GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

REGULAR PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

THURSDAY

MARCH 9, 2023

+ + + + +

The Regular Public Meeting 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 PETER MAY, Commissioner 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 DANIEL LIU, ESQUIRE

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Regular Public Hearing held on March 9, 2023

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

Case No. 22-20 1301 Good Hope Road, LLC 4	:
Case No. 22-10 Trenton Park Apartments, LP6	
Case No. 22-12 Mid-Atlantic Neighborhood Development Corporation 1	0
Case No. 15-24C JBG/6th Street Associates, LLC & Gallaudet University1	3
Case No. 15-18C Initio, LP	7
Case No. 22-31 SIM Development, LLC	0
Case No. 22-34 Berean Baptist Church2	4

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, and joining me this evening are Vice Chair Miller, Commissioner May, and Commissioner Imamura. We're also joined by the Office of Zoning staff, Ms. Sharon Schellin and Mr. Paul Young, who will be handling all of our virtual operations. Also the Office of Zoning legal division, Ms. Lovick, Mr. Ritting, and Mr. Liu. I will ask 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 is 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 actions items, the only documents before us this evening are the application, the ANC set-down report, and the Office of Planning report. All other documents will be -- 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 requests otherwise.

If you experience difficulty accessing Webex or with

your phone call-in, then please call our OZ hotline number at 202-727-0789 for Webex log-in or call-in instructions.

At this time, Ms. Schellin, does the staff have any preliminary matters?

MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir.

COMMISSIONER HOOD: Okay. Let me get my agenda up. Sorry, I got to figure out how to turn this phone. Okay. Let's go to our first case under final action Zoning Commission Case No. 22-20, 1301 Good Hope Road, LLC, map amendment at Square 5768.

Ms. Schellin?

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. Since proposed action, since the hearing, the new exhibits at Exhibit 30, there's an in NCPC letter that -- or report that states that the NCPC staff has concluded that the project is exempt from NCPC review. And then at Exhibit 32, there's a cover letter and a draft order from the Applicant. And so this case is ready for the Commission to consider final action today. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, MS. Schellin.

Again, as teed up by Ms. Schellin, we did have a hearing on January 23rd, 2023, and there was a discussion, as we all know, about IZ Plus. In this proceeding, I believe we felt the case -- and also we want to appreciate Mr. Theresa comments. And I believe that the Commission -- I thought at that time we adopted OP's rationale for the for the primary justification with IZ and

in their report, and we took Mr. Theresa's reasoning as a secondary justification, but not a substitute. So I think we had discussed a lot of this at that time, but I wanted to make sure we put this on the record in the Commission and we noted that it does not find IZ Plus appropriate for this property because of the disproportionate amount of existing affordable housing already in the area. And I think we've not only heard that from OP, we've heard it actually from residents. While we push IZ, we're trying to find and strike that balance. But with that, let me open it up for questions and comments.

Let me do this. Commissioner May?

COMMISSIONER MAY: I have no comments. I think you summarized things very well. I agree with your --

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

And Commissioner Imamura?

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Likewise, I recall a very healthy discussion about the disproportionate amount of existing affordable housing, and agree with you and Commissioner May.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

And Vice Chair Miller?

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I concur with your comments.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So with that as noted, if there's nothing else, I would move that we approve final action

for Zoning Commission Case No. 22-20 and ask for a second. 1 2 COMMISSIONER MAY: Second. CHAIRPERSON HOOD: It's been moved and properly 3 4 second. Any further discussion? Not seeing any, Ms. Schellin, would you do a roll call 5 6 vote please. 7 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood? 8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes. 9 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller? 10 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes. MS SCHELLIN: Commissioner May? 11 12 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. 13 MS SCHELLIN: Commissioner Imamura? 14 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes. 15 MS SCHELLIN: The vote is four to zero to one to approve 16 final action in Zoning Commission Case No. 22-20, no IZ Plus to 17 apply. The minus one being the third mayoral appointee position, 18 which is vacant. Thank you. 19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. 20 Next, let's go to Zoning Commission Case No. 22-10, 21 Trenton Park Apartments, LP, map amendment at Square 59, 69, and 5973. 22 23 Ms. Schellin? MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. Since the hearing, we have 24 25 at Exhibit 45 a letter from the Applicant advising that it met with the three people who testified in opposition at the hearing and advising about that meeting. And Exhibit 45A is a draft order. Exhibit 46 is NCPC letter advising that the case is exempt under the guidelines from NCPC's review. And let's see. And that is it. So this case is ready for the Commission to consider final action. Thank you.

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: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Schellin.

Let me see if others would like to go first, and then I will talk about the tenant relocation. I think -- I will say this, I think this is pretty similar to the case we just did with the disproportionate amount of affordable housing in the area. And as we've noted, that again I think the recommendation was that IZ Plus not apply in this area as -- for the same reasons -- I think for the same reasons that we did previously, but anyway. Also let me just go ahead -- the tenant relocation plan, I find that acceptable. I appreciate the Applicant for continuing to do that. And also the three that were in that had concerns in opposition, some of their concerns, I don't know how germane they were, but it looks like they're going to continue their conversation. We have the Applicants' word on it, so I'm hoping they will continue to have discussions with the residents, for me, whether they're in good standing or not, and let's help them try to get in good standing. So that's kind of where I'm -- let me hear from others.

Commissioner May?

COMMISSIONER MAY: I was not part of this case.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you.

All right. Commissioner Imamura?

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I certainly understand the concern that, you know, not applying IZ Plus in areas where there exists affordable housing that could result in future displacement. But you know, I think the current goal here is to increase affordable housing stock in areas where it doesn't exist, you know, to encourage market rate housing in areas with a disproportionate amount of affordable housing. So I agree with your comments.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you.

And Vice Chair Miller?

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, I concur with each of your comments, and would note, as I think I noted at -- as we noted at proposed action, that even though we're not considering a specific project, the redevelopment plans, and more importantly the affordable housing covenants that already exist on this property, will provide more affordable housing than the IZ Plus minimum would require. So and I'm -- I agree with you on the tenant relocation plan being adequate and commend the Applicant's outreach on that point. And I think we'll get some good quality affordable replacement housing for the outdated housing that was there and plus additional affordable housing and market rate housing, mixed income housing,

all good things. Thank you.

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, Vice Chair and Commissioner Imamura.

I do want to say this again about the disproportionate amount of affordable housing, and I think I've mentioned this before. We're not just saying this fly by night. I know I was approached by two ladies in Ward 7 who told me they didn't want all that in their neighborhood. And I had to come back and reassess because we are always pushing for affordable housing and IZ, and it made me have a pause to balance. So I want the public, those who are listening, not to think that we just it's a script and we just going to know. We definitely get confronted in the community. So I want to make sure -- I've said that previously, and I always think about that as much as I've been talking about 0 to 30 percent and pushing, and when those two ladies got me over in Ward 7, I just -- and they may be listening and they know who they are -- and it made me think about it a little differently. And I would concur with the fashion in which this Commission is moving forward.

Anything else, Commissioners?

Okay. So would somebody like to make a motion? And Commissioner May is not on this one.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Sure, Mr. Chairman.

I would move that the Zoning Commission take final action on Case No. 22-10, Trenton Park Apartments, LP, map

amendment at Square 6 -- 59 and 69 and 5973, a map amendment 1 2 which -- without a specific IZ Plus designation, but IZ regular will obviously apply, as well as whatever 3 other legal requirements. With all that, I move that motion. 4 5 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Second. 6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Commissioner Imamura. It's been moved and properly second. 7 Any further discussion? 8 9 Not hearing any, Ms. Schellin, would you do a roll call 10 vote please. MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller? 11 12 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes. 13 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Imamura? 14 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes. 15 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood? 16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes. The vote is three to zero to two to 17 MS. SCHELLIN: 18 approve final action in Case No. 22-10, and that is without IZ 19 Plus being applied. The minus two being Commissioner May, who 20 did not participate in the case, therefore not voting, and the third mayoral appointee position, which is vacant. 21 Thank you. 22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Schellin. 23 Let's go to Zoning Commission Case No. 22-12, Mid-Atlantic Neighborhood Development Corporation, map amendment at 24 25 Square 2819.

Ms. Schellin?

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, at Exhibits 32 and 32A you have the Applicant's cover letter and draft order. Exhibit 33, once again you have an NCPC staff letter advising that the application falls under an exception that exempts it from an NCPC review. So this case too is ready for the Commission to determine final action. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Schellin.

In this case IZ Plus would be appropriate. Let's -- I think we've already decided that previously. So we did have support from ANC 4E and 4C even though they still had some resistance on density. But I think what the determining factor, the other policy of the affordable housing for seniors, was very much an incentive to garner their support. And I think we've already taken proposed -- have we taken proposed action in this case, Ms. Schellin?

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So -- okay, yeah, so we've taken proposed action. I don't have anything else on this. Let me open it up for questions --

MS. SCHELLIN: Actually, it was a -- it's a one-vote.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Oh, it's a one-vote, okay.

MS. SCHELLIN: It's a second stage -- right. So it's only a one-vote case.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: It's only one vote, okay.

All right. So let me open it up for any questions or 1 2 comments. MS. LOVICK: No, no, this is the map amendment, isn't 3 it? 4 5 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah, this is map amendment. 6 MS. LOVICK: Isn't this 22-10. Oh, yeah, 22-12. 7 this is a two-vote. 8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah, we're still in the final 9 action. 10 MS. SCHELLIN: I'm sorry, I was jumping ahead. 11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'm sorry to start that. That was 12 my fault. Put it back on me because I'm trying to figure out 13 did I do proposed action, but we did. Okay. So --14 MS. SCHELLIN: Yeah 15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Anyway, let me go -- let me hurry 16 up and go to somebody else. 17 Commissioner May? COMMISSIONER MAY: 18 I think this is very 19 straightforward case. And I think you've summarized the minimal 20 issues that were discussed at the hearing. And when you take 21 proposed action with IZ Plus and nothing changes that at this 22 point. I think I'm prepared to vote for final approval of this 23 map amendment with IZ Plus. 24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. 25 Commissioner Imamura?

1	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
2	remember this hearing quite well. I think there's a lot of
3	positive potential behind this map amendment and prepared to vote
4	in favor.
5	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And Vice Chair Miller?
6	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I concur
7	with all your comments.
8	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Would someone like to start us off
9	with a motion? Obviously, this we're going to be in favor, I
10	believe.
11	COMMISSIONER MAY: I would make the motion that the
12	Zoning Commission take final action to approve Zoning Commission
13	Case 22-12, Mid-Atlantic Neighborhood Development Corporation,
14	map amendment at Square 2819 with IZ Plus.
15	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Second.
16	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. It's been moved and properly
17	second. Any further discussion?
18	Not hearing any, Ms. Schellin, would you do a roll call
19	vote please.
20	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner May?
21	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
22	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Imamura?
23	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.
24	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood?
25	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.

MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller?

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is four to zero to one to approve final action in Zoning Commission Case No. 22-12, and this one does include IZ Plus. The minus one being the third mayoral appointee position, which is vacant. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

Next, Zoning Commission Case No. 15-24C JBG/6th Street Associates, LLC & Gallaudet University, second-stage PUD at Parcel 129/112.

Ms. Schellin?

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, this is the one I was looking at that was a one-voter. This case has at Exhibit 26 a corrected ANC 5D report which corrected the vote to reflect the nine total votes. At Exhibits 27 through 27All is the Applicant's posthearing submissions and that is what is in the record. I have spoken to the attorney. They will be providing a draft order shortly, so this is ready for the Commission to consider final action. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. Let me let me start with somebody else on this one. Who would like to start us off? I usually go to Commissioner May. Were you on this one?

COMMISSIONER MAY: I was on this one. I don't have a whole lot more to say about this. I mean, I think we hashed out the issues. The design had improved from set-down, and I don't

think there are any outstanding issues with the design. I believe Vice Chair Miller had some questions about the two-bedroom units and the market analysis for that. So I'll let him speak to that.

And you know, I mean, you know, this case has what we would consider today to be insufficient inclusionary zoning based on the way we are viewing cases right now, but because we are at the second stage and those issues were addressed in the first stage, in my mind I don't feel like we're in a position to impose or even to ask strongly for much in the way of inclusionary zoning or changes to that. There's no change in the relief or, you know, any other benefits that the Applicant would be getting, so there isn't really that much that we can do other than look at the fact that, you know, if this were happening now, we would have -- if this were stage one right now, we might have gotten to a higher IZ level on this one, but we are where we are, so I'm prepared to move forward with final action today.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Commissioner May.

Commissioner Imamura?

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think the Commissioner May summarized it quite well. It's regrettable that the Applicant couldn't reach at least some of the requests by OP, DHCD, DOEE, but on balance, I think, you know, the architecture, landscape, public space I think will be a positive public benefit. So I don't think I have any further -- anything further to add.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

And Vice Chair Miller?

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Again, I concur with each of your comments. I did ask, as Commissioner May noted, at the public hearing or proposed action I can't remember, for addit- -- since there was a reference in the Applicant's statement about that the market would not support as much affordable two-bedroom units as OP was requesting an increase of and so was DHCD. They did provide some information to back up their previous statement on that, and I will accept that as reasonable.

This is a large project which will bring a large amount of housing to this neighborhood, including affordable housing. And the ANC, as you've noted, and the Office of Planning support it. And so I continue to support it. I think I was -- might have been critical at proposed action or the hearing. I get confused. Maybe they were the same day. I might have been critical of the design a little bit. I think I might have called it a lot of punched out facade in my face. And I don't know if it's -- there were design changes or there were better renderings, but -- or whether it's just I've gotten used to it, but it's grown on me a little bit. The latest renderings are not as underwhelming as I found the previous rendering, so I'm prepared to move forward. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Vice Chair.

1	Sometimes if you look at it long enough, it grows on
2	you, so. So anyway, I would agree with all of my colleagues,
3	especially with the ask. You know, government is always
4	predictable. And what we do needs to be predictable. And I
5	understand where we are. And I think Commissioner May and
6	Commissioner Imamura summed it up the best, but I'm going to go
7	a little step further and just ask if the Applicant can find in
8	the kindness of their heart to do what OP, DDOE, and DHCD has
9	requested, it would most appreciated and I'll leave it at that.
10	Any other questions or comments? Okay. So with that,
11	I think this is ready for our approval unless I hear otherwise.
12	I would move approval of Zoning Commission Case No. 15-24C with
13	the comments as we've made in this case and ask for a second.
14	COMMISSIONER MAY: Second
15	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: It's been moved and probably second.
16	Any further discussion?
17	Not hearing any, Ms. Schellin, would you do a roll call
18	vote please?
19	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood?
20	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.
21	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner May?
22	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
23	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller?
24	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.
25	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Imamura?

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.

MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is four to zero to one to approve final action in Zoning Commission Case No. 15-24C. The minus one being the mayoral appointee position, which is vacant. And if we can have the Applicant provide that draft order within two weeks, that would be great. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

Let's go to time extension, Zoning Commission Case No. 15-18C, Initio, LP, two-year PUD time extension at Square 1194.

Ms. Schellin?

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

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes sir, the Applicant is requesting, as you stated, a two-year time extension to extend the date to start construction to March 9, 2025. A building permit was filed on time by the March 9, 2020 start deadline and approvals were received in the summer of 2022. The Applicant has stated that financial difficulties resulting from COVID-19 have made it difficult for the Applicant to secure tenants or investors for the site. In addition, the costs of construction and financing has increased. The Applicant has also learned that its building permit documents needed to be updated to comply with the 2017 building code, and it has spent considerable time searching for a consultant to review the plans to bring them into conformance. And to add to that, the Applicant's original mechanical, electrical, and plumbing engineer firm went out of business and the Applicant has had to hire a new firm to redraw and restamp the mechanical drawings.

So with that, the Applicant has made this request, and it is before the Commission. Oh, I am sorry, at Exhibit 5, OP did file a report recommending approval of the time extension request and at Exhibit -- I'm sorry, the ANC 2E has not submitted a response. However, the time period of 30 days has passed, so at this point the Commission is free to move forward if it chooses to do so. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Schellin, for teeing that up. I won't be repetitive and repeat any of that.

I do -- I am sympathetic to what's going on here, especially after COVID. I know prior to COVID, I used to hear different rationales, sometimes I really had to weigh it, but I know COVID has taken a big issue in the way things are even going on in downtown and around town and around the country, so. And when I hear that the firm has went out of business and have to go back to another firm, me personally, I don't want to put any more on this Applicant. And that's where I am, so with that, I'm ready to give them a two-year time extension and I hope things work out for them. So let me open it up, any questions or comments?

Commissioner May?

COMMISSIONER MAY: I was just -- I've been wondering recently whatever happened to this project because I know it hadn't gotten under construction. But now I know. And boy, is

it a saga. So I'm sorry that it's been so difficult. 1 And 2 hopefully this two-year time extension will give them the time they need to get them underway. So I'm in favor of granting the 3 time extension. 4 5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. 6 Commissioner Imamura? COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: I don't think I have any further 7 8 -- anything further to add. I hope the Applicant is able to get 9 back on track. It's regrettable that they had to find a new MEP 10 firm, that's difficult to do (indiscernible). CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. 11 12 And Vice Chair Miller? 13 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I concur 14 with each of your comments and look forward to this project 15 proceeding. 16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. 17 Would somebody like to make a motion for the two-year 18 time extension? 19 COMMISSIONER MAY: I'll make the motion. 20 CHAIRPERSON HOOOD: Okay. 21 COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. I would move that the Zoning 22 Commission approve a two-year time extension in Zoning Commission Case 15-18C, Initio, LP, and that's a PUD time extension at Square 23 1194. 24

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Second.

25

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: It has been moved and properly 1 2 Any further discussion? Not hearing any, Ms. Schellin, would you do a roll call 3 4 vote please? 5 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner May? 6 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. 7 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller? VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes. 8 9 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood? 10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes. 11 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Imamura? COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes. 12 13 MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is four to zero to one to 14 approve final action in Zoning Commission Case No. 15-18C. The minus one being the third mayoral appointee position, which is 15 16 vacant. 17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Next let's go to hearing action 18 Zoning Commission Case No. 22-31, Sim Development, LLC, map 19 amendment at Square 5868. I believe it's Ms. Thomas. 20 (Pause.) 21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Ms. Thomas? Can you all hear me? 22 23 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah. 24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Just making sure. You never 25 know around here.

MS. THOMAS: I am so sorry.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Oh, okay, there you are.

MS. THOMAS: My computer went -- just the power cord just went out. Sorry.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

MS. THOMAS: Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: You may begin whenever you're ready.

MS. THOMAS: Yes, sure. Good afternoon, Mr. Chair, members of the Commission. Karen Thomas presenting OP'S setdown report for Case 22-31, a map amendment to rezone the property at 2662 to 2666 Martin Luther King Jr. Avenue, S.E. from the RA-1 to the MU-8A zone.

This site was previously developed with two one-family detached dwellings, one on each lot, and have since been demolished and the lots are now overgrown with vegetation. It is situated between a four-story 110-unit apartment house to the north; two two-story rowhouses to the south; to the east is unimproved Dunbar Road and Southern Parkway; and to the west, a three-story garden apartment buildings. Next slide?

The existing RA-1 zone permits low to moderate density development, including detached dwellings, rowhouses and low-rise apartments. And the proposed MU-8A zone is a medium density mixed-use residential office and retail zone intended to be located on arterial roadways such as Martin Luther King Jr. Avenue. This is not inconsistent with the future land use map

and the main street corridor of the general policy map. increase in density would lead to more housing and commercial opportunities for the community, ultimately improving the overall quality of life in the area. To that end, that said, OP does not recommend the map amendment be subject to IZ Plus due to the disproportionate number of affordable housing units in the far southeast and southwest planning area where the property is located. And here it has more than 30 percent of all affordable housing in the District. And that data is included in our setdown report. So in light of the abundance of the existing affordable housing and the intent of IZ Plus to produce affordable housing in areas that are not reaching their goal, we are recommending that this rezoning not be subject to IZ Plus, but to maximize the density of the new zone housing an inclusionary zoning unit would be required. As a map amendment application, there are no particular details about development of the site, but it establishes what can be allowed and potentially develop. Thus, a racial equity evaluation will only be able to analyze potential development uses and impacts under the proposed zone compared to the existing zone. The comp plan analysis applying the equity tool is in our report. As a vacant property (indiscernible) standing policy focus area, it could support infill housing within the planning area. And the application of inclusionary zoning will increase units for persons of low and moderate incomes. On balance, the proposal would not be

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

inconsistent with the comprehensive plan, and a permitted increase in residential density would increase housing available to existing and future Ward 8 and District residents. OP is asking the Commission to set-down the application for public hearing. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you very much, Ms. Thomas. And I would just ask at the hearing, since you did not recommend IZ Plus, that OP come again to elaborate on the mitigating circumstances it has identified in making its recommendation of IZ Plus is not appropriate. And we can discuss that further at the hearing. Also, we would like to ask for an updated racial equity analysis that complies with our revised tool that we have out. And also, just if we can hear about from the Applicant as well as OP the follow-up on engagement it has done with ANC 8C and other stakeholders. I think that will be very fruitful and productive, as I believe we may set this down. So that's my ask. Let me ask others.

Commissioner May?

COMMISSIONER MAY: I don't have any questions or comments. I agree with the Office of Planning's report and prepared to vote for set-down.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

And Commissioner Imamura?

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I align myself with your three requests and prepared to vote in

favor of set-down.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

And Vice Chair Miller?

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, I also concur with each of your comments and your, Mr. Chairman, your three requests, and also would add to that a request that the Applicant at the hearing, if we set it down, which appears to be the case that we're going to do, that at the hearing or prior, that they, the Applicant, provide an updated analysis of the consistency with the Congress Heights Small Area Plan, which may have been developed -- which includes this property, I believe. And so it may have been developed after this application was originally filed. But just to have a little more information on that, as well as what you've requested, Mr. Chairman. It's largely a zoning consistency case, which seems to be very appropriate.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So with that, I'll just go ahead, unless there are other comments, let me move that we -- let me find the case number, hold on a second. Go back up. Bear with me. I move that we set down for a zoning -- set-down Zoning Commission Case 22-31 with the comments we've made and ask for a second.

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Second

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Been moved and properly second.

Ms. Schellin, could you do a roll call vote please?

MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood? 1 2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes. MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Imamura? 3 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes 4 5 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner May? 6 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller? 7 8 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes. 9 MS. SCHELLIN: So Case No. 22-31 is set-down as a 10 contested case by a vote of four to zero to one. The minus one being the third mayoral appointed position, which is vacant. 11 12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And thank you, Ms. Thomas, for your 13 report. 14 Let's go to our next case is Zoning Commission Case No. 22-34, Berean Baptist Church, map amendment at Square 2991. 15 16 Ms. Schellin? Oh, I'm sorry, Mr. Kirschenbaum. 17 I'm putting Ms. 18 Schellin in the OP now. Okay. 19 MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: It's an honor to be mistaken as Ms. 20 Schellin. So good afternoon Chair Hood and members of the Zoning 21 Commission, I am Jonathan Kirschenbaum with the Office of 22 Planning. This application is for a proposed map amendment from 23 the RF-1 zone to the RA-2 zone on a 14,000 square foot property owned by Berean Baptist Church. 24 25 Faith-based institutions, such as Berean Baptist Church, represent a significant opportunity for the development of affordable housing, which is often within their charitable missions. Much of the land owned by these institutions is in residential neighborhoods and have some type of residential zoning, such as the RF-1 zone at the subject property. This type of zoning limits any new development to low-density single-family homes or flats.

As part of the District's faith-based housing initiative, OP is committed to removing zoning barriers that prevent the development of new housing, particularly affordable housing on land owned by faith-based organizations. On balance, when viewed through a racial equity lens, the proposal is not inconsistent with the comprehensive plan, including its policies, future land use map, and generalized policy map. OP recommends this application be set-down for a public hearing, and the proposal would be appropriate for IZ Plus. Next slide please?

The future land use map indicates that the property is appropriate for moderate density residential uses according to the framework element of the comprehensive plan that the RA-2 zone is consistent with this land use category. Next slide please?

The generalized policy map indicates that the property is designated as a neighborhood conservation area. As discussed in finer detail in our set-down report, this does not preclude new development or the ability to upzone a property. The framework

element states that densities for the neighborhood conservation areas are guided by the property's FLUM designation. And as I just mentioned, the proposed map amendment would not be inconsistent with the FLUM. 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

So IZ Plus would be appropriate to apply to this map amendment because the rezoning request is to a new zone that permits greater density. And as of November 2022, 5.2 percent of total housing units in ANC 4B, which was the prior ANC prior to 2023, were affordable, and 7.3 percent of total housing units in the current ANC, which is ANC 4D, are affordable. Further, the Rock Creek East planning area only contained 4.9 percent of the District's total number of affordable housing units as of 2022. The District's housing equity report sets a goal that every planning area should contain at least 15 percent of the District's total number of affordable housing units. And so applying an IZ Plus requirement will help, you know, the District achieve these goals. Since map amendment applications only consider consistency with the comprehensive plan and not a specific development proposal, OP estimates that six IZ units could potentially be provided through an IZ Plus requirement if the property were to be rezoned and redeveloped. Next slide please?

So the comprehensive plan analysis through a racial equity lens indicates that the map amendment is not inconsistent with the comprehensive plan. The proposed map amendment could

provide an estimated 30 dwelling units overall where currently none exist at the property with an estimated 20 percent IZ Plus set-aside requirements. This planning area has both the lowest shares of dedicated -- has one of the lowest shares of dedicated affordable units in the District and the second highest need for more affordable housing units as identified in the housing equity report. Making room for more housing and more affordable housing has the potential to benefit non-white populations who on average have lower income than white residents. Redevelopment of the site would not result in direct displacement, as there are currently no residential uses at the property. displacement is also not likely because increased residential density creates more housing options overall, and comprehensive plan recognizes that without increasing housing, the imbalance between supply and demand drives up the cost of housing, and that particularly impacts low-income residents. There should also be no negative physical impacts because the primary uses allowed by the proposed RA-2 zone are residential and community facility uses.

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 finally, the proposal will be located near many neighborhood amenities, including schools, retail, supermarkets, other recreational opportunities across the street, and several bus lines on Georgia Avenue. This concludes my presentation. Please let me know if you have any questions. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Mr. Kirschenbaum. First,

let me put a disclosure out there, Reverend Robert Chiles, who some may know as a school board member some years ago is the pastor of Berean Baptist Church, who is someone that I know and familiar with. I don't know about all what they plan to do with this particular application. But I want to put that on the record, so later on down the road if that comes out, then I've already disclosed that. But I plan to participate unless I hear my colleagues or others say otherwise. He's a great minister here in the city. I do know of his reputation. I know of him. And I'm sure Rob and others, Commissioner -- Vice Chair Miller and others, remember him when he was on the school board years ago. So I will leave it at that unless I hear from others.

The other thing -- and I plan to participate. The other thing is that I would ask the Applicant, Mr. Kirschenbaum, if we can just -- if they can revise their racial equity tool to come up to par or up to speed with our new tool, I think that would be great. I know they've already provided information on the community engagement, which I think is sufficient, but if they want to upgrade that -- update that, that would be good. That's sufficient, I think, for me for right now. So with that, let me see if others have any questions or comments.

Commissioner May?

COMMISSIONER MAY: I do not have any comments. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Commissioner Imamura?

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: No 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

CHARIPERSON HOOD: And Vice Chair Miller?

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, I would associate myself with your comments, all of your comments, and just note that this is another zoning consistency map amendment case. Both the existing RF-1 and the proposed, is it, RA-2 zoning are not inconsistent with the comp plan, but the proposed rezoning would provide for the opportunity for additional density, enhanced development standards, new residential housing, including importantly, affordable housing, supporting critical District-wide affordable housing needs, and needs in this particular planning area. So I'm supportive -- I support setting down this hearing.

And I also would commend the Applicant on their statement that includes a discussion of potential inconsistencies with the comprehensive plan, because there are a lot of policies in that thousand plus page comprehensive plan, as we know, as neighbors know, neighborhoods know. But they addressed — they went through any potential inconsistencies and addressed why the balancing exercise weighs strongly in favor of this map amendment. So I'm supportive of setting it down, Mr. Chairman, thank you.

CHAIRPERON HOOD: Thank you.

And again, Mr. Kirschenbaum, thank you for your report.

And I apologize, I will tell you, you weren't around when they

used to confuse me and Carol Mitton all the time. So I apologize 1 2 to you. So with that, would somebody like to make a motion? 3 4 Thank you again Mr. Kirschenbaum for your report. 5 Can I get a motion? 6 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: I will make the motion, Mr. 7 Chairman. 8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. 9 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yeah, I move the 10 Commission set-down Case No. 22-34, Berean Baptist Church, map 11 amendment at Square 2991. 12 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Second. 13 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay, great. 14 It's been moved and properly second. Any further 15 discussion? 16 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes, Mr. Chairman. echo Vice Chair Miller's comment about Mr. Kirschenbaum's 17 18 thorough analysis about the potential inconsistencies and just wanted to make a comment that it's a model example of what we'd 19 20 like other applicants to prepare as well. And I'm certain that 21 Ms. Steingasser is listening in also, so compliments to Mr. Kirschenbaum for his work. 22 23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Well said. I would ditto and echo 24 that as well. 25 Any further discussion?

1	Not hearing, Ms. Schellin, would you record the vote
2	please?
3	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Imamura?
4	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.
5	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller?
6	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.
7	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood?
8	CHAIRPERSON HOOLD: Yes.
9	MS SCHELLIN: Commissioner May?
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
11	MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is four to zero to one to set-
12	down Zoning Commission Case No. 22-34 as a contested case. The
13	minus one being the third mayoral appointee position, which is
14	vacant. Thank you.
15	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Ms. Schellin, do we have
16	anything else on the agenda?
17	MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir.
18	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. The Zoning Commission will
19	be meeting again
20	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Mr. Chairman?
21	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.
22	VICE CHAIR MILLER: So we don't have any reports from
23	the Office of Planning today?
24	Ms. Schellin, we don't have any reports from the Office
25	of Planning?

MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Do we have another meeting in March?

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. I was expecting an update on a particular long-pending discussed zoning case at one of our meetings in March. So as long as we have another meeting in March, I will be expecting an update on that downtown IZ zoning exemption case.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I will tell you that I've looked up our next meeting. I was going to the Nationals opening, and when you said the next meeting, it jarred my memory that I will not be going to the Nationals open because I will be here doing zoning. So anyway. All right. So the Zoning Commission will meet again on March 13th -- no, I'm sorry. The Zoning Commission will -- yeah, we will meet again March the -- for a public hearing March the 13th. The hearing is Zoning Commission Case No. 22-33, NHP Foundation on these same platforms at 4 p.m. So with that, I want to thank everyone for their participation in this meeting tonight, and this meeting is adjourned. Good night.

(Whereupon the above-entitled meeting was adjourned.)

$\underline{\mathsf{C}}\ \underline{\mathsf{F}}\ \underline{\mathsf{R}}\ \underline{\mathsf{T}}\ \underline{\mathsf{I}}\ \underline{\mathsf{F}}\ \underline{\mathsf{I}}\ \underline{\mathsf{C}}\ \underline{\mathsf{A}}\ \underline{\mathsf{T}}\ \underline{\mathsf{E}}$

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript.

In the matter of: Public Hearing

Before: DCZC

Date: 03-09-2023

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