

GOVERNMENT OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

```

-----:
IN THE MATTER OF:      :
                        :
Text Amendment to Subtitle : Case No.
C, IZ-XL, Phase 2,       : 21-05
Applying Inclusionary     :
Zoning to Conversions    :
of Non-Residential       :
Buildings to Residential :
Use                       :
-----:

```

THURSDAY

OCTOBER 7, 2021

+ + + + +

The Public Hearing of Case No. 21-05 by the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened via videoconference at 4:00 p.m. EDT, Anthony J. Hood, Chairperson, presiding.

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

- ANTHONY J. HOOD, Chairman
- ROBERT MILLER, Vice Chairperson
- PETER SHAPIRO, Commissioner
- PETER MAY, Commissioner

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

- RON BARRON, Zoning Data Specialist
- PAUL YOUNG, Zoning Data Specialist

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

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

JONATHAN KIRSCHENBAUM
ARTHUR RODGERS
JENNIFER STEINGASSER

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PRESENT:

HILLARY LOVICK, ESQUIRE

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Public Hearing held on October 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

OPENING STATEMENT:
 Anthony Hood 4

PRESENTATION:
 Case Number: 21-05 - Inclusionary Zoning XL, Phase II
 Applying IZ conversions of non-residential buildings. . . 6

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS:
 Commissioners
 13

VOTE:
 Commissioners
 22

ADJOURN:
 Anthony Hood
 22

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

(4:00 p.m.)

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. We are convening and broadcasting this public hearing by videoconferencing. My name is Anthony Hood. Joining me are Vice Chair Miller, Commissioner Shapiro, and Commissioner May. We're also joined by the Office of Zoning Staff, Mr. Barron, and also Mr. Paul Young, who will be handling all of our operations, and Ms. Lovick, who is our counsel. We ask all others to introduce themselves at the appropriate time.

Copies of today's virtual public hearing notice -- copies are available on the Office of Zoning's website. Please be advised that this proceeding is being recorded by a court reporter and is also Webcast Live, WebEx and YouTube Live. The video will be available on Office of Zoning's website after the hearing.

Accordingly, all of those listening on WebEx or by phone will be muted during the hearing, and those who have signed up to participate or testify will be unmuted at the appropriate time. Please state your name and home address before providing oral testimony on your presentation. When you have finished speaking, please mute your audio so that your microphone is no longer picking up sound or background noise.

The subject of this evening's case is a proposed text

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

1

2 amendment to revise the applicability requirements for the
3 Inclusionary Zoning, IZ, under Subtitle C, 1001, as provided in
4 Appendix I of the report, in Appendix I.

5 If you experience difficulty accessing WebEx or with
6 the telephone call-in, then please call our OZ hotline number
7 at 202-727-5471 to sign up or to receive WebEx login or call-in
8 instructions.

9 All persons planning to testify either in favor or in
10 opposition, we encourage you to sign up in advance and we'll
11 call you by name at the appropriate time. If you wish to file
12 written testimony or additional supporting documents during the
13 hearing, then please be prepared to describe it and discuss it
14 at the time of your testimony.

15 The hearing will be conducted in accordance with
16 provisions of 11-Z DCMR Chapter 5 as follows: preliminary
17 matters; presentation, in this case by the Office of Planning;
18 report of other government agencies; report of the ANC and this
19 is City Wide. Testimony of organizations will have five
20 minutes, testimony of individuals will have three minutes,
21 respectively. And we'll hear in the order from those in
22 support, opposition or undeclared. While the Commission
23 reserves the right to change the time limits for presentations,
24 if necessary, it intends to adhere to the time limits as
25 strictly as possible and notes that no time shall be ceded.

Again, any issues, please call our OZ hotline number

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

1

2 at 202-727-5471.

3 At this time, the Commission will consider any
4 preliminary matters.

5 Mr. Barron, do we have any preliminary matters?

6 MR. BARRON: Staff has no preliminary matters, Mr.
7 Chair.

8 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

9 All right. Mr. Young, if we can bring Mr.
10 Kirschenbaum and Mr. Rodgers, and I believe Ms. Steingasser up.
11 And I believe I'll turn it over to -- I think Mr. Kirschenbaum,
12 you may go first or whomever, and you may begin.

13 MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: Thank you. So good evening,
14 Chairman Hood, and members of the Zoning Commission. I am
15 Jonathan Kirschenbaum with the Office of Planning. And as you
16 mentioned, I'm joined here tonight by my colleague, Jennifer
17 Steingasser, and Art Rodgers, who will help assist with any
18 questions you may have.

19 So just to sort of review what happened at the last
20 hearing, the Commission requested the OP to respond to comments
21 submitted to the case record, review prior conversions to
22 understand why they were financially feasible, and to also
23 contact all ANCs to provide them with another opportunity to
24 review and comment on the case.

25 At Exhibit 17, we filed a supplemental report to
address these items that the Commission requested. Regarding

1

2 ANC notice, we contacted all ANCs on August 18th of this year
3 via email, reminding them that the Commission requested their
4 comments on the case. To date, no ANC comments were submitted
5 to the case record.

6 The supplemental report provides our response to the
7 comments that were provided at the last public hearing and also
8 filed to the case record by individuals and organizations
9 including DCBIA. We grouped these comments according to theme,
10 and my colleague Art will start with the first two, and then I
11 will pick up on the last two. Thank you

12 MR. RODGERS: Good afternoon, Chairman Hood, and
13 members of the Commission. My name is Art Rodgers. I'm the
14 senior housing planner for the Office of Planning. And as my
15 colleague, Jonathan said, I'm going to be covering the first
16 two comments, a bucket of comments that we received.

17 So the first bucket of comments we received, centered
18 around financing and housing production. And they included a
19 couple of comments; one, that regulations should be clear and
20 simple, and I think OP fully agrees with that. They also
21 advocated for flexibility. And flexibility is good, but we
22 acknowledge that flexibility in trying to cover all the
23 potential development scenarios, can create complex regulations
24 that make it hard to understand and make it difficult to
25 enforce, and so there's a tension there. We also received
comments in this area that the regulations would make it more

1

2 difficult to gain financing.

3 We received comments that there should be tax
4 abatements offered for this type of conversion. And then a
5 question about how it would affect the office market and
6 whether or not it would create more affordable housing. And
7 so, I'll be covering these in a little bit more detail a little
8 bit later on. But in general, you know, financing, I imagine
9 is often difficult for a lot of projects, but IZ broadly,
10 there's no sign that it has affected the ability of projects to
11 get financing. We're seeing lots of projects.

12 This past year, the DIC published the annual report,
13 and we've had more IZ units entering into supply this year than
14 ever before, so lots of projects are getting financing. And
15 so, we don't see any reason why conversions would be any
16 different from a normal project finance.

17 Tax abatements, that's a council issue. The council
18 did pass a tax abatement for affordable housing in what we call
19 the high-cost areas and the high opportunity areas and so that
20 is available. And then whether or not it's going to affect the
21 office market. So I'll go into a little bit more detail when I
22 cover the history of conversions that the Zoning Commission
23 requested for, but we don't see this really affecting the
24 office market for a variety of reasons. One, the office market
25 is centered in the D zones, and we're not talking about the D
zones with this amendment.

1

2 And that two, most of the office conversions outside
3 of the D zones have had a significant amount of expansion
4 available for the project. And so, we don't see this affecting
5 the office market at all. And we do feel, though, it is going
6 to add a net gain of affordable IZ units largely through the
7 fact that conversions will not have to wait to have an IZ
8 requirement until the 50 percent expansion threshold that
9 residential projects have.

10

 And then the other bucket that I'm going to cover is
11 the density, and there was concern that the density is not
12 there. And as I said, I'll go into this a little bit more
13 detail. For office developments outside of the D zones, we
14 found that the density is there. The vast majority of these
15 projects had not only matter right density, but many of them
16 were PUDs and had opportunity under the future land use map for
17 map amendments.

18

 And then finally, on the density issue, we did find -
19 - again, I'll go into more detail. A hotel, for instance, is
20 given the matter of right density that a residential project is
21 in these Mixed-Use Zones. However, it does not have the right
22 to get the bonus density from IZ. And so even with hotels that
23 are generally at that matter of right density the same as a
24 residential project, there is still additional density for the
25 hotel to have. I'm going to stop there, and I'll let Jonathan
take the next two bucket of comments that we received.

1

MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: Thanks, Art.

2

3

4

5

6

7

So the next sort of theme was vesting. We heard that there was a need for a delayed effective date for IZ to apply to conversions in D zones to allow existing conversion deals to sort of proceed forward under the current -- under their current economic assumptions.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

Again, as we stated at the last public hearing, these types of amendments will not apply to D zones that are already exempt from the IZ program. For zones where this text amendment will apply, we do not recommend an extended effective date. The case was set down March 11th, 2021, by the Commission, and this has allowed ample -- we think that this has allowed for ample time for property owners to be aware of the proposed changes as part of these text amendments.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And lastly, we had a couple comments about the set-aside requirements, and that there should be some sort of, you know, alternative set-aside requirements that is lower than the existing IZ program set-aside requirement. Again, we recommend keeping the set-aside requirement consistent with the existing IZ program to again sort of keep these regulations as clear and simple as possible. And again, we think that having the same IZ requirements as what currently exist will not financially impact conversions. And so now, I'll turn back to Art who will discuss sort of the history of several conversions with you.

MR. RODGERS: Thanks, Jonathan.

1

2 So the Zoning Commission asked OP to provide them
3 more information on the conversions that have happened in the
4 District. And so we went back to the report that was in our
5 public hearing report, a report that the Office of Planning
6 published on our website about office conversions, and we
7 investigated each of those projects that went through and found
8 that a majority of the projects are not what we would call a
9 conversion. I think everyone has this idea that a conversion
10 is you keep the building as is, and you convert it from one use
11 to the other.

12 We found that a majority of these use changes, I'll
13 call them use changes, were actually expanding the building or
14 demolishing the building and building new, and most of these
15 were outside of the D zone. So up Wisconsin Avenue and
16 Connecticut Avenue, I'm sorry, Wisconsin Avenue primarily, all
17 of those projects were either expanding the project and
18 accessing the bonus density that IZ provides, or they were
19 demolishing the existing office and building a new apartment
20 building.

21 And so in those instances, we found that there's
22 really -- the bonus density is there. And so the actual
23 conversions that I think a lot of people perceive as
24 conversions is where you take the structure and simply convert
25 that and no additions, no expansions, you don't demolish it,
those were the minority of the projects. And we found that

1

2 outside the D zones, there were two types. There were non-
3 conforming office structures. So for instance, the two
4 projects down in Buzzard Point, they were non-conforming under
5 the zoning, and so they didn't really have the opportunity to
6 build more commercial. And so it was actually
7 -- their best option was to convert to residential.

8

And then we did find that, as I mentioned, the hotels
9 because they are generally permitted the same manner of right
10 density as residential projects, that they were more likely to
11 be a straight conversion of one. And for a lot of other
12 reasons. Hotels, floor plates, and hallways and infrastructure
13 in the building are easier to convert to housing. And so we
14 did find that there were more of those that are more likely to
15 be straight conversions. We want to make clear, though, that
16 the bonus density is still there. The 20 percent is still
17 there. Now, with a conversion like this, it might be more
18 difficult to achieve it because of site constraints, because of
19 the structure is not able to have additional floors on top of
20 it, and so it's more likely that the developer is going to be
21 much more careful about their decision on whether just to
22 convert to residential. They may stay and keep the hotel use
23 or they may demolish it and build new.

24

Now, as I said before, there are other options as
25 well. They can be found that a lot of these sites had capacity
under the future land use map, so they could pursue a map

1

2 amendment or PUDs and get additional density for the project to
3 work that way. And so, in general, we found that the very
4 small minority of these hotels that might stay as hotel, that
5 loss of potential IZ units was a lot less than the ones we gain
6 by applying IZ to conversions, especially when they don't have
7 to wait for the 50 percent threshold for it to apply. And
8 that's where I'll stop my comments and turn it back to
9 Jonathan.

10 MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: So just to sort of wrap up our
11 presentation, we continue to recommend approval of the text
12 amendments that we proposed in our public hearing report, which
13 is at Exhibit 9. And we respectfully request of the Commission
14 take proposed action on these very important text amendments
15 this evening. And this concludes our presentation, and we're
16 happy to answer any questions anyone from the Commission may
17 have. Thank you so much.

18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Kirschenbaum,
19 and Mr. Rodgers, and all of the Office of Planning for working
20 on this. I think this report was very well done. It shows
21 that you put a lot of time into it. We all may not agree with
22 everything that's in it, but it's a very good analysis. From
23 my standpoint and reading, you all hit the high points. And
24 I'm looking at who all did not come. Some of the folks who had
25 concerns did not come out. I guess they may have read your
report and hopefully they are satisfied with what you all have

1
2 presented because I think you put a lot of work into it, and
3 it's always worth a try, and we always will make a change if we
4 need to. That's my opinion. So those are my comments. Let me
5 open it up.

6 Commissioner May, do you have any questions or
7 comments? Okay.

8 COMMISSIONER MAY: I do not. I'm interested in
9 hearing whatever testimony we have tonight.

10 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioner Shapiro, any questions
11 or comments?

12 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: I just want to thank you all
13 for the very thorough report. Even reading DCBA's comments and
14 reading it down to DCBIA's comments and concerns. I think you
15 answered all the questions that I had about what the potential
16 market impact on this might be. And it's -- I mean, as you're
17 describing it, you're describing it, gives me confidence that
18 any impact would be quite limited, and the benefits greatly
19 outweigh any kind of negative impact on the market as you have
20 described it. So we'll look to see what others have to say,
21 but I really appreciate all the work that you did. That's all
22 I have, Mr. Chair.

23 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

24 And Vice Chair Miller.

25 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and
thank you, Mr. Kirschenbaum, Mr. Rodgers, and the entire Office

1

2 of Planning team for your work on this case and the other
3 Inclusionary Zoning cases where we're looking for ways to
4 increase affordable housing with the limited zoning tools that
5 we have. We realize that the Inclusionary Zoning program, like
6 a lot of programs that our friends in downtown have pointed out
7 to us, is a balance. It's a careful balance and has worked
8 thus far, and we want it to continue to work and expand. And
9 I'm sure that -- I know that OP, if we go forward with this
10 expansion of Inclusionary Zoning to conversions that are not
11 currently covered, to some conversions that are not currently
12 covered, because there are currently totally exempt zones like
13 downtown that will remain totally exempt unless we go forward
14 with another case, which is being studied but it's not
15 currently pending before us if I recall.

16 Anyway, I'm sure that OP will continue to monitor and
17 evaluate the dynamic of all the conversions and track the
18 creation of new housing and IZ units going forward. We share
19 the goal to ensure that this rule change, if it were adopted,
20 achieves the intended -- continues the intended balance of
21 increased affordable units while minimizing discouragement --
22 any discouragement of new housing being constructed and
23 conversion of obsolete uses. So if we need to make changes
24 that the Chairman has alluded to -- stated, if we go forward
25 with this particular change, we will make the change. This is
a change that we're making. This will be the change that we're

1

2 making now. The Zoning Regulations are a living document that
3 are constantly being monitored and evaluated by us and the
4 Zoning Commission and by the stakeholders, all the stakeholders
5 involved, and we will hear from you if there are problems going
6 forward that we can resolve through additional amendments.

7

8 But I really think this is an opportunity to increase
9 the potential application of IZ to areas that -- to non-
10 residential buildings that will be converted and to increase
11 the supply of affordable housing, so I'm fully supportive of
12 this. I understand the concerns that have been raised. And
13 we'll hear from those tonight who have those concerns. And I
14 look forward to hearing from there, and I have an open mind
15 about it.

16

17 But let me just ask one question, maybe to the Office
18 of Planning. Well, just to clarify. This particular case
19 pending before us does not apply to conversions in zones,
20 zoning districts, such as downtown, that are currently totally
21 exempt; is that correct, Mr. Rodgers or Mr. Kirschenbaum?

22

23 MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: That is correct. And again, there
24 are three downtown zones that do have IZ requirements already,
25 so these text amendments would apply to those zones. But the
majority of these zones are exempt from IZ, and these text
amendments would not apply to those zones. Nothing in the
actual text amendments touches anything about applicability,
language in any of those downtown zones.

1

2 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I appreciate you stating that for
3 the record again. There are many downtown zones. People think
4 of downtown as the old downtown centered around the Metro
5 Center. What are the three downtown zones that that IZ
6 currently does apply to and where are they? Just remind me.

7 MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: Well, it's the D-2, it's the D-4
8 and it's the D-8 zones where there is an IZ requirement. Maybe
9 Art can fill in about where they are actually geographically
10 mapped.

11 MR. RODGERS: So the D-2 is the old -- and I'm a
12 1958 zoning guy -- so the D-2 is the old SP2 along 16th Street
13 in downtown. And there is actually an IZ project, one of the
14 quote conversions was there on lot -- in the old SP2, and in
15 that case, the non-residential is permitted three FAR and with
16 housing can go to six and with IZ it can go to 7.2. And so
17 that's one of the D-2.

18 The other one is they are the old C-3C zones where IZ
19 applied to previously. And then I think the other one is also
20 C-3C, but it's the D-8 is south of the mall.

21 MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: Independence Avenue around there.

22 MR. RODGERS: Yeah.

23 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Thanks. So the core of
24 downtown, the old C-4 is totally exempt and is not affected by
25 this case. What other zones, if any, are currently totally
exempt other than much of downtown -- are there other zones
that are totally exempt that this case again would not apply

1

2 to?

3 MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: More or less because of IZ-XL
4 Phase I, which is Case 21-02, most zones -- well, by January of
5 next year, those zones would also have an IZ requirement.
6 There are certain -- there are the occasional sort of special
7 purpose zones that have sort of separate IZ requirements or
8 different than the traditional, but more or less, it will -- as
9 of January or somewhere around there, it should only be these D
10 zones that will continue to be exempt from the IZ program.

11 VICE CHAIR MILLER: And those zones that under IZ-XL
12 one --

13 MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: (Indiscernible.)

14 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: What is it?

15 MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: Phase I.

16 VICE CHAIR MILLER: That -- where it was expanded to,
17 as I recall, is that the one that it granted back to Georgetown
18 and Anacostia Historic Districts, and I forget which other area
19 expanded it to but --

20 MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: Yeah, also RA-5 was a large zone
21 that it will apply to.

22 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Right. Okay. All right.

23 MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: R-5E.

24 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Well, thank you very much.
25 I appreciate that information, and I appreciate all of your
work on this case and everybody's interest in this case, and

1

2 we'll look forward to the other testimony.

3 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let's see. Report of other
4 government agencies. I don't know why I keep thinking about a
5 DOEE report, that may have been yesterday, but I can't find it
6 now. Do we have a DOEE report in either one of these cases
7 tonight? That must have been yesterday All right. They start
8 running together, I think, after a while. All right.

9 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Mr. Chair.

10 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.

11 THE REPORTER: We do have comments from DOEE.

12 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Maybe that's it.

13 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: From May.

14 CHAIRMAN HOOD: No, this is relatively recent, so I
15 think it was yesterday's case. All right.

16 Report of the ANC. I didn't see anything in the
17 record from any ANCs. I do appreciate our counsel for giving
18 me the exhibits outright. It says, Rick Ammirato from DC BID.
19 We have a letter of support from Coalition for Smarter Growth.
20 We had testimony again, from DC BID; comments from DCBIA which
21 was alluded to; comments from Leslie Steen. We had a letter in
22 opposition from downtown DC BID. I think I've acknowledged
23 everyone who wrote a letter previously.

24 All right. Mr. Barron, do we have any one here to
25 testify?

MR. BARRON: There is no one registered to testify.

1

2 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So I thought -- so that's what
3 I meant. I believe maybe the Office of Planning, they read
4 their report and maybe hopefully, people are satisfied with the
5 results. But as we have always said, if there are changes we
6 need to make, we will make them on a dime.

7 So with that, no one here -- any other comments from
8 my colleagues, questions or comments?

9 All right. I think Mr. Kirschenbaum, Mr. Rodgers,
10 and the Office of Planning have a request in front of us. I
11 think it's pretty straightforward unless we have some
12 reservations. We did meet on this June 28th, and we had a
13 number in opposition, and we meet back on this case on October
14 7th, and no one is here to testify. I don't want to read into
15 that, but I'll leave it at that.

16 Let me open it up. Would somebody like to make a
17 motion or any additional comments either one. I'll entertain
18 either one. Commissioner May.

19 COMMISSIONER MAY: Just couple of quick comments.
20 First of all, I really do appreciate the Office of Planning's
21 outreach to the ANCs as that is something we specifically asked
22 for. And I'm a little disappointed that we didn't hear
23 something, right. It would have been good to hear from the
24 ANCs, particularly those who might be affected by this.

25 I would also note, Mr. Chairman, that you had
specifically were hoping for comments from Corey McKinney

1

2 (phonetic) and Mark Eckenwiler who often testify on cases like
3 this. We didn't hear from them either. I understand not
4 everybody has time. I mean, it's often a volunteer effort for
5 people to come and testify before us. So I can certainly
6 understand why some people might elect not to, particularly if
7 they feel confident with what's being proposed and how it's
8 being defended and supported by the Office of Planning. So I
9 do find the Office of Planning's report to be very helpful in
10 their analysis of the comments and concerns that were raised at
11 the earlier hearing, and I'm ready to move ahead today as Mr.
12 Kirschenbaum has requested on the proposed action tonight.
13 Thank you.

14

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioner May, I really appreciate
15 you reminding me because I actually forgot about the second
16 part. But now, you put them in -- I'm going to remember that
17 for a while. I actually forgot about that. And you're right,
18 we got -- we didn't get anything. So other than a few new
19 exhibits, but no ANCs tonight. And I want to echo Commissioner
20 May's comments about reaching out to the ANCs. All ANCs were
21 notified. So hopefully, everybody's all on board. And again,
22 if there are concerns, we will ramp up and do what we need to
23 do to try to mitigate that as well.

24

Any other comments, Commissioner Shapiro or Vice
25 Chair Miller?

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I would just say

1

2 that if we take action tonight, which I'm prepared to make a
3 motion to do, that we do take proposed action that there'll be
4 an opportunity for further comment before we take final action
5 even -- and even after final action. As you said, if there are
6 changes that need to be made, we can do that. But I'm prepared
7 to -- unless somebody wants to discuss this further, but I'm
8 prepared to move that we -- the Zoning Commission take action
9 this evening on proposed text amendment, Case No. 21-05, IZ,
10 Inclusionary Zoning-XL Phase II, applying Inclusionary Zoning
11 to some conversions of non-residential buildings to residential
12 use and ask for a second.

13 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Second.

14 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. It has been moved and properly
15 second. Any further discussion? Not hearing or seeing any.

16 Mr. Barron, could you please do a roll call vote?

17 MR. BARRON: Commissioner Hood?

18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.

19 MR. BARRON: Commissioner May?

20 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.

21 MR. BARRON: Commissioner Shapiro?

22 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Yes.

23 MR. BARRON: Commissioner Miller?

24 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

25 MR. BARRON: The vote is 4-0-0, with one Commissioner
not present, to approve the motion to take proposed action on

1

2 Zoning Commission Case No. 21-05.

3 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

4 Mr. Barron, do we have anything else before us today?

5 MR. BARRON: We do not, Mr. Chairman.

6 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. The Zoning Commission will be
7 having its regular public meeting next Thursday, October the
8 14th at 4:00 p.m. on this same platform. It looks like we've
9 had -- and I apologize to those -- we had to cancel our
10 previous meeting as we had some things to come up. But anyway,
11 we will take care all those cases, I believe on October the
12 14th, that's when our next regular meeting is at 4:00 p.m. on
13 these same platforms.

14 So with that, I want to thank everyone for their
15 participation tonight, and this hearing is adjourned.
16 Goodnight.

17 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the
18 record at 4:31 p.m.)

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

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

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: 10-7-21

Place: Teleconference

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

GARY EUELL