GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA Zoning Commission

Public Hearing

Case No. 15-28 [Forest City Washington - Modification of Consolidated PUD for Square 744-S, part of Lot 805, and Square 744-SS, part of Lot 801.]

6:34 p.m. to 7:07 p.m. Monday, September 19, 2016

Jerrily R. Kress Memorial Hearing Room 441 4th Street, N.W., Suite 220 South Washington, D.C. 20001

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.

1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington, DC 20036
Washington: 2028981108 • Baltimore: 4107523376
Toll Free: 8884453376

Board Members:

ANTHONY HOOD, Chairman

PETER MAY, Commissioner

ROBERT MILLER, Commissioner

MICHAEL TURNBULL, Commissioner

Office of Zoning:

SHARON SCHELLIN, Secretary

Office of Planning:

JENNIFER STEINGASSER

KAREN THOMAS

Other:

DAVID AVITABILE

JOHN LECKER

PHILLIP BLASE

PETER CALKINS

Toll Free: 8884453376

PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, this is the public hearing of the Zoning Commission for the District of Columbia. Today's date is September 19th, 2016.

My name is Anthony Hood. Joining me are Vice Chair Miller, Commissioner May, and Commissioner Turnbull. We're also joined by the Office of Zoning Staff, Ms. Sharon Schellin, the Office of Planning staff, Ms. Steingasser, and Ms. Thomas.

The proceeding is being recorded by a court reporter. It's also webcast live. Accordingly, we must ask you to refrain from any disruptive noises or actions in the hearing room including the display of any signs or objects. Notice of today's hearing was published in the D.C. Register and copies of that announcement are available to my left on the wall near the door.

The hearing will be conducted in accordance with provisions of Subtitle Z, Chapter 4, as follows: preliminary matters, applicant's case, report of the Office of Planning, report of other government agencies, report of the ANC, organizations and persons in support, organizations and persons in opposition, rebuttal and closing by the applicant.

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.

The following time constraints will be maintained in this meeting. The applicant has up to 60 minutes, organizations five minutes, individuals three minutes. This is a modification. We don't need nowhere near 60 minutes.

All persons appearing before the -- wishing to testify before the Commission in this evening's case are asked to register at the witness kiosk to my left, and fill out two witness cards. If you need any assistance, Ms. Schellin will be able to assist you.

When presenting information to the Commission please turn on and speak into the microphone, first stating your name and home address. When you're finished speaking please turn your microphone off so that your microphone is no longer picking up sound or background noise.

The staff will be available throughout the hearing to discuss procedural questions. Please turn off all electronic devices at this time so not to disrupt these proceedings.

Would all individuals wishing to testify please rise to take the oath? Ms. Schellin, would you please administer the oath?

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Please raise your right

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.

hand.

[Oath administered to the participants.]

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Do we have any preliminary matters?

MS. SCHELLIN: Just, there's one proffered expert, and that's Phil Blasé or Blasé. Blasé, in architecture.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Colleagues, we have Mr. Blasé's resume as Exhibit 10A, I believe.

[Pause.]

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Any objections? Does anybody need more time to look at the resume again, review it? Okay.

So not hearing any objections, we will give Mr. Blasé expert status with us. Anything else, Ms. Schellin?

MS. SCHELLIN: No, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Are we ready to begin, Mr. Avitabile?

MR. AVITABILE: Yes, sir. Good evening. David Avitabile with Goulston and Storrs, here on behalf of the applicant, Forest City.

With me tonight to my left is John Lecker from Forest City. Also with us tonight from Forest City is Peter Calkins. To my right, as you just had

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.

it introduced as an expert witness, is Philip Blasé from Calison RTKL.

So we're here tonight for a modification of an approved PUD for a movie theater and parking garage structure down just east of the ballpark in Southeast, D.C. We have four items before you tonight that are modifications. The first is a minor modification to the number of parking spaces. The PUD was approved with approximately 331 spaces.

When we filed the modification, based on the design of the garage at that time, we asked for permission to go down to 323 spaces. As we looked at the parking garage design as we were getting ready for the hearing, we actually realized we were back up at 333 spaces, so I guess we are now asking for a slight increase in the number of parking spaces, from 331 to 333 spaces.

The second item, and I think this is the major, relatively major set of changes that led us to a hearing tonight, are changes to the design of the building. They're largely focused on the materials used for the building. Many of them have been driven by code reasons. I think primarily the change in the design of the lower portion of the building from a metal mesh to a solid material was driven by the fact

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.

that no matter what, the garage was going to be mechanically ventilated. So once that was the case it made more sense to use a solid material.

There were also code-driven changes that have led to changes on the roof, adding a roof stair, adding mechanical pits to accommodate exhaust for the building. And finally, I think, one modification to the design of the street scape to allow for an asphalt paving at the intersection of One and a Half Street and N Place, rather than the pavers that were original contemplated in the event that that intersection is accommodating D.C. Water truck traffic, it may make more sense to have it be a more durable material.

The third change is the change to the condition regarding a bike shower. We've discussed this with DDOT and asked for permission to come up with an alternative amenity to promote bicycle use and they've agreed to a condition that would provide bike share memberships to the employees of the movie theater.

And finally, the last item is the item that I raised in the prehearing submission, which is a request for flexibility from the typical requirement to have a record lot, given the rather unique nature

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.

1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington, DC 20036 Washington: 2028981108 • Baltimore: 4107523376

Toll Free: 8884453376

of the ownership and use of these parcels. We may not be able to actually create a record lot in time to pull the building permit for this building, so we're asking for flexibility to be able to do that on an assessment and taxation lot.

We're here tonight with DDOT's support, with OP's support, with ANC support, and with no opposition. And so I think with that I'm going to turn briefly to Philip to run through a couple of items on the design of the building and then we'll be here to answer any questions.

Thank you very much. Just MR. BLASE: quickly, this is the previous version of the project.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Could you identify yourself first?

MR. BLASE: Sorry. My name is Phillip Blasé. I'm with Calison RTKL, representing the architecture firm.

The previous design of the building had the metal panel at the theater levels, and then the metal mesh at the garage levels.

As the design developed it became evident through the number of stair shafts and share walls and other elements of the design that we were not going to be able to naturally ventilate the garage

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.

1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington, DC 20036 Washington: 2028981108 • Baltimore: 4107523376

Toll Free: 8884453376

and rather having to mechanically ventilate it and enclose it.

And so with that we chose to use the metal panel material which has sort of a color shift characteristic to part of it, to bring that down to the pedestrian level and engage that at the street level.

And then use the material, the fiber cement panel, which we think is a high quality material, masonry in nature, durable, easily maintained, at the theater levels to continue to the design intent of the original concept.

We've also included LED lighting on the upper levels at the fiber cement panel to graze that façade from a side perspective, and wash those panels in light to activate that façade.

We did provide some openings. Again, as the design progressed we did have to introduce some elements for the mechanical ventilation openings in the façade. Those openings occur on the south and east facades, which are not the, what we would call public facades, to allow for an intake of air to properly ventilate the garage exhaust. We looked at a number of different scenarios for that. But in terms of the amount of air intake we felt that it was

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.

-- the best design was to minimize the number of openings and allow the interior fans to help move that air.

I think that's essentially the changes that were --

MR. AVITABILE: Okay. So that's really, I mean, we just wanted to briefly run through the changes that we had made to the design. If you could bring up the -- actually, we'll wait and see if you have questions about the lot, the lot issues that I briefly touched on, and I'm happy to talk through those as well.

But with that, you know, with the support of the agencies and the ANC, we think that the project will still go forward and still, you know, meets the original intent of the PUD and we look forward to the questions from the Commission. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you very much for that quick presentation. We know this is a modification. But let's go through the lot issue.

MR. AVITABILE: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let's talk about that right quick.

MR. AVITABILE: You bring that -- that's fine. Okay.

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: We'll go write down questions after that.

MR. AVITABILE: Great. So right now the site consists of two tax lots, briefly, and this actually shows the lots we're proposing to divide. But basically there are two tax lots. There is a lot that's the area that's to the south of that red line. And that's lot 801 and square south of south of 744. That's right. That lot there.

And then there's a square -- then there's a lot to the north, which is the red, blue, and green. That's currently one tax lot.

Original intent, and these two tax lots currently contain the area that we're developing as part of the PUD, and they also contain the area that D.C. Water currently uses for its O Street pumping station and where it intends to construct its headquarters building. The original intent was to take these lots and create two record lots. One for our PUD and one for D.C. Water's PUD.

Now you can't create a record lot unless you can go through the process and show that you have the authorized signatories to all the properties. As we've delved into the title history of that southern lot, a portion of that southern lot used to be

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.

Reservation 248, which is a federal reservation.

Now that Reservation 248 was quit claim deeded over to the District of Columbia a few years ago. It was part of that large land transfer related to Poplar Point and the other pieces of property.

I think we don't believe -- there are some historical documents that suggest that Reservation 248 was a larger triangle than the triangle that was deeded over. We don't think that's correct. I don't think the Federal Government thinks that that's correct either. But our title company at the time isn't convinced entirely, and so they want us to work through that. So we won't be able to deal with that. And so that then has a whole series of effects that limit us from creating the original record lots we intended.

Now, one solution would be to simply take that northern lot that doesn't involve Reservation 248, and create a record lot or two out of that. However, those lots actually literally bisect the O Street pumping station and you can't create a record lot that bisects a building. So what we're left with is essentially an inability to create the record lots that we would need to create to build our building. And so that's why we're asking for flexibility, to

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.

basically take the existing tax lot and divide it into three tax lots.

One, the Blue Lot, which would be the lot for the movie theater building that we're here for, and the Green Lot which would correspond with the One and a Half Street lot, and then the remainder lot, which would be the Red Lot, which would essentially remain as a remainder tax lot until such time as we work through these issues are able to formally create the record lots.

So this is largely a housekeeping item to allow us to get through the permit process now for the moving theater building, and then later on fix those issues when it's time to come through for the rest of the buildings. And we anticipate that we should be able to do that in a matter of months. But since it may involve to make the title company happy, getting the Federal Government to do an additional quit claim deed, that could take some time. So that's why we want to allow for the time to do that, to work through that with the Federal Government.

MR. MAY: Was that one of the ones that the Park Service Quit claimed, or was it a GSA?

MR. BLASE: It was -- I believe it was Park Service quit claimed it.

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.

MR. MAY: Could take more than a few months.

MR. BLASE: Well, that's why, again, why we wanted to address that here.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Any other questions on regular lots? Okay.

Any other questions at all, or comments on this, all we've heard? Vice Chair Miller?

MR. MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. No, I just had a couple questions. This seems pretty straight forward and it's still a great product to get another movie theater east, on the eastern side of the city.

When is the projected -- when would be the projected construction and opening of the movie theater?

MR. LECKER: So the current -- oh, John Lecker with Forest City.

The current projection, we have some issues we need to coordinate with D.C. Water. Our current projection is that we would actually be able to break ground the summer of 2017, and that would put the opening about 30 months later. So that would be the end of 2019.

MR. MILLER: And just one design modification question, and that was, I think you were replacing

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.

green screen somewhere on the, you know, the ground floor with a dimensional metal panel. And if you could just explain what the rationale was for that. The green wasn't going to be green all year round, or it just went -- you wanted a unified design with all the rest of the dimensional panel.

MR. BLASE: Yeah. Phil Blasé with Calison RTKL.

It was sort of a combination of both of those. We were concerned about the equality of the planting material and the sustainability of the planting material in that location. And then also having a consistent skin at that street level.

MR. MILLER: But that of course would be, as are shown in the rendering, there's trees and other green space in front of --

MR. BLASE: That's correct.

MR. MILLER: Next to the curb, so.

MR. BLASE: Yes.

MR. MILLER: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Any other questions or comments? Mr. Turnbull?

MR. TURNBULL: Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Chair. The rendered perspective you showed in the beginning is from the original approved drawings that we did

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.

from the hearing.

MR. BLASE: This is the current perspective rendering. This was the original from the approved --

MR. TURNBULL: So basically it hasn't changed other than some of the panels has changed.

MR. BLASE: That's correct.

MR. TURNBULL: Paneling. Let me -- but now you've introduced this new exterior lights; light bulbs.

MR. BLASE: The lights were actually there -MR. TURNBULL: Weren't they in the panels
or --

MR. BLASE: They're sort of integrated into the skin and they still remain that way. Again, the idea was to just sort of side wash the façade and activate it at night.

MR. TURNBULL: They were originally there? I thought they were part of the original. I thought there was something in the panel system or something.

Or maybe --

MR. BLASE: We'll pull it up. This is -some of these materials are actually from the filed
plans, not in the presentation you have tonight. But
we brought them just in case. So this shows you the

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.

approved PUD plan. So the approved plans did have lighting in between the panels --

MR. TURNBULL: I thought I remember. But the lighting is not like an exposed bulb.

MR. BLASE: That's correct. It's a --

MR. TURNBULL: It's got a cowl on it or something?

MR. BLASE: It does have a hood on it, yes.

And it's an LED fixture that sort of grazes and

washes --

MR. TURNBULL: Okay.

MR. BLASE: -- the skin.

MR. TURNBULL: Now how -- what is your proposal for having the lights on? Is it while the theater is open, or --

MR. BLASE: Well, I think it would be, yeah, probably during operating hours. I think that's probably an operational question for Forest City.

MR. LECKER: Yeah. This is John Lecker. I think the current thinking is that it would be washing the building while the theater is operational. Just a point to note is that, you know, we have our land adjacent to the theater, which is residentially owned, so we'll be certainly sensitive to the lighting that --

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.

MR. TURNBULL: That was my concern.

MR. LECKER: Yeah.

MR. TURNBULL: Is residential aspects that --

MR. LECKER: Yeah. Most certainly have a vested interest in making sure that we do the right thing.

MR. TURNBULL: Okay.

MR. BLASE: That's right, because in addition to the parcel to the west that's a part of this PUD, the two parcels to the north and to the northwest are part of the yard's development.

MR. TURNBULL: Right.

MR. BLASE: That Forest City also controls.

MR. TURNBULL: Okay. Sorry.

MR. BLASE: We will care more than anyone to make sure that the light --

MR. TURNBULL: Well, that's what I thought. I thought you weren't going to go out of your way to try to, you know, annoy neighbors around the -- who are trying to sleep.

So, the other thing is there is, on Exhibit - the drawings you submitted on Exhibit 19A, 19B, you
have a way of putting little notes at the bottom of
some of these drawings. It says, "Signage is
illustrative only and is subject to change. Signage

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.

generally reflects size orientation and location."

I'm assuming what you're showing is what you're going to be doing.

MR. BLASE: So this -- there's been a little bit of a change, I think, in the way the Commission has treated signage. This is -- these are actually the notes that were on the previous set of approved drawings as well.

What we had always done, historically, is kind of give you a signage plan that --

MR. TURNBULL: Right.

MR. BLASE: -- generally shows you the location --

MR. TURNBULL: Yeah.

MR. BLASE: -- and the size of the lettering. But for example, if they change the name of the theater to something other than Showplace Icon, or change their actual icon to a different type of drawing, that would change but it would still be in the same location, size.

MR. TURNBULL: Okay.

MR. BLASE: So on and so forth. But that's essentially the idea.

So, for example, we wouldn't add a second additional sign, you know, north of the existing

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.

sign --

MR. TURNBULL: Yeah.

MR. BLASE: -- that also says -- that's what the intent is.

MR. TURNBULL: Okay.

MR. BLASE: We're limited to what's on the drawing.

MR. TURNBULL: Okay. So, you're basically looking as far as like an operational issue if you different --

MR. BLASE: That's right.

MR. TURNBULL: Okay. Now the other thing you have is location of doors and windows are conceptual.

I mean, you're not talking about the main entrance and everything like that is --

MR. BLASE: No, I think that's intended to govern --

MR. TURNBULL: That's the ones down the street on N Place then.

MR. BLASE: That's right. The retail doors, because we might --

MR. TURNBULL: Right.

MR. BLASE: -- need to move them around for the tenants.

MR. TURNBULL: Okay.

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.

MR. BLASE: And probably was also intended to capture if, let's say, an egress door had to move slightly one way or another, we wanted to capture that as well.

MR. TURNBULL: And -- okay. All right. Those are my questions. Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Commissioner May.

MR. MAY: Yeah. So, the first question I have is the separate roof structure for the stairway, you don't need relief for that.

MR. AVITABILE: Not anymore because of the new --

MR. MAY: Not under the new regulations, right.

MR. AVITABILE: Not under the new regulations.

MR. MAY: Right. We're allowed to have a separate stair. Okay. Just, it's hard for me to, you know --

MR. AVITABILE: I understand.

MR. MAY: Making the transition here.

MR. AVITABILE: There have been a few changes lately.

MR. MAY: Yeah. So, and then -- and so that means that you're being reviewed fully under the

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.

current regulations now? Okay.

MR. AVITABILE: So the -- I'll stay in the -- some of the things that Richard Turnbull asked about.

So the external lighting system, I'm looking at the detail that's in the package that was submitted. And on A17 -- so your A17 is different from mine. It's the detail.

MR. AVITABILE: It's the cut, this one.

MR. MAY: Yeah, shows it in section. Did we just pass it?

MR. AVITABILE: Did I pass it?

MR. MAY: I don't know. Maybe.

MR. AVITABILE: There we go.

MR. MAY: Okay. All right. No, there. Thank you.

So, on the lowest plan cut there, the enlarged plan. Yeah, or down there. So it points to the light fixture. It says ornamental light fixture. And it just looks like -- I'm sure this is not what you want it to look like, but it's -- it just looks like a bare fluorescent fixture, right?

But you're saying it does have a cowl, and the only light is going to be across the face.

MR. BLASE: That's right. It's an LED fixture so it has a very narrow profile, and it is

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.

hooded such that it casts the light more or less sideways down the --

MR. MAY: Right.

MR. BLASE: Down the façade.

MR. MAY: Just grazes it. Okay. I was curious about that because I saw that I was just in Dallas over the weekend and it seems like every building downtown has some sort of exterior lighting, and many of them now move and you know, all sorts of exciting super graphic stuff which, you know, is not what we really love here.

So, I was just a little concerned when I saw that and it's like -- and then, you're from Dallas and so I just like, immediately --

MR. BLASE: Yeah, these are actually white LEDs. They're not color changing.

MR. MAY: Okay.

MR. BLASE: They're just meant to really graze --

MR. MAY: Right.

MR. BLASE: -- the façade.

MR. MAY: Just put a little light on the panels.

MR. BLASE: That's right.

MR. MAY: And some of the renderings are kind

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.

of muddy. Well, all of them are kind of muddy. So, are we seeing the true representation of the color?

Is it going to be this spectrum of going from gray to a pink? Or is it just a poor rendering?

MR. BLASE: Well, I think that the opalescent nature of that skin material in the daylight will have that effect. I think it might be less so --

MR. MAY: So, I mean, how many colors are actually going to be up there? Just two?

MR. BLASE: That's right.

MR. MAY: Okay. All right. So, you know, when I hold it this way and I think I'm catching Mr. Avitabile's tie. So it looks a little pink.

Okay. So, that helps clarify. And so the other question I had with regard to the facades, and we can see them even on this rendering here, but the openings for ventilation -- I appreciate the fact that they're not on the major facades and that's good. But they seem kind of random in shape. I mean, the one that's in the, you know, the top one here seems like it's replacing an entire panel. That one kind of makes sense. But the other ones here, were it's like the middle third of the two vertical panels, I mean, is there something driving that?

MR. BLASE: So what you're seeing there is

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.

the bottom panel is actually the upturned beam that becomes the vehicle barrier. And then the upper third, I'll call it, is the actual depth of the perimeter beam structure. And so the opening is actually the amount of space in between those two pieces.

MR. MAY: Uh-huh. And it's completely open, or does it have some sort of cable across it to keep somebody from falling out or --

MR. BLASE: Well, again, the vehicle barrier goes up to --

MR. MAY: Right.

MR. BLASE: -- I think 42 inches.

MR. MAY: And other than the vehicle barrier in the --

MR. BLASE: No, it is completely open.

MR. MAY: Okay. And you're not going to forget, it's going to look just like, you know, some oops, somebody forgot to put a panel on there?

MR. BLASE: No, I think we're -- we would rather see that than a larger amount of openings if we were to perforate or --

MR. MAY: Right.

MR. BLASE: -- some other means, introduce air. We'd have to, you know, essentially quadruple

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.

the number of panels that we'd have to introduce. So again, we're just looking for a more consistent --

MR. MAY: Uh-huh. Yeah, I mean, it just, it -- can something be done to the treatment of the beam to make it -- well, I mean, because right now it looks like it's a fairly light color. And then of course you've got total darkness beyond it.

MR. BLASE: Yeah, I think our intent is to paint that beam. You know, the, whatever that panel in the rhythm of the pattern that's --

MR. MAY: Yeah. But then you've got a big black square in the middle of it.

MR. BLASE: Yes.

MR. MAY: Okay. Well, I'm not going to try to micromanage the design. But it just, it just looks funny because it doesn't seem to have a relationship to the rest of the design. And if it were on a façade that anybody other than the pump house people would see it, then maybe I'd be concerned; more concerned. But it does seem a little bit out of synch with the rest of it.

That's it for my questions.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. Mr. Avitabile, only question or comment I have is apparently DDOT has asked you to have continued coordination on a few

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.

bullet points which was in their report. And you agreed to all of those.

MR. AVITABILE: Yes, we do. I think they're all just kind of -- essentially they're reiterating all the conditions of our approval and how it dovetails with D.C. Water's conditions of approval, and we'll certainly work with them on all those items.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Their continued coordination.

MR. AVITABILE: Exactly.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

MR. AVITABILE: We've been doing that extensively and will continue to do it.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. Let's go to the ANC. Is there anyone here representing the ANC?

Okay. Let them do cross-examination. But I have a report that I'll read at the appropriate time for ANC 6D.

Okay. Let's go to the Office of Planning.

MS. THOMAS: Good evening.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Ms. Thomas.

MS. THOMAS: Good evening, Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission. Karen, with the Office of Planning.

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.

We would basically stand on the record of our report in support of the changes made as it remains within the confines of what was approved, originally approved. And I'll be available for any questions. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Any questions of the Office of Planning? We do have a DDOT report. Any questions? Not hearing any.

Again, no one is here from the ANC so we can't do the cross. The report of the ANC, basically Exhibit -- Exhibit 17 basically states that the ANC supports -- it's regularly scheduled meeting and properly noticed public meeting on May the 9th, with a quorum being present, a quorum being four commissioners, Advisory Neighborhood Commission, ANC 6D, voted five to zero to zero for a motion to support the PUD modification in Zoning Commission Case No. 13-05B. And it's signed by Chair Andy Litsky.

Okay. Do we have anyone present in organizations or persons would like to come and testify in support? Any organizations or persons who would like to testify in opposition?

Mr. Avitabile, I don't think you have any rebuttal. I don't think there's anything to rebut.

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.

So you can give us a closing.

MR. AVITABILE: We're here, thank you very much for your time tonight. We hope we've answered your questions. We look forward to your action on this case at the appropriate time. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. Thank you.

Colleagues, any follow up questions or comments?

Okay. I would suggest that we move forward. And as you know, under our new rules I believe this is one action. So, in our new rules we all have to get accustomed to them. I have to get accustomed as well.

I would suggest that we move forward with this modification this evening, unless there any objections. So, not hearing any as prescribed and noted, I would move that we approve the minor PUD modification of Zoning Commission Case No. 13-05B and ask for a second.

MR. MILLER: Second.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Also, let me reiterate with the flexibility of the record lot issue.

MR. AVITABILE: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: They include that. Can I get a second on that too?

MR. MILLER: Second.

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.

1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington, DC 20036
Washington: 2028981108 • Baltimore: 4107523376
Toll Free: 8884453376

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. It's been moved and properly seconded. Any further discussion?

[Vote taken.]

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Any opposition? Not hearing any, Ms. Schellin, would you please record the vote?

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. Staff records the vote four to zero to one to approve final action in Zoning Commission Case No. 13-05B, Commissioner Hood moving, Commissioner Miller seconding, Commissioners Turnbull and May in support, third mayoral appointee position vacant, not voting.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

MS. SCHELLIN: If we could have a draft order sooner rather than later? Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Is everything -- we have anything else, Ms. Schellin?

MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I want to thank everyone for their participation tonight and this hearing is adjourned.

[Hearing adjourned at 7:07 p.m.]