning
12	Commission Case No. 08-07D. Is that sufficient, that motion?
13	MS. SCHELLIN: C, it's C and not D.
1 1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: What'd I say?
14	
15	MS. SCHELLIN: You said D.
	MS. SCHELLIN: You said D. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, 08-07C.
15	
15 16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, 08-07C.
15 16 17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, 08-07C.  MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, but that motion was
15 16 17 18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, 08-07C.  MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, but that motion was sufficient.
15 16 17 18 19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, 08-07C.  MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, but that motion was sufficient.  COMMISSIONER MAY: Second.
15 16 17 18 19 20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, 08-07C.  MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, but that motion was sufficient.  COMMISSIONER MAY: Second.  CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. It's been moved and
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, 08-07C.  MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, but that motion was sufficient.  COMMISSIONER MAY: Second.  CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. It's been moved and properly seconded. Any further discussion? Commissioner May
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, 08-07C.  MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, but that motion was sufficient.  COMMISSIONER MAY: Second.  CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. It's been moved and properly seconded. Any further discussion? Commissioner May seconded. Who did I say?
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, 08-07C.  MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, but that motion was sufficient.  COMMISSIONER MAY: Second.  CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. It's been moved and properly seconded. Any further discussion? Commissioner May seconded. Who did I say?  COMMISSIONER MAY: I did.

1	discussion? All in favor?
2	(Chorus of aye.)
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any opposition? So Ms. Schellin,
4	would you record the vote?
5	MS. SCHELLIN: Staff records the vote four to zero
6	to one to deny the request I'm sorry the waiver request
7	from CARE that only parties may file a motion for
8	reconsideration. Commissioner Hood moving, Commissioner May
9	seconding, Commissioners Miller and Turnbull in support of
10	denial, Commissioner Shapiro not present, not voting.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Schellin, do we have anything
12	else?
13	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, the applicant's motion to
14	strike the attachments from the record that CARE included in
15	their request. The applicant would like those attachments
16	stricken from the record.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let me hear what others have to
18	say about that. I don't see where that's necessary, but let
19	me open it up for others.
20	COMMISSIONER MAY: The attachments being the CARE's
21	argument? I mean, if we don't grant the waiver, then they
22	shouldn't be in the record, right?
23	MS. SCHELLIN: The waiver request stays in the
24	record.
25	COMMISSIONER MAY: But the attachments, they were

1 attached to the waiver. 2 MS. SCHELLIN: Right, and they -- I'm sorry. Ι have to pull it up really quick because I didn't make notes 3 But do you want to go ahead and speak to it? 5 MS. LOVICK: Since you denied it, you're not 6 accepting them into the record technically speaking. 7 think you can grant the request. 8 All right. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. With that, do 9 we need to make a motion on it? Okay. That makes sense. That makes sense. 10 11 MS. SCHELLIN: I'm sorry, yes. Unfortunately, 12 CARE made their waiver and their motion for reconsideration 13 all in one document. So that's the problem. attachments that they included, yes, they need to be --15 CHAIRMAN HOOD: So it can stay in the record. But the thing is the waiver was not granted. 16 So we really don't get to the merits of what was in his --17 18 MS. SCHELLIN: But it's the attachments that they 19 want stricken. 2.0 COMMISSIONER MAY: May I ask a question, 21 I mean, the mechanics of how these documents are Schellin. submitted and become part of the electronic records of the 22 I mean, do we have any control over that, we being 23 It's all just based on how they submit it. And so when 24

we get something, it comes in like a submission that comes

1	in 15 parts. It's because it came to us in 15 parts.
2	MS. SCHELLIN: And unfortunately, the way that
3	CARE filed this, they should have filed their waiver request
4	as one document and the motion for reconsideration as an
5	attachment.
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: So in the future
7	MS. SCHELLIN: And they didn't.
8	COMMISSIONER MAY: So in order to avoid this
9	problem in the future, should
10	MS. SCHELLIN: We should reject it.
11	COMMISSIONER MAY: that should be rejected.
12	MS. SCHELLIN: We will.
13	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. All right.
14	MS. SCHELLIN: And what they did is they I'm
15	sorry, but on the materials that they attached, they were
16	supplemental information that the applicant is saying it
17	doesn't bear in this case, they've got new information
18	that bears upon substance. So the application that was
19	released after the hearing, they submitted information that
20	Reunion Square Development would be receiving 60 million
21	dollars in tax increment financing.
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Schellin, we don't want to get
23	into that. Let's just do this. Since it happened like it
24	did, I would move that we strike as request on our own, not
25	necessarily we appreciate the applicant. But as to this

1	discussion, I think that we need to strike that from the
2	record. I move that and ask for a second.
3	COMMISSIONER MAY: Second.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: It's been moved and properly
5	seconded. Any further discussion? All in favor?
6	(Chorus of aye.)
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any opposition? So Ms. Schellin,
8	would you please record the vote.
9	MS. SCHELLIN: Staff records the vote four to zero
10	to one to strike the attachments to CARE's motion.
11	Commissioner Hood moving, Commissioner Miller seconding,
12	Commissioners Turnbull and May in support, Commissioner
13	Shapiro not present, not voting.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I appreciate you trying to
15	explain that to us, Ms. Schellin.
16	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: But after all that in our
18	discussion, that's what I'll base my motion on.
19	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Schellin, do we have anything
21	else?
22	MS. SCHELLIN: Staff has nothing else?
23	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Office of Planning, do you have
24	anything?
25	MS. STEINGASSER: No sir.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Office of the Attorney General,
2	do you have anything else for us? Okay. I know the answer
3	is no. So I wish everyone a happy holiday.
4	Also I want to put on the record Ms. Esther
5	Bushman is going to be leaving us. And since I won't be here
6	to be able to say some nice congratulatory remarks, I'm going
7	to say them now. I would just say that I've known Ms.
8	Bushman a long time. She has brought a lot to this office.
9	She has brought a lot of service to the city. She's done a
10	good job and wish her well in her retirement as she moves
11	forward. So with that, and I think that can be said by all
12	of us. We've known Ms. Bushman for a while. So some of us
13	may even have worked with her.
14	VICE CHAIRMAN MILLER: Yes, I have worked with
15	her, both at the council and here at the zoning office.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So we wish her well and we
17	thank her for all of her service, not just at the Office of
18	Zoning but to the city. Ms. Schellin, do we have anything
19	else?
20	MS. SCHELLIN: No sir.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So with that, I want to
22	thank everyone for their participation. And this meeting is
23	adjourned.
24	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the
25	record at 7:29 p.m.)
ļ	I .

### <u>C E R T I F I C A T E</u>

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Regular Meeting

Before: DCZC

Date: 12-17-18

Place: Washington, DC

was duly recorded and accurately transcribed under my direction; further, that said transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

Court Reporter

near 1 aus 8