

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PRESENT:

MAXIMILIAN TONDRO, Esquire

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the
Regular Public Hearing held on January 7, 2021

HUNT REPORTING COMPANY
Court Reporting and Litigation Support
Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia
410-766-HUNT (4868)
1-800-950-DEPO (3376)

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

	<u>PAGE</u>
OPENING STATEMENT:	
ANTHONY HOOD	4
PRESENTATIONS:	
Office of Zoning, Case Number 20-25, Office of Zoning text amendments to subtitles C, U, and X to clarify conforming use status of lawfully constructed apartment houses in the RF Zones Brandice Elliott	7
COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS:	
Commissioners	9
CLOSING REMARKS:	
Anthony Hood	19
Max Tondro	20
VOTE:	
Commissioners	21
ADJOURN:	
Anthony Hood	23

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

(4:00 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Good evening. This is the virtual public hearing of the Zoning Commission of the District of Columbia. Tonight's Zoning Commission case is 20-25. My name is Anthony Hood. Joining me is Vice Chair Miller; Commissioner Shapiro; shortly, Commissioner May and Commissioner Turnbull; as well as the Office of Zoning staff, Ms. Sharon Schellin and Mr. Paul Young.

Tonight's case consists of public hearing -- I mean, consists of Zoning Commission text amendment to clarify apartment house in the RF zones, revisions of Subtitle C 204.7, Subtitle U 301.1 and 301.5, and Subtitle X 1001.3.

Copies of today's virtual public hearing notice are available on the Office of Zoning's website. Please be advised that this proceeding is being recorded by a court reporter; it is also webcast live via Webex and YouTube Live. The video will be available on the Office of Zoning's website after the hearing.

Accordingly, all those listed on Webex or attending by phone will be muted during the hearing, and those who have signed up to testify will be unmuted at the appropriate time. In all cases, we ask that you sign up in advance so that you are sworn in. If you have not signed up, please contact the staff on the Hotline number, which will be given out shortly.

When presenting, please state your name and home address

HUNT REPORTING COMPANY
Court Reporting and Litigation Support
Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia
410-766-HUNT (4868)
1-800-950-DEPO (3376)

1 before providing testimony. When you are finished speaking,
2 please mute your audio so that your microphone is no longer
3 picking up sound or background noise. If you experience any
4 technical difficulty or any problems during these proceedings,
5 then please call our OZ Hotline number at 202-727-5471, and the OZ
6 staff will assist you.

7 The hearing will be conducted in accordance with
8 provisions of 11 Z DCMR, Chapter 5, as follows: preliminary
9 matters, presentation, in this case, it's going to be the Office
10 of Planning; reports of other government agencies; reports of the
11 ANC, again, this is city-wide; and then we will hear testimony.
12 The testimony will be provided by organizations, five minutes; and
13 individuals, three minutes; and we will hear in the following
14 order: support, opposition, and undeclared.

15 While the Commission reserves the right to change the
16 time limits for presentations if necessary, it intends to adhere
17 to the time limits as strictly as possible and notes that no time
18 shall be ceded. Again, any issues, please call the OZ hotline
19 number at 202-727-5471.

20 At this time, the Commission will consider any
21 preliminary matters. Does the staff have any preliminary matters?

22 MS. SCHELLIN: I do want to advise that while the
23 proposed rulemaking was already published and technically, we
24 could -- or the Commission could take final action this evening,
25 unfortunately, staff did not refer this case to NCPC, and it was

1 not referred until December 30th, so the 30-day comment period has
2 not run. And so we need the Commission to not take final action
3 if they were so inclined this evening so that that comment period
4 can run.

5 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I see Mr. Tondro has something he
6 wants to add to that. Mr. Tondro?

7 MR. TONDRO: Yes. Thank you. If that's going happen,
8 what I would like to do would be to propose that the -- if the
9 Commission is so inclined, that they take revised proposed action
10 tonight. As you note, there were some changes. I don't believe
11 they were substantive changes proposed by the Office of Planning
12 in association with the Office of Attorney General, and so this
13 would be an opportunity to do that. I think because there already
14 was notice provided by a proposed rulemaking, this could be on a
15 shortened time frame, a seven day, and so you could do that
16 revised proposed rulemaking.

17 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Sounds good. Thank you, Mr.
18 Tondro. So we heard advice, both Ms. Schellin, and we've also
19 heard Mr. Tondro's legal advice to us, so any objections in how to
20 proceed in that fashion?

21 (No audible response; indicated no.)

22 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. We'll leave the rest up to
23 staff. Okay. Anything else, Ms. Schellin?

24 MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir. You have Brandice Elliott from
25 the Office of Planning who will be presenting this evening.

1 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

2 COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chairman?

3 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.

4 COMMISSIONER MAY: I just happened to be reading the
5 Office of Planning's report, and they're requesting that we waive
6 the ten-day rule on their submission of their report because it
7 was submitted in less than ten days in advance, so --

8 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Commissioner May. I actually
9 remember writing that down, but I didn't even mention it, so thank
10 you. So any objections to the request? They did ask, as
11 Commissioner May has already mentioned, and I wrote it down right
12 here for a waiver of the ten-day filing report. Any objections?

13 (No audible response; indicated no.)

14 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So we will honor it. Thank you,
15 Commissioner May. Anything else, Commissioners? Okay. All
16 right. Where is Ms. Elliott? She was -- I saw her a minute ago.
17 Okay. Ms. Elliott?

18 MS. ELLIOTT: Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Elliott, you may begin.

20 MS. ELLIOTT: Thank you. And I appreciate it. You're
21 off to a good start, Chairman Hood. You got my name right. I'm
22 just keeping tabs on the side.

23 CHAIRMAN HOOD: I mean, yeah. Let's do that. Let's see
24 how many times I mess up this year.

25 MS. ELLIOTT: It's a good time to start over. So good

1 afternoon, Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission. I am
2 Brandice Elliott representing the Office of Planning and Happy New
3 Year.

4 OP recommends that the proposed text amendment, which is
5 addressing apartment houses in the RF zones be approved by the
6 Zoning Commission. The text amendment specifically addresses
7 legally constructed apartment houses that are not subject to a
8 conversion, which we typically call purpose-built apartment
9 houses.

10 So the Zoning Commission took emergency action on this
11 text amendment in November of last year in order to address
12 several BZA cases that were in progress.

13 In summary, the test amendment clarifies that purpose-
14 built apartment houses are conforming and that expansions do not
15 require use variances; however, area variances are still required
16 when the 900 square feet of land area per dwelling unit is not
17 provided. So for example, the BZA cases that we saw, typically,
18 had some sort of space in the building that was not being used,
19 like a basement or a laundry area, and they were converting those
20 spaces into additional dwelling units. And this was intended to
21 address those. They required BZA review because they were not
22 complying with the 900-square-foot rule, so -- but rather than
23 requiring both a use and area variance, these only required area
24 variances for the 900-square-foot rule.

25 Since the emergency adoption of the text, OP has worked

1 with OAG to clarify Subtitle U, Section 301.5 so that it's a
2 little bit easier to understand. This section basically reads
3 that a purpose-built apartment house may be expanded as a matter-
4 of-right as long as it meets certain requirements, including the
5 900-square-foot rule. We just found this section to be very
6 confusing and difficult to follow, so we hope that the
7 modification makes it easier to understand, and we appreciate
8 OAG's assistance with reorganizing that section.

9 So that concludes OP's report, and I'm happy to answer
10 any questions you may have.

11 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Elliott. Let's
12 see if we have any questions or comments. Commissioner May?

13 COMMISSIONER MAY: No, no.

14 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Commissioner Shapiro?

15 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: No, sir.

16 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioner Turnbull?

17 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I'm good. I'm good with it.

18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: And Vice Chair Miller?

19 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I'm good too. And thank you, Ms.
20 Elliott, for your report.

21 CHAIRMAN HOOD: So everybody's good, and I guess I'm the
22 only one -- maybe I'm the only one that's confused. I was hoping
23 that we were going to have a discussion because maybe I'm off
24 field. Let me ask, first -- let me ask Mr. Tondro to come back
25 up. Mr. Tondro? Maximilian Tondro -- oh, there you are. Mr.

1 Tondro, I have been discussing some issues with you which -- when
2 I started reading this, I started thinking this was -- some of
3 this -- could you help me -- and I'm not really putting you on the
4 spot, I'm just curious, does this fall in -- kind of in line with
5 some of the stuff -- discussion -- I'm going to go to OP, but this
6 would fall in line with some discussions you and I have been
7 having about the 900 square feet and some concerns that I have
8 been having, even though I know we're talking about historic in
9 this case?

10 MR. TONDRO: I suppose so. I mean, I think that this
11 was -- as I think Ms. Elliott made clear, this was a situation
12 that was partially due to the changeover between the 1958
13 regulations and the 2016 regulations. And there was this -- these
14 category of these apartments that were built either prior to
15 zoning or at some time when they were permitted under zoning and
16 so they were legally conforming at the time, but subsequently, the
17 rules changed. And so the question was, did it clarify that they
18 would not need a use variance if they wanted to expand within --
19 but they would need an area variance. And so I -- so yes, it
20 relates to what we're talking about, but I think I would probably
21 leave it with Ms. Elliott's presentation. I think she was dead
22 on.

23 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. And I wasn't putting you on the
24 witness stand, I just wanted to know before I go off into what I
25 want to go off into, and I wanted to make sure this -- either was

1 | this was the appropriate time or not the appropriate time, but I'm
2 | going to do it anyway to a certain point.

3 | MR. TONDRO: Okay.

4 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'm going to do it anyway, and when you
5 | said "somewhat," that lets me know.

6 | So Ms. Elliott, what I think is fundamentally happening,
7 | and Mr. Tondro, I'm going to ask you to stop me if I'm going too
8 | far over into something else because I tend to do that, and I
9 | don't have a problem. But anyway, Ms. Elliott, my issue is, when
10 | we sit down and we do regulations like this -- and I know the
11 | Office of Planning does its due diligence, believe me, but then it
12 | seems like when we get to the BZA, we have these cases where it is
13 | not a good fit. So I guess, out of this -- what we're planning to
14 | do here -- and I understand the nonconforming use, and I
15 | understand all that part, but what is the unintended -- what do we
16 | think that we may see down the road that we might have to come
17 | back and revisit this because as you know, neighbors are getting
18 | highly upset in the city about these big structures right next to
19 | their house. And I'm sure nobody wants that.

20 | So my goal now is to try -- at least I would hope the
21 | Commission would support this, is to find that tool to where we
22 | could still accomplish the Mayor's goal about housing and still
23 | also be able to look at consideration for the -- I mean for the
24 | neighbors. I know that we have the special exception to adverse
25 | impacts, I understand that, but there's got to be another way that

1 | we can find -- try to find that happy medium. And the reason why
2 | I'm hesitant on these is because it seems like even though we
3 | approve these kind of regulations, we're always coming up with --
4 | or when I get to BZA we got something that just looks totally out
5 | of character. I don't know if you have an answer for that, and I
6 | don't know if this is the appropriate time, but I throw it out
7 | there now anyway.

8 | MS. ELLIOTT: Well, I'm happy to take a stab at it,
9 | Chairman Hood, and maybe, you know, Ms. Steingasser will have
10 | something to add on to it. But generally, with these purpose-
11 | built apartment houses, I mean, they're already built, so they're
12 | already incorporated into the neighborhood character. I mean when
13 | you walk through Capitol Hill, there are apartment -- purpose-
14 | built apartment houses sort of sprinkled in with the rowhouses
15 | and, they're already there, so you're used to seeing these.

16 | So in terms of, you know, impact to the neighborhood
17 | character, we wouldn't expect this to have a tremendous impact.
18 | And also, what we're doing here is clarifying, and I think that
19 | the intent of the zoning regulations was to allow for these
20 | purpose-built apartment houses to be expanded if they complied
21 | with the regulations, including the 900-square-foot rule. So
22 | we're allowing for that to happen if they have the land area for
23 | that. And, you know, I think that the special exception review
24 | and the variance reviews, you know, when you have too large a
25 | building on too small a lot, that's just part of the regulatory

1 process. You know, we have to determine whether expanding that
2 building is actually, you know -- the only way we have of
3 determining whether that expansion is creating an undue impact on
4 neighboring properties is to go through the BZA process. So I'm
5 not sure if that answers your question, but I'll leave it there
6 and maybe Ms. Steingasser has something to add.

7 CHAIRMAN HOOD: I appreciate the -- we'll get some
8 feedback from somebody. Why don't we do this, put everybody on
9 mute. Everybody go on mute, that might help us unless it's me.
10 Okay. Okay. There you go. So I appreciate that, and I do want
11 to hear from Ms. Steingasser, but I do appreciate the response,
12 Ms. Elliott, but I'm still concerned about and -- and again, maybe
13 this not the forum, but I did read where the expansion -- we still
14 could do an expansion.

15 My problem is, when we do an expansion, we need to be
16 considerate. And what we're running into is -- and I don't want
17 to really get into any particulars, but what we're running into,
18 like I said, these large facilities right next to a house. And I
19 think the way I'm understanding this, people are allowed to do
20 that, but at the time, they were not -- they didn't do it, but now
21 they're able to do it, so it's almost like a culture shock. But
22 meanwhile, the Office of Planning, the Zoning Commission, we're
23 the ones who are taking the heat for it. And honestly, when I
24 look at it from my standpoint, it just doesn't fit; it doesn't
25 look right.

1 I'm not saying deny anyone from being able to expand,
2 but to just go ahead and just do anything without some type of
3 careful review like we did with the pop-ups or pop-backs, or
4 whatever we used to call them, or whatever they're called now, we
5 did some careful architectural review to make them look quality,
6 you know, not just throw something in there right next -- because
7 nobody -- the reality is -- and I'm hearing this from residents,
8 both on the record and when you're out in the street, in the
9 store, even during COVID, a lot of folks are getting very upset
10 with us, very upset with the Commission and the Board and the
11 Office of Planning and just the way this whole thing is coming up.
12 So I don't know, Ms. Steingasser, if you have anything to add?

13 MS. STEINGASSER: Yes, sir. And I can see why you're
14 concerned. You, in particular, have been on several cases, all of
15 which are a slightly nuance difference with these apartments, and
16 this is a very targeted text amendment. It doesn't allow for the
17 construction of new apartment buildings, so it's specifically
18 targeted to existing apartment buildings that pre-date the zoning
19 rights, that are basically before -- there's three conditions
20 under which they were originally and legally constructed.

21 So they then have to have at least 900 square feet of
22 land area for each unit. So these are existing apartment
23 buildings that have sufficient land area and are in the RF zones.
24 So some of the ones that have been the most contentious have been
25 in the RA-1 Zone, which is the old R-5A where there's that --

1 | there's a lack of real -- it's just -- it's much more of a lenient
2 | zone.

3 | This is very targeted, so this is reflected in several
4 | cases that have been in front of the BZA recently where the
5 | apartment house might have been built in, like, 1890 or 1910,
6 | maybe even 1930, and they've got all this land area. They want to
7 | convert basement space that had been previously used for a laundry
8 | room into an apartment, maybe they've -- and they've got that
9 | area, but they can't because they're considered a nonconforming
10 | use. So even though the building is not expanding outward, and
11 | they certainly have the land area to absorb that relative density,
12 | they've been stuck in this kind of cycle of having to get a use
13 | variance even though they exist as that use. So this is very
14 | targeted towards those.

15 | Some of the issues that you've seen have been in the
16 | single-family residential zones where a building was built for
17 | commercial purposes, now they want to occupy space and they can't
18 | do residential down there and so they are stuck also spinning in
19 | this use variance, but this does not address those. So you've had
20 | a lot of cases and this is very targeted just towards those
21 | existing apartment buildings that pre-date the zoning regulations.

22 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Steingasser. Let
23 | me ask you this. Is the 900 square foot -- the way I read it, it
24 | is waivable, right?

25 | MS. STEINGASSER: If they wanted to get around that,

1 | they would have to go apply to the BZA for a variance. They would
2 | have to get an area variance. It's not a special exception.

3 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So that would be a little more of
4 | a harder hill to climb.

5 | MS. STEINGASSER: Yes. Yes.

6 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So let me ask you, Ms. Elliott
7 | and Ms. Steingasser, so if he -- if the Zoning Commission which it
8 | sounds like since maybe I am the only one that has some concerns
9 | (audio interference), so we don't really see anything that's going
10 | to show up at the BZA, all those big structures without an
11 | oversight, next to somebody's house. I guess, I'm just putting
12 | this plain as I can put it.

13 | MS. STEINGASSER: Well, not unless it's already there.
14 | All right. So (audio interference) for existing apartment
15 | building, so it would already be there, and they would then just
16 | be adding it -- a unit within that apartment building.

17 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So again, I am not trying to stop
18 | anybody from developing, I'm just trying to help -- trying to
19 | balance it because it seems like we're taking some hits. So I
20 | think for me, my 2021 discussion is going to be on this. So I'm
21 | just letting everybody know, so I appreciate the assurances. I do
22 | know that it's already existing, but they can still build though,
23 | right? They can build, like, higher or towards the back, or just
24 | -- they just have to build within the envelope that's already
25 | there. I'm trying to make sure I got that.

1 MS. STEINGASSER: They could expand as long as they have
2 900 square feet of land for each dwelling unit. So this is
3 focused in the RF zones, the rowhouse zones, not the apartment
4 zones.

5 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Apartment zones. Okay. Okay.

6 MS. STEINGASSER: They have to meet that 900 square feet
7 per land area, and, you know, we're very diligent about that.
8 That has to be a variance, whether it's a conversion or whether
9 it's an apartment building, it -- that 900 square feet is, you
10 know, is a very solid criteria that they would then have to go get
11 an area variance for.

12 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So I'm just trying to make sure
13 that -- try to head off, and some of this I'm -- maybe I'm not
14 understanding to a full extent, but I want to make sure that I at
15 least ask about those adverse impacts or issues at the beginning
16 because what I don't want to happen is to be on BZA, "Well, the
17 Zoning Commission did this," and we -- our hands are tied. So I
18 don't want to keep doing that. I don't know about my other
19 colleagues, but that, to me, now, that's getting kind of old, and
20 I've been around a long time. Let me give somebody else a chance.
21 Thank you both. Mr. Turnbull?

22 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I just had one question for Ms.
23 Elliott and Ms. Steingasser. And to refresh my -- I can't recall
24 if in the RF zones, if we add a unit, is parking affected --
25 parking requirements, does that get affected by adding a unit to

1 our -- how does that work then?

2 MS. ELLIOTT: So the applicant would be required to
3 provide parking for the new units that complies with the
4 regulations. A lot of times, these apartment houses are located
5 in historic districts though, and so you wouldn't see parking
6 provided. But it does need to comply when outside of an historic
7 district.

8 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: And if they don't have room for
9 parking, they're going to ask for a variance to get that or a
10 special exception?

11 MS. ELLIOTT: It's special exception relief.

12 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: For the parking. Okay. I was
13 just curious. I mean, that becomes what the Chairman was getting
14 at. Sometimes, that can become an impact. People say, "Oh,
15 you're adding another unit, we have no places to park cars," and
16 now they're going be parking on the street again, and that's going
17 to screw up everybody else. So that's my only thing that I was
18 throwing out. I was just curious. That could be the only -- one
19 of the unintended consequences, the parking impact, I guess.
20 Thank you.

21 MS. STEINGASSER: And if they came before the BZA for a
22 special exception from the parking, they would have to establish
23 that that lack of parking had no adverse impact on the
24 neighborhood.

25 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Was there any other follow-up

1 questions or comments?

2 (No audible response; indicated no.)

3 CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Thank you both, Ms. Elliott
4 and Ms. Steingasser. We appreciate the testimony and responses.

5 Ms. Schellin, I didn't see -- I don't want to mess with
6 this computer too much, but I didn't see any other government
7 agencies in the record unless something came in after I looked at
8 it.

9 MS. SCHELLIN: That's correct. That's correct.

10 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Do we have anyone here in
11 opposition, support, or undeclared who would like to testify?

12 MS. SCHELLIN: There was no one registered.

13 CHAIRMAN HOOD: No one registered. Okay. So with that,
14 Commissioners -- we've heard how the path forward was earlier. I
15 guess we would have to wait for the scheduling, and I think it's
16 going to be readvertised as Mr. Tondro had mentioned with some
17 minor changes, I believe, and then we'll go from there. So I guess
18 that will be another 30 days, Ms. Schellin? Oh, 7 days; you said
19 7 days? Oh, that's right. Mr. Tondro said 7 days.

20 MS. SCHELLIN: Well, it has to be 30 days because of the
21 NCPD referral, which expires the end of January. So our first
22 meeting in February is the 11th, I believe.

23 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

24 MR. TONDRO: We can make that -- the two time periods
25 match up, I think. I just didn't want to add any extra time since

1 everyone has already been on notice from the first notice, and the
2 changes are really nonsubstantive. So I'll work with Ms. Schellin
3 to make sure that we coordinate those two.

4 MS. SCHELLIN: Correct.

5 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Ms. Schellin, if you could -- so
6 I don't -- any other questions or comments, colleagues?

7 (No audible response; indicating no.)

8 CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Not seeing any. I thank
9 you, Ms. Schellin -- I'm sorry, Vice Chair Miller?

10 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I guess I misunderstood, Mr. Tondro
11 at the beginning. Are we going to make a motion for a revised
12 proposed rulemaking, or we're just -- we are? Okay. So we're
13 going to make a motion for revised proposed rulemaking because
14 there's been some changes --

15 MR. TONDRO: Right. I'm sorry, the Office of Planning
16 together with OAG worked on some revised -- again, I think they're
17 nonsubstantive, but just to clarify the text, they're included in
18 the OP hearing report. They were specifically for Section U,
19 301.5A, and so that would be what -- I think it's before U, so if
20 you wanted to take proposed action to adopt that -- the revised
21 text as proposed in the Office of Planning's hearing report. And
22 then we can deal with the shortened notice period in light of the
23 fact that it's nonsubstantive and that there was already a
24 previous notice out there that's been published.

25 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Vice Chair -- or would somebody

1 | like to make a motion that we adopt a revised text?

2 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: Sure. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
3 | would then move that the Zoning Commission adopt the revised
4 | proposed rulemaking as described by Mr. Tondro as just some
5 | clarifying language, and that's on Case No. 25-25 Office of
6 | Planning Text Amendment to Subtitles C, U, and X to clarify that
7 | purpose-built apartment houses are conforming uses and ask for a
8 | second.

9 | COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Second.

10 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. It's been moved and properly
11 | seconded. Any further discussion?

12 | (No audible response; indicating no.)

13 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not seeing any. Ms. Schellin, would you
14 | do a roll call vote, please?

15 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller?

16 | COMMISSIONER MILLER: Yes.

17 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Shapiro?

18 | COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Yes.

19 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood?

20 | COMMISSIONER HOOD: Yes.

21 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Turnbull?

22 | COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes.

23 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner May?

24 | COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.

25 | MS. SCHELLIN: And I think I got everybody, right? So

1 the vote -- Commissioner Shapiro, did I not get you?

2 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: That's five.

3 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. That's 5 to 0 to 0 to approve
4 proposed action to adopt the revised text proposed -- as proposed
5 by OP and to allow OAG to work on that text.

6 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Anything else, Ms. Schellin for
7 the case today?

8 MS. SCHELLIN: That's it.

9 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Give me one second. I'm trying
10 to -- you know, Ms. Schellin, I wanted to get you to -- the Zoning
11 Commission -- I don't know what the computer is doing -- the
12 Zoning Commission will be meeting again this coming Monday,
13 January the -- is that the 14th? Yeah, the 14th, that's this
14 coming Monday, correct?

15 MS. SCHELLIN: The 11th.

16 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: No, the 11th, Mr. Chair.

17 CHAIRMAN HOOD: And when is our next meeting, the 11th?

18 MS. SCHELLIN: The meeting is the 14th. I think (audio
19 interference) confused.

20 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I'm thinking about the meeting.
21 So we have another hearing coming January 11th. Ms. Schellin,
22 would you tell us what that is, please, for the public?

23 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, it is Case No. 18-04A, and it's a
24 text amendment regarding construction of playing fields and
25 accessory structures. I believe that's at RFK maybe, I believe,

1 | yes.

2 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right. And we do that -- I'd
3 | like to do that just in case somebody would want to follow what
4 | we're doing, make that announcement. So Commissioners, anything
5 | else?

6 | (No audible response; indicating no.)

7 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not seeing anything. Thank you, Ms.
8 | Schelllin, Mr. Tondro, and also the Office of Planning. And
9 | Commissioners, with that, this hearing is adjourned.

10 | (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the
11 | record at 4:29 p.m.)

C E R T I F I C A T E

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Public Hearing

Before: DCZC

Date: 01-07-21

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

HUNT REPORTING COMPANY
Court Reporting and Litigation Support
Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia
410-766-HUNT (4868)
1-800-950-DEPO (3376)