

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

ZONING COMMISSION

VIRTUAL PUBLIC MEETING

VIA WEBEX

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 2023

The Public Meeting by the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened via videoconference pursuant to notice at 4:02 p.m. EDT, Anthony Hood, Chairperson, presiding.

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

SHARON SCHELLIN, Secretary
PAUL YOUNG, Data Specialist

OFFICE OF ZONING LEGAL DIVISION STAFF PRESENT:

JAKE RITTING, Esquire

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Public Meeting held on November 2, 2023.

Diversified Reporting Services, Inc.

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

C O N T E N T S

Case No. 23-09 650 Morton Steet NW, LLC	6
--	---

P R O C E E D I N G S

(4:02 p.m.)

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Today's date is November the 2nd, 2023.

Welcome to November. We are convening broadcasting this public hearing by video conferencing. My name is Anthony Hood, and I'm joined by Vice Chair Miller, Commissioners Stidham and Imamura, as well as the Office of Zoning staff, Ms. Sharon Schellin, and Mr. Paul Young, who will be handling all of our virtual operations.

Also, our Office of Zoning Legal Division, Mr. Jake Ritting. I will ask all others to introduce themselves at the appropriate time.

The virtual public hearing notice is available on the Office of Zoning's website. This proceeding is being recorded by a court reporter. The platforms used are Webex and YouTube live.

The video will be available on the Office of Zoning's website after the hearing. All persons planning to testify should have signed up in advance and will be called by name at the appropriate time.

At the time of sign up, all participants will complete the oath or affirmation required by subtitle Z48.7.

Accordingly, all those listening on Webex or by phone will be muted during the hearing and only those who

1 signed up to participate or testify will be unmuted at the
2 appropriate time. Excuse me.

3 When called, please state your name before
4 providing your testimony. When you are finished speaking,
5 please mute your audio. If you experience difficulty
6 accessing Webex or with your telephone call in, or have not
7 signed up, then please call our OZ hotline number at 202-
8 727-0789.

9 If you wish to file written testimony or
10 additional supporting documents during the hearing, then
11 please be prepared to describe and discuss at the time of
12 your testimony.

13 The subject of this evening's hearing is Zoning
14 Commission Case Number 23-09. This is 650 Morton Street
15 Northwest LLC map amendment that's square 3040, Lodge 33 and
16 34; 650 and 654 Morton Street Northwest. Again, today's
17 date is November 2nd, 2023.

18 The hearing will be conducted in accordance with
19 provisions of 11Z, DCMR Chapter Four as follows, preliminary
20 matters, applicant's case. An applicant has up to 60
21 minutes. I'm not sure.

22 I haven't had a chance to see what they ask for,
23 but they can -- whatever they ask for, if they ask for it,
24 they can do that.

25 Report of other government agencies, report of

1 Department of Transportation, report of the Office of
2 Planning, and report of the ANC; testimony of organizations
3 and individuals, organizations, five minutes; individuals,
4 excuse me, three minutes, excuse me.

5 And we were here in the following order from those
6 who are in support, opposition, and undeclared. Then we
7 have rebuttal and closing by the applicant.

8 Again, the OZ hotline number is 202-727-0789 for
9 any concerns during these proceedings. And, again, the ANC,
10 in this case, is ANC 1E. I believe they are the only ANC.
11 Yes. ANC 1E.

12 Again, the OZ hotline number I stated 202-727-0789
13 for any problems. At this time the Commission will consider
14 any preliminary matters. Does the staff have any
15 preliminary matters?

16 MS. SCHELLIN: There are no proffered expert
17 witnesses, no party status requests. The applicant has
18 stated they need about 15 minutes for their presentation.

19 Karen Thomas is representing the Office of
20 Planning. ANC 1E is represented by Bradley Gallagher. And,
21 I don't see him on just yet. We can check later. I don't
22 know if they'll be participating in the hearing or not, but
23 he is the representative for 1E.

24 Other than that, staff has nothing else, as far as
25 preliminary matters. The applicant is represented by

1 Alexandra Wilson at Sullivan and Barros. And I believe it
2 will be her and the applicant's representative, Mr. Burns,
3 who will do the presentation.

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And thank you, Ms. Schellin,
5 for teeing all that up. Let's bring everyone up on the
6 applicant's team. And it looks -- is it Marty Sullivan or
7 Ms. Wilson, whomever it is? Mr. Sullivan. Okay. All
8 right.

9 Mr. Sullivan, why don't you --

10 MS. SCHELLIN: Sorry about that, Marty.

11 MR. SULLIVAN: It's okay. Thank you.

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: You're good to go. Mr.
13 Sullivan, whenever you're ready.

14 MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

15 Marty Sullivan here on behalf of the applicant in
16 this case. If Mr. Young could please load the PowerPoint
17 presentation? Thank you.

18 And yes, Mr. Burns should be with us here as well
19 if the Commission has any questions. Mr. Burns is a
20 principal with the ownership entity.

21 So, the subject property is 650 and 654 Morton
22 Street Northwest.

23 Next slide, please.

24 These properties are currently zoned RF-1. You
25 can see on the map in the lower right corner, the

1 highlighted property is 650. The property to the left of
2 that is 654. And then that's Georgia Avenue just to the
3 west of that, and that's the NC -- well, it's no longer NC-
4 7. It's NMU-4 something now. It's the MU-4 with the George
5 Avenue overlay, is what's to the west of there.

6 Applicant is proposing to change the zone to RA-3
7 as is consistent with the FLUM map designation as
8 residential medium density and the map amendment may
9 eventually result in more affordable units as the
10 development would be designated as an IZ Plus development.

11 We do have the support of ANC 1E and the
12 residential tenants of 654 Morton, it's an existing
13 apartment building, have been notified in map amendment and
14 do not have any issues with the proposal.

15 And in fact, the owner has joined in with this
16 application. The Office of Planning recommends approval and
17 it's determined that it is not inconsistent with the
18 comprehensive plan.

19 And we have no objection from DDOT and we have
20 three letters of support from community members.

21 Next slide, please.

22 It's 650 and 654. These are the properties from
23 the frontage.

24 Next slide, please.

25 The future land use map designation. This is

1 essentially an application to make the zoning map consistent
2 with the future land use map and the comprehensive plan.

3 It's medium density residential and this
4 designation is used to define neighborhoods or areas
5 generally, but not exclusively suited for mid-rise,
6 apartment buildings.

7 Medium density residential designation also may
8 apply to taller residential buildings surrounded by large
9 areas of permanent open space. Pockets of low and moderate
10 density housing may exist within these areas. And density
11 typically ranges from 1.8 to 4.0 FAR.

12 Although greater density may be possible when
13 complying with IZ or when approved through a PUD. The RA-3
14 zone, as noted, is consistent with medium density
15 residential category.

16 And the designation here on the future land use
17 map applies to this entire block, as you can see from the
18 map on the right.

19 Next slide, please.

20 Properties located in a neighborhood conservation
21 area. The proposed amendment is not inconsistent with the
22 policy map as neighborhood enhancement areas are primarily
23 residential in character. And many of these areas are
24 characterized by a patchwork of existing homes and
25 individual vacant lots, some privately owned and others

1 owned by the public sector or nonprofit developers.

2 These areas present opportunities for compatible
3 small scale infill development, including new single-family
4 homes, townhomes, and other density housing types. Land
5 uses that reflect the historical mixture of diversity of
6 each community should be encouraged.

7 Further, the comp plan notes that the guiding
8 philosophy in the enhancement areas is to ensure that new
9 development fits in in response to the existing character,
10 natural features, and existing plant infrastructure
11 capacity.

12 This would be designated IZ Plus. So any project
13 --any IZ project resulting or ever taking place on these
14 properties in the future will trigger a 20 percent set aside
15 requirement for the IZ.

16 Next slide, please.

17 This is a comparison of the existing and proposed
18 zoning elements and the area development standards. The use
19 currently is single families and flats. The use would be
20 multifamily under RA-3.

21 FAR would be 3.0, 3.6 with an IZ. Height would go
22 from 35 feet and three stories to 60 feet, and the parking
23 requirement is reduced from the RF zone to the apartment
24 zone.

25 Lot occupancy from 60 to 75 percent. And there's

1 a difference in the rear yard. There, as you see there, it
2 depends on the height, the side yard, and green area ratio
3 would apply now for the two and RA project.

4 Next slide, please.

5 Regarding the racial equity analysis tool. And I
6 know that the ops planning has gone into this in more detail
7 on their report as well, but we've gone into it in our
8 statements and in this presentation here.

9 Next slide, please.

10 This is a slide just summarizing and highlighting
11 the equity crosswalk policies. In red, from a comprehensive
12 plan, including variety of neighborhood types, neighborhood
13 revitalization, equitable transportation access, a four-to-
14 one mixed income housing, advancing diversity and equity
15 planning areas, and preserving affordable rental housing,
16 and the redevelopment of affordable housing.

17 Next slide, please.

18 Some of the citywide elements met by this
19 application. The land use element, the proposal encourages
20 new housing and new affordable housing on the 650 property
21 and will preserve existing houses on the 654 property --
22 existing housing.

23 George Avenue is a priority corridor in the
24 District, and this would encourage growth along that
25 corridor. It will create more opportunities for individuals

1 and families who cannot afford a six-figure single-family
2 home in this area to live in this area fostering growth and
3 equity.

4 The transportation element. The proposal allows
5 for transit-oriented development around a major
6 transportation bus corridor. As Georgia Avenue is
7 designated as a priority corridor. It is located less than
8 a half mile from the Georgia Avenue Petworth Metro Rail
9 Station and this will naturally incentivize investment into
10 surrounding infrastructure.

11 The housing element. The proposal encourages new
12 development on underutilized land. This will help meet the
13 need for higher density and affordable housing in the area.

14 The environmental protection element. The
15 proposal allows for new development on the 650-property
16 compliant with the green energy codes, which could include
17 green roofs and other planting elements currently not on-
18 site.

19 Also as noted, GAR is required in the RA zones.
20 It's not required in the RF.

21 The mid-city area element. The proposal furthers
22 the goals stated in the comp plan regarding the mid-city
23 area element by allowing the potential for new complimentary
24 residential development, which includes affordable housing
25 and allowing for existing housing to be renovated and

1 rehabilitated. So existing residents avoid displacement.

2 Next slide, please.

3 Part two on community guidance and engagement. So
4 stakeholders are the Columbia Heights area, Mid-City
5 Planning Area, Park View community, ANC 1E, and tenants.

6 ANC 1E is in support. The tenants. The proposed
7 zone change will not cause physical displacement of tenants
8 or residents as attested to by the owner of 655 Morton.

9 And the 650 Morton building is vacant. It was a
10 single-family home, or it is a single-family home, but it's
11 been vacant for a while.

12 Neighbors. The applicant's initial outreach to
13 the community began with its counsel reaching out to the SMD
14 for the area

15 In October of last year, five months prior to sending the
16 notice of intent to file and six a half months prior to
17 filing the map amendment, the applicant personally reached
18 out to neighbors on the block by knocking on doors and
19 sending individual notices.

20 And as a result, the applicant did speak directly
21 with the owner of 654 Morton and 648 Morton. With respect
22 to the Park View community, the applicant emailed ANC to
23 request information about any civic associations in the
24 area.

25 The applicant was informed that at one point there

1 was a civic association in the area the Park View United
2 Neighborhood Coalition. However, they had not met since the
3 pandemic and did not appear to be active.

4 The applicant did reach out and has followed up
5 with them periodically since its initial outreach. And as
6 the civic association is apparently not active, the
7 applicant wanted to make sure the greater surrounding
8 community was made aware of the map amendment.

9 Accordingly, we mailed postcards, which provided
10 map amendment information to 1,110 properties within ANC 1E
11 01 and 1E02.

12 Next slide, please.

13 Based on information regarding past and present
14 racial discrimination, based on the information available on
15 the DGS website, the Park View neighborhood is a historic
16 African American neighborhood.

17 This page also highlights efforts to preserve the
18 historic field house located on the Park View Rec Center
19 site for blocks north of the properties. Based on
20 information from the PUD application for the development on
21 this block, there was a lack of investment in infrastructure
22 in the area, specifically for the housing project on that
23 PUD site.

24 This lack of infrastructure created a situation
25 where the buildings were not salvageable and required

1 demolition and rebuilding rather than reuse. And that PUD
2 is part of an ongoing effort in the community to redevelop
3 and provide high quality of four-to-one market rate housing
4 and the map amendment will allow for complimentary
5 development on the 650 property.

6 It also allows the 654 property to have more
7 flexibility in maintaining and upgrading its building in
8 order to avoid a situation where the building becomes
9 unsalvageable.

10 So with PUD set the standard for the changes in
11 the community given the development is for a mix of high
12 quality, affordable end market rate housing. And the
13 proposed upzoning is minor in comparison, but will allow for
14 a complimentary development on the 650 site.

15 Additionally, the owner of the 654 property, in
16 his letter, has expressed his commitment to continuing to
17 provide housing priced below market rate to his
18 predominantly nonwhite tenants who might not otherwise be
19 able to afford housing in the area.

20 Next slide, please.

21 Part three, the disaggregated data regarding race
22 and ethnicity. The housing equity report housing goals for
23 the Mid-City Planning Area. Note, the affordable housing
24 production goal of 1,010 units; 451 units have been produced
25 and 717 units have been newly covenanted since 2019.

1 The comprehensive plan policies affected
2 increasing affordable and market rate housing near public
3 transit and commercial corridors. It's city planning and
4 development priorities, concerns include need for
5 revitalization of lower Georgia Avenue, concentration of new
6 development near high volume transit corridors, and
7 preserving existing affordable housing.

8 The age profile of mid-city is different than the
9 District at large as there were fewer residents under the
10 age of 18 and over the age of 65 in 2017. About 12 percent
11 of the residents were under 18, compared to a district-wide
12 total of 18 percent. Over eight percent were over 65,
13 compared to the district-wide total of 12 percent.

14 The majority of residents are between 18 and 64
15 with approximately 45 percent between 18 and 34 years of
16 age.

17 Next slide, please.

18 And the general Rock Creek East area demographics.
19 In 2017, the area had a population of 96,489 or about 14
20 percent of the District's total population. Between 2000
21 and 2017, the area grew by over 15,000 residents largely due
22 to new housing construction of multi-family buildings,
23 particularly in the western part of the area.

24 Between 2000 and 2017, the Mid-City Planning Area
25 experienced a shift in population characteristics. In 2000,

1 black residents were mid cities predominant racial group at
2 52 percent and the Hispanic-Latino population was 22
3 percent.

4 By 2017, the black population decreased to 31
5 percent of the total population, and the white population
6 increased from 27 percent to 52 percent of the total
7 population, and approximately 18 percent of the population
8 was Hispanic-Latina.

9 Next slide, please.

10 And here's a chart showing some of the things that
11 I talked about in the last two slides.

12 Next slide, please.

13 Evaluation of zoning action through the racial
14 activity lens, part four and physical. The proposed zone
15 change will not cause physical displacement of tenants or
16 residents as attested to by the owner of 655 Morton. And
17 again, the 650 Morton building is vacant.

18 Economic indirect displacement of tenants or
19 residents is not expected to occur in the area surrounding
20 this zone change. Cultural displaced is unlikely as the
21 additional housing will help Mid-City residents remain in
22 the neighborhood and provide a complimentary development to
23 returning and new residents of Park Morton, adding to the
24 community overall.

25 Approximately 24 to 26 new housing units. Twenty

1 percent of that will be IZ. So approximately seven to ten
2 IZ units, possibly, devoted to affordable. This would help
3 preserve existing housing listed below market rate on the
4 654 property as it would give that owner the ability to
5 upgrade, renovate, or add to the building without BZA
6 approval for area variances. The apartment building would
7 require review in the RF-1 zone.

8 The single-family home would be replaced with
9 additional market rate and affordable housing adjacent to a
10 major priority corridor. And the action could provide
11 homeownership opportunity if the 650 property was developed
12 as a condo building.

13 A housing burden. 650 property will alleviate
14 housing burden by providing seven to ten IZ units and by
15 maintaining the ability to provide affordable units now and
16 in the future.

17 And there is no specific project right now
18 contemplated for 650, so we don't know what the unit size
19 would be. The 654 property has one three-bedroom unit.

20 And I believe that's it. Yes. That's it for our
21 presentation. And if the Commission has any questions for
22 myself or for Mr. Burns. Thank you.

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Mr. Sullivan, you
24 and the team. We'll see if we have any questions or
25 comments.

1 I'm going to start with the Commissioner Imamura.

2 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

3 Thank you, Mr. Sullivan and the applicant for
4 bringing this map amendment before the commission.

5 This proposed map amendment seems pretty
6 straightforward. So that's what gives me a little bit of
7 pause. I want to make sure that we haven't missed anything.

8 So I just have a few questions, Mr. Sullivan. I
9 know you mentioned, on your last slide, that there is not a
10 project planned for 650. And I know that this this is a map
11 amendment. We're not talking about projects, but I'm
12 curious what was the genesis for this then? The map
13 amendment to bring this forward? Is there anything planned
14 for 654? I know there's existing tenants there. Just a
15 little background to the story if you could, please.

16 MR. SULLIVAN: Yeah. I'll answer briefly, and
17 then I'll turn it over to Mr. Burns because he could
18 probably fill it more, especially in regard to his
19 conversations with 654.

20 But certainly a project is intended at some point,
21 but there's nothing specific is what I meant by that. And
22 that's the purpose of the request for the map amendment.

23 Regarding the property at 654, Chris, do you want
24 to talk a little bit about the owner there and what that
25 building's like? It doesn't look like it's likely to have

1 any renovation or addition. I mean, it's an existing
2 building. It's a fairly substantial building. It's only
3 two stories, but they have, existing tenants. I can't
4 remember how many units it is. Chris, you might remember.

5 MR. BURNS: Yeah. Good afternoon, everyone. I'm
6 principal of 650 Morton Street Northwest LLC.

7 This project came or this map amendment
8 application came out about as just an opportunity. The
9 owner of 650 Morton was just getting, you know, it was not
10 his personal residence. The building became vacant. He did
11 not want, you know, it was falling in disrepair. And so we
12 had gotten in touch with him and we decided to make a sale.

13 And I had seen that, you know, what was going on
14 across the street at the Park Morton redevelopment and I
15 looked at the future land use map and it just seemed like a
16 no brainer to, you know, because of a lot size here to try
17 to, you know, go after a map application here.

18 My conversation with Mr. Granados, who is the
19 owner of 654, you know, he is a long-time landlord. He owns
20 other buildings in the area. He lives nearby in Columbia
21 Heights. He feels a very strong kind of service. He feels
22 that he's in service to his tenants. I think there's 13 or
23 14 units there. Predominantly, Spanish speaking, Hispanic
24 tenants.

25 And, you know, he feels that, you know, he feels

1 that his, you know, his apartment building is kind of his
2 way to give back to the community, you know, from when he
3 was in, you know, an immigrant about 20 or 30 years ago.

4 And he gives, you know, he there's a lot of, you
5 know, it's working-class tenants and he's able to provide
6 housing for them so they can easily get to work instead of
7 being kind of pushed out to the suburbs, like,
8 unfortunately, so many, you know, tenants in that socio
9 demographic have been forced to do so.

10 MS. GLOVER: Great.

11 MR. SULLIVAN: I would add too that one of the
12 reasons we have 654 included as well because it gives us a
13 connection then to the edge of the zone, and I know the
14 Commission in the Office of Planning don't want a spot zone
15 So rather than just have this here, it was -- we always try
16 to extend it to the end of the zone or at least include a
17 group of properties that makes a little more logical sense
18 than just a specific property.

19 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Sullivan,
20 appreciate the added clarity, and thank you, Mr. Burns, for
21 your response as well.

22 And I want to talk about that for a minute. So,
23 Mr. Sullivan brought up in his PowerPoint presentation about
24 some of the disaggregated data that we've asked for.
25 Since 2000, black residents have gone from 52 percent to 31

1 percent in this area and the white population has increased
2 from 27 to 52 percent.

3 So I would like to know or hear your response to
4 how will this map amendment, while you're only anticipating
5 24 to 26 units, seven to ten of which might be IZ units.
6 Probably not enough to change the dial, but, with more
7 projects or mapping amendments like this, how do we balance
8 out the diversity of the neighborhood here? How will this
9 map amendment support that?

10 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, I don't know if this is just
11 my personal opinion, but the creation of 26, possibly 26
12 units, whether it's just one, each one of those units will
13 be more affordable than what this one unit would be.

14 It's a large lot too. The 650 is 6,740 square
15 feet. So, but at the most you could do, even if you
16 subdivided it would be -- I don't even think it has the
17 width to do two lots, maybe two lots, maybe four units.

18 MR. BURNS: It has, yeah, let me I've looked at
19 this just in case this, you know, for whatever reason, was
20 not accepted. But you would be able to subdivide, you know,
21 the alternative here would be to subdivide the lot into two
22 different lots, keep it RF-1 and basically create two large
23 townhome style condos on each, you know, on each on each
24 lot.

25 And there's precedents that's been set for this

1 sort of thing on Park Road, which is, you know, just the
2 next block north. Which is not part of this FLUM map area.

3 MR. SULLIVAN: Thanks, Chris.

4 Yeah. So the most you could do is four market
5 rates and this, the projects that's going to take place here
6 is going to have more IZ units than the market rate could
7 currently, in addition to the fact that the low a
8 affordability or small a affordability is increased as well
9 with the smaller size and more number of units, more
10 density.

11 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: All right. Thank you, Mr.
12 Sullivan. Thank you, Mr. Burns.

13 I think, that seems pretty evident based off of
14 the record, but I think it's important for the public to
15 hear that, right? That you've gained this out, right?
16 This is what the potential could be and if we don't move in
17 this direction, this is the other outcome, right? And so we
18 have something to evaluate and use as baseline. So I
19 appreciate that.

20 There's a couple other comments I'd like to make,
21 about that. So I think in your slide deck, Mr. Sullivan, I
22 just wanted to confirm we are in a neighborhood area, or
23 neighborhood conservation?

24 MR. SULLIVAN: It is a I believe it's a
25 neighborhood -- sorry. Conservation area.

1 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Okay. And when we're in a
2 neighborhood conservation area, I always like to pay a
3 little more closer attention to what we're doing and what
4 those outcomes might be.

5 And I think in the Land Use Policy, which you're
6 very familiar with about row house neighborhood character.
7 And there might be some inconsistency here with that Land
8 Use Policy about specifically, and I don't want to be too
9 pedantic about this, but respect to the character of the row
10 house neighborhoods by ensuring that infill development is
11 compatible with existing design patterns.

12 And there are two letters in the record in
13 opposition that have expressed concern for the matter of
14 right, the height, with that comes with the matter of right
15 here.

16 And so I'd like for you to address that a little
17 bit, if you would, please? As well as their other concerns
18 that they've listed. One, which is also the potential
19 removal of a large tree.

20 And so I tried to take a look on Google Earth and
21 see what tree specifically they were talking about. Maybe
22 you could enlighten me a bit on where that is and talk a
23 little bit about the height here in the neighborhood?

24 MR. SULLIVAN: Okay. Thanks. And I think I may
25 have misspoke or there might have been a typo in that

1 presentation.

2 It's a neighborhood enhancement area on the
3 general generalized policy map, but regarding the trees.
4 I'll turn it over to Chris to talk about that because he's
5 got an arborist and they've look into that a little bit.

6 MR. BURNS: Yeah. We've had -- there's three
7 sizable trees on the edges of the lot. One is an Atlantis
8 tree, which is not a heritage tree or a protected tree. One
9 is two elm trees that are twisted together that is -- well,
10 my arborist is saying that is probably a heritage tree.

11 And then we have a Catalpa tree, which is a
12 protected heritage tree. However, it has been causing
13 significant damage to the adjacent building. It is hollowed
14 out because it's been rotting through the middle and there
15 is -- it is unfortunately, housing a very large rodent
16 population.

17 My arborist has been in touch with Urban Forestry.
18 I think Maddie, I forget her last name, regarding all of
19 these matters. So we are in communication with them
20 regarding these three large trees on the on the site.

21 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: That's good to hear. And
22 I'm hoping that, as part of your outreach you'd expressed
23 that with those stakeholders and tenants, that you have been
24 in touch with the urban forestry. That is top of my --

25 Talking about outreach. I do want to compliment

1 you on the 1,100 mailings, that's pretty significant. And
2 there is something in the record, it looks like an email
3 that was provided in the record for your outreach to, you
4 know, substantiate, your outreach efforts.

5 Sara Harkcom, I think a case manager there, with
6 your firm Mr. Sullivan, had reached out to Commissioner
7 Gallagher asking about, are there any civic associations
8 within the agency boundary?

9 You did address this a little bit. I do you
10 acknowledge that your applicants gone door to door and that
11 the association that you spoke of, essentially sort of
12 disbanded after the pandemic. But I just wanted to follow
13 through on that and ask if there is any additional effort,
14 beyond the mailings and any other associations that you were
15 in contact with, outside of just sounded as if the ANC kind
16 of punted on this and said, you know, these are the
17 associations or organizations and that's about it? So.

18 MR. SULLIVAN: No. I don't think anything more
19 than what we described. I mean, we worked real closely
20 with, you know, with the ANC and this ANC is very
21 knowledgeable and active and so we think they really -- if
22 there was more we should have done or could have done, they
23 would have let us know about that or let those organizations
24 know about that, I'd say.

25 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: All right. And then

1 lastly, the challenge is about (inaudible), which came out
2 of their letter in opposition as well. I'd like to give you
3 an opportunity to address that.

4 MR. SULLIVAN: Sure. Well we were, I forget the
5 location, very close to a Metro stop on Georgia Avenue,
6 close to Georgia Avenue, which has several bus lines and
7 there is a rear alley, so the parking requirement would be
8 met on any project that would take place here.

9 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: All right. Thank you, Mr.
10 Sullivan. Thank you, Mr. Burns.

11 Mr. Chairman, I don't think I have any other
12 questions at this moment and will yield the floor. I'm
13 interested to hear what my fellow commissioners have to ask.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Commissioner
15 Imamura.

16 I'm a seize the moment.

17 Mr. Sullivan, what do you consider the closest
18 Metro station?

19 MR. SULLIVAN: One second, Mr. Chair. I can't
20 remember offhand.

21 MR. BURNS: I could chime in here. It would be
22 the Georgia Avenue Petworth, green and yellow line station.
23 It's about four blocks --

24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So --

25 MR. BURNS: -- three or four blocks --

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: (Inaudible) Avenue. That's
2 going north. Yeah. So, I mean -- well, maybe when I was
3 younger, I would've thought it would've been close, but
4 that's, to me, that's a hump and, but I do agree there's one
5 there.

6 I do agree with the Georgia Avenue bus line, which
7 has been one of the best for years. So I'll just leave it
8 at that.

9 It was one other question that Commissioner
10 Imamura and I'll be I want to ask before I forget, and then
11 I'll go to you -- I'll come to you Commissioner Stidham.

12 The association -- what about the -- I didn't see
13 or did I miss it? The Park View Citizens Association, and I
14 agree with Mr. Sullivan. That the ANC would have,
15 definitely alerted you, but I just can't believe all those
16 have went dormant.

17 It's unfortunate, but did you -- any talk of the
18 Park View Citizens Association?

19 MR. SULLIVAN: No. Not that I'm aware of. No.

20 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Well, I do agree, Mr.
21 Sullivan, that the ANC would have definitely directed you
22 somewhere there, but it's just the one that you -- the other
23 one that you all mentioned as well as the Citizens
24 Association I know we're very prominent at one time in the
25 Park View area and they had a very strong nexus over the

1 years. So I'll just leave it at that.

2 All right. Commissioner Stidham?

3 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Thank you, Chair. I agree.
4 This seems pretty straightforward, and I appreciate the
5 questions from Commissioner Imamura regarding this.

6 I think, I know we're not talking about a project
7 here, we're just talking about the zoning, but that there is
8 a project on the horizon.

9 There was one concern of a letter of opposition
10 related to the historic character of the neighborhood. I
11 just wanted to hear your thinking about that and your
12 thoughts on consistency with that character if a project
13 were to move forward?

14 MR. SULLIVAN: I'm not sure if I have -- since we
15 don't know what the project would be. I mean, I think it
16 would be in the interest of any developer who developed a
17 project to try to stay compatible with the neighborhood with
18 the historic integrity of the neighborhood.

19 It's not a historic district, of course. So I'm
20 not exactly sure how to respond to that comment.

21 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: I was really just looking
22 for the just the overall intent to be consistent with the
23 neighborhood as the project or as something moves forward
24 within this zone.

25 MR. SULLIVAN: Yeah. I mean, I think it's a

1 substantial enough project that that would be an interest,
2 there's a market interest of a developer of this.

3 MR. BURNS: I can speak to this. I mean, I would
4 just we try to stay consistent and take the lead from what's
5 being done at the Park Morton redevelopment across the
6 street.

7 I mean, those buildings are already starting to be
8 framed up and the phase one is well underway. You know,
9 that, I think, would be the guiding force of any kind of
10 design, it would be any potential project developed here on
11 650 Morton.

12 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Okay. Thank you.

13 I really don't have anything else, Chair.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Commissioner
15 Stidham.

16 Vice Chair Miller?

17 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And,
18 thank you to Marty Sullivan and Christopher Burns, the
19 applicant's team for bringing this map amendment forward,
20 which is, you know, a map amendment is largely evaluated for
21 the comprehensive plan from designation, which is medium
22 density residential for this area.

23 And, certainly what's being proposed, the RA-3
24 zone is more consistent with the medium density, residential
25 future land use map comp land designation than the existing

1 RF zone. But just to and I appreciate the questions and
2 comments of my colleagues.

3 And just to follow-up on Commissioner Stidham's
4 question. The Office of Planning also did point out
5 interests of the neighbor, couple of the neighbors being
6 concerned about the historic integrity, even though it's not
7 a historic district.

8 But they also planning did point out the
9 potential, the one potential inconsistency with a comp plan
10 policy is the comp plan policy. And they did it from page
11 17 of their report, which is Exhibit 28 where they point out
12 the Land Use Policy of respecting the character of row house
13 neighborhoods by ensuring that infill development is
14 compatible, and that's what you said.

15 Your intent is, if there is a development, to go
16 forward -- a project to go forward, that you would be
17 respectful of that, but let me just read the policy.

18 Respect the character of Row House Neighborhoods
19 by ensuring that infill development is compatible with
20 existing design patterns and maintained or expands the
21 number of family sized units; upward and outward extension
22 of row houses that compromise their design should be
23 discouraged.

24 I mean, the Office of Planning goes on to conclude
25 in page 18 of the report, that that potential conflict is

1 outweighed by the city-wide priority need for additional
2 affordable housing, the redevelopment potential of the
3 property consistent with the medium density residential
4 designation of the future land use map with the inclusionary
5 zoning plus designation, and the location of the lots as a
6 transition between the commercial corridor and the row house
7 neighborhood, I guess, to the east from my direction, right?

8 The rezoning one balance would not be inconsistent
9 with the comprehensive plan as a whole. So I said all that
10 just to say, ask you -- I assume that you would disagree
11 with that conclusionary statement about any potential
12 inconsistency of that row house neighborhood respect
13 language is outweighed by other comp plan policies, the
14 future land use map designation, and meeting density
15 residential, and all of the very high civic priority
16 policies that emphasize creation of new housing,
17 particularly affordable housing.

18 So I just could give you opportunity there to --

19 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes. I would agree with the Office
20 of Planning. I would say it's heavily outweighed by the
21 positive aspects of how the application meets the comp plan
22 elements and specifically, as to this property, the property
23 between 650 and Georgia Avenue, which is 654 is already a
24 multi-family, it's not a row house.

25 And ironically without a map amendment, the

1 project is probably to extend or expand or create existing
2 row houses here, which is also to be discouraged according
3 to that element.

4 So I think it's a little mixed, but I think, yes,
5 to the extent that that's a negative, I think it's heavily
6 outweighed by the positive aspects.

7 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yeah. And the property at 664
8 Morton, owned by Mr. Granados, and we do have that letter of
9 support in the record, from him at Exhibit Number 14d, which
10 I think you provided as an attachment to your --one of your
11 pre-hearing statements.

12 So that multi-family apartment house did an RF-1
13 zone must be a grandfathered or non-conforming use in this
14 zone -- in the existing zone, I assume; is that correct?

15 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes. It was clearly there since
16 before 1958. I can't remember the exact year, but I think
17 it might have been the '30s that it was originally
18 constructed.

19 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Right. So he is not here this
20 evening, is he to testify as part of your team or in our
21 attendance list, I don't think, but he has said in his
22 letter that he is committed to -- he's been committed to
23 providing affordable housing and would be committed to
24 assume, you know, it isn't stated specifically in his
25 letter, somehow address taking care of those existing

1 tenants who want to remain, even though they're on short
2 term leases, as I understand.

3 But if they want to be retained or want to return
4 or have assistance in relocating, if -- I would hope that
5 would be the case.

6 Your building, Mr. Burns, has been -- is vacant
7 and it's been vacant for how long?

8 MR. BURNS: It's been vacant since I purchased it.
9 I know --

10 VICE CHAIR MILLER: When did you purchase it?

11 MR. BURNS: I think it was March of this year.
12 Give or take.

13 VICE CHAIR MILLER: And you don't know how long it
14 was vacant before that?

15 MR. BURNS: No.

16 VICE CHAIR MILLER: And it's one three- bedroom
17 unit in a row house?

18 MR. BURNS: Yeah. It's a single-family house.

19 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Right. Okay. Okay.

20 I don't think, Mr. Chairman, I have any other
21 questions at this time. If I do, I'll raise them later.

22 So thank you all very much for bringing this
23 bringing this forward. I think it's very -- I think it is
24 compelling that this would, according to your testimony, it
25 would have 26 -- did you say 26 new units? Oh, is that for

1 your property? That was just for your property.

2 MR. BURNS: That's just for -- you know, I had a
3 massing study done by GTM Architects, and they, yeah, they
4 were predicting somewhere between, with the current lot and
5 this RA-3 zoning, you know, potentially building 24 to 26
6 units just on my property.

7 That's not, obviously, Mr. Granados wants to
8 maintain his housing and his structure as it is right now on
9 654. So that's just my property.

10 VICE CHAIR MILLER: And his has 10 to 13 units, is
11 that what you said?

12 MR. BURNS: I think it has 14. It's 13 or 14
13 units.

14 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Right. And we have in the
15 record that from I think the DDOT report that says that
16 rezoning would, potentially if it was built out to its full
17 permission, would potentially have 43 more units than the
18 current zoning. So I guess it's adding in the 14 that are
19 there to your 26 maybe, and maybe adding some more in. I
20 don't know.

21 MR. BURNS: Yeah.

22 VICE CHAIR MILLER: If DDOT's here, I'll ask them
23 about where they got that number in it, or OP, if that's the
24 additional amount of new housing that potentially could be
25 permitted by this rezoning, and it's, additional, the IZ

1 Plus designation would result in, as you said, seven to ten
2 additional units.

3 And I think OPs report or a DDOTs report says ten
4 additional affordable units. So, that's an important
5 element that is supportive of the housing policies and the
6 comprehensive plan and the land use map designation.

7 So thank you very much all of you for your work on
8 this.

9 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you.

11 Mr. Burns, let me just ask, did you -- when you
12 purchased this property, was some of it contingent on how
13 the neighborhood was flourishing with the redevelopment of
14 Park Morton? Did that weigh on your decision, first of all,
15 to buy and also to do this?

16 MR. BURNS: Yeah. Absolutely. I mean, I've been
17 following the Park Morton project for years. It's kind of
18 had its ups and downs and has taken a lot of twists and
19 turns.

20 And, you know, but the driving factor, you know,
21 obviously that was, you know, supported that, you know, the
22 neighborhood is -- that neighborhood is going to look very
23 much different with the added development and the new
24 housing once that project is completed, but it was simply an
25 opportunity, you know, it was an aging property owner. The

1 property, quite frankly, was trashed, when I bought it and
2 it was in disrepair and, you know, he just -- it wasn't, you
3 know, I looked at the FLUM map and, you know, with what was
4 going on across the street it seemed like a no brainer to
5 try to pursue this path.

6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So again, I'm trying to make
7 sure I capture this that the -- and this this Commission had
8 a lot to do with Park Morton and we were challenged, so some
9 of what was going on was a decision because you saw what was
10 going on in the neighborhood? That's what I'm trying to
11 drive. And I think you pretty much answered what I -- yeah.

12 MR. BURNS: Yeah. Yeah. Absolutely. I mean,
13 yeah. I see them all interconnected. You know, the map,
14 the future land use map was -- is designated as such because
15 of what's going on across the street. So they're kind of,
16 you know, they're kind of commingled. At least --

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

18 MR. BURNS: At least that was the driving factor
19 for why I took on the project.

20 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. The other thing is the,
21 and I did look it up and I think the Office of Planning,
22 it's a half a mile. I just thought it was -- the Metro was
23 just so farther far away, but it's only a half a mile.
24 That's still far away when you get a certain age. It was on
25 the older you get the further away I think it gets.

1 So maybe I'm getting to that point where it's
2 getting too far for me, but either way, I don't have -- I
3 had one other question I wanted to ask. That's why I should
4 write stuff down.

5 Maybe I forgot. Okay. So the arborist. You
6 mentioned about the arborist earlier. You had an arborist.
7 Now, again, explain to me what's going on with that because
8 I know there were some concerns as my colleagues were. I
9 know what the other question was, but I'll wait.

10 MR. BURNS: Yeah. So let me just, like, address
11 it because I've read the opposition letters. I've had one
12 conversation by phone with the owner at 644 Morton Street.
13 I think her name is Leila. She was one of the individuals
14 who provided that letter of opposition.

15 I had one conversation. It was very cordial. It
16 regarded -- it revolved around what's going to happen with
17 parking and what, you know, the tree. And I said, you know,
18 I'm not even sure which trees they're referring to. I think
19 it's the Elm trees which I'm planning on not touching at
20 all.

21 You know, my arborist has identified that this
22 Catalpa tree is a problem. Right? Not only is it a safety
23 problem, but it's also creating structural issues for the
24 adjacent problem next door. So you know, he has submitted,
25 I think, some permits, and he is in conversation with Maddie

1 from Urban Forestry.

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So I want to know are the roots
3 starting and this happens all over the city and the
4 sidewalks roots, and I'm just curious. Are the roots
5 starting to affect some of the plumbing in homes? That's
6 usually the issue.

7 MR. BURNS: Yeah. There's a structural report
8 that we had done. We had a structural inspection and report
9 done for the adjacent building at 654. Some of the root --
10 the roots are creating some water infiltration problems into
11 the bit -- in the, you know, in his bit -- in the lower
12 level or the cellar level of 654 Morton, there are there are
13 units in there and there's water coming in. Not only
14 through some common areas, but also into some of the units
15 themselves.

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And this my last question, I
17 think. Typically do and we're not talking about a project,
18 so I want to make sure I take the lead on not talking about
19 one.

20 Typically, my phrases -- well, typically when
21 you're getting support, it looks to me like you got a lot of
22 support from like developers that may do some of the same
23 thing. So is that normal? Let me ask you this. Have you
24 written support for other people who are doing something
25 similar to you in the area? And that's not a, I got you

1 question, I'm just trying to figure out --

2 MR. BURNS: Yeah.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Do you all support each other?
4 How does that work?

5 MR. BURNS: No. I haven't written any support. I
6 know that there's a gentleman I worked with on, you know,
7 his project as a realtor across, you know, on Park Road, but
8 the other the other letters to support were not from other
9 developers.

10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I just noticed I saw one
11 who identified that. It looks like he lived in the
12 neighborhood, which, if he did, I think is great. And if he
13 didn't, that's not a criteria.

14 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yeah.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I don't have any further
16 questions. No. No. But you have not heard -- other than
17 the concerns from the young lady who I believe this young
18 lady who asked not to be mentioned, and I'm not going to
19 mention it. Other than some of those concerns, did you hear
20 anything else from any community members?

21 MR. BURNS: Yeah. I got -- so I got a few,
22 responses when I first sent a postcard around introducing
23 myself and what my plans were for the property. I got some
24 emails of support that people thought it was great. It was
25 going to bring more housing to the block.

1 But I did not hear any -- there was no other
2 opposition or kind of flack, you know, for attempting to
3 rezone this property so that, you know, more housing could
4 be built.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. All right. Thank you.
6 I don't have any other questions, but I would tell you that
7 I've been around a while and Georgia Avenue is -- and I've
8 had -- we've had a lot to do with it. It's really starting
9 to look very much different and I'll leave it at that.

10 All right. Any follow-up questions? All right.
11 Thank you.

12 Ms. Schellin, do we have anyone here from ANC IE?
13 Yeah, 1E.

14 MS. SCHELLIN: We did not. Let me double check
15 and see if he has shown up. He has not, so we do not have a
16 representative. His name is Bradley Gallagher.

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Gallagher.

18 MS. SCHELLIN: So we can show that he has not --
19 he has not participated.

20 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Do we have any other
21 government agencies besides DDOT and Office of Planning? I
22 don't know of DDOTs here, but --

23 MS. SCHELLIN: DDOT is not here. We have the
24 Office of Planning, Karen Thomas.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. This is --

1 (Crosstalk.)

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Let's go
3 over Mr. Lawson and Ms. Thomas.

4 MS. THOMAS: Thank you. Yes. Hi, good afternoon.
5 Good evening, Mr. Chair.

6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Good evening, you may begin.

7 MS. THOMAS: And members of the Commission. Karen
8 Thomas with the Office of Planning for the proposed map
9 amendment from the RF-1 to the RA-3 for two combined lots
10 being brought forward by 650 Morton Street LLC.

11 The current zone designation of the RF-1 zone
12 limits new development to single-family row homes or flats,
13 but would allow for some conversions of some row dwellings
14 to apartment buildings based on the lot area requirement of
15 900 square foot per unit.

16 The map we have showing on the slide, and we have
17 a table, show the transition in height that would result
18 from rezoning. We see that the proposed RA-3 would result
19 in a stepping down from the 90-foot height approved along
20 the Georgia Avenue.

21 For that part at 1026, 10-26a, and the lower
22 heights of the adjacent row houses along Morton Street. And
23 it will narrow the height approved for the property across
24 Morton Street, the PUD at 16 -- 1612, .1612.

25 So we see similarity in the heights, and the

1 proposed rezoning. The only difference here is that it
2 gives the subject lots a little bit more density, because it
3 might be a little bit smaller than the others, the larger
4 lots within the pod.

5 Next slide.

6 The future land use map indicates that the
7 property is generally appropriate for medium density,
8 residential uses. And according to the framework element of
9 the comp plan, the RA-3 zone is consistent with this
10 category.

11 The generalized policy map indicates that the
12 property is designated as a neighborhood enhancement --
13 within the Neighborhood Enhancement Area, sorry, and the
14 framework elements provided guidance for densities,
15 including value properties from designation.

16 So in light of that, I'll highlight OP's response
17 to the Commission's request to consider rezoning the rest of
18 the square including the existing rural homes.

19 We found that a review of the comp plan and in
20 mid-city policies indicated that overall the main emphasis
21 would be to retain a mix of housing typologies existing in
22 the square.

23 Further, we saw that under PUD 1612, known as Park
24 Morton PUD, with surrounding road structures. This was
25 developed under the Park Morton Redevelopment initiative

1 plan, which is reflected in the approved design of that PUD.

2 Under this initiative, it was concluded that
3 development including architectural style respectful of the
4 surrounding area with porches, yards, and balconies. And,
5 as does the elements of the comp plan noted in our report,
6 and also, you know, in the Park Morton design.

7 So I'd also like to point out that the Park Morton
8 PUD includes around 41 townhomes as well. And they would
9 front on Morton Street opposite this -- obliquely opposite
10 this development.

11 Next slide.

12 So that said, OP would encourage, where
13 appropriate.

14 Next slide, I think.

15 Okay. We would encourage where appropriate to
16 include IZ Plus to map amendments, including this one,
17 because here, the RA-3 zone would permit a greater density
18 for market and affordable units.

19 And this map amendment, although it's not focused
20 on a particular future development plan, it could increase
21 dedicated housing affordability in the neighborhood and the
22 planning area.

23 We see that the housing equity report of 2019 set
24 a goal that every planning area should contain at least 15
25 percent of the District's total number of affordable housing

1 units.

2 And updated information, in January of 2023,
3 through the Mayor's Comeback Plan, it showed that the mid-
4 city planning area currently exceed the mayor's 2025
5 affordable housing goal. And will continue to do so in
6 2025. And that's a good thing.

7 While IZ Plus, we add to the currently exceeded
8 gold for Mid-City, this is desirable in an amenity rich
9 neighborhood with equitable access the transportation, fire,
10 metro bus, and nearby metro stations.

11 So room for more market rate and affordable
12 housing could also help diversify the demographics and
13 benefit the economically challenged in these neighborhoods.

14 And we saw that brought out in the applicant's
15 presentation and you could refer to the demographic tables
16 in our report as well in this regard.

17 Next slide.

18 So the compound analysis, through a racial equity
19 lens, indicated that the map amendment proposal on balance
20 would not be inconsistent with the comp plan. A proposed
21 map amendment could provide an estimated 20 percent IZ Plus
22 set aside requirement overall, implying that more housing in
23 a vacant single -- they could have more housing in the
24 single-family row existing on the lot.

25 And redevelopment of this site would not result in

1 direct displacement as there are currently no residents in
2 this vacant portion of your property. An indirect
3 displacement is also not likely because increased
4 residential density would create more housing options.

5 So with increased housing we can mitigate the
6 imbalance between supply and demand, which drives up housing
7 prices and adversely impact low-income residents.

8 Negative physical impacts not anticipated because
9 you have primary uses allowed by the RA-3 zone as
10 residential and community facility uses.

11 And finally, the proposal would be located near
12 many neighborhood opportunities, including schools, retails,
13 supermarket, other recreational opportunities, and bus lines
14 with access to Metro.

15 Within, like you said, half a mile of the Petworth
16 Metro Station. And I think you can walk that still, Mr.
17 Chair, and to the north and to the Howard University Metro
18 Station to the south.

19 And we just note that the ANC also voted
20 unanimously to support this amendment. And so does OP. So
21 with that, I'll be happy to take any questions. Thank you.

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Maybe I'll learn how to use the
23 bicycle system, and I can just ride there. But it's only a
24 half a mile. So thank you, Ms. Thomas, for your confidence.

25 All right. Thank you for your report as well.

1 Let's see if we have any questions of Ms. Thomas.

2 Commissioner Imamura?

3 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

4 I'm quite certain that Commissioner May would probably link
5 his bicycle for you.

6 Ms. Thomas, thank you for your report. I just
7 have a question. One question. And it really has to do
8 with, the appropriate appropriateness for RA-3 and the
9 height as a matter of right.

10 So between what exists now as RF-1 and the RA-3,
11 there's a difference of 25 feet in height plus the
12 penthouse, so almost double the height. And as many of you
13 know, I'm always concerned about the scale and massing of
14 potential map amendments and the matter of right and what
15 that might -- how that might impact the urban design in the
16 streetscape, particularly with, shadows, shade, and shadow.

17 And I've got a question for Mr. Burns here, but I
18 guess, my question to you, Ms. Thomas, is, based on your
19 analysis, is this the most appropriate zone? Are there any
20 other zones they could consider or think that might be
21 appropriate, particularly because of the concern about the
22 height and the surrounding row homes?

23 MS. THOMAS: I can understand -- I could
24 appreciate the concern here, but, it as you see in the first
25 slide, the PUD that has been approved for the majority of

1 the opposite side of the square or within that square, and
2 we're going to have some open space there as well, is going
3 to be at 60 feet as well.

4 We have no, you know, I can't say what a future
5 developer would do at this location, but it is within the
6 context anticipated under the comprehensive plan for RA-3
7 for medium density rather.

8 The RA-3 zone is consistent with that designation
9 and, like I said, it would all depend on the development,
10 but it should not be seen as out of scale or compliance with
11 the rest of the square when fully developed in the future.

12 And, I believe that they, based on, (inaudible)
13 report, for completion at 617 Morton Street, that should be
14 done within the second quarter of 2024. So I think you
15 know, it gives the applicant some, you know, base to look at
16 and then see.

17 And, again, the initiative, the Park Morton
18 Initiative prescribes sort of a consistent character of
19 porches and balconies and stuff consistent with the row
20 structure, but density is a -- a little bit more density is
21 where we would get the ability to have more affordability,
22 within these areas. So, you know, there's always a
23 tradeoff.

24 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Agreed. Thank you, Ms.
25 Thomas. I think you're right. There is always a tradeoff.

1 There is sort of a I guess a tussle between, the two to
2 balance that out. So thank you very much, Ms. Thomas.

3 Mr. Chairman, I don't have any other questions.

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Commissioner
5 Imamura. Let's go to Commissioner Stidham, any questions,
6 comments?

7 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: No, sir. But thank you,
8 Ms. Thomas, for your report. Greatly appreciate that.
9 Thank you.

10 MS. THOMAS: Thank you.

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. Vice Chair Miller?

12 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and
13 thank you, Ms. Thomas, for your report and work on this case
14 and for addressing the question that I had raised at the set
15 down about why we aren't rezoning the rest of the square to
16 a higher density than RF-1 given that the future land use
17 map medium density residential designation sends all the way
18 from the edge of the PUD, I guess, from the adjacent
19 property to all the way to -- is that border or is it park?
20 It's Porter Street between Park Road and Lamont,
21 essentially.

22 And you provided an explanation as to the -- first
23 of all, the those are separately owned and they didn't bring
24 forward this application. Mr. Burns is said 650 didn't
25 bring it forward, but did reach out to 654 since that's the

1 property adjacent to the Georgia Avenue PUD that you said is
2 at 60 -- you said is at 60 feet in that PUD?

3 MS. THOMAS: Yes.

4 VICE CHAIR MILLER: And so this would be
5 comparable to that. And that's what the RA-3 zone permits.
6 And the Park Morton public housing across the street,
7 correct me if you're wrong, it includes both townhouses and
8 an apartment building, I thought, that might rise to 60
9 feet, yeah, around 60 feet as well. I thought it was from
10 five stories, but that's a case that's, what is it -- it's
11 16-12.

12 That was the case that wasn't challenged, Mr.
13 Chairman, as part of the -- that's the public housing site,
14 is that correct? And not the Bruce Monroe site that was
15 also going to serve as -- that it is going to serve, I
16 think, is replacement housing. That's the one that's on the
17 other side of, Georgia.

18 MS. THOMAS: Gotcha.

19 VICE CHAIR MILLER: But the Park Morton Public
20 Housing site, PUD, which was not challenged, we approved.
21 That height, I think, does go up to around 60 feet as well;
22 is that correct?

23 MS. THOMAS: That, yes. The Park Morton does go
24 around to 60 feet on fronting Morton Street.

25 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Right.

1 MS. THOMAS: Yes.

2 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Thank you. I just
3 wanted to get that on the record.

4 So I think there is a rationale that you provided
5 and that is in the record as to how this does provide a
6 transition That's compatible with what's immediately
7 adjacent across the street and can fit into the
8 neighborhood.

9 So, I thank you for your -- I thank you again,
10 thank you for your work on this case.

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So I can't remember. Thank
12 you, Vice Chair, if you corrected my thoughts. It's been a
13 while, but I just remember --

14 VICE CHAIR MILLER: It was a 2016 case according
15 to that 16-12. I mean, that's a while ago.

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I just know we might have we
17 took a lot of heat and might have been in the hearing, but I
18 know it was somewhere.

19 VICE CHAIR MILLER: And it was for the related
20 replacement housing --

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

22 VICE CHAIR MILLER: -- Bruce Monroe site. Not far
23 away across the Georgia Avenue. And I don't remember what
24 the status of that is. I think it was remanded to us, and I
25 think we dealt with it, but I that part, I don't remember.

1 I know it was remanded to us, but I don't know if we've
2 dealt with that case yet. I'm not sure if we need to know
3 that for this hearing.

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Oh, but one thing I've noticed,
5 though, when things work out real well, nobody I don't hear
6 about it no more. Everybody's enjoying it.

7 So I'm trying to figure that out. But, anyway,
8 we'll see what happens. And I'm wishing everybody up there
9 well, especially, what we voted on in what, 2016? I can't
10 remember what I did last week sometime.

11 All right. I don't have any questions for
12 you, Ms. Thomas. Thank you so much for your report.

13 Let's see, Mr. Sullivan, do you have any
14 questions? You or Mr. Burns?

15 MR. SULLIVAN: No, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah. I think -- we going to
17 check on that, Vice Chair, because I think it was or I think
18 it was, but I we're going to check. I'm just curious now to
19 see what happened. I hate to bring it back.

20 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I am too. I am too. I'm
21 sorry I brought it up, though.

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. Okay. Thank you
23 again, Ms. Thomas.

24 Let's go to -- one second. Did the ANC provide a
25 report my file closed? And I can't remember. I know it's

1 1E. I think they did.

2 MS. SCHELLIN: They did.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah. My file. Does anybody
4 have it handy and can read it?

5 MS. SCHELLIN: It's Exhibit 12, recommending
6 approval.

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah, I can't -- I don't --
8 over my files over -- to somebody else if they have it?
9 Stuff just closes up when it gets ready.

10 Oh, I have it. I have it. I have it. I got it
11 for a change. All right. ASC 1E with members of for quorum
12 of four, the member's present.

13 And in this case, they voted six -- a record vote
14 on the motion to adopt to report was four -- no, it was 6-0,
15 so it was unanimous and I believe this was to support. Am I
16 correct, Mr. Sullivan?

17 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes. That was the unanimous vote.
18 Yes.

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. All right. Right.
20 Let's go to -- Ms. Schellin, do we have anyone who's here to
21 testify support, opposition, or undeclared? Any of them?

22 MS. SCHELLIN: Sorry about that. I hit the wrong
23 button.

24 We have only three people who have registered to
25 testify. All three are in opposition. Camille Glover.

1 Beth Oberding. And the last one is sorry -- let me get we
2 just had this one Leila Katirayi.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

4 MS. SCHELLIN: Those are the only three who have
5 registered to testify.

6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Let's bring them up, and
7 I'm a take a two-minute break. Let's bring them up.

8 (A short break was taken.)

9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I think we've had two minutes
10 and I appreciate the indulgence. You hear noise at your
11 door you have to go check sometime. See what's going on.
12 It's the thing about this environment, this virtual
13 environment.

14 All right, Ms. Schellin. I think Camille Glover,
15 let's start off with Ms. Glover first.

16 MS. GLOVER: Hello, everyone. I'm trying to allow
17 for -- to turn on the camera. Okay.

18 Hello, everyone. Thank you so much to the
19 Commission and to the ANC's for allowing me the opportunity
20 to come here today to speak on behalf of myself, Camille
21 Glover, a resident on Morton Street and a property owner on
22 the 600 Block.

23 I reside at the 646 location of Morton Street. So
24 I did send in testimony in opposition of this development.
25 I am opposed to this construction for multiple reasons.

1 The first is that the developer has acknowledged
2 that he was going to remove what we know as the largest tree
3 in our neighborhood and there is a large animal bird
4 population that resides there.

5 As a resident on Morton Street in a row home that
6 I am a property owner of, I also am concerned about the lack
7 of height restrictions. All of the row houses on Morton
8 Street are connected and that includes 650 Morton as it
9 currently is.

10 The 654 Morton Street is actually separated by an
11 you know, an area and a space. So it actually is not
12 connected to all of the row homes. So I'm concerned about
13 the height -- lack of height limitations. It's going to be
14 up zoned.

15 So that will restrict our ability to not have a
16 level of light for our plants and our homes and ourselves to
17 enjoy. It will restrict that on the western side. It will
18 also create concerns in the construction aspect, in terms of
19 the blasting and other things that will be taking place to
20 our structural dwellings.

21 I am concerned about the structure of our units
22 being negatively impacted by the construction process that's
23 going to take place. Blasting and things like that does
24 have the ability to erode the foundation of all of the row
25 homes on the 600 Block on our side of Morton Street.

1 Therefore, I am in favor of keeping the three-
2 story height limitation that is currently in place. I think
3 that is truly what is in line with the history of the
4 neighborhood and the street and particularly that side of
5 the street.

6 I also, again, want to emphasize it does not
7 preserve the historic integrity of the neighborhood. The
8 neighborhood is just, you know, in dire need of parking
9 opportunities. And based on what I have read, it does not
10 appear that they intend to create actual additional parking
11 structures for the residents.

12 So they're going to basically bring more residents
13 and that's going to result in less parking for all
14 residents. So street parking, which is already at a
15 premium, is going to be even more challenging.

16 I would be remiss if I also did not speak as I
17 believe the sole African American property owner on my side
18 of Morton Street and possibly the only or one of the few
19 African American property owners on Morton Street at this
20 time. Thank you.

21 MS. SCHELLIN: Time.

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. Ms. Glover. We may
23 have some questions if you can hold tight for a second.

24 Ms. Schellin, I think -- who was next?

25 MS. SCHELLIN: That would be Erin. I believe was

1 her name. Let me see the list again. Ms. Olberding, I
2 believe was her name? Sorry, I lost my list.

3 MS. OLBERDING: Hi.

4 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

6 MS. OLBERDING: Thank you.

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: You may begin.

8 MS. OLBERDING: Thank you. Thank you for your
9 time.

10 I was able to join last minute, which I appreciate
11 because hearing the plans really did solidify kind of more
12 of the concern.

13 So I am here to also oppose. I live with my
14 husband, live and own property directly behind this
15 property. While I'm in support of higher density and
16 understand the need to cater to that in the city, I oppose
17 it based on height as well.

18 And the fact that, as others have stated before,
19 is the height is double what's in -- what's proposed
20 currently. Additionally, the height -- what I'm concerned
21 by is as everyone is also in solar panels, the right to
22 shade, and the fact that this is so close to existing row
23 homes, both on the backside and next to it adjacent.

24 Park Morton itself has, you know, it's set back
25 from these row homes and in the general area quite a bit.

1 Whereas this was not. It is right in the middle I'm
2 concerned about the alley traffic.

3 Again, like, the character of it would not be in
4 line with existing row homes in the area, it's double --
5 completely right next to it. It's the only green space on
6 the block of the row homes.

7 It's one of the largest yards. And as mentioned,
8 there's three major trees there. So without -- I'm opposed
9 to it because there is no other -- there's no plan for
10 conserving some of that green space as well.

11 In addition to the height being so and the density
12 being so high. And I question why 60 feet is what's
13 necessary to develop a higher density, I guess, residents
14 there.

15 Yeah. I was going to say parking is already an
16 issue, as everyone has stated, due to kind of existing
17 restaurants and bars and residents who live there. And the
18 alley traffic. It's a tight alley back there. So
19 increasing the residents, the number as well would not be,
20 useful.

21 So I think that's all I have. Thank you for your
22 time. I appreciate it, but really the right to shade and
23 the height differential is be my major concern. So thank
24 you.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

1 Ms. Schellin, who was next?

2 MS. SCHELLIN: There's one person left, Leila
3 Katirayi, I believe. I'm sure I'm not saying that right.

4 MS. KATIRAYI: Hi, I'm here. Can you guys hear
5 me?

6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes, we can. You may begin.

7 MS. KATIRAYI: Great. So I agree a lot with what
8 Camille and Beth have said. My major issue, again is the
9 height. I do not think it is necessary to build this
10 absolute monstrosity on this block.

11 I think if there was another version of what we
12 have at 654, like a smaller apartment building. I
13 understand that, you know, Chris has made this investment
14 and wants to make money off of it, and I can, you know,
15 appreciate he wants to improve the neighborhood, but we
16 don't need a monstrosity.

17 Like, I think we would be good with just another
18 what we have at 654, with a three-story apartment building.
19 The shade is an issue. I mean, people, we have gardens and
20 there is a return to being able to feed your families and
21 garden and plants and gardening, but it depends on light.
22 And that's -- there's no solution for that. And solar power
23 is money.

24 And so we will lose the opportunity when we have
25 all of this shade over our buildings. And it's just it's

1 completely not necessary. Like I said, I'm going to keep
2 going back to that because Chris can still make money off
3 doing a three-story unit.

4 And I'm also going to I'm going to poke at the
5 fact that we're calling this affordable housing because
6 there is no rule that says this is going to be affordable
7 housing.

8 I mean, Chris can turn around and rent those units
9 for 3,200 if he wants. And so I don't think we should try
10 to, like, sell this as something it's not. It is
11 development. And Morton Street's pretty rough.

12 So development is welcome, but we wanted to be
13 maintained within our neighborhood integrity and not be at
14 the cost of the rest of us in our investments in this
15 neighborhood.

16 And I also want to laugh about that comment about
17 parking that, oh, there's an alley, so there's parking. I'm
18 not sure how that translates. Because there's an alley,
19 doesn't mean there's parking.

20 There is currently a plan to have substantially
21 fewer parking spots. I think I read that 654 had a parking
22 spot for every one to two units. And this new building, the
23 monstrosity, will have one to three to four units.

24 And so, like, that that just doesn't work. I
25 mean, we're also going to increase what are we going to do

1 renting our parking spots for \$400 a month to be able park
2 in this neighborhood and, you know, the increase in
3 congestion?

4 I think we're really losing the neighborhood
5 appeal here of Columbia Heights. And I also want to comment
6 on what Beth said as well about this is not comparable to
7 Park Morton because that's the -- it is a standalone
8 building not neighboring on row houses.

9 So I would like us to just drop that comparison.
10 Yes, that's going to be five stories, but like I said, it
11 stands alone. Let's see if I have anything else to add. I
12 think I've covered all my points. That's it.

13 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

14 So let me first of all, is that it, Ms. Schellin?

15 MS. SCHELLIN: That's all the witnesses. Yes.

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Let me, first of all,
17 ask Ms. Glover.

18 Ms. Glover, did you submit a submission? Did you
19 give us your testimony?

20 MS. GLOVER: I did. However, I believe it was
21 submitted, after the time frame, but it is in your
22 possession now. So I do believe it is with the Office or
23 the Commission. So you all do have this.

24 MS. SCHELLIN: It is not. It was submitted after
25 the deadline. So if she wants it submitted, she has to ask

1 for it to be accepted, since it was after the deadline.

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

3 MS. GLOVER: So I will request that it be
4 accepted. That my testimony be accepted.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Listen, unless I have an
6 objection, I like to get Ms. Glover's testimony into the
7 record.

8 And I knew about two other -- I knew about Leila;
9 I don't want to pronounce -- I don't want to go no further
10 than that. And I know about Ms. Olberding, or did I know
11 about? I'm looking here. I don't see -- did you submit
12 something, Ms. Olberding?

13 MS. OLBERDING: No. I was listening in to
14 understand more about what the plans were as well before I
15 submitted. So I was -- I was able to add my testimony last
16 minute.

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So this brings for me, and I
18 I'm talking to my colleagues now. This is when I hear
19 concerns like these raised that I was not aware of when I
20 was reviewing, I thought what was submitted including what
21 Leila had mentioned, I thought we could work through that.

22 Now, I understand people saying, don't equate
23 this, don't equate that. This is on the Zoning Commission,
24 and we look at things holistically not just individually,
25 and we don't take and parch anything out of it.

1 So I want to make sure that's clear. But I will
2 say that I was not aware of the rest of the opposition. I
3 thought that what I saw in front of me could be worked out
4 This takes me back to a question that I think Commissioner
5 Imamura asked or he has asked in the past of cases like
6 this, and I'm sure all of us have, is there another zone? I
7 don't know if you asked that tonight. I can't remember.

8 Yeah, you did. Okay. Good. Okay. We're
9 consistent. When you work with people long enough, started
10 -- they're just like, know what I'm going to do, I kind of
11 know what they're going to ask, but that's another question
12 that that a commissioner is always asking.

13 And I think Commissioner Imamura has taken that
14 on, and I appreciate that. So now I'm in line with that.
15 Now that I'm hearing this.

16 So I just want the acting to know where I am. I
17 think Ms. Glover, and Ms. Olberding, I appreciate you
18 joining in, but let me ask this. Have you all participated
19 in your ANC process? Ms. Glover?

20 MS. GLOVER: I have not fully participated, but I
21 have spoken in the past with my ANC, but I do intend to
22 fully participate. I have been in communication, however,
23 with my Council member about various issues within the
24 neighborhood, and have, you know, and as well as the staff
25 to learn about various potential development projects and I

1 am very engaged in those issues.

2 And, as I stated and during my testimony, as the I
3 believe, sole, Africa American property owner on that that
4 side of Morton Street, if not on the entirety of Morton
5 Street at the present time.

6 I feel that the issue of racial equity in the
7 development always has to be addressed, and raising concerns
8 about that because, unfortunately, as we all know, often
9 when development projects occur, particularly ones such as
10 this, it does not actually result in, as Leila shared, the
11 level of affordable housing, as well as the level of ethnic
12 and racial as well as economic diversity that, you know, the
13 neighborhood has historically been very proud to state.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. What I'm going to ask is
15 I'm going to go to my colleagues to see what they think, but
16 I'm always about one of communication, and I know that this
17 has been brought to our attention.

18 And I think Ms. Glover is exactly correct when we
19 talk about racial equity, which we are mandated to go by in
20 the comprehensive plan.

21 So what I'm going to ask, Mr. Burns and Mr.
22 Sullivan, as a result of this, you never know what's going
23 to go on around here. I thought this was -- I thought
24 things that were presented in front of me could probably be
25 worked out. I did.

1 I would tell you, because we don't talk about a
2 project, and I'm saying this to all those in opposition, we
3 don't necessarily, by law we cannot talk about a project,
4 but I know at the end result there's going to be something
5 done here.

6 It's never made sense to me but our legal counsel
7 been telling me -- I've been here 25 years, they've been
8 telling me that for years, and I'm still trying to grasp it
9 and still trying to figure out why we don't talk about a
10 project.

11 And I'm sure if they watch this tape, I'll get
12 another dissertation again about why we don't talk about a
13 project. And I've had about five of them.

14 So what I want to do, as long as I'm going to stay
15 in compliance, I would like, Mr. Burns, for you to have a --
16 have you had a conversation with any -- well, I want you all
17 to have one and to have a discussion and see where we can
18 bridge the gap, okay?

19 Do you think that's worth doing, Ms. Glover, Ms.
20 Olberding? Since you all came tonight, and I didn't know
21 about your testimony, either one of you all's testimony.
22 And you can -- you might as well include Ms. Leila in that
23 as well.

24 And I think it's always good. And then here's the
25 thing, also, bring in your ANC if you can, because I think

1 that's very important. I'm not saying change anything. I'm
2 not saying do anything, but I think you need to collaborate
3 to see if we can find a way to iron out our concerns and
4 let's make sure that we meet one of the main pieces of the
5 engagement of the comprehensive plan, which is community
6 engagement.

7 So I'm going to leave it at that. Let me hear
8 from others. Commissioner Imamura?

9 MS. KATIRAYI: Wait, Anthony. Can I just add one
10 -- one piece of information? I know that you were, not
11 exactly happy to the comments for coming in late, but I did
12 want to let you know that I only communicated

13 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Ms. Leila, hold tight, hold
14 tight, hold tight. I'm talking to my colleagues now. I'll
15 come back to you. Give me a moment.

16 Commissioner Imamura?

17 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
18 And I just want to put out there, you're very generous to
19 allow public testimony.

20 And so, Ms. Leila, I'm confident that the Chairman
21 will come back to you.

22 I don't have any specific questions for the three
23 of you. But I did hear, you know, there's a general theme.
24 And as, Commissioner or Chairman Hood has commented, you
25 know, two things that I think the Commission has really done

1 a strong job, and that's the Good Neighbor Policy set by the
2 Chairman for applicants to work with adjacent neighbors and
3 stakeholders. And then to your comment, Ms. Glover, you
4 know, our racial equity tool that we've rolled out,
5 balancing diversity is very important to the Commission
6 here.

7 So projects like these present an opportunity to
8 balance out diversity and add more affordable housing for
9 the District. The general theme about your concerns or
10 collective concerns about height.

11 And I think Vice Chair Miller had asked some very
12 good questions of OP to demonstrate that, on balance in the
13 area in the neighborhood there, his is generally pretty
14 consistent. It might be consistent with the matter of
15 right.

16 My point here is that you may want to ask Mr.
17 Burns. He did say on the record that he had an architecture
18 firm do some massing studies. With those massing studies
19 also probably come with a shadow studies.

20 So the backyard is actually in the south. So much
21 of the shadows you'll find throughout the day will actually
22 be cast on the street.

23 So that's what I surmise, but I'm confident that
24 Mr. Burns and his architecture firm have probably sussed
25 this out, and I think it's probably worth that conversation

1 that Chairman Hood has asked Mr. Burns to have with you to
2 ask for that, and see -- and that might help temper some of
3 your concerns with the height and the shadows for this
4 potential -- for this map amendment. I don't know.

5 And I would just caution too Ms. Leila about,
6 projecting sort of, or articulating, you know, diminished -
7 monstrosity of a project. There is no project. We don't
8 know what it might. So, you know, I think that's, just a
9 bit premature there.

10 But that's all that I have to say, Mr. Chairman.
11 Thank you very much.

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Commissioner,
13 Imamura, well said.

14 Commissioner Stidham?

15 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Thank you, Chair. And
16 thank you for those of you who came tonight.

17 Just a question, Mr. Burns indicated that he went
18 door to door and left postcards. I'm just curious if you
19 had had -- if you received the postcard, if you had any
20 previous conversations with Mr. Burns regarding your
21 concerns?

22 MS. OLBERDING: Are we allowed -- I was going to
23 say, are we allowed to? Okay.

24 I was going to say, I do have a packet about this
25 exact meeting, but apart from that, I did not receive

1 anything else, nor did I see Mr. Burns.

2 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Okay. Ms. Glover?

3 MS. GLOVER: I did not receive that either. I
4 believe I may have seen Mr. Burns maybe this past Saturday.
5 I think I saw (inaudible) someone, maybe a representative.
6 It appeared there was, I don't know if it was an open house
7 or something, but I remember just seeing someone I sort of
8 waved at them, and that was maybe the extent.

9 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Okay. And apologies. But,
10 Leila, I don't know your last name. So I'm curious if you
11 had any -- if you received any of any visits from Mr. Burns
12 or the postcard that he had left at people's doors when he
13 was going around?

14 MS. KATIRAYI: No. I received one letter in the
15 mail, which I actually screenshotted and emailed to all my
16 neighbors because it's so easy to miss mail with the amount
17 we all travel in DC. And they had not received it.

18 And so then I reached out to Ella, who's been
19 great and she gave me a link that had like all the documents
20 because I did have a number of questions.

21 So I think I was a little bit ahead of the queue
22 in terms of being able submit my comments because I got all
23 that information from Ella.

24 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Okay. Thank you.

25 MS. OLBERDING: May I also speak on that? A lot

1 of our neighbors, speakers Spanish has their first language.
2 So I don't think also that it's very accessible. It was
3 just in English. So I think that's kind of a red flag with
4 community engagement in this area, especially.

5 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Okay. Thank you for that.
6 Yeah. Thank you for that.

7 So, Chair Hood, I would agree. It sounds like Mr.
8 Burns probably has information that he could walk through
9 with people from the neighborhood and alleviate some of
10 their concerns related to the -- any potential project in
11 the future from this map amendment that we're discussing
12 tonight. So I would encourage that conversations to take
13 place.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, and Vice Chair
15 Miller?

16 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And
17 thank you to the neighbors, Leila, Camille Glover and Beth
18 Olberding for participating here tonight and presenting your
19 testimony and submitting whatever written comments you had.

20 Not that this is really relevant, but just out of
21 curiosity, I guess my question would be to each of you, how
22 long have you lived on Martin Street? Each of you can
23 answer. I guess, I see Ms. Glover right in front of me.
24 So --

25 MS. GLOVER: Sure.

1 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Maybe you can --

2 MS. GLOVER: I've lived on Morton Street since
3 June of 2022. However, I initially came to the neighborhood
4 as a college student, for college where I attended Howard
5 University for my undergraduate degree. And I've lived in
6 various parts of Ward 1, many, you know, various times.

7 So I am a long-time Ward 1 resident, very, very
8 active. I actually used to chair the Ward 1 Democrat. So
9 I'm pretty actively engaged in those issues. So I
10 definitely am very, very invested in all of Ward 1, but now
11 in particular, Morton Street and the activities that go on
12 there as a property owner. Thank you.

13 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Right. And I wouldn't be
14 questioning and I'm not questioning your commitment to the
15 neighborhood to regardless of your tenure on Morton Street,
16 as a as an owner of the property that you're in now.

17 Ms. Olberding, how long have you been on Morton
18 Street?

19 MS. OLBERDING: We're actually based on Lamont.

20 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Oh, Lamont.

21 MS. OLBERDING: So we from the backside. Yep.
22 And we have been here since late 2019. So a few years.
23 Pre-pandemic.

24 VICE CHAIR MILLER: And, Leila, you might have
25 said it in your written testimony, which I did read, because

1 I saw it in the record, are you still here?

2 MS. KATIRAYI: I'm here. Yeah. So I bought my
3 house in October 2019. But while I'm speaking, I actually
4 wanted to respond to one other comment from Joe about the
5 western light not being important.

6 That's actually the time of day that we're home
7 the most because most of us work. So if we want to sit in
8 the backyard, barbecue with our friends, like, we don't want
9 to be sitting in the shade.

10 So the western light is actually very important.
11 And I also wanted to clarify. I understand that this would
12 be an 80-foot increase in height if I understand correctly.
13 And so, Joe, I mean, we all have our own language, but to
14 me, that is among and I think I'm entitled to use whatever
15 language I want.

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Actually, you're not because
17 we're in a public forum, and you just referred to me as
18 Anthony. I tried to sit here and be calm and take
19 exception. Even the late Marion Barry called me either
20 Chairman Hood or Anthony Hood when --

21 MS. KATIRAYI: No, no, I meant, Joe, not you
22 Anthony.

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: No, yeah, you keep calling me
24 Anthony. I'm Chairman Hood in this setting or I'm Anthony
25 Hood or Commissioner Hood. We don't do it -- you're the

1 only one that wants to keep their last name not called.

2 So please be respectful. So you can finish
3 answering Vice Chair Miller's question.

4 MS. KATIRAYI: Okay. No. I will call you
5 Chairman Hood. I'm making a note of it right now, but I'm
6 sorry for any disrespect, but I was not actually responding
7 to your comment. It was the other guy, Joe.

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Ms. Laila, let me just say
9 this. Earlier you said Anthony, and I tried -- and let me
10 just say this. I've been doing this a long time. You're
11 the first person ever come here and call me Anthony or any
12 commissioner, but let me just say this. In this realm of
13 the way we do stuff in the District, we show respect in
14 these forms.

15 So you called me Anthony a few moments ago. You
16 know how I know? Because it was just text me and I also
17 heard it. So what I'm asking you to do is be respectful of
18 me, the staff at OZ, and all of us. All right. Let's
19 continue this hearing. Thank you.

20 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Imamura also not Joe.

21 MS. OLBERDING: Okay.

22 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Let me just -- so I and
23 I'm not sure I have any other questions of the witnesses.

24 Again, I appreciate your concerns. I think the
25 Chairman's and, Commissioner Imamura's, Commissioner

1 Stidham's encouragement of the collaboration with the
2 applicant in this case, the further collaboration, the
3 sharing of the massing study, which Mr. Burns referred to in
4 his testimony. And I was going to ask and now I will ask
5 that that be submitted to us as well so that we can see what
6 -- if it has illustrative -- particularly if it has
7 illustrative renderings of the potential massing that could
8 occur versus what's there now.

9 But we have to -- this is really more -- so I
10 would that's a request to the applicant to submit that
11 particularly if it has any illustrative renderings and
12 Commissioner Imamura referred to -- if it had any shadow
13 studies or if it shows the setback that it from the
14 neighbors to the east, if I have my directions right, show
15 what setback there is.

16 So I agree that when you used to western sun or
17 eastern sun or any sun, you want all of that sun, especially
18 as it turns colder now.

19 So yeah, so I would that's a request I would make
20 of the applicant. But I'd the comment I would make -- I
21 don't have any further questions to the applicant, but the
22 comment I would make is that our evaluation is not about a
23 particular project. And that any massing study would just
24 show a potential maximum, at which the applicant has already
25 stated, they are sensitive to the compatibility of the

1 neighborhood.

2 So I just would point that out for the record. I
3 also would put out for the record there's been reference to
4 no height limitation. There is a height -- there is no
5 story limitation. There is a height limitation of 60 feet
6 before you get to the penthouse.

7 And the medium density residential designation on
8 the comprehensive plan future land use map, which was
9 adopted by the mayor our mayor, your mayor, and our Council,
10 your Council.

11 And I don't know if this medium density
12 residential designation was making the most recent 2021
13 mayor Council comp plan amendments, but that is where the
14 involvement was critical for neighborhoods to weigh in on
15 what's happening in their neighborhood because even though
16 that medium density residential designation does not specify
17 height, it does specify FAR, as some of you have pointed
18 out, up to 4.0 and talks about mid-rise apartment buildings.

19 And I think most people -- I think I and maybe you
20 wouldn't consider five or six stories a mid-rise apartment
21 building. It says it right there on the medium residential
22 designation definition. And it's consistent with what's
23 adjacent on the Georgia Avenue side and across Morton
24 Street.

25 I realized those are obviously different projects,

1 fronting different areas, different -- everything's
2 different. Everything's unique. But it -- our evaluation
3 is whether the map amendment is consistent with the
4 comprehensive plan when viewed through a racial equity lens.

5 And on that point, I would just say that a
6 reference was made that there's no affordable housing that's
7 guaranteed to be in this new development. It will be
8 designated, with this map amendment, as IZ Plus,
9 inclusionary zoning plus, which requires a 20 percent set
10 aside of affordable housing under the Zoning Commission's
11 definition of affordable housing.

12 Some of us have wanted -- and we've periodically
13 debated lowering those medium family income levels further
14 than what they currently are, but it currently are, if it's
15 a rental, it will be 60 percent, 20 percent of those new, of
16 those apartments would have to be rented to households at 60
17 percent medium family income, which we know the median
18 family income in the district is all over the place and very
19 high.

20 So 60 percent may not be getting to the level
21 where everybody can afford -- would be able to afford those
22 affordable units. We get that, believe me. We've had hours
23 of debate over that.

24 So but it will require what's required under our
25 zoning regulations and terms of inclusionary zoning, 20

1 percent set aside if it's rental, 60 percent median family
2 income.

3 So that's just something to -- I just wanted the
4 record to be complete about no guarantee of affordable
5 housing. Well, there is a guarantee of what's called
6 affordable under the inclusionary zoning regulations for
7 whatever that's worth to you all.

8 I think it's worth something. I think it has
9 produced, incrementally, more diversity in neighborhoods
10 where there wouldn't be otherwise. It has been complied
11 with, I think, for the large part. It's just a little mound
12 and it's not deep enough, and it's not enough set aside, but
13 we're talking about private development here. Not a
14 publicly owned site where the District has a lot more
15 flexibility to and requirements, actually, to set aside more
16 and have deeper levels of affordability.

17 But I think the massing study would be useful.
18 And certainly always more collaboration, which my fellow
19 commissioners have encouraged with the neighbors, is
20 critical. You're neighbors. So, you want you want to be
21 able to live together going forward.

22 So I think that's all my comments at this point,
23 Mr. Chairman.

24 I'm meant to ask the Office of Planning when the
25 medium density residential designation got put onto the land

1 use map of the comprehensive plan. I have a feeling it
2 might have been two years ago, the most recent comp plan
3 designations. I don't know.

4 But that's a critical element in terms of our
5 evaluation here. So I guess I've rambled on too long. I
6 apologize. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: No problem, Vice Chair. Did
8 you want to get an answer to your last question?

9 VICE CHAIR MILLER: To Mr. Burns about the massing
10 study?

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah. So is the Office of
12 Planning still around? Ms. Thomas?

13 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Well, yeah, and Office of
14 Planning, if they're here still.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let's go back to it.

16 VICE CHAIR MILLER: If they know that answer to
17 that question?

18 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Well, Ms. Schellin, while Ms.
19 Thomas come back up, I do want to -- is Ms. Thomas back up?

20 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Oh, okay. Thomas.

22 MS. THOMAS: What was the question with respect to
23 the?

24 VICE CHAIR MILLER: When was this area designated?
25 If you know, was it changed in the most recent land use map

1 comp plan changes by the mayor and Council in two 2021
2 amendments? Is that when it went from a moderate, probably
3 a moderate residential to a medium density residential?

4 MS. THOMAS: Let me -- I'm looking.

5 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Or was it much further back?
6 It might have been years ago. I don't know.

7 MS. THOMAS: Let me look. I'm looking. I'm
8 checking right now on that.

9 MR. SULLIVAN: Vice Chair Miller, if I may. And
10 according to the map that shows the changes this was medium
11 density before the change. It doesn't show it as a recent
12 change.

13 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Well, I appreciate you
14 clarifying that, Mr. Sullivan.

15 MS. THOMAS: It predates -- let me look. I'm
16 looking.

17 VICE CHAIR MILLER: So it's been that way for
18 years. Which well, not everybody when they're buying into
19 your neighborhood knows what the comp plan feature land use
20 map designation is, and if you're buying in a row house
21 neighborhood, you may think that that's what it's always
22 going to be.

23 But if it's designated on the future land use map
24 that the mayor and Council have adopted as medium density
25 residential and not moderate, that's high -- that's

1 generally, if not every property that's in that area that's
2 designated. And we're not doing the entire area because it
3 goes all the way to cover your properties, which isn't being
4 proposed here.

5 But, all the way to a Warder Street, I think. So
6 it's just something to be aware of. So I appreciate Mr.
7 Sullivan, that information, and I don't know -- and if Ms.
8 Thomas, yeah.

9 MS. THOMAS: Yeah. It does predate, the most
10 recent change in the comp plan. So it's been that way for a
11 while.

12 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Right. And I mean, this
13 planning area, that's a small area -- there are small area
14 plans -- the Georgia Avenue corridor has been slated for
15 redevelopment at a higher density for many years, and this
16 is the step down from what's on the corridor to the row
17 house neighborhood.

18 This is kind of a transition area, but I
19 understand the concerns of the neighbors here, and I
20 encourage all of the collaboration that's been encouraged by
21 my fellow colleagues.

22 And Mr. Burns might have an answer on the massing
23 study at some point.

24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Let me, first go to, Ms.
25 Leila. You were getting ready to say something to me early

1 on before Commissioner Imamura went. Okay. Guess you don't
2 have to say.

3 All right. Let's go to -- we're going to come
4 back to Mr. Sullivan. But first, I still want that
5 collaboration to have, and I appreciate Commissioner Imamura
6 bringing that up. I've been talking about the Good Neighbor
7 Policy for years, and I think that's very important.

8 And I learned it myself in my neighborhood and my
9 own house years ago, about 30 years ago, and I've called it
10 a Good Neighbor Policy. Because you come in somebody's
11 neighborhood, we're the ones who live there. You want to
12 develop and leave, and I'm not pointing to this development,
13 I've been saying it for years. Check the record.

14 And I appreciate the Vice Chair for bringing that
15 up. Because, yes, this Commission, myself, in particular,
16 has been pushing for zero to 30 percent of the MFI.

17 Now, people think I'm crazy, but you ask for
18 something lower, you may get to where you need to be. And
19 people say, Hood, I don't know why you always ask for zero
20 percent. I get that. But I appreciate all of what he laid
21 out. And I would tell you, it's important for you all to
22 have that conversation with Mr. Burns as he's already
23 stated.

24 The regulations say one thing, but my problem is
25 the engagement piece, and the comp plan is our regulations,

1 and what I'm hurt hearing here today, I don't think that was
2 covered even I know they've done some, but I don't think it
3 was covered to the multitude that I feel comfortable with,
4 as far as especially now with our racial equity as Ms.
5 Glover and others have had bought up.

6 So with that, I'm going to go to Mr. Sullivan.
7 Let's do the rebuttal.

8 We don't have anybody else, right, Ms. Schellin?

9 MS. SCHELLIN: No one else.

10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Let's go to Mr. Sullivan
11 and the rebuttal, and Mr. Sullivan, before you get started,
12 our request is our request.

13 So go right ahead, Mr. Sullivan.

14 MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and
15 members of the Commission. Of course, as always, we advise
16 our clients and Mr. Burns especially knows this too. We'll
17 continue to cooperate with all neighbors and keep them
18 informed about anything that's going on here. And has done
19 so for about a year now too. And I'll start with
20 responding.

21 The DC code, the DC law requires, of course, that
22 the zoning maps and regulations not be inconsistent with the
23 comprehensive plan. So that's the starting point, of
24 course, for any map amendment. And it requires that. It
25 says that it shall not be inconsistent.

1 And so and that's the source of the authority
2 worked why we're here today, of course. And this has been a
3 year-long process with an extensive effort from the Office
4 of Planning, from the ANC, from the applicant, extensive
5 outreach as well.

6 In fact, I believe Ms. Olberding said she did
7 receive a packet. And to come in at the last second -- two
8 of the witnesses have not filed anything. Do not appear at
9 any meeting and are now showing up with the last second
10 after this year-long effort by many parties, with a more --
11 which may be a larger focus on what goes on and what's
12 needed in order to create housing and to create affordable
13 housing in the city.

14 Some specifics, the height change goes from -- we
15 can get 40 feet by special exception, 35 feet as a matter of
16 right and we're asking for 60. So it's 20 feet. I heard
17 somebody say 80 feet.

18 It's a 20-foot difference, and it's only a 10-foot
19 difference from the zone in between, which would not be --
20 which would be inconsistent with this.

21 And of course, as Commissioner Miller mentioned,
22 there is a inclusionary zoning requirement, a significant
23 one. It's double what the normal one would be for a matter
24 of (inaudible) projects.

25 So with that, I think that the applicant and the

1 Office of Planning have made the case in support of the map
2 amendment but the applicant, of course, is willing to do
3 whatever Commission requires in the way of further
4 interaction or providing additional materials. Thank you.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Mr. Sullivan and Mr.
6 Burns, we appreciate the further engagement. And I
7 appreciate the Vice Chair. He really ran out of detail of
8 what we have to look at.

9 So I appreciate that. So what I would do is ask -
10 - I don't have anything further to add to what I've already
11 said. I don't know if my colleagues do. Commissioner
12 Imamura anything? Commissioner?

13 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: I agree with you, Mr.
14 Chairman, that, Vice Chair Miller offered a master class
15 tonight. So thank you, Vice Chairman.

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. Commissioner
17 Stidham, do you have anything else to add?

18 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: No, sir.

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. And Vice Chair Miller,
20 do you have anything else to add to your --

21 VICE CHAIR MILLER: No. No. Thank you.

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Well, I'm really hoping
23 because I'm getting some feedback somewhere. Can everybody
24 mute? Because I know other people don't want to hear me
25 talking and I sure enough don't want to keep hearing me

1 talk.

2 So this is a serious, you know, this is very
3 serious business. The ladies who've come down for us, Mr.
4 Sullivan, I appreciate your understanding. It is kind of
5 unfortunate that they did not participate with their ANC and
6 others, but oftentimes we don't get that, Mr. Sullivan, and
7 that doesn't happen all the time.

8 So I appreciate your indulgence and you all
9 working along. And make sure that the conversation is had
10 and who knows? There may be -- not that we're going to all
11 get what we want, but it may be a mitigation method or
12 something that you all say or do.

13 And I have to remember and this is, when we get to
14 this, I have to remember, I don't think we can condition a
15 map amendment. We've had this conversation a thousand
16 times. I just can't remember where it lies, because
17 sometimes -- it changed every ten years.

18 It's like I get some different advice. But either
19 way, that may be something, but I don't think we can do it,
20 but I'll see. So, anyway, I'm rambling, and I don't want to
21 keep rambling.

22 So, Mr. Sullivan has already given us a closing.

23 Ms. Schellin, can we come up with some dates? Can
24 you work with Mr. Sullivan? Let's come up with a date for a
25 decision.

1 Not in a week or two, because it's going to take
2 him a while to meet with the neighbors. And I'm going to
3 ask the neighbors, and I did this in another case, and the
4 neighbors didn't even meet with the applicant. So what does
5 that leave? What does that leave us with? So please -- Mr.
6 Chairman --

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes?

8 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Mr. Chairman, you added, in
9 your previous comment, that the ANC should also be included
10 in that meeting since they are the locally elected rep --
11 the hyper local elected -- I don't know if that's the word.
12 Hyper locally elected representatives that we are required
13 to give great weight to, which they've approved this,
14 application.

15 So any meetings that are scheduled, I would hope
16 they too would be invited since they've unanimously approved
17 this proposal.

18 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Right. I would -- I thank you
19 for bringing it up, Vice Chair because once before I did
20 that, and the ANC wrote me a wasn't a nasty letter. This is
21 another case. It was a letter saying, basically
22 reinforcing, hey, look.

23 We already gave you one letter.

24 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Right.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'm asking this to --

1 VICE CHAIR MILLER: They can do that. We do our
2 part. They do their part.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Right. Right. So I'm asking.
4 I'm hoping they would, so that they can hear from maybe the
5 three neighbors who may not have had a chance to participate
6 in ANC. So I'll leave it at that.

7 Ms. Schellin, I'll turn it over to you.

8 MS. SCHELLIN: Sure. And just to clarify, you are
9 leaving the record open for the three ladies who spoke this
10 evening to be able to provide a response, a follow-up about
11 those meetings only. Correct?

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Right. Yeah.

13 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: For that, I would like to get,
15 I think, Ms. Glover had her testimony. I think we opened it
16 up for that. I'd like to get.

17 MS. SCHELLIN: Right. I've already made a note
18 that we can go ahead and put that testimony in. So that
19 testimony will be added already.

20 But I just want to clarify that the record will
21 be, since they're not parties, that they will be allowed to
22 submit their view about what happened at the meeting so that
23 they'll be able -- because the records closed at the end of
24 the hearing except for what you guys asked for.

25 So I just want to clarify that those three only,

1 along with the parties, which is the ANC and the applicant
2 will be allowed to report back on that meeting. So --

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: (Inaudible). Is it Daisy?

4 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah, you and Daisy got it
6 correct. Thank you.

7 MS. SCHELLIN: Yeah. She keeps on hitting the
8 keys.

9 So Mr. Sullivan, do you know how much time you
10 think you might need to be able to include the ANC with the
11 three ladies who spoke this evening?

12 Well, I've reached out to some commissioners right
13 now, but I'll look up where their meeting is.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Well, I'm really concerned.
15 And, yeah, the Commissioners could be a part of it. I don't
16 want to bog down their time and get them upset because they
17 already have a letter.

18 But I would like them to be a part, but it's
19 really might maybe communicating with Ms. Glover and others.
20 There's Leila and the others, Ms. Olberding, I think, but
21 communicate with those three, how you all can work it out.
22 I don't know how.

23 MS. SCHELLIN: Who was in opposition?

24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah.

25 MS. SCHELLIN: Mainly, those in opposition. Okay.

1 So if the ANC can be there. Great. If not, it's not a big
2 deal. I think it's what the Commission is saying since
3 they've already weighed in. If I'm hearing correctly from
4 Chairman Hood.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'm sure that the community
6 would be able to get them come to the table. At least the
7 same time, I'm a district, if need be.

8 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. All right. Does that sound
9 good? Maybe a month? Does that sound good?

10 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes. Yeah. That that would be
11 fine.

12 MS. SCHELLIN: That way we can get it in time for
13 our only meeting in December. If we could have you, the
14 ANC, if they choose to participate, and, I believe the three
15 who testified this evening, are still listening.

16 If all of you could meet and report on the outcome
17 of the meeting by three o'clock PM on, I'm going to say
18 December 1st. That's a Friday. So by 3 PM, December 1st.
19 And then the applicant should submit its draft findings,
20 facts conclusions of law by December 4th. I'm sorry.
21 December 7th.

22 Give you a little more time since those letters
23 are coming in on the 1st. We can put this on for our
24 meeting or the Commission's meeting on 14th December. And,
25 of course, the submission from the applicant, the draft

1 order on the 7th, would be due by three PM also. And then
2 we'll put this on the Commissions meeting on December 14th
3 at four o'clock PM. So anyone who wants to watch may do so.

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And I made a comment about
5 conditions in map amendments. I want to thank our counsel
6 because I just got my lecture again, but I appreciate them
7 always keeping me straight. So thank you. I've already
8 been --

9 One other thing I want to state, there were few
10 other items that the Commission asked for. If the applicant
11 could provide those also by December 1st. And then the ANC
12 OP and DDOT, if they choose to respond to those submissions,
13 they would have until three PM on the 8th of December to
14 provide their responses.

15 And I'll change the date for your draft findings'
16 facts and conclusions of law to the 8th also. That way,
17 there's no three dates.

18 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Do we have anything else, Ms.
19 Schellin?

20 MS. SCHELLIN: That's it.

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. Before I close out,
22 the Zoning Commission will meet again November the 6th 2023.
23 Zoning commission case number 20-29A. This is trustees for
24 Harvard University on these same platforms at 4 PM.

25 I want to thank everyone for the participation

1 tonight. And you can follow us as Ms. Schellin has
2 mentioned.

3 And with that, this hearing is adjourned. Good
4 night, everyone.

5 (Whereupon, the above-entitled meeting was
6 adjourned.)

7 * * * * *

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 Meeting

Before: D.C. Zoning Commission

Date: 11-02-2023

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