GOVERNMENT

OF

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

OFFICE OF ZONING

+ + + + +

REGULAR PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

THURSDAY

OCTOBER 29, 2020

+ + + + +

The Regular Public Meeting of the District of Columbia Board of Zoning convened via Videoconference, pursuant to notice at 4:03 p.m. EDT, Anthony J. Hood, Chairperson], presiding.

## ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

ANTHONY J. HOOD CHAIRPERSON
ROBERT MILLER VICE CHAIR
PETER G. MAY COMMISSIONER
PETER SHAPIRO COMMISSIONER
MICHAEL G. TURNBULL COMMISSIONER

## OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

SHARON SCHELLIN
PAUL YOUNG, Zoning Data Specialist

### OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

JENNIFER STEINGASSER, Deputy Director, Development Review & Historic Preservation ELISA VITALE

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Regular Public Meeting held on October 29, 2020.

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

	PA	GE
OPENING REM	ARKS Mr. Hood	4
	N A. Z.C. Case No. 20-09, Wagner, LLC - Consolidated PUD and Related Map Amendment at Square 5740, Lot 337 Mrs. Schellin	4
VOTE		15
	A. Z.C. Case No. 18-04A, Office of Planning, Text Amendment to Subtitle A, § 209.2, Construction of Playing Fields & Accessory Structures at RFK, Parcel 149 Lots 65-66	15
VOTE		18
	B. Z.C. Case No. 19-27B, Office of Planning, Text Amendment to Subtitle J, Zoning Reorganization, and Subtitles A, B, C, U, W, X, Y and Z, Zoning Conformity Ms. Steingasser	19
VOTE		20
	C. Zoning Commission Case No. 20-25, Office of Planning Text Amendment to Subtitle C, U, and X, Clarification, Conforming Apartment Houses in the RF Zones Ms. Elliott	22
VOTE		24
AD.TOURN		26

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

2 4:03 p.m. 3 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Good afternoon, ladies and 4 We are convening and broadcasting this public 5 meeting by video conferencing. My name is Anthony Hood. Joining me is Vice Chair Miller, Commissioner 6 Shapiro, 7 Commissioner May, and Commissioner Turnbull. We are also 8 joined by Office of Zoning staff, Ms. Sharon Schellin, and 9 Mr. Paul Young who'll be handling all of our virtual 10 operations. Copies of today's meeting agenda are available on the Office of Zoning's website. 11 12 Again, we do not take any public testimony at our unless the Commission requests someone to come 13 meetings 14 And this is a very important announcement. forward. Ιf 15 you're having any problems accessing or seeing this video 16 recording, please dial 202-727-5471 for Webex login or call-17 in instructions. 18 Again, if we have any hearing items, the only 19 documents before us this evening are the application and the ANC set down report, and the Office of Zoning's planning 2.0 All other documents in the record will be reviewed 21 22 at the time of the hearing. 23 So with that, let me go right into it. 24 staff have any preliminary matters?

No, sir.

MS. SCHELLIN:

25

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Again, today's date is October 29th, 2020. Our first case is final action, Zoning Commission Case Number 20-09. This is the Wagner LLC Consolidated Map Amendment at Square 5740, Lot 337. Ms. Schellin?

Yes, sir. At Exhibits 27 and 28, MS. SCHELLIN: and also 38 through 38E, we have the, I'm sorry, 30 through 30E, have the Applicant's post hearing submissions. Exhibit 29 was the submission from Mr. Watson. And Exhibit 31, and also it was corrected at 31A, is ANC 8B's response submissions the Applicant's that ask the Commission consider final action on this case this evening.

Thank you, CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Ms. Schellin. Again for those watching, this application proposes to develop the site of a new five-story apartment containing approximately 67 senior affordable house residential units. One hundred percent of the residential units in the building will be dedicated to seniors with income not exceeding 60 percent of the median family income.

The building is proposed to have a maximum height of 55 feet, approximately 50,733 square feet of gross floor area, and a lot occupancy of 53 percent. And then also we have a requested map amendment. It's currently an R3 zoning. The Applicant has requested a PUD related map amendment to rezone.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

that's just the background of 1 the Commission will be discussing. Let me start off. 2 We did receive a letter from Mr. Watson. And I will just say that 3 Mr. Watson's letter brings up a lot of concerns and issues. 5 I think what I would do, our job is to deal with and I would advise Mr. Watson, if these are some relief. 6 issues that he has, that me may want to go to some of those, to BEGA, to the ANC Office, and deal with those issues at 8 9 that point. 10 Our particular job is on land use and relief sought for the project. And I know he has some concerns he 11 12 wants to address. But unfortunately, this is not the forum. This is about planning. If it was something improperly done, 13 the people who do the investigative stuff are the experts, 14 15 not us. So I would encourage him, if those are concerns, 16 that hopefully they can resolve it without doing all that, 17 but I would encourage him to go to the proper venue to get 18 19 that resolved. 20 So does anybody have any comments on that? 2.1 All right, so let me open it for discussions on 22 the zoning issues that are before us. Let me see, does 23 have any comments, or questions, or follow-up 24 comments? Commissioner Turnbull?

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL:

25

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Ι

just want to say that one of the things that, when we talked at the hearing and went over reviewing the case, I really just pointed out that architecturally the entrance of the building looked a little, at least from my standpoint, it like it wasn't much of an entrance. It looked hidden, it didn't really draw, especially the location of the building on the street where it is at the corner, it seemed to want to be a little bit more open, more noticeable.

And the architect did go back, looked at the building, and they made, on Drawing A19, they made a change showing a much more prominent looking entrance and, I thought, one that had a lot more character to it. So from that standpoint, I'm quite happy with it. So I'm satisfied that they went back and changed it.

From the other standpoint, at least for me, I think the proffer's that they've made, this is a very, it's all affordable senior housing. I think that's a significant attribute for this project. And I think it does a lot, not only for the neighborhood but for the whole city, to have this kind of senior housing.

But I think that the proffers that they've given, the superior architecture, I think the building, they've done a lot with this, how you have a step back as it meets the neighborhood from the corner. I think that there were just so many aspects to the design that they did that I thought

2.1

2.3

it was very significant. But I think the affordable housing is a big factor. And I'm more than willing to vote in favor of this project tonight.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, thank you, Commissioner Turnbull. Commissioner May?

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. I'd like to echo what Commissioner Turnbull had to say. I have to admit, I was not totally onboard with his concerns about the entry at the hearing. But I was really quite pleased to see what they produced in response. Because I think that what we have now is better.

And I especially appreciate the fact that they continued the brick facade all the way up at that corner. Because I do think that that's an improvement. They did also provide some information to address my concerns about the use of hardy panel and how that's detailed.

And, you know, seeing the detail is helpful, seeing photographs that don't really show, they're not of sufficient size or, you know, you can't get a close enough look at the detail to really understand how, you know, what it looks like, and how it performs, or how it has performed in those particular buildings.

That was not particularly helpful. But I think that, you know, the biggest concern I have is that it was in some pretty prominent locations. And I think that's been

2.0

So I'm less concerned about that now overall. 1 2 But next time this particular architect comes to 3 us with a design that features this particular detail, would like to see some closeup photos of this installation 5 of hardy panel in action and how it's weathered over time, just to understand how it looks. 6 7 I also, I mean, there are other issues that they 8 address, the color of the panel. I'll let Mr. Shapiro speak 9 to that, since I think that was his issue. But they also 10 addressed things like the parking concern. And I think it's pretty clear that this is not going to have a negative impact 11 12 on the parking in the neighborhood. So all in all, I'm with Commissioner Turnbull all 13 I mean, I think this is a good project, and I'm 14 15 prepared to vote in favor of it. 16 Commissioner Shapiro, do CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. 17 you have any questions or comments? 18 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: I don't, Mr. Chair. D'T associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues. 19 20 will be supporting this as well. 21 Vice Chair Miller? CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. 22 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 23 I would agree with, concur with my colleagues as well that 24 the design changes that made were as а result

at

the last,

comments

colleaques'

hearing,

the

at

improvements.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

It looks, the entrance looks much better. And the brick going up that area looks much better. And it shows you the value of having our architectural colleagues sometimes make suggestions which work out very well. So I appreciate that.

And I agree that the, I'd ask for more parking information about the availability of on-street parking spaces. Even though they weren't required to provide that, in this type of case, but they did provide that. And based on what they provided, in addition to the other information that had previously been provided by DDOT and others, I think there is available, there's been a showing that there's enough both on-street and off-street being provided that this can go forward.

It's meeting all the zoning requirements for sure. But there's also availability of on-street parking which was a question in my mind based on the opposition testimony we had gotten. So I hope that that works out.

I think we still may need to revisit, from a policy perspective with DDOT, as a Commission, whether or not in senior housing the same kind of parking requirements, minimums, whether there need to be higher requirements, more parking provided in senior housing than in other types.

So I think that's a policy issue that's not for

this case, although it was highlighted by what was being -I think there are only five off-street spaces being provided,
maybe an additional two with a car care and electric. So
that's something maybe to revisit, this and other things to
revisit from a policy perspective was a design concern that
I had raised which wasn't addressed.

There were only nine Juliet balconies being provided in this 60-some odd units, even though there are terraces and other outdoor spaces that are being provided, and landscaping which is good. But nine out of 60-some seem a little -- and they're only Juliet balconies.

So I just want to reiterate to the Office of Planning, who is listening, something I've said previously, which I think they're looking at, which is the issue of not counting the FAR of balconies in the overall FAR of a project so that what we have in our regulations is not providing a disincentive, essentially, to providing the balconies, the essential, not essential, but the very desirable private outdoor space that residential projects and residential tenants and occupants would like to have in their projects.

So I think sometimes that's why we get fewer balconies, and Juliet balconies rather than usable balconies, is because they don't want to be bumping up the FAR and having to get additional relief. And when there's a balancing going on, and with what the FAR and density is with

2.1

other Com plan policies, that comes into play.

2.0

So I would hope that the Office of Planning is looking at that issue o that the FAR of balconies is not being counted in a way that is disincentivizing their use or their development in residential projects.

But I think as Mr. Turnbull said, the biggest amenity or the biggest public benefit is the all affordable housing, all affordable senior housing that is being provided by this without many additions to the design. So I am ready to go forward, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I would agree with all the comments that I've heard. One of the things that I did look at was the up to 60 percent. I've always encouraged to go lower, I've always tried to get 30 and 20 as doable, but I will leave that up to the Applicant and the other realm and avenues that they have to go through.

I will say that the question about the laptops, I think it is a public benefit, especially the timing of it which I mostly appreciate it being ready for the young folks before they go to school. I think that was very important. So I would also not have a problem including that as a, continue to include to that as a public benefit.

The other thing is that, just to make sure that, again for the record, that Mr. Watson knows it hasn't been on deaf ears. But if he could take those concerns to proper

authorities, those who do that work, and go from there, and 1 hopefully the ANCs, and Mr. Watson, and everybody can work 2 through all of those conditions. 3 4 I think this senior affordability, I always like 5 to go deeper, as I stated earlier, but it's always good to at least see the attempt made, as we do in this case. 6 And 7 I think all the architectural questions have been remedied 8 mostly to the satisfaction of my colleagues. And I think 9 this is well worth us approving this project. It would be 10 very beneficial to, not just to Ward 8 but to the city So with that, unless somebody else has any other 11 12 follow-up, I would move that we approve Zoning Commission Case Number 20-09, Wagner, LLC, Consolidated PUD and Related 13 Map Amendment, Square 5740, Lot 337, and ask for a second. 14 Vice Chair Miller? 15 16 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Second. 17 CHAIRMAN HOOD: been moved and properly It's seconded. Commissioners, further discussion? 18 any 19 Commissioner May? 2.0 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. I just wanted to be clear what we are voting on is inclusive of the benefits package 21 2.2 had been previously discussed and presented to us. 23 Because there was discussion in the Applicant's, you know, the Applicant's submission, and in the ANC's submission, 24

about making changes to that in terms of who receives money

and all that sort of thing.

2.3

But I assume that we are going with what was originally presented and discussed and, you know, if there are issues with how the ANC acted, you know, that can get sorted out through whatever means Mr. Watson chooses to do in that. You know, we don't want to back away from anything that was committed to as a proffer from the Applicant.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Right. I would agree. I think that what was agreed to. I think that's what this motion entitles to. And that's what our processes are. If it's something different, I think they would have to come back for either a consent calendar item or anything other, you know, whatever course they have, if they're still with us, they would have to come back, whatever course of action is, we would have to take within our realm of how we do our things for the zoning purposes of the PUD.

I don't know if that answers your question, Commissioner May, but yes. We would be attuned to what we have.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, it does. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioner Turnbull?

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes. I just want to be clear also on just what we're, we're including the laptops as a proffer?

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, that's our recommendation. 1 2 Because with PUD, I don't think we would have any laptops. 3 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right, okay. 4 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Maybe I'm assuming too much, but 5 6 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I just wanted to be sure. 7 Because somehow it was in, it was out. I just wanted to make 8 sure that that's going to be in. 9 CHAIRMAN HOOD: I think it's in. I appreciate the 10 timing of it. That was very important --11 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes, I would agree that they 12 should be included as a public benefit. They wouldn't have happened but for the PUD. And the fact that they happened 13 earlier than we normally would see, I think that's above and 14 15 beyond what our regulations require. And it was beneficial 16 to the community. And we shouldn't punish Applicants for 17 good behavior that goes beyond our requirements in terms of 18 timing. 19 other benefits in And the of the terms 2.0 contributions to the community organizations that the ANC has 2.1 identified, I think that's important as long as they meet all 22 of our verifiable zoning regulations. So I think as the 2.3 second for the motion, that was all part of the motion, from 24 my understanding.

CHAIRMAN HOOD:

Okay, sounds good.

25

Okay,

it's

1	been moved and properly seconded. Any further discussion?
2	Okay, Ms. Schellin, would you do a roll call vote,
3	please?
4	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood?
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.
6	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller?
7	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.
8	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner May?
9	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
10	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Shapiro?
11	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Yes.
12	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Turnbull?
13	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes.
14	MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is five, to zero, to zero
15	to approve final action in Zoning Commission Case Number 20-
16	09.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Next, let's go hearing
18	action, Zoning Commission Case Number 18-04A, Office of
19	Planning text amendment to Subtitle A, 209.2, Construction
20	of Playing Fields and Accessory Structures at RFK, Parcel
21	149, Lots 65 through 66.
22	Ms. Vitale?
23	MS. VITALE: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair, and
24	members of the Commission, Elisa Vitale with the Office of
25	Planning for Case 18-04A. OP is recommending set down of a

modification to the zoning text that was approved for the RFK campus. The original text allowed for the construction of three athletic playing fields, an unenclosed pavilion, three shade structures, and three accessory buildings on unzoned land next to the RFK stadium.

The playing fields pavilion, one shade structure, a visitor building, a storage building, and restroom facility have been constructed and are currently in use.

Events DC, which has a long-term lease agreement with the National Parks Service on behalf of the District government, has determined that an additional restroom facility is required. And they have requested that a text amendment be brought forward to allow a fourth accessory building.

The amendment is necessary to allow for the issuance of a building permit for the interim use on land that is not yet zoned or subdivided. The field use and associated structures support community serving recreational uses, and the proposed amendment would not be inconsistent with the comprehensive plan.

This concludes my report, and I'm happy to answer any questions. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'm going to start off with every time I've pronounced your name I actually practiced pronouncing your name. And it seems, I guess, it's going to

2.1

1	take me longer with your name than it took me to get Ms.
2	Elliott. So just to let Ms. Elliott know, it's taking me
3	even longer. But I'm going to get it right eventually.
4	MS. VITALE: I think you're close.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'm close, okay. All right, well,
6	thank you.
7	Okay, let's see if we have any questions or
8	comments. Commissioner May?
9	(No audible response.)
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commission Shapiro?
11	(No audible response.)
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioner Turnbull?
13	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: If Commissioner May's
14	fine, since he's the custodian over there, I'm okay.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, that's
16	COMMISSIONER MAY: custodian, you know, some
17	days.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Vice Chair Miller?
19	(No audible response.)
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So we have the requested
21	force. Commissioner May, since you are unmuted, could you
22	make a motion?
23	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: I thought you were going
24	to say since he's the bathroom custodian.
25	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ha, ha, ha.

1	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. You know, when this first
2	came up, I had to, maybe they already knew, but I reminded
3	people that, you know, you needed to have a zoning amendment
4	in order to build this extra bathroom. So yes, I am still
5	the custodian.
6	Anyway, I would like to, I've got to find the
7	right thing in front of me here, sorry. What case number is
8	this?
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: This is Case Number 18-04.
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: Thank you very much. I have
11	a long list of these things, but it doesn't have the names
12	on it, 18-04, yes. So I would move that we set down for
13	hearing Zoning Commission Case Number 18-04A, Office of
14	Planning Text Amendment Subtitle A regarding RFK Stadium, and
15	ask for a second.
16	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Second.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. It's been moved and
18	properly seconded. Any further discussion?
19	Not seeing any, Ms. Schellin would you please do
20	a roll call vote?
21	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner May?
22	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
23	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Turnbull?
24	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes.
25	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood?

1	CUATOMAN HOOD: No.
1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.
2	MS. SCHELLIN: Commission Shapiro?
3	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Yes.
4	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller?
5	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.
6	MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is five, to zero, to zero
7	to approve Zoning Commission Case Number 18-04A as amended.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. I want to thank
9	Ms. Vitale for her report.
10	Let's go to Commission Case Number 19-27B. This
11	is the Office of Planning Text Amendment to Subtitle J,
12	Zoning Reorganization, and Subtitles A, B, C, U, W, X, Y and
13	Z, Zoning Conformity. Ms. Steingasser?
14	MS. STEINGASSER: Yes, Chairman Hood,
15	Commissioners, this case represents the third and hopefully
16	final segment of the reorganization of the zoning
17	regulations. It incorporates the zonings from Case 18-16 and
18	reorganizes the Subtitle J, which is the PDR zones, to
19	reflect those new names and that new structure as well as
20	provide conforming language for other subtitles to
21	incorporate the new zone names.
22	The Commission has approved the other 19-27 and
23	19-27A per proposed action as well as the Zoning Case 18-16.
24	This will be final portion, and we recommend that the
25	Commission sets this case down.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Steingasser.
2	Let's see if we have any questions or comments. I'm looking
3	to see if anybody Could just throw your hand up if you have
4	any Okay, I see none of you.
5	Okay. Well, Ms. Steingasser, thank you. Good
6	job, no questions or comments. So with that, since I'm
7	unmuted, I will move that we set down Zoning Commission Case,
8	wait a minute, set down Zoning Commission Case Number 19-27B
9	as stated and ask for a second.
10	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Second.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, Commissioner Shapiro
12	seconded. Any further discussion?
13	All right, Ms. Schelling, could you do a roll call
14	vote, please?
15	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood?
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.
17	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Shapiro?
18	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Yes.
19	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner May?
20	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
21	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller?
22	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.
23	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Turnbull?
24	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes.
25	MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is five, to zero, to zero

1	to set down Zoning Commission Case Number 19-27B as a
2	rulemaking case.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, thank you. I Thank Ms.
4	Steingasser for her report.
5	Next, I think this is last on our agenda. Let's
6	go to Zoning Commission Case Number 20-25. This is the
7	Office of Planning Text Amendment to Subtitle C, U, and X,
8	Clarification, Conforming Apartment Houses in the RF Zones.
9	The request is a waiver of a ten-day filing rule
LO	to accept the report, and the set down, and then take
11	emergency action, and authorize the immediate publication
L2	of Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, and then approve a shorter
L3	notice period of 30 days for public hearing notice.
L4	Ms. Schellin, do you have anything else to add?
15	MS. SCHELLIN: No sir.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I shouldn't be coming to
L7	you anyway. I should be going to Ms. Vitale.
L8	MS. SCHELLIN: Right.
L9	(Laughter.)
20	MS. VITALE: Actually, I believe this is Ms.
21	Elliott's case.
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, I'm going on what I, Ms.
23	Elliott, I didn't get your name wrong this time. I'm looking
24	at what I have here in front of me. Ms. Elliott?
25	MS. ELLIOTT: Man, ha, ha.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I thought she was 1 2 I thought --MS. ELLIOT: 3 You can't hold me responsible for CHAIRMAN HOOD: 4 That's what's written here. 5 All right, Ms. Elliott? Well, that's sorted. All right, I'm 6 MS. ELLIOT: 7 here, I'm happy to be here. Good evening, Mr. Chairman, and 8 members of the Commission. I'm Brandice Elliott, 9 Zoning Commission 20-25. for Case OP is 10 recommending that the emergency text amendment which intended to address apartment houses in the RF zones is set 11 12 down for a public hearing. Specifically, just to clarify, we're talking about 13 14 legally built apartment houses that are not subject to a 15 conversion. We often refer to them as purpose built 16 apartment houses. And just for the sake of clarity, I'll go 17 ahead and call them that for this presentation. 18 The BZA has recently seen some requests to expand existing purpose built apartment houses in the RF zones where 19 2.0 are variances have been requested in order to increase the 21 number of dwelling units beyond the 900 square-foot rule 22 allowance. 23 So in reviewing the relief for these cases, we 24 found that the regulations explicitly call out existing built apartment houses as non-conforming

including those that were built prior to the 1958 zoning regulations.

So the purpose of this text amendment is to ensure purpose built apartment houses in RF zones considered conforming uses and may expand, as permitted, under the matter of right provisions included in Subtitle U without the need for a use variance. This leaves the 900 square-foot rule intact, and an area variance is required when 900 square feet of land area is not provided for a dwelling unit.

The text amendment would amend sections of Subtitles C, U, and X to explicitly call out these legally constructed apartment houses as conforming uses. The Zoning Administrator has also requested a minor amendment to Subtitle U, 301.1, to clarify uses in the RF zones.

Accepting these amendments would allow the BZA cases that are in process to proceed with the requested area variances and without use variances.

OP requests that the text amendment be set down for a public hearing, that the Commission takes emergency action, and approve the immediate publication of a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, and approve a shorter notice period of 30 days for the notice of public hearing. The public hearing would be held on permanent text within 120 days. So thank you, I'm going to leave at that. And I'm happy to take any

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

2.3

1	questions that you have.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, thank you, Ms. Elliott. Ms.
3	Schelling, could you send a copy of what we had when I gave
4	it to Ms. Elliott so she can see that I did not make that
5	mistake, because I've agreed I've made it for so many
6	years I just can't let that one go, really.
7	Let's see, do we have any questions or comments?
8	I don't see anybody. So since I'm unmuted, I
9	would move that we set down, as asked for, the waiver of ten-
10	day filing report, the separate report. We set this down,
11	we take emergency action, and authorize the immediate
12	publication of Notice of Proposed Rulemaking.
13	And we also approve a shorter notice period for
14	30 days for public hearing notice for Zoning Commission Case
15	Number 20-25 which is the Office of Planning text amendment
16	to Subtitle C, U, and X, clarification of RF zones and ask
17	for a second. Commissioner May?
18	COMMISSIONER MAY: Second.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: It's been properly seconded. Any
20	further discussion?
21	Not seeing any, Ms. Schellin, would you please do
22	a roll call vote.
23	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood?
24	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.
25	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller?

1	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.
2	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner May?
3	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
4	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Shapiro?
5	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Yes.
6	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Turnbull?
7	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes.
8	MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is five, to zero, to zero
9	to set down Zoning Commission Case Number 20-25 as a
10	rulemaking case, to waive the ten-day filing period, to take
11	emergency action, and to approve the immediate publication
12	of the proposed rulemaking, and also to approve a 30-day
13	notice period for the public hearing notice.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you, and thank you,
15	Ms. Elliott.
16	Ms. Schellin, do we have anything else tonight?
17	MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir, we do not.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right. I want to thank
19	everyone for their participation. The Zoning Commission will
20	have a hearing on this coming Monday, November the 2nd.
21	Office of Planning text amendment to Subtitle C for the GAR
22	requirements for certified landscape expert requirements.
23	And that will be at 4:00 p.m. on November the 2nd.
24	We'll be back on this same web server link. Or you can go
25	to that website, and you can watch us. So unless I hear from

1	anyone else, this meeting is adjourned. Good night.	
2	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the	
3	record at 4:34 p.m.)	
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

# <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: Public Meeting

Before: DCZC

Date: 10-29-20

Place: teleconference

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 aus &