GOVERNMENT
OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

----:

IN THE MATTER OF:

. : Case No.

ANC 8A MAP AMENDMENT

: 17-17

----:

Monday, March 19, 2017

Hearing Room 220 South 441 4th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C.

The Public Hearing of Case No. 17-17 by the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened at 6:30 p.m. in the Jerrily R. Kress Memorial Hearing Room at 441 4th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20001, Anthony J. Hood, Chairman, presiding.

## ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

ANTHONY J. HOOD, Chairperson
PETER MAY, Commissioner
ROBERT MILLER, Vice Chairperson
PETER SHAPIRO, Commissioner
MICHAEL G. TURNBULL, FAIA, Commissioner (AOC)

## OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

SHARON S. SCHELLIN, Secretary

OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL STAFF PRESENT:

ALAN BERGSTEIN HILLARY LOVICK

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

JENNIFER STEINGASSER

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Public Hearing held on March 19, 2018.

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

Preliminary Matters	. 6
Presentations by Proponents of Amendment	. 9
Presentation by Office of Planning	. 45
Presentations by Opponents of Amendment	. 48
Adiourn	7.8

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

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

6:41 p.m.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. We're ready to start. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. This is a public hearing of the Zoning Commission for the District of Columbia. Today's date is March 19, 2018. My name is Anthony Hood. We're located in the Jerrily R. Kress Memorial Hearing Room.

Joining me this evening are Vice Chair Miller, Commissioner Shapiro, Commissioner May, and Commissioner Turnbull. We are joined also by the Office of Zoning staff, Ms. Sharon Schellin as well as the Office of the Attorney General staff, Mr. Bergstein and Ms. Lovick as well as the Office of Planning staff, Ms. Steingasser.

This proceeding is being recorded by a court reporter. It's also web cast live. Accordingly, I must ask you to refrain from any disruptive noises or actions in the hearing room, including the display of any signs or objects.

A notice of today's hearing were published in the DC Register and copies of that announcement are over to my left on the wall near the door. The hearing will conducted in accordance with provisions of 11-Z DCMR Chapter preliminary matters, presentation by follows; petitioner -- un this case, it'll be ANC8A represented by Richardson -- reports of other government agencies, report the ANC, organizations οf and persons in support,

organizations and persons in opposition, organizations and persons who are undeclared.

The following time constraints will be maintained in this meeting. The petitioner has 45 minutes they requested. They have up to 60 but they've requested 45; organizations, five minutes; individuals, three minutes. The Commission intends to adhere to the time limits as strictly as possible in order to hear the case in a reasonable period of time. The Commission reserves the right to change the time limits for presentations, if necessary, and notes that no time shall be ceded.

All wishing testify before t.he persons to Commission in this evening's hearing are asked to register at the witness kiosk, which we see they're already doing, to my left and fill out two witness cards. These cards are located to my left on the table near the door. forward to speak to the Commission, please give both cards to the reporter sitting to my right before taking a seat at When presenting information to the Commission, please turn and speak into the microphone, first stating your name and home address. When you are finished speaking, please turn your microphone off so your microphone is no longer picking up sound or background noise. If you need assistance, you can see Ms. Schellin.

The staff will be available throughout the hearing

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

1 to discuss procedural questions. Please turn off all electronic devices at this 2 3 time so not to disrupt these proceedings. 4 At this time, the Commission will consider any 5 preliminary matters. Does the staff have any preliminary 6 matters? 7 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. There is -- there are two preliminary matters. I think the easiest one to -- or 8 the quicker one to get -- to dispose of is that petitioner filed their affidavit of posting late. 10 They post 11 on time but they just didn't file the affidavit of posting So they are asking for a waiver of that and would 12 on time. just ask the Commission to accept the late filing that's at 13 Exhibit 19. 15 How many days were they? CHAIRMAN HOOD: MS. SCHELLIN: I don't recall how many. 16 17 Let me -- if my computer CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. comes back on again -- is anybody else having a problem? Oh, 18 19 maybe it's just me. 2.0 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Their reasoning was that they inadvertently obtained the wrong form and the instructions, 21 they were confused with the instructions so that was their 22 good cause for requesting the waiver. 23 24 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Certainly, I have

I'm sure they don't do this all the time so I

objections.

don't have any objection. Any objections?

2.0

Do we need to do a motion or we just by general consensus?

MS. SCHELLIN: General consensus.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So no objections from us.

MS. SCHELLIN: So the next issue is a request from the actual owner of the property that's the subject of this evening's map amendment. At Exhibit 33, starting on page 4, they are requesting that this case be heard as a contested case instead of a rulemaking, so I ask the Commission to consider that before we move forward.

MR. BERGSTEIN: If I could just expand a little bit? So this is a rulemaking. No motions are permitted in a rulemaking. At this point, it's not a contested case but certainly, if the issue has been raised, you either start this as a rulemaking or you don't. So although normally, I wouldn't suggest that anyone, including the owner of the property, could make a request to the Commission, it is, I think, appropriately a preliminary matter for you to just either confirm that you're going to proceed with this as rulemaking but if it's not a rulemaking, then you would have to re-advertise this as a contested case, give people the opportunity to request party status, et cetera.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I believe, colleagues -- and I'll start it off -- this is a policy consideration. This is not

about any particular case or project. This is a policy whether or not the FLUM, the future land use map, is inconsistent with the zoning. So I think the request is a rezoning if I'm not mistaken so I want to make sure that we understand about this being a contested case. It's actually from my -- I'm not going to say out of our purview but this is something that we have to deal with to make it consistent, make it not inconsistent with the Comp Plans. So this is a policy question.

Any other comments on that, any objections? So we will continue this as a rulemaking. Do I need to do anything else with that?

MR. BERGSTEIN: No, sir. You're the presiding officer.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Well, thank you -- I don't usually thank you, Mr. Bergstein. Okay. So Ms. Schellin, do we need to do anything else?

MS. SCHELLIN: No, that's it.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So we'll start review, Ms. Richardson? Ms. Richardson, we have reviewed the record. Let me say this at the outset. I was a little disturbed by some of the information I saw in here. This is not about a project so to save your time, my time, and me having to cut you off -- well, I won't because you'll just -- if you're talking about a project, that's not why we're here tonight.

2.0

We're here to talk about a policy question. We're here to talk about a rezoning, changing the zoning, not about any project, who wants to do what, who didn't do what. We're not here for that. So if you want to waste your time, your three minutes -- and I noticed -- we need to talk because I notice that counsel's now going four minutes but we want to -- if you want to waste your three minutes, that's our regulation. Now if you want to do that, you can do that but let's talk about the map amendment. Let's stay on it. In other words, let's stay on course.

Now if it gets too much talking about a project, I will cut you off but if you want to waste your three minutes talking about a project, which is not before this Commission tonight, then do so. You know, this is free speech, public right, but I want you to make sure we stay germane to the subject.

We all in agreeance with that? We're not -- MS. RICHARDSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: -- going to talk about a project?

Okay. All right. Ms. Richardson, you may begin.

MS. RICHARDSON: Yes. Good evening, Chairman Hood and Members of the Commission. I am appearing as a zoning consultant on behalf of ANC 8A which petitioned to rezone Lot 0812 from its current PDR-1 zoning is low impact production distribution and repair to RA-2. RA-2 is what the zoning in

2.0

the neighborhoods immediately surrounding this site is. The PDR use on this site was discontinued some time ago. There was a vacant building on the property for some time. It was torn down. I believe it was condemned and the -- during the last comprehensive planned amendment rounds, this lot was designated as RA-2 on the future land use map.

It -- there was, prior to the amendment cycle, a citywide study on industrial land uses. The -- that study contended that isolated residential -- isolated industrial zoned lots in residential neighborhoods were suitable for PDR uses and should be re-zoned. And we are here tonight to, I quess, advocate for that re-zoning. We Planning that the Office of did comprehensive study or analysis on the applicable policies. I would just note that in addition to the policies for the far northeast-southeast area elements, there are a couple of policies in the implementation element procedural that do strongly advocate for updating the zoning map to conform with the future lands use map.

So this -- re-zoning this will be consistent with far northeast-southeast policies calling for conserving low density neighborhoods. And this is a neighborhood of row houses and also some individual houses, some of them of historic significance. This will -- re-zoning will help to conserve the neighborhood. And this site is also, I think

1

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

it's done so the Anacostia River, can walk to it in five minutes and this will help connect the river link.

So those are my opening comments on the benefits of re-zoning and I will now turn it over to Commissioner Holy Muhammad, 8A01.

MS. MUHAMMAD: Good evening, Chairman Hood and Commissioners. My name is Holly Muhammad. I am Advisory Neighborhood Commission 8A, single-member district 8A01. I'm here to represent the Advisory Neighborhood Commission 8A on this petition to rezone the lot that is located in my single-member district, which is located at 1401 22nd Street, SE.

I first would like to say that we've been requesting to -- we've been trying to request to have this lot rezoned over several months. Basically, we want to bring it in consistent with the comprehensive plan to keep -- its located in the middle of a residential neighborhood. It is within 50 feet of a national park which is Anacostia Park, and we, the community supports, the ANC supports this lot being rezoned to residential so that it be inconsistent -- it will be consistent with the surrounding neighborhood, which is residential.

The proposed map amendment reflects the anticipated land use on the comprehensive plan future land use map. Rezoning of this lot will allow for moderate residential housing to be developed and become consistent

2.0

with the surrounding land uses in the neighborhood. The requested map amendment will be consistent with the Office of Planning's recommendations stated in the far northeast and southeast element and policies of the Comprehensive Plan to include FMS 1.1.1 consisting of low-density neighborhoods; 1.1.7, row house neighborhoods in the Fairlawn and Twining neighborhoods; encouraging in-fill housing constructed in the architectural style and materials compatible with brick row houses and semi-detached houses that predominate in these areas; new development in these neighborhoods should be consistent with prevailing densities;

FMS 1.2.2, connecting to the river, but our own City Council members have designated 2018 as the year of the Anacostia and the Fairlawn Community abuts the Anacostia Park and the Anacostia River. So we want to be an integral part of this celebrating the Anacostia River.

Connecting to the river as designated by Office of Planning would link the neighborhoods of northeast and southeast to the Anacostia River through trail, path, transit, and road improvements, provide new amenities and facilities in the waterfront parks that meet the needs of far northeast and southeast residents. And in that, we have the safety of the pedestrians to the neighborhood include children which seniors and and everything in between that utilize these streets that are

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

surrounded -- that are surrounding the lot at 1401 22nd Street, SE, which would be 22nd Street which has residential housing and/or an elementary school less than 100 feet from this lot, Fairlawn Avenue, which abuts the park and we have residents walking and cycling and jogging along these streets, so we want to make sure that we can protect the safety of the residents and pedestrians in utilizing the park from the neighborhood.

Balance growth, which is 1.1.3, strongly encouraged the development of new housing on surplus, vacant, and underutilized land in all parts of the City, which means including in Ward 8, ensure that a sufficient supply of land is planned and zoned to enable the City to meet its long-term housing needs including the need for low- and moderate-density, single-family homes as well as the need for higher density housing.

The proposed map amendment would be consistent with these recommendations. Remapping this site from PD-1 to RA-2 zone district would permit residential development consistent with the surrounding land uses. The location of the proposed map amendment is in a prime location for It is surrounded by residential homes residential living. It is located less than 50 feet from the and apartments. entrance to Anacostia Park that connects the neighborhood to recreational activities such as roller skating, soccer,

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

fishing, smart bikes, basketball, a fitness center, walking trails and much more. It is less than two blocks from Orr Elementary School and three blocks from Kramer Middle School.

Developing moderate-density residential at this location will allow vehicle-free urban living with access to the Anacostia Metro Green line less than a mile away, the Potomac Metro Orange, Blue, and Silver lines less than a mile away also. This location is also well-serviced by the Minnesota Avenue, SE bus lines, the B2, V7, along with the Pennsylvania Avenue, SE bus lines, the 30 lines, 36, 32, and the M6 and others. There's also a ZipCar location on Fairlawn Avenue not even a block from this lot. So this lot is prime location for residential development because this is -- it's located in a residential neighborhood.

Rezoning of this lot to moderate-density residential will be consistent with Mayor Bower's commitment to providing housing opportunities in all eight wards.

Allowing for the PDR-1 zone to remain in this area will permit the encroachment of an inappropriate commercial residential in areas. The PDR-1 zoning allows use development that will destroy the walkability the community adjacent to a national park and causes a pedestrian safety hazard for residents and neighborhood children. PDR-1 zoning, which allows for industrial uses and commercial in the middle of a residential neighborhood trucks

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

inconsistent with Mayor Bowser's Vision Zero initiative put forth by DDOT to create safe streets for DC and eliminate vehicle-related fatalities.

Creating an opportunity means being able to take a walk or wait for a bus without concern for your safety. This is Mayor Bowser's vote from the State of the District March 2015. "ANC-A requests that the Zoning Commission accept its recommendation to rezone Square 5564, Lot 812, from PD-1 to RA-2 for the benefit of the Fairlawn community and Ward 8 residents. This petition is supported by our Ward 8 City Councilman, Trayon White, and many others who will speak here tonight."

At its February meeting, 2018, ANC-7B also voted unanimously to support our petition to rezone this lot to residential. ANC-B -- I'm sorry -- ANC-7B, their ANC area is -- divides -- separates -- I'm sorry -- abuts ANC 8A's area at Nicholson Street right in front of the park. So they are a part to this petition and they did vote unanimously to support ANC 8A in this petition. They have not submitted their letter, and we request that the Commission keep the record open in enough time for them to submit that. I did speak with their Chairman, DL Humphrey tonight. Thank you.

MR. MAY: Good evening, Chairman, Commissioners.

I'm here to speak as a proponent of the rezoning of 1401 22nd

Street, SE. I'd like to address a quote that was in Exhibit

2.0

33, the brief that was submitted by PAL. They cited the comprehensive plan and in doing so, they noted that PDR-1 uses should be well-buffered from residential uses and other sensitive uses such as schools, ease of the access to major roads and railroads, and characterized by existing concentrations of PDR and industrial uses.

There is no buffer between this lot and the adjacent residential lot, and there's only a 15-foot alleyway between it and other residential lots. It's a corner lot, of course, so it only abuts two properties. There are sensitive uses that are at hand. There's a school, as Commissioner Muhammad mentioned, within one block. There's a national park across the street. It's not easily accessed by major roadways.

PAL claims the site has easy access to 295 as well as to other roadways, but the reality is Fairlawn is a residential neighborhood with narrow one-way streets. Both 22nd Street and Fairlawn at 1401 22nd Street at one-way streets with residential parking on both sides of the street. It is not conducive to commercial traffic.

The rail right-of-way that's across the street is defunct. CSX has no intent to bring back a commercial railway that would cross Pennsylvania Avenue there. There is not going to be any major arteries that would service this site.

2.0

Further, there's no nearby PDR-1 or industrial activity. This is a standalone site. Perhaps it made sense for the site to be industrially or commercially zoned when there was a railway running by it. There's no railway running by it.

On every point, this though fails the test of what makes for a PDR-1 lot according to the comprehensive plan. I request that you rezone it to RA-2 as recommended by the Office of Planning. Thank you.

MS. KOVALKOSKI: Good evening, Chairman Hood and distinguished Members of the Zoning Commission. My name is Caitlin Kovalkoski and I'm a homeowner at 1419-1/2 22nd Street, SE on the same block as the site in question tonight. I am speaking tonight in support of the ANC 8A's petition to rezone this lot residential from commercial not only for the reasons that the Office of Planning outlines in their report for this hearing but also based on my own observations as a new resident of Fairlawn.

My boyfriend and I used to live over on H Street, NE, pretty busy happening scene for young couples. Unfortunately, we realized we want to make DC our permanent home and start a family in the coming years. That led us to begin the ever-notorious task of house hunting in the City. We found a home in Fairlawn that we loved and checked many of our boxes; an easy commute to the Congressional Office

2.0

Buildings, a home with good bones that just needed a little bit of updating, a backyard to play fetch with our dog and barbecue with friends and most importantly, a room to start our family in the coming years.

We also love the assets of the neighborhood. First, the mix of row houses, duplexes and detached homes make the neighborhood feel so residential, you almost forget 295 is hovering nearby. Second, having access to Anacostia Park is wonderful because I enjoy spending much of my free time cycling and running along the river trail. I actually trained for my first triathlon last summer using the trail for those two purposes, and I really look forward to the day where we can actually swim in the Anacostia to give me that practice for open water swim as well.

I'm thankful for the new Parkland 5Ks that take place every Saturday morning at 9 a.m. in Anacostia Park and the new Capital Bikeshare dock that has now been located right at the recreation center, the first on Park Service land outside of the national mall. And as the Park Service celebrates 2018 as the Year of the Anacostia, more and more Fairlawn neighbor residents are coming out to the park to enjoy all of the amenities that the park has to offer.

Finally and maybe most importantly, DCPS is making a \$47 million dollar investment in the new Orr Elementary School one block south of the site in question. The existing

1

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

school is already over its stated 400-student capacity and the new school will grow that capacity over 60 students. I think this speaks not only to the growth that **DCPS** is anticipating for future enrollment but also reinforces the anticipated growth of the city outlined in the comprehensive plan.

All contribute of these assets to great neighborhood and I believe other individuals and families opportunity to should also be given the live in our neighborhood by rezoning the site to residential.

Finally, I would like to just end with a note of I've worked in the city for over a decade personal capacity. community working for three separate development financial institutions. Everyone in this room knows the hard truth that I see every day at my job in DC. We have an affordable housing crisis in this city and if the city's population continues to grow at its projected rate, affordability will only worsen when we have a fixed amount of land to develop and a height restriction that will impact affordable density. Τ view the lack of housing in communities across the country as a market failure, and correcting market failures is one of the quintessential roles I ask you to serve in the role tonight and of government. of future the future of think about the DC and the communities we want to create here where all are welcome and

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

all are welcome and all are able to afford an affordable housing option in this District.

For me, somebody of decent means, a college degree and a further degree beyond that, I was lucky enough to purchase a home in Fairlawn. Let's think about how we can include additional housing in Fairlawn whether it looks like multifamily residential, whether it's market rate apartments, or it's condos with inclusionary zoning. I really truly believe this is a great community to develop more housing, and I think this will be a step in the right direction.

And then for the sake of tonight's hearing, please prioritize people and communities over profits. Thank you.

MS. SULLIVAN: Good evening. My name is Ruth Sullivan and I am a proponent to down-zoning this lot. We live at -- my husband and I live at 1409 22nd Street, SE, next door to the lot. We bought the house 15 years ago and the house was custom-built by the original owner of Columbia Island (phonetic) in the turn of the century. The house has historic value and we would like to preserve it as a historic site.

We are two miles from Capitol Hill, from the center of Capitol Hill, and very close proximity to downtown. Homes on the other side of the river -- everybody has talked about housing; I'm in the business of housing and housing on the other side of the river is in the \$700,000.00 and upward

2.0

of \$1 million. Houses in this area are affordable.

2.0

Keeping this as an industrial site poses a threat to not only the culture of the neighborhood but also as homeowners, it's posing a threat to the value of our homes. There are people in our neighborhoods, people across the street, people up the street who have been in the neighborhood for 45 years, and this is going to change the nature of the neighborhood as well as the value of our properties.

As you know -- everybody talked about it -- there's a shortage of houses in DC and particularly in this area because it still allows for affordable housing.

And lastly but -- is that keeping it an industrial zone gives an opportunity to developers who are not from this area to come and do with it whatever suits their needs without any consideration to the community. And we ask you to consider that and change the zoning. Thank you.

MR. SULLIVAN: Good evening. I'm Novell Sullivan, Ruth Sullivan's husband and when I first saw this lot and this house, I was a teenager and I always admired it. So later on in life, it came available and we purchased this house. And we love the neighborhood, you know, and it's just -- I just can't understand how people can look at something that is really wholesome and nice for the community and want to abruptly change it to bring in more traffic, more

1 pollution, bringing in to this neighborhood something that's 2 not beneficial for the community. 3 So I would ask that this not happen and they change the zoning so that we can continue to have the type 5 of neighborhood that is conducive for families, children, sports enthusiasts, and everybody that wants to enjoy the 6 7 Every day I see people walking down, fishing in the river and it's something that is very dear to me to see this 9 type of life in the city. So I ask you to rezone this so we can keep it commercial -- I mean so we don't -- we can keep 10 11 it residential and thank you. 12 MS. RICHARDSON: Do you have any questions or we'll bring up some other witnesses? 13 14 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Have you finished all your witnesses? 15 MS. RICHARDSON: No, I haven't but if you're going 16 to ask questions of this panel --17 18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, so you have some more 19 witnesses that are coming up? 2.0 MS. RICHARDSON: Yes. 21 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So this -- you have more than one panel, okay. So we need to stop the clock. Okay. You did that. Maybe I'm the only one don't know what's going 23 24 Okay. Let's -- any questions colleagues? Let me just 25 say that was very well done. Everybody stayed on point and

1	I appreciate it so I hope the next I hope your next panel
2	does the exact same thing, stay on point. So we will turn
3	it over to you Ms. Richardson. It's your show.
4	MS. RICHARDSON: Thank you.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Richardson, can I ask you how
6	many panels do you have?
7	MS. RICHARDSON: We have two. I will try to move
8	on. The last the testimony will be short
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: No, that's fine. I just wanted
LO	to know how many panels you had?
11	MS. RICHARDSON: Two panels.
L2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Seems to be very well-
13	coordinated. We'll make sure you're on the mic. I'll wait
L4	until you come back to the mic.
15	MS. RICHARDSON: Any other people who are speaking
16	in favor of the rezoning, come up now or
L7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let me just add if she if Ms.
18	Richardson if you're on Ms. Richardson's panel and you
19	have some kids, if you can come up. Ms. Richardson, I
20	usually do the I'm not going to take over what you're
21	doing but I usually let the people who have their kids go
22	first so they can take them home and put them in bed. I've
23	always done that. That's my practice. So I'll let you work
24	that out, Ms. Richardson.
25	MS. RICHARDSON: So you go first.

MS. BROWN: Good evening. My name is Yvonette Brown. I am a homeowner at 2107 Fairlawn Avenue, SE, right next door to the lot that we are here asking for rezoning. I purchased my home eight years ago in the Anacostia area, very happy, very excited, still am; second child in and we love it.

And we're here asking for the lot to be rezoned for this very reason, the storage unit -- excuse me -- the project would be a huge eyesore. It would be right in the middle of a residential neighborhood, definitely not part of my checklist when I purchased my home eight years ago, very excited to do. I'm from Brooklyn, New York. That was a dream of mine from a little child and I made that possible through hard work and perseverance.

So to see a neighborhood be destroyed by not rezoning that particular lot, it would be very disheartening. It would be a major heartbreak. It will -- this particular situation could bring crime, rodents, abandonment, squatters, lights blaring all night, movements all type of hours. neighborhood needs to stay residential as it is. Му children, my significant other, we all frequent that park. We walk to my daughter's school, Friendship Chamberlain. It's a Tier I school in Capitol Hill Southeast but we walk to that school. We walk from our home through the park, through a beautiful park. We watch the people row and we

1

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

walk to and fro. I walk to the Metro to go to my good-paying job which is also in the District of Columbia.

I can't speak anymore about the rezoning. I apologize I don't have all of the word and jargon and diction that goes along with this type of hearing. I'm just here basically saying please rezone it. It makes 100 percent sense to rezone it to residential. We're happy to open our neighborhood to more residents and not a commercial property that's just an easy dollar, don't require any people, doesn't require any serious labor, material, just an extreme eyesore. Thank you.

MS. CASTEEL: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Ezra Casteel. I live at 1602 16th Street, SE, which is also in ANC 8A. And I just wanted to thank you for the opportunity to speak tonight on this important issue. I support this change form PDR-1 to RA-2 and urge you to approve this request.

This is a lot that I pass by almost every single day on my way to and from work and other places. And I do support this site being developed but with it being surrounded by residential and at the entrance of a national park. This truly does belong as a residential zoning site and any zoning should fit into the community.

When you look at the community that is around it, there is no other industrial uses. This isn't an area where

2.0

it would have that type of use there. Switching it to residential is what it truly should be. Housing is a critical need in the community. That's evident when you look at other areas in that particular neighborhood and across the city. But that's what we should be actually doing there and that's what I would support.

MS. WARD: Good evening, Chairman Hood and other Commission Members. My name is Bernita Ward. I live in the Fairlawn community. I'm here to ask that this lot be rezoned to residential. In talking with some of my neighbors, we came up with what our community is like and what it means to us, and I'd like to read something to you.

The Lot at 1401 22nd Street, SE is already a part of our residential community. The Lot is surrounded on the streets closest to it by homes, single-family town and apartments. Anacostia National Park is directly across the street from the Lot. All points north, southeast and west of the lot consist of residences. We live in our community just as others do in their communities. We walk or drive or bike in our communities and beyond and we come back home. We go to work. We go to school, to appointments as residents of other communities do. We come back to our community that we have helped to establish and maintained over time. We know what is best for us.

We have set goals and priorities for our community

2.0

which are city goals that tie us to other communities. Our goals and priorities are keep areas free of trash and debris, maintain existing properties, seek additional housing and counseling, become more healthful, improve our schools through participation, and seek job training and employment opportunities. We are very careful in our community moving about the streets, especially with allowing our children and seniors to walk unaccompanied.

The traffic that comes from Interstate 295 and Pennsylvania Avenue onto 22nd, Nicholson and Proudt Streets is heavy and fast and overbearing. We have had to handle this traffic almost on our own for years but we cannot allow any other traffic to come into our community. We cannot manage the extra traffic, the extra wear and tear on our streets, and the additional safety of our community.

Two years ago we said "no" to the storage facility. We have not changed our minds. We still say no.

Our community is a growing community. We have moved ahead.

A new state-of-the-art elementary school is opening in school year 2018-2019 just down the street from 1401 22nd Street. Along with some new innovative teachers and programs, our children will move forward in this changing community and city. Both Kramer Middle School and Anacostia High School have recently been renovated to the extent that any teen with approval of family would be excited to attend.

2.0

All of these schools are within walking distance of each other.

We are now tackling a new problem. We need housing for our young families and for seniors who live in our community. Many young families are living in single rooms in other people's homes. They need the space to grow. We also need housing for seniors with everything needed to run a household on one level.

change has begun to take place in our community regarding housing. It is a community that is in transition. Many of the residences that have been established for over 30 years have recently been sold. Some remodeled moderately and sold. Some being completely renovated showing us what the homes we now live in will look like in the future. To this growing community with new members coming each day, what might possibly be added are more homes designed for families, with children allowing this community to grow and prosper even more. you.

MS. RICHARDSON: Thank you. In view of the time allocated to this case, I'm going to ask the remaining witnesses if they will simply state their names, where they live and just to keep -- state one key point about why you're here in support of the rezoning if that's acceptable.

MR. PRESBURY: Do I have a choice? Do we --

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Actually, though, Ms. Richardson, they do have 60 minutes. If they need -- because I know people prepared testimony and when they come in, we don't want to shortchange them so if they can stay within the limit, we'll be fine if we go over 40. I know you all have 60 minutes. You only took 45. I want to be fair.

MS. RICHARDSON: Okay.

All right. I don't have --MR. PRESBURY: Okay. my name is Graylin Presbury. I'm the President of the Fairlawn Citizens Association. I live at 1331 Ridge Place, SE. My wife and I bought our house in 1986, and I involved with the Fairlawn Citizens Association 2001. And after about 10 years, I was approached about President of the Association, and I've been the President of the Association since.

In 2010, we did a report on the history of Fairlawn and in the report, we touched on some of the industrial areas within Fairlawn that date back to the World War II era. But our main focus was on the change during the 60's. That's when the most rapid change occurred as far as by race within the neighborhood. The report is called, "Fairlawn: from the Flats to the Heights." The Anacostia Park, as we know it today, was once known as Fairlawn Park, and it was once known as the Flats, which was an open almost swamp-like area until it was converted into a park shortly

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

after the turn of the century.

1

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

The Fairlawn Citizens Association supports rezoning the property at 1401 22nd Street from industrial purposes to a residential purpose. As has been said, that property is surrounded by residential area and it's located at the entrance to Anacostia Park.

We've campaigned to keep the park entrance clean from the bird poop that accumulates under the bridges of Nicholson Street that leads into the park. That park has seen growth in its use that is being compounded by the fact that recently, the parks at East Potomac -- is that East Potomac or West Potomac -- I forget -- the parks downtown near the Mall have become more restrictive in their use.

I've been volunteering at Anacostia for pretty much since we moved into the neighborhood, for 30 years and seen substantial change in the use of the park. the reasons why, when the 295 was renovated, the pedestrian crossway was kept. IT was actually refurbished. There's only three entrances to the park. There's Nicholson Street, Good Hope Road, Howard Road. Other than that, it's the pedestrian bridge

Having this Lot become an industrial purpose area would have a definite effect on the people of the community and on the use of that entrance to the park. I dare say that it's probably a safety concern, most definitely, particularly

considering increased vehicular traffic. I think I've said enough. Thank you.

MR. CURRY: Thank you, Ms. Richardson, Chairman Hood, Commissioners. My name is John Curry. My wife and I own 1341 Ridge Place, SE, neighbors of the Presbury family. We moved in two years ago and we've been thrilled to both occupy a house built in 1926, same year Ernest Hemingway wrote his first novel and enjoy the capital of the Riparian community around this national park. My wife celebrated her birthday roller skating at the park in the pavilion last year, and we are thrilled to tell our friends about the jewels that exist within Anacostia, bring them over to the east side of the river.

But it's not just the capital of the park and the capital of the beautiful homes that we now occupy on that road, but it's the human capital that we came to find out among the neighbors that exist, that live on the same road that we do, neighbors that have been there for decades. And it's been a wealth of knowledge to learn from them, to learn from what Anacostia was, what it is now, and what it could be in the future.

So I speak on behalf of my wife and myself in support of a rezoning to a residential area for the lot, the corner lot at 1401 22nd Street, SE. DC has tremendous promise. It always has had tremendous promise. Anacostia

2.0

1	has tremendous promise and the idea that you have to have a
2	competition between an investment in capabilities and capital
3	and bringing in business and bringing in an expansion of
4	industry in this area, there's value to that. I get that.
5	But on the other hand, particularly with the challenge of
6	affordable housing in the City, I ask that you would take a
7	step to protect the investment in human capital and the need
8	for humans, for new neighbors to be able to come in and have
9	property of their own, and build a new chapter of this of
10	the Anacostia neighborhood. Thank you.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: We may have some questions. I'm
12	going to pick on this group. Mr. Presbury's very modest.
13	Mr. Presbury doesn't know that we know we're in tune up
14	here, too we know that you're the President of the
15	Federation as well; am I correct? Or were the Federation?
16	MR. PRESBURY: I am the Presidnet
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. My hat's off to you. About
18	20 years ago, I was nominated and I turned it down, so my
19	hat's off to you.
20	(Laughter.)
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: And I tell you why. Seriously,
22	I turned that down because I was doing this. I had to learn
23	this. So when you talk about bringing different jargon, I
24	brought it so it's already here. I brought it here.
25	Let me just ask this question and this is not

1	necessarily germane. When I I was sitting here and I keep
2	thinking about Fairlawn and something stuck me. In the 80's,
3	do you all know what Fairlawn was since you all did the
4	history Mr. Presbury, I'm going to pick on you because
5	you're the President of
6	MR. POTTER: Okay.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: both Fairlawn and the
8	Federation of Civic Associations, and by the way, I can use
9	you down here a lot so you can explain to us how all that
10	works, because I kind of know being a president myself
11	former president for 20 years in Woodridge
12	MR. POTTER: Okay.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: but I won't put you on that
14	spot. But let me ask you what was Fairlawn known for in the
15	80's? Do you remember since you all did the history?
16	MR. PRESBURY: In the 80's?
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes. What was well, let me
18	back up. What was the President the President what
19	United States President came to Fairlawn in the 80's and
20	walked in the community?
21	MR. PRESBURY: Oh.
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: What was Fairlawn known for in the
23	80's?
24	MR. PRESBURY: In the
25	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'll write the next history

1	lesson. You all were known for the orange hats. You all
2	taught this ity
3	MR. PRESBURY: Oh, yes.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: you all taught this city how
5	to work orange hats. You know why?
6	MR. PRESBURY: That's right.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Because Eddie Johnson and James
8	Foreman taught me.
9	MR. PRESBURY: Yes.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So my hat's off and I don't
11	know if I have not heard from them in years
12	MR. PRESBURY: Yes.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: but if you see them around
14	MR. PRESBURY: They're still
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: just tell them I send my
16	regards.
17	MR. PRESBURY: Sure, Mr. Hood, I can do that.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I know that had nothing to do with
19	Zoning but I want you to know we do more than zoning.
20	MR. PRESBURY: Okay.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So and I walked that I
22	walked those streets over there many, many nights, okay. All
23	right. Any other questions up here? My colleagues probably
24	say he just goes off where he wants to. So you see what I
25	bought down here. So anything else?

	33
1	MR. PRESBURY: Yes.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Thank you, panel. We
3	appreciate it. And Mr. Presbury, thank you for letting me
4	pick on you.
5	MR. PRESBURY: Sure.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right.
7	MR. PRESBURY: Sure, no problem. Thank you.
8	MALE SPEAKER: Still have your orange hate?
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, I do. I still have my orange
10	hat. I need to get the dust off of it.
11	MS. RICHARDSON: If there are people who are here
12	in support of the rezoning who do not wish to testify,
13	perhaps the Chair could simply ask them to raise their hands
14	and you would get a sense of the support.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So I'm going to let you do that
16	Ms. Richardson.
17	MS. RICHARDSON: Okay. Raise your hand if you're
18	in support of this petition to rezone to residential. Show
19	them Ward 8 does come out to hearings. Is there anyone else
20	who wants to testify? If so, please come forward now.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: We've seen the hands and we got
22	the gist but we don't want to deny anybody the opportunity.
23	MS. RICHARDSON: Right, okay.
24	MS. RESPER: Good evening. My name is Susie
25	McFadden Resper. I live on Young Street, which is only a

couple of blocks from the site that's in question here. And I would just like to say that I've been living there for a couple of decades now, and it's really a great place to live. We've had our ups and our downs but overall, I've had a great time there because I felt safe. There were times when I didn't feel so safe but mostly, when my child was growing up, we could send our children to the park in groups, 9-10-years-old. No one felt fear of something happening to them because we were so close to the park and we had no big, you know, buildings blocking anything. You know, the view from houses and apartments and all that makes you feel safe when you have children in the community and they can move around freely without you being fearful of letting them go.

So I'm here to support the rezoning because I think that the community should remain residential. And entrance to the park is real important. It's important for everyone there, children, adults. I now have a grandson and, you know, my husband can walk him to the park. My sister can walk him to the park. I don't do a lot of walking but if I wanted to get on my scooter and go to the park, I would feel safe doing it, and that is very important to me. And I know that it is important to most people in the community to be able to move around freely without any fear of, you know, being hurt or harmed. And that's very important, you know, for us and that's all I want to say.

2.0

When you make your decision, keep that in mind that people in the community benefit from the community remaining residential.

MS. RICHARDSON: Thank you.

Good evening, Commissioners. MR. BROWN: is Terry Brown. I am a native Washingtonian. Actually, my family's been in DC for over five generations, makes -- my kids are six generation Washingtonians. I am a recent I moved -- my wife and I moved in with Fairlawn neighbor. our two children approximately three years ago, and we cycle, walk, run through -- to the park which traverses directly past the lot. And my son, who is now 10, well, he rides his bike and traffic, current traffic is a problem and this lot, with development that type of development would potentially bring harm to my family as well as, I'm sure, many other families and the children who go to the nearby school.

So I come -- I'm a bit, actually, upset because many -- the City has rezoned -- the whole City's been rezoned and how this particular lot was missed is a travesty, because it is a residential neighborhood. How this zoning remained, I don't know. It's a mistake. God forbid, some kid is injured or killed as they try to get to the park. We have enough profit over people and I urge you to change the zoning for this lot. It will be a mistake to leave it as it is.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

If one child or adult, whoever's injured, that could be -that's a problem. And so I am in support of the downzoning
to RA-2. I have had many lots and properties that I own
downzoned. It's just what it is. Why this one was missed,
I don't know.

And so I -- please, change this for my family and the many other families in this community. And I did not speak -- plan to speak today but I felt compelled to come before you. So I ask you to rezone this Lot to RA-2. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ACKER: Good afternoon, My name is Commissioner Acker and my SMD is Commissioners. 8A03, which is the Good Hope Road area. However, I am a community organizer at Bread for the City and I advocate for the homeless here in the City. And one thing that hasn't been brought uр is the fact that we have been becoming more popular in population that has Anacostia park area. And I also know that storage facilities like this are often used as homes for homeless people.

Τ would like to say that Ι support rezonina, because I don't want to see that population continue to grow and the kids decide to make those shelter their home also, which I know is actually going on. quite a few being at Bread for the City and working as an advocate and known quite a few families that have made

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

like this their homes because of the homeless 1 shelters 2 population here in the City. 3 So I just wanted to say that, that I support it because of that reason and I'd like for you to take that into 5 consideration. Thank you. 6 Thank you. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let's see if any 7 questions. Any questions of this panel? Okay. Ms. Richardson, I turn it over. 8 Thank you. 9 MS. RICHARDSON: That concludes our We did cover a few more --10 oral testimony. 11 CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'm sorry. We have a question. COMMISSIONER MAY: 12 Not for the panel but for Ms. Richardson. 13 14 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I'm sorry. 15 COMMISSIONER MAY: I just have one question which is I mean is we understand it from what we've received in 16 various Exhibits, the permit to construct something that's 17 consistent with the PD-R uses has already been granted? And 18 is that -- I mean does everybody understand that this is --19 that there's a good chance that even if this is rezoned, it 2.0 21 won't affect what has already been permitted? 22 MS. RICHARDSON: That has certainly been like 23 stated many times, yes. There's been -- that is certainly 24 the understanding of the ANC. The ANC has certainly taken 25 many steps to, you know, communicate the reality of the

1	situation. This the ANC has also participated in other
2	processes involving this particular site, such as appearing
3	before DDOT on public space, etcetera. So I think that
4	everybody's on the same page but, you know, tonight the issue
5	is rezoning so that's what we're here to address.
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. That's great. That's
7	all I wanted to know
8	MS. RICHARDSON: Okay.
9	COMMISSIONER MAY: want to understand that.
10	MS. RICHARDSON: So I'm just going to say that if
11	there are any issues raised by the other side, then we would
12	like to have the opportunity to do a brief rebuttal, issues
13	that we have not addressed here.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: This is a rulemaking and our
15	process does not allow for rebuttal.
16	MS. RICHARDSON: Thank you very much.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. We get it. This is about
18	policy. I think your panels, with the exception of maybe one
19	or two, but for the majority of all the testimony, 98 percent
20	of it was on point
21	MS. RICHARDSON: Right.
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: okay, as far as what we're here
23	for tonight. I think it's very important, though, and I
24	said this at set down because we get blamed, we our
25	shoulders are broad but we get blamed for a lot of things and

apparently, there have been permits or whatever, whatever's been already issued has been issued under the whatever the zoning was.

MS. RICHARDSON: Yes.

2.0

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Depending upon which way we go -- and I'm saying this for the public, not you Ms. Richardson because I know you know -- it's -- but I think that's a very important point that Commissioner May mentioned, because I, too, have went through a rezoning and something else took place years ago. And not understanding everything, I've learned that they operated under the existing zoning and we wanted to do a rezoning. And when we did do that, when we did change it, it was after the fact.

MS. RICHARDSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: So I just want to make sure everybody's -- because -- well, they'll say, oh, that Zoning Commission doesn't ever listen. No, that's not true. That's not true but there are some circumstances, as Ms. Richardson already knows and has probably already articulated, some other avenues that are already being worked on but depending upon what action this Commission takes, whatever's already out there is out there. But anything after that will have to come up under what this Commission does depending upon which way this Commission goes.

MS. RICHARDSON: Yes. And when I --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

MS. RICHARDSON: -- spoke of rebuttals, yes, I know that that's not the right word and I really meant if there are any policy issues that are raised, but I guess we'll just let it go. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right. Any other questions? All right. You have a question?

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Richardson, hold on, we have some questions.

You may have -- I think you VICE CHAIR MILLER: did touch on this in your opening remark and some of the Maybe this can get to what you wanted others did as well. So this is a zoning map to try to do in terms of rebuttal. consistent to case as we -- as I see it and as, I think, others see it, the Comp Plan calls for moderate density residential and PD-R is not consistent with that. The RA-2would be. But there are other comprehensive plan policies that call for preserving a limited amount of industrial that's in the City with appropriate buffers. Maybe you could address why the -- why certain Comp Plan policies, including obviously the land use map policy, take priority over some of the industrial preservation policies since we have such a limited supply of industrial land.

MS. RICHARDSON: Yes. That actually is what I had

in mind. This is a case of Comp Plan interpretation where the land use is the primary element and it has greater weight. And then the other elements, the area elements and then small area plans are interpreted in light of the land use element.

Now in this case, what we have here is a very clear directive in the land use element for, let me see, for giving up the industrial uses where they are no Give me one second, please. appropriate. Let's see. it's land use policy 3.1.4, wanted to question -- yes, rezoning of industrial areas provides allow the rezoning of industrial land for non-industrial purposes only when the industrial longer viably support PDR activities or is located in proximity to housing and is -or cannot be buffered with other -- adequately with adjacent Examples include land in the immediate existing uses. vicinity of Metro rail stations, sites with an historic districts, and, quote, small size in the midst of stable residential neighborhoods." In the event such rezoning results in the displacement of active uses, then assist those uses in relocating to designated PDR areas. That's a land use element that spins off perfectly into the decision to designate this particular Lot as moderate density residential on the land use map.

And, of course, there was no active PDR use when

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

this was written. The PDR use had ceased. So the Comp Plan, despite recognizing the need to maintain some industrial land, did feel that once, you know, in some areas, when it's gone, it's gone. You can't bring it back.

And as you recall, the industrial area study which took place over two years -- mid-2000's, and that was used in doing the last round of Comp Plan amendments or the one before that. And the land use element says -- or hey, we took that study into account and we did -- and we took some policies from it and so that study's been subsumed in the plan as we have it today.

And if you look at page 153 of that study, there's a chart there that kind of takes a look at -- that's on page 10 of my testimony -- takes a look at all of the different industrial areas next recommendations. And as to the CSX2 Anacostia-Fairlawn area, it says, "Suitable for continued PDR use, no." So I think that's -- this is not supposed to be used for industrial use.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you very much.

MS. RICHARDSON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Richardson. Thank you for the way you assembled your panels. We appreciate it. Oh, Ms. Muhammad's work. Well, Ms. Muhammad, I definitely want to give credit where credit is due. Well, both of you, thank you.

2.0

(Off mic comments.)

2.0

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Well, I'm going to give it to both of you, to everybody. All right. Ms. Schellin, do we have the -- oh, let's go to the Office of Planning. I'm sorry.

MS. STEINGASSER: Chairman Hood, Commissioners, the Office of Planning stands in support of this petition and recommends the site be rezoned from the PDR-1 to the RA-2.

I want to build a little bit on the arguments and Comp Plan foundation that's just been laid. The future land use map identifies the site as moderate density residential. As part of this case, we went back and we looked at every amended land use map back to 1985 when the original home rule first comprehensive plan was adopted, and it always has shown the site as moderate density residential. So it should have been zoned by now but it's not and it's clear that there was no intention for this to maintain its industrial use.

There is the industrial plan that -- industrial study that has been referenced and you'll hear more about later. There was many opportunities if the sense from the council or the Office of Planning or the neighborhoods were that this site should be responsive to that plan in a way that it should maintain an industrial ;use, there were multiple times where the map could have been changed and that never happened. So we believe it is strongly intended to be

a moderate density residential.

1

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

I also want to just add into the record a little bit more than we usually do in a case like this, but the importance of the future land use map and its categories is set out in the framework element of the Comprehensive Plan. That's Chapter 2. And it very clearly states purpose of the land use map and says a future land use map is part of the adopted comprehensive plan and carries the same legal weight as the plan document itself. That means the map and the policies are on even footing. The map uses color-coded categories to express public policy and the preparation of the amp is explicitly required by DC law. Its purpose is to, "represent the land use policies set forth in the proposed land use element."

This map has always shown this site as being moderate density residential. Interpreting it in terms through the lens of what's identified as the purpose of the land use map, it's reinforced that it should be moderate density residential.

Ms. Richards just referred to the land use policies in the land use element, which is Chapter 3 of the comprehensive plan and there is land use policy 3.1.3, which talks about the location of PDR areas. And it gives some general advice about areas that are well-buffered from residential uses and other sensitive uses such as schools,

easily accessed from major roads, characters and such areas are generally designated as PDR on the future land use map. This site is not designated for PDR on the map.

Then it gives the conditions of when such zoning should be changed, and Ms. Richards just read that section where it specifically calls out small sites in the midst of stable residential neighborhoods. I think the testimony you've heard tonight reinforces that this is a stable residential area.

So I also wanted just to kind of go through a summary of the logic. The site is currently unimproved. What had been on the site has been demolished. It's zoned it's designated residential. is the site So considered industrial land as referred to through the Comprehensive Plan by mere virtue of the zoning? And I think I think when you look at the balancing of these other factors, the other reason I think it is not the Office of Planning's position is that zoning shall not be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan and that's the DC charter. was -- the Home Rule Act passed by Congress changed it from consist to not inconsistent and makes it very clear. So, therefore, the zoning that's on the site must be changed. It's in conflict with the land use map. It's in conflict with the policies of the Comprehensive Plan and it must be changed.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

1 And with that, Ι stand available for any 2 questions. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, 3 Ms. Steingasser. 4 Commissioners, any questions or comments? Commissioner May. 5 COMMISSIONER MAY: So I had one. Looking at the map, the broader zoning map, what's zoned PDR goes beyond 6 7 this particular property and it includes some area that is clearly not developed as PDR. Some of that's -- I think most of the actual land that remains as PDR is the railroad right-10 of-way, right, that space. So I'm wondering why we are not 11 taking care of all of that at once and eliminating all of the PDR use? 12 MS. STEINGASSER: We will be doing a comprehensive 13 review of that as part of the land use element in the future 15 land use map amendments that are going forward now through the Comprehensive Plan amendment cycle. 16 17 COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. 18 MS. STEINGASSER: So it is being reviewed. This one got pulled out because the ANC petitioned to have that 19 2.0 rezoned. 21 COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. So that's something that we got straightened out at a later point, okay. 22 Thank you. 23 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other questions, comments? 24 now Ι have a list of opponents to the map 25 amendment. So I'm going to call John Curry, Alex Hurst,

1	Robert Cerrone, and if I mispronounce your name, just come
2	forward anyway; if it sounds like your name, come forward,
3	Mr. Andres, Meredith Moldenhauer, Phinis Jones, Stephen
4	Varga, Eric DeBear oh, wait a minute, how many people
5	am I going to how many do I have; do I have enough there?
6	Now it looks like most people are from Palatine;
7	is that how you pronounce that? So everyone, one person will
8	have five minutes and everybody else will have three. Is
9	that right, Ms. Schellin?
10	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. So who's taking the five
11	minutes?
12	MS. MOLDENHAUER: Mr. Hurst will take the five
13	minutes.
10	
14	MS. SCHELLIN: Mr. who?
14	MS. SCHELLIN: Mr. who?
14 15	MS. SCHELLIN: Mr. who?  MS. MOLDENHAUER: Hurst.
14 15 16	MS. SCHELLIN: Mr. who?  MS. MOLDENHAUER: Hurst.  MS. SCHELLIN: Hurst, okay.
14 15 16 17	MS. SCHELLIN: Mr. who?  MS. MOLDENHAUER: Hurst.  MS. SCHELLIN: Hurst, okay.  CHAIRMAN HOOD: So it looks like you lined up a
14 15 16 17 18	MS. SCHELLIN: Mr. who?  MS. MOLDENHAUER: Hurst.  MS. SCHELLIN: Hurst, okay.  CHAIRMAN HOOD: So it looks like you lined up a panel, okay. I mean, you know, I can look right here and see
14 15 16 17 18	MS. SCHELLIN: Mr. who?  MS. MOLDENHAUER: Hurst.  MS. SCHELLIN: Hurst, okay.  CHAIRMAN HOOD: So it looks like you lined up a panel, okay. I mean, you know, I can look right here and see them. We have one chair left? Somebody's missing, somebody
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS. SCHELLIN: Mr. who?  MS. MOLDENHAUER: Hurst.  MS. SCHELLIN: Hurst, okay.  CHAIRMAN HOOD: So it looks like you lined up a panel, okay. I mean, you know, I can look right here and see them. We have one chair left? Somebody's missing, somebody from the panel didn't show up. Sas
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. SCHELLIN: Mr. who?  MS. MOLDENHAUER: Hurst.  MS. SCHELLIN: Hurst, okay.  CHAIRMAN HOOD: So it looks like you lined up a panel, okay. I mean, you know, I can look right here and see them. We have one chair left? Somebody's missing, somebody from the panel didn't show up. Sas  MS. SCHELLIN: We called eight names but not
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS. SCHELLIN: Mr. who?  MS. MOLDENHAUER: Hurst.  MS. SCHELLIN: Hurst, okay.  CHAIRMAN HOOD: So it looks like you lined up a panel, okay. I mean, you know, I can look right here and see them. We have one chair left? Somebody's missing, somebody from the panel didn't show up. Sas  MS. SCHELLIN: We called eight names but not  CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Sas
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. SCHELLIN: Mr. who?  MS. MOLDENHAUER: Hurst.  MS. SCHELLIN: Hurst, okay.  CHAIRMAN HOOD: So it looks like you lined up a panel, okay. I mean, you know, I can look right here and see them. We have one chair left? Somebody's missing, somebody from the panel didn't show up. Sas  MS. SCHELLIN: We called eight names but not  CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Sas  MS. SCHELLIN: everybody showed up.

1	is
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Sas Gharai. Thank you. Is Mr.
3	Gharai
4	MS. MOLDENHAUER: I believe he's here if he needs
5	to testify.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Are you testifying?
7	MR. ANDRES: I'm representing.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. He wasn't going to. Okay.
9	It's on you. I mean there's a seat over there but if you're
10	not going to, we're not going to twist your arm and make you
11	come up. So I guess you're here with the opponents. Okay.
12	We'll start with MR. Hurst because he has the five
13	minutes. Let me Mr. Andres, are you with Palatine as
14	well?
15	MR. ANDRES: I'm representing Palatine.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So everybody will only Mr.
17	Hurst will have five minutes. Everybody else will have
18	three. Okay. Now I see now we have Mr okay. All
19	right.
20	MS. MOLDENHAUER: We would ask the Board's or
21	the Zoning Commission's indulgence to also provide Mr. Varga
22	five minutes as an expert in land use and zoning.
23	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Moldenhauer, we're going to
24	provide him the same time that we do everybody else.

MS. MOLDENHAUER: And we would ask the Board --

1	Zoning Commission's indulgence to allow him five minutes in
2	order to provide some additional issues.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'm going to
4	(Off mic comments.)
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Right. It's not a party case so
6	I'm going to deny that request and I'm going to he's going
7	to have three minutes like everyone else. That's the rule.
8	MS. MOLDENHAUER: So noted.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
10	MR. ANDRES: Chairman Hood, can I cede my time,
11	a minute to Mr. Varga?
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Is this one where I read no time
13	shall be ceded? Mr. Andres, you were here. You've been
14	I we say that all the time. Anyway, let's and I'm sure
15	everybody else is going to follow suit so let's go ahead.
16	Let's make sure we follow the rules. I can't do the rules
17	one way one week and then do them another way the next week.
18	I have to try to be consistent. If not, I'll be back down
19	here like we were before trying to straighten up something
20	the courts had me do us do. So Mr. Hurst, you have five
21	minutes. You may begin.
22	MR. HURST: Thank you.
23	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Turn your mike on.
24	MR. HURST: Thank you. My name is Alex Hurst.
25	I am the founder and managing partner of Palatine Capital
ļ	

Partners Management. We own 1401 22nd Street, SE, which is the subject of this proposed zoning map amendment. I'm here tonight on behalf of Palatine to tell the Commission that we, as owners, strongly oppose this proposed map amendment.

Palatine was founded in 2007 as a real estate investment firm. Since our founding, we've invested and developed a number of real estate projects throughout the country. We have worked in a variety of development settings whether it's new construction or capital improvement projects.

I want to provide some background and my company's plans for the property including an explanation as to the benefits a self-storage facility would have for the community and the negative impact the proposed downzoning could have on Palatine and its investors. You will hear more on the inconsistency of this proposed map amendment with the Comprehensive Plan and other land use policies from our attorney, Meredith Moldenhauer, as well as our expert in land use and planning, Stephen Varga.

In 2007, Palatine purchased the property with approved building permits to construct a self-storage facility. The property is in an ideal location for a self-storage facility. The property is not only vacant but it is zoned PDR-1, which permits a self-storage facility as a buy right use. As you may know, there is an extremely limited supply of vacant industrial land in the District of Columbia

2.0

so the property presents an excellent opportunity for a planned self-storage facility. Based on our research, there are no self-storage facilities currently operating in Ward 8.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Please stop the clock. Mr. Hurst, were you here when I made my opening statement?

MR. HURST: Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN HOOD: When I said we weren't going to talk about a project, were you here?

MR. HURST: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Ms. Moldenhauer, I don't I'm talking to him now. So we're not talking need you. about a project so if you can leave out self-storage, no storage, whatever storage. Let's talk about the amendment. Let's talk about what's being proposed to rezone. We're not talking about a project. I have -- we have nothing to do with the project.

MR. HURST: Self-storage is a PDR use. IT's an allowable use in the PDR zone. The Zoning Commission should not evaluate this map amendment in a vacuum. The PDR use that we will build is low impact. The individuals who have testified are asking for housing now. Unfortunately, a downzoning will not accomplish that request. As a result of this proposed downzoning, the self-storage facility will immediately become a non-conforming use at the property as

a self-storage facility is not a buy right use in an RA-2 zone.

The Comprehensive Plan advocates for economic development and growth. A map amendment would not be consistent with the Comp Plan policy because it will create a non-conforming use. The most important impact to us is that we will not be able to rebuilt the self-storage facility in the event that more than 50 percent of the structure is destroyed in a casualty event such as a fire or an act of God. Also, we will be unable to substantially alter or expand the proposed storage because non-conforming uses cannot be extended in gross floor area or use intensity. The limitations create both short-term and long-term financial harm to my company and our investors, which would have larger impacts to others looking to invest in Washington, DC.

Looking at this PDR -- this -- looking at the PDR this -- looking at this PDR property, it is ideal and a viable PDR use. It is located next to the 295 highway and in close proximity to freeways and major intersection access. Based on my professional experience, this site is and will continue to be viable for low impact industrial use such as our self-storage facility. Palatine will face --

Finally, I would like to talk about our community outreach. Since we found out about this case in January, we have attempted to engage with the community to begin a

2.0

self-storage dialoque about our planned facility. Unfortunately, ANC 8A would not honor our request to formally discuss the project at their March 6th hearing -- meeting -apologize -- meeting. Nonetheless, we attended community meeting on March 13th to discuss the project. The issues and concerns raised by community members during that meeting generally concerned traffic and pedestrian safety. We asked if we could offer any community benefits that could address those concerns but the community members responded that they wanted a residential building. We believe we've addressed the concerns in our filing and in our testimony.

We also have numerous letters of support for our self-storage facility. We look forward to working with the community throughout the course of this project and remain open to continued discussion.

I would also like to add that we are open to a conversation around eliminating industrial uses to the extent that we could rebuild the self-storage facility in the event of a casualty event. Thank you for your consideration.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Who's going next. Three minutes.

MR. CERRONE: Good evening. My name's Robert Cerrone. I'm a member of Palatine's investment team with specific focus and sort of seeing -- evaluating executing self-storage facilities. I'm here to talk about both the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

benefits of a self-storage facility as well as the low impact a self-storage facility has on a surrounding community.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: You all just want to make my -this -- I don't understand it. You know, the -- you know
what, if you're going to talk about it, so go right ahead.
You all have three minutes.

MS. MOLDENHAUER: There is evidence in the record that their use, this use --

Ms. Moldenhauer, I'm talking to CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'm not -- this is a rulemaking. the next person. This is not a contested case. This is run totally different. not going to let you come there -- nobody come there and make this a contested case. It's not. You can make it hard on vourself. So go ahead. If you want to talk about a selfstorage, no storage, whatever, go right ahead because I can quarantee you we're going to stick with -- we're going to stick with the issue. You need a minute to regroup and take self-storage out of your conversation, I'll give you that. So let's take three minutes and take self-storage out of your conversation. I'm going to take all my stuff out of self-Take it out of your conversation, please. Thank storage. You have three minutes.

Let me just say this. We don't have any demonstrations in the -- were you all here also -- see, I'm a fair guy. Were you all here earlier. We weren't clapping

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

and --- okay, Commissioner Muhammad. All right. Thank you. We're going to take three minutes.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter at 8:06 p.m. and resumed at 8:13 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. We're ready to get started. I have consulted and I thought about it. If you -- we're not talking about a project, as I stated, and I know you all reworded -- but if you mention it, you know, I just think that -- and I've done this before -- I just think that it's advisable to make sure that you commence this Commission why this rezoning shouldn't be, about the rezoning. So let's -- it's some tickle. This is a map amendment. It's not anything else so anyway, who's next? You may begin.

MR. CERRONE: Again, my name is Robert Cerrone. The low impact PDR use that we are proposing for this, again, is within the current zoning. We -- in my experience -- I've 20 years experience with this type of project and I can speak to the amount of traffic and the amount of activity that goes on in one of these facilities, and I can compare it to low impact residential use, and there will be virtually no rush hour type traffic created when this -- much of the activity happens on off hours. The facilities are typically limited hours so there's nobody permitted on the site after access hours, which normally end at 7:00 p.m. So that limits the amount of activity.

2.0

Generally, in this particular asset class, we see an average of one to four people on site at any given time. This is going to be much less than if there's a 50-unit low density residential use on this facility. We will have employment on the facility with skilled workers without advanced degrees, so we will be providing some employment opportunities for them. In addition to that, we -- there is a service that is available to the community and it's frequented heavily, in my experience, in the community.

MR. ANDRES: Good evening, Chairman Hood, Members of the Commission. Erwin Andres with Gorove/Slade Associates. My statement is geared to respond to certain statements that have been made and some assertions that have been made in certain filings related to this proposed rezoning.

As a matter of background, the site is actually well-served by local and regional access. They're near major arterials, both Pennsylvania Avenue and Minnesota Avenue are both two to three blocks away. Relative to the proposed rezoning, DDOT had issued a letter February 2, 2018 that I'm going to reference that identified the ability to, with the rezoning, create a certain number of apartments. We've looked at that and believe that we can actually, with the new rezoning, can fit about 50 apartments of about 800 square feet, which are consistent with the market. So in that, with

2.0

an -- with these 50 apartments, these 50 apartments during the weekend, evening, peak hour would generate less than a low impact PDR use that would be viable for the site. So -- and the reason for it is because, as -- excuse me - -would generate more traffic than the -- than low impact PDR viable use for the site. And the reason for that, as Mr. Cerrone had mentioned, is because of the fact that for certain PDR uses, there are opportunities for those to take place sporadically and spread out during off peak hours.

Now there have also been certain comments made about the incompatibility with certain PDR in sues residential zones. To put this in context, at 1701 Florida Avenue as well as 14th and U, there is a PDR use that has been maximized on those sites that are in heavily pedestrianfriendly areas, that are in heavily bike and transit-friendly And they co-exist with the nearby residential sues relatively well. So the fact that it's a PDR use, there are some PDR uses that may demand larger vehicles but there are some lower scale, lower impact PDR uses that are actually relatively compatible with those neighboring residential neighborhoods which I've just cited.

So with that I'm available for questions. Thank you.

MR. VARGA: Good evening Chairman Hood and Members of the Commission. My name is Stephen Varga, Director of

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

Planning Services at Cozen O'Connor. ANC 8A filed this map amendment proposing to downzone the property from the PDR-1 The proposed map zone to the RA-2 zone. amendment inconsistent with several planning objectives in the Comprehensive Plan as well as a number of adopted public land As such, we request that the Commission deny use policies. the map amendment.

The property is located in the Anacostia CSX2 Fairlawn area and is zoned PDR-1. The PDR-1 zone permits self-storage uses as a matter of right. The PDR zone is located next to four separate spans of highway promoting the PR use at the property. The map amendment is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan and other policies. subtitle X500.3, a map amendment can only be approved if it is demonstrated that the amendment is not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan and with other adopted public policies active programs related to the subject site. The overwhelming policy initiative of the Comprehensive Plan is for the preservation of industrially-zoned land.

The land use element contains a number of citations that call for the preservation of industrial land and as I summarize these, I should remind the Commission that because the land use element integrates the policies and objectives of all the other District elements and should be given greater weight than the other elements as competing

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

policies in different elements are balanced as stated in Section 300.3.

and First foremost, policy land 3.11 recognizes the importance of industrial land to the economy of the District of Columbia, specifically its ability to support public work functions and calls for ensuring that land use decisions protect viable PDR land uses. According to the industrial land use study conducted in 2005, only five percent of the District is industrially-zoned land. When you take out railroad tracks, public rights-of-way, etcetera, the number drops to only 1.2 percent. This suggests that the PDR zoned land is industrial land regardless if it's vacant or Also, policy land use 3.12 encourages exactly what the property owner seeks to do, redevelop outmoded and nonproductive industrial sites with higher value production that support core sectors of the District economy.

Finally, highlight Ι wanted to two studies commissioned by the District that likewise discourage the rezoning of industrial land. The previously cited industrial land use study prepared for the Office of Planning include the key finding that once industrial land is developed for non-industrial use, the return of industrial use to redeveloped property is extremely unlikely. Each development decision made in DC carries with it an opportunity cost, the foreclosure of other development options for PDR uses

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

In closing, in my professional opinion, the request is inconsistent with the Comp Plan and several planning objectives. As noted, competing elements must be weighted against each other and the preponderance of support falls on the side of the current designation. Particularly, the recommendation that comes from the land use element which should be given more weight Simply put unbalanced -- the support to justify the downzoning is lacking. Once the industrial land is gone, it's going forever. Thank you.

MR. GHARAI: Hello, Chairman Hood, hello, Commissioners. My name is Sasan Gharai. I'm the architect on the project and I just want to point out a few things, that first of all, the project is correctly buffered in terms of zoning uses.

The other thing I want to point out is that in terms of the neighborhood of plucking out this one PDR-1 use, the use that's proposed for the site is -- the specific use is compatible with residential use. It's not -- I mean, for example, it's -- you know, as a PDR-1 use, it's not -- we're not making anything there. It's not like a slaughterhouse or anything like that. It's a self-storage, which for the most part, will be used by residential -- other home owners who store their stuff there. It's not going to be a commercial use per se and that's it for me.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Jones, I think you're the only

2.0

one who hasn't spoken.

MR. JONES: And Ms. Moldenhauer.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, Ms. Moldenhauer. Okay.

4 | Thanks.

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Good evening, Commissioners. MS. MOLDENHAUER: My name is Meredith Moldenhauer from the law firm of Cozen O'Connor. I'm here representing Palatine Capital Partners Management. Palatine has identified this evening they're the You've heard a plea to turn this lot into property owner. a residential use. The ANC testified directly asking for more housing. A map amendment, unfortunately, given the certain facts of this property and the existing vested All that it will do is create a permit, will not do that. non-conforming structure as of the date of this -- of a potential decision.

As the Zoning Commission is aware, the creation of non-conforming structures is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan. In addition to that, the Comprehensive Plan, as identified by the Office of Planning, only allows for -- under LU3.1.4, only allows for industrial land to be rezoned, quote, "only when the land is no longer viable." What I believe you've heard this evening from Palatine's property owner as well as another representative, Mr. Crozen (phonetic), from the property that this property viable for industrial use. It was acquired under the intention of doing

that. It is located in a viable location near a highway, and it has been used as commercial since 1919 when the base map showed that it was improved with an ironworks facility, and it was at that time surrounded by a residential property.

In 1958, when the zoning regulations and map were enacted, the property at that time was then again zoned commercial CM-1 and was also buffered and abutting a residential community.

The question that the Zoning Commission need ask themselves is why now, and is this appropriate as indicated by Mr. Varga, and is this consistent with all of the elements of the Comprehensive Plan. The -- obviously, the ANC's identified the future land use map as well as the Office of Planning. That is one of the very broad elements of the Comp Plan. We have pointed out in our filing as well as this evening numerous other sections, both in the elements and the policy map requirements, that would encourage preservation of industrial use.

And as I indicated, there -- sorry -- the Comprehensive Plan also indicates economic development goals that support, quote, "strengthening of the District's economy by attracting new and diverse industries as well as creating new jobs." We've also -- we have heard that this project or that a potential low impact PDR use would create jobs as opposed to a residential use. There is testimony in the

2.0

record and information in the record from DDOT, which is Exhibit 20, page 2, which references and compares a storage facility to a potential residentially downzoned property. And we've heard testimony from Mr. Erwin Andres that the change in and downzoning would have a larger negative impact to the neighborhood community from a traffic perspective than maintaining a low zone -- low density PDR use.

As the property owner, Mr. Palatine, testified through Hurst, the property owner would be open to the Zoning Commission considering a potential downzoning if there was an opportunity for a tax amendment that would be connected with that to allow for and maintain the commercial low density impact use of a self-storage facility to not create an adverse impact on the property owner or future development and to be consistent then with maintaining industrial uses. Thank you. We'll be available for questions.

MR. JONES: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, my name is Phinis Jones. I live in Ward 8 near the site. I have lived in Ward 8 for 40 years and I've lived at my current address, 1845 Woodmont Place, which is at 20th and Good Hope Road, for the last 8. I co-developed at that site the first single-family garaged homes in Ward 8.

It would send a chilling effect, I believe, for all developers in Ward 8 if, in fact, you could hire an architect, you could pull a permit, you could get the permit,

2.0

you start work -- and I think Commissioner May asked the consultant for the **ANC** the central question, understand that it's under construction" -- I think it would send a chilling effect across the city if, in fact, the Zoning Commission is going to downzone property after developers go through the process, pull a permit and start work, start construction. And that's the problem that I'm having with this.

And I want to emphasize citywide, it would be -send a chilling effect. I am also absolutely surprised at
the Office of Planning asking you to do something that would
have a building, a non-conforming building on the site since
construction has begun.

I was before you last month when you rotated to the BZA, Chairman Hood, on a non-conforming building in ANC 8A. The ANC opposed it because we were asking for a variance. I don't know how one agency of the government comes in and asks you to do something that creates a non-conforming building. That seems to be inconsistent and I don't believe that is the purpose.

The other thing I will say, that because the construction is underway, I worked -- started working with the developer. I attended -- let me back up and say I attended the meeting, the community meeting on the 13th of March when the question was asked of the community, "Is there

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

1	anything that we can do," and the answer was, "No, we just
2	don't want this constructed on the site." I then thought I
3	had an obligation to reach out to the developer and put
4	together a community benefit package, and I've done that.
5	Thank you.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let me just say that Mr.
7	Jones is the one colleagues mentioned as putting community
8	benefits packages where they don't belong, like the variances
9	in the BZA cases. He alluded to the BZA case and I told him
10	then that was unheard of and I'm going to say it again. It's
11	unheard of in these situations. So anyway, that's
12	MR. JONES: Chairman Hood
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Sure.
14	MR. JONES: our community has great needs and
15	when there is an opportunity because I've lived there
16	really lean times when I moved to Ward 8 40 year ago. I know
17	what those challenges are, particularly around our children
18	and the school and that's what I did.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Jones, was your project
20	approved?
21	MR. JONES: Yes.
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right. Let me just ask
23	Mr. Varga. Mr. Varga, when the Zoning Commission is faced
24	with a Comprehensive Plan consisting of a map amendment, what
25	do we what is our charge to do?

MR. VARGA: Commissioner Hood, my understanding is that the Commission is asked to weigh all of the elements of the Comprehensive Plan, which include, obviously, the future land use map but also the text as well, as Ms. Steingasser noted. We would note that there are several different areas in the Comprehensive Plan that speak to the preservation of industrial land and industrially-zoned land as well, specifically. And those elements, in the land use part, are given greater weight than other parts of the Comprehensive Plan, as noted in 300.3 I believe.

So when you look at the land use element citations that are given by the petitioner, they don't stack up with the ones that are -- that support industrially-zoned land. As Meredith Moldenhauer said, the one sole land use citation that the petitioner offers up is 3.1.4 which, again, allow rezoning of industrial land only when the land can no longer viably support industrial uses or cannot co-exist.

So here we have a situation where a building permit has been obtained for an industrially-zoned use that's permitted as a matter of right. And so for those reasons, the citations for the land use portion that speak against the petition outweigh those that support it. So for those reasons, I would say that it should be denied.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Are you aware that this is not the first rezoning this Commission has had that exactly put us

2.0

1	in this I guess you would be
2	MR. VARGA: Correct. Oh, I
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: being the Office of Planning
4	and Office of Zoning and now
5	MR. VARGA: Absolutely.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: where you are. Okay.
7	MR. VARGA: I'm well aware of situations where
8	there
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: It's nothing new to decide.
10	MR. VARGA: are competing elements. Oh, yes,
11	of course of course.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. I just wanted to make
13	sure because it's acting like, oh, wait a minute, hold it
14	here.
15	MR. VARGA: No. It's I
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Because it's not
17	MR. VARGA: no, I just no, I didn't mean to
18	intend that you weren't aware of that.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
20	MR. VARGA: Yes.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right.
22	MR. VARGA: But it is a viable site and that's the
23	only thing we wanted to emphasize in our testimony.
24	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So this is not like this has not
25	been done before, you know, so I just want to make sure we

1	are, you know, mixing putting apples and apples.
2	MR. VARGA: Absolutely.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Any other questions up
4	here? Commissioner May.
5	COMMISSIONER MAY: I was just curious, you were
6	the first one that said that it's actually under
7	construction. So what's happening on the site right now?
8	MS. MOLDENHAUER: I think the property owner can
9	probably answer that best.
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay.
11	MR. HURST: We've started dewatering the site and
12	are we consider that to be construction. We intend to
13	start breaking ground and beginning to dig the subgrade
14	structure.
15	COMMISSIONER MAY: When?
16	MR. HURST: Weeks away.
17	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Any other questions or
19	comments up here?
20	(No response.)
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. I want to thank this
22	panel, greatly appreciate it. Do we have anyone else? Do
23	we have anything else? Do we have anyone else who would like
24	to testify in opposition of this rezoning? What about
25	anybody who's undeclared? Okay.

1 MS. MOLDENHAUER: There were two people 2 signed in I believe that are no longer here. CHAIRMAN Moldenhauer 3 HOOD: Ms. Ms. 4 Moldenhauer, I got it. Getting it on the record. 5 MS. MOLDENHAUER: 6 I got it -- I got it. I called CHAIRMAN HOOD: 7 for it. I didn't see anybody move. Does anybody else here Ms. Moldenhauer and I want to know. 8 want to testify? 9 (No response.) Okay. We don't see anybody. 10 CHAIRMAN HOOD: 11 Colleagues, we --- all right. Commissioners, we have 12 the request from 8A. We've heard both sides and 13 rationale. We do have before us a Comprehensive consisting of a map amendment which we know we're charged to We've heard both sides of why we think it should be done 15 and should not be done. And we also heard form a potential 16 who may be potentially doing some type of development which 17 predates what our action is. 18 So anyway, I think all that's -- I 19 I think the record speaks for itself but 2.0 record is clear. 21 before we -- I want to thank everyone for not basically talking about a specific project for the most part and being 22 23 straight on the map amendment and the rezoning that we are charged to deal with. 24

But anyway, let me open it up for any discussions.

Vice Chair Miller.

2.0

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to thank ANC 8A for bringing for this map amendment which obviously, as some have alluded to, zoning map amendment should have probably been brought -- I didn't know it went all the way back to '85 that the Comp Plan map says "moderate density residential." So I think -- I find -- I just wanted to commend the ANC for bringing it forward and for all of the, I find, persuasive, the Comprehensive Plan zoning consistency arguments in your testimony, both the written testimony that was submitted and the resolutions and the testimony today, I find -- which agrees with Office of Planning's Comprehensive Plan analysis, which I agree with.

And I hesitate to go -- I don't want to talk about a project so I'm not going to go there given the Chairman's admonition. I was just -- I'll just say generally to the extent a PDR use becomes non-conforming, if ever there was a case where it should become non-conforming when we've had the policy for it to be moderate density residential for over 30 years, this might be the case where we can proceed ahead. They still can do the -- they can still do -- they have the permit for a PDR use apparently from what I've head in the record.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right. Any other comments or questions? Commissioner Turnbull.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Oh, I just want to say whenever we do downzoning or any kind of a zoning change, there's also a great deal of angst. And I can remember when we did Georgia Avenue and all the commercial-residential Remember LP went through it. We looked and it was units. a very long night going through and looking at these uses and preserving but it made sense in the residential neighborhoods from these little bits and pieces of commercial that had been somehow -- were -- for the most part, were not fitting in with the residential character of the streets adjacent to Georgia Avenue. So that was very -- but thought in the long run, it made a lot of sense. We didn't please everybody but I think we pleased the residential neighborhood that was concerned about the impact of commercial getting into the neighborhoods.

So this is not quite the same but it's similar, the similar -- the impact onto a residential neighborhood, so I do agree with Office of Planning's analysis of it and it's one of those things that when something slips through the crack for so long, you are concerned there's probably others throughout the City, too that we just haven't picked up yet. So -- but I'm very concerned about the impact and I think OP's analysis makes a lot of sense.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other questions or comments? Mr. May.

1

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. I think the ANC made a strong case and Office of Planning certainly made a very compelling consistency case that iust as а case, Comprehensive Plan consistency case that there really is only decision. I mean I appreciate the fact that, you know, it does create this non-conforming use, and I understand that that potentially has impact, but really, I mean this is the right thing to do. It's consistent with what has been shown in the future land use map for a really long time.

It's unfortunate that it was not acted upon sooner. I hope that we don't have too many more of these kinds of cases. But I am very much in favor of approving this map amendment.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioner Shapiro.

COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Nothing to add and I agree with my colleagues. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. And I would agree. These are difficult cases for us but these consistency cases, as Commissioner Turnbull, both May and Vice Chair Miller all have said, that it's been going on for so long, so we say we're not looking for anymore of these, but I think we probably will see some more. We've -- I think we say that every time. We don't want to see anymore but it's just the way it works and as already said, this is a consistency case and this won't be the first time. I can remember another

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

1	case around a trash transfer facility that we had to deal
2	with.
3	So anyway, would someone like to make a motion?
4	Vice Chairman?
5	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Mr. Chairman, this is a two
6	vote
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: This is two
8	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Two vote. Okay. So I would
9	move that the Zoning Commission take the proposed action on
10	Zoning Commission Case Number 17-17, Advisory Neighborhood
11	Commission 8A Map Amendment at Square 5564, Lot 812, now Lot
12	66, at 1401 22nd Street, SE, and ask for a second.
13	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Second.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. It's been moved and
15	properly seconded. Any further discussion?
16	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Mr. Chair, just for
17	clarification?
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.
19	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: There's discussion about
20	moving the map amendment from PDR-1 to R-3 or RA-2?
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I think
22	VICE CHAIR MILLER: That's in the original
23	language. Do we need to
24	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I think it's PDR-1 to RA-2,
25	correct?

	76
1	PARTICIPANT: Correct.
2	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: So we need to
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: That's what's understood.
4	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: be specific about that.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So we're being specific.
6	We accept PDR-1 to RA-2.
7	PARTICIPANT: That was what I was
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes. That's what I was thinking
9	it was, too, but he's right. We want to make sure the record
10	is complete.
11	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Make sure
13	we have to cover all bases. Okay. Anyone else?
14	(No response.)
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. I'm going to call the
16	vote and then I'm going to say something, Ms. Schellin,
17	before we do the vote. Moved and properly seconded. Any
18	further discussion?
19	(No response.)
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All in favor, aye?
21	(Chorus of ayes.)
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any opposition?
23	(No response.)
24	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing any Ms. Schellin,
25	only thing, we're going to leave the record open for the

1	second vote is whatever needs to come in other than what I'm
2	getting ready to say is the ANC 7B's submission. That's.
3	We don't need anything else. Okay.
4	MS. SCHELLIN: Right.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Schellin, would you call
6	MS. SCHELLIN: Well, the ANC absolutely has an
7	opportunity to make their submission.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: The 7B has not and we were asked
9	the record was asked to be left open for them.
10	MS. SCHELLIN: Right.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Right.
12	MS. SCHELLIN: And they can do that if we could
13	get it. You're going to work with them, Ms. Muhammad? Okay.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So can you call the vote? Thank
15	you.
16	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Staff calls the vote 5 to
17	0 to 0 to approve proposed action, Zoning Commission Case
18	Number 17-17; Commissioner Miller moving, Commissioner
19	Turnbull seconding, Commissioners Hood, May, and Shapiro in
20	support. And once the proposed rulemaking is advertised, the
21	record reopens for 30 days for a comment period.
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Right. I was just thinking what
23	I said. Yes, the record is open for 30 days for a comment
24	period so disregard that, disregard what I said. But we do
25	want to make sure the record's open to get 7B, but disregard

1	my comment because you can comment in the 30-day period.
2	Anything else?
3	(No response.)
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right. So with that,
5	I want to thank everyone for their participation tonight and
б	this hearing's adjourned.
7	(Whereupon, at 8:43 p.m., the above-entitled
8	hearing was adjourned.)
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

## <u>C E R T I F I C A T E</u>

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Public Hearing

Before: DC ZC

Date: 03-19-18

Place: Washington, DC

was duly recorded and accurately transcribed under my direction; further, that said transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

Court Reporter

Mac Nous &