GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

REGULAR PUBLIC

MEETING

THURSDAY

DECEMBER 15, 2022

+ + + + +

The Regular Public Hearing of the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened via teleconference, pursuant to notice at 4:00 p.m. EDT, Anthony Hood, Chairperson, presiding.

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

SHARON SCHELLIN, Secretary
PAUL YOUNG, Zoning Data Specialist

OFFICE OF ZONING LEGAL DIVISION STAFF PRESENT:

JACOB RITTING, ESQUIRE HILLARY LOVICK, ESQUIRE DENNIS LIU, ESQUIRE

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Regular Public Hearing held on December 15, 2022

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

Preliminary Matters Sharon Schellin 4
Case No. 20-06B Felice Development Group6
Case No. 22-17 Wisco Wally, LLC10
Case Nos. 08-07K/08-07L Four Points Development, LLC
Case No. 14-12G EAJ 1309 East 5th Street, LLC
Case No. 19-22A MR 622 Eye Street Land, LLC
Case No. 22-06 801 Maine Avenue S.W. PJC, LLC
Case No. 22-09 MCF Heritage 1700, LLC
Case No. 22-11 MCRT Investments, LLC
Case No. 22-19 Mcdonald's Corporation
Case No. 22-33 Application of 501 K Street Property Owner, LLC
OP Report Jennifer Steingasser
Adjourned 110

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

2 (4:00 p.m.)

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. We are convening and broadcasting this public meeting by video conferencing. My name is Anthony Hood. Joining me are Vice Chair Miller, Commissioner May, and Commissioner Imamura. We're also joined by the Office of Zoning staff, Ms. Sharon Schellin, as well as Mr. Paul Young, who will be handling all of our virtual operations, as well as the Office of Zoning's legal division, I think we have all of our counsel here, Ms. Lovick, Mr. Ritting, and Mr. Lie.

I will ask all others to introduce themselves at the appropriate time. Copies of today's meeting agenda are available on the Office of Zoning's website. Please be advised this proceeding's being recorded by a court reporter and is also webcast live Webex and YouTube Live. The video will be available on the Office of Zoning's website after the meeting.

Accordingly, all those listening on Webex or by phone will be muted during the meeting unless the Commission suggests otherwise. For hearing action items, the only documents before us this evening are the application, the ANC setdown report, and the Office of Planning report. All other documents in the record will be reviewed at the time of the hearing. Again, we do not take any public testimony at our meetings unless the Commission makes a request otherwise.

If you experience difficulty accessing Webex or with 1 2 your phone call-in, then please call our OZ Hotline Number, 202-727-0789 for Webex, login, or call-in instructions. 3 At this time, does the staff have any preliminary 4 5 matters? 6 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir, I have one. And that is for 7 the Commission to vote on closed meetings for 2023, if you would. 8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Ms. Schellin, did you send 9 it to me? 10 MS. SCHELLIN: I did. I emailed it to you. CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Give me one second. 11 I'm 12 I didn't see that. I knew you were saying you was going 13 to send it. That was the last I dealt with it. So give me one 14 moment. Okay. There it is. All right. In accordance with 15 405(c) of the Open Meetings Act, D.C. Official Code 2-575(c), I 16 move that the Zoning Commission hold closed meetings on each 17 Monday and Thursday that is scheduled to hold a public meeting 18 or public hearing for the calendar year of 2023. The closed 19 meetings will begin at 3:15 p.m. and are for the purpose of 20 obtaining legal advice from our counsel on all cases and to 21 deliberate upon, but not voting on, the contested cases scheduled 22 on the Commission's agendas. Is there a second? 23 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Second. 24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Will the secretary please take a 25 roll call vote on the motion before us now that it has been HUNT REPORTING COMPANY Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia

> 410-766-HUNT (4868) 1-800-950-DEPO (3376)

1 second? 2 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Mr. May had a question. CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Question, Commissioner May? 3 4 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah. I'm sorry, I -- your motion 5 is for closed meetings on every Monday and Thursday when there 6 are hearings and meetings? 7 MS. SCHELLIN: It's for every meeting and if we need 8 them for a hearing. So we're already voting on it because there 9 were times -- this started when Alan Bergstein was here, that way 10 if you guys need to have one before a hearing, you can do it. COMMISSIONER MAY: Oh, okay. I didn't realize that we 11 12 had set it up that way because we don't typically do them before 13 hearings. 14 MS. SCHELLIN: This is our third year. Yeah. COMMISSIONER MAY: I did not realize that. 15 16 MS. SCHELLIN: Yep. 17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: It's in there just to cover us. 18 MS. SCHELLIN: Just in case. 19 COMMISSIONER MAY: I get it. I get it. 20 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: But I will tell you that I stuttered 21 when I read it because I was like wait a minute, but anyway, it 22 works. So it's been moved and seconded. All right. At this 23 time we'd asked Ms. Schellin to do a roll call vote please. 24 MS. SCHELLIN: Chairman Hood? 25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes. HUNT REPORTING COMPANY Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia 410-766-HUNT (4868)

1-800-950-DEPO (3376)

MS. SCHELLIN: Vice Chair Miller? 1 2 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes. MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner May. 3 COMMISSIONER MAY: 4 Yes. MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Imamura? 5 6 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes. 7 MS. SCHELLIN: The vote carries four to zero to one, 8 the third mayoral appointee position being vacant. Thank you. 9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Give me one moment please. 10 (Pause.) 11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. If nothing else, we'll move right on with our agenda. Let me call under consent calendar 12 13 item, we have deliberations and modification of consequence, 14 Zoning Commission Case No. 20-06B. 15 Ms. Schellin? 16 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. On this case at the October 17 27th meeting, the Commission determined this was, in fact, a 18 modification of consequence and asked for some further 19 submissions. At Exhibits 14 and 15 the Applicant submitted a 20 supplemental statement, and at Exhibit 16 there's an OP report. 21 And so this is ready for the Commission to deliberate on. 22 you. CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. Let me just say at our 23 2022 meeting The Commission determined 24 October 27th. 25 application was a modification of consequence as already stated HUNT REPORTING COMPANY Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia 410-766-HUNT (4868)

1-800-950-DEPO (3376)

and asked for another supplemental submissions from the Applicant to clarify various concerns raised by OP and ANC 6B. The Applicant agreed to all of the ANC 6B's mitigation measures, which talks about increasing long-term residential cargo, tandem sized bicycle parking spaces, installing electrical conduit to provide approximately 47 EVs, and it goes on, flexibility in the final order. And then it talked about shifting of theoretical lot lines, shifting ground level PUD boundaries, shift the below grade PUD boundary, increase in vehicle -- and I'm just reading the topics, as my colleagues know -- and increase in bicycle parking as is already stated. And that's kind of (indiscernible) And then we have a summary of the modifications as requested, as I stated, expanding the below grade boundary, a reduction in the eastern side yard, modification of consolidated PUD, increasing the number of vehicle parking spaces as noted, increase the number of long-term bicycle parking spaces in the east tower from 163 to 167, and also increase the number of shortterm bicycle parking spaces, shifting the theoretical -- as I mentioned -- modification of PUD to provide 14, and correction of the IZ calculations for consolidated PUD and the revised transportation demand management plan, well as the programmatic design changes within the flexibility. And that's all laid out. So those are some of the changes. I'm not sure who asked for what, but let me open it up for any question or comments.

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?

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah, I appreciate the recap of all of that. And I think -- and this is -- there's a lot that went on with this modification of consequence. And I appreciate the Applicant going ahead and meeting with the ANC and the ANC's, I think, very thoughtful suggestions on further improvements to the modification. So I mean, I think it's basically all the concerns that we had have been worked out and I really appreciate getting to this result and feeling like we can support this with confidence. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And let me just add, as we know DDOT did have submissions and they had additional modifications. And I think all that has been agreed to from the DDOT report, which is Exhibit 7.

Anything else, anybody?

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes?

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: While, I wasn't here for the hearing at the -- late October, I did read into the record, and I'd underscore there are a lot of moving parts here, but it does appear that everybody's reached an alignment, if you will. So I'm prepared to move forward.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Great. I should do that first.

Vice Chair Miller?

1	VICE CHAIR MILLER: And I concur, Mr. Chairman, with
2	your comments and those of Commissioner May. I agree with all
3	the and appreciate all the Applicant's condition and
4	conditions in response to the ANC 6B's mitigation concerns. So
5	ready to move forward.
6	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. And Commissioner
7	Imamura will be participating, he has reviewed the record.
8	So with that I would move approval of the modification
9	of consequence as noted and specified in the case file of Zoning
10	Commission Case No. 20-06B Felice Development Group, PUD
11	modification of consequence at Square 1048S, and ask for a second.
12	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Second.
13	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Been moved and properly second. Any
14	further discussion? Not hearing any, Ms. Schellin, would you do
15	a roll call vote please?
16	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood?
17	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.
18	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller?
19	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.
20	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Imamura?
21	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.
22	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner May?
23	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
24	MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is four to zero to one to
25	approve final action Zoning Commission Case No. 20-06B, the minus HUNT REPORTING COMPANY Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia 410-766-HUNT (4868) 1-800-950-DEPO (3376)

one being the third mayoral appointee position which is vacant.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Now we are in the final action. Zoning Commissioner Case No. 22-17 Wisco Wally, hopefully I pronounced all that right, LLC, map amendment at Square 1913.

Ms. Schellin?

MS. SCHELLIN: I'm sorry. At Exhibit 34, there's a letter in opposition from Scott Jakyl (phonetic). Exhibit 37, a request to reopen the record from a group of neighbors was received and approved by the chairman, and their letter in opposition was placed in the record at Exhibit 37A. Exhibit 38 is the Applicant's draft order. Exhibit 39, the Applicant's response to the group of neighbors in opposition. And at Exhibit 39 there's an in NCPC report stating that the project is exempt from review per Chapter 8 NCPC's submission guidelines. So this case is ready for the Commission to consider final action. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Schellin for (indiscernible). I'm not going to be redundant and repeat all that. I appreciate it. But I also want to acknowledge that, as Ms. Schellin said, there's opposition to this proposal, which is now part of the permanent record. Also I want to reiterate that IZ Plus will apply to the map amendment, and its overall consistency with the plan, notably its potential to increase housing and affordable housing. Before we start getting into HUNT REPORTING COMPANY

that, I do want to -- I was very disturbed after dealing with this. And let me apologize for any confusion. We all -- that's why the record was open. But I have some problems with some information I received from one of the folks in opposition. I want to tell neighborhoods, be careful of who you get to represent you. I want to, first of all, apologize to Ms. Ella J. Ackerman. And I hope, Ms. Schellin, you will pass this on. I'm sorry the way the public talked to her in saying that she has a S-H-I-T job. I don't appreciate that. I think my 10 colleagues and I all agree -- and I think residents of this city, we are more -- we can disagree, but we should be respectful to 11 12 tell her that she needs to gain decency and do something good 13 for the city, that hopefully that she would leave this S-H-I-T 14 job -- and I'm putting this on the record for her and I hope 15 she's listening. I don't make -- she doesn't make any money, that I am not doing any good -- she's not doing any good here in 16 17 this position, and her salary's basically nothing. What a way 18 to talk to a public servant. And I will tell all those people who have that petition next time find somebody better to represent 19 you. And yes, Anthony Hood said it. We're not going to -- this 20 21 Commission's not going to let nobody just call our staff and blow 22 and downgrade them when they're doing the best they can and we all do the best we can for the interest of this city. So with 23 that, Ms. Schellin, thank you. I just -- could you pass that on 24 to Ms. Ackerman, please? Thank you. 25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

MS. SCHELLIN: I will.

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: And I apologize for that person, so.

Okay. Let me open it up, let me turn to my colleagues,

whoever'd like to go first. I'm just going to see who --

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Vice Chair Miller?

VICE CHAIR MILLER: As I indicated at the hearing, this is in my neighborhood. It's about three blocks away. And I acknowledge that you have the letters of opposition that have come in from some of the neighbors. I just would note that it's the ANC 3C supported this application, as I do, and don't agree with the concerns that have been expressed by those in opposition.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

Commissioner May, I think I saw your hand too.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah. I just want to say it's -you know, it's unfortunate that we didn't have a couple of items that were the opposition letters that entered into the record late, it's unfortunate we didn't have those before the meeting, but I understand that there was, you know, the folks who were in opposition already were engaged. And I don't fully understand exactly why they could not join the hearing on the day of because apparently they were ware of the day of, and we would have benefited from hearing from them at that time. That being said, excuse for the mistreatment that that's no the Chairman referenced before of the staff of the Zoning Commissioner. Wе

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

-- I think this is probably the first time I've really heard a substantive complaint about the Zoning Commission staff for the most part. We hear great compliments about how the staff tries to help the people who are interested in the cases that come before us. So it's a very unfortunate incident. And in terms of the merits of the case, I think the concerns in the opposition are not of great concern to me. And I think that the Applicant has made the case, the ANC's in support, as the Vice Chair said, and so I'm ready to support this.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And I think, Commissioner Imamura, you did read the record, I believe?

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: I did, yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I did read into the record for this as well. And I don't think I have anything additional to add, but I agree with the comments of my colleagues, as well as your -- share in your disappointment the event that took place with OZ staff. Public servants who work on behalf of the residents of this District, I think deserve a great applause. But I'm prepared to move forward.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. And I would also add, I agree with all my colleagues' comments. I would also add the racial equity lens in this case I think is very superior. While I know that we are filling a need in an area that definitely needs it. So I will also be voting in support of this application. I think we covered everything. And also the letters in opposition, I think we pretty much discussed there was some information that

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

1	we looked at, but I don't think it swayed me enough that it could
2	not be mitigated. But I think we pretty much discussed a lot of
3	some of the issues that were very germane to the whole area. So
4	I would leave it at that and ask maybe somebody else make a
5	motion, I wasn't going to say going to approve somebody make
6	a motion to approve or disapprove.
7	COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chairman, I would make a motion
8	that we approve Zoning Commission Case take final action to
9	approve Zoning Commission Case No. 22-17, Wisco Wally, LLC, map
10	amendment at Square 1913.
11	VICE CHAIR MILLER: And I would second that. And is
12	this the map amendment has IZ Plus, as you've noted? Yeah,
13	so just to reiterate that.
14	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
15	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.
16	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes. So it's been moved and properly
17	second. Any further discussion? Not hearing any, Ms. Schellin,
18	would you do a roll call vote please?
19	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner May?
20	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
21	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller?
22	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.
23	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood?
24	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.
25	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Imamura? HUNT REPORTING COMPANY Court Reporting and Litigation Support
	Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia 410-766-HUNT (4868)

1-800-950-DEPO (3376)

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.

MS. SCHELLIN: The vote's four to zero to one to approve final action Zoning Commission Case No. 22-17. The minus one being the third mayoral appointee position which is vacant.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So I have two -- I think I can do both of -- I'm going to call these two cases both together and I think I've been advised by counsel I can do them both together, even though one requires a waiver and one doesn't. But let me just try it this way. Zoning Commission Case No. 08-07K, Four Points Development, LLC, two-year PUD time extension for Building 1 at Square 5785. This one needs a waiver. The next one is Zoning Commissioner Case No. 08-07L, Four Points Development, LLC, two-year PUD time extension for Building 6 and 8, at Square 5772 and 5783. This one does not need a waiver.

So Ms. Schellin, you want to work on the first one first and then do the second one?

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. So on the 08-07K, the Applicant's requesting a two-year PUD time extension stating good cause being because of litigation involving Building 4, negotiating with OFCO and the D.C. Council regarding tax incremental financing for Buildings 4, 5, and 8 in COVID-19. In addition, the Applicant has requested a waiver which is needed to approve this time extension as it is the third request and per the regulations that limits the extensions to two, with the second one being only for one year. Exhibit 7, you have an OP report in support of the HUNT REPORTING COMPANY

waiver and the extension, and as of today, ANC 8A has not responded, but the time period for doing so has expired.

With regard to 08-07L, the Applicant's requesting again a two-year PUD time extension stating good cause being a lot of what was previously discussed in the prior case, but specifically for Building 8. It is now in a historic district and the Applicant needs time to work with HPO. With respect to Building 6 and 7, they're currently occupied with office tenants and because of the pandemic, the market is unpredictable and the Applicant prefers to leave the current tenants in place until the market improves. Exhibit 6 is an OP report in support of the extension, and as of today again ANC 8A has not responded. But again, the time period for doing so has expired. And the Commission may proceed forward if it chooses to do so. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Let me first see if anyone has any issues to -- let's talk about the waiver issue first, Subtitle Z 705.5. I like to always call it the Herb Franklin rule, and that's one of the things that we talked about for years about. I think for me and I think the African -- but let me see, does anybody have a problem with waiving the rule? Let's talk about that. I know it's hard, but.

Commissioner May?

COMMISSIONER MAY: I am just very pleased to know that you will always cite the Herb Franklin rule. I was thinking HUNT REPORTING COMPANY

about placing a wager on that with my fellow Commissioners in advance of this meeting to see if I could win some money. I probably -- they probably wouldn't have voted against me. But yes, I -- there are some really extenuating circumstances in this case, and I feel like it's completely appropriate to waive the rule in this circumstance and grant an extension. And I'll save the speech about whether we should pull the plug, because I just don't think that's appropriate at this point.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Anyone else want to comment on the waiver?

VICE CHAIR MILLER: I think good cause has been demonstrated here, Mr. Chairman, as Mr. May and you have said.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

And Commissioner Imamura, any comments?

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: I would only echo that these are extraordinary times. Generally, I you know, time extensions I have -- give me a little bit of pause. But I think in this case, it certainly -- certainly could do so.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I'm sorry. I thought you -- I'm getting a kind of late -- it's better, so don't touch anything. So it's getting better. So on that case, we will provide the waiver. And that's not some -- that's a hard threshold. But I think, as my colleagues have stated, this is different times. I appreciate that Commissioner Imamura, because it is different times. When we wrote that rule we wouldn't have HUNT REPORTING COMPANY

never expected some of the things that have happened.

Okay. Let's talk about the merits of the first one, 08-07. The other one does not need a waiver. So any comments on that? The good cause, I think Vice Chair's already mentioned, the good cause, talking about litigation. I think they talked about incremental financing, dealing with things with the D.C. Council. And a lot of things got slowed up, especially due to COVID. And I know they had a COVID time as well. That didn't count towards this, as noted. And also materials in these cases is starting to be harder for people to get. They weren't even making cars, but, so I think these circumstances here warrant that request to -- I think it was the November 22nd, 2024.

Anybody else on the first one, anything else?

Okay. Let's go to the second one. Any comments on the second one?

Okay. I think that those comments would go for both with the exception of the waiver. So with that, let me make the motion since it's two. We will remove time extensions as prescribed in both cases on the Zoning Commission Case No. 08-07K as well as include the waiver in that case, as well as Zoning Commission Case No. 08-07L which does not have a waiver, and ask for a second.

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Second.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Been moved and property second. Any further discussion?

1	Not hearing, Ms. Schellin, would you do a roll call
2	vote please?
3	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Before I do the roll call, I do
4	want to point out that the on Item B, staff left out Building
5	7. So it includes Building 6, 7, and 8. I just want to make
6	that correction on the
7	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So let me I was making a motion,
8	I will accept the corrections, 6, 7, and 8, and the person who
9	second it will accept it I believe. And so
10	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner yeah, Commissioner
11	Imamura.
12	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Commissioner Imamura, okay.
13	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.
14	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And Ms. Schellin, could you now do
15	a roll call vote with the correction?
16	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.
17	Commissioner Hood?
18	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.
19	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Imamura?
20	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.
21	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller?
22	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.
23	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner May?
24	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
25	MS. SCHELLIN: Vote's four to zero to one to approve HUNT REPORTING COMPANY Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia 410-766-HUNT (4868) 1-800-950-DEPO (3376)

final action in Zoning Commission Case Nos. 08-07K approving the extension and the waiver, in 08-07L approving the extension as requested. The minus one being the third mayoral appointee which is vacant. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Our next case under final action, Zoning Commission Case No. 14-12G, EAJ 1309 5th Street, LLC, two-year PUD time extension at Square 3591. We also have a waiver request here as well.

Ms. Schellin?

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. The Applicant's requesting a two-year PUD time extension as stated. Their good cause has been stated as economic changes, financing difficulties, and construction challenges. As you stated, they are requesting a waiver. It's needed to approve this extension. It is their third request. So again, per the regulations to be in the max with the second one being for one year. Exhibit 6 is an OP report in support of the waiver and the extension. And ANC 5G submitted a report today in support, so we'd ask the Commission to consider moving forward with final action today.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Schellin.

Okay. Colleagues, you've heard the requests again of Subtitle Z 705.5 in this case, the waiver, which we should -- time extension the waiver, which allows only two time extensions for an approved PUD and limit the second time extension to one year. That's necessary for us to do this for the third time. So

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

let me hear what my colleagues have to say on this.

Commissioner May?

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: Yeah. Unlike the last one, I'm not feeling so good about this one. Now, you know, I appreciate the fact that we, you know, we got a late breaking letter from the ANC in support. And I certainly understand the challenges that the Applicant is facing in trying to get this project built. But I have to say, I'm not surprised that they're facing these challenges. I mean, some of them are, you know, the challenges that are common to so many projects nowadays, you know, having to deal with the pandemic and its aftermath, interest rates, supply chain, construction issue -- you know, construction supply issues that can affect how a project might be built. But I -you know, from the very beginning, I was very concerned about the prospects that a movie theater and office building on top of the union market building was a viable project. I just -- I, you know, I'm not convinced of this. Now, I mean, I guess I could go along with an extension at this point, but at a certain point, the assessment should not be well, how do we get this financed or how can we try to move ahead, it's whether they should be moving ahead. And maybe they just need this time to figure out whether in fact they should be moving ahead or whether they need to reimagine what this project should be. But I just -- I have very little confidence that what was originally approved is ever going to get built.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

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

Anyone else? Vice Chair Miller?

VICE CHAIR MILLER: I would concur with Commissioner I didn't have the initial skepticism whenever May's comments. this was originally approved about the office and theater -movie theater market. But I certainly do today, and I think everyone in the nation does and maybe around the world. So I agree with OP and the ANC that there's been good cause demonstrated and a good faith effort has been made by the Applicant to try to achieve this diversity of uses in this union market neighborhood. But I agree that it's time to probably -as we've seen in another project, I don't know if it's on our agenda today or recently where they reimagined the theater and office to be residential and other things because the market just is not there post -- not post pandemic. We're still in the pandemic. We're still in the pandemic. But anyway. So I think I concur with the time extension for the reasons that others have stated.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And Commissioner Imamura, any comments on this?

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Just briefly, Mr. Chairman. I'm in agreement. I want to be consistent about, you know, where we evaluate these. So these are complex projects. And again, it's extraordinary times. Everybody's dealing with the same issues. But I'm optimistic we'll pull out of that and perhaps our judgment

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

will change later. But I'm prepared to vote in favor.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I would agree. And again, the late breaking for me, what really helped me get over this, you know, I agree with the Herb Franklin, but I agree with Commissioner May wholeheartedly, but I also thought about -- what helped me get over my -- I was I was on the fence. I don't like to be on the fence. But what helped me get over it was the strong letter of support from the ANC that -- late breaking strong letter of support that we received. So I would go along with my colleagues and let's grant this this time. It's not favorable to us, that's why we put the rule in -- the Franklin rule in place. Very critical and very important to keep things moving in the city. So in this case, as we said in the other case, and as my colleagues said of being consistent, I will agree to allow this extension as well.

Commissioner May?

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah, I just want to add, I don't think we -- the Applicant should interpret our skepticism as, you know, a desire for this to not happen. I mean, I think it would be nothing better than for them to succeed with what they envisioned. I -- you know, and it's important to have that mix of uses in the union market area, not just have, you know, apartments and restaurants. I think, you know, this would be a terrific addition if it could happen. But I do think it's a time to consider whether, in fact, it should happen. So again, I'm

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

okay with the extension, but I'm guessing this is -- this should probably be the last one.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And I would agree, Commissioner May. Let's just talk about that for the moment, as you mentioned. We want them to be successful. I think they've been successful, especially with their rooftop they have over there, which is fabulous. The community enjoys. It's a draw. And that area has been a major draw. And I think the key is what -- the reason we started doing this because things get tied up. And years ago, about 20 years ago, things just kept on being tied up and kept on being tied up. And I just remember Herb Franklin sitting next to me, the late Herb Franklin, always bring that up. And then after these years, I now understand exactly what he meant. And I think, Commissioner May, we all are in line with your comments, I'm sure, that we want this to be successful, but we don't want it to be tied up forever. So that's kind of where we --

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah. And I think, Mr. Chairman, you brought up a good point, which is that, you know, maybe part of the reason why it's okay for this to drag on a bit further is the fact that, you know, this is not a vacant lot. Right? This is not a parking lot. It's not -- I mean, this is -- it's an active use that's happening there. And there isn't really any great harm in continuing it. But I do think that if there's, you know, if something is going to happen, the Applicant needs to figure out what that is during this time extension.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I agree. 1 2 So let's see. Somebody like to make a motion? I mean, I can make them all, but I don't like to do that. Y'all want me 3 to call -- do I have to start calling on people to make motions? 4 Mr. Chairman, I will perform my 5 VICE CHAIR MILLER: 6 vice chair duties and make the motion that the Zoning Commission 7 approve Case No. 14-12G, EAJ 1309 5th Street, LLC, two-year PUD 8 time extension at Square 3951 (sic) -- did we already do the 9 waiver request -- with the waiver request and ask for a second. 10 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Second with a friendly amendment 11 at Square 3591. CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Is it 3590 or 3591? Oh, I'm on the 12 13 wrong case. I thought it was -- which one -- what did he say, 14 Commissioner Imamura? COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: He said 3951. 15 16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Oh, well, that's definitely off. I 17 think it's -- is it 3590 or 3591? 18 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: 3591. 19 VICE CHAIR MILLER: 3591, I quess I have become dyslexic 20 there, so. 21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. It's been moved and 22 properly second with the correct Square 3591. Any further 23 discussion? All right. Ms. Schellin, can you do a roll call vote 24 25 please?

MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller? 1 2 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes. MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Imamura? 3 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes. 4 5 MS. SCHELLIN: Chair Hood? 6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes. 7 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner May? 8 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. 9 The vote is four to zero to one to MS. SCHELLIN: 10 approve final action in Zoning Commission Case No. approving the time extension and the waiver. And the minus one 11 12 being the third mayoral appointee position which is vacant. CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Ms. Schellin, we're going to 13 14 keep right on moving. D I believe is where we are. Zoning 15 Commission Case No. 19-22A, MR 622 Eye Street Land, LLC, three-16 year extension of combined lot development covenant per Title I 17 805.14 at Square 453. 18 Ms. Schellin? 19 The Applicant is requesting a second MS. SCHELLIN: 20 three-year extension of the expiration of the CLD covenant to allow the architect to provide it certification for release of 21 22 escrowed funds. The Applicant provided an affidavit stating the reasons it has not been able to fulfill this requirement. 23 addition, the Applicant has requested a waiver which is needed 24 25 to approve this time extension as it is the second request. HUNT REPORTING COMPANY

the regulations do allow -- give the Commission authority to grant additional time up to a maximum of three years to make the certification and release the funds. Exhibit 5 is an OP report in support of the waiver and extension. Exhibit 6 is an ANC 2C report in support of the request. Again, asking the Commission to consider taking final action on this.

2.4

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Schellin.

Again, we have a waiver request which will allow -- we would grant -- Commission can grant the authority to allow additional time up to a maximum of three years to make certification for release of the funds. So let me say this is a second -- necessary to permit a second three-year extension. So let me hear what we have to say, whoever wants to go first.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, I don't really have comments on this. This is a very unusual situation, and I don't think there's anything good that comes from not granting the extension. I think we should go ahead and grant it and grant the waiver.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Any objections? I will follow suit with that. Any objections to what Commissioner May said?

Commissioner May, since you said that, would you mind making the motion?

COMMISSIONER MAY: Not making a motion, I'm going to make a motion.

I would move the Zoning Commission approve the waiver ${\tt HUNT\ REPORTING\ COMPANY}$

1	and three-year time extension for MR sorry, Zoning Commission
2	Case 19-22A MR 622 Eye Street Land, LLC, three-year extension
3	(indiscernible) lot development covenant per Subtitle I, Section
4	805.14, at Square 453. I didn't know it was going to be that
5	complicated when I started to make the motion.
6	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Second.
7	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: It has been moved and properly
8	second. Thank you both.
9	Any further discussion?
10	Not hearing any, Ms. Schellin, would you do a roll call
11	vote?
12	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner May?
13	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
14	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Imamura?
15	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.
16	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood?
17	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.
18	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller.
19	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes. And I think we had an ANC
20	letter in support of this one that came in late. So I just wanted
21	to mention that if we hadn't already mentioned that.
22	MS. SCHELLIN: Yeah, we did.
23	And did I oh, you did say yes, I'm sorry.
24	So the vote is four to zero to one to approve final
25	action, 19-22A. The minus one being the third mayoral appointee HUNT REPORTING COMPANY Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia 410-766-HUNT (4868) 1-800-950-DEPO (3376)

position.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let's go to proposed action Zoning Commission Case No. 22-06, 801 Maine Avenue, S.W., PJV, LLC, consolidated PUD and related map amendment at Square 390.

Ms. Schellin?

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. On this one, Exhibit 110, there's a letter in opposition from Jack Toumid (phonetic). Exhibit 111 is OAG's supplemental report. Exhibits 112 through 112I, 117 through 119A5, 121 and 123 are the Applicant's post hearing submissions. Exhibits 113, 114, and 122 are post hearing submissions by Capitol Square Homeowners Association. Exhibit 116 is ANC 6D's post hearing report. And Exhibit 120 is a letter in opposition from Councilmember Allen. Would ask the Commission to consider taking proposed action on this case. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Schellin.

Colleagues, as you all may remember, what we did, as Ms. Schellin has mentioned, we did get an updated public benefits and amenities package. There were a number of moving parts in this case. The ANC and the party in opposition, which is Capitol Square Homeowners Association, still believes -- and we asked them to go back and work some more, but they still believe -- those bodies still believe that the profit benefits are inadequate and do not fully address their concerns about the project's density high impacts are inadequate on the vehicle and pedestrian safety and cut-through traffic through the Capitol

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

Square Homeowners Association. They also, in the way I understand it, they also put money up -- the Applicant also did some things to try to mitigate and continue to mitigate some of the requests that the Capitol Square Homeowners Association has done. appears that there's still opposition. And then I quess for me, what concerns me the most about this is that the council member now has weighed in. These are his constituents. But then there's a letter from the Applicant telling the council member that we can meet with you to explain some of the inefficiencies. just bothered by this whole thing. I always believe time is better to heal things. I'm not saying everybody's going to hold hands. They're still far apart. But at least have a conversation with the council member. And I don't know if it's a verbal one or -- council member -- because he wrote a letter. And I know we have our various opinions of it, but that concerns me. it also concerns me that the ANC still has a problem even with the amended -- I mean, the changes that the Applicant has made. So I'm open for discussion. I still think I'm not -- personally I'm not prepared to move forward on this. I think there still should be some more conversations because the end of the day, Capitol Square, the ANC, folks who live in that area are going to have to deal with whatever decision we make and the impacts that this development's going to have on that area. But let me hear from others who may have a different opinion or the same opinion.

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?

1

2 COMMISSIONER MAY: Sure. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to move forward tonight. But of course, if you really don't want 3 to, I would not insist on it. I do believe that the Applicant 4 5 has made the case that they have met the tests for approval of this PUD. It is undoubtedly a complicated one. And, you know, 6 7 there are aspects of it where they are seeking density that's at 8 the very high end of what would be considered medium density, and 9 that they are, you know, they are seeking a zone designation that 10 is technically above what would be considered medium density. However, the project itself, you know, they're not seeking the 11 12 full FAR that would be possible under that zone designation. And 13 the need for that zone designation is driven by the need to push 14 the height of the building closer to Maine Avenue. And I think 15 that they made a good case of explaining why having that density, 16 that taller building -- I'm sorry, who's the call-in user who 17 just came in here? 18 MS. NADIA: Okay. Hi, I'm Nadia. I'm the president 19 of the tenants association. How are you doing? How is everybody 20 doing? 21 COMMISSIONER MAY: I'm sorry, I'm not --22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I think we need to take her out. I'm not sure what that is, but yeah, let's just take her out. 23 Thank you very much, yeah. 24 COMMISSIONER MAY: 25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: We'll get back to you, Ms. Nadia. HUNT REPORTING COMPANY Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia

> 410-766-HUNT (4868) 1-800-950-DEPO (3376)

COMMISSIONER MAY: Anyway, I think the Applicant made
a good case to explain why how this proposed PUD is consistent
with the comprehensive plan and is consistent with the southwest
small area plan. And it's you know, their attempts to I think
mitigate any of the potential negative impacts associated with,
you know, parking and traffic I think have been reasonable. Their
attempts to mitigate the concerns of the abutting neighbors to
the north or actually the neighbors across the street to the
north I think are reasonable, offering to contribute \$100,000 to
some, you know, direct methods they might use to stop cut-through
traffic. I think further conversation with DDOT actually might
be in order there to see whether there are other changes to the
roadways that might reduce that potential. I think one of the
reasons why people do that cut-through is because there's no way
to turn right on G Street there, you know, off of, what is it,
7th, 9th, I forget. Anyway, you know, they cut through because
they can't you know, it's a one-way stretch of road. I don't
know if that's something that can be done differently. There are
some things that I think that DDOT needs to do to look at that
offramp from the freeway and 9th Street coming through from the
through L'Enfant Plaza. I think that there's there's some
sort of reconfiguration that needs to happen there because it's
a very confusing intersection. So it might be part of a bigger
there might be a bigger solution in the future to address
those concerns. But I do think the Applicant has done what they

б

can to try to address that, again, with that donation to the homeowners association and also the contribution to а (indiscernible) study for a traffic signal at the intersection. Let's see, what other aspects did I want to hit on this? I think the you know, there is an essential misunderstanding. don't know how many times we have to say, I feel like we've said it over and over and over again, but IZ Plus is not the standard by which PUD affordable housing should be measured. It is a tool that is used for map amendments when there are not other benefits to be gained through the PUD process. And that, you know, IZ Plus applies whenever the nature of the up-zoning calls for it, and is it necessarily the best time to do a PUD, sometimes it has to do with the size of the property, sometimes it has to do simply with the fact that there isn't that much to be gained and that the best thing to do is simply apply IZ Plus and a map amendment. There are significant additional benefits associated with this project that would not be achieved if this were a map amendment, whether it was -- whether it would be at the proposed zone, the MU-9A zone, or some lesser zone like MU-8. I think that this project yields better benefits to the community. That's the whole point of a planned unit development to be able to harvest some of those greater benefits for the broader community, both the immediate community and then the city as a whole. so, you know, we can't set that -- the IZ Plus numbers as a threshold. I mean, it is useful as a measure to understand HUNT REPORTING COMPANY

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

whether we are getting enough and whether some of the other benefits, how those figure into it, it's a useful measure, but it is not a floor that we should be abiding by. And I think that there is an essential misunderstanding that is being promoted by the Office of the Attorney General and others that I think is counterproductive because it creates this image that we are somehow discounting the inclusionary zoning component of projects like this for no good reason. We are not discounting it. We are — you know, we are looking at the overall picture that includes things much more — much beyond the affordable housing component. And I think that's a critical piece that people need to come to understand. I don't know how many times more we'll have to say it, but we'll keep saying it I think in order to make it — in order to help people understand

I think there was one other thing that I was going to say. What was I going to say? Gosh, and now I'm losing it. I guess I'm all talked out. I lost my last point. Maybe I'll remember it when everybody else is talking.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: You'll think of it. You'll think about it.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Oh, I know, I know what it was. I know what I was going to say, which is to say I don't know if the Chairman would be willing to consider taking proposed action tonight, knowing full well that we may not take final action at some later date. And I think we could encourage the Applicant HUNT REPORTING COMPANY

to have the discussions with the council member's office as they see fit and then provide an additional submission to the record once that happens, and then we could take final action at some later date. I'm not usually the one who suggests that course of action, but I would certainly be open to that if other members of the Commission and of course the Chairman are willing. But I don't feel super strongly about that, I just wanted to throw that out there, as you often say.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. All right. Thank you. And I'll respond last.

Commissioner Imamura, any questions or comments -- I mean, not questions, you don't have questions. Any comments?

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: That was -- that would be -thank you, Mr. Chairman. That is difficult to follow-up with
Commissioner May, his comments there. I recall that there's
certainly a tremendous amount of opposition here in the record,
but what I do recall also from the hearing is that there was an
agreement that this project is not -- will not rectify or resolve
the traffic issues that the opposition had raised as part of
this. And so I think there was that acknowledgment and I think
there are certainly a number of public benefits that far outweigh
some of these concerns. Certainly compassionate and empathetic
to those issues that are that are raised in the opposition, but
I certainly am prepared to move forward and take Commissioner
May's approach, but also amenable to your thoughts, Mr. Chairman.

HUNT REPORTING COMPANY

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. 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. I could not agree more than I do agree with the comments of Commissioner May and Commissioner Imamura just now. This affordable housing proffer in this PUD-related map amendment is among the highest of all recent PUDs that do not involve -- that do not involve -- any public subsidy, public financing, or public disposition or ground lease. Fifteen percent of the residential gross floor area in the PUD will be reserved for affordable housing, including eight -- eight -- three-bedroom units at the 50 percent median family income level. We just do not see that in a non-publicly -- we have not seen that in a non-publicly subsidized project. As far as I know, that's the case with this I certainly was sympathetic, empathetic with the project. concerns raised by the party in opposition, Capitol Square Homeowners Association, but there were adjustments that were made in response to their concerns, reducing the height in that northern portion. So yeah, in order to keep the amount of affordable housing and market rate housing, which are all important priorities of the city, in addition to all the other public benefits associated with this PUD, they increased the height on the Maine Avenue side to 130 feet, except for, I think, a small section at the southeastern corner, at 120 feet. And I certainly would have preferred that it be 120 feet since there

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

is that medium density designation in the comp plan land use map. But as we have stated and the courts have affirmed from our orders that you can balance out the 90-foot versus the 130-foot, the overall 7.99 FAR is within the medium density designation with the PUD and with the inclusionary zoning that's being provided here.

So yeah, I would have preferred if it was less than that tunnel effect. I don't want to see that tunnel effect on Maine Avenue, and any precedent set for future sites. But I think there's been a lot of work to try to mitigate the adverse impacts upon those to the north and including the traff- -- all the transportation related contributions to studies for the signalization at 9th and G, and the contri- -- the self-funded study I think by the Applicant of how to mitigate cut-through traffic through this neighborhood to get to the wharf. But as Commissioner Imamura said, I mean, one project cannot solve all of the transportation-related issues in this whole southwest neighborhood area, which are many.

So I mean, in general, I think that the comprehensive plan consistency argument case had been made by the Applicant, especially in its response to Councilmember Allen and that the PUD balancing test that the public benefits and amenities associated with the project outweigh -- are commensurate with the height and density that's being requested, the amount of affordable and market rate housing. They tried to respond to the

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

conflicting -- I heard conflicting -- concerns about a grocery store. So they tried to say that it won't be a minimum -- 6,000 will be a minimum, 3,000, and then the opposition party said we never said we wanted it less. They did say they wanted less traffic impact from any grocery store food option that would be provided there. I think food options need to be provided everywhere throughout the city equitably. And I think this project would try to try to help that situation.

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 I do agree with Commissioner May's point to you, Mr. Chairman, that we could take proposed action. He normally does not go along with that. I do usually go along with that and hope that and encourage the parties to continue to work together. The Applicant has offered to meet with the council member. know if that has happened yet. It should happen, and further meetings should happen. And there was a mistrust that got built up between the Applicant and the party in opposition, which was unfortunate but evident at the public hearing. But I think it can continue to be attempted to be rebuilt in the time between a proposed action and a final action, then maybe further mitigations and modifications might be able to be made without -- well, with -- maybe further mitigation and modification be made without jeopardizing the public benefits and amenities that are so significant here. So I'm ready to move forward, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for the opportunity to express this opinion.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you for all your HUNT REPORTING COMPANY

comments. I really appreciate it.

I still say that my concern of the -- I'm still trying to grasp my arms around this \$100,000 of mitigation. Is it a study, is it mitigation? And I'm saying this for the Applicant -- I'm with the Applicant, if I decided to go in the way that Commissioner May, which is usually the opposite because I'm usually ready to do it that way and Commissioner May's the other way, so this is very opposite. But I'm a guy that will -- I can go along with that, Commissioner May. I was sitting here thinking that why you were talking, should I do a proposed, I don't like to send too many strong signals, but I have no problems when it gets to final than to vote against it, even though it sounds like I'm going to be the only vote against it for now.

But I will tell you that the \$100,000 concerns me. And I looked at what the homeowner association sent, (indiscernible) square, the homeowners association, the letter they sent, and this -- it's like a study. You know we study to study to study. And I know they're talking about the gates and they're recommending some things, but those kind of things should be to the point where we're ready to put them in place, not studying something and then we try to figure it out. I think -- I just see it -- I think what I would like to see, if we vote for proposed tonight, I would like to see the Applicant just shore that up a little bit for me, explain to me what's really going on and how we're going to carry out that mitigation. It may be

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

there and maybe this is not it's not pops out it doesn't
pop right out at me. I have to keep reading it over and over
again to try to figure out. And also, Vice Chair, you mentioned
about the eight three-bedroom units at 50 percent of the MFI.
People that look like me still can't afford that. I'm sorry. So
I understand what the ANC and what the community and a lot of
people are saying. You know, if we want to make the waterfront
conducive for all, we need to try not just this project, but
everything that's going on down there. We need to make it
conducive. People still today complain about how much parking
is at the waterfront. They still complain about how much it
costs. So you know, if I'm asking now, I'm asking the
Applicant, and just drop it so a few people that look like me
can get down there and live. And I'm not saying they don't, we
have a few, but we do could do better. So some of those things
I like to tighten them. And even more than that, I'd like to
know if they have had a conversation with the council member
because that's what he's asked for. A lot of council members
don't weight in, some do. And I know that this council member
has weighed in. And I think with continuing to work with
Councilmember Allen as well as the ANC, as well as the homeowners
association, I think we'll have a better outcome.

And to Commissioner Imamura's point about the different projects, when you vote on enough of the different projects, like I have, and you hear the same things on all those different HUNT REPORTING COMPANY

projects, somewhere we got to draw the line. And I'm not saying this may be the right -- probably should have drew it about nine There was a area -- there was a group in this projects ago. area, and Commissioner May, you may remember this group, they looked at all the profits and benefits in that area. very well organized. I don't know what happened. I think Ms. Hamilton -- and I don't know what happened with that group, but I can just tell you that that was very beneficial starting off, it's like it disappeared. So I don't have a problem voting for proposed, but I just want to have some things tightened up. is a voluminous record, a lot of different pieces are moving, but I just think that I -- and let me just say this, there is a lot of letters in support. There's not just all opposition. are some -- a lot of letters in support in this application. Let me -- hold on, let me make sure I'm looking at the right, yeah, there are letters of support in this application. So that's why I'm -- I don't know if the Applicant is not clear on what I'm asking for. I'm asking for more definite resolution to this study to study to study, and let's get it done, not just study it. I am concerned about the eight, 50 percent, and I agree with you, Vice Chair, but how do we get it so we can be inclusive to all? And it's just, to me, it's still so much uncertainty of the folks who want to be living there. So that's why I was not prepared necessarily to move forward, but I will do the proposed. I do think there are some benefits to this application, but I

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

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

also think there's a lot of uncertainty and confusion and 1 2 misunderstanding as well. So hopefully we can shore all that up. That's where I am 3 Anything else, Commissioner May? 4 Mr. Chairman, I appreciate 5 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah. 6 your trying to clarity on what the \$100,000 is for. I mean, it's 7 pretty clear to me that that's comes from a study and that it will be money that goes to the homeowners association to actually 8 9 implement some of the cut-through preventative measures. 10 certainly understanding that better, as, you know, we would have time to be able to do that between proposed and final. And I'm 11 12 sure the Applicant would be able to provide a succinct write-up 13 that lays it out very clearly for you -- or for us. 14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah, I thank you, because the way 15 I read it, it's a study to study to study. So and I may be wrong, 16 but I've read it more than once trying to figure out what was 17 actually happening. 18 So anything else? And thank you, Commissioner May, for 19 that. 20 Anything else, anybody? 21 All right. So since I'm the one that's hesitant on 22 making the motion, I'll let somebody else make it. 23 COMMISSIONER MAY: I can go ahead and make the motion. 24 I would move that the Zoning Commission take proposed action on 25 Case No. 2206, 801 Maine Avenue, S.W. PVJ, LLC, consolidated PUD HUNT REPORTING COMPANY Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia

> 410-766-HUNT (4868) 1-800-950-DEPO (3376)

and map amendment at Square 390, and requesting that the Applicant provide update on any sort of further communications with the council member and further information on the \$100,000 mitigation money for the traffic issues brought up by the homeowners association. And think that's all that we were asking for, right?

VICE CHAIR MILLER: I'll second.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I know this is a pretty -- all I'm doing is asking. I know it's 50 percent of the MFI. I'm asking we look at maybe seeing what we can do to lower it. I'm not saying all of it.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. All right. And I would accept that as a friendly amendment to note that you're requesting further information on the MFI levels. So did I hear the Vice Chair second?

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes. Second.

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: It's been moved and properly second.
17 Any further discussion?

And let me just clarify. I think while we don't necessarily make our decisions on what council members write to us or not, I just want to clarify that -- I just wanted to make sure that the correct conversation has been had with the council member since now he has noted, because it looks like they say well, we could -- in the letter that we got -- and I'm going by what's in the record, in the letter we got from the Applicant, it says oh, council member, we can meet with you to explain it.

HUNT REPORTING COMPANY

1	I'm just that gives me a lot of pause. So anyway, hopefully
2	that'll happen. And we like as Commissioner May has already
3	mentioned in his motion and we get results from that. I just
4	want to be clear.
5	Okay. It's moved and properly second. Any further
6	discussion? And this is proposed action.
7	Ms. Schellin, would you do a roll call vote please?
8	MS. SCHELLIN: Was that Commissioner Miller who second
9	it?
10	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.
11	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.
12	MS. SCHELLIN: Okay.
13	Commissioner May?
14	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
15	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller?
16	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.
17	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood?
18	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.
19	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Imamura?
20	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes. And I appreciate the
21	dramatic effect by Chairman Hood.
22	MS. SCHELLIN: You did a half dramatic effect there,
23	your little hesitation.
24	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Actually, I was my mouse was on
25	the other screen, I'm moving to the next case, and I couldn't HUNT REPORTING COMPANY Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia 410-766-HUNT (4868) 1-800-950-DEPO (3376)

get it back down to unmute myself.

Now, Commissioner --

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: We believe that, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Commissioner Turnbull told me hit the space button, but if the mouse is up in the other screen, the spacebar doesn't work. So anyway. I need my grandkids here to help me. So anyway, let me -- okay. Maybe Archie can tell me over the phone what I need to do.

MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. With the holidays --

VICE CHAIR MILLER: He's not here tonight.

MS. SCHELLIN: Yeah. With the holidays I'm going to put this on for final action at our February 9th meeting. So I'm going to give the Applicant until January 26 to provide — to be able to meet with the council member and provide what they need to do. That's January 26, 3:00 p.m. And the parties can respond to that if they choose to do so. They cannot provide anything else. I know that they were listening, but the ANC and the party in opposition can only respond to what is submitted by 3:00 p.m. on February 2nd. And then, like I said, we'll put this on for the February 9th meeting. And in addition, of course, the Applicant knows that they need to go through the proper process per the regulations. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Let's go to -anybody need a break or we good? Okay. Let's go to our next
case, Zoning Commission Case No. 22-09, Mid-City Financial
HUNT REPORTING COMPANY

Heritage -- well, let me -- MCF Heritage 1700, LLC, consolidated PUD and related map amendment at Square 419.

Ms. Schellin?

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. Exhibits 45 through 45D and 48 through 49A are the Applicant's post hearing submissions and then exhibits 46 and 50 through 50A are ONE DC's post hearing submissions. Exhibit 47 is an OP supplemental report. This case is also ready for the Commission to take proposed action on. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

Again, colleagues, there was some information that came up from, I think, ONE DC, I know I talked about solar panels. There were some design changes. So the biggest issue for me was ONE DC, but I won't start off on this one, I'll wait to hear from others. And I know this happened -- and I think testimony that -- a lot of this stuff happened prior to this and there was a phasing out process that went on. I can't remember all of it, but as I was reading back through it, I know there was a phasing out. And my only issue that stuck me was there consideration given as we were phasing out with the I think it's HPAP, or whatever the assistance was. So anyway, let me open it up, let me hear from others. And I guess if we can -- I don't know if anybody -- I guess we can start it talking about ONE DC. That's very critical and I know they really brought back to us the racial equity lens, which we're required to look at by law. So if my

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

colleagues are ready and we can -- let's just -- let me hear your comments on ONE DC.

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, you'd like to go first 'cause --

COMMISSIONER MAY: I was wondering if you wanted to go first, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Well, I can go first.

COMMISSIONER MAY: See what resonates for you?

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah, I can go first. I'm still concerned, but I'm just trying -- well, you know what? I'm really concerned about how they were done, but I don't know if that's what we should be looking at. I know that the Applicant has been working with them, and I don't believe from what I see in these submissions, they're still not satisfied. I would kind of do just like I did the previous case, continue to have those discussions because I think that as they will phase -- the way I understand it, the way they were phasing things out and I think they relocated, what, 27 -- was it 27 people or 27 families, 27 residents, so I don't know if that's 27 homes or what, but 27 residents moved to another property, the one across the street. Now the Applicant has said, and I wanted to make sure, the way I understand it, the Applicant has said they're not going to do any redevelopment yet to the place across the street. That's the way I understood it.

So my only thing is I want to make sure that folks at ONE DC understand what's going on and also -- because the way I HUNT REPORTING COMPANY

-- the submission really they just flat out against what's happening here and I know some things happened to them prior. So that's kind of where I am. I'm always open to making sure they continue to have conversations. If not, I'll just simply vote against it. That's just where I am.

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, you want to -- I don't know if --COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah, sure. I mean, I can talk about this a bit too. Yeah, I mean, it's not great that, you know, at this point, now nine years after the building became a market rate building that we're now facing this question of how is it that, you know, people came to vacate the property over the years? I don't think there's that much that we can do about it on the one hand. And you know, was this part of a greater long-term strategy on the part of Mid-City financial to try to encourage people to leave? I mean, certainly they made -- they created opportunities for people who wanted to leave the building to move across the street to I think what were renovated units. And I think we have an indication from the Applicant that they are, you know -- even when they've talked to people about the prospect of moving back, there's not a whole lot of interest in doing that. So yeah, I mean, I think there's -- it creates a little bit of an uneasy feeling. But I also feel like we can't, you know -- what's before us now is does it make sense to build this larger building on this property.

I believe we've got another caller who needs to be HUNT REPORTING COMPANY

taken out, I think.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Can we take that call -- can we take the caller out again? Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah. Anyway, it's going to be a larger building, there's going to be significant affordability within the building. It's going to bring amenities to the neighborhood. I think that overall it's a worthwhile project the way it has been designed. I would acknowledge that the Applicant has looked at some of the questions that came up about the design between, you know, the hearing and today. And I didn't have a whole lot of concerns about those aspects of the project, but. So I'll leave it to my colleagues to comment on the things that were questions from their perspective. I think my questions were answered on the day of the hearing.

So I mean, all things considered, I think it makes sense for us to move forward with this because I do think given where we are right now, the best thing to do is to see this property redeveloped with a significant affordable housing component. And yeah, I mean, I think that overall, you know, it's a worthwhile PUD. It's again -- you know, I have to say IZ Plus is not the floor. It may be a measure that we can look at, but this was brought up again by the Office of the Attorney General, I don't know how many times I have to say that.

Anyway, I think that there -- yeah, I think that on balance the overall benefits of this project are worthy of this HUNT REPORTING COMPANY

map amendment and approval of the PUD. And so I'd be prepared to vote in favor of it tonight.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

Commissioner Imamura, any questions or comm- -- I mean, any comments?

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I agree mostly with Commissioner May in the fact that it does bring a number of benefits, deeply affordable housing. I think that its location will -- it will be a node at that Betro station there. I certainly understand that people are looking back to what's happened in the past, but here we are to look forward and evaluate what's before us. I'm wildly underwhelmed by some of the modifications that have taken place with the design, but that's not enough to prevent me from agreeing to move forward with this project.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

And Vice Chair -- let me just state -- let me go to Vice Chair -- let me let the Vice Chair go first. Vice Chair Miller?

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just briefly, I mean, I agree again with all Commissioner May's comments. And I think that the OAG's continuing misapplication of our Inclusionary Zoning Plus regulations to PUD-related projects does a disservice to the public, disservice to the District government, and creates false hope that something is HUNT REPORTING COMPANY

provided for in regulation that is not provided for. And it's very unfortunate, especially given that they were our former legal counsel and are very aware of that fact, which we reiterated at this hearing and previous hearings, where they've misstated what the what the floor should be. It's important to understand what it would be if it was just a straight map amendment, just to understand the overall context, but that's not what's required for good or bad that's not what's required under the regulations we adopted with OAG advice years ago.

Anyway, I think the comprehensive plan consistency test has been met in this case. I think the PUD balancing tests of public benefits commensurate -- amenities commensurate with the height and density has been met in this case. And I'm prepared to move forward tonight with proposed action. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chairman, can I make one other point? This is something that I should have mentioned in the last -- on the last case as well. But I think one of the things that people don't understand about the difference between IZ Plus, map amendments, and PUDs is that there is a much greater level of community engagement, involvement, participation in shaping the project itself. Right? I mean, when it's just a map amendment, all we're doing is saying how big it can be and how much land it can take and what the yards -- I mean, it's those -- it's -- we're establishing a zone and that's it. And HUNT REPORTING COMPANY

so there's no room for those -- for the, you know, the community benefits agreements. There's no room for addressing other concerns of the neighborhood that might be mitigated by the project. And so you know, there is a real cost, if we think of it just in terms of well, you know, all we really need is more affordable housing and this should be the floor because you're just not going to get that and you're losing control if you don't go it. So this is why PUDs are important to be able to do in this circumstance, because there's more to a project than just what the percentage of affordable housing is. And the community has a role in saying how much more and what that is. That's it.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

You know, I don't disagree with anything that I've heard my colleagues say. My only problem is it's always trying to grapple with -- let me back up. Mid-City did a project in my neighborhood and I tried to stay far away from that. Actually, I did very well. I evaded, staying away from the neighbors and everything, and it actually worked out to be better, much beneficial and better for the community. And I really appreciate that. So I know the work that they do. I'm not against the work that they do. But also I understand that the conversation, as my colleagues have said and counsel has mentioned over and over again to us in the submissions, that what went on previously is not part of this application. I get that. But the residents don't see it that way. So what -- I know they had a meeting, I

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

think December the 8th, in preparation for this meeting, which was our meeting here, the 15th. But what I'm going to continue to ask for and I think this is a two-vote case. Am I correct, Ms. Schellin?

MS. SCHELLIN: Uh-huh.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I always ask that they continue to have conversations because I can count -- I can understand the conversation and I can count the votes. So what I -- and I don't see myself voting against this project. I think if it's like the one in my neighborhood, I think it's very beneficial to the residents of this city and to the neighborhoods, because the one in my neighborhood really -- and I don't want to sound redundant, but it really has made a heck of a difference. So I just want to make sure that we be inclusive and I appreciate the Applicant of what they're not going to do to ONE DC. And I tell you, I would just encourage them to continue -- Mid-City to continue to work with folks and keep everybody abreast and give them some comfort and some predictability. I know that's not necessarily in the regulations, the zoning regulations, but I think you get a better outcome.

So in Exhibit 48, I've read that, I've read Exhibit 46, and I want ONE DC to know that, and I agree with my colleagues what they said, I'm not going to even respond to the OAG because that's again more misinformation that confuses people and muddies the water. So I'll just leave that alone. I do appreciate the HUNT REPORTING COMPANY

solar panels. I forgot maybe that I'd even mentioned solar -me of all people solar panels. But I do appreciate the response
I got back, and what it's going to go to the construction costs
and some of the things. The design changes, I think my colleagues
already mentioned. The comprehensive plan issues, I think we've
talked about it being consistent.

So I think in light of that, the balancing test I think has been met. And in light of that, I think that the only thing that I can do is vote for it and ask that the Applicant continue to work with ONE DC and listen, let's not make them feel like they are -- even though I know it happened, what, eight years ago or nine years ago, let's not make them feel like that they are -- we're totally disregarding them because by no means would I ever disregard any residents in the city. So I think it meets all of the development standards. I don't have any issues with it. And I'm sure it'll improve the -- as my colleagues already stated, I'm sure it'll improve the area and also beneficial to the city. So I'll just leave it at that. Anything else?

Vice Chair Miller?

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Did we mention the ANC's, I think, support for this application in this case, ANC 6E is it? I just I just wanted to mention it in part of our deliberation.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Let me make sure -- somebody let's find that and make sure 'cause -- it's 6E. I think they were in support, but let me make sure.

1	Mr. Ritting, can you tell us right quick or I may have
2	to look for it?
3	MR. RITTING: Right, it's 6D and they were in support.
4	It's in the record at Exhibit 19.
5	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Ritting.
6	MR. RITTING: Thank you.
7	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Ritting, do you have enough
8	information to write the order or do we need to talk some more?
9	I think the record's complete.
10	MR. RITTING: Well, you have to vote for final action
11	in the future. So you'll have plenty of time to talk about it.
12	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Oh, that's right. This is two
13	all right. Okay. Well, all right, you can turn your camera back
14	off now, Mr. Ritting. All right. All right.
15	Okay. So again I would hope that the Applicant would
16	take all of our comments and concerns. And I know the young lady
17	who was trying to come on, I believe, is the young lady who
18	represents ONE DC. So we I would like to know the status
19	between proposed and final of again continuing those
20	conversations. So I'm asking the Applicant as well as ONE DC if
21	those are the only two things I would like.
22	So would somebody like to make a motion?
23	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I'll move that the
24	Zoning Commission take proposed action on Case 22-09, MCF
25	Heritage 1700, LLC, consolidated PUD and related zoning map HUNT REPORTING COMPANY Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia 410-766-HUNT (4868)

amendment at Square 419, and ask for a second. 1 2. COMMISSIONER MAY: Second. CHAIRPERSON HOOD: It's been moved and properly second. 3 Any further discussion? 4 5 Not hearing any, Ms. Schellin, would you do a roll call 6 vote plate? 7 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller? 8 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes. 9 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner May? 10 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. 11 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood? 12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes. 13 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Imamura? 14 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes. The vote is four to zero to zone to 15 MS. SCHELLIN: 16 approve proposed action 22-09. The minus one being the third 17 mayoral appointee position, which is vacant, of course. 18 think that with the holidays, if we could use the same schedule 19 as the last case, give the Applicant and ONE DC until January 20 26th to meet and have them both follow-up with a response which would be due by February 2nd. And we'll put this on for February 21 22 9th. 23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Again, let me just say, I understand that that what happened previously has nothing to do with this 24 25 application. But I think it's always good to have that HUNT REPORTING COMPANY Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia 410-766-HUNT (4868)

conversation and continue the dialog, and I just want to make 1 2 sure that that's happens. So thank you all. Thank you both, ONE DC and Applicant, for doing that. 3 4 All right. We ready to move on? I need to take a 5 break. 6 MR. RITTING: Just wanted to pop up for a second to 7 remind the Applicant that because you're taking proposed action 8 that the proper --9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Proper --10 MR. RITTING: (Indiscernible) schedule in addition to the days that Ms. Schellin mentioned. 11 MS. SCHELLIN: Right. It's in the regs, so it's -- we 12 13 don't say it -- really have to say it anymore because it's in 14 the regs. But occasionally I do it as a reminder, but it's in 15 the regs, so we don't always say it. 16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. Well, thank you. 17 Can we take a three-minute break please? Three 18 minutes. 19 (Whereupon, there was a brief recess.) 20 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, everyone, for those three 21 Let's go to Zoning Commission Case No. 22-11, MCRT minutes. 22 Investment, LLC, consolidated PUD and related map amendment at 23 Square 439S. 24 Ms. Schellin? 25 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. Exhibits 86 through 86A and HUNT REPORTING COMPANY Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia 410-766-HUNT (4868)

Τ	88 we have the Applicant's post hearing submissions. And then
2	87 and 87A is the OAG supplemental filing. Exhibit 89 is AND
3	6D's post hearing report. So this case is ready for the
4	Commission to consider proposed action on also. Thank you.
5	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'm on mute. Who'd like to start
6	us off on this case? I'll go to somebody else.
7	Vice Chair Miller, you want to start us off? No, no,
8	going to go to Commissioner Imamura, you want to start us off on
9	this case?
10	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: I'll defer to Vice Chair Miller.
11	That's fine.
12	VICE CHAIR MILLER: And I will defer to Commissioner
13	Imamura.
14	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: All right.
15	COMMISSIONER MAY: Well, that's why I wind up going
16	first all the time.
17	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Exactly. You defer it and I have
18	to do it and the Chairman usually goes last. I've learned from
19	Phil Mendelson, I've learned from Vince Gradler and from Linda
20	Kropp, I've learned from all of them how to do it.
21	So Commissioner May, could you start us off please?
22	COMMISSIONER MAY: I'd be happy to. So you know, we
23	had great anxiety about this case in the very beginning, so much
24	so that we were not prepared to set it down immediately, as I
25	recall. Or no, we were not prepared to we set it down, but HUNT REPORTING COMPANY Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia 410-766-HUNT (4868)

we were not prepared to go ahead with the hearing when it first came up. And so we postponed that initial hearing. And I think the Applicant made very substantial changes to the project to address some of the greatest concerns about it. It is at this point, I believe, that they have met the standards for approval of the PUD and the map amendment. I think I should just record my speech about OAG and IZ Plus and how it doesn't apply and we could just like push a button and play it whenever it happens. But once again, the OAG had comments about, you know, what level of affordability, what the IZ component should be. And you know, it's IZ Plus is not the floor. It's not the minimum. It is -it's something that we can look at, you know, to provide some information, but it's not a map amendment, it's a PUD and a map amendment, which means that we are looking at IZ and all of the other benefits of a project. And you know, I think that if we look at the other benefits of the project, I think they're pretty substantial. The -- I mean, there is a 170 percent more housing than permitted under the existing zoning, 200 percent more affordable housing than permitting under the existing zoning, 6 market rate, and 3 IZ three-bedroom units. The sustainable design, rooftop solar, the contributions to the public (indiscernible) on Maine Avenue, a contribution to Jefferson Middle School, contribution to Habitat for Humanity. this is you know, it's a well-rounded project, I think, well considered, and far more than we would achieve through a straight HUNT REPORTING COMPANY

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

map amendment. I think there was a you know, the issue was raised about whether, you know, if this were a -- considered as a map amendment that the Office of Planning would not support a map -- a straight map amendment to MU-10. And again, you know. Office of the Attorney General has misunderstood the process, right? I mean, yes, it's absolutely true that the Zoning Commission gets to make the decision about whether a particular map amendment should be approved, but the Office of Planning is the, you know, the first stop on the road to getting a map amendment or a PUD. And if the Office of Planning is not going to support a particular project, it is not likely that we would set it down for a hearing or consider it. We want to know that our planning experts in this city support this particular move before we would consider it. And so it would never even come to us as a straight up map amendment to MU-10. So I think that they are -- you know, it's the -- the logic that they are applying in this circumstance simply doesn't make sense.

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

Now, I know we had concerns that were raised by nearby residents. I understand those concerns. I think they were pretty general in nature. And I think that they have been addressed by the Applicant. I think we also had the ANC in opposition. Oh, sorry, conditional support. But that conditional support is based on an improved IZ proffer up to the level that the OAG wanted. So again, this is where the OAG's statements about these things is misdirecting other people who are trying to look at HUNT REPORTING COMPANY

this earnestly and consider what should be done. So I think, you know, it's -- the Office of Attorney General is doing a significant disservice by trying to make it sound like we should be taking a different action. We are the Zoning Commission. We have made the rules. And the rules are that the PUD is not a map -- not an IZ Plus map amendment, and that this is a way for the community to be involved in reaping all of the potential benefits and not simply bottom lining things to an IZ proffer.

So I think that there were, you know, some other concerns raised by the ANC. I don't think those really resonated with me, but I do appreciate every- -- you know, all of the work of this ANC in particular, because there is so much development they have been dealing with over the years and it seems to be continuing unabated with so many development projects within this ANC. But I do think this is a good one and -- now it is a good one and that it is worthy of our support. They've met the balancing test and I am prepared to vote in favor tonight.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

Who'd like to go next?

Vice Chair Miller?

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Commissioner May, for as usual, stepping up to the plate first because you often almost always cover everything. And I concur with everything you said. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right.

And Commissioner Imamura?

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I agree with Vice Chair Miller that Commissioner May is always thorough and comprehensive in his summary. And I will say at least OAG seems to be consistent in their message. But again, as Commissioner May pointed out, it's not a comparison to some hypothetical alternative. So with that, I'm prepared to move forward with this project. There's a number of benefits and that Commissioner May has already laid out and that's in the record, so. I'm prepared to vote in favor.

You're on mute, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. I must be getting tired of talking now, so.

What I did not see is that -- I know that ANC was in opposition in Exhibit I think 59, and in Exhibit 82 they were conditional. And there were a number of points and I'm trying to go off the top of my head, a number of points, I guess I could have pulled it up, there were a number of points that the ANC mentioned. And I didn't see whether or not the -- and maybe counsel or somebody could help me, I didn't see whether or not the response from the Applicant or maybe I missed it. Well, I wouldn't be surprised. Did the Applicant respond to what ANC's 6D's conditional support said? So either way, this is a two-vote case, I believe, right?

MR. RITTING: Yes. So here are the points in the ANC. 1 2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Yeah, I know the points. I just -- I got the points, I got that in front of me. I just 3 4 wanted to know --5 MR. RITTING: FAR, that's not changing, public art, oh, 6 I can't -- don't quote me on this, but I think there was some 7 movement, but I don't know. I can't tell you exactly what it There was some movement on the contri- --8 was. 9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Ritting, what exhibit are you 10 looking at now? 'Cause I'm looking at something totally 11 different. 12 Mr. RITTING: Exhibit 82. 13 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: 82, okay, yeah, that's --14 MR. RITTING: That was the report that was at the 15 There was -- after the hearing in the post hearing hearing. 16 submission, the ANC addressed principally the affordable housing. 17 So if your question was about the affordable housing issue, that's 18 19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: No, my question is, I just didn't see where the Applicant accepted some of the things they talked 21 about or if there's nothing to change. I'm thinking that the 22 Applicant's proffered the 75k to support a public -- so they outlined what was there, and I didn't see -- hold on. The cond-23 -- I want to make sure that the conditional support is intact 24 with -- I want to make sure the conditional support has been 25 HUNT REPORTING COMPANY Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia

> 410-766-HUNT (4868) 1-800-950-DEPO (3376)

agreed to by the Applicant. That's all I'm trying to figure out. 2 And I didn't see that.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. RITTING: No, they didn't -- there's still some -- there's a gap in a number of their (indiscernible).

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So I hear my colleague says move forward, what I want to do -- because as mentioned -- thank you, Mr. Ritting. What I want to do is mention again I do understand that they're going by our regulations. And the Vice Chair and all of us have talked about this before. Sometime maybe we need to relook at them or revisit them. We might need to get deeper, lower, we need to change our rules because some of the things that they're asking are some of the things that maybe we should be looking at. And then we can stop -- we can cut off some of this misinformation that the Office of the Attorney General is giving.

Ms. Schellin, you have something for me?

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. The Applicant's attorney contacted me and said that they did not agree to their conditions.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: None of them? Because I didn't see that in the --

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah, I didn't see an indication that they'd agreed to the conditions that I saw, but I'm going off of my notes rather than the (indiscernible).

MS. SCHELLIN: I'm waiting for a response about whether they agreed to none of them or not.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So here's what I want to do. I would like for the ANC and the Applicant to tell me where they disagree at. If it's all of them, just tell me it's all of them. I'm going to vote in favor, because it does meet the standards of our review. But I'm trying to get -- what I would like to do at some point is figure out how to get to where ANC 6D is. That's my goal. That should be all of our goals, because I think what ANC 6D wants or is trying to get in all of these projects for the most part is as a very diverse and livable community. think that's what they're trying to do. And it's coming bright -- it's coming through -- most of the projects that go on in that area, they vote against. And like I have another case on the BZA that I want to bring to the Commission too once I get it together, but most -- sometimes we have to make it conducive for the people who live there and that's the people who live in the city, and that's what I'm trying to get to. Do we need to relook I think so. But do we need to change them? to the Commission. But I think at least every so often we need to do a onceover and make sure that we are proceeding correctly or within the best interests of the residents, so anyway.

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 will leave it at that and anything else? And just ask in between proposed and final that we can kind of hash a little more than just telling me this is the list and no response or what comes prior to that says they disagree with this or we're not going to agree to anything or we agree with three of them,

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

1	but we don't I need to know where you part at. If it's all
2	of it, just say all of it, so. All right. Hopefully, that's
3	understandable. If not, call Ms. Schellin, she'll explain my
4	foreign language to you.
5	All right. So anything else? Somebody'd like to make
6	a motion?
7	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Sure, Mr. Chairman.
8	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Commissioner Imamura, go right
9	ahead.
10	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: I move that the Zoning
11	Commission take proposed action for Case No. 22-11 in CRT
12	Investments, LLC, consolidated PUD and map amendment at Square
13	439S, and ask for a second.
14	COMMISSIONER MAY: Second.
15	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: It has been moved and properly
16	second. Any further discussion?
17	Not hearing any, Ms. Schellin, would you do a roll call
18	vote please?
19	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Imamura?
20	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.
21	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner May?
22	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
23	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood?
24	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.
25	MS. SCHELLIN: And Commissioner Miller? HUNT REPORTING COMPANY Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia 410-766-HUNT (4868) 1-800-950-DEPO (3376)

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

MS. SCHELLIN: So besides the proffer process, the ANC and the Applicant will make their submission, each of them make their submissions, of what their understanding is of what's been agreed to by January 12, 3:00 pm, and then they can each respond to each other's submission by January 19 at 3:00 p.m., and we'll put this on for January 26th. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And again, let me just say to both of those, the ANC and to the Applicant, if I missed it, forgive me, just tell me where it is because I didn't see it. All right.

Let's move on to the next case. Just a second. Okay. Zoning Commission Case No. 22-19, McDonald's Corporation map amendment at Square 3786.

Ms. Schellin?

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Exhibit 39, the Applicant's post hearing submission. Exhibit 40 is an OP supplemental report. This is ready for the Commission to consider proposed action. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. With this one I'm going to start with Commissioner -- Vice Chair Miller.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I think. So I support this application going forward. I was concerned at the hearing about the potential inconsistency in our own zoning regulations between the description of what an MU-7 zone is as medium density, whereas the comp plan I think was HUNT REPORTING COMPANY

recently modified to change this site, and correct me if I'm wrong, there's so many cases before us tonight, it's hard to keep track of all of them, I think it was changed I think from low to moderate density commercial. And this is a map amendment to change it from -- is it MU-3 currently -- to MU-7, which is clearly designed to permit what's being contemplated here because the MU-7 zone is the first MU zone which would allow a drivethrough fast food restaurant which is what's being contemplated here, a renovation, an expansion of this McDonald's in this neighborhood, which based on the testimony we received by and large, not without exception, but by and large, has been a benefit to the community in many different ways. So there may be a resolution that we have to do between the text of our zoning regulations at MU -- which describes MU-7 as being a medium density zone and the comp plan land use map is -- says that this site is in that moderate density. But it clearly in the comp plan land use map, the framework element I think it does say that MU-7 could be one of the potential zones that are allowed for here.

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 we have the unfortunate situation of the DDOT recommendation that it not be changed to an MU-7 zone because they -- DDOT doesn't support drive-through fast food restaurants at all because of the vehicular impact that that has on neighborhoods. And I was concerned at some point also during the hearing that there might be queuing or backup in the neighborhood.

But I think we received sufficient testimony and evidence that that can be mitigated, that that isn't a problem, that the benefit outweighs that potential adverse impact.

And so, Mr. Chairman, maybe you can remind me, the ANC, I believe, was in support of this project; is that correct?

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes, Vice Chair, they've actually sent us, I think, three letters. So we -- I want to make it clear to the ANC, we got it. They sent us three letters explaining to us that --

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Right. You're required to give great weight, statutorily we are required to give great weight to the ANC and to the Office of Planning, which is recommending this map amendment. So I am prepared to move forward tonight and think that it will be appropriate to have this map amendment for this site.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Imamura?

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll try to be brief. This particular case gave me some heartburn about whether -- I think Commissioner May had suggested and maybe DDOT had also suggested about consideration for MU-5 just for consistency sake versus MU-7. And as Vice Chair Miller pointed out, and as you pointed out, Mr. Chairman, great support from the ANC, give great weight to the OP and the ANC for this certainly I think. At the hearing, I was sort of -- I was conflicted about

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

this. The testimony was compelling and I can -- certainly empathetic to the issues that were raised in terms of just general mobility and how adding a drive-through would be helpful for those who have mobility issues or are impaired in some way. I think the Applicant certainly has been there for quite some time. And this is a mainstay in the neighborhood. And I am prepared to move forward and vote in favor of this.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I thank you.

And I will -- I'll go last.

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'll let Commissioner May go next.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. So I remain concerned about the prospect of a drive-through being built here in a replacement restaurant. I mean, there are good reasons to support this map amendment. The idea of increasing the density and allowing for housing and affordable housing are good things, but -- and who knows, maybe someday that might happen. But we have heard that the primary reason or one of the primary reasons why this particular zone is sought is so that they could have a drive-And we have this -- you know, we have a report from through. DDOT where they take the position that a lower zone would be more appropriate because they do not support a drive-through. to say that I have consistently raised concerns, if not opposed, to drive-throughs in the past. And in fact, when we were doing the zoning regulation rewrite, I recollect that I argued to no longer allow them, period, which is something that has happened HUNT REPORTING COMPANY

in many jurisdictions across the country because they are not
good for traffic and they are not good for the environment.
They're not good for the people nearby because of the, you know,
the vehicular traffic that they generate. I certainly understand
and I am somewhat sympathetic to the testimony that we heard
about how much a benefit a drive-through is. And I will admit
that I have on occasion gone to a drive-through. And there are
times when, you know, especially when I'm wrestling with many
young children in the car well, not actually wrestling them,
but they're in there and they're wrestling, you know, it's a
convenient thing, but it's not impossible in many, many
circumstances. And I mean, granted, there are some circumstances
where it really truly is a benefit for some individuals. But I
don't know that that's enough justification. And I would like
I would prefer it if we had actually taken action to simply
no longer allow drive-throughs in the District of Columbia
because I think that, you know, we are very forward thinking,
very progressive on issues of environmental concern and issues
of mitigating traffic issues and trying to drive down the use of
cars and but on this one, I think we are still a bit backward.
So I understand that I would not be in the majority, but I planned
plan to vote against this tonight. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I really appreciate my colleagues and Commissioner May in particular. You and I have served together a long time. We don't always agree. And this is one HUNT REPORTING COMPANY

of those where we definitely don't agree. As I looked into this 1 2 and I started doing my own research and when I looked at the bicycle lanes, this being proposed at South Dakota avenue, I have 3 the audacity to say that DDOT has a problem with drive-through 4 5 with seniors who predominately want to drive-through but they don't mind bicycle lanes. I think that's disrespectful to a 6 middle-class black neighborhood and I have problems with that. 7 8 I do know that it can be mitigated. We mitigate everything else. 9 And then also to tell a neighborhood North Michigan Park -- and 10 yeah, this is where I grew up, in this area. So the thing about it -- and we all grew up in some areas. But then I fundamentally 11 12 disagree with my good friend, Commissioner May, 100 percent. 13 He's saying do away with drive-throughs and I see everybody 14 getting a drive-through. So I'm getting mixed signals from what 15 Commissioner May is saying. I'm not making this about 16 Commissioner May because I'm sure he's well stooped what he's But I don't see that. I see drive-throughs being put 17 18 in. I don't think nobody builds anything else, especially in the suburbs and even in cities without a drive-through now. And I 19 20 think that's what they're trying -- we just had a drive-through 21 put in up the street just put in.

COMMISSIONER MAY: I'm not talking about the nearby jurisdictions, I'm talking about across the country, there are many reports of them being banned in certain cities.

22

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I would love to -- I would do some

HUNT REPORTING COMPANY

Court Reporting and Litigation Support

Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia

410-766-HUNT (4868) 1-800-950-DEPO (3376) more research, but I can just tell you, even right here in this city, right up the street one was just put in a couple of months ago.

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: I understand that. It's allowed in certain zones.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So what I'm saying is -- so to say that we're concerned about pedestrian and pedestrian traffic and car traffic, I don't understand DDOT's philosophy. I got by not what I read, but what actually happens. When you look at Pennsylvania Avenue and across Pennsylvania Avenue down there by the White House and even at 1300 right near the Wilson building, if you walk across there in the bicycle lanes and you walk across there and you standing there waiting to get to the other side, you better watch out for the bicycles. You want to talk about pedestrian safety, and now you're talking about putting bicycle lanes on South Dakota Avenue? Let's get real. Those residents, the ANC -- and Vice Chair, I appreciate you bringing that up, Chairman Edwards has sent us three letters, two to three letters, the last one I remember saying I read this at the hearing, it specifically said we reiterated what we said previously. then Office of Planning found a zone where they can -- for the plan -- from the plan -- they're the planners, not DDOT, but then on the other side of it, DDOT has their own plan for this neighborhood, a middle-class black neighborhood, that they want to see what they want to see in somebody else's neighborhood. I

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

think that's not actually the way to go. While I appreciate DDOT, but you can't tell me anything about a drive-through versus bicycle lanes on South Dakota Avenue. That's ludicrous, it makes no sense to me how you're going to argue one against the other.

But again, as has already been stated, you have to give the Office of Planning great weight. And I appreciate the work that they did, they're the planners. And you also have to give the ANC great weight. Not only that, the North Michigan Park Civic Association, which had 96 people, 96 people I understand, at that meeting was testified to. And I know you have four or five people who came and they have concerns. But all that can be mitigated. North Michigan Park has always been a area in which they work together to make things work.

So I'll leave it at that. I appreciate the conversation. And with that, we will go ahead and proceed unless somebody else have any additional comments.

All right, so --

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes?

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Mr. Chairman, I just want to compliment Commissioner May standing on principle, on good planning principles. I believe in my own professional judgment he's not wrong about the environment -- the environmental impacts of this, the traffic impacts of this. But as you see, Mr. Chairman, I personally believe that I think there could be a safe HUNT REPORTING COMPANY

drive-through here. So against my better judgment, I'm still willing to vote in favor of this at a benefit to the neighborhood and its residents, so. But I just again wanted to reiterate that Commissioner May, in terms of planning and design principles, is not wrong.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I'm going to follow up on that. We're going to follow up on that because I do want to learn more about -- because what he's saying I don't see it. I see more drive-throughs and I see people continue to build them. Matter of fact, people pass by this McDonald's I know for a fact and go to the one over there in Maryland because it has a drive-through.

COMMISSIONER MAY: We heard that in testimony.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah. Okay. I knew I heard it from somewhere. But anyway.

Vice Chair Miller, you had your hand up?

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yeah, Mr. Chairman. Just to say I understand where everybody is coming from on this issue. But I do particularly understand where you're coming from on this issue and the reality that we all like to occasionally use drivethroughs. I have. And they're convenient and they're helpful. And if it can be worked out with the traffic pattern. And also, I mean, I generally support -- not generally, I strongly support the city's expansion of bike lanes throughout the city, but it'll be interesting to see what happens on Connecticut Avenue when two

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

lanes are removed to have two bike lanes there, for all that commuter traffic that's going to end up in my neighborhood three blocks away because they can't move on Connecticut Avenue. anyway, there are a lot of a lot of nuances in all of these proposals and a lot of ramifications. But we need to equitably provide choices for both bike lanes and drive-throughs and other food, healthy food options throughout the city that's been kind of a theme throughout this evening's hearing. It needs to be equitable. If you're going to allow it in one neighborhood, it shouldn't be suddenly disallowed in another neighborhood. Maybe it's grandfathered in the drive-through that's located not too far from where I'm located, although I've never actually used that one. But anyway, I just wanted to express that I understand where everybody's coming from on this issue. And it can be a conversation and a policy issue that we can look at again, Mr. May, as we go forward. I can't remember where I was when we considered that in ZR16, I probably was close -- more closely aligned with you going forward, but I can't remember.

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: Well, I don't want to pick on Commissioner May, but I appreciate -- what I do appreciate though is the discussion on this, because I think as -- even though we are on different ends, I think we come out with a better outcome. But I'm pretty sure I wasn't with you, Commissioner May, on that one, so I'm pretty sure of that already without even trying to think about it. So with that, unless there's some more HUNT REPORTING COMPANY

discussion, I would move that --

COMMISSIONER MAY: I think a lot of people were not with me on that.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I can't wait for 20 years from now.

I know you and I are going to stay in touch 20, 30 years from now I want to see you on that bike doing all the -- I can't wait for this. I'm looking forward to it. If the Lord allows me -
VICE CHAIR MILLER: There'll be the bike-through lane at the McDonald's.

COMMISSIONER MAY: I have ridden my bike through the drive-through lanes.

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say one more thing and just about the bikes is that we're all familiar with the term every time a bell rings, an angel gets its wings. I firmly believe that every time Commissioner May rings his bike bell, D.C. gets another bike lane.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And let me clarify this though. I am not against bicycles. I got beat up some years ago, if you all remember. I go to Bike Day every -- I used to go to Bike Day down at Freedom Plaza after that, every year. I am not against it, but -- like I appreciate the Vice Chair, it's about choices. Let's give people choices, equitable choices. So I appreciate that. All right. Let's go -- I make -- I would move that we approve Zoning Commission Case No. 22-19, McDonald's Corporation map amendment at Square 3786, and ask for a second.

HUNT REPORTING COMPANY

1	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Second.
2	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Move and properly second. Any
3	further discussion?
4	And I also would hope that DDOT would not try to throw
5	up any roadblocks even in public space, because I know that they
6	have last say. But the community wants that. They're the ones
7	who live there. And I'll leave it at that.
8	Any further discussion?
9	All right. Ms. Schellin, would you do a roll call vote
10	please?
11	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood?
12	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.
13	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller?
14	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.
15	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Imamura?
16	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes, ring, ring.
17	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner May?
18	COMMISSIONER MAY: No.
19	MS. SCHELLIN: So staff records the vote three to one
20	to one to approve proposed action in Zoning Commission Case No.
21	22-19. Commissioner May opposing and the minus one being the
22	third mayoral appointee position which is vacant. Again, this
23	one well, actually it's not a PUD, so I don't need to remind
24	them of anything. Thank you.
25	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. And this the last thing I'm HUNT REPORTING COMPANY Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia 410-766-HUNT (4868) 1-800-950-DEPO (3376)

1	going to say about Commissioner May. I'm going to stand out at
2	the McDonald's when it's raining and see if he uses it wher
3	they if they do a drive-through, which I don't know what they
4	might do, but if they do a drive-through, I'm going to stand
5	there and see if I see him go through the drive-through.
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: If I do, it'll be on my bike.
7	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: No, I don't even want you to do it
8	on your bike.
9	COMMISSIONER MAY: On those great new bike lanes.
10	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Oh, I may ride a bike down there
11	too, but I don't want to kill myself.
12	All right. I think the next thing we have thank you
13	all for that discussion I think the next and more to come,
14	I'm sure.
15	All right. Hearing action is hearing action the
16	next one, Ms. Schellin, I think?
17	Okay. Hearing action Zoning Commission Case No. 22-
18	33, and going to bring Mr. Mordfin up and then we'll hear from
19	Ms. Steingasser.
20	Good evening, Mr. Mordfin, you may begin when you're
21	ready.
22	MR. MORDFIN: Okay. Thank you. Good evening, Chair,
23	and members of the Commission. I'm Steven Mordfin with the Office
24	of Planning. Okay. So the subject property, which is located
25	at 7050 Eastern Avenue, N.W., is on the southwest side of Eastern HUNT REPORTING COMPANY

Avenue between Piney Branch Road and Cedar Street, N.W. The Applicant's requesting a map amendment for what is today a split zoned lot from RA-1, a low to moderate density residential zone, and MU-4, a moderate density mixed use residential and retail zone to rA-3, a medium density residential zone. Can you move to the 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

24

25

The future land use map predominantly identifies the subject property as appropriate for moderate density residential uses consistent with the requested RA-3 zone. The generalized policy map predominantly locates the site within the neighborhood conservation areas or locations intended for conservation and enhancement of established neighborhoods, but not to prevent development. The requested map amendment would permit an increase in density and could facilitate the construction of new affordable and market rate housing that will be subject to the IZ Plus zoning regulations. Located within walking distance of a Metro station, this site, if rezoned, could improve access to economic, educational, and healthcare opportunities throughout the Washington area, helping to address barriers that communities of color often experience. Therefore, OP recommends the Commission set this application down for a public hearing and is available for questions.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Mr. Mordfin. Let's see if we have any questions. Who'd like to start us off? I don't want to always call on Commissioner May. Just raise your hand.

HUNT REPORTING COMPANY

Is that what Fred says, just raise your hand, I forgot how he says it. I get tickled, raise your hand. Feel like I'm in school.

Okay. Well, Commissioner May?

COMMISSIONER MAY: I don't have any comments. I support the set down.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Well, I'm -- Commissioner Imamura? You're on mute. I think you're still on mute or something's going on. All right. I'll come back to you. I'll come back to you.

Vice Chair Miller?

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So I support set down of this case. I would just note, as our counsel has advised and I'm reading from their advice to us, the comp plan consistency racial equity analysis of a zoning action considers displacement as a factor because the property owner here exercised its tenant opportunity of purchase rights to purchase the property and assigned that rights to this developer entity. In this case, displacement of the existing tenants at the property is more of a certainty than would typically be the case because of rezoning. For this reason, we need to ensure — so it was kind of a voluntary displacement because they agreed to do this redevelopment project. So they're saying that we should ensure, and I agree, that the relocation and right to return plans are clearly described by the Applicant, both at the

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

public hearing and in the final case record. So I support this set down. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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: Thank you. Thank you all. I'm going to go back to Commissioner Imamura in a moment. Are you straight now? Okay. No, I can't -- I don't know. Okay. So I guess for the -- we don't have much, so you can just wave or something, okay.

So I appreciate Vice Chair Miller for bringing that up. I think that's very important as our counselors and Liu has -but I always want to say this while I'm thinking about it, I really appreciate the way our counsel looks at all the legal issues for us and help us frame them. While we make the decisions on the legal stuff and sometimes we may not follow it always, but they always give us the legality and let us know what we should be doing, what the letter of the law is and we follow that to a point. But we always put our own pieces in it. But I just wanted to thank them for that, because I think they did a heck of a job, especially today. They do it all the time, but especially today. So I appreciate all the legal stuff, even though sometimes it's kind of complex sometimes. As long as I've been doing it, I still have to read stuff, the same sentence sometimes four and five times, so I do want them to know I appreciate that.

All right. So with that, I think this is ready for set down. We don't have any other questions. Thank you, Mr. Mordfin.

HUNT REPORTING COMPANY

1	And what we'll do, Vice Chair Miller, I'll ask you to make a
2	motion if you don't mind.
3	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Thank you. I would move
4	that the Zoning Commission set down for a public hearing Zoning
5	Commission Case No. 22-33, NHP Foundation, map amendment at
6	Square 3351 from RA-1 and MU-4 to RA-3 and ask for a second.
7	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'll second it.
8	It's been moved and properly second.
9	Ms. Schellin, when you call the vote, Commissioner
10	Imamura will raise his hand if he's in support. There's no sense
11	in logging off and come back on right now.
12	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller?
13	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Hold on.
14	Any further discussion? Hold on one second. Any
15	further discussion?
16	Not hearing any, Ms. Schellin, would you do a roll call
17	vote please?
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: Commissioner Imamura?
25	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.
	HUNT REPORTING COMPANY Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia 410-766-HUNT (4868) 1-800-950-DEPO (3376)

MS. SCHELLIN: Oh, we heard him. So and the vote is 1 2 four to zero to one to set down Zoning Commission Case No. 22-33 The minus one being the third mayoral 3 as a contested case. 4 appointee position, which is vacant. 5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Schellin. 6 I know we have a Office of Planning update. 7 Yeah, Ms. Steingasser? 8 MS. STEINGASSER: Yes, Mr. Chairman. 9 Mr. Young, could you bring up our PowerPoint as well 10 as Mr. Kirschenbaum and Art Rogers? It'll be a part of our presentation. Thank you. Jonathan and Art, are they up? 11 12 MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: I'm here, I think Art is in as well. 13 MS. STEINGASSER: Okay. 14 Good evening --15 MR. ROGERS: Yep, I'm here as well, thank you. 16 MS. STEINGASSER: Okay, good. Thank you. 17 Chairman Hood, Commissioners, at the last meeting, the 18 Commission asked that OP provide an update on the roundtable that 19 OP had hosted on IZ in the downtown, affordability in general 20 terms district wide. And so that's what this report is about, 21 this update. Next slide please? So at the roundtable, which we hosted on November 1st, 22 23 we had 22 people sign up. We had over 50 in -- that were observing, but 18 provided testimony, either written or verbally 24 25 at the roundtable. And we sought general comments on ideas stated HUNT REPORTING COMPANY Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia 410-766-HUNT (4868)

1-800-950-DEPO (3376)

here, ways to encourage housing and affordable housing citywide. We were also looking for any kind of thoughts and ideas people have and opportunities for new housing and affordability in the downtown and any thoughts about the recent changes in the demand for office and the trend that we are seeing of conversion of resident — of office space to residential, and ways that we could leverage inclusionary zoning as well as other tools that affect the supply of housing and affordable housing. As you know, IZ is just one of many tools and it hits a very narrow slice of the housing. So Art Rogers is going to go through the issues as they were presented to the public. And then Jonathan's going to follow up with the comments that we heard back, and then we'll give you our next steps and time frame. So I believe the next slide would go to Art.

MR. ROGERS: Hi, members of the Commission. My name is Art Rogers. I'm the senior housing planner for OP. And apologies, I don't know if my camera is working, so it doesn't seem to be working. But as Jennifer said, I'm going to present to you tonight sort of a few slides that we presented at the roundtable. Not all the slides, but the slides that talk about the District's affordable housing tools, about IZ and about some of the steps that we're doing for affordable housing in central Washington. So I believe the Commission has seen this slide before. We've presented it. It's a good graphic that illustrates all the different types of tools or many of the different types

1	of tools that the District uses to provide affordable housing.
2	And I think the key lesson for everybody is that all these tools
3	generally have a target income that they try to serve and we meet
4	the needs of a variety of different incomes by blending these
5	tools together. So no one tool typically can target extremely
6	low income households. They often need a layering of subsidies.
7	And I think that's a good lesson for us all to remember. And in
8	this case, what does happen with inclusionary zoning is, for
9	instance, with the rental units that 60 percent of the median
10	family income, if we could advance the slide, it's actually not
11	the slide, just animate it.
12	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I think Commissioner May is saying
13	something.
14	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah, sorry, before we go, can we
15	ask questions? Each one of these categories includes something
16	called an affordable dwelling units. And what exactly is that?
17	MR. ROGERS: Those are in many cases, those are
18	projects that were pre IZ. There's two major types. So they
19	are the PUDs that were delivered prior to IZ. They are also, in
20	some cases, the land disposition units from public lands.
21	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. All right. Thank you.
22	MR. ROGERS: Yeah. So if we can advance, we have an
23	animation to show the links. There we go. Thank you.
24	So this just shows the link of how inclusionary zoning
25	works with vouchers to enable lower income households to afford

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

the units. As the Commission knows, the IZ units, the matter of right IZ targets rental units at 60 percent of the median family income. And through blending in with these other tools, the different types of vouchers, primarily the housing choice vouchers, and then the District's local rent supplement program, we can make the IZ units affordable down to extremely low household incomes. Similarly with the housing ownership units. If we could advance it again? There we go.

Occupants of the IZ units that are set at 80 percent of -- excuse me -- of AMI often rely on the two major homeownership programs the District offers. One is the home purchase assistance program through DHCD, which is a down payment assistance program, and then there's also through the Housing Finance Agency called Open Doors. It is a low interest rate mortgage program. And in the case of IZ units, in the past fiscal year report that should be published by the DHCD fairly soon, about 17 purchasers of the IZ units at 80 percent of AMI also used the D.C. Open Doors and the HPAP program. And so in this way, we can again achieve affordability to those deeper and lower income households. Okay. Next slide please?

This is very similar. It presents to the Commission though the incomes and the household sizes that fit the extremely low, very low, and low income housing definitions under the comprehensive plan. And also you can see on the slide that the definition of the moderate income households. So there's not HUNT REPORTING COMPANY

much more to say about this budget, but it does provide the 1 2 Commission an understanding of the types of household incomes and those household sizes that the different targets will serve. 3 4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So Mr. Rogers, excuse me, can we get 5 this -- can we get your presentation, can you email it, have Ms. 6 Schellin and email it to us? I'd like to keep this, especially 7 this chart. 8 MR. ROGERS: Absolutely, yes. And this is in the 9 It's in the housing element. comprehensive plan. So you can 10 also find it there. But we'd be happy to provide it to the 11 Commission. CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Well, I don't want to look through 12 13 all them pages. This right here is sufficient, thank you. 14 MR. ROGERS: Understood. Okay. If we could have the 15 next slide? 16 did provide the basic information to So we participants 17 of the roundtable, the basic information 18 inclusionary zoning. So I think the Commission is fully aware 19 of this slide. So I'm not going to go into too much detail. One 20 of the things that we did call out were the flexibility, the 21 existing flexibility, that the program offers. So next slide

We also provided the performance of the program on how many units have been produced and where those units are being produced. And I think this is a very useful illustration of the HUNT REPORTING COMPANY

22

23

24

25

please?

program and its change over time. You can see that the number of units delivered annually has pretty consistently increased since about 2014, up until where we're receiving almost 400 or delivering almost 400 units a year in 2021. The other thing I want to point out to the Commission is this chart also shows the results of the changes to the IZ program back in 2016 and 2017, which shifted the targeting of the rental units towards 60 percent of AMI. You can see those in orange. So we can see the increase in the number of units targeting 60 percent of AMI. And I think what's also interesting is we're also maintaining a good share of units at 50 percent of AMI, and this is achieved through a variety of different ways. This includes units developed through the penthouse regulations, through PUD proffers, and also some residual projects that were -- had their development rights prior to the to the IZ changes. And then on the right, we can see where inclusionary zoning units are being located. And I think the good story about this is they're really being distributed all across the city, but particularly in those areas where we see a lot of market rate development. As the Commission is aware, that's what IZ is really tied to, is where there is market rate interest to build new residential units. So I think these two slides really tell a good story about the program. And this is, again, what we presented to the folks on the roundtable. slide?

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 we also talked to the members of the roundtable

HUNT REPORTING COMPANY

Court Reporting and Litigation Support

Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia

410-766-HUNT (4868)

1-800-950-DEPO (3376)

about the focus on planning areas, but specifically central Washington. As the Commission is probably aware, the housing element and the comprehensive plan adopted goals across all planning areas to have a minimum of 15 percent affordable units by the year 2050. And then you can see on the slide the direct policy statement that is directed at central Washington and the goals of central Washington are to absorb a lot of the demand for the high density housing and encourage affordable housing production through regulations and incentives. Next slide?

Is this past fiscal year, or this past budget I should say, the council approved a tax abatement to provide IZ units in this area that you see outlined in the purple would require affordable housing and in exchange they would get a tax abatement.

HUNT REPORTING COMPANY

And I think one of the interesting thing is the Commission -- or not the Commissioner, I'm sorry, the coucil decided that the program should require 15 percent of the units to be affordable at 60 percent of the median family income. And with a number of proposed conversions of housing, there is potential for a number of projects to use -- to decide to use this tax abatement and deliver affordable units in central Washington. So the next slide?

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

And then finally, I wanted to share with the Commission some of the successes the District has had. As I said earlier, there is a goal of 15 percent affordable units in all planning areas by 2050, and we want to let the Commission know that we are very close to that right now, we're around 14 percent. I think what's interesting is we're maintaining that 14 percent as the number of market rate projects that are exempt from IZ are proposed in central Washington. And we're doing it through a variety of tools. So these projects here you see represent some of the major tools that we use for affordable housing. For instance, at 555 East Street, there is a land disposition that from DMPED has 57 affordable units in it. There's an example of financing at 1035 4th Street in the Mount Vernon Triangle area, and that project has 223 affordable units. And the Commission may be familiar with the Wal-Mart in downtown on 8th Street at 77 8th Street, that has IZ units in it. And then finally proposed at 1133 North Capitol is the redevelopment of the existing housing

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

authority site, and that's proposed to have 86 affordable units in it. And the only other thing I would like to say about this is most of these projects have a blend of affordability that reaches down to 30 percent of the median family income. So the 77 8th Street is an IZ project that was built prior to the changes in 2016. And so it only has units at 80 percent of the median family income. But all these other projects have a variety of income targets that they're serving. That pretty much concludes what I want to share with the Commission. And I'll now hand it over to Jonathan, who will share the feedback that we heard from the public.

MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: Thank you. So I am Jonathan Kirschenbaum with the Office of Planning. Next slide please?

So as Mr. Steingasser mentioned, we did have a number of organizations and some individuals testify at the roundtable. We also had people who could not testify live provide testimony to us in writing. And so the summary of those -- so there's a summary of those comments both that were given at the roundtable and also received after. We received a lot of comments about both housing and affordable housing, both District wide and also pertaining to the downtown. The testimony ranged from policy directly related to zoning, and then there's also comments related to more broader affordable housing policies that are not necessarily within the scope of zoning. So on the next couple slides, we summarize what we heard by topic. So the first topic

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

is downtown zoning. We heard that an IZ requirement should only be applied if IZ bonus density or tax abatements could be provided in those downtown zones. Related to this, we also heard that transfer and recordation tax relief should also be considered. We heard without bonus density or tax subsidies, IZ would reduce residential land values by approximately 20 percent and would make it difficult to finance conversions of existing office buildings to residential use. So we heard that this would make it inappropriate to apply IZ to downtown. We also heard from several people that IZ. should apply to downtown, regardless of the ability to provide either zoning bonus density or tax abatements. We also heard that an IZ requirement in the downtown would increase the likelihood that properties would stay vacant for extended periods of time, resulting in negative impacts on surrounding land values and tax revenues. And lastly, we heard that an IZ requirement, if it is applied, should be done over a phase period of time over three years to allow financing and land values to adjust accordingly for the new IZ requirements. 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

24

25

Regarding to comments related to citywide zoning and affordable housing, we heard the following: OP should maximize the IZ Plus program by initiating map amendments to apply IZ Plus to more properties to support the creation of more affordable housing. So that would be particularly bringing forward map amendments where there have been FLUM changes as part of the last

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

comprehensive plan update. We heard that PUD level density should be provided as a matter of right if the proposal is for all affordable housing. We also heard that minimum parking requirements for affordable housing units should be eliminated. We also heard that existing IZ affordability levels should be maintained. So the current MFI levels that the IZ program requires, those should be maintained because requiring deeper affordability is not a good fit for the land value capture program that IZ currently is. And then lastly, we heard that any increase in density provide for more affordable housing should be compatible with the existing neighborhood character. 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

24

25

And then these are comments that really deal with more sort of broader affordable housing policies that are not quite directly tied to zoning. We heard that an affordable housing property acquisition fund for high opportunity areas should be created to purchase land and buildings for the creation of permanent affordable housing. The existing rent control program only applies right now to buildings built in 1975 and earlier. So there was a comment that rent control should be extended to post-1975 buildings. The District's right of first refusal should be extended to all land sales instead of just properties that are vacant, blighted, or funded by housing production trust Another idea was a land value taxation system fund dollars. should be created to make it more expensive and to also HUNT REPORTING COMPANY

disincentivize landowners keeping from land vacant and underutilized. That -- the idea behind that would it would be -- incentivize owners to develop their properties with more Another idea was that the Cash for Covenants program housing. should only be used for existing market rate run -- excuse me, to bring affordability to existing market rate units and not to run stabilized units to ensure that units are -- excuse me, to ensure that units made affordable are truly affordable new units. Right now, the program can be used for rent controlled units, and the idea is that that's not really creating more or new affordable We also heard that the D.C. Housing Authority should permit residents to have pets such as dogs. And we also heard that the existing D.C. housing programs should be examined to look out how they're succeeding and where they can be further strengthened to ensure that the current programs that we have are working as intended. 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

24

25

And then we also heard some comments about the Height Act. Several comments suggested that the District should investigate changes to the Height Act to support the development of more housing and affordable housing, while others were against changing the character of Washington and amending the Height Act. And those are a summary of the comments we heard from the roundtable. And I will turn it over to Ms Steingasser to talk about our sort of next steps in this process. So next slide please?

MS. STEINGASSER: So Commissioners, as you can see, we heard a lot -- a very broad range of ideas and recommendations, warnings, concerns, enthusiasm. And the whole idea of the very first slides was to show the complex relationship between the various AMIs and MFIs and the funding tools that are available but that need to work together. So we're going to spend -- we'll right now we're continuing to work with the stakeholders and go through some of these comments. We're trying to model some of them financially and economically and analyze those options and see how they work together. We'll be doing that through the rest of December. We hope to be -- in the winter sometime in January, February, we'll be bringing a report to you on the parking exemptions for affordable housing that ties into DHCD programs and their time-frame, so we want to be able to be responsive to So those will be coming to you first. The off-site those. provision and deeper affordability, there is a text amendment that has been filed from another agency that's before you. will be responding to that text amendment. We see that coming in February, March sometime. And then as all of those are moving on, we'll still be looking and analyzing and working on the downtown IZ and how does IZ -- how can it be integrated into the downtown, at what levels, should there be phasing, you know, what is the financial impacts of those, and so we're going to be spending a lot of time modeling and forecasting that. expect to be able to bring you something in Spring, April, May. HUNT REPORTING COMPANY

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

1	So and that may be concepts, it may be text amendments directly,
2	we don't know. But we've been very clear that when we bring
3	something back to the Zoning Commission, we will have worked with
4	the stakeholders, we will have worked with the development
5	community, whether it's the developers roundtable, DCBI, they
6	nobody will be surprised. OP won't work in isolation; it will
7	be a very public process as we continue to investigate these
8	things. So with that's our time-frame and that's our status
9	report on the issue.
10	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Steingasser, Mr.
11	Kirschenbaum, and Mr. Rogers. You have time for a couple of
12	questions?
13	MS. STEINGASSER: Yes.
14	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So. So first, let me ask you
15	about the and I may not be clear how it was presented let
16	me ask you about the roundtable. So you said you had, what, 18
17	people testify, but you had 50 in total?
18	MS. STEINGASSER: You know how you can see the count
19	of who's watching?
20	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Oh, okay, I gotcha, I gotcha.
21	MS. STEINGASSER: Yeah, that's how we were
22	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So you had 18 though to
23	testify?
24	MS. STEINGASSER: Yes, sir.
25	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Now, of those 18, was were there
	HUNT REPORTING COMPANY Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia 410-766-HUNT (4868)

1-800-950-DEPO (3376)

developers, were there housing advocates, citizens who don't really do this all the time? I mean, what was -- do you know what the makeup kind of was?

MS. STEINGASSER: Yes. Yes, there was -- and we have that list. There were developers. There were, like you say, housing advocates. There were the Committee 100. There were preservationists. There were those who were worried about the quality of life in public housing and the animals. We had a pretty strong range of participants. We also had -- you know, we had people representing some smart growth organizations and -- yeah, and we have that whole list. And when we come back to the Commission with the more formal written report, we'll list those representations.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Good. Sound like you had a great representation of all aspects of advocates in whatever position --

MS. STEINGASSER: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: -- whatever position they're in.

The other question is the way I looked at the presentation, it looks like, at least from that roundtable, that a lot of people will have a problem with IZ being applied to D zones, was that -- did I get that right?

MS. STEINGASSER: There is a lot of concern by property owners and developers who work in the downtown about the heavy application of IZ, because there is no ability to offset through HUNT REPORTING COMPANY

incentives or bonus density. So yes, there is a very big concern about the state of downtown right now. You know, there's over a million square feet of vacant office space and there is a -- I've heard that Washington may be leading the country in converting office space to residential in the downtown, but it's a very expensive process and not all office buildings lend themselves easily to conversion to residential. So there's, you've got to put in different elevator cores, you've got to cut in -- you know, the floor plates are of an office building are much larger and wider. The window, the light, safety, fire, all of that's very difficult and requires often a loss of a square footage. So the issue of inclusionary zoning is very closely watched, yes, sir.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Well, thank you, Office of Planning, Ms. Steingasser, and her team for having that roundtable. And I know my colleagues may have other questions. Really appreciate the status report and update.

Let me see. Commissioners, any question?

COMMISSIONER MAY: I just wanted to comment. I saw two -- at BZA yesterday we had two different office to residential conversions and they were both terrific projects. I was very excited to see both of those.

MS. STEINGASSER: Yeah, I saw those. Yeah. And those smaller buildings can lend themselves very easily. It's the bigger ones.

1	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah. One of them seemed like a
2	pretty natural adaptation, given the shape of it. But the other
3	one, they had to cut a courtyard into the middle of the building,
4	the deep floor plates. So that's obviously very costly, but it's
5	terrific because they're going to deliver, you know, a lot of
6	housing in places where there maybe isn't that much.
7	MS. SCHELLIN: Yeah. Yeah. We're very supportive of
8	that.
9	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Right. Any other questions or
10	comments?
11	Vice Chair Miller?
12	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank
13	you, Ms, Steingasser, Mr. Rogers, and Mr. Kirschenbaum, for your
14	presentation update this evening on the application of
15	inclusionary zoning to downtown. I was one of the 50 observers
16	of your November 1st public roundtable and I would encourage my
17	fellow commissioners who may not have been able to tune in, I'm
18	sure it's on, if not our website, on OP's website; is that
19	correct, Ms. Steingasser?
20	MS. STEINGASSER: Yes, sir, it is. It's on the OF
21	YouTube channel.
22	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yeah. And it was I appreciate
23	all your work and the presentation that you did there and the
24	information you provided and the feedback that you got and the
25	information that you're providing tonight. This is a complicated

issue. IZ is just one little, as you said, sliver of the affordable housing programs that the District has that we are involved with. And there's so many more. We're mostly involved with private sector housing development. And so we have a program that took a long time to get promulgated. I was involved in that effort with your Office of Planning and the community many years ago in getting it promulgated. And the Office of Planning's original position was that it should be voluntary IZ, but it became mandatory IZ. I don't know if you remember those nomenclatures, you probably do.

MS. STEINGASSER: Yes. Yes, I do.

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: Yeah. So I mean, that was a big deal then. And the development community was adamantly opposed, even though under that proposal, voluntary or mandatory, there was the additional density that was able to be provided to compensate for the new affordable housing requirements that would be laid on to a what otherwise would be a matter of right zoning development. And we don't have that -- we understand that, we don't have that with downtown currently because downtown is at its maximum intensity and there is a bonus density be provided. But it's -- but the argument then was partially about this will reduce land values of the wherever you're going to require it. And it might have. I don't know if it did. And certainly the commercial office where a lot of the residential was being -- the IZ was going to be required was going to maybe have an effect, a

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

deleterious effect, on the commercial property tax revenue that downtown traditionally has generated for the District of Columbia to fund everything that we do, that we want to do for social and economic justice and programs.

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

And the pandemic has highlighted how the downtown and other property values throughout the city and the nation, maybe the world, have to be devalued beyond their overvalued prices of what they are in order to permit or facilitate the development that's currently permitted, or if we want to put another requirement on it, like IZ downtown, it may be devalued further, but that may be an appropriate time to devalue when it's already being devalued and maybe our property tax assessments don't reflect appropriately the value of downtown property that is 25 percent vacant or 50 percent bacon or one million square plus vacant that you just said tonight. I mean, that's a lot of vacant. So that's -- but there needs -- that's part of what it's It is part of adjusting the values to accommodate all about. the goals, the aspirational goals, that we want to meet in the city that are equitably distributed throughout the city, and downtown should absolutely be participating in affordable housing when downtown under I think Zoning Commission Chairman Cherse Gozeberg (phonetic) or maybe Obana (phonetic), I can't remember, maybe it was under both of them, did the downtown development district regulation that basically down-zoned downtown to try to meet housing, historic preservation, retail, other requirements

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

1	and you weren't going to just be able to do, you know, 12-story,
2	13-story office buildings. And there was that argument from DCBA
3	and all the others how it's going to devalue downtown, but I
4	think we all can agree 30 years later, 30 plus years later, that
5	we got a better downtown because we required housing, we required
6	we didn't require affordable housing, but we required housing.
7	We required historic preservation. We required retail, although
8	we probably did too much retail at the time. We had to scale it
9	back because we did the second floor. And arts, overlay. We
10	had all these overlays. So there are always adjustments and
11	evolving the evolving zoning regulations, which is just a very
12	small part of what we're trying to achieve in the city in terms
13	of equitable development. But downtown needs to be participating
14	in the affordable housing development, and we've seen projects
15	come forward voluntarily because it's not mandatorily required
16	except in, I think, 3D three downtown zones right now, is it
17	D-2, 4, and D-2, 3, and 4? What is it?
18	MS. STEINGASSER: I think it's 2, 4, and 6. Oh, go

ahead.

MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: D-2, D-4, and D-8.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Right. And so the D-5 zone, which is -- has been particularly problematic because that's near southwest along the south capitol corridor. Nobody thinks that that is really the downtown. And when those projects have come forward without any inclusionary zoning or sometimes voluntarily, HUNT REPORTING COMPANY

1	they threw a bone to the ANC, that was good if they did, but they
2	should D-5 should have been included. And so I don't know if
3	all of downtown should be included because that's pretty I can
4	understand the ramifications of that on our property tax base in
5	the long short-term and long-term. But our property tax base,
6	if it's being assessed properly, it's probably already adversely
7	impacted from everything that's happened.
8	I appreciate you having the November 1st roundtable.
9	That was, I think, very useful to have. And you said the council
10	passed tax abatement for downtown housing and requiring 50
11	percent of units to be affordable. I don't think that's funded,
12	right? I don't think they've funded it yet. Does that is
13	that right, Jonathan I mean, Mr. Rogers?
14	MR. ROGERS: No, I believe it is funded. Yes.
15	VICE CHAIR MILLER: They funded it? Beginning when?
16	MR. ROGERS: I believe it's going to start in fiscal
17	year '24. Right now, DMPED is working on
18	VICE CHAIR MILLER: So October October 1, 2023.
19	It's not funded right now.
20	MR. ROGERS: It was in the it was in the budget that
21	was passed.
22	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yeah.
23	MR. ROGERS: And I believe DMPED is beginning to draft
24	the regulations.
25	VICE CHAIR MILLER: And do you know how much money is
	HUNT REPORTING COMPANY Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia 410-766-HUNT (4868)

1-800-950-DEPO (3376)

allocated to that, just out of curiosity?

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

MR. ROGERS: We can find that out for the Commission.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: I mean, it's not really relevant to our deliberations, but it's a lot of money. I mean, I realize it's an expensive proposition to require affordable housing to be on the most -- what was most, what used to be the most property in the city. I'm not sure it is anymore, given everything that's happened and happening with remote work, office work. I'm not sure what other questions I might have, but I think the timetable for bringing something forward to us for a case that's currently pending, so you have the January, February, I think, for the parking affordability. I think you got -- I don't want the April, We've waited too long. We've talked about looking at May. downtown housing. We just want to have a hearing on it. I know you need to do your analysis, but really we've been talking about this for three years.

MS. STEINGASSER: Uh-huh.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: We need to have a set down hearing. We'll do it ourselves if you're not going to recommend it to us, or at least I'll recommend it. I don't know if there are three colleagues -- two colleagues that would support me. We need to have a public hearing on applying inclusionary zoning to more of the city, especially the downtown, or at least parts of the downtown. Doesn't have to be the central core, but the D-5 adjacent to the southwest baseball park -- ballpark yard area,

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

that needs to be part of -- they need to be -- everybody needs to be participating in this. It's really a de minimis effort that we can do. It's zoning. It takes a lot more with the subsidies and the land writedowns and the public dispositions to do all that we need to do for affordable housing and acquisitions of properties, which should have been probably done in up in my upper northwest neighborhood. There are -- we've had so many missed opportunities, whether it's Marriott Wardman, the Maza Galleria site, Lord & Taylor, they're not going to be there forever for affordable housing to be included in the area, which is the most deficit -- has the most deficit of affordable housing. And I'm embarrassed that I live in that neighborhood where there is that deficit of mixed income housing. And I know it's expensive. It's obviously very expensive, but we spend a lot of expensive things on a lot of things that we want to do. And affordable housing is the number one civic priority in the comprehensive plan. And we need to put our money where our mouth So if anyone wants to comment in response to that, I got -- not really a question, but I just wanted to vent, Mr. Chairman, 'cause it's what I do. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. I think that was very

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: All right. I think that was very well said, Vice Chair. I want you to add my list to the support of we have to do it. I want to give Ms. Steingasser and them time, because if we do it, I don't know, some of the time I always wonder about the outcomes. But I would even put my RA-1 issue HUNT REPORTING COMPANY

on the back burner for this, and I think it's very important that we move as fast -- as expeditiously as possible in this case. But I did hear that what Ms. Steingasser and the report said about the concern, but I would agree, I think it was the D-5 you mentioned, but I would agree with you, you have my support on I don't know how we'd do that. I don't want to jump -and jump into the fire. I don't want to do that out the frying pan, but I do want to make sure that I give Office of Planning their due diligence, but we want to move this as fast as possible. And again, I will put that RA -- forgot what it was now -- I haven't heard a lot on that lately, but I'll put that on a back 12 burner, Ms. Steingasser to try to move this faster.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Let's see if, Commissioner Imamura, you have any comments or questions?

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm kind of in a position here because I stand between the end of this meeting and everybody's dinner hour. So not always a good spot to be in before food. But I just want to mention, Mr. Chairman, that I too, along with Vice Chair Miller, was one of those participants at the public roundtable. And just want to take this opportunity at the end of our meeting here today to highlight the work that Ms. Steingasser and her team did during Tremendous work, highly professional. the hearing. know, given that at the beginning of this meeting, we were all sort of disheartened by the way one of our team members was HUNT REPORTING COMPANY

treated, I just want to remind everybody out there the good work that Ms. Steingasser and her team and other public servants out there do on behalf of the residents of D.C. And I want to say, Mr. Rogers, some of the maps and charts that you showed certainly gets me excited about planning and the reason why I enjoy the role that I have. And, Mr. Kirshenbaum, thank you for finishing off the second half of the presentation and articulating all the thoughts and interests of the residents. But I will say those maps and charts definitely demonstrate the work that you all are 10 doing in addition to other city agencies in partnership with OZ well, to advance the city and our goals. So thank you very much 11 12 for working on behalf of the residents to make D.C. a better 13 place to live, play, and work. So thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. STEINGASSER: Thank you. I appreciate that. And I'll pass that on to all my colleagues that work on this.

> COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Please do.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So the other thing I do want to mention, Vice Chair Miller mentioned it, I came in on some of the tail end of those discussions. I remember when Gerilee was the chairperson, Gerilee Press (phonetic), I remember Charlie Doctor, I remember Terry Lynch, and I think it was called a downtown cluster.

MS. STEINGASSER: Uh-huh.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: They were the ones who were really pushing. And you brought back some of that, when you mentioned HUNT REPORTING COMPANY

Maybelle (phonetic), who I replaced, which she had some great shoes to fill, and I still haven't filled them. But you had Maybelle and you mentioned Cherse Gozeberg, people who I've learned from and have had many conversations with. So you know, I know, Terry, I don't know if Mr. Doctor is still around or still hopefully he is, or still out doing things, but I know Terry is. I would be interested in -- I don't know -- have you all reached out to them, Ms. Steingasser, have y'all had discussions with Terry Lynch?

MS. SCHELLIN: We have not talked with Mr. Lynch about this. And I believe Mr. Doctor passed away a few years back.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. I just know that those two always came in front of the Commission advocating for downtown housing, and it just jogged my memory when the Vice Chair mentioned. So, you know, let's see what we can do to kind of move this along even faster. Whatever we need to take off your plate, Ms. Steingasser, we will. But we appreciate the work you do. And I appreciate the work. One thing that I tell people when they stop me in Costco, when they don't go through the drivethrough and we in McDonald's talking, you know, if you're telling me this, you can imagine the Office of Planning, the Zoning Commission, the Office of Zoning, or even the D.C. Council, you get one person to tell you something on the right side, you're going to hear something totally different on the left side, and you don't know what's coming down the middle. So you know, those

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

of us who have all these things to weigh, sometimes it's not all that easy. So I would I would ask the public not always to get mad with us because we have to listen to more than just one If I didn't just -- if we just all of us just in one person's way, that's different. But we have a whole lot of input that we have to try to make (indiscernible) and make our decision I know that's on a soapbox. They probably say Hood's now. getting tired 'cause it's getting late. But that's the reality of it. And I want to thank Vice Chair Miller for that, I'm not going to call it a dissertation, I'm going to call it, for that bringing us up to speed of where we need to be and also bringing 12 back and I appreciate your comments more than you ever know 13 because I just -- it recollect me on the people who fought before 14 us about downtown housing and what was going on downtown, Charlie 15 Doctor and Terry Lynch showed up every time we had a case or 16 something downtown. So let's see if we can continue that legacy 17 and move it on.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Any other comments or questions?

All right. I want to, again, Ms. Steingasser, thank you, as Commissioner Imamura said, thank you for all the work that you all do. We appreciate it.

MS. STEINGASSER: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. We've had a long meeting. I want to thank everybody. Let me see when we meet again. Seems -- like I said the other night, seems like we're just going to HUNT REPORTING COMPANY

1	meet through the holiday, but the Zoning Commission Ms.
2	Schellin will tell me if I get this wrong, because for some reason
3	I always go in here and it seems like I get it wrong. You know
4	what? We meet Monday the 19th or no, that was canceled. No,
5	wait a minute, hold on. I'm on 'cause it's not showing up in
6	my give me one second 'cause I want to announce this for the
7	public. Oh, yeah, here we are. December the 19th. Zoning
8	Commissioner will meet again on these same platforms. Our Case
9	No. is 22-22, December the 19th, on these same platforms. Our
10	case is Preservation DCL and 6, LLC. I want to thank everyone
11	for their participation tonight and appreciate your indulgence.
12	It's been a long meeting, so with that, I want to thank everyone
13	and thank my colleagues for all the work they put in, and our
14	staff and everyone. So with that, this public meeting is
15	adjourned. And goodnight. Have a nice weekend.
16	(Whereupon, the above-entitled hearing was adjourned.)

(Whereupon, the above-entitled hearing was adjourned.)

CERTIFICATION

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Public Meeting

Before: DCZC

Date: 12-15-2022

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