

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

ZONING COMMISSION

VIRTUAL PUBLIC HEARING

VIA WEBEX

THURSDAY, JULY 18, 2024

The Public Hearing by the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened via videoconference pursuant to notice at 4:00 p.m. EDT, Robert Miller, Vice Chair, presiding.

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

SHARON SCHELLIN, Secretary
PAUL YOUNG, Data Specialist

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Public Hearing held on July 18, 2024.

Diversified Reporting Services, Inc.

1426 Duke Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(202) 467-9200

C O N T E N T S

Introduction	3
Preliminary Matters	5
Case No. 23-24 Eckington Mews, LLC - Consolidated PUD & Related Map Amendment from RF-1 to RA-2, 1708-1710 1st St.NE (Sq. 3524, Lots 52, 53, 800, 802 & 803) - Ward 5	6

P R O C E E D I N G S

(4:00 p.m.)

INTRODUCTION

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Good afternoon, everyone. Today is Thursday, July 18, 2024. We are convening and broadcasting this public hearing by video conferencing. My name is Robert Miller and joining me this evening are Chairman Anthony Hood and Commissioners Tammy Stidham and Joseph Imamura. We are also joined by Office of Zoning Staff, Sharon Schellin, Secretary to the Commission and Paul Young, who is working behind the scenes to make sure everything goes smoothly with this hearing. Others will introduce themselves at the appropriate time.

Copies of today's virtual public hearing notice are available on the Office of Zoning's website. Please be advised that this proceeding is being recorded by a court reporter and is also webcast live via WebEx and YouTube Live. The video will be available on Office of Zoning's website after the hearing. Accordingly, all those listening on WebEx or by phone will be muted during the hearing and only those who have signed up to participate or testify will be unmuted at the appropriate time. Please state your name and home address before providing oral testimony or your presentation. Oral presentations should be limited to a summary of your most important points. When you are

1 finished speaking, please mute your audio so that your
2 microphone is no longer picking up sound or background
3 noise. If anyone is experiencing difficulty accessing WebEx
4 or with the telephone call in, then please call our OZ
5 Hotline Number at 202-727-0789 to sign up or to receive a
6 Webex log-in or call in instructions.

7 All persons planning to testify, either in favor
8 or in opposition must sign up in advance and will be called
9 by name. At the time of signup, all participants complete
10 the oath or affirmation required by Subtitle Z, Section
11 408.7. If you wish to file written testimony or additional
12 supporting documents during the hearing, then please be
13 prepared to describe and discuss it at the time of your
14 testimony.

15 This hearing will be conducted in accordance with
16 the provisions of 11Z DCMR Chapter 4 as follows: One,
17 Preliminary Matters; Two, the Applicant's case, which I
18 understand they may be taking 20 minutes or so or 30
19 minutes; Three, Report of the Office of Planning and
20 Department of Transportation; Four, Report of other
21 Government Agencies, if any; Five, Report of the Advisory
22 Neighborhood Commission; Six, Testimony of Organizations and
23 Individuals, each will have five and three minutes
24 respectively and we'll hear an order from those in support,
25 opposition and undeclared and Seven, Rebuttal and Closing By

1 the Applicant. At this time, the Commission will consider
2 any preliminary matters. Does the Staff have any
3 preliminary matters, Ms. Schellin?

4 PRELIMINARY MATTERS

5 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Just real quick, since there
6 hadn't been any opposition that showed up, the Applicant
7 will actually take less than 20 minutes for their
8 presentation, so I just want to put that out there. So they
9 have a couple proffered expert witnesses. Let's see,
10 Gregory Powe in architecture. He has previously been
11 accepted.

12 His resume is at Exhibit 13D. And I'll give you
13 the ones we've previously accepted, Dan VanPelt at Exhibit
14 22B in Transportation, Dan Salomon, also in Transportation.
15 They're both from Gorove Slade, so I think just one of them
16 will be showing up.

17 And I couldn't find Dani Alexander, he's a
18 landscape architect, being here previously, so maybe you
19 guys remember, but I don't think he has been. So I think
20 that's the only one, if you would accept the others.

21 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I have no objection to the
22 others that we previously accepted. Do my fellow
23 commissioners have any concerns or questions with those who
24 have been previously accepted? Hearing no concerns, we'll
25 go onto Dani Alexander.

1 CASE NO. 23-24

2 MS. SCHELLIN: Ms. Alexander, yeah.

3 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Do we have the resume --

4 MS. SCHELLIN: We did not -- my staff did not find
5 her as previously accepted, so we may have to have Mr.
6 Kadlecek come up and see if he recalls or if she recalls
7 being here before.

8 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. And do we have a resume
9 for Ms. Alexander?

10 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. She's at 13D, Page 3.

11 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Thank you.

12 MS. SCHELLIN: And that's landscape architect.

13 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Hello, Ms. Alexander.

14 MR. KADLECEK: Good afternoon, members of the
15 Commission. Cary Kadlecek on behalf of the Applicant from
16 Goulston & Storrs. Yes, we're proffering Ms. Alexander as
17 an expert in landscape architecture. I don't believe she's
18 ever been qualified as an expert before the Commission, but
19 she's here and available to answer questions.

20 MS. SCHELLIN: Thank you. So 13D, Page 3, Vice
21 Chair Miller.

22 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. As we're pulling that
23 up, let's just take a moment to look at that and if my
24 fellow commissioners, Chairman Hood, Commissioner Stidham or
25 Imamura if you have any questions, please speak up.

1 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: All right, thank you, Vice
2 Chair Miller. I don't have any problems actually with Ms.
3 Alexander as an expert witness, but just do want to ask for
4 the record here, because it's not stated on her resume,
5 certainly extensive, so Ms. Alexander, welcome. Glad to
6 always have a landscape architect as a proffered expert
7 witness for us.

8 But the question that I have that's not on a
9 resume is just duration and what I'm getting at is the Peter
10 May ten-year rule for those that know the rule with that.
11 So I just want to ask whether it's in DC, Virginia or
12 Maryland when you earned those licenses, if it's been longer
13 than ten years, which I'm certain that it has been. Can you
14 just mention that for the record?

15 MS. ALEXANDER: Hi, can everyone hear me? I have
16 been licensed in the District for -- the District only began
17 to accept landscape architectural licenses in 2020, so I've
18 been a licensed landscape architect for the entire duration
19 that they've accepted landscape architects. I have been
20 licensed for ten years, if you include my reciprocal
21 licenses beginning in Massachusetts in 2014, so ten years.

22 COMMISSIONER IMMAMURA: Great, thank you. That's
23 what I was getting at, so I appreciate it very much. Vice
24 Chair Miller, I fully support Ms. Alexander as a proffered
25 witness.

1 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Commissioner
2 Imamura. Does anyone else have any questions? If not, we
3 will accept Ms. Alexander as an expert in landscape
4 architecture. So welcome and glad to have you here.

5 And Mr. Kadlecek, you can (crosstalk) --

6 MS. SCHELLIN: Just a couple real quick -- okay,
7 so the OP report is at Exhibit 24 is in support. We now
8 have an ANC 5F report at Exhibit 33 in support, a DDOT
9 report at Exhibit 27 with no objections, an OAG report at
10 Exhibit 28, 28A in support and I believe that is it. So
11 like I said, they're represented by Cary Kadlecek and his --
12 and Lawrence Ferris from Goulston & Storrs. Thank you.

13 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Ms. Schellin.

14 Mr. Kadlecek, do you have any preliminary matters
15 or you can begin whenever -- otherwise, you can begin
16 whenever you'd like.

17 MR. KADLECEK: Thank you, Vice Chair Miller.
18 Again, for the record, Cary Kadlecek from the Law Firm of
19 Goulston and Storrs on behalf of the Applicant. We will try
20 to make this as brief as possible while hitting just the
21 main points so that the commissioners can get an overview of
22 the project. Starting off, just to give everyone an
23 orientation, the proposed PD map amendment to the RA-2 zone
24 concerns a property in Eckington, just south of the McKinley
25 Tech Campus, consisting of two existing townhouses, adjacent

1 large alley lots and a dead-end alley stop that is proposed
2 to be closed. The proposed project is a townhouse-style
3 residential development that will preserve and incorporate
4 two existing townhouses for a total of 16 for sale
5 townhouses, of which 11 will also include accessory
6 apartments.

7 The PUD and map amendment from the RF-1 to RA-2
8 zone will enable the development of new housing, including
9 three affordable homes and other public benefits on the site
10 that is consistent with the height and density of the
11 surrounding row home community. As set forth in our written
12 submissions, in addition to the standard design flexibility
13 that the Commission typically approves, as part of this
14 application, we are requesting the following flexibility
15 first: a waiver from the minimum area requirements for an
16 RA-2 PUD, which is one acre, but the property is just over
17 half of an acre.

18 Two, we're requesting flexibility from the
19 penthouse single enclosure requirements of C1503.1 to allow
20 separate rooftop solar panel pergolas on each of the
21 townhouses since they each will be separately owned and
22 maintained. And three, finally, we're requesting
23 flexibility from the IZ location requirements to allow the
24 IZ units to be located towards the east side of the
25 property.

1 It's a flexibility request with which the Office
2 of Planning and ANC are supportive of. Before I hand it
3 over to the rest of the development team, I'll just note
4 that we're pleased to have the support of the Office of
5 Planning, DDOT, ANC5F and the Eckington Civic Association.
6 So with that, I will turn it over to Mr. Brown, who is the
7 representative of the developer.

8 MR. BROWN: Hey, my name is Brian Brown. I've
9 actually resided in that area for the last -- since 1988. I
10 personally live about eight blocks from the property and
11 have been investing in Eckington, Shaw and (inaudible) Park,
12 all that time purchasing, developing rentals, of which 83
13 percent of them are affordable units. When we approached
14 this project, we've had this land since 2001. When we
15 started this project, we actually approached the
16 neighborhood in 2014 to ask about proposing an apartment
17 building. Their pushback at that time was they wanted
18 townhouses in keeping with the character of the
19 neighborhood.

20 So in 2019, I reconfirmed that and then we started
21 down the path of development of the townhouses. So one of
22 the things we specifically did is outreach from day one. We
23 came up with the preliminary design, presented it to the
24 ANC. The ANC did outreach in the community where I was
25 present and gave out the same diagrams that we're using now

1 and said this is what we're thinking about. So we've been
2 very communicative all the way through. In that area, we
3 ultimately reached out to the civic association and the ANC
4 multiple times. There's also 34 houses that actually touch
5 the property. I've reached out to, I believe, approximately
6 28 of them directly. Either in conversations on the street
7 where I gave them a copy of those documents or in the
8 community meetings that confirmed who they were, but my goal
9 was to have something that's conclusive. Because I live in
10 the neighborhood, I wanted something noncontroversial. The
11 goal was something that made sense and that was really our
12 entire approach.

13 We've been very systematic about that and the
14 whole goal for that was to study this process, study the
15 process and then turn around and develop something that the
16 neighborhood wanted. Even the changes we made, such as
17 moving from a common trash to trash per townhouse with
18 requests coming from feedback from the neighborhood, our
19 goal was to have something that was noncontroversial. If
20 you could go to the next slide, please.

21 This is pretty much a timeline of what I've just
22 talked about with the ANC actually voting in support a few
23 days ago. If we could go to the next slide. What we're
24 offering -- go to the next slide. What we're offering is a
25 superior design because it's designed to be architecturally

1 integral to the neighborhood. The landscaping is designed
2 so we exceed the requirements from a landscaping
3 perspective. It's entirely green, where we're building to
4 LEAD G old design, including solar, our goal was to have a
5 circuit drop in each garage where if, at some point, we
6 decide to have charging stations, it's easy to add. No gas
7 in any of the buildings.

8 Other things, we're doing a set-aside, 12.3
9 percent, which is above the normal 10 percent, but two of
10 the units are actually at 60 percent MFI, one at 80 percent.
11 The other aspect we looked at is how we could deal with --
12 the neighborhoods had a problem for a long time with people
13 racing down the alley the wrong way and the right way to
14 bypass R Street traffic. So one of the things they asked
15 for and we worked for DDOT to do as a proffer, not a
16 requirement, but as a proffer was to do calming mechanisms
17 that were acceptable to DDOT to slow down the traffic in
18 that area and that's all I have. If I could pass it on to
19 Greg Powe, the architect.

20 MR. POWE: Next slide, please. Good afternoon,
21 I'm Greg Powe, Powe Studio Architects. The site is in
22 Eckington, just north of R Street alley, between Lincoln
23 Road and 1st Street Northeast, just south of the academic
24 complex, Emery and McKinley. Next. It's in an area that's
25 currently zone RF and the design of the 16 townhouses meets

1 many of the requirements, even though we're seeking an
2 apartment zoning. You know, we're 60 percent lot coverage.
3 We are 35 feet high. We're three stories. Very similar in
4 scale to the neighborhood. Next.

5 Here's an aerial of the property itself. It
6 consists of alley lots and then two townhouses. They alley
7 lots, you can see from the aerial, there's a series of
8 garages and open spaces, storages in those photographs south
9 of the alley. Next. The bottom center is three row
10 townhouses, two of which we own, the two on the right, which
11 are integrated into the complex. The image on the top left
12 is looking down the alley from 1st towards Lincoln and the
13 top left is looking from the adjacent parking lot for the
14 educational complex, which is our neighbor. Next.

15 The property consists of three alley lots,
16 fronting on the R Street alley and backing onto a retaining
17 wall, beyond which is the educational buildings. In
18 addition, we have two townhouses. One is a typical 18-foot
19 lot and the other is much wider, so we have 45 feet frontage
20 on 1st Street. And there's an alley in between that is 20
21 feet wide. We're requesting, through the alley closure
22 process, closing that alley so that we can make one
23 contiguous lot of about 23,000 square feet. We've decided
24 to leave that one little step at the request of our neighbor
25 just to the south of us there. We think it works well for

1 all of us. Next.

2 So the building is a single building, which is
3 required by the zoning, but it has been configured to create
4 16 separate townhouses. Each townhouse has their own
5 individual entrance. There's no common areas and of the 16
6 townhouses, 11 of them also have a second accessory unit as
7 a flat. So we have a row of ten townhouses that are three
8 story and linking townhouses to the two on the right, which
9 are the original two townhouses with an added townhouse to
10 the back of each of those for a total of 16. Next.

11 Access -- pedestrian access is up at the north
12 edge of the site, paralleling the educational lot north of
13 us. You enter off 1st Street through a gate. We have bike
14 racks there. All of the units have access off of that
15 sidewalk, including the second units in each of the 11 that
16 are second units, with the exception of the two original
17 townhouses where we're using the original front doors.
18 There's a secondary entrance into this Mews area from top
19 left, which is off the side alley, which is a great place to
20 bring your bike in and there's bike racks right there.

21 The vehicular access is off the alley. The Row 10
22 shows a garage and in the garage, in addition to the car,
23 there's a bike rack. Then that little stub alley leads to
24 three parking spaces, two of which are in the garage. Next.

25 I won't spend much time on this, but we can come

1 back to the unit design. It's basically the ten units have
2 a one-story, one-bedroom flat with its own entrance and then
3 a separate entrance upstairs to a two-story, three-bedroom
4 flat with a rooftop terrace. And we are using the solar
5 array to provide shading on the rooftop terrace. And then
6 there's a basement garage accessible off of the alley. The
7 property drops one full story from front to back. So on the
8 front of the building, there are three stories, a flush
9 entrance on the back, where you're able to slip into the
10 garages. Next.

11 So there's the layout of the ten plus the two
12 linking, plus the two to the right that are the existing
13 townhomes with the second townhome behind each for a total
14 of 16 towns. Next. Next, please.

15 So architecturally, they're massed very similar to
16 the historic townhouse neighborhood that we're in. They are
17 18-foot wide townhouses that have bay fronts. What makes
18 them more contemporary, I feel, is the larger living space
19 and the larger window patterns. There is a rooftop terrace,
20 which is visible from the northside from the school, but
21 from the southside, it's set well back off the edge, so that
22 it's not visible from the alley side of the property. We
23 played with a pallet of three bricks, two lighter colors we
24 alternate with the townhouses in pairs and then the darker
25 accent color, after having worked with OP's design folks,

1 we've done accented cornices and so on and we have a flint,
2 if you will, of the basement garage is on the darker brick
3 base. Next.

4 So here's a view from the Mews from the northside,
5 you can see all of the entrances of the three stories and
6 the roof terrace above. We'll discuss the landscape in a
7 minute of the front yards. Next.

8 Here's the existing townhouse with the link towns
9 to the row of ten in the back, looking at it from the north
10 side, from the school side. Next. And here's a view of the
11 alley, the three stories plus the basement garage. Next.

12 Now I'd like to ask our landscape architect, Dani
13 Alexander of Studio AKA to describe very quickly the site
14 plan. Thank you.

15 MS. ALEXANDER: Thanks. This is an overall site
16 plan. Our focus was to take an overall site approach that
17 responded to the site context while creating something that
18 provided both a residential and community feel. Next slide.

19 Here's an eastern enlargement facing the 1st
20 Street side. You can see the shared access path running
21 along the back of the project that links the units. Next
22 slide.

23 And as the site boundary expands, you see the yard
24 space for each unit expands as well. And we're leaving room
25 for effective stormwater management, as well as additional

1 bike storage. Next slide.

2 We're focused on incorporating native and adaptive
3 plans into the design, which will provide many benefits,
4 including air filtration, shading, seasonality and
5 supporting native pollinators. Next slide.

6 And this is just a sample of plants that will be
7 included in the project, we will add as the project
8 develops. Next slide.

9 This is a draft green area ratio sheet for the
10 project based on the current plan. Sustainability is the
11 leading focus of this project as we're designing to LEAD
12 Gold for the building. We're also -- the site already
13 demands the highest minimum green area ratio score, but we
14 are going to surpass it by one to achieve at least a .5
15 score. The design elements that contribute to this include
16 landscape pervious areas, native plantings, tree plantings
17 and inclusion of solar panels. Next slide.

18 MR. VANPELT: All right. Good afternoon,
19 Commissioners. I'm Dan VanPelt.

20 MS. ALEXANDER: So I think Dan from Gorove Slade
21 is going to speak to this.

22 MR. VANPELT: Okay. Can you hear me?

23 VICE CHAIR MILLER: We can hear you.

24 MR. VANPELT: Okay. You can hear me. Thank you.
25 All right. So for the record, I'm Dan VanPelt, Vice

1 President and Senior Principal at Gorove Slade. Can you
2 hear me? I'm just hearing background noise. I want to make
3 sure I'm heard.

4 VICE CHAIR MILLER: We can hear you.

5 MR. VANPELT: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner
6 Miller. So I think I'm going to just skip through the first
7 couple of the transportation related slides, so I think
8 we're all probably pretty familiar where the site is located
9 and then I think Greg did a really nice job of talking
10 through the access and circulation, so if we could skip
11 forward two slides, please, to the one that traffic calming
12 and safety measures. And I'm happy to come back and answer
13 any questions that you might have about any of the other
14 slides, but just wanted to touch on a couple different
15 things. I think one of the things that was important to the
16 community was around, and then Brian mentioned this,
17 addressing some of the traffic concerns about traffic
18 calming in the alley and so we -- I think we've come up with
19 a nice solution there that DDOT agrees with.

20 And then during the review, DDOT came back and
21 asked for some additional safety measures out on -- for the
22 intersection dealing on Lincoln Road. I'm happy to talk
23 about those a little bit more with you, but I think we've
24 come up with something that we know DDOT is agreeable to.
25 Next slide, please. And as speaking to the DDOT

1 coordination, we did a transportation statement. We scoped
2 that with them. We worked through the review with them,
3 DDOT. We're pleased to have their support in the form of a
4 no objection transportation report. And they had a couple
5 conditions, which we've agreed to. And we look forward to
6 continue to working with them through the public space
7 permitting process. And so with that, I think I'll be happy
8 to answer any of your questions. I think I'll turn it back
9 over to Cary.

10 MR. KADLECEK: Next slide. Thank you, Dan. That
11 concludes our presentation and we're happy to answer any
12 questions from the Commission.

13 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Well, thank you to Mr.
14 Kadlecek and the Applicant's Eckington Mews team and thank
15 you for all of the community engagement and responsiveness
16 to concerns or requests of the Advisory Neighborhood
17 Commission and others in the community and to suggestions by
18 the Office of Planning on design issues and just doing the
19 whole row house concept, townhouse concept to begin with
20 when you first approached the community. So let me see if
21 my fellow commissioners have any questions or comments.
22 I'll turn first to Commissioner Imamura.

23 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Vice Chair
24 Miller. Thank you to the Applicant for your outreach to the
25 community and listening to them for preference for townhouse

1 style development here. I don't have any questions, just, I
2 guess, a couple comments on the architecture. Mr. Powe, I
3 mean this in the best sense possible. I think the design
4 fits nicely in terms of its character. The selection of
5 brick is somewhat muted, so it's in the best possible way
6 kind of this vanilla sort of design that fits well into the
7 neighborhood there. And paired with Ms. Alexander, not a
8 lot of opportunity in terms of landscape design, but I
9 thought I just appreciate the fact that you've mentioned,
10 obviously, native species and pollinators. Your selection,
11 your plant selection, I think, offered a variety of colors
12 and textures and form against the sort of muted brick. So
13 and I also appreciate the fact that you did think through
14 seasonality, too.

15 So not a lot to do with -- in terms of just sort
16 of kind of a creative design, but landscape and
17 architecturally that I think both of you did a nice job in
18 terms of what the site opportunities were and the site
19 constraints in the program. So that said, I think it's just
20 a very understated project. And I think that's a sign of
21 success for this particular development, so almost as if
22 it's been there a while. The only comment I guess I do have
23 is just the alley just seems sort of inhospitable, just a
24 lot of brick there, pretty hot on the south side, not a lot
25 you can do with that, but, you know, we think about that

1 especially during the intensive heat days that we've had
2 during the past couple of weeks, but otherwise -- and I'm
3 inclined to support the flexibility that you all are looking
4 for, so -- and I guess one other thought would be I wish I
5 would've seen at least a perspective or a rendering of the
6 rooftops. I don't think I saw that in the slide deck, but
7 that would've been great to see. Otherwise, those are all
8 the comments that I have. Thank you, Vice Chair Miller. I
9 yield back.

10 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Commissioner
11 Imamura. Mr. Kadlec, does anyone in your team have any
12 response to the comments of Commissioner Imamura? Is there
13 a rendering available in the exhibits or of that rooftop or
14 not at this time?

15 MR. POWE: Unfortunately, not at this time.

16 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Powe.

17 MR. POWE: And thank you, I've never been
18 complimented for being plain vanilla in a positive way
19 before and I appreciate the comment. Thank you.

20 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Powe.

21 Commissioner Stidham, do you have any comments or
22 questions of the Applicant?

23 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Thank you for your
24 presentation. I didn't have -- I have one question and
25 maybe I missed it in your presentation. The existing

1 townhouses, what is happening to the tenants of those
2 townhouses?

3 MR. BROWN: This is Brian. The current tenants,
4 one of the tenants actually sent me an email yesterday
5 because they're actually moving to Maryland, so they'll
6 probably vacating in the next 30 days, that's the 1708 unit,
7 1710, the other unit, is currently a four-unit affect. We
8 have number of rentals in the immediate neighborhood, and
9 I'm pretty certain that one is going to be coming open
10 between now and December that we can relocate her to.

11 In the event she isn't, I've got a network of
12 other landlords in the area that have four bedrooms that I
13 can bring her into. I've done that before with tenants
14 where they've been in a two-bedroom and they outgrew it and
15 need a three bedroom, but I didn't have a place, I've walked
16 into reputable landlords in the neighborhood because my
17 philosophy has been if I can find good tenants and I can
18 keep them in the neighborhood, I get a better neighborhood.

19 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Right. Thank you for that.
20 And the other thing I would just comment on is the number of
21 three-bedroom units, so thank you for thinking about that
22 and providing so many. Other than that, Vice Chair, I don't
23 have anything else.

24 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Commissioner
25 Stidham.

1 Chairman Hood, did you have any questions or
2 comments of the Applicant, if you're able to speak?

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah. I'll speak. I was just
4 saying to -- I want to say to Mr. Kadlecek, I'm trying to
5 remember this case. This was a case once before and I saw -
6 - I know it was on hold. Could you tell me what was that
7 was proposed there previously? Was it something similar?
8 Because this is much better, but I can't remember. I
9 thought we had a hearing about that little area right up
10 here by the field in McKinley some years back. Do you
11 remember that, Mr. Kadlecek or am wrong?

12 MR. KADLECEK: That was not me.

13 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

14 MR. KADLECEK: And Mr. Brown is telling me that
15 there's never been a project that we've sought here, but
16 maybe something nearby. I mean I know there's been a fair
17 amount of, you know, development in the neighborhood, so
18 maybe it's something else.

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Are we sure -- back up in that
20 area of 1st Street, are we sure there's never been a project
21 there?

22 MR. POWE: We many years did an apartment building
23 scheme, which we reviewed with the Office of Planning. We
24 were not happy that the neighborhood was not happy and we
25 never formally filed it.

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Well, I know we had that
2 -- something like that in front of us. I went to school at
3 McKinley, so I know about this little area back up in there.
4 And I know that was in front of us, but either way, where we
5 are today, I think, is a much better solution. I do like
6 the design. I like where it's at and I appreciate all of
7 the outreach that's been done, so thank you all. Thank you
8 all and thank you, Vice Chair.

9 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So I
10 guess I just have a couple comments and questions for the
11 Applicant's team. Can you just confirm the total number of
12 units? I think it's 27, 24 of which are or 20 of which are
13 three bedrooms with the accessory dwelling unit; four of
14 which are three bedrooms; one of which is two bedrooms and
15 two are four bedrooms with the ADU. Is that -- did I state
16 that correctly? Or if you want to restate it the way you
17 want to state it --

18 MR. KADLECEK: Yeah, Mr. Powe will state it. I
19 think you got it right, Vice Chair Miller. There's the ten
20 that have three bedrooms with a one bedroom accessory unit.
21 Then there's two three-bedroom units, a three-bedroom and a
22 four-bedroom. And then another three-bedroom and another
23 two-bedroom on the street, got it. Sorry if that wasn't
24 very clear, but --

25 VICE CHAIR MILLER: For a total of 27?

1 MR. KADLECEK: Twenty-seven units, right. So
2 there are -- so think of it this way, 11 of them have an
3 accessory unit and five of them don't have an accessory
4 unit. So there's 16 essential -- there's 16 townhouses, 11
5 of which have the accessory unit, five of which do not have
6 an accessory unit.

7 VICE CHAIR MILLER: And which of these units are
8 the inclusionary zoning units?

9 MR. KADLECEK: Yeah. If we could pull back up the
10 presentation, we have the site plan that shows which ones
11 are the IZ units. Mr. Young, if you could pull our
12 presentation back up, please.

13 VICE CHAIR MILLER: But the total is three of the
14 27 are --

15 MR. KADLECEK: Correct.

16 VICE CHAIR MILLER: -- inclusionary zoning, two
17 at --

18 (Crosstalk).

19 MR. KADLECEK: Go back one or forward one. There
20 we go. So you can see the three IZ units there. I'll have
21 to have Mr. Powe help me here.

22 MR. POWE: Units 12 and 13 are each three-bedroom
23 units. Unit 15 is the existing townhouse, which has a
24 bedroom upstairs and a den because it doesn't have a window
25 and a bedroom downstairs. So it's a two-bedroom plus den,

1 so we're committing to two three-bedroom units, three-
2 bedroom, two-bath and one two-bedroom plus den, two-bath.

3 VICE CHAIR MILLER: And two of those townhouses
4 will be offered for sale at the 60 percent median family
5 income level and one at the 80 percent median family income
6 level; is that correct?

7 MR. KADLECEK: Yes. Two of them will be 60
8 percent MFI; one will be 80 percent MFI.

9 VICE CHAIR MILLER: And that's to be commended
10 because the 60 percent is a deeper affordability level than
11 the current IZ regulations provide for ownership units. And
12 the set aside of 12 plus percent is greater than the minimum
13 set-aside that's also in the IZ regulation, so that's to be
14 commended and the number of family-sized units, which is
15 what this basically all is, except for maybe the one two
16 bedroom unit, all of them are family size, three and four
17 bedroom units, so that's to be commended as public benefit
18 as part of this planned unit development and map amendment.

19 Let me just ask about the traffic calming measures
20 that you're proffering as a result of community feedback.
21 Is there a dollar value associated with -- I assume the
22 applicant is assuming the cost of those traffic calming
23 measures? And are you also constructing them in
24 coordination with DDOT or to their standards, of course?

25 MR. KADLECEK: Yes. So the Applicant's assuming

1 the cost and the responsibility for constructing them in
2 accordance with the DDOT permits and approvals for them.

3 VICE CHAIR MILLER: And is there a dollar value
4 estimated associated with that --

5 MR. KADLECEK: I don't think we know that yet, no.

6 MR. POWE: Yeah, I don't think we've done that
7 estimate.

8 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Just one more transportation-
9 related question, the number of vehicle parking spaces is
10 13; is that correct or -- and that satisfies the minimum
11 under the zoning regulations, can you just confirm the
12 number and that it satisfies the zoning regulation?

13 MR. POWE: The number is correct and it's a
14 delicate balance between the neighborhood wanting lots of
15 parking and DDOT discouraging it so we meet DDOT. OP is in
16 agreement with the count, too.

17 VICE CHAIR MILLER: So yeah, that was going to be
18 my question, do you think 13 is enough? But I understand
19 the balance that you're trying to strike there.

20 MR. POWE: Yes. The garages have the potential to
21 -- in the row of ten have the potential to actually have two
22 cars in each and we're only counting them as a single.

23 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Well, I don't think I
24 have any other questions or comments at this time, unless my
25 fellow commissioners have any questions or comments, we can

1 move on to the Office of Planning I think is --

2 MS. SCHELLIN: Cross-examination, I don't see
3 anybody on from the ANC. The vice chair, nor the chair are
4 on, so I just want to make sure that we called for it, so
5 you're right. First, let's see if the Office of the
6 Attorney General is on. I think that would be -- I don't
7 see the name.

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: She's on.

9 MS. SCHELLIN: Is she on?

10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah, she's on.

11 MS. SCHELLIN: Oh, Nicole Wurst, okay.

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.

13 MS. SCHELLIN: Or Noelle Wurst, I'm sorry. Just
14 pulled her up, there we go.

15 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Welcome, Ms. Wurst, you're
16 here on behalf of the Office of Attorney General, right?

17 MS. WURST: Yes.

18 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Well, you can begin
19 your testimony whenever you like.

20 MS. WURST: Mr. Young, my slides are Exhibit 32,
21 please. Great. Thank you. Good evening, Commissioners.
22 My name is Noelle Wurst and I am testifying on behalf of the
23 DC Office of the Attorney General. These slides may be
24 found at Exhibit 32 and our written filing is at Exhibit 28.
25 Next, please.

1 So tonight, OAG recommends that the Zoning
2 Commission approve the PUD on the basis of its significant
3 affordable housing proffer. We believe that this proffer
4 both advances the Comp Plan's affordable housing goals to
5 achieve an equitable and inclusive city yet satisfies the
6 PUD balancing test by compensating for its requested added
7 density. Next, please.

8 In response to the District's housing crisis, the
9 Comp Plan has identified affordable housing as the only high
10 priority public benefit in the evaluation of residential
11 PUDS. Next, please.

12 And the Comp Plan has two primary reasons for this
13 prioritization, the first of which is that the rising cost
14 of housing has created a crisis of affordability
15 particularly felt by the District's lowest income residents
16 and next, to become more equitable and inclusive, the city
17 needs to address this crisis of affordability through
18 providing access to housing that is healthy, safe and
19 affordable for a range of household types, sizes and incomes
20 in all neighborhoods. And this is especially important in
21 order to address the district's income and wealth
22 disparities that exist along racial lines. Next, please.

23 In addition, the Comp Plan highlights particular
24 categories of affordable units that address specific
25 challenges within the District's housing prices. First is

1 the call for more deeply affordable units which for the
2 ownership units, this is a level corresponding to 60 percent
3 MFI or below. And this is to address the greater housing
4 cost burdens in the District, which are more likely to fall
5 on lower income families, which are also disproportionately
6 households of color.

7 Also, the Comp Plan calls for more affordable
8 ownership units and this is in order to support the long
9 term stability of neighborhoods and families and provide
10 opportunities to build intergenerational wealth. And this
11 has an equity aspect as well, since intergenerational wealth
12 building is especially important for households of color in
13 order to counter a history of structural discrimination.
14 Next, please.

15 So the Comp Plan calls, likewise, for family size
16 units which have three or more bedrooms and these respond to
17 the District's population growth trends over time and ensure
18 that it remains a viable place for families of all income
19 levels to live and grow. It's notable that family sized
20 units aren't equitably distributed across the city, meaning
21 that low income families are often limited as to where
22 they're able to live.

23 Finally, the Comp Plan prioritizes affordable
24 units close to amenities, such as access to transit,
25 employment centers, schools, public facilities, recreation

1 and retail, which also includes groceries, pharmacies and
2 banks. Next, please.

3 Within the mid-city planning area, most of the
4 affordable housing stock is concentrated in the west side,
5 though the Mid-City East Small Area Plan calls for
6 additional affordable housing in the eastern portion of the
7 planning area. Next, please.

8 Though there are two main challenges to increasing
9 housing in mid-city. The first is that planning area has a
10 severely limited stock of land being less than one percent
11 vacant land at this point, posing limited opportunities to
12 even build new housing. Second is the declining median home
13 size. Since newer homes built in multifamily housing tend
14 to be smaller than single family homes, thus less
15 opportunities to incorporate more family-sized units. Next,
16 please.

17 Though there are a number of solutions to increase
18 the housing despite these changes and these are two increase
19 site utilization, infill vacant parcels and repurpose
20 existing vacant buildings. Likewise, the Comp Plan poses a
21 special rule for row house neighborhoods to be used to
22 augment the mix of unit size and housing tenure in mid-city.
23 Next, please.

24 So additionally, the Comp Plan maps, when read
25 together, call for moderate density on the site to support

1 housing. The site's GPM designation is neighborhood
2 conservation area, which does support the use of infill
3 housing to address citywide housing needs and likewise, the
4 PUD site is located on the FLUM map in the local public
5 facilities designation noted here in teal, but otherwise,
6 the density is guided by that of the surrounding area, which
7 in this case is moderate density residential. And within
8 this designation, the PUD's proposed RA-2 zone is
9 specifically listed as consistent. Next, please.

10 So in light of the city-wide affordable housing
11 crisis and planning area specific challenges, OAG supports
12 the PUD for its contributions to addressing these
13 challenges. The PUD is going to provide three IZ ownership
14 units, comprising almost 13 percent of residential GFA. And
15 this proffer has additional features that enhance it and
16 directly respond to Comp Plan policies. First of all, two
17 of these units are provided at deeper levels of
18 affordability at the 60 percent MFI level. And as a
19 reference point, the DHCD's maximum purchase price for a
20 three-bedroom unit in a multifamily development at the 60
21 percent MFI level is about \$188,000. And that's as compared
22 to about \$280,000 for the same unit at the 80 percent MFI
23 level. Additionally, two of these units are critically
24 needed family-sized units. Next, please.

25 All right. For PUDs and map amendments, the Comp

1 Plan charges the Commission to leverage increases in density
2 which are granted as a benefit to the Applicant to provide
3 affordable housing as a benefit to the district via Comp
4 Plan Section 229.3. Additionally, the Comp Plan Section
5 224.9 calls for affordable housing, especially as a high
6 priority public benefit. This project is doubling the
7 density on site and would need to provide public benefits
8 commensurate with this flexibility. So as one point of
9 comparison, IZ+ does provide a metric to measure the
10 appropriate benefit to the District in the form an increased
11 IZ set-aside to compensate for the increase in density. So
12 for a comparable project, IZ plus would call for a 20
13 percent set-aside. Next, please.

14 So here, OAG argues that the PUD's affordable
15 housing proffer is so significant because it even exceeds
16 the IZ+ metric. So you can see on the right-hand side,
17 we've totaled the housing proffer square footage and then
18 have also applied credits to reflect the additional benefits
19 brought about by both the deeply affordable units and the
20 family-sized IZ units with these credits based on the DHCD's
21 maximum purchase price table. Now more information about
22 these credits and calculations can be found in our written
23 filing. Next, please.

24 So in addition to the significant housing proffer
25 itself, it's even more impactful, given the site's proximity

1 to community amenities. These include the schools and
2 recreation centers, other public facilities to the immediate
3 north, access to transit via bus lines and other options and
4 also proximity to retail and grocery options to help improve
5 the standards of living for the residents there. Next,
6 please.

7 So in sum, OAG recommends that the Commission
8 approve the PUD since it provides such a significant benefit
9 to the District. The PUD advances numerous Comp Plan
10 policies and more than compensates for its added density.
11 Next, please.

12 So here's the OAG staff's contact information, so
13 thank you for your time and I welcome any questions you may
14 have.

15 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Ms. Wurst, for your
16 testimony on behalf of the Attorney General in support of
17 this application. I particularly thank you for the Comp
18 Plan consistency arguments and I particularly commend you
19 for the slide that showed the Comp Plan consistency
20 arguments with moderate density residential that's
21 compatible with the neighborhood for this map amendment and
22 your testimony that it satisfies the PUD balancing test. I
23 would note, just as we've noted in the past, we have an
24 agreement to disagree with the OAG, I guess, on the argument
25 that the OAG makes that the IZ+ is the baseline for the --

1 whether the public benefit of affordable housing is being --
2 meets that PUD balancing test where you think it's the IZ+
3 as the baseline, we think it's IZ -- we think it's the
4 matter of right zoning. But in this case, it doesn't really
5 make a difference because it exceeds both.

6 MS. WURST: Right.

7 VICE CHAIR MILLER: And particularly since they
8 really aren't even using the additional height. They're not
9 using any additional height that the RA-2 zone would have
10 provided and they're only using a very small fraction of a
11 decimal point for the increased density from 1.8 to 1.86, as
12 opposed to the almost 3.0 FAR that the RA-2 zone would
13 provide. So the development standards, it does look like a
14 townhouse in an RF-1 zone and that's to be commended. So we
15 thank you for the OAG testimony. We agree with you -- I
16 agree with you that the affordable housing proffer is
17 significant, the home ownership, the family-sized units, all
18 of what you -- all of which you stated. Let me see if my
19 colleagues have any comments or questions to you, Ms. Wurst.

20 Commissioner Imamura?

21 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Vice Chair
22 Miller. No questions. I underscore and agree with all of
23 your comments, Vice Chair Miller and Ms. Wurst, as Vice
24 Chair Miller said, I appreciate the slides that you provided
25 that show the Comp Plan consistency and that OAG is in

1 support of this. And to your point, Vice Chair Miller, that
2 it does look like townhomes in that RF-1 zone, so the
3 architect, while understated, I think met the program
4 requirements and that's the sign of a lot of very skilled
5 and experienced architects. So no further questions. Thank
6 you, Ms. Wurst.

7 MS. WURST: Thank you.

8 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Commissioner
9 Imamura.

10 Commissioner Stidham, do you have any questions or
11 comments?

12 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: No, no questions or
13 comments. Thank you.

14 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Chairman Hood, did you have
15 any questions or comments of OAG?

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: No questions or comments and
17 thank you for your report.

18 MS. WURST: And thank you, Commissioners.

19 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. I thank you, Ms. Wurst.
20 I guess we next move on to the Office of Planning; is that
21 correct, Secretary Schellin?

22 MS. SCHELLIN: And again, calling for cross of the
23 Applicant.

24 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Oh.

25 MR. KADLECEK: No questions, thank you.

1 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. And the ANC, again, I don't
2 see anybody from the ANC. So next, we have DDOT. Noah
3 Hagen from DDOT and then if Mr. Youngs want to go ahead and
4 pull up OP, it would be Matt Jesick and Joel Lawson. Thank
5 you.

6 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Ms. Schellin.

7 MR. HAGEN: Good afternoon, Chairman Hood and
8 members of the commission. For the record, I am Noah Hagen
9 with the District Department of Transportation. DDOT is
10 supportive of the Applicant's PUD application to develop the
11 property at 710 1st Street Northeast. In our July 8, 2024
12 report, which is in the record as Exhibit 27, we recommended
13 approval with one condition, which is implementation of the
14 Applicant's transportation demand management plan with added
15 provisions about traffic calming measures and signage. And
16 as you've heard in the Applicant's presentation, they've
17 agreed to this condition and with those included in the
18 zoning order, DDOT has no objection the approval of this PUD
19 application.

20 DDOT also encourages the Applicant to provide a
21 covering for the short term bicycle parking located at the
22 rear of the site, as many site residents will use the secure
23 area for permanent bicycle storage. We look forward to
24 continuing to work with the Applicant on the streetscape
25 design, particularly the placement of the short-term bicycle

1 racks and curbside management plan as they go through public
2 space permitting. Thank you and I'd be happy to answer any
3 questions you may have.

4 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you very much for that,
5 for the DDOT report and for your presence here tonight. I
6 have no questions. Let me ask if any of my colleagues have
7 any questions.

8 Commissioner Imamura?

9 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: No questions. Thank you,
10 Mr. Hagen, for your report.

11 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Commissioner Stidham.

12 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: No questions for me,
13 either. Thank you very much for your report.

14 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Chairman Hood?

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Just wanted to say, Mr. Hagen,
16 thank you for your report. Thank you.

17 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Hagen. If you
18 can hang on in case the Applicant has any questions of you.
19 I doubt that they do and I guess the ANC is not here to ask
20 any questions.

21 Mr. Kadlecek, did you have any questions of DDOT?

22 MR. KADLECEK: No, thank you.

23 VICE CHAIR MILLER: No, okay. Let's go to the
24 Office of Planning, then, Mr. Jesick.

25 MR. JESICK: Thank you, Mr. Vice Chair, Mr. Chair

1 and members of the Commission. The Office of Planning
2 recommends approval of the PUD and related map amendment, as
3 well as the areas of requested flexibility. Since the time
4 of step down, we have continued discussions with the
5 Applicant and all of our initial questions and comments have
6 been resolved. The project would not be inconsistent with
7 the Comprehensive Plan, including when viewed through a
8 racial equity lens. The project would make use of a vacant
9 lot. It would be compatible with the existing neighborhood.
10 It would improve the aesthetics of the alley and it would
11 provide family-sized housing in a walkable transit-
12 accessible neighborhood.

13 We've also found that the benefits of the project
14 would be commensurate with the small degree of flexibility
15 sought through the PUD. As Commissioner Miller noted, the
16 FAR would be increasing only slightly from an equivalent FAR
17 in the RF-1 zone of 1.8 to a proposed FAR of 1.86. So in
18 summary, OP finds that the PUD meets the criteria for
19 approval and recommends that the Commission approve the
20 application. Thank you and I'd be happy to take any
21 questions.

22 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Jesick, for
23 your presence here tonight and the Office of Planning Report
24 and for all of your suggestions and working with the
25 Applicant to improve the project, both its design and

1 function. Let me see if any of my colleagues have any
2 questions or comments to you.

3 Commissioner Imamura?

4 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Vice Chair
5 Miller. I echo your sentiment. Thank you, Mr. Jesick for
6 working with the Applicant to make improvements to the
7 project. I also want to comment and thank you as well as
8 Mr. Lawson and Mr. Hagen for the work that you do on behalf
9 of the residents of the city and appreciate your report
10 tonight. Thank you.

11 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Commissioner
12 Imamura.

13 Commissioner Stidham, did you have any comments?

14 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: No, just to echo what
15 Commissioner Imamura said and thank you for your report.

16 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you.

17 Chairman Hood, did you have any comments or
18 questions for Office of Planning?

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: No. Thank you, Mr. Jesick, for
20 your report.

21 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Let's see if the Applicant has
22 any questions for the Office of Planning. You've been
23 working with the Office of Planning, so I assume -- and
24 everything's resolved, according to both of you, but any
25 questions for the Office of Planning?

1 MR. KADLECEK: No questions. Thank you.

2 VICE CHAIR MILLER: And Ms. Schellin, the ANC is
3 still not here, right, to --

4 MS. SCHELLIN: Correct.

5 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Do we have any -- so I
6 guess that's it for the Office of Planning and government
7 testimony. Do we have any individuals or organizations who
8 have signed up to testify tonight?

9 MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir. There are no public
10 witnesses and, like I said, you have the ANC report at
11 Exhibit 33 in support and there's no more testimony. Thank
12 you.

13 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Right. We do have some
14 individual letters of support, which are in the record at
15 Exhibit -- well, at various exhibits, 25, 29. I don't have
16 numbers on the others, but several neighbors have submitted
17 letters of support, which we appreciate. So I guess that
18 comes back to the Applicant, do you have any rebuttal or
19 closing argument, Mr. Kadlecek or your team to make in this
20 point, in this case?

21 MR. KADLECEK: No, thank you, Vice Chair Miller.
22 Nothing to add, other than on behalf of the Applicant team,
23 we'd just like to thank you for your time and consideration
24 of this.

25 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Well, I think this is

1 pretty straightforward. I think a lot of work has been done
2 with the community, with the Office of Planning DDOT, the
3 responsiveness to concerns and suggestions that have been
4 raised and we appreciate that that work is done ahead of
5 time. It makes our hearings and work a lot easier and so we
6 thank everybody else for their hard work in getting to this
7 point.

8 I am ready to move forward. Let me see where my
9 colleagues are with -- I think this is a two-vote case, so
10 let me hear if somebody's ready to make a motion or if they
11 have any concerns or any of my colleagues, if anyone wants
12 to make a motion for a proposed action to approve the
13 proposed action tonight, please go ahead at this time.

14 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Vice Chair Miller, I'll
15 take you up on the offer and make the motion. I move that
16 the Zoning Commission take proposed action on Case No. 23-24
17 Eckington Mews, LLC consolidated PUD map amendment at Square
18 25-34 with a lot of lot numbers.

19 I think I remember Ms. Schellin saying we don't
20 need to list all of those off as long as we've got the case
21 number, so I'd ask for a second.

22 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Second.

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. It's been moved and
24 properly seconded. Let me ask if there's any further
25 discussion from my colleagues at this time. Hearing none,

1 Ms. Schellin, would you take a roll call vote?

2 MS. SCHELLIN: Sure. Commissioner Imamura?

3 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.

4 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Stidham?

5 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes.

6 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood?

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.

8 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller?

9 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

10 MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is four to zero to one to
11 approve proposed action in Zoning Commission Case No. 23-24
12 and the minus one being the third mayoral appointee seat
13 which is vacant. And if I may, Vice Chair Miller, I don't
14 think you guys asked for any additional documents; is that
15 correct? Nobody asked for anything. So we will refer this
16 to NCPC, but they do need to go through the proffers and
17 conditions process, the first filing being due in seven
18 days, per the regulations, so I know Mr. Kadlecek is very
19 familiar with that process. And if we could have a draft
20 order by the end of August, that would be great and that's
21 it.

22 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Ms. Schellin. So I
23 don't think we have any further business before the Zoning
24 Commission this evening. I think our next meeting is, I
25 believe, Monday -- is it Monday, July 22nd, would that be?

1 I don't have the case number in front of me. I usually
2 don't look at it until I don't have any other cases before
3 me so that I remember what we're talking about. What is the
4 date?

5 MS. SCHELLIN: 23-29, it is another PUD case.

6 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Ms. Schellin. Does
7 anybody else have any other closing comments that they want
8 to make? If not, thank you all for your participation
9 tonight.

10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Vice Chair, I just want to
11 thank you for running this tonight. Thank you very much. I
12 appreciate it.

13 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Well, don't make it a habit,
14 Mr. Chairman, but you've set a model that it is easy to
15 follow -- not easy to follow, but it's good to follow and I
16 try to follow it. So thank you very much. Thank everybody
17 for their participation tonight. This meeting is adjourned.

18 (Whereupon, the hearing was adjourned at 5:05
19 p.m., Eastern Daylight Time.)

20 * * * * *

21

22

23

24

25

REPORTER CERTIFICATE

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

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Public Hearing

Before: D.C. Zoning Commission

Date: 07-18-2024

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