GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

REGULAR PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

IN THE MATTER OF:

BXP 2100 Penn, LLC : Case No. 06-11V/06-12V

PUD Modification

of Consequence

at Square 75

Office of Planning : Case No. 20-21

Text Amendment

to create

the Barry Farm Zone

Office of Planning : Case No. 20-24

Map Amendment

at Square (5862, 5865, :

5866 and 5867)

Westminster : Case No. 20-12 Presbyterian Church, :

et al. Consolidated PUD :

& Related Map Amendment :

at Square 499

Howard University - : Case No. 20-08A

Interim University

Use of Washington

Metropolitan School

Building at 300 Bryant :

Street, N.W.

HUNT REPORTING COMPANY Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia 410-766-HUNT (4868)

1-800-950-DEPO (3376)

The Institute of : Case No. 21-07 Urban Living -Consolidated PUD & Related Map Amendment : at Square 5876 Office of Planning - : Case No. 21-05 Text Amendment to Subtitle C, IZ-XL Phase 2, Applying Inclusionary Zoning to Conversion of Non-Residential Buildings to Residential Use Gallaudet University : Case No. 15-24B & JBG/6th Street Associates, LLC -First Stage PUD Modification of Significance. Second Stage and Consolidated PUD & Related Map Amendments: at Square (3591, Lots 4 & 6); and Squares (3593 and Lots 5 and 6). : Case No. 20-26B Offices of Zoning Text Amendment to Subtitle Y and Z to continue administrative time extensions due to COVID-19. Congress Park Community : Case No. 21-17 Partners, LLC -Map Amendment at Square 5914.

Dance Loft Ventures, LLC: Case No. 21-18

Consolidated PUD

& Related Map Amendment :

at Square 2704.

THURSDAY

DECEMBER 16, 2021

+ + + + +

The Regular Public Meeting of the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened via videoconference pursuant to notice at 4:00 p.m. EDT, Anthony J. Hood, Chairman, presiding.

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

ANTHONY J. HOOD, Chairperson ROBERT MILLER, Vice Chairperson PETER SHAPIRO, Commissioner PETER MAY, Commissioner JOSEPH IMAMURA, Commissioner

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

SHARON SCHELLIN, Secretary
PAUL YOUNG, Zoning Data Specialist

OFFICE OF PLANNING PRESENT:

MAXINE BROWN-ROBERTS JENNIFER STEINGASSER STEPHEN MORDFIN

OFFIE OF ZONING LEGAL DIVISION STAFF PRESENT:

HILLARY LOVICK, ESQ. JACOB RITTING, ESQ.

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Public Hearing held on December 16, 2021.

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

| PAGE | <u> </u> |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|
| OPENING STATEMENT Anthony Hood | } |
| PRESENTATION: Preliminary Matters Closed meetings |) |
| VOTE: Commissioners | 0 |
| PRESENTATION: Case No.: 06-11V/06-12V - PUD Modification of Consequence at Square 75 | 5 |
| COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS Commissioners | 6 |
| VOTE: Commissioners | 8 |
| PRESENTATION: Case No.: 20-21 - Office of Planning - Text Amendment to create the Barry Farm Zone 18 | 3 |
| COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS: Commissioners | 9 |
| VOTE: Commissioners | 1 |
| PRESENTATION: Case No.: 20-24 - Office of Planning - Map Amendment at Square 5862, 5865, 5866 and 5867 2 | 1 |
| COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS Commissioners | 2 |
| VOTE: Commissioners | 3 |

| PRESENTATION: Case No.: 20-12 - Westminster Presbyterian Church, et al. Consolidated PUD and Related Map Amendment |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| at Square 499 |
| COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS: Commissioners |
| VOTE: Commissioners |
| PRESENTATION: Case No.: 20-08A - Howard University - Interim University Use of Washington Metropolitan School Building at 300 Bryant Street, N.W |
| COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS: Commissioners |
| VOTE: Commissioners |
| PRESENTATION: Case No. 21-07 - The Institute of Urban Living - Consolidated PUD & Related Map Amendment at Square 5876 33 |
| COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS Commissioners |
| VOTE: Commissioners |
| PRESENTATION: Case No.: 21-05 - Office of Planning - Text Amendment to Subtitle C, IZ-XL Phase 2, Applying Inclusionary Zoning to Conversion of Non-Residential Buildings to Residential Use |
| COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS: Commissioners |

| VOTE: |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Commissioners |
| PRESENTATION Case No. 15-24B - Gallaudet University and JBG/6th Street Associates, LLC - First Stage PUD PUD Modification of Significance. Second Stage and Consolidated PUD & Related Map Amendments at Square 3591, Lots 4 and 6; and Squares 3593 and Lots 5 and 6 43 |
| COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS Commissioners |
| VOTE: Commissioners |
| PRESENTATION Case No.: 20-26B - Offices of Zoning - Text Amendment to Subtitle Y and Z to continue administrative time extensions due to COVID-19 |
| COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS: Commissioners |
| VOTE: Commissioners60 |
| PRESENTATION: Case No.: 21-17 - Congress Park Community Partners, LLC - Map Amendment at Square 5914 60 |
| COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS: Commissioners64 |
| VOTE: Commissioners68 |
| PRESENTATION: Case No.: 21-18 - Dance Loft Ventures, LLC - Consolidated PUD and Related Map Amendment at Square 2704 |
| COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS: Commissioners |

| VOTE: Commissioners | 79 |
|---------------------------------------------------------|----|
| CORRESPONDENCE: Anthony Hood | 79 |
| OFFICE OF PLANNING STATUS REPORT: Jennifer Steingasser | 83 |
| COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS: Commissioners | 95 |
| CLOSING REMARKS: Anthony Hood | 98 |
| ADJOURNED: Anthony Hood | 99 |

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

1

2 (4:00 p.m.)CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Good afternoon, ladies 3 gentlemen. We are convening and broadcasting this public meeting 4 by videoconferencing. Today's date is December the 16th, 2021. 5 My name is Anthony Hood. Joining me are Vice Chair Miller, 6 7 Commissioner Shapiro, Commissioner May, and Commissioner Imamura. We also joined by Office of Zoning staff, Ms. Sharon Schellin, 8 as well as Mr. Paul Young, who will be handling all of our virtual 9 10 operations. The Office of Zoning Legal Division, Ms. Lovick and 11 Mr. Ritting. I think I have everyone covered. 12 Copies of today's meeting agenda are available on the 13 Office of Zoning's website. Please be advised that this 14 proceeding is being recorded by a court reporter and is also webcast live, Webex or YouTube Live. The video will be available 15 on the Office of Zoning's website after the meeting. Accordingly, 16 17 all those listening on Webex or by phone will be muted during 18 the meeting unless the Commission suggests otherwise. For hearing action items, the only documents before us 19 20 this evening are the application, the ANC set down report, and the Office of Planning report. All other documents in the record 21 will be reviewed at the time of the hearing. 2.2 23 Again, we do not take any public testimony at our meetings unless the Commission requests someone to speak. 24 25 If you experience difficulty accessing Webex or with

your phone call-in, then please call our OZ hotline number at 1 2. 202-727-5471 for Webex login or call-in instructions. First, does the staff have any preliminary matters? 3 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. I have two. 4 5 The first one is regarding closed meetings for 2022, 6 unless you want to do your preliminary matter first. 7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: No, I opened it -- what you said, 8 the follow up, so we are good with that preliminary matter, so 9 we can do that one first. 10 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. All right. So we can go ahead 11 and do the 2022 closed meetings. CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So please note everyone, in 12 13 accordance with 405(c) of the Open Meetings Act, DC Official Code 14 2-575(c), I move that the Zoning Commission hold closed meetings on each Monday and Thursday that it is scheduled to hold a public 15 16 meeting or public hearing for the calendar year of 2022. 17 closed meetings will begin at 3:15 p.m. and are for the purpose 18 of obtaining legal advice from our counsel on all cases and to 19 deliberate upon but not voting on the contested cases scheduled 20 on the Commission's agendas. 21 Is there a second? COMMISSIONER MAY: 22 Second. 23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. Will the Secretary 24 please take a roll call vote on the motion before us now that it 25 has been seconded?

| 1 | You're on mute, Ms. Schellin. |
|----|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | MS. SCHELLIN: Sorry about that. I was switching |
| 3 | screens. And let me get over here. |
| 4 | Commissioner Hood? |
| 5 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes. |
| 6 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller? |
| 7 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes. |
| 8 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Shapiro? |
| 9 | COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Yes. |
| 10 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner May? |
| 11 | COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. |
| 12 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Imamura? |
| 13 | COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes. |
| 14 | MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is $5-0-0$ to hold closed meetings |
| 15 | at 3:15 during the calendar year 2022 prior to a public meeting |
| 16 | or public hearing as needed. |
| 17 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Ms. Schellin, give me one |
| 18 | moment. Let me find my file here. Yeah. I have it. No matter |
| 19 | how much prep you do at the beginning, when it's time when |
| 20 | the lights show and there's action, you can never find it, but I |
| 21 | do have it. Okay. |
| 22 | This is in reference to a text amendment or text |
| 23 | amendments of a press release that was mentioned publicly, and I |
| 24 | just want to comment on it. |
| 25 | Normally, the Zoning Commission is not in the practice |

of updating the public on the status of a newly filed text amendment. However, it is unusual for us to be notified of a filing by press release, especially when it comes to -- our legal counsel, at the time, who have advised us over the years. So I'm very taken back, not just as a Commissioner, but as a resident on how we are operating. So I feel that we should inform the public that the cases filed by the Office of Attorney General have been referred to the Office of Planning. And as the normal practice -- this is normal practice; this is nothing new -- that we will consider amendments for set down at a future public meeting after we receive the Office of Planning set down reports.

2.

Also, dependent upon our -- unfortunately, the text amendment was set without any backup data or any analyst -- analyzation. So I would, Ms. Schellin, I ask that you send it back to the petitioners who have sent it to us and ask them if this is appropriate time. I will work it out with Ms. Lovick and our legal folks, but I would like to see at some point their analysis.

I don't know if this is a time or it's up to the Office of Planning, I'm not sure the sequence. But the reason I'm taken back and kind of perplexed is because they have worked with us for years, and I'll just leave it at that. So we are -- I think a lot of what's being discussed, this Commission has already tried to incrementally get to, so it's nothing new. I'm not sure or what the -- what kind of pitch, but as one of my aunts used

to say, "a thing occurred," so I'll leave it at that. 2. Ms. Schellin, is there anything else I need to respond on that or --3 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. I think the appropriate time 4 5 will be once OP takes a look at it to see if they feel there's 6 anything needed. 7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So that again, that's the 8 statement when it comes to the issue that was presented to us 9 and it was a press release. Normally, I don't usually see a lot 10 of stuff in the press presented to us in that fashion. So anyway, we will continue to do what we do for the best interest of the 11 12 city as a whole. 13 Anything else on that, Ms. Schellin? 14 MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir. 15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. 16 Let me ask my colleagues, any comments on any of that? 17 Vice Chair Miller? 18 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I don't know if you wanted me to 19 comment. I think you probably did not. 20 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Go ahead. 21 VICE CHAIR MILLER: The way you asked but -- so I'll 22 keep it quick. I concur with everything you said. I think it 23 was important to acknowledge, even though we don't always acknowledge immediately when we receive text amendments. 24 25 though it's on our -- I think it's on our printed agenda that

this case has been filed as a petition for cases, for inclusionary zoning cases to expand inclusionary zoning by the Office of Attorney General, who as you said, up until October 1 were our legal counsel. And it is disconcerting, as you have indicated, during this transitional period, we all knew was coming based on the Mayor and council direction of having our own legal division within the Office of Zoning versus the Office of Attorney General, and some of the attorneys from OAG did comment to our OZ staff, which we appreciate.

But it is somewhat disconcerting that there wasn't a little bit more collaboration, coordination, communication, not agreement. It never is agreement. They're an independent agency, we're an independent agency. Executive is independent from --but communication before finding out about this from a press release, especially about items that we've asked, at least some of us, if not all of us, individually over the past year or two or three to find ways to -- both of OAG and of OZ and of Office of Planning to find ways to increase -- expand the scope and reach of inclusionary zoning, which is just one of very many tools that the city has at its -- in its toolbox to try to expand affordable housing in the city.

And so we've been asking for some of the very analysis that has resulted in these OAG text amendments. OP, we know, has been looking at these issues as well, and we are going to look at them. We are going to look at it, and we do need more

economic analysis from the petitioner, OAG in this case, that we would normally get from an outside petitioner on these issues. I think I can speak -- I'll just speak for myself. I'm favorably inclined. I want the Office of Planning analysis. I want economic analysis from OAG, who's proposed these, because the IZ is a very delicately balanced program. It's only really designed -- it's not designed to get to deeply affordable house, even though we pushed for that. And we've enacted deeply, more deeply affordable housing and greater set asides than the original program, but it's a delicate balance. It was designed to be workforce or housing. There are other programs that require -- this is the only -- one of the only programs that is -- doesn't require a subsidy from the city.

And so there are other programs that need -- of the city that are in place, devoted hundreds of millions of dollars to providing subsidized deeply affordable levels of housing. We need affordable housing at all levels of the city as the Mayor indicated today at a press conference that I haven't seen them reporting and there are things that are being done. So we acknowledge that this has come in. We want more analysis from OP. I want to hear these cases going forward in the near future and maybe they should be probably consolidated.

I think we're going to have more discussion about that at our January meeting when they would normally be on our agenda. They wouldn't normally be on our agenda tonight, but you brought

them up because of the public profile of them, so I appreciate you doing that, Mr. Chairman. And I'm sorry I went on as long as I did. I hope we can have a constructive dialogue going forward.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Vice Chair. I'm sure we will. I appreciate your comments. I'm sure we will definitely have constructive conversation. And I have more to add, but I just figure I'll leave it right there because I'm trying to still understand the process. I know our legal folks that did this knew the process.

So anyway, let me -- any other questions or any comments from any colleagues, Commissioners? Okay. All right.

Give Ms. Schellin a moment and we will get started. Let me do this. Let me just tee it up. We're going to go right with our agenda. Modification of consequence set for deliberation. Zoning Commission Case No. 06-11V/06-12V; BXP 2100 Penn, LLC, PUD modification of consequence at Square 75.

Ms. Schellin?

2.

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. On this one, we have two new exhibits that came in. The Commission decided at the prior meeting that this was indeed a modification of consequence, so it is now up for deliberations. The party, Foggy Bottom Association, submitted a letter in support of Exhibit 9. And at Exhibit 10, ANC 2A submitted a report in support, 8-0-0. So this is ready for your deliberations.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Schellin.

As Ms. Schellin mentioned, I think the reason we held off is because ANC 2A did not give us a report, Foggy Bottom did. And the other parties that -- well, others did. But I think the initial change in language is the applicant shall also demonstrate that it has contributed \$100,000 to the Foggy Bottom Association to fund future watering needs in the park, a green wall along the sidewalk of 26th and I Streets, and/or additional landscaping in either location.

And again, my colleagues, remember, this was a letter about a public water submission and the landscaping barrier have been removed from the project benefits. And this is the replacement that has been worked out from the applicant and also those parties involved. Any other questions or comments? And we do have the letter from ANC 2A, which we were waiting for. We wanted to hear from them.

Any other questions or comments?

(No audible response.)

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So with that, no other questions or comments, I will move that we approve as specified in Zoning Commission Case No. 06-11V and 06-12V with the added language, which I just read, as a PUD modification of consequence at Square 75 and ask for a second.

COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Second.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: It's been moved and properly

| 1 | seconded. Any further discussion? |
|----|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | (No audible response.) |
| 3 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And before I forget, I know Mr. |
| 4 | Imamura is not participating in this case because he did not hear |
| 5 | it. Okay. So with that well, anyway - |
| 6 | MS. SCHELLIN: I think he did participate on the |
| 7 | modification of consequence. |
| 8 | COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: I did participate on the |
| 9 | modification of consequence. |
| 10 | MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, he can do that. |
| 11 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So that's the one time I remembered, |
| 12 | so I don't remember anything else. |
| 13 | MS. SCHELLIN: Yeah. It's final actions that that |
| 14 | you're thinking about that he |
| 15 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. |
| 16 | MS. SCHELLIN: (indiscernible) about. |
| 17 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So strike my comment. |
| 18 | MS. SCHELLIN: Mixed them up. |
| 19 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Strike my last comment. So I messed |
| 20 | it up. |
| 21 | MS. SCHELLIN: Yeah. |
| 22 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So moving perhaps, any |
| 23 | further discussion? |
| 24 | (No audible response.) |
| 25 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Ms. Schellin, can you do a |
| | |

| 1 | roll call vote, please? |
|----|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. |
| 3 | Commissioner Hood? |
| 4 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes. |
| 5 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Shapiro? |
| 6 | COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Yes. |
| 7 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner May? |
| 8 | COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. |
| 9 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Imamura? |
| 10 | COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes. |
| 11 | MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is 5-0-0 to approve final action |
| 12 | in Zoning Commission Case No. 06-11V/06-12V and the |
| 13 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: The vote so I'm not sure I got |
| 14 | a roll call, but I vote yes. |
| 15 | MS. SCHELLIN: Oh. I'm sorry, Commissioner Miller. I |
| 16 | thought I called you second. Sorry. |
| 17 | All right. Well, I voted for you anyway, so you were |
| 18 | voted in. Again, 5-0-0. And we'd asked the applicant to provide |
| 19 | an order within two weeks, and I believe that can be a summary |
| 20 | order. |
| 21 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes, it's a summary order. |
| 22 | Okay, moving right along. Let's go to Zoning |
| 23 | Commission Case No. 20-21: Office of Planning text amendment to |
| 24 | create the Barry Farm Zone. |
| 25 | Ms. Schellin. |

| 1 | MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. The proposed rulemaking was |
|----|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | published on November 12. We received no comments. And this is |
| 3 | ready for the Commission to consider final action, and this one, |
| 4 | Mr. Imamura did not participate on. |
| 5 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. I was making sure I |
| 6 | called the right case. I thought I might have jumped, but I |
| 7 | didn't. |
| 8 | Okay. So let me open it up. Again, colleagues, we |
| 9 | have heard the Barry Farm issues for a while. And I think |
| 10 | hopefully, we've gotten some resolve to move forward, so the |
| 11 | residents can again increase the quality of life in their |
| 12 | neighborhood. So I think it's very important that this get |
| 13 | moving. I think this is a win-win for everybody and I'm looking |
| 14 | forward to it. I'm hoping that it moves along soon. |
| 15 | But let me open it up and ask my colleagues. Any |
| 16 | questions or things you were looking for in this particular case? |
| 17 | Anything you want to add? I don't know if there's anything to |
| 18 | add. So let me |
| 19 | Commissioner May, anything? |
| 20 | COMMISSIONER MAY: Nothing more to say about this. |
| 21 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Commissioner Shapiro? |
| 22 | COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: No, sir. |
| 23 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And Vice Chair Miller? |
| 24 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: No, except just to acknowledge all |
| 25 | of the work that and the testimony that we've received on this |
| | |

and to incorporate in this final action all of the comments that we each made at proposed action and during the public -- extensive public hearing process. It's a long time coming. And it's long overdue to have this quality replacement affordable housing at Barry Farm.

2.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And I want to thank all those who increased this. This, to me, was the most important piece. The issues that were raised by some of those who were in opposition. And I think this is an important piece. This goes through this text amendment as well as the map amendment as far as I'm concerned. It says, at the recommendation the Commission, we add a new Subtitle K, 1105.4(c), requiring the replacement unit report to be submitted to the ZA and ZC in the Zoning Commission Case 20-24, the companion map amendment case to map of the BF Zone. Each time an application for building permit is requested for residential use, the Commission agreed with the OP's recommendation and include the new Subtitle K 1105.4 in the amendments as proposed action.

So I think, we had talked about this. We talked about it in 2014. And that same issue carries along with us so we can monitor it and make sure those who want to return have a right and that's where we are -- that's where we were then and that's where we are now, so we're consistent.

Anything else? Any other comments? (No audible response.)

| 1 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I would move that we approve. |
|----|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | I'll do this one. This one (indiscernible). I will move that |
| 3 | we approve Zoning Commission Case No. 20-21, Office of Planning |
| 4 | text amendment to create the Barry Farm Zone and ask for a second. |
| 5 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: Second. |
| 6 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Moved and properly seconded. Any |
| 7 | further discussion? |
| 8 | (No audible response.) |
| 9 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Not hearing any. |
| 10 | Ms. Schellin, would you please do a roll call vote? |
| 11 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood? |
| 12 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes. |
| 13 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller? |
| 14 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes. |
| 15 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Shapiro? |
| 16 | COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Yes. |
| 17 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner May? |
| 18 | COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. |
| 19 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Imamura? |
| 20 | COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Not voting. |
| 21 | MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. So the vote is 4-0-1 to approve |
| 22 | final action Zoning Commission Case No. 20-21. The minus one |
| 23 | being Commissioner Imamura, who did not participate in the case. |
| 24 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Schellin. |
| 25 | Let's go to Zoning Commission Case No. 20-24. This is |

| 1 | the Office of Planning map amendment at Square 5862, 5865, 5866 |
|----|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | and 5867. |
| 3 | Ms. Schellin. |
| 4 | MS. SCHELLIN: On this case, the proposed rulemaking |
| 5 | was also published on November 12th. And again, no comments were |
| 6 | received, so it is ready for the Commission to consider final |
| 7 | action. |
| 8 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I would just pretty much move my |
| 9 | same comments from the first text amendment to this case. |
| 10 | And let me open it up. Any further questions or |
| 11 | comments? |
| 12 | (No audible response.) |
| 13 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Not seeing any. |
| 14 | Would somebody like to make a motion? |
| 15 | COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Mr. Chair, I move that we take |
| 16 | final action on Zoning Commission Case No. 20-24: Office of |
| 17 | Planning map amendment at Squares 5862, 5865, 5866 and 5867, and |
| 18 | look for a second. |
| 19 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: It was second I'll second it. |
| 20 | It's been moved and properly seconded. Any further |
| 21 | discussion? |
| 22 | (No audible response.) |
| 23 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Ms. Schellin, would you do a roll |
| 24 | call vote, please. |
| 25 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Shapiro? |

| 1 | COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Yes. |
|----|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood? |
| 3 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes. |
| 4 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller? |
| 5 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes. |
| 6 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner May? |
| 7 | COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. |
| 8 | MS. SCHELLIN: And Commissioner Imamura, I believe is |
| 9 | recusing himself? |
| 10 | COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes, I'm not voting. |
| 11 | MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. So the vote is 4-0-1 to approve |
| 12 | final action in Case No. 20-24. Again, Commissioner Imamura |
| 13 | being the minus one as he did not participate. |
| 14 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Schellin. |
| 15 | Let's go to Zoning Commission Case No. 20-12. This is |
| 16 | the Westminster Presbyterian Church, et al. consolidated PUD and |
| 17 | related map amendment at Square 499. |
| 18 | Ms. Schellin. |
| 19 | MS. SCHELLIN: There were two new exhibits to come in. |
| 20 | At Exhibit 56 is the applicant's post-hearing submissions. And |
| 21 | Exhibit 57 is the ANC 6D's response thereto. So I would ask the |
| 22 | Commission to consider final action on this case. |
| 23 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Let me open this up for |
| 24 | discussion. We do have, as Ms. Schellin has already mentioned, |
| 25 | the applicant's Exhibit 56 and also, the supplemental post- |

hearing submissions to us as well as ANC 6D's responses. I'm still remembering outstanding issues dealing with the light tower, the bedroom issue, which I don't believe was addressed; the curbside management plan, which I believe has been resolved. And some of the other issues that -- the IZ requirement, which I think the ANC still thinks is not up to par.

2.

But anyway, let's open it up for any questions or comments here. I'm really curious about the -- well, let me just see how this goes and then I'll -- any questions or comments?

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Commissioner Imamura, are you -- I got confused now. I don't know what -- are you on the --

(No audible response.)

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: I was not on this. I did not participate in this hearing.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. Commissioner May?

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah. I am still not very supportive of the light feature. I find that ANC's final submission on this to be persuasive. And that it's not really a good idea to have these kind of light features. Again, I know there are a number of them in Southwest and many of them were done as a matter right, and I don't think any of them are very good. And I think they are, you know, they can be disruption to the neighbors. So, you know, other than that, I think they've answered the questions that they can. I don't find the other arguments from the ANC to be persuasive to the other topics. I think that the applicant

has adequately answered them. That's the one part of it that still troubles me.

2.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Again, Commissioner May, I'm glad you -- that's where I was going, so I'm glad you started the discussion there.

I hear what the ANC is saying about they don't have a problem with the cross. As I mentioned at the hearing or when we did the -- you know, it was at the first time we spoke about this. I'm always nervous when we start tampering with religious symbols. And I know there's federal law out there, which protects, and I mentioned this. But I see what the ANC is saying about pulling it back. But when I look at this -- I often wonder when talk about embellishments and certain things that we look in architectural design -- I wonder if -- and I look at the way things are evolving, and the way people are going to newer things. I'm wondering this, you know, I'm looking at how my kids operate versus how I operate. I don't always agree with it, but sometimes that's the new way. And I may be wrong in my way of thinking, but sometimes, some of the -- I think they call them progressives or what is it -- younger folks or whatever they are, millennials.

But is this the new architecture that we have to get used to? And I've said this before and I'm just wondering, and I know I have -- and I'm saying that with no qualifications other than learning here on the Zoning Commission and start paying attention to it. I'm wondering if that is the new way. That's

all I want to say on this, so I will leave that alone and go to others.

I understand where Commissioner May, and I respect Commissioner May's -- especially his architecture abilities because I've worked with him for years. And most of them have come out, I think all the ones that I remember have come out correct. So I don't, you know -- but I don't want to take from the religious institutions, so I really am -- I know I'm flipping -- I'm sounding like some windshield wipers, and I'll leave it at that.

Commissioner Shapiro?

2.

COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Yeah. I'm a little bit more where you are on this. And respectfully, Commissioner May's, his aesthetic and his experience with design, but I don't have a problem with it. I'm not worried about the precedent. It feels gentle to me. And I certainly wouldn't want this to hold up this very important project either. So I'm more inclined to suggest that we let the plans go forward and, you know, I hope we can support it as is. So that's where I'm at Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Commissioner Shapiro.

Vice Chair Miller?

23 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

On the light feature, I think I said -- are we at proposed action or final -- we're at final action, right?

(No audible response.)

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yeah. So I think I said a proposed action. I thought that the light feature was distinctive for the church. It's one of the few things that you would know or might symbolize that this is a church as part of this mixed-use, affordable housing, mixed income development. And I agree with Commissioner May that there are plenty of matter of right and other projects that have light features that have really detracted from the nation's capital vistas and they're -- and I think they are -- I'm not sure that we've approved any of them. I think they were matter of right. And I think at the White House, that one at the White House, when I first saw that when I was walking on Constitution Avenue maybe --

COMMISSIONER MAY: Going to (indiscernible).

VICE CHAIR MILLER: -- enlighten me on that.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah. But you're talking about the penthouse that changes colors and all that sort of stuff?

VICE CHAIR MILLER: I was shocked when I saw the White House being illuminated that way when I first saw that, I don't know, 15 years ago --

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: -- 10 years ago, whatever it was. But I think this -- so I don't think this is a precedent. I think it's distinctive for this very (indiscernible) project by this very worthwhile church, who wants to -- who has done so much

good works in the neighborhood, for the community, for the city for so many decades. And then now is partnering with the developer to do a market rate and affordable housing development to support their being able to stay and continue their good works for the city, so I'm okay. And I think they -- in response to -- I think Commission and other -- and ANC concerns, they have adopted controls, timing wise and otherwise, that will be part of the order that moderate the light when it's shown and all of that.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So I feel -- other than that on the affordable housing part of it, I just would incorporate what I said and proposed action. And it's an important project going forward that's going to provide a lot of housing that's needed in the city, both market rate and affordable in a high opportunity neighborhood. So I think it will be -- and I think the public's benefits that are involved here, the public amenities and the public benefits help balance out all of the -- any Comprehensive Plan land use issues, although there was a change since when this (indiscernible) file to increase the density, but there's still issues that some people have raised about the density, but I think the balancing out of those public benefits, the housing benefits most importantly, which are all emphasized in the most recent Comprehensive Plan amendment cycles that the Mayor and the council have approved. So I think it's an important project that should move forward tonight. I'm ready to vote for it.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

2.2

Have all of us -- Commissioner May?

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah. I'm not going to keep beating this. But there are certain things about this that I just want to repeat. First of all, the applicant in their submission says they do not think any sort of restriction on the timing of when it's going to be lit is necessary. So there is no agreement that it's going to shut off at 11 o'clock at night or anything like that. You know, they may well do it, but they're not agreeing to stipulate.

The second thing I would point out is that the ANC, I think, rightly notes that if this were just a matter of a cross feature that was backlit, they wouldn't have a problem with it. It's the fact that it is, you know, right next to it, there's this entire glass tower that will also be lit. And lit at a very low level if you can trust the renderings (indiscernible). But it's that component of that very large glass, lit glass that they're mostly concerned about. And, you know, I can count votes as the Chairman says, so it seems like even if I were to vote against it, the thing would be approved. So I hope that in the end, the lighting level is very subtle and not so visible, not so bright.

I will say, I also agree, or rather I believe, based on the renderings that I've seen and based on sort of the visibility in that area, I don't really know that this is going

to be perceivable as a cross because of its height of that feature. I think it's going to get lost. And what people will see is just, you know, I mean, your normal field of vision just doesn't go up that high. And so they're not really going to see it. I think it's -- I think they're losing an opportunity to increase the visibility of the church by going with this gargantuan venture. So I think from an architectural perspective, it's not going to be very effective.

2.

As for whether this is sort of the newest thing or something that, you know, is more current in architecture, I don't think so. I think most things in -- most sort of innovations in architecture and changes in contemporary design, I mean, it's somewhat cyclical. Things go into fashion and out of fashion. I think it is a sort of a modernist approach that is reminiscent of much of the other modern architecture in that part of the city.

Yeah. I mean, there are aspects about it that are new and different ends because of the technology of LED lighting and the fact that it can be more affordable to light things up more with less energy. I think that yeah, there's a little bit of innovation that's associated with it, but it's not like it's a brand-new thing. And I hope it's not because I hope we don't see a whole lot more sort of glowing towers in the city.

All that being said, I think I'm inclined at this moment to go along with the majority. I still don't like the feature.

But I think what makes it feasible from my perspective is that to the north directly across the street is a school and to the east, directly across the street is a church. And neither of those are going to be -- they're not going to have people in apartment buildings that are, you know, eight floors up looking out of their window and seeing, you know, this glowing thing as you might see on portions of I Street and other parts, like in Southeast we're aligned with big buildings that have been built with weird lighting and glowing features and so on. So it's not going to be really disruptive to somebody who's living across the street.

2.

Diagonally across, there's an apartment building, but it is set back from a corner. So I think it's far enough away that it's not really going to be too adverse and it's not going to be limiting there. But again, my sympathies are with the ANC. I don't believe -- you know, in terms of our actions, I don't believe anything sets a precedent because we consider everything individually. And the real damage that comes with things like this come out of matter of right projects not ones that we value. So I don't see the real downside there but -- so I will reluctantly vote in favor, noting objections of this.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So Commissioner May, what I was going to do was just take a vote on the tower and then vote on the whole case. If that would give you a comfort level, you can vote against the tower, so you'd be on record?

| 1 | COMMISSIONER MAY: I think I've gone on record as being |
|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | against the tower. |
| 3 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. |
| 4 | COMMISSIONER MAY: But there's enough good things about |
| 5 | the project that I should be voting for it. |
| 6 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. |
| 7 | COMMISSIONER MAY: So, on balance, I will vote for it. |
| 8 | If anybody else was more inclined to go my way, maybe |
| 9 | I'd keep talking and try to get people to go along, but like I |
| 10 | said, I can count votes too. |
| 11 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. All right. I would also ask, |
| 12 | in this case, that we give our counsel the authority to modify |
| 13 | the conditions of the order to ensure that all proffers are |
| 14 | reflected in the conditions. So we will give that authority to |
| 15 | our counsel. Hopefully, that's legally sufficient for him to do |
| 16 | what he needs to do as stated. |
| 17 | Any further comments or questions? |
| 18 | (No audible response.) |
| 19 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So would someone like to make |
| 20 | a motion? |
| 21 | COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: I remember that we |
| 22 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Before we make the motion, let me |
| 23 | just say, I'm hoping that the applicant will consider everything |
| 24 | that we've heard from Commissioner May. And also consider that |
| _ 1 | |

| 1 | little more comfort level when this church I have a comfort |
|----|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | level when people give me their word, but this is a church. And |
| 3 | I know you all of the great work, as the Vice Chair has |
| 4 | mentioned, that we already know that you all have been doing |
| 5 | that has come out during this proceeding, I think that great work |
| 6 | will continue. So I'm sorry. |
| 7 | Commissioner Shapiro. |
| 8 | COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Mr. Chair, thank you. |
| 9 | I move that we take final action on Zoning Commission |
| 10 | Case No. 20-12: Westminster Presbyterian Church, et al., |
| 11 | consolidated PUD and related map amendment at Square 499, and ask |
| 12 | for a second. |
| 13 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'll second it. |
| 14 | Is it nobody likes to reach for their mute and unmute |
| 15 | on their computer? |
| 16 | I'll second it. |
| 17 | Ms. Schellin, would you do a roll call vote, please? |
| 18 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Shapiro? |
| 19 | COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Yes. |
| 20 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood? |
| 21 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes. |
| 22 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller? |
| 23 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes. |
| 24 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner May? |
| 25 | COMMISSIONER MAY: Reluctant yes. |

| 1 | MS. SCHELLIN: And Commissioner Imamura, recused. |
|----|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes. |
| 3 | MS. SCHELLIN: All right. |
| 4 | COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Recusing, yes. |
| 5 | MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. The vote is 4-0-1 to approve final |
| 6 | action in Zoning Commission Case No. 20-12. Again, Commissioner |
| 7 | Imamura not voting having not participated. |
| 8 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Does anybody need a 10- or 15-minute |
| 9 | break? If not just let me know. 10 or 15. You can take the |
| 10 | 10 or you take the 15. |
| 11 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: You think this is the BZA? |
| 12 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'm really having fun right now. |
| 13 | Okay. Let's go to Zoning Commission Case No. 20-08A |
| 14 | Howard University, Interim University use of the Washington |
| 15 | Metropolitan School building at 300 Bryant Street, Northwest. |
| 16 | Ms. Schellin. |
| 17 | MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. The record was left open so |
| 18 | that ANC 1B could submit their report and they've done that. |
| 19 | They voted $8-0-0$ to support the application and the Commission |
| 20 | can now consider final action. |
| 21 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I think this was pretty |
| 22 | straightforward. I know a couple of my colleagues had questions |
| 23 | or comments of things they wanted to see, and I'll just open it |
| 24 | up for any discussion. |
| 25 | Commissioner May? |

| 1 | COMMISSIONER MAY: I don't think I have anything that |
|----|----------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | I need to see on this. |
| 3 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. |
| 4 | COMMISSIONER MAY: I think we're now, I'm a little |
| 5 | bit confused because I think it was just the ANC report. Yeah, |
| 6 | we got the ANC report, that was the only thing that was |
| 7 | outstanding. |
| 8 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I thought somebody had asked |
| 9 | for something. I guess not. Okay. Well, let me just go around |
| 10 | and make sure. |
| 11 | Commissioner Shapiro? |
| 12 | COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: No, sir. Straightforward as can |
| 13 | be. |
| 14 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Now, I know I'm going getting this |
| 15 | wrong. |
| 16 | Commissioner Imamura, didn't you hear this one? |
| 17 | COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: I did hear this one. Yes, sir. |
| 18 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I'll get on my |
| 19 | (indiscernible), Mr. Chair. |
| 20 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. And Vice Chair Miller. |
| 21 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: Is this are we on Gallaudet? |
| 22 | COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: No. |
| 23 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: No, we're not on Gallaudet, okay. |
| 24 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Howard. |
| 25 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: Howard, okay. I'm fine with Howard. |

| 1 | COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Vice Chair Miller, don't you |
|----|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | want a light tower on this one? |
| 3 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: It's always a light of hope and I |
| 4 | within blocks of the National Cathedral's light of |
| 5 | inspiration, the bells that ring at all hours, I don't care. I |
| 6 | love it. I think anyway. |
| 7 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Well, I have some other uses that I |
| 8 | can move out of my neighborhood up to your neighborhood, but |
| 9 | anyway. It sounds very pleasurable what you're talking about. |
| 10 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: That I'm sorry about I'm sorry |
| 11 | about that. |
| 12 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. So there were no comments |
| 13 | from any of us, so would somebody like to make a motion? |
| 14 | COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chairman, I would move that the |
| 15 | Zoning Commission approve Case 20-08A: Howard University, interim |
| 16 | university use of the Washington Metropolitan School Building at |
| 17 | 300 Bryant Street, Northwest. |
| 18 | COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: I'll second it. |
| 19 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. It's been moved and properly |
| 20 | seconded. Any further discussion? |
| 21 | (No audible response.) |
| 22 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Not hearing any. |
| 23 | Ms. Schellin, would you do a roll call vote, please? |
| 24 | MS. SCHELLIN: And were just to confirm that's for a |
| 25 | four-year interim use period, right? |

| 1 | COMMISSIONER MAY: Correct. |
|----|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Four years. |
| 3 | MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. |
| 4 | Commissioner May? |
| 5 | COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. |
| 6 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Imamura? |
| 7 | COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes. |
| 8 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood? |
| 9 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes. |
| 10 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller? |
| 11 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes. |
| 12 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Shapiro? |
| 13 | COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Yes. |
| 14 | MS. SCHELLIN: And the vote is 5-0-0 to approve final |
| 15 | action in Zoning Commission Case No. 20-08A. |
| 16 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Our next case is Zoning |
| 17 | Commission Case 21-07. Do I have the right let me see |
| 18 | something. Yeah. That is the right one. Zoning Commission Case |
| 19 | No. 21-07: The Institute of Urban Living, consolidated PUD and |
| 20 | related map amendment at Square 5876. |
| 21 | Ms. Schellin. |
| 22 | MS. SCHELLIN: The applicant's post-hearing submissions |
| 23 | are at Exhibits 26 through 26E. And all five of you heard this |
| 24 | one, so it is ready for your consideration this evening for final |
| 25 | action. |

| 1 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. And thank you, Ms. |
|----|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | Schellin, for letting us know that everybody is on this case, so |
| 3 | I won't get that messed up. |
| 4 | So anyway, let me open it up for questions or comments. |
| 5 | I know we do have some submissions about the facade color, the |
| 6 | truck turning diagrams, and I think Commissioner May might have |
| 7 | tree preservation and the updated landscaping plan and other |
| 8 | issues we may have. Let me open it up. |
| 9 | Commissioner May. |
| 10 | COMMISSIONER MAY: No. I think they submitted the |
| 11 | information that we requested from the hearing, so I'm ready to |
| 12 | move forward. |
| 13 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. |
| 14 | Commissioner Shapiro? |
| 15 | COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: I concur, Mr. Chair. |
| 16 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. |
| 17 | Commissioner Imamura? |
| 18 | COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: I'm pleased with the |
| 19 | preservation plan, the prepared and the detailed landscape plan, |
| 20 | so I'm prepared to move forward as well, Mr. Chairman. |
| 21 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. And Vice Chair Miller. |
| 22 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: Ready to move forward. |
| 23 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So with that, I'm ready to |
| 24 | move forward. Would somebody like to make a motion here's |
| 25 | the thing. In history, I don't want my name to be the only one |
| | |

| 1 | down who's making motions or the one person being the only one |
|----|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | down to second it, so that's why I opened it up. |
| 3 | Would somebody like to make a motion? |
| 4 | COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Mr. Chairman |
| 5 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes. |
| 6 | COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Mr. Chairman, I move that the |
| 7 | Zoning Commission approve Case No. 21-07: The Institute of Urban |
| 8 | Living, consolidated PUD and related map amendment at Square |
| 9 | 5876, and ask for a second. |
| 10 | COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Second. |
| 11 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. It's been moved and properly |
| 12 | seconded. Any further discussion? |
| 13 | (No audible response.) |
| 14 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Not hearing any discussion. |
| 15 | Ms. Schellin, would you do a roll call vote, please? |
| 16 | MS. SCHELLIN: Sorry, my dogs are going crazy because |
| 17 | UPS just arrived. |
| 18 | Commissioner Imamura? |
| 19 | COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes. |
| 20 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Shapiro? |
| 21 | COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Yes. |
| 22 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood? |
| 23 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes. |
| 24 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller? |
| 25 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes. |

MS. SCHELLIN: And Commissioner May?

2 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.

MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is 5-0-0 to approve final action in Zoning Commission Case No. 21-07.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

Next. Let's go to Zoning Commission Case No. 21-05. This is the Office of Planning text amendment to Subtitle C, IZ-XL, Phase No. 2, applying inclusionary zoning to conversions of non-residential buildings to residential use.

Ms. Schellin.

MS. SCHELLIN: At Exhibit 20, there's an NCPC report of delegated action finding that the text amendment would not be inconsistent with federal elements. And at Exhibit 21, there is one comment from the Committee of 100. So this is ready for the Commission to consider final action.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Let me open it up for discussion or comments on this. I appreciate us getting to this point. This is something that we have gradually incrementally been trying to achieve and we're still working on this. This is, to me, a work in progress. And I know there are other comments, but I appreciate the support; even though they have comments in the Committee of 100, they have support. And as we continue to try to make sure that balance (indiscernible) strike as we continue to move in this fashion. So let me open it up for any question or comments.

| 1 | Commissioner May? |
|----|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | COMMISSIONER MAY: I have nothing more to add at this |
| 3 | point. |
| 4 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Commissioner Shapiro? |
| 5 | COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: This is to build on what you |
| 6 | said. It may be worth noting that the specific issues that the |
| 7 | Committee of 100 addressed, even with the support, are issues |
| 8 | that we are considering and are working through the process, so |
| 9 | I don't want that to go without being said. |
| 10 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Commissioner Imamura? |
| 11 | COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Mr. Chairman, I will be recusing |
| 12 | myself. I'm not participating in this case. |
| 13 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: You know, I just can't win on that |
| 14 | because I thought you were okay. I can't win on this. Okay. |
| 15 | Thank you. |
| 16 | Vice Chair Miller? |
| 17 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. |
| 18 | I agree with your comments and others and Commissioner |
| 19 | Shapiro. And I'm happy to say that I don't get to say this |
| 20 | often, so I'm happy to say that I generally concur with the |
| 21 | comments of the Committee of 100 on the Federal City. |
| 22 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah. I would agree, and I'm very |
| 23 | happy. And I'm actually happy for all the work that they do, |
| 24 | and their people put into it. I think the input that we get in |
| 25 | anything that we do, helps come out with even when we disagree |
| | |

| 1 | us disagreeing comes up with a to me, a better outcome. |
|----|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | You've heard me say it before, I say it all the time. |
| 3 | All right. So we've all commented. Would somebody |
| 4 | else like to make a motion besides Anthony Hood? |
| 5 | COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Mr. Chair, I move that we take |
| 6 | final action on Zoning Commission Case No. 21-05, Office of |
| 7 | Planning text amendment Subtitle C, IZ-XL, Phase 2, applying |
| 8 | inclusionary zoning to conversions of non-residential buildings |
| 9 | to residential use, and ask for a second. |
| 10 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: Second. |
| 11 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. It's been moved and properly |
| 12 | seconded. Any further discussion? |
| 13 | (No audible response.) |
| 14 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Not hearing any. |
| 15 | Ms. Schellin, would you take a roll call vote, please. |
| 16 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Shapiro? |
| 17 | COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Yes. |
| 18 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller? |
| 19 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes. |
| 20 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood? |
| 21 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes. |
| 22 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner May? |
| 23 | COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. |
| 24 | MS. SCHELLIN: And Commissioner Imamura recused, so the |
| 25 | vote is 4-0-1 to approve final action on Zoning Commission Case |

No. 21-05. 1 2. CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Let's go to proposed action. Commissioner Imamura, are you on -- you're on this one? 3 4 I'm sure. 5 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am. 6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I figured I'd ask first. 7 Okay. 8 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Just want to keep you on your toes, sir. 9 10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okav. So let's go to Zoning 11 Commission Case No. 15-24B: Gallaudet University and JBG 6th PUD modification 12 Street Associates, LLC; first stage 13 significance; second stage and consolidated PUDs and related map 14 amendments at Square 3591, Lots 4 and 6; and Squares 3593 and Lots 5 and 6. As we proceed in these discussions, I want to go 15 16 by Hearing 1, Hearing 2, and Hearing 3, and it all is encapsulated 17 in that caption that I just read. 18 So Ms. Schellin. 19 The applicant's post-hearing MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. 20 submissions are at Exhibits 49 through 49-I7. And then there is 21 a supplemental report from OP at Exhibit 50. It's ready for the 2.2 Commission to consider proposed action this evening. 23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Colleagues, as first as Okay. noted, there are still a lot of -- a few outstanding issues 24

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

related to the PUD balancing test relating to the alley. And I

25

| 1 | think we gave them some additional time, so we can focus our |
|----|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | comments on whatever we decide to, but I think the Comprehensive |
| 3 | Plan issues as we've been advised, I think is the best avenue, |
| 4 | but anything else that comes to mind, we can do that too as well. |
| 5 | So let's start off with hearing we'll try to go in the order. |
| 6 | Hearing 1: Was the change to the Stage 1 PUD approved |
| 7 | for the entire site, the new map amendment that adds some |
| 8 | additional property to parcel 2 in the map and the amendment |
| 9 | to the campus plan. So let me open it up. |
| 10 | Any questions or comments on that? That was Hearing |
| 11 | 1? |
| 12 | COMMISSIONER MAY: I have nothing on Hearing 1. I |
| 13 | mean, that was the initial Stage 1 consideration in the campus |
| 14 | plan amendment, and I think those things are pretty |
| 15 | straightforward. We dove deeply into some issues, I think, so |
| 16 | we're getting ahead of one of the subsequent hearings, so I think |
| 17 | that that was pretty thoroughly discussed. |
| 18 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Commissioner Shapiro? |
| 19 | COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Yeah, I agree with Commissioner |
| 20 | May. I mean, we had some questions about the pedestrian |
| 21 | experience, and we drilled in little bit more in the public art |
| 22 | locations. And I think they addressed all the questions and |
| 23 | concerns that we had. |
| 24 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Commissioner Imamura? |
| 25 | COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: I have nothing further to add, |

| 1 | Mr. Chairman. |
|----|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And Vice Chair Miller? |
| 3 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: (No audible response.) |
| 4 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I have nothing to add as well. |
| 5 | Now, Hearing 2. This was the scope was consolidated |
| 6 | second stage PUD review of parcel 2, east side of 6th Street |
| 7 | adjacent to Gallaudet campus. |
| 8 | Any questions? We do have some responses to some things |
| 9 | that we asked for and it's in the record. Clarifications of |
| 10 | Building 2B, the IZ unit distribution, parking and allocation of |
| 11 | spaces, the e-bike, and the Building 2B ground floor design. |
| 12 | So let's open it up. Any questions or comments on any |
| 13 | of that? |
| 14 | Commissioner May? |
| 15 | COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah, Mr. Chairman. |
| 16 | I believe that the applicant responded to all the |
| 17 | things that were of particular concern to me. I will note the |
| 18 | chart, proposed parking and allocation spaces was very helpful |
| 19 | in sort of summarizing where that stood across the entire project. |
| 20 | The IZ unit distribution, and I appreciate the applicant bringing |
| 21 | more of the IZ units up to the fourth floor rather than keeping |
| 22 | them off the top two floors, which, you know which was |
| 23 | which is okay for a taller building, but not really when it's a |
| 24 | five-story building. E-bike charging station, they agreed to |
| | |

25 that, I think at the hearing, so I didn't see an issue with that.

| 1 | And so, yeah, I mean, I think there are other issues that other |
|----|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | Commissioners have but I'll let them speak with those, but I'm |
| 3 | pretty satisfied with what they've submitted. |
| 4 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Commissioner Shapiro? |
| 5 | COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: I concur with Commissioner May. |
| 6 | There was a they brought forth more information about that |
| 7 | ground floor design for Building 2B. I'm satisfied and I can |
| 8 | move forward. |
| 9 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Commissioner Imamura? |
| 10 | COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: I concur with Commissioner May |
| 11 | and Commissioner Shapiro; what they provided is satisfactory. |
| 12 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. And Vice Chair Miller? |
| 13 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: Are we on Hearing 3? |
| 14 | COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: 2. |
| 15 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: We're on 2. Okay. No additional |
| 16 | questions or comments. I appreciate all of the responsiveness |
| 17 | to my fellow colleagues' concerns. |
| 18 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. And I don't have anything to |
| 19 | add. |
| 20 | By this time, to me, all the hearings, were starting |
| 21 | to run together, so let's go to Hearing 3. This is the second |
| 22 | stage PUD review of parcel 3, west side of 6th Street. And we'll |
| 23 | give Commissioner May a shot to take a break. And let's go to |
| 24 | you, Vice Chair, since you asked for Hearing 3. |
| 25 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: So the Hearing 3 issue that I wanted |
| | |

| 1 | to highlight was the IZ issue, the proper they agreed at our |
|----------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | last hearing, I believe, to not have the flexibility to go beyond |
| 3 | the minimum IZ that Office of Planning was recommending and we |
| 4 | I appreciate that in their verbal commitment at that hearing. |
| 5 | And then in their written subsequent submission and saying that |
| 6 | there'll be 14 two-bedroom units. So I think that is |
| 7 | responsive to the concern that I had and that others had, so I'm |
| 8 | ready to go forward. |
| 9 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Commissioner Imamura, |
| 10 | anything on Hearing 3? |
| 11 | COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: No, Mr. Chairman. Some of the |
| 12 | lighting issues that I had some concern about, they addressed. |
| 13 | And also notes the additional perspectives they provided about |
| 14 | the bridges that Commissioner May asked about. |
| 15 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. Commissioner Shapiro? |
| 16 | COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. |
| 17 | Yeah, at the risk of stealing Commissioner May's |
| 18 | |
| | thunder, I really appreciated that perspective for that 6th |
| 19 | thunder, I really appreciated that perspective for that 6th Street bridge. It helped me make sense of that. I thought it |
| 19 20 | |
| | Street bridge. It helped me make sense of that. I thought it |
| 20 | Street bridge. It helped me make sense of that. I thought it was quite attractive and I'm satisfied with all of their |
| 20 21 | Street bridge. It helped me make sense of that. I thought it was quite attractive and I'm satisfied with all of their responses. |
| 20 21 22 | Street bridge. It helped me make sense of that. I thought it was quite attractive and I'm satisfied with all of their responses. CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. And let me go back to the |

| 1 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: I can defer to Commissioner May. |
|----|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Commissioner May? |
| 3 | COMMISSIONER MAY: I have nothing to add. |
| 4 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Oh. |
| 5 | COMMISSIONER MAY: It's been covered. Thank you. |
| 6 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Maybe that's the order we'll go in |
| 7 | from now on. |
| 8 | Vice Chair Miller. |
| 9 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: Is this the case where we needed |
| 10 | to do a waiver because the applicant didn't provide the our |
| 11 | counsel with the conditions? |
| 12 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: When you see that you see (audio |
| 13 | interference) not, because you see that counsel has come on and |
| 14 | they |
| 15 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: Let our counsel talk about what we |
| 16 | need to do. |
| 17 | MR. RITTING: No, there's no waiver needed for this |
| 18 | one. I think you're referring to Case 20-12, the Westminster |
| 19 | one. There was the issue in that case about the proffers and |
| 20 | conditions process, but I think that that was resolved by the |
| 21 | Chairman giving me the latitude to make changes to the conditions |
| 22 | after final action. |
| 23 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Well, I'm sorry for coming |
| 24 | in late on that issue. |
| 25 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Sorry, Vice Chair. All of us have |

made a mistake or two during this hearing, so glad that you joined 1 2. the rest of us. All right. Oh. Commissioner May hasn't made one. 3 4 don't think Commissioner Shapiro or Imamura, those three have not 5 made one, but Ms. Schellin and I are glad you joined us. There's still time. 6 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: 7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. I think everybody's --8 I don't have any comments, other than I think we can get the 9 resolve, and I'm saying this for all those involved, the parties 10 involved. I think we can get the resolve on the alley access before final. So I don't want anybody to miss the point. I said 11 12 we can get the resolve on the alley access before final. 13 means I'm coming with unresolved. Let's get the resolve before 14 final. 15 All right. Anything else on this? 16 (No audible response.) 17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. So with that, I would 18 move proposed action on Zoning Commission Case No. 15-24B, with all the caption that goes along with that zoning case number and 19 20 ask for a second. 21 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Second. 22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: It's been moved and properly 23 seconded. Any further discussion? 24 (No audible response.) 25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Not hearing any.

| 1 | Ms. Schellin, would you do a roll call vote, please. |
|----|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood? |
| 3 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes. |
| 4 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller? |
| 5 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes. |
| 6 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Shapiro? |
| 7 | COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Yes. |
| 8 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner May? |
| 9 | COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. |
| 10 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Imamura? |
| 11 | COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes. |
| 12 | MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is 5-0-0 to approve proposed |
| 13 | action in Zoning Commission Case No. 15-24B. |
| 14 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. And the next now, we're |
| 15 | at hearing action, I believe, correct? |
| 16 | (No audible response.) |
| 17 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Hearing action in Zoning |
| 18 | Commission Case No. 20-26B: Office of Zoning text amendment to |
| 19 | Subtitle Y and Z to continue administrative time extensions due |
| 20 | to COVID-19. |
| 21 | Ms. Schellin. |
| 22 | MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. |
| 23 | The current action expires the end of this month that |
| 24 | the Commission approved. And I'd ask would ask the Commission |
| 25 | to consider extending this to at least June 30th because I've |

been approached by several applicants that they are still having issues due to the COVID pandemic. And so because this extends in a matter of, I think, two weeks now, I'm asking that you would set this down as an emergency. So to set it down, take emergency action and authorize the immediate publication of the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and also approve a shorter notice period of 30 days for the public hearing notice.

2.

In addition to that, I would ask the Commission just to confirm, because the language does not say otherwise, that an applicant who obtained a time extension, an administrative time extension this year in 2021, would be eligible to receive another one during the six-month time period. I just want to put on the record that that is okay because that's what I'm going to work off of when these are approved administratively, so that's something else.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Let me see. Any objections?
(No audible response.)

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So Ms. Schellin, the answer from my colleagues is yes, but let's talk about this. Let me go around, and we'll start with Commissioner May.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah. I'm fine with this extension, and I think six months is the right period of time. We don't know, I mean, it's possible that we may need to extend it again after that. But I do feel like we should grab this period of administrative extensions that don't require Commission input,

| 1 | you know, do it in shorter segments of time rather than just sort |
|----|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | of doing them a longer blanket one. And then we can take it up |
| 3 | again, you know, if we need to in June, but maybe things will |
| 4 | change enough at that point for it to not be necessary. I |
| 5 | actually would appreciate between now and then to get a little |
| 6 | bit of an accounting for it, so if we wind up considering it |
| 7 | again in June, knowing exactly how many requests have been made |
| 8 | and granted, so. But we don't need to address that in our set |
| 9 | down discussion, that will be hopefully going into the future. |
| 10 | Thank you. |
| 11 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Commissioner Shapiro, |
| 12 | anything to add? |
| 13 | COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: I concur, Mr. Chair and I also |
| 14 | concur with the information request as well. I think that will |
| 15 | be helpful. |
| 16 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Sounds good. |
| 17 | Commissioner Imamura? |
| 18 | COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: I'm in agreement with both my |
| 19 | colleagues and I think this is a fair and reasonable time frame. |
| 20 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And Vice Chair Miller. |
| 21 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes. I concur with the extension |
| 22 | or administrative extensions and the information request. I |
| 23 | think Commissioner May's request for information is helpful. |
| 24 | I have a question to you, Mr. Chairman. I know we made |
| | |

| assume and hope that we were will continue to do these virtual |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| hearings for at least those six months. But I don't know if |
| we've made an announcement to that effect or if we need to do |
| anything to that effect. Ms. Schellin can probably inform me of |
| that. But I think just to say what we've said previously, this |
| virtual hearing process, in my own view, which I think others |
| agree with, has worked incredibly well, mostly because of our |
| staff. The tech people, Paul Young, it's been very seamless. |
| The public has been able to participate really in a way that is |
| more convenient than ever. And we've been able to participate |
| in a way that's more convenient than ever. And I know some people |
| miss the intimacy of in-person on dais in hearing room |
| interactions at One Judiciary Square, the new Barry Building, but |
| I don't miss it. I think this is actually very intimate. I |
| haven't met Joe in person or some of my BZA colleagues in person |
| yet, but, you know, you're right in my face for hours at a time. |
| I might, in my own face, hours at a time. It's a very intimate |
| personal experience. So anyway, I just because we're talking |
| about COVID administrative extensions, I just or I assume that |
| we are continuing our virtual hearing experience for that period |
| of time at least as well. |
| CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So let me just comment. I'm glad |
| you brought that up because I thought it was well known, Omicron, |

hearings until the end of the year where we're almost at.

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

and whatever the new name is Delta, Omicron and all the rest of

| | them, as far as I'm concerned, has extended our time for another |
|---|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | year, so I will leave it at that, and we can discuss that. I |
| | don't know what notifications we need to do, but safety first, |
| | safety for us, our staff, the residents of the city or whomever, |
| | safety first. So I know we're saying six months, but I'm saying |
| | a year and then we can back back, because hopefully, we don't |
| | have to extend it. That's just where I am on that. And I'm |
| | hoping whatever announcements we need to make or whenever we need |
| | to make them, I'm hoping that people are listening to this now, |
| | even though it's in the middle of a debate question of a case, |
| | Zoning Commission Case No. 20-26B, but I think this goes along |
| | with that this is a good time to bring it up. Unless somebody |
| | disagrees with me, I'm saying we set it off for December 31st, |
| : | 2022, unless somebody disagrees. And if they do |
| | VICE CHAIR MILLER: I second that. |
| | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. If the public disagrees with |
| | it, they can call Ms. Schellin and Ms. Schellin will let others |
| | know. |

MS. SCHELLIN: Well, I will say that we are not ready. Our hearing room will require some changes that -- and technology will require changes. We have a manager's meeting every week. We've discussed it and we're not there.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Right. So our last --

MS. SCHELLIN: If we'll just -- this week.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let's just set it out there. Unlike

| 1 | the case that we're dealing with, let's just set that out to |
|----|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | December 31st, 2022, so that won't be an issue, Ms. Schellin, if |
| 3 | we could at the next meeting, if I need to do a formal |
| 4 | announcement, unless I hear from my colleagues anything other |
| 5 | that's what we'll do, Commissioner May. |
| 6 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner May wants to be in the |
| 7 | hearing room. |
| 8 | COMMISSIONER MAY: I miss the candy bowl. |
| 9 | MS. SCHELLIN: I'll send you a bag of candy if that's |
| 10 | what you want. |
| 11 | COMMISSIONER MAY: No, no, no. I like the bowl because |
| 12 | it's like |
| 13 | MS. SCHELLIN: I'll send you my bowl. I'll send you |
| 14 | the bowl. |
| 15 | COMMISSIONER MAY: Just to find (indiscernible). You |
| 16 | got to send me a bowl like every time or two. |
| 17 | MS. SCHELLIN: Oh, no. Come on, seriously. Do you |
| 18 | want me to show up at your door and pass it around, you know? |
| 19 | COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, that'd be great. |
| 20 | MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. You go sit in the hearing room |
| 21 | alone and you can have my bowl. I'll put it there every Monday |
| 22 | and Thursday for you. |
| 23 | COMMISSIONER MAY: Maybe. |
| 24 | MS. SCHELLIN: Yeah. |
| 25 | COMMISSIONER MAY: I mean, I will say I am optimistic |
| | |

that like, I mean, I think I'm going to be back in my office in probably about four months. And that's largely because renovations that are keeping us out that long and otherwise would be probably just another two months.

MS. SCHELLIN: Yeah.

2.

COMMISSIONER MAY: But it is, you know, how we wind up doing this. And make the best or take the best that has come out of these virtual hearings with the ability to be in a room together and to be able to see people in person and to see each other in person and be able to read the room and appreciate everything that we are seeing, I mean, I think there is benefit to that. I hope that we can get to some sort of a hybrid sooner than a year, but if it takes a year, so be it. I'm not going to really complain, and I guess I'll have to get my own candy.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So I think moving forward

16 --

MS. SCHELLIN: And Commissioner Hood, please feel free to take Commissioner Imamura to lunch to see his face in person and the new BZA folks. We won't be sad if you want to do that just so you can see them in person.

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: You mean Commissioner May. I mean 22 --

MS. SCHELLIN: I thought you said I haven't met Commissioner Imamura.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I've met him.

| 1 | MS. SCHELLIN: Oh. You met him. Who said they hadn't |
|----|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | met them? |
| 3 | COMMISSIONER MAY: It's Vice Chair Miller. |
| 4 | MS. SCHELLIN: Or maybe Commissioner Miller. |
| 5 | COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah. |
| 6 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller, please feel free |
| 7 | to take him to lunch. |
| 8 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: I will. |
| 9 | MS. SCHELLIN: He will appreciate it. |
| 10 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: We will I will. |
| 11 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So Ms. Schellin, you have really |
| 12 | helped |
| 13 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: (Indiscernible). |
| 14 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: on my point. My point was this |
| 15 | is the new way. |
| 16 | MS. SCHELLIN: This is the new way. |
| 17 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: That's what I was saying early. |
| 18 | This is the new way. We got to get used to this. So I have met |
| 19 | Commissioner Imamura. But you know what, let's get back because |
| 20 | I've even lost focus on what I was doing what we were doing. |
| 21 | MS. SCHELLIN: I'm sorry. |
| 22 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Zoning Commission Case No. |
| 23 | 20-26B, but I think that was a good thing to bring up |
| 24 | COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: If I were to |
| 25 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Vice Chair Miller. |

| 1 | So let's go back to the case unless somebody wants to |
|----|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | stay back. |
| 3 | COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: I just have one other comment. |
| 4 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Sure. |
| 5 | COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Go ahead, Commissioner May. |
| 6 | COMMISSIONER MAY: No, I was going to say. Can we take |
| 7 | a 5- or 10-minute break now? |
| 8 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. Let's take a let's |
| 9 | look. Let's take a 5-minute break. |
| 10 | COMMISSIONER MAY: No, no, no. I'm kidding. |
| 11 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Oh. No. You're doing the BZA. Oh. |
| 12 | Okay. |
| 13 | MS. SCHELLIN: It was a BZA joke. |
| 14 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: You don't know whether to come back |
| 15 | in 5 minutes or 10 minutes. |
| 16 | COMMISSIONER MAY: Commissioner Imamura, please. |
| 17 | COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: It serves I just want to say, |
| 18 | Mr. Chairman, that to Vice Chair Miller's comments, that even |
| 19 | though we haven't met, we do see each other twice a week and I |
| 20 | feel close enough that I think we could be very good neighbors. |
| 21 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Yeah. I'm thinking in the |
| 22 | hearing room let me see. I've even forgot how we sit. Who |
| 23 | sits to my right? Rob used to well, Commissioner Miller sits |
| | |
| 24 | to the right. |

| 1 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Oh. You're to the left. Okay. |
|----|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | MS. SCHELLIN: Shapiro is to your right. |
| 3 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: He is on the right. Who sits on the |
| 4 | other side? |
| 5 | MS. SCHELLIN: You've been doing this too long to |
| 6 | forget. |
| 7 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Oh. Okay. So yeah, yeah. We'll |
| 8 | be neighbors. Okay. |
| 9 | COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: We sure will be. |
| 10 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Imamura will be my new |
| 11 | seatmate. |
| 12 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So |
| 13 | MS. SCHELLIN: and Rob. |
| 14 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: let me apologize for us going way |
| 15 | off wherever we went, so we will come back. But I think that |
| 16 | was a very important discussion. We will work with a year and |
| 17 | move our way back if, you know, the science says to do that, so |
| 18 | we will follow that. |
| 19 | Again, we're on Zoning Commission Case No. 20-26B. I |
| 20 | think we're doing six minutes, I mean, not six minutes, six |
| 21 | months. And so we have a set down, we have an emergency action, |
| 22 | and we are going to approve a shorter notice. So with all those |
| 23 | things said, I would approve all the things I just mentioned in |
| 24 | Zoning Commission Case No. 20-26B and ask for a second. |
| 25 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: Second. |

| 1 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: It's been moved and properly second. |
|----|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | I don't see Office of Zoning Legal Division lighting up, so I |
| 3 | guess everything's in order. Any further discussion? |
| 4 | (No audible response.) |
| 5 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Not seeing any. |
| 6 | Ms. Schellin, could you do a roll call vote, please? |
| 7 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood? |
| 8 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes. |
| 9 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller? |
| 10 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes. |
| 11 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Shapiro? |
| 12 | COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Yes. |
| 13 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner May? |
| 14 | COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. |
| 15 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Imamura? |
| 16 | COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes. |
| 17 | MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is 5-0-0 to set down Zoning |
| 18 | Commission Case No. 20-26B as a rulemaking case, to take emergency |
| 19 | action and authorize the immediate publication of the Notice of |
| 20 | Proposed Rulemaking, and to approve a 30-day notice period for |
| 21 | the public hearing notice. Thank you. |
| 22 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Next, hearing action in |
| 23 | Zoning Commission Case No. 21-17: Congress Park Community |
| 24 | Partners, LLC, map amendment at Square 5914. It looks like we |
| 25 | have Ms. Brown-Roberts and Ms. Steingasser from the Office of |

Planning. I believe it's probably going to be Ms. Brown-Roberts.

MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Good evening, Mr. Chairman and members of the Zoning Commission. Maxine Brown-Roberts from the Office of Planning on Zoning Commission Case 21-17. And I'm waiting for Mr. Young to start the PowerPoint. Okay. Great.

Next slide, please.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

Next slide. Great. The Congress Park Community Partners, LLC request a map amendment to rezone a portion of the former Malcolm X High School at 1351 Alabama Avenue, Southeast from the moderate density residential RA-1 Zone to the mixed-use zone, MU-8B. OP recommends that the map amendment not be subject to IZ Plus due to the amount of existing affordable housing already in existence within the Far Southeast/Southwest planning area as outlined in our report. The property would remain subject to the standard IZ requirements. In addition, the property is owned by the District government, which is a requirement for all affordable developments with affordability at 30, 50, 60 and 80 percent MFI in perpetuity and would be greater than required -greater than that required by the regular IZ requirements. Overall, when evaluated through a racial equity lens, the proposed map amendment is not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan and rezoning would allow DC government to utilize a property provide is underdeveloped to affordable neighborhood serving retail and service uses, which would be a benefit to area residents.

Next slide. The Future Land Use Map recommends the site for local public facilities, which is reflective of its prior school use that recommends the new zoning designation will vary depending on surrounding uses. The framework plan element provides additional quidance that new designations on former school sites should be generally compatible in density or intensity to those in the vicinity. The FLUM designation on the remainder of the school site as well as the area around the Metro station is mixed-use medium density residential, medium density commercial. The proposed density -- the proposed MU-8 Zone is designated for a mix of medium density uses and is therefore comparable with the surrounding development pattern and not inconsistent with the FLUM.

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

Next slide. The Generalized Policy Map indicates that the property is within the neighborhood enhancement area. The proposed MU-8B Zone would not be inconsistent with designation as it would allow for the redevelopment of a District owned property at a desirable location with affordable housing and supportive services to serve existing and future residents of the neighborhood as well as citywide needs. Overall, the neighborhood character will be protected or enhanced as the development takes place. The proposed map amendment will not be inconsistent with the citywide elements including policies and recommended actions, which the proposal is compatible. development would be transit-oriented providing new affordable

housing. Its proximity on -- to an ongoing development of a mixed-use area around the Congress Heights Metro Station is timely and beneficial for the District's growth and equity.

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

The subject property is in the Far Next slide. Southeast/Southwest area element and would not be inconsistent with its recommendation for growth in this area, housing and affordable housing and retail. In particular, the property is within the Congress Heights Metro Station policy focus area that recommends mixed-use medium density and commercial development around Metro Station and its vicinity. The Comprehensive Plan recommends a small area plan for the area including the subject The Congress Heights small area plan study has begun. Office of Planning believes that the proposed rezoning is timely as the community engagement has been extensive and the proposal is consistent with its draft recommendation for deeply affordable housing, service and retail uses. The ANC is also in support of The Office of Planning therefore rezoning moving forward. recommends that the proposed map amendment be set down for public hearing and that it would not be appropriate for IZ Plus.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I'm available for questions.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Brown-Roberts.

I can tell you, so far looking at the submissions that we have, you know, when they say this should be set down, I think this should be set down. I just want to say that because this

| 1 | applicant has thrown in some things and I'm sure we can talk |
|----|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | about it, but they're not even required, and my hat is off to |
| 3 | the applicant. Hopefully, they are listening, and all the parties |
| 4 | involved, so I just wanted to start off with that. Whenever I |
| 5 | see something like that, I think that's very it doesn't |
| 6 | you don't have to ask the question about equity because it's |
| 7 | there. So I commend the Office of Planning, the city, or whoever |
| 8 | else is all involved with this project, the applicant and everyone |
| 9 | and the ANC as well. |
| 10 | So let me open it up for questions and comments. |
| 11 | Commissioner May. |
| 12 | COMMISSIONER MAY: I don't have any questions or |
| 13 | comments. I'm prepared to vote to set this down. |
| 14 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. And Commissioner Shapiro? |
| 15 | COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: I concur, Mr. Chair. |
| 16 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Commissioner Imamura? |
| 17 | COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: I'm in agreement, Mr. Chair. |
| 18 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. And Vice Chair Miller? |
| 19 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: I concur totally with your |
| 20 | comments, Chairman Hood about the what this project is offering |
| 21 | for the community and the city. Thank you, Maxine Roberts |
| 22 | Brown-Roberts for your report. |
| 23 | I guess I had one question. I should maybe notice. I |
| 24 | understand why you are not recommending that this site, the map |
| | |

25 as IZ Plus because this Southwest/Southeast planning area as you

stated has more than their fair share of affordable housing for the city. But what I don't know, off top of my head is what would be the difference? There seems to be a lot of affordable housing in this project. Would IZ Plus be requiring -- if it were IZ Plus would that require anything more than what they're already offering -- proposing in this project? I guess I just forget what IZ Plus requires. I thought it was double. there's a map amendment that's increasing the density, it was double the set aside, but maybe it's more than that. seems like this would be more than double the set aside anyway. MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Yes. And it, I mean, the number of units in addition to that, the affordability, it has a deeper level of affordability in this. VICE CHAIR MILLER: So IZ Plus would be deeper than what's being proposed in this case, you're saying? MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: No, what I'm saying is that I think that this is deeper than the IZ Plus.

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

VICE CHAIR MILLER: That's what I thought. So what is the -- I guess, then what is the harm? I understand why Southwest/Southeast planning area doesn't need IZ Plus map amendment because they're doing their fair share, like this case is providing which -- but what would be the harm in mapping it as IZ Plus if they're already doing what would meet IZ Plus?

MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Well, this has a RFP on it. On this site, there's an RFP, so I think it would be, you know,

1 | conflicting with that and ask them to do IZ Plus and then there
2 | is --

VICE CHAIR MILLER: If they're financing or something else, I mean, I guess I need more -- so when we get to the hearing, maybe I just need more information --

MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Okay.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: -- why it would make a difference if we didn't map it as IZ Plus since they seem to be meeting, by what they're proposing, both the set aside and the deeper affordability level what IZ Plus would require from the applicant or from OP. And there may be a logical reason why not to do it. I just wanted to understand that.

MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Okay. Yeah. We'll do -- we'll provide that information, yes.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you.

MS. STEINGASSER: Commissioner Miller, this is Jennifer Steingasser. I would just say we tried to be very consistent with how we review these regardless of ownership. So the site is either appropriate or inappropriate for IZ Plus. And in this case, because of the disproportionate amount of inclusionary zoning and affordable housing and deeply affordable housing in the overall area, it's not appropriate. So we would take that position just as a consistent application of our analysis, the regulation.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. So I understand that

| 1 | principle, so I just wanted to understand how it's being applied. |
|----|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | Thank you. |
| 3 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Any other questions or |
| 4 | comments for Ms. Brown-Roberts? |
| 5 | (No audible response.) |
| 6 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Well, thank you, Ms. Brown- |
| 7 | Roberts for your report |
| 8 | MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Thank you. |
| 9 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: and Ms. Steingasser opined, and |
| 10 | thank you, Vice Chair, for bringing that up. |
| 11 | So would somebody like to make a motion? |
| 12 | (No audible response.) |
| 13 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I think we are ready to set this |
| 14 | down. |
| 15 | COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chairman? |
| 16 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Sure. |
| 17 | COMMISSIONER MAY: I would move that the Zoning |
| 18 | Commission set down Case No. 21-17: Congress Park Community |
| 19 | Partners, LLC, map amendment at Square 5914. |
| 20 | COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Second. |
| 21 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. It has been moved and we have |
| 22 | a second. Any further discussion? |
| 23 | (No audible response.) |
| 24 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Not hearing any. |
| 25 | Ms. Schellin, would you do a roll call vote, please? |

| 1 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner May? |
|----|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. |
| 3 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Imamura? |
| 4 | COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes. |
| 5 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood? |
| 6 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes. |
| 7 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller? |
| 8 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes. |
| 9 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Shapiro? |
| 10 | COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Yes. |
| 11 | MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is 5-0-0 to set down Zoning |
| 12 | Commission Case No. 21-17 as a contested case. |
| 13 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Commissioners, I'm going to |
| 14 | need a 5-minute break, five minutes. So let's come back at 5:35, |
| 15 | it might be six minutes, but the time to come back is 5:35. Okay. |
| 16 | (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the |
| 17 | record and then resumed.) |
| 18 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So it's 5:35, we're all back. |
| 19 | Let's go to, I think, our last case. And do we also |
| 20 | have an item that I need to bring up and then we will have the |
| 21 | Office of Planning, will have a presentation for us, I believe |
| 22 | in that order. So let's go to our next case for hearing action, |
| 23 | it's Zoning Commission Case No. 21-18. This is the Dance Loft |
| 24 | Ventures, LLC, consolidated PUD and related map amendment at |
| 25 | Square 2704, and we'll go to Mr. Mordfin. |

MR. MORDFIN: Good evening, Mr. Chair and members of the Commission. This is Zoning Commission Case 21-18 for Dance LLC, PUD. The applicant is requesting a Loft Ventures, consolidated PUD with a PUD-related map amendment from the MU-3A to the MU-5A Zone to construct a mixed-use building in the 4600 block of 14th Street, Northwest, as you can see on the FLUM map as pointed out with the blue arrow. The building would include 101 apartments; two-thirds of which would be affordable at between 30 and 60 percent AMI. Twenty-four of those apartments would be three-bedroom units. New space for the Contemporary Ballet/Dance Loft on 14 would be provided allowing this nonprofit performing arts organization to remain on site, and approximately 1,900 square feet of new modern hotel space would be included.

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

The subject property is currently developed with oneand two-story commercial structures. Two areas of flexibility
are requested. One is to permit a related PUD map amendment from
the MU-3A to the MU-5A to permit additional building height, and
the other is to permit a reduction in onsite parking from 55 to
40 spaces. As a deeply affordable building, the family sized
units designed to achieve LEED Gold certification with a net zero
energy target including the use of solar panels and a green roof
with native plants, the proposal would be consistent -- can we
go to the next slide, please I'm sorry -- would be consistent
with the Future Land Use and Generalized Policy Maps. It would

further many of the citywide elements of the Comp Plan including land use, transportation, housing, environmental protection, urban design in arts and culture, and the Rock Creek East area elements. Should the Commission set this application down, OP recommends the applicant revise the flip-up door on 14th Street, modify the front elevation of the building to improve its appearance from the street, and identify the locations of the utility vaults. Therefore, OP recommends the Commission set the application down for public hearing and is available for questions. Thank you.

2.4

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Mr. Mordfin.

Let's see if we have any questions and comments. We appreciate your report. Commissioner May.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah. Mr. Mordfin, you know, we have information in the record from the applicant indicating that the ANC is not very happy about this. They have concerns about the size of the project. And when I look at some of the images of the project, it also has me concerned. We are going from --which zone was it? It was a from 5 -- I'm sorry, MU-3A to MU-5A with a PUD. And, you know, the growth of development potential that goes with that change is really very substantial. And granted, they're not maximizing it, right. They're not going in the 90-feetm, but they could theoretically, they're sticking at 66 feet.

I just -- FAR is not going all the way to 5 and change

this thing at 3.79. But still, I mean, 3.79 is three times what it's currently zoned for. And, you know, it's hard for me to reconcile this development with the designations of moderate density housing and moderate density commercial. So I'm -- I just, you know, given our recent or relatively recent experience, I don't know, over the last 5 years, 10 years, I don't know. was during it, I can't remember. I just feel uncomfortable with that much of an increase given the moderate density designation. Can you say anything to justify that further for us? 10 MR. MORDFIN: Well, it is recommended in the current Comp Plan for the mixed-use and does include moderate density 11 residential. And this does fit in with those recommendations of 12 13 that Comp Plan recommendation. And with the zoning, the applicant 14 has requested, which is moderate density zone, which includes moderate density residential is hard. It's also --15 16 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah. I mean, 5A is explicitly 17 included in the new Comp Plan as moderate? 18 MR. MORDFIN: Yes. I will double-check on that and 19 make sure. 20

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. I guess I should have checked the submissions more carefully to understand that as well. that I mean, that's something that makes me concerned about it. I'm not necessarily so concerned that I would not vote to set it down because clearly, it's a property that should be redeveloped. But I don't know that they're going to get all the way up to this

level of density given the nature of public feedback that I would expect at the hearing. And if it is not -- the MU-5A is not explicitly included within moderate density, and I mean, it doesn't seem like it would be at 90 feet, but I mean, I think I would have a problem with setting it down. I don't know. I'm interested in hearing what others have to say.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Shapiro.

2.

COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I actually don't have a lot to add. I'm happy to set this down. In terms -- Commissioner May, in terms of the level of density, I mean, we may get an earful about this. It feels appropriate for the location. I'm curious to see Mr. Mordfin confirming that this is a moderate density zone, but really, Mr. Chair, that's all. I don't have anything else to add.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Imamura, any questions or comments?

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: I'm a bit conflicted, Mr. Chairman. Obviously, you know, we have a shortage in housing stock, and we want to increase density where we can and where it makes sense. But I share Commissioner May's concerns generally about the massing of it and just sort of -- they did provide sort of a shade and shadow study in the winter solstice. And because of the height of the building, it completely shuts out some of the neighbors during that time from any sunlight at all. And so

certainly I have some concerns and reservations about that, but in general, those are my only comments, and no questions for Mr. Mordfin.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you.

Vice Chair Miller?

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

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and thank you, Mr. Mordfin for your report.

I support the set down of this case to keep Dance Loft in this location where they've been for a while, a long time, I I do share the concerns of my colleagues who mentioned concerns about the consistency with the Comprehensive Plan moderate density designation because this is one of those cases that seems that where we always -- the moderate density always seems to get us into a problematic or questionable area. you're proposing in here, five, four or five stories, hundred units, a lot of affordable units, which is great. So I think that we'll just need to see -- I support set down. I think we'll need to see a timely hearing how the consistency analysis is provided by both the Office of Planning and the applicant. And how public benefits may outweigh any potential inconsistencies, which I think there are a lot of public benefits here. not sure if I have any questions specifically for Mr. Mordfin. No, I don't think I have any specific question for Mr. Mordfin at this time, maybe when we get to the hearing, I will. just think -- I think we do need more information, amplification,

elaboration in the record as to how it meets the Comprehensive Plan.

2.

And I think when you do a racial equity analysis, which is a new requirement in the Comprehensive Plan, all the affordable housing emphasis in the new Comprehensive Plan, I think you can probably pass that threshold if there's any concern about any potential moderate density inconsistency, but I think that case needs to be made at the time of the hearing in our record further than what we have currently. So I look forward to seeing all of that and seeing this case move forward, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner May, let me ask you. Did you say that the ANC had opined on this? Did you say that, or did I not hear you correctly?

COMMISSIONER MAY: Not officially. We've heard only in the applicant's submission that the ANC had concerns about.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Okay. Okay. Yeah.

So I too share concerns, but stated, you know, I know we're trying to maintain an institution here, Dance Loft. I know what we're trying to do. But I really would be interested in seeing what the community opine. I would encourage the applicant to continue to work with the councilmember of Ward 4, as well as the community, because I think that's very important. As others have already mentioned going from MU-3A to MU-5A, we don't want to revisit some things that are actually still kind of going on

all those years, so we want to make sure we look at that.

2.

And I heard one of my colleagues, I think it was Commissioner Shapiro say, I forgot how he phrased it, we may get a lot of information back. We also may give some along with the community as we move forward. I forgot how you exactly worded it. But I think not only will we get it -- oh, you said, get an earful. We may get an earful and we may give an earful is what I wanted to say so, at least from what I see now. But I would encourage the applicant -- while I don't have a problem setting it down, to make sure they work vigorously with the communities. I'm very interested because it's right across the street, as you know, from another institution that has been dealt within the city for years.

Let's see if there are any follow up questions or comments.

COMMISSIONER MAY: I am just curious as to whether Mr. Mordfin found a specific reference, if he could confirm it.

MR. MORDFIN: Yes. So -- well, from moderate density residential, the definition of that is that it is used to define shopping and service areas that some are greater in scale and intensity than the low-density commercial areas; retail, office -- this is from the Comp Plan -- and service businesses are predominant uses. Areas with this designation range from small business districts that draw primarily from the surrounding neighborhoods to larger business district uses that draw from

broader market area. Buildings are larger and taller than those in the low-density commercial areas. And the density typically ranges from 2.5 to 4.0 with greater density possible when complying with inclusionary zoning or when through a planned unit development. And so the MU-5 through the MU-7 Zone Districts are consistent with the moderate density commercial category.

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

COMMISSIONER MAY: All right. Well, I still have anxiety about this, and I look forward to hearing it. And clearly, there's a majority in favor of setting it down, so I'll support set down at this moment but I'm -- again, I maintain a significant concern about this. And I think that, you know, we do have to be thinking about, you know, the impacts on the immediate neighbors. And I think that we will hear an earful -- we'll hear an earful from the ANC, but I'm expecting the neighbors to the south and north. Where they are in rowhouses now, they'll be looking out their backyards at this very large It's going to have an impact. We'll hear about it, so we'll see. Hopefully, the developer will work with the community and be able to resolve their concerns and offset, mitigate any major concerns, but we'll just have to see.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Again, I will echo Commissioner May's comments and link my comments because, again, the earful is not going to just come from the community, I think it will come from us as well. So let's see if we have any further questions and comments. If not, will somebody make a motion to

set this down or not set it down?

2.

COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Mr. Chair, actually, under continuing a discussion, it's just -- there is -- I'm noting the topography and the pretty -- it looks like a pretty significant slope, if I'm reading it correctly. So I'm not sure what to say. But I'm just thinking about some kind of deeper explanation of that, which helps us make sense of the light, the shadow study in relation to how the building height and how it's sloped down in the back. And I'm ready to make a motion, Mr. Chair, unless you want to see if there are other questions. So I move that we set down Zoning Commission Case No. 21-18, Dance Loft Ventures, LLC, consolidated PUD and related map amendment at Square 2704, and ask for a second.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'll second that motion. Forgive me, Commissioner Shapiro for doing that. I didn't want to unmute. I was lazy that time, so I'll second that.

It's been moved and properly seconded. Any further discussion?

VICE CHAIR MILLER: The only thing I would say, Mr. Chairman, in response of what Commissioner Shapiro and Commissioner May said about shadow -- and I think, Commissioner Imamura said about shadow impact. From what I read in the applicant's statement about what the ANC concerns were, they offered to reduce the height by one floor which might have affected the shadow. We'll hear about this at a hearing if we

| 1 | set this down. But they offered but apparently, that wasn't |
|----|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | enough because they weren't going to do enough setback in addition |
| 3 | to reducing a floor. So we'll hear about that, and we'll decide |
| 4 | what we decide based on what we hear. But there are a lot of |
| 5 | ways to mitigate any concerns that are there, and we'll hear |
| 6 | about that at a hearing if we set this down. |
| 7 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. We had a second. It's been |
| 8 | moved and properly seconded. Any further discussion? |
| 9 | (No audible response.) |
| 10 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Not hearing any. |
| 11 | Ms. Schellin, would you do a roll call vote, please? |
| 12 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Shapiro? |
| 13 | COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Yes. |
| 14 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood? |
| 15 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes. |
| 16 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller? |
| 17 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes. |
| 18 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner May? |
| 19 | COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. |
| 20 | MS. SCHELLIN: And who did I miss? I think I got |
| 21 | everybody. |
| 22 | COMMISSIONER MAY: Commissioner Imamura. |
| 23 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Imamura? |
| 24 | COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes. |
| 25 | MS. SCHELLIN: Sorry about that. |

1 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: It's all right. 2 MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is 5-0-0 to set down Zoning 3 Commission Case No. 21-18 as a contested case. CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. 4 5 I think that's it for decision and discussion of cases, 6 correct? 7 MS. SCHELLIN: Correspondence, yes. 8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Oh. Okay. Yeah. I'm going to 9 correspondence and then we'll go to Office of Planning's review 10 of their PowerPoint. 11 Commissioners, I sat on the case. I know we sit on 12 cases often, but this is the first one -- I'm not sure which Commissioner sat on the previous one. You may recall, former 13 Commissioner Gambrell. I think he's a former Commissioner or 14 maybe still a commissioner, but I'll just leave it at that. 15 16 He came with explaining to the BZA that we were not 17 calculating the full lot occupancy. We were making it less 18 restrictive. And this was -- I'll be frankly honest, when I 19 heard all of this and I remember talking about the building height 20 measuring point, BHMP, I thought I said, this is a case I wish 21 Commissioner May was on instead of me because I believe that --I know we've had these discussions. And you know, I stay in my 2.2 lane. I review and -- but I know we had an exhaustive discussion 23 on the building height measuring point. 24 25 Natural grade, whether the grade is built up. I know

we went through all of that. He, Mr. Gambrell, I'm hoping I'm phrasing this right, I know that I'll ask our legal folks to go. But I wanted to come back in front of us to make sure that the calculations and the way the BZA is doing it is correct. And what made me think about. We are also a customer service-oriented body, the way I look at it, as well. Even though we're -- but when somebody comes and said, look at something and I know, you know, people are on this. He's been on another -- other issues that have helped us -- when somebody says, I've asked -- mentioned this to you once before, I want to make sure we are right in our decision-making.

2.

So what I wanted to do is I'm asking the Office of Planning as well as Office of -- legal -- Office of Zoning Legal Division, I got to eventually learn that name, to opine and look at this. And I want to us to make sure that the way the BZA is articulating, or exercising is exactly that long discussion that we had. So I wanted to figure out how to get it back to us and I've been trying to figure that out. But I think right now, the Office of Planning and the Office of Zoning Legal Division is looking at it. Because what struck me was when he said, he -- this is the second time he or third time he's mentioned it to us. So I want to make sure that we also provide the customer service and then be able to explain of why we're doing it the way we're doing it in the BZA. So more to come on that. I don't have all the answers. Just bear with me. Just know that this

is coming. And I think not just this case, but any case when a resident or somebody who's using the regulations have concerns about some of our regulations as we've always said, I think we always need to revisit and make sure that we are applying them correctly. So that's the whole crux.

2.

Any questions for me? Vice Chair Miller?

VICE CHAIR MILLER: So maybe this would be an agenda item to add to our upcoming training session that we have with BZA and Zoning Commission colleagues with our OAG counsel just to talk about that issue.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Well, I would (indiscernible) the staff, because there are some legal requirements, because this is a live case, but I'm not necessarily going after the case.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. I didn't realize it was -
15 I didn't realize it was a live case.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah. I don't know if the order has been written. But I want to make sure that what we are applying to it is correct and when we're applying it.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. I didn't realize this was a live case, so --

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah. I would ask -- no. I think the case has been settled. I'm not sure the order has been written, but I would ask that Ms. Lovick -- and this is not just that one case, he has mentioned another case and another case. So when I'm hearing stuff like that, I think that we need to make

sure that we work along and make sure that everybody's on the same page. The public, us, the regulations, all of that and make sure that it's being interpreted and exercised correctly. That's all I'm trying to do here. So I think the best way -- I will leave the course of action, Vice Chair Miller, up to Ms. Lovick --

MS. SCHELLIN: And OP.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: -- of how to do it and OP, and also our Office of Zoning. And they will -- at the end of the day, I want it to come back here. So we can either validate or say no, this is the way it needs to be done.

MS. SCHELLIN: Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah. So because I would --

MS. SCHELLIN: Because I think he's made reference to maybe a definition being changed or something. So I think it does need to go to OP as Chairman Hood said.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So regardless of what the format -- I'm just trying to correct something, either correct it or leave it as it is. I don't know. If the way we have it is correct, let's leave it that way. But I wanted the five Commissioners: Commissioner May, especially Commissioner May because I remember us talking about the building height measuring point. Do you remember those conversations, Commissioner? We went on and on. So I want to make sure that we at least revisit it. And Commissioner Shapiro and Vice Chair Miller, you all were

there too. Commissioner Imamura, you're not going to be recused on this one. You're going to have to weigh on in this one too.

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Gladly.

2.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. So thank you all for your indulgence. Looking forward to when we can get that and Mr. -- I want Mr. Gambrell to know that we take his comments very seriously and that's where we are.

Okay. Ms. Schellin, I guess we're ready for Office of Planning. Do we need a 15-minute break or 20?

MS. SCHELLIN: They have made a PowerPoint presentation. I did email it to you, guys, just a little bit ago just in case you want your own copy, but they are going to do a PowerPoint presentation for you. And I just, as I said, sent it to him. So I believe Jennifer and Joel. Jennifer will let Mr. Young know if someone else needs to be pulled up.

MS. STEINGASSER: Good evening, Chairman Hood, Commissioners. This is Jennifer Steingasser with the Office of Planning.

I wanted this evening to go over our housing initiatives and talk to the zoning approach to housing and affordable housing and the work plan that is in front of the Development Review Division and the Office of Planning as it stems from other planning work and other government work, and so this is what this presentation is about. So let me find my -- so as you know, this week the Mayor, the Deputy Mayor, the

Director of the Office of Planning and the Interim Director of DHCD have been now talking about housing and affordable housing production citywide.

2.

Earlier this week, the Deputy Mayor and the Director of the Office of Planning were downtown talking about the opportunities for converting office buildings to residential and recognizing the challenges facing the office market with the historic levels of office vacancy in the CBD, the central business district. They've requested information on the challenges and opportunities facing these conversions from anybody who is willing to provide such information.

This morning, the Mayor, the Deputy Mayor and the Directors of OP and DHCD were in Chevy Chase with the release of the Rock Creek West Roadmap. The roadmap recognizes the unique housing context of Rock Creek West and its deficiency for the level of affordable housing and housing as identified through the Housing Equity Report. And it identified several near-term opportunities to significantly increase the supply of affordable housing and the tools that can be used to realize those opportunities, and obviously, zoning is one of those tools. Building on that, I want to present to the Commission the plan of zoning work that we plan to bring to the Commission during the next two years.

Next slide, please. So this slide represents the major umbrellas that will be working under the blue headings. I'm

sorry. I got multiple slides going here. The blue headings represent the bigger kind of umbrellas under which a lot of our work will be taking place. And looking at the -- I'm sorry. Hang on just a second.

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

So next slide, please. So looking at the IZ work, the Commission can remember -- may remember that the -- we've already done several major initiatives to amend and expand the inclusionary zoning regulations. We had a series of public hearings in 2016 and altered the median family income to adjust that to tender type -- tenure type, resident -- rental residential and home ownership. The Commission also expanded the IZ program to allow voluntary opt in, which made the bonuses and flexibility of the IZ program available to properties that were not otherwise required to participate in IZ. And we've had good luck with that expansion where people, especially in the lower density zones, have been struggling with some of the old historic lots that just aren't quite wide enough to develop under the current regs but can under the IZ regs.

Next slide, please. So, of course, recently, including just this evening, IZ Plus and IZ-XL are both new amendments that expanded the program geographically and by building type, and then the required level of the IZ set asides. The IZ-XL case was only completed with the final vote of approval this evening, so we're very excited about seeing how that moves forward.

Next slide, please. I'm sorry. Where are we? So

thankfully zoning becomes the next major initiative that we'll be working on, especially throughout the coming year. already started with the faith based. We've been working with the institutions and coordinating with the Deputy Mayor for Planning and Economic Development Office and the Mayor's Office of Religious Affairs on ways to encourage the faith-based institutions to provide affordable housing on their lands, many of which are often underutilized or used for parking. So this is an opportunity to work with those that especially have a mission-based initiative to provide affordable housing, and so we're working with them on ways, obviously, zoning will be part We anticipate bringing forward several map amendment cases to rezone lands consistent with the recent changes to the Future Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan. Most recently, the Commission set down the first case last month in November and we plan to bring forward more cases in February and March of this coming year.

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

Next slide, please. So regarding text amendments. There's policy language in the land use elements and the implementation elements that speaks directly to the issue of working with faith-based institutions. And working with their — those that have the mission to provide affordable housing and to encourage others to also provide affordable housing within this framework. We'll be bringing forward text amendments to allow options for the development of these properties. And we've

already started working on this by identifying and mapping all the properties across the District that are identified on the tax maps -- on the tax rolls as being either religious or faith based. We're looking at their context and their relationship to the Comprehensive Plan and the environment as they sit today. We anticipate bringing forward possibly three, at least, options. And those options will be one, which should allow for a matter of right type of development and then a higher degree of density would be through a special exception. And then we're also looking at the PUD regulations to providing flexibility in lot sizes for the larger projects in terms of density that may be coming forward. As the Commission may remember, we've had several where the Commission has had to waive the minimum land area to allow for some kind of affordable housing project, and so we'll be looking at that as part of this issue as well.

2.

Next slide, please. Also related to our work is the housing related zoning changes, and we're going to be continuing to work on the regulations regarding the RA-1 Zone. Obviously, we're also looking at alley lots and accessory dwellings, especially accessory dwellings and accessory buildings. This has become a little bit more complex than we anticipated. And so we'll be reviewing those regulations and bringing forward changes to the Commission in regards to that. We expect those amendments to come to the Zoning Commission in mid-2022. So the middle of next year, we hope to be bringing these text amendments to the

Commission.

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

Next slide, please. Obviously, the Future Land Use Map consistency cases, we'll be bringing forward several of those cases to the Zoning Commission. OP will be taking the lead in forward hopefully as rulemakings, bundling bringing these together many of the properties that are called out in the new FLUM, new Future Land Use Map. So in November of last -- of this year, last month, we've brought forward three already that the Commission has set down. The Lisner home in Ward 3 was one. A site in Ward 8 also got set down. And then a property on S Street Northwest, the Commission also set down. All three of those were initiated as Comprehensive Plan consistency cases through the future -- changes to the Future Land Use Map. Two more were set down this evening, both of which were based on changes to the Future Land Use Map, both the PUD and the map amendment on Alabama So in February, we expect to bring forward four more sites that will be along -- some of which will be along Benning Road and Minnesota Avenue. And those will be brought to the Commission as part of that work. And then in -- I'm sorry, in March, we also expect to bring forward more. Next slide, please. So these are the Future Land Use

Next slide, please. So these are the Future Land Use Map consistency. We've got to focus on Ward 7 in this coming year, moving -- bringing forward the comprehensive rezoning consistent with these -- also with these Future Land Use Map changes.

Next slide, please. So the Office of Planning is also working on several planning area studies, and this work will lead to zoning changes with a focus on opportunities for housing and affordable housing. And these are listed here and the estimated times that the zoning arm of the work would come to the Commission.

Next slide, please. So the Rock Creek West study and through the Housing Equity Report, the Mayor has set a goal for the Rock Creek West planning area to provide 1,900 additional affordable housing units by 2025. Obviously, this is the most challenging planning area in the District to get these affordable units. So the study for Rock Creek West includes what we're calling the Roadmap, which talks to the issue of how to get to these numbers through a combination of tools; one of which is zoning. The Chevy Chase small area plan, the Wisconsin Avenue and Connecticut Avenue development framework will all lead to zoning changes, which the Zoning Commission will be a part of when they get done.

Next slide, please. So the Roadmap recognizes, again the unique housing context of Rock Creek West and identifies several near-term opportunities. It identifies opportunity sites that could significantly increase the supply of affordable housing. There are also types of tools that could be used for these opportunities. And some of those tools -- most of those tools are outside of zoning. They, you know, use the Housing

Production Trust Fund, Low-Income Housing Tax Credits, different kinds of programs that are being established by the Mayor, and we'll get to in just a second. One of which is a faith-based opportunity, a request for applications that the Mayor announced this morning, that faith-based institutions or someone acting on their behalf can apply for a grant. It's a million-dollar program. They are looking for ten type -- ten different properties. And they -- this would help establish predevelopment soft costs and cover that kind of application of that early pre-development work to help the faith based look at their properties. I've also put the link to the Rock Creek West Roadmap so that if you would like to spend some time looking at that.

Next slide, please. The Chevy Chase Small Area Plan is also a small area plan that the Office of Planning has been coordinating with the community over the last year. It also identifies some opportunity areas, the most notable of which is this. This is one that shown as striped in the upper corner and highlighted in pink. That's the Chevy Chase Community Center and library site. And that is the site where the city is looking at doing a mixed-use -- redevelopment of those two facilities and a mixed-use with residential above. So that will also, of course, required zoning changes that will be coming to the Zoning Commission.

And then -- next slide, please. And the Armed Forces Retirement Home. This is going to be a very large project. It's

a 272-acre campus. It sits on the Ward 1, Ward 5 border. And it's also a historic district and it has a hundred buildings and ancillary structures. Approximately 4.3 million square feet of new development is anticipated for the site. The site has been in federal ownership and use, and therefore, has been unzoned. So initial zoning will be coming to the Zoning Commission in the coming year. It has a master plan that has been through coordination with the city and with National Capital Planning Commission because of its kind of hybrid of federal local status. So the development will be consistent with --

2.

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I think we lost Ms. Steingasser.
12 She'll join us in a moment.

MS. STEINGASSER: -- highlight the work program as it's coming forward in the next couple years. The Zoning Commission has done a lot of critical citywide housing adjustments already. And now, we were at a time of applying changes to areas and sites consistent with the Comp Plan and recent changes. I'm going to use a quote from the Deputy Mayor for Planning and Economic Development this morning, who said the reason why we need a Roadmap is because we have to have some intentionality. And I think that word intentionality is really important and kind of highlights how all this works -- going to be fitting together to both address housing and affordable housing consistent with the Comp Plan and the small area plans. And with that, that's all I have. I'm happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Steingasser. We appreciate the report of the Office of Planning. Even though there was a minute there, we lost you for about 15 seconds, but I think --

MS. STEINGASSER: Oh.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: -- you filled right in, so we just waited those 15 seconds. And I'm sure it's something that whatever was said in between that time, I'm sure we will be able to recover it as we move through this process.

I'm going to start off. I just have one question. When we did ZR16 after 9 years or 10 years, I can't remember how long it took us, but I know we did an exhaustive -- an exhaustive outreach and no sooner than we finished, one of the Baptist ministers in the city came to me and said, "Hood, we didn't do this, and we didn't do that. We didn't outreach. We didn't know about this; we didn't know about that," and I understand.

So that, to me, when I heard that, I'm thinking about, you know, dealing with the faith based. And not just the Baptist ministers, but all the clergy. I'm thinking about the balance and leveling of the playing field. So what I would also ask, Ms. Steingasser, and I'm not sure what the outreach is going to be, since that group came to me after nine years. And my question to them was, we've spent nine years working on this and doing outreach, where have you all been? So he said I was tough on him. So I would like for us to -- if we could and I'm not just

saying them, but all of the clergy and all the different 1 denominations, and especially the Baptist ministers who meet in Ward 7 every first -- every Monday. And I know Reverend Toogood (ph.) is the first vice president, he'll be the president. Lionel Edmonds, I think is the president. can't remember. when we're presenting, I would like for us at least stop by that group.

> MS. STEINGASSER: Okay.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Are they already on board?

MS. STEINGASSER: I'm sorry. I'm having hear --I'm going to turn off my video so maybe I can hear problems. better.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

14 MS. STEINGASSER: Okay.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Can you hear now, Ms. Steingasser?

16 MS. STEINGASSER: Yes, sir.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I was just wondering if the ministers conference that meets in Wards -- it's actually Maryland, the DMV, the ministers that meet over there in Ward 7. I was wondering if they were on board, and if not, is there a way we can also reach out to them and maybe explain the program. Even if they're not involved in -- so we can explain the program to them so they will be in tune. So I know you -- I heard you say that you're working with -- I think Ward 7 and -- Ward 6 and 7 clergy or ministers and the faith based. It would be good to

go not just that organization, but all organizations and explain the process. Is that the intentionality of what we're going --

2.

MS. STEINGASSER: That is exactly the intentionality. There is a staff at the Deputy Mayor's for Planning and Economic Development, who is focused on the faith-based community as well as the Mayor's Office of Religious Affairs. And we're -- we work -- we're working and coordinating with those offices to make sure that it is a broad citywide outreach not just focused on one ward or another ward, but that it is broad and, you know, citywide, so yes.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Well, I think that answers my question. I'm sure the Mayor's Religious Affairs director is on it. I'm sure he knows about the Baptist ministers. And not just the Baptist ministers, I'm talking about all clergy. But I just know specifically in that case, the Baptist ministers came to me after nine years and I was telling them, you know, where you all have been for nine years. We've been outreaching and outreaching and outreaching. And I know a lot of them, so that's why I kind of went back at them to get engaged. So I'm glad to know that we're already doing that, so I'm glad --

MS. STEINGASSER: We've also been working with Enterprise, which has a strong faith-based coalition and been to a couple different sessions with them. And it just the onsite -- it's fascinating to hear the churches talk about themselves

and the business structure of each of the denominations and the history of it through the sites and it's very interesting to see their challenges. So yes, we are definitely trying to make sure that we do a broad reach.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And I don't think, Ms. Steingasser this goes back to the discussion that the Commission had earlier, new ways of doing things, people attending church different ways, they're doing different things. The younger people are going to mega churches. So again, a lot of churches now have gotten into development because they are trying to offset their tithes and offerings and donations that they get. So I think this is good. It's a great program. I'm looking forward to more of what you presented. I think you all did an excellent PowerPoint. And now it's time for us to put the pedal to the metal and keep it going, so thank you.

MS. STEINGASSER: Yes, sir.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Any other questions or comments?

Commissioner May, Commissioner Shapiro, Commissioner Imamura, and

Vice Chair Miller?

VICE CHAIR MILLER: You know, I will not resist the game on affordable housing. So thank you to the Office of Planning, to Mayor Bowser, to the Deputy Mayor Falcicchio, and our departing Office of Planning Director, Andrew Trueblood. I want to take this opportunity to say thank you, Director Trueblood for all your work the last three years, somewhere in there, you

can correct me on that timeline. But it's been a pleasure working with you and receiving all of your reports, your team's reports, and your efforts on behalf of the Bowser administration to advance affordable housing in the city.

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

I'm obviously a little biased being a mayoral appointee to the Zoning Commission, but there have been a lot of efforts. And we look forward to the future cases that you've laid out here tonight that we're going to hear coming forward for expansion of opportunities for affordable housing by faith-based institutions. We had a faith-based institution that came forward tonight that we took final action on. Without your support, I mean, without your whatever's financial incentive support that may be proposed in a future case. I mean, those are important opportunities for affordable housing. We need to look for them everywhere, so we appreciate all of that effort. So that's really all I wanted to Chairman, that it's a collective effort. challenge for all cities around the United States, especially high demand cities like Washington, D.C., where people want to live and so that drives the housing prices up. So we need to look for ways to increase opportunities for -- to increase affordable housing.

So I look forward to all of the efforts coming to fruition as soon as possible. The Roadmap for Rock Creek Park West, where I happen to be living. So that's it. I will help. I welcome affordable housing units everywhere, especially in my

own neighborhood, which needs more. So thank you for that report, 1 2. and we look forward to the future progress on this effort. CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Vice Chair. 3 4 Ms. Steingasser, when is Mr. Trueblood leaving? 5 leaving the end of January or is it the end of December? 6 MS. STEINGASSER: It's the end of December. Yes, sir. 7 Yes. 8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: If you could pass on our comments. We thank him for all his diligent work. I know all the time in 9 10 these positions, you don't always get a lot of smiles and a lot of handshakes, a lot of congratulatory remarks, but I think that 11 12 the things that he had put in place with his team and OP, well, the city will benefit tremendously for years to come. So he will 13 14 leave his impact and we will benefit for years to come. So if you can pass on our congratulatory to him as he move forward in 15 16 his future endeavors and as we thank him for what he's done to 17 the city. So if you can pass that on to him, we appreciate it. MS. STEINGASSER: Yes. I will. Thank you. Yeah. He 18 has done an enormous amount of positive work in a very short 19 20 time. 21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Right. Right. So thank you --22 thank him for us and thank you and the whole team for holding up 23 the banner, because I'm sure you all will be doing that. 24 So I will ask any other questions, follow up questions 25 or comments?

(No audible response.)

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

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Ms. Schellin, do we have anything And thank you Office of Planning for that presentation. Looking forward to seeing some -- and I want to thank you all And I thought about after I spoke to this for indulging me. minister about our ZR16 for an hour and a half, I remember thinking okay, I passed this person on, who's a guy I know, passed him on I think to you, Ms. Schellin, for the next hour and a half, because it was a total of three hours. Just know that there's a lot of time that goes into it. And I thank the staff, Ms. Schellin and Ms. Bardin. It was one of you all, I passed him on to so, and I said that publicly, but anyway. But the deal is we want to make sure that everyone has the information needed so they can figure out how they can best utilize. And again, as the Vice Chair said, we want to thank all those; the Mayor and her team and Office of Planning and the residents, all for what they do because it makes a better city for all of us.

All right. So Ms. Schellin, do we have anything else on the agenda for tonight?

MS. SCHELLIN: Nothing else.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Let me see. The Zoning Commission will meet again, I think -- I think this is our last meeting for the year.

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: December the 20th, and we have two

| 1 | cases for well, it's the same applicant but it's two different |
|----|----------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | cases. |
| 3 | MS. SCHELLIN: They'll be heard together, so it's |
| 4 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: It will be heard just as one case? |
| 5 | MS. SCHELLIN: Yeah. |
| 6 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So we will hear 16-02C and |
| 7 | 16-02D; H&A DCU JV, LLC on this coming Monday on these same |
| 8 | platforms. So I want to thank everyone for their participation |
| 9 | tonight. Unless I hear from my other colleagues, this meeting |
| 10 | is adjourned. Good night, everyone and thank you. |
| 11 | (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the |
| 12 | record at 6:13 p.m.) |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |

$\texttt{C} \ \texttt{E} \ \texttt{R} \ \texttt{T} \ \texttt{I} \ \texttt{F} \ \texttt{I} \ \texttt{C} \ \texttt{A} \ \texttt{T} \ \texttt{E}$

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Public Hearing

Before: DCZC

Date: 12-16-21

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