GOVERNMENT
OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

-----:

IN THE MATTER OF:

:

High Street, LLC

Map Amendment

Case No. 18-10

@ Square 5799, Lot 976

:

2352-2360 High Street, S.E. :

-----:

Thursday, March 21, 2019

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

The Public Hearing of Case No. 18-10 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 ROBERT MILLER, Vice Chairperson MICHAEL G. TURNBULL, FAIA, Commissioner (AOC) PETER G. MAY, Commissioner (NPS)

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

SHARON S. SCHELLIN, Secretary

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

JOEL LAWSON STEPHEN MORDFIN

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PRESENT:

MAXIMILIAN TONDRO, ESQ.

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Public Hearing held on March 21, 2019.

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

								<u>P</u>	<u>AGE</u>
Preliminary matters	•					•		•	6
Presentation by Petitioner High Street, LLC		•							9
Report of the Office of Planning	•	•				•		•	26
Report of other government agencies	•	•				•		•	27
Report of the ANC	•					•			30
Organizations and persons in support						•			39
Organizations and persons in opposition/undeclared			•	•	•	•	•		47
Adiourn									80

1 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 2 6:39 p.m. 3 Good evening, CHAIRMAN HOOD: ladies and This is a public hearing of the Zoning Commission gentlemen. for the District of Columbia. My name is Anthony Hood, and 5 we're located in the Jerrily R. Kress Memorial Hearing Room. 6 7 Today's date is March the 21st, 2019. 8 Joining me this evening are Vice Chair Miller, 9 Commissioner May, and Commissioner Turnbull. We're also joined by the Office of Zoning staff, Ms. Sharon Schellin, 10 11 as well as the Office of Attorney General staff, Mr. Tondro, as well as the Office Planning, Mr. Lawson and Mr. Mordfin. 12 This proceeding is being recorded by a court 13 reporter and is also webcast live. Accordingly, I must ask 15 you to refrain from any disruptive noise or actions in the hearing room, including display of any signs or objects. 16 17 Notice of today's hearing was published in the DC 18 Register, and copies of that announcement are available to 19 my left on the wall near the door. 20 The hearing will be conducted in accordance with 21 provisions of 11Z DCMR, Chapter 5 as follows, preliminary matters, presentation by the Petitioner in this case, and 22 then we'll have a report by the Office of Planning, reports 23

organizations and persons in support, organizations

agencies,

other

government

24

25

of

of

the

ANC,

and

report

persons in opposition, organizations and persons who are undeclared.

The following time constraints to be maintained in this meeting, the Petitioner has up to 60 minutes, but I think that we have read all the submissions, one is kind of outstanding that we need to deal with -- organizations, five minutes, individuals three minutes.

All persons wishing to testify before the Commission at this evening's hearing are asked to register at the witness kiosk to my left and fill out two witness cards. These cards are located to my left on the table near the door. Upon coming forward to speak to the Commission, please give both cards to the reporter sitting to my right before taking a seat at the table.

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

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

Before I go forward with Ms. Schellin asking for any preliminary matters, I do want to thank everyone in this

1 This case was moved from Monday to tonight for various We needed to attend the State of the District. 2 3 And I'll be very honest, we're part of the city as well. and we need to know what's going on. Ι 5 your indulgence and any apologies for any 6 inconvenience. And I wanted to make sure I said that to you, 7 Mr. Washington, especially. 8 MR. WASHINGTON: Okay. 9 Thank you for understanding. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ι didn't ask you did you understand. I said I'm going to say 10 11 thank you though. I'm assuming that you understand, so I'll just leave it at that. And you can let me know later when 12 you see me around town. 13 14 At this time, the Commission will consider any preliminary matters. Does the staff have any preliminary 15 16 matters? 17 MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir. 18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: We will begin Okay. -- do we need to deal with --19 20 I'm sorry, MS. SCHELLIN: just their expert 21 witnesses. I forgot about that. All right, let's go. 22 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. 23 MS. SCHELLIN: Mr. Dettman, he's been accepted before, but just if the Commission would choose to accept him 25 in this case?

	7
1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I don't think we usually revisit.
2	Have your credentials, have you changed your credentials?
3	Have you had anything taken away?
4	(No audible response)
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, so I don't think we would
6	do anything on that.
7	Anything else, Ms. Schellin?
8	MR. FREEMAN: We also have Ms. Nicole White. We
9	don't expect her to testify but
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yeah, but we've already proffered
11	her previously. Anybody that we have not proffered?
12	(No audible response)
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Can you all give me one
14	minute? Mr. Tondro?
15	(Pause)
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Give me one moment. I am trying
17	to come up to speed on something that was just given to us.
18	And just give me one moment, please.
19	(Pause)
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Again, as I stated in other
21	hearings, when we get last minute submissions, we do have
22	jobs. And when we get the last minute submission on our way
23	over here to do this job, we do have a submission that I've
24	been made aware.
25	I think, Ms. Schellin, you can correct me, on

1 Exhibit 36 from Mr. Ari Theresa. And I would have to ask to 2 make sure I pronounced it correctly. And we have made a determination, I guess, about 3 a year or so ago that this would be, whenever we did it, I think September, in September of 2018, that this case will 5 be a rulemaking. 6 7 Now, all of sudden, I think six or seven months later, and even later than that, shortly before we came out, When I look in the record I see the addition I'm notified. which says that this should be a contested case. 10 11 We decided that, but we will be considerate of anything that's given to this Commission and any requests. 12 We will hold that in abeyance, and I will give parties or 13 anyone the opportunity to respond if they would like, as we continue to deal with this again. 15 This seems to be a pattern. It seems to be about 16 17 five minutes or ten minutes before we walk out here we get 18 something to respond to. And we actually need to do some 19 regulation on the next one. Because we need to be afforded the opportunity to be able to make informed decisions. 20 21 think right now we will hold that in abeyance and give everyone the chance to respond to that. 22 Anything else, colleagues, on that? 23 24 (No audible response)

Okay, Mr. Freeman.

CHAIRMAN HOOD:

MR. FREEMAN: Good evening. And for the record, my name is Kyrus Freeman with the law firm of Holland and Knight here on behalf of the Petitioner. I am joined by, to my immediate left, Joe Gaon, an associate with our firm, Shane Dettman, as you know, our zoning and land use expert, and most importantly our client, Adrian Washington, on behalf of High Street, LLC.

We will be brief. I'll just talk through a couple of points, and Mr. Dettman, Mr. Washington, and Ms. White will make themselves available to answer any questions.

As the Commission is aware, we have fought a petition to amend a zoning map to rezone the property from the R-3 District to the RA-2 District. This is a Zoning consistency case which the Commission stated, and is aware, and stated at set down.

It's not a review of particular plans, it's not a review of a particular project. But it is an analysis of whether and how to request a map amendment.

It is not inconsistent with the Comp Plan, the future land use map, or the generalized policy map. It advances the purpose of the Comp Plan and other District policies. It complies with the guide and principles in Comp Plan, and furthers a number of major elements of the Comp Plan.

I will submit that our evidence of record clearly

indicates that we meet all standards for the map amendment application. We're happy, as I'm sure the Commission is aware, that the Office of Planning submitted two reports, dated September 7th and December 3rd, agreeing and confirming that the petition meets the applicable map amendment standards.

DDOT submitted a report indicating that -recommending approval of the application. And most recently,
on March 12th, the ANC unanimously voted to support and
recommend approval of the application.

So we believe that the record is thorough and clearly indicates how the application meets the requirements.

lieu testifying, In of Mr. Dettman submitted his testimony. You have that in front of you. response to a recent filing today, we got an additional letter from DHCD, which you should have in front of you, indicating that, just reconfirming that DHCD is not the Petitioner. High Street, LLC, is the Petitioner, and that the project is important in order to help fulfill District goals and plans with respect to increasing housing and affordable housing throughout the District which, I know, you heard a lot about on Monday at the State of the District.

Can I respond to the submission by CARE at this point? I think CARE essentially makes two points, one that the property should -- this case should be a -- I read their

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

submission to say that this case should be a contested case since it was filed by DHCD.

Again, the letter indicates that DHCD is not the Applicant. This petition was not filed by a public agency and thus is not required to include multiple properties. H&K, Holland and Knight, we don't represent DHCD.

And if you look at their authorization letter, which is in the record, it clearly states that the authorization is contingent. And if certain things happen their authorization is null and void. So this case, again, we don't represent DHCD. The Petitioner is High Street, LLC.

I think their second argument, I should also say this application falls under Section Sub-title Y 201.7(b). Since it was filed by a private entity, and the Petitioner does not own all the property included in the application, the Zoning Commission, in fact, has applied this standard in a number of Zoning Commission cases recently, 18-19, 19-03, 17-27,17-17.

So although this argument may be kind of new, the Zoning Commission has consistently treated these types of cases as rulemakings.

And in fact, as the Zoning Commission is likely aware, on Monday you will be reviewing a text amendment filed by the Office of Planning, Case 1905, which clarifies and codifies that map amendments, particularly those not involved

in PUDs, are rulemakings and not contested cases.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So I think the Board's prior actions and the text amendment that you'll be hopefully setting out on Monday includes clarification that rulemakings are, in fact, that map amendments are rulemakings.

I think the other argument that I do want to make sure I highlight, I think the letter suggests that somehow, by setting this case down as a rulemaking, I will quote, that it caused people who would have normally opposed the project to not participate. The actual facts and record demonstrate that this argument is is flawed.

First of all, the Petitioner participated in 17 community meetings in canvassing (phonetic) dates. I could submit a list of them, but they range from May 29, 2018, all the way through March 5th, 2019, at which point the ANC voted to recommend approval of the case. So any assertion that there wasn't adequate public engagement is clearly not true.

As you know, Commissioners, deferred our we hearing date from December 13th to March, so three additional And as we said in the letter, months. that was for additional community engagement which ultimately was essential, because the ANC voted unanimously to support the project.

I would note this seems to be a continual argument, that if people knew they would have opposed it.

But again, the facts here don't support that conclusion.

There was a transcript that was uploaded at 5 o'clock. I'm not quite sure what the -- it was just uploaded. There was cover letter, there was no indication of what the purpose of the transcript was for. That transcript was from a DHCD hearing in November of 2018.

As it relates to CARE's position that people thought it was a done deal and would have shown up if they knew, if you read that transcript, ten people, a number of people came and testified in support and opposition of the project variously.

So people clearly are aware of this. People clearly have been expressing their opinion in public forums.

And in fact, you'll see there're people here tonight.

I would note, if you look at Page 49 and 51 of that transcript, Mr. Theresa, who now opposes the project, on Page 49 says, and I quote, I think that this project is a decent project. I have seen projects come up all over the city, and I haven't seen very many projects that are truly mixed income, and this is one.

Further down, he says, so, you know, I want to applaud DHCD, you know, for doing this. I can't think of any time I've ever done that. I mean, you guys have been on my hitlist for a while. But I think that this project, in consideration of everything else that's happened in the

1	neighborhood, I think it's reasonable.
2	So that was what he said in November 2018. Now
3	we're hearing that folks haven't had an opportunity to
4	express their feelings about the project.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: And let me just ask, what page is
6	that you read on?
7	MR. FREEMAN: I'm reading the transcript that was
8	uploaded.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Right.
10	MR. FREEMAN: I think it was broken up into two
11	different packets.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I just want it for the record.
13	MR. FREEMAN: Page 49.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I looked at the transcript
15	MR. FREEMAN: Sure.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I just want the page number.
17	MR. FREEMAN: I was reading starting on Page 49,
18	50, through 51.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'll tell you that Maximillian
20	Tondro is on the ball. Thank you.
21	MR. FREEMAN: So again, the argument that folks
22	haven't had an opportunity to learn about or talk about the
23	project is directly contradictory to the materials that
24	someone just submitted this afternoon.
25	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So, Mr. Freeman, let me just say
ļ	

1	this, and I hate to interrupt your presentation. But your
2	responses in a sound bite one-pager would be very helpful as
3	we do that.
4	MR. FREEMAN: And I am with that, I'm actually
5	going to conclude that if you look at their submissions,
6	there's nothing in their submission that says anything about
7	how this application is inconsistent with the Comprehensive
8	Plan, which is what this case is all about.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: But I think, okay, thank you, Mr.
10	Freeman. I hate to keep interrupting, but that you. You
11	rattled off some things that we need to really look at.
12	MR. FREEMAN: Sure.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: And if you could just condense
14	that, we don't need a
15	MR. FREEMAN: Sure.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: 20-pager, just a one-pager will
17	be very helpful, on the highlights of the issues that were
18	raised in Mr. Theresa's statement.
19	MR. FREEMAN: Absolutely.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: That would be helpful.
21	MR. FREEMAN: I'm happy to submit what I just
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Do you have it in that oh, you
23	have that?
24	MR. FREEMAN: Yeah.
25	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, okay. If you could submit
	I .

1 that for the record, that would be sufficient. 2 MR. FREEMAN: Yeah, yeah. I'm happy to get that 3 in the record. 4 CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. So thank you all for Mr. Washington, you didn't want to add 5 your presentation. 6 anything? Are you fine? 7 MR. WASHINGTON: No. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Since you had to wait two or three 8 9 more days. 10 But actually, you know, MR. WASHINGTON: Okay. 11 Chairman Hood, I was out of town. So actually the delay was, 12 it was --13 CHAIRMAN HOOD: So I can save the apology for another time. 15 But no, thank you. MR. WASHINGTON: Okay. I just want to say a couple of things. Thank you for your time. 16 I know how hard you all work on this. And so we appreciate 17 I've been, you know, before the Commission many 18 being here. 19 Hopefully you know our work, providing hundreds of units of both market rate and affordable housing in the city. 20 21 This project is a continuation of that work. think it's a project that is very worthwhile. It is moderate It is mixed income, it's on a vacant lot. 23 density. just think it's a very exciting addition to what the District 24 25 is trying to do in many regards.

1 And just, you know, not to overly echo what Mr. 2 Freeman said, but we've worked extensively with the 3 community. And I really have to applaud my team. They spent many, many nights at formal community meetings, they spent many days at informal community meetings, they've walked the 5 6 streets, they know it. One of my staff members intends to 7 live in the neighborhood. He's looking to buy a house there. 8 We've been very invested in making sure that we have reached out to the community. The project has been altered quite a bit through community input. 10 It was larger, 11 we listened to them, we made is smaller. There was less parking, we listened to them, we provided more parking. 12 The design was something that people wanted to, you know, they 13 had their own input on it. And we listened to that. 15 So we take very seriously the concerns of the community. We work very hard. 16 We got a unanimous ANC 17 support and support of many other people as well. 18 understand your concerns. Your concerns are our concerns. 19 And we think this is a project that the vast majority of the community does support. 20 21 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, thank you all for your presentation and responses. Let me see if there are any 22 questions or comments up here? 23 Vice-Chair Miller? 24

VICE CHAIR MILLER:

25

And

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

thank you for your presentation and for all the community outreach that the development, well, that the Petitioner did with the community, particularly ANC 8A.

So I see in our record, and maybe you alluded to this, that we have a resolution from ANC 8A signed by Chairman Prestwood in support saying the ANC unanimously voted to support the Petition, conditioned upon the development's commitment to do certain things. And I think there are 13 or 14 different things.

And then also in our record is the Memorandum of Understanding which memorializes those 14 or so commitments, and it's signed by both Adrian Washington and the ANC 8A. So the question is, we see that you made this commitment, could you speak to that commitment and its enforceability?

MR. FREEMAN: Sure.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: It's the map amendment that we normally don't do, conditions associated with a map amendment. So as you said, it's a consistency case.

MR. FREEMAN: So in my experience, what the Commission does is they, you know, Mr. Washington signed the MOU. He's committed to those things. But typically, in a map amendment order, it's not -- I haven't seen MOUs as conditions in a map amendment order.

So for the record, we're committed to do that. But in all the other map amendments I've handled before the

Commission, the Commission has routinely said that MOUs and CDAs are not enforceable through the map amendment process. But again, he's fully committed to abiding by the terms of that MOU.

And as you look at it, all of those conditions the building that will be built if the map amendment is approved which, as you know, Commissioner Miller, we're not in a map amendment, we're not looking at building. We're looking at consistency with Comprehensive Plan, future land use map, and other applicable But again, he's fully committed to all of those conditions in the MOU.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Right. And I understand and agree with everything you've said about the map amendment process. Is it enforceable through another process?

MR. FREEMAN: So I don't want to get kind of too far down the road. But I will say that they don't own the property, so they will have to make certain representations and reach certain agreements with DHCD consistent with DHCD's expectations about what will result as a result of this disposition. So there will be additional agreements that incorporate relevant information from this MOU.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Say that again, I'm sorry.

MR. FREEMAN: So for example, the AMI levels, that would be subject to a DHCD affordability covenant. The

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	number of units, the building form, all of that will be
2	subject to an agreement that High Street will enter with
3	DHCD.
4	MR. WASHINGTON: And, you know, I know this isn't
5	a legal term but, I mean, we have a long track record both
6	in the District and working with DHCD. We have a track
7	record of working in nearby communities. We want to continue
8	to work with DHCD and nearby communities.
9	So for us not to follow this would be just, you
10	know, it'd be suicidal. I mean, it would just be terrible
11	business and terrible ethics. And also though, we like
12	VICE CHAIR MILLER: I'm glad to hear that, I mean,
13	and I agree with you that that is the most enforceable
14	MR. WASHINGTON: Right.
15	VICE CHAIR MILLER: is when you next have to
16	come before us or that ANC.
17	MR. WASHINGTON: And also, I mean, this is not the
18	market rate project where bigger is better and you make more
19	money. I mean, we have an agreement with DHCD. It's set,
20	we like this project, we think it's the right size.
21	The community did a great job in helping us shape
22	something that's appropriate. And it's not a situation where
23	we'd want to do something, you know, bigger and better. This
24	is the right project.
25	VICE CHAIR MILLER: There's an existing agreement

1	with DHCD that memorializes some of these commitments?
2	MR. WASHINGTON: There is a, what's the status of
3	our agreement?
4	(Off the record comments)
5	MR. WASHINGTON: There is a draft PDA which
6	incorporates AMI levels and the project size, and the number
7	of units that
8	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Realizing it's well, I
9	think it might be helpful to add that into the record.
10	MR. FREEMAN: I don't know that we could submit
11	that at this point.
12	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Because it's a draft.
13	MR. FREEMAN: Right. And again, I think, as it
14	relates to map amendment standards, I'm not sure that I
15	appreciate the question. I'm not minimizing your question.
16	I've never done that in any other map amendment case.
17	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Never submitted a draft
18	agreement
19	MR. FREEMAN: No, sir.
20	VICE CHAIR MILLER: between DHCD and the
21	MR. FREEMAN: No, sir. Primarily because that
22	agreement has a lot of confidential information that we
23	wouldn't necessarily want in a public record. And there's
24	nothing in that agreement that relates to a map amendment.
25	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. And I understand all

that. So I don't want to draw this out, but I just have one final question. So, I mean, we have seen in other map amendment cases, I believe, an MOU like the one you have but which did have -- I mean, I don't know if you represented the Petitioner in those cases.

But I think I recall one from ANC 3 that was made with ANC 3E, I believe, where there was an enforceability, kind of a private right of action provision built right into the MOU that was signed by the potential developer and the ANC.

And in another case, I believe, there was a covenant that was entered into by, you said, the petitioners, or Mr. Washington's not the owner right now. But there was a covenant in that case, I believe, and someone can correct me if I'm wrong, between the owner of the property and the — to record against the land, the conditions that the community was seeking in that particular case.

MR. FREEMAN: I'm not aware of those as a map amendment. So I will just say, as it relates to zoning issues, those will all be within an agreement with DHCD that will ultimately be recorded in the land records.

So for example, AMI levels, building form, parking, like, most of these issues in terms of it's for sale, it's going to have condos, most of that will be in an agreement with DHCD with covenants recorded in the land

1	records -
2	VICE CHAIR MILLER: So that would be a disposition
3	agreement?
4	MR. FREEMAN: Yes.
5	VICE CHAIR MILLER: And so that will go before the
6	Council or no?
7	MR. FREEMAN: I don't know. Does this yes.
8	VICE CHAIR MILLER: So there's another body
9	MR. FREEMAN: Yes.
10	VICE CHAIR MILLER: that will be looking to see
11	if the commitments that are being made are being and
12	what's the timing on that, or what do you hope to be if we
13	move this forward in a timely manner?
14	MR. FREEMAN: Let me ask Diarra McKinney who's
15	with Neighborhood Development to answer that question. I'm
16	not
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: If you want to, you can come to
18	the table and identify yourself or you can respond. You can
19	actually have a seat, man, there's plenty of seats here. We
20	want to make you comfortable.
21	MR. MCKINNEY: Hi, my name is Diarra McKinney.
22	For the record, I'm a vice president of Neighborhood
23	Development Company. I've been working on this project since
24	January of 2018.
25	We recently went through a similar process. It

1 was not a zoning process but a disposition process on another 2 DHCD site. So that timeline is really driven bу 3 negotiations of the Property Disposition Agreement. 4 a draft right now. Assuming that the project is approved at the 5 6 Zoning Commission, we will then finish that draft with the 7 DHCD. DHCD then puts together a package, submits that to the Mayor's office which then gets submitted to City Council. 9 There is a, I believe it's a 60-business day period in which the Council has the opportunity to take up 10 11 If that vote is not taken, the project is -- or the PDA is deemed approved after that 60-day wait and see period. 12 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you all for your answers 13 to my questions and for your presentation. 15 Okay, Mr. Turnbull? CHAIRMAN HOOD: COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 16 just have a question for Mr. Dettman. 17 18 I know we talk about compliance with the Comp 19 Plan, and the FLUM, and the generalized land use map. wonder if you could, for the record, just talk to the concern 20 21 that may be out there. I mean, you've got an RA-2 that you're proposing in CLR-3. 22 There's an RA-1 off to the side, but this RA-2 is not adjacent to that RA-1. 23 It's going to be in the middle of R-3. 24

Could you talk to why you think this is not spot

zoning?

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. DETTMAN: Certainly. So, Commissioner Turnbull, when you look at the future land use map it's moderate density residential which then, under the framework are considered to element in terms of zones that be compatible with the moderate density residential land use designation, RA-2, or the former R-5B, is expressly stated as being considered compatible with the moderate density residential land use designation in certain locations. So if you look at it, that's why --

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: In certain locations?

MR. DETTMAN: Yeah. So if you look at the chart that's attached to my testimony, which was also attached to DCOP's report, that was something that we prepared, we took a look at the surrounding development context to see, you know, what is the prevailing development pattern in the areas.

There's a lot of, as you mentioned, R-3. There's also RA-1 that's in the area. But if you look at the actual development pattern, you'll find that there are many multifamily apartment buildings in the immediate and further out surrounding area, generally around the range of, say, 35 feet, that have been around for quite some time.

In fact, this is a site that used to have three three-story apartment buildings on it up until 2013. So it

1 even has a history of accommodating apartment buildings on the site. 2 We think that the RA2 -- the problem with the R-3 3 site, which allows 40 feet and three stories, is it doesn't allow multi-family. We think that the RA-2 is the right 5 zone, because from a use perspective we're able to get the 6 7 multi-family use in there. 8 And also, it allows us with a little bit of lot 9 occupancy so we can spread out a little bit more and reduce the height of the building, per the agreement with the ANC, 10 11 to a height that's actually compatible with not only the prevailing development pattern but also what's even allowed 12 as a matter of right under the existing zoning. 13 14 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay, thank you. 15 CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right, any other questions or 16 comments? 17 (No audible response) Let's go to the Office of 18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. 19 Planning. Mr. Mordfin? 20 Good evening, Chairman and members MR. MORDFIN: 21 of the Commission. This map amendment application, which is a request to rezone the property from R-3 to RA-2, was set 22 down by the Commission at its September 17th, 2018, meeting. 23 24 At that meeting, the Commission requested the 25 to the ANC regarding any Applicant reach out concerns

1 regarding the mixing of apartments with single family 2 detached and attached housing. The Applicant met with the ANC on March 5th, 2019, 3 4 at which time the ANC voted to support the application. Commission also requested the Applicant submit drawings of 5 potential buildings that could be constructed on the site 6 7 should the application be approved. 8 However, as the request is for a map amendment and 9 not a PUD, there are no drawings. Instead the Applicant 10 submitted а photographic survey of the surrounding 11 neighborhood depicting the variety of housing types existing 12 within the community. OP continues to find the application to be not 13 inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan as it would allow for the development of a vacant, District-owned lot within 15 one half mile of a metro Station as an apartment building. 16 Commission 17 Therefore, OP recommends the approve the application. Thank you. 18 19 CHAIRMAN HOOD: I want to thank you, Mr. Okav. Mordfin. Office Planning's 20 with the of report. 21 Commissioners, any questions of Office of Planning? 22 (No audible response) Other government agencies, 23 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I think we've already mentioned. 24 To exhaust, to a point, the

DHCD letter, we do have a letter from the ANC.

25

And I think

1	that has been mentioned and discussed. And it's already been
2	noted for the record that the Applicant agrees to everything
3	that's in some of those articles.
4	(Off the record comments)
5	Okay. Oh, let me see, is the Chair or Vice-Chair
6	here?
7	(Off the record comments)
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Is the Chair or Vice-Chair here?
9	They didn't designate anyone, did they.
10	(Off the record comments)
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Do we have that? I mean, I'm
12	going to bring you up, but I just want to make sure we do
13	we have that?
14	Well anyway, let me back up and finish my point.
15	We do have an ANC letter which is in support. It's already
16	been noted that the Commission has already
17	(Off the record comments)
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Excuse me, excuse me?
19	Excuse me. Excuse me. Okay, so why don't we just cool down,
20	and settle down. I know issues are hot. Believe me, I'm
21	involved, I'm here all the time. So let's just settle down,
22	and let's respect each other.
23	If you're on one side, let's respect each other.
24	If nobody wants to hear from you, don't talk to them. Let's
25	do that, I think. My ears are big enough, I heard that. So

1 let's respect each other. All right? 2 All right. We don't have the letter, but I know Chairman Prestwood would not mind me bringing one of his 3 colleagues up, I don't believe. So I'm going to go ahead and But let me just finish. 5 do that. It was already stated by Mr. Freeman that the 6 7 Applicant agrees to everything in the letter. So even though it's not part of our process, I think the record is complete. I mean, it shows, if it is ever challenged, it shows that this is the consensus of the Applicant. 10 11 So if you can come up, I'm not sure, I've seen you before, and forgive me for not remembering your name, but if 12 you can come up, Commissioner, and identify yourself. 13 14 And let the record reflect I don't see anything in the record which designates, unless you're the vice chair, 15 and are you the vice chair? 16 17 MS. AGYEI: No, I'm the secretary. 18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: You're the secretary. So 19 typically what our rules are, you have to be either the 20 chair, or the vice chair, or have to be appointed. 21 needs to be done in writing. 22 But let's forget all that now. I'm going to just forgo that rule this time, because maybe I don't know what 23 happened to Chairman Prestwood. 24 25 (Off the record comments)

1 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yeah, they can follow-up and say 2 that they give you authorization to represent tonight. Could you turn your microphone on. Identify yourself first, and 3 then if you can help us with all that. Dorcas Agyei, I'm Commissioner of 5 MS. AGYEI: 6 The actual project is an 8A06. I'm not sure where 7 But I will be speaking on behalf of that commissioner is. the ANC as well as some of the concerns of my constituents. 9 And for the record, it's very important that some of the questions that were asked here are fleshed out. 10 11 Because the only reason that I voted for the project, and a lot of my colleagues voted for the project, is because it did 12 13 come down in scope. 14 I am the one that submitted the hearing testimony, believe that you all need to hear what the 15 Ι I don't know why that was not submitted to 16 the hearing, but I believe all hearings where the public 17 comes out and testifies should be submitted so you all can 18 19 see what the temperature is and what people say. 20 Initially, that hearing was on November 11th. opposed the project at the time, as well as a lot of others, 21 because of the scope of the project. 22 At that time, we were told it was 52 units. 23 24 I believe the document that you all have and

originally read, the project was actually 60 units.

what we agreed upon. The project is going to be 28 units.

I was comfortable with that scope, because the said that they would work with the residents to make the exterior of the buildings look and conform with the residential area.

The initial picture, what am I trying to say, the initial picture and sketches that they presented at the 11th -- November 5th public hearing did not match at all with what the existing homes were in the area.

They agreed to work with the community to make something that was more in scope. Even though it's not in a historic district, they border a historic district. And they agreed to work with the community to make it flesh and, you know, conform, and not take away from the existing homes. We agreed to that. That's another reason why the ANC unanimously voted for it.

As you can imagine, it takes a lot for people to agree when they're on different sides of a project. We agreed to that because they were going to bring down the scope. They were going to do additional traffic studies, they were going to increase parking. And we felt that they were listening to the needs of the community, and we wanted to work with them in good faith. That's why we agreed on all of that.

One of the concerns I did have is that, since this

1 is actually map amendment, does this actually go specifically 2 to the project, which is why we agreed to it, because they said that they would build the 28 units. 3 4 But a concern that we had, and what you brought up, was how was this going to be enforceable? 5 Because one of the issues was DHCD would not sign a letter stating that 6 7 they agreed to the 28 units. So that is still something that we're concerned about as a Commission, because we have been burned before when we thought the project was going to be one thing, but it turned out being another. 10 11 So I definitely want to make sure that, you know, the developer is saying they're willing to do the 28 units, 12 DHCD in the hearings are saying that they agree to the 28 13 units, so if there is a way for us to enforce that in a binding documents that they submit when they actually get the 15 everything, 16 permits and the paperwork, that appreciated. 17 18 am going to pass it off now And Ι to the 19 Commissioner that's actually involved with this project. 20 So let me, before we --CHAIRMAN HOOD: 21 MS. AGYEI: Yes? go to the Commissioner Jones, 22 CHAIRMAN HOOD: 23 think I've seen you recently, before so to 24 Commissioner Jones, let me just ask this question.

Yes.

MS. AGYEI:

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: You mentioned a hearing on
2	November the 11th?
3	MS. AGYEI: Yes. No, November the 5th 11th,
4	I'm sorry, November the 5th which is what the hearing that
5	that's the transcript that was uploaded at 5 o'clock,
6	actually it was at 4:00.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Was that our proceeding or was
8	that another proceeding?
9	MS. AGYEI: No, this was an open hearing hosted
10	by DHCD. The developer was there as well as the Commissioner
11	at the time, Greta Fuller. And the residents came.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So while we appreciate that
13	that's another proceeding, we're dealing with the land use
14	MS. AGYEI: Right.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: basically, here and how, you
16	know, the map amendment. So, I mean, I think it's good, but,
17	you know, you're asking us to do something with somebody
18	else's proceeding, unless I missed the point.
19	MS. AGYEI: You're misunderstanding why I uploaded
20	it.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Help me get to
22	MS. AGYEI: I definitely will, because I'm showing
23	you how the Commission got to where we got to.
24	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
25	MS. AGYEI: We contested the project at that time,

because it was 52 units. We agreed to the project now 1 2 because it's 28 units. 3 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. 4 MS. AGYEI: And that's reflected in the complaints 5 that you'll see in the hearing. 6 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, so you're not asking us to 7 do anything? 8 MS. AGYEI: No. 9 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I was thinking you were asking us to show how it was enforceable. 10 So you were giving 11 us some background as to --12 MS. AGYEI: I was. Well, let me just say this. 13 CHAIRMAN HOOD: really appreciate it. I thought there was an ask for us with the DHCD proceeding. But let me, first of all, thank you. 15 I appreciate the -- bringing us up to speed on that. 16 17 There's not an ask for you to rule on, MS. AGYEI: but there is a request that you read the hearing, and you see 18 19 the views of the neighborhood, and you take in mind that, when hearings come before you, a lot of the time the people 20 that voice their opinion don't always make it here. 21 So just because you don't see someone in front of 22 you does not mean that they did not care, and they didn't, 23 24 you know, have an opinion on the project. 25 CHAIRMAN I'm sure. You know, HOOD: in mу

1 neighborhood, and I tell my neighbors all the time, you might 2 not make it downtown. So I'm in those ANC meetings when I'm 3 I'm in those civic meetings. I'm in those civic engagement groups as well. So I understand that fully. But let me make an ask of you. 5 And I know that 6 this came in, I don't know when it came in, but for me, it would be helpful. And I'm not -- sometimes when you give us 7 that stuff, which is very appreciative from my standpoint, I'm sure others do as well, I would like to have a chance to really digjest and look into that. 10 11 And I have not been afforded the opportunity that you asked me to, even though I will, but I have not been 12 So if you could give me a little more time to be 13 able to read this document, this transcript, I would actually 15 like to see how it proceeds. So what I'm actually doing is commending you and thanking you for giving that to us. 16 17 MS. AGYEI: Right. And had this been my project, you would have gotten it earlier, but it's not my project. 18 19 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, okav. 20 But there are some last MS. AGYEI: minute 21 actions, and I felt that I needed to upload it. 22 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, all right. Well, whoever's listening out there, and whoever streamed, it's noted that 23 we are very much interested in it. 24 25 And like I said the other night in another case,

1 we don't live somewhere else. We live here too. 2 some of these ANC and community meetings as well. And we 3 also take part in that as well. So thank you. 4 MS. AGYEI: You're welcome. 5 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioner? 6 JONES: So I have prepared a MR. Thank you. 7 statement. 8 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, that's right. We may have 9 You can hold your seat. some questions for you. I'm sorry. 10 Chairman Hood and commissioners, my MR. JONES: 11 Tyron Jones, and I am an Advisory Neighborhood I'm joined here today by Commissioner 12 Commissioner for 8A06. Agyei, 8A05, who may also provide comments, which I think she 13 provided first, regarding Case Number 18-10. 15 At our regularly scheduled meeting on March 5th 16 commissioners, auorum of seven ANC unanimously to support the zoning map amendment to rezone 17 18 properties located at 2352 through 2360 High Street, SE, 19 Square 5799, Lot 976, from the current R-3 zone to the RA-2 20 zone. 21 After looking at the project holistically, taking in perspective from the community, the developer, and the 22 Department of Housing and Community Development, myself, and 23 the Commission believe that Applicant's petition will further 24

facilitate the development of mixed income home ownership

options in our community.

The RA-2 zoning map amendment will permit matter of right development of multi-family residential housing. And this amendment supports the District Comprehensive Development Plan for the area by providing moderate density housing in the community.

Moreover, in collaboration with the Department of Housing and Community Development, the R-2A zoning map amendment will help meet the District goal of providing affordable housing and offering home ownership to more residents.

The developer and the Neighborhood Development Corporation has committed and have shown their commitment to work with the community to ensure the project aligns with the residents' desire to preserve the neighborhood's historical character and provide amenities that the entire community can benefit from.

I'll also add that the developer, outside of the MOU, has committed to other community requests including looking at additional onsite parking spaces during the design process. And they have stated that they are open to including in the site in the Historic District.

ANC 8A supports this condition upon the commitment agreed to by the developer in the Memorandum of Understanding that has been submitted with the support letter and agreed

to by the developer.

In closing, while we still see the map amendment as a route for developers to go around the community while infringing on the community, this developer has shown his willingness to work with the community on a project that we all can support.

We are here today standing with the developer as they request this map amendment, because we have no doubt that this developer plans to good neighbor. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I want to thank both commissioners. And as you were reading, I also was thinking about what Commissioner Agyei had done. And I really appreciate it. So I was able to it put in context. And I really was serious about what I said about submission. I was able to put in context what you said, thanks to her showing me what the concerns were. And I kind of briefly looked at some of it. That's why I had a chance -

So I was able to put all that, even though it might have come in different order, I was able to put it all back together with the community, how you got to where we are, how you got consensus, and how to scale down, and how you got the support. So I appreciate both commissioners.

Let me see if there's any questions up here.

Any questions or comments?

(No audible response)

1 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing any, thank you all for 2 all the work that you do. Appreciate it. Okay, so I'm going to go to organizations and 3 4 persons who are here in support. Do we have any 5 organizations or persons who are here in support? 6 (Off the record comments) 7 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Support, okay. Anybody who supports the project, I mean, not the project, because we're not talking about a project, the map amendment? I'm getting confused myself. There's no project in front of us. 10 11 (Off the record comments) CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ronald Thompson? 12 So let me be 13 clear. Because I say this all the time. Here I am, there's no project in front of us, okay. So you may begin? 15 Anyone else who's here in support? (No audible response) 16 17 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, you may begin. Turn your mic on, identify yourself. 18 19 My name is Ronald Thompson, Jr. MR. THOMPSON: I'm a resident of ANC 8A04 which is adjacent to, in part, 20 21 somewhat 8A06. So this project, I walk past the project. I've seen the site. 22 My name is Ronald Thompson, Jr. 23 I am 21 years I prepared this testimony in preparation of the earlier 24 25 date of Monday. So I now, I've been 21 for four, three days

or something like that. But I've been 21 for a few days. And I've lived my entire life in the District of Columbia in Ward 8.

Combining the ages of my parents and I, I have over 100 years of experience living in the District. And adding my brother, and sister, and grandmother, well over two centuries.

I spent the early part of my life on the far end of southeast and southwest, spending the early part on First Street in the Washington Highlands neighborhood and then on Southern Avenue right across from what was then Greater Southeast.

My eldest brother and I spent a great deal of time in Congress Heights going to see our grandmother on Mississippi Avenue and hearing the sounds of the Blue Marching Knights practicing in the afternoons and evenings down the hill.

We would walk down to Bellevue, down to South Capitol Street to run errands for our grandmother. My brother attended Draper Elementary School which is now closed. My mother attended Highland Elementary School which is now known as Fairview Hope but still closed. She graduated from Hart Junior High School and Ballou Senior High School.

I have deep roots in Ward 8 and know this

community. I have spent the better part of the last decade living in Anacostia. I've seen the good and the bad, the change and stagnation, the growth and the contraction. I've seen it all.

And so I come here today to be what at times has seemed like a lone dissension in opposition to forces who do not understand. They do not understand what it is like to hear stories of your grandmother and her family moving from one little district to another because of urban renewal.

They do not understand what it is like to have a mother who grew up in the Highland dwellings, worked since she was 16 years of age, and still has struggled to own a home or maintain the cost of rising rent.

They do not know what it's like to have a brother who has lost friend after friend due to gun violence, almost always because they were trapped in a situation of despair and deprivation in the same neighborhood that we grew up in.

They do not know what a chance that quality housing means to a high school graduate who is away at college in his first year and is constantly worried about whether or not his parents are able to send money for laundry without dipping into rent money.

I come here in support of High Street LLC's request for a map amendment at 2359 High Street, because I support equitable development that brings home ownership

42 1 opportunities to all who are able, regardless of class, 2 color, or creed. I know what this project will potentially mean for 3 folks like my eldest brother and his young daughter, my sister and her wife who have a young school-age daughter, or 5 my mother and I who are looking for some degree of stability 6 7 in terms of housing in the community we've called home. 8 I have many neighbors with young children and good paying jobs who would leap at the opportunity proposed by the 10 The opportunity requires High Street, LLC, to go developer. 11 forward with their project which requires this map amendment 12 petition to be granted. 13 I have a last paragraph but I'll save that. 14 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ι want you to finish 15 testimony. 16 MR. THOMPSON: Τ would like this. Factionalism never ought to be the force in zoning policy. 17 18 I attended the November 5th meeting, I have a recording of This is my first time ever attending the 19 it in my phone. 20

Zoning Commission hearing, but it will likely not be my last because of the level of vitriol, exclusion, and classism that went into an effort to derail this project.

We were talking about 53 units that would have brought a sizable portion of affordable housing to a number of people in Ward 8 and throughout the District.

21

22

23

of the first projects of home ownership I've seen at that scope, at that scale.

And to hear the developer say that they were going to scale it back to meet the needs of the community, I said, well that offends me. Because I live among tenants, people that want home ownership. And it's hard for them to get to that point.

And to hear that we're contracting the size of available home-owning, affording units bothered me, especially knowing where that site sits. People treat the alley that is adjacent to this vacant lot as a roadway. And right behind that alley is a very large RA-1 development.

Based upon my experience with this project, a minority of people are driving conversations. It is incumbent upon this body to do all that it can in conjunction with other agencies responsible for zoning, planning, and development.

I will continue to advocate on behalf of the folks who helped raise me, those tenants who have been working and waiting their entire lives for the chance to own a home. We must all do more to create an inclusive district for everyone.

But our governmental agencies and representatives must do more to ensure that the voices most likely to lose out on an opportunity are included at the table. We are

1 facing an uphill fight to ensure that we are delivered a 2 piece of the pie. I thank you for the opportunity to testify today 3 and hope that you all vote in favor of the map amendment 5 petition. And if I can just add very quickly, this is an 6 7 article from DCist that came out on March 8th of this year. And the title is a bunch of new condos are about to hit the DC market. 9 The contents of this article talk about luxury 10 apartments and how it is such a cause for developers to bring 11 affordable home ownership opportunities in the form of condos 12 to the District. 13 14 We have several thousand new condo units coming online. But we have none that people who work every day, who 15 work 80 hours a week in some cases, like my mother has done 16 for the 21 years I've been alive, who cannot afford rent and 17 cannot afford the opportunity to buy a home, as the price of 18 19 homes go up astronomically. 20 So if we're talking about what we need, we need 21 projects like the one that High Street, LLC, is proposing. 22 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Thompson. And we really appreciate your heartfelt testimony. 23 24 And I'm glad to see -- would you have been 21 on Monday if

Is that your --

we had had the hearing?

1 MR. THOMPSON: On Sunday. 2 CHAIRMAN HOOD: On Sunday. So I would have been -- on Sunday. MR. THOMPSON: 3 4 CHAIRMAN HOOD: So we gave you an extra day to 5 celebrate your birthday. 6 MR. THOMPSON. You did, thank you. I appreciate 7 it. 8 CHAIRMAN HOOD: So, you know, I know that I'm not going to be sitting up here for no long time either. 10 of us are going to be moving on. This is for the people like 11 I always say this. People that are Millennials, or 12 whatever the generation, what's the next one, X, or whatever going 13 there're anyway, be of millionaires. 15 Because of the thought pattern. You know why? 16 Your thought pattern and your -- for the first time to come in front of the Zoning -- my first time in front of the 17 Zoning Commission I thought back to it, I may have been about 18 19 But I was not as eloquent as you were. 20 And I want to commend you. And I want you to stay involved and stay engaged, just like you made a commitment 21 And also, I want to make sure we have that in the 22 record. We're going to need that, especially what you showed 23 Hopefully, it's not your last copy. But we'll give you 24

1	MR. THOMPSON: I have copies at home.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. We're going do you have
3	your testimony too?
4	MR. THOMPSON: I can submit this for the record.
5	But I don't have
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Sure. Do we have your testimony
7	already? I didn't see it.
8	MR. THOMPSON: No, I don't think I submitted it.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So did you read what you just
10	said?
11	MR. THOMPSON: Yes, this is
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I would love to have that in the
13	record, even if you only one copy.
14	MR. THOMPSON: Okay.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I think that needs to be in the
16	record. And I want to commend you. I don't want you to go
17	away from anything you're doing, not just in Ward 8 but make
18	yourself city-wide. Because I think you have the potential,
19	and you have the talent, and you have the passion.
20	And I'm not sitting here just saying that because
21	you're here. But I heard it come across loud and clear. And
22	that's what we need more of. Because a lot of people in the
23	room, and I hate to lump us all together, we're going to be
24	gone. We to shall move on. And we need to make way for
25	people like you to come, with that thought pattern, to make

1	this city better than what it is, okay. So we really
2	appreciate it.
3	And let's see if we have any other comments or
4	questions up here.
5	(No audible response)
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: None? Okay, we're good. Thank
7	you very much, we appreciate it.
8	MR. THOMPSON: Thank you.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, do we have any organizations
10	and persons who are in opposition?
11	Okay, come forward. It looks like we have Ms.
12	Fuller, are you coming as well?
13	(No audible response)
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So we have four. So Mr.
15	Freeman, if you all could step back. Anyone else who's here
16	in opposition?
17	Anyone who's here who's undeclared, if you can
18	come up as well.
19	Okay, we're going to start to my left, this young
20	lady here, and we'll come right on down.
21	(Off the record comments)
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Are you an organization or an
23	individual?
24	MS. SCOTT: I'm an individual.
25	CHAIRMAN HOOD: You have three minutes. But, you
l	I .

know, we're pretty flexible. 2 (Off the record comments) Well, we're not that flexible. 3 CHAIRMAN HOOD: You may be by -- I may have to skip everybody else, and you 5 may be by yourself. No, I'm just --6 MS. Well, good evening, ladies SCOTT: 7 I live in historic gentlemen. My name is Barbara Scott. Anacostia, 8A06. And just a little bit background for me, I am from Oakland, California. And I grew up in a very, very devastated neighborhood, much like Anacostia was back in the 10 11 '80s, and I was able to pull myself up. And in Oakland, we do have -- or there is still 12 a commitment to people that come from low areas to come back 13 to your neighborhood, and try to invest in it, and try to, you know, move people along. 15 So that's where I'm coming from. I've been in 16 Anacostia for six years. And I've seen some things that have 17 18 troubled me. But, you know, I've seen it all over the United States, about the gentrification that's going on. 19 is a cycle here in America. 20 21 Regarding this zoning process, I am against it for a couple of reasons. I do know that historic Anacostia is 22 one, it has a long history, a very proud history, and it 23 started with very modest homes that were there. 24

It was the first subdivision of DC. And it looks

25

as such. Small, low slung homes were built there. And we're the only historic district east of the river. And as such, we have small streets. And they're not going to change, because it is a historic district.

Georgetown and Capitol Hill have been able to nurture their historic districts and benefit monetarily because of that, among other things, by saving the historical character and charm by keeping their streets and zoning intact.

However, unlike those districts, historic Anacostia has constantly lost character of the neighborhood by the powers that be. And other DC areas, such as Georgetown, and Capitol Hill, and other parts, were created and have prospered by redlining by the powers that be, rezoning by the powers that be, political will, and money. And they've profited, as such.

Now, our district has been plundered because of that. Because the site that is being proposed to be rezoned, in the '60s they had the three buildings that you saw. But before that, they had homes.

And the reason why there were able to have homes and then have the buildings was because they got rezoned. And the reason why they got rezoned was because other places in, like, Southwest, et cetera, they were doing some maneuvering, and then they had to put people who couldn't

come back somewhere.

So there they went. They put them where they didn't have resources or put up cheap buildings, and things that would not help the community somewhere. And they put it close to the historic district.

So we really do not have the space and the streets to accommodate these buildings. We have a huge building right down the street from this proposal. And the traffic is horrible. The traffic is not going to change, because we can't widen the streets. And what should really be here is houses. That's what this historic district usually had or had at the beginning. And it should have that again.

Now, we are a vulnerable community. We do not have the resources that other communities have. So I would like you to carefully consider the pattern that is being set.

And I believe that, as the city is trying to align whatever goals they're trying to align, they're going to look for the place that has the least that will not be able to push back.

So I would ask you not to rezone this, because frankly, I don't trust DHCD. We've had several projects where they've said one thing, but they have not come through. So that's all I have to say. Do you have any questions?

(No audible response)

CHAIRMAN HOOD: We will ask our questions when

1 everybody gets through. 2 MS. SCOTT: Okay, thank you. 3 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Next? 4 MR. THERESA: Hi, my name is Aristotle Theresa. 5 I'm representing an organization, CARE. So could I have five minutes? Thank you. 6 7 Yeah, so I'd like to sit and talk about details of this project, the affordability levels and the 9 homeownership. But Ι know that that's not this what proceeding is about. 10 11 of fact, this proceeding explicitly Matter those sorts 12 excludes of things. This really is about changing the zoning of an area from 40 feet height limits to 13 50 feet height limits and from unstated FAR to about 2.0 FAR. 15 And whatever comes on the site is what comes on But that's not really part of this hearing today 16 because of how this is being handled. And it's being handled 17 as a rulemaking proceeding rather than a contested case. 18 19 I do not believe that that is appropriate for this lot, specifically because it's already zoned for what should 20 21 be there. And you're really just talking about some more air rights which, by statute, is a contested case. 22 23 And the reason why this is so concerning for me is because I've seen this happen here, which is a project 24

which Kyrus noted I agreed with in some respects.

That's prior to me understanding that this was going to be rulemaking, that's prior to me understanding that Poplar Point was going to be a rulemaking, that all kinds of other projects are now about to become rulemaking as I see a recent text amendment proposed by the Office of Planning.

And so I see this as nothing more than a way for the Office of Planning to implement its agendas on communities that cannot push back. So whether it's a project I agree with today or one that I disagree with tomorrow, most likely it will be ones that I disagree with tomorrow, because that seems to be the pattern of development in the city.

I cannot abide by these kinds of proceedings. A rulemaking proceeding in this situation, in this context, is wrong. It doesn't fit. This isn't what's happening here. This is not broad-based policy decision.

So on the one hand, if you can't consider what they're developing here, and that's not something we can talk about, how is raising the height limits ten feet a broadbased policy? It just isn't.

This involves the rights of parties. It involves DHCD, it involves a third party purchaser, and it involves the people who live on that street. And they should have the chance to come before this body as a party and oppose it, and oppose it with all of the rights that the D.C. Administrative Procedures Act makes available to them.

1 And this type of proceeding takes power out of the 2 of the ANC, takes power out of the hands of the 3 community, and it's not something that I will ever agree with, my clients don't agree with it, and it's just not 5 something that should be happening. 6 This project is a contested case. It's more 7 appropriate as a PUD or even a contested case map amendment. Thank you. 8 9 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Next? You want to turn your mic on? 10 11 MS. SAPP: Oh, hello. 12 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes. My name is Yetunde Sapp. 13 MS. SAPP: And I'm 19 And I've lived next to the site since I was four vears old. The site is 2352, 2356, and 2360 High Street. 15 years old. And I remember the gigantic boarded buildings that 16 were there over a decade of my growing up. And there were 17 18 racoons loitering, burning of stolen cars, and guns pulled from the building when it was finally demolished, and then 19 the gigantic -- I felt like it never fit the fabric of the 20 21 neighborhood anyway when it was there. 22 So we've appreciated what the lot looks like now, as it's kind of just empty and green, and kind of anticipated 23 what's going to come next. And it brings up some concerns 24

about the proposed project.

My mother attended the meetings about this project last summer, this fall, and several weeks ago. And we appreciate that the developers have taken into account some of the community's concerns. But some of our household concerns include the following, for one, the rezoning.

Currently, the lot for the proposed project is zoned for R-3 which allows for groups of three or more row dwellings mingled with detached dwelling and the semidetached dwellings. And the R-3 zoning allows for the equivalent of about five houses on the lot in question.

And the site of the proposed project is not zoned for RA-2 which is the type of zoning needed for the proposed 28-unit development. And changing the zoning to RA-2 would allow for predominantly moderate density residential housing. But this type of density is not appropriate at High Street and Maple View. And so we are opposed to the DCHD changing of the zoning from R-3 to RA-2.

And changing the zoning would cause more problems, we believe. What is guaranteed that we have from the developer, from DHCD, that the developer's current proposal of 28 units will not be honored once the zoning is changed? Our community has been burned before by such promises and the monstrosity in Maple View Flats is proof of that.

We want the zoning to stay at R-3. Something like five houses would be ideal for the maintaining of the

historical fabric, the character and residential nature of our neighborhood.

My second concern is the density. Once the zoning is changed from R-3 to RA-2, the density of the building and the people will be an issue, since our neighborhood is a historical residential neighborhood. And we want to keep it that way as much as possible, especially up and down the side streets.

At the corner of Martin Luther King, on Main Street, and Maple View Place, we now have Maple View Flats, a massive project that was also built with utter disregard for the residents legitimate concerns. Specifically, many community members fought against Maple View Flats and wanted the city to preserve and rehab - do I just keep going -- okay, the three historical houses that were once there.

The community was even presented with restoration plans for the house and the lot. But DHCD went against those plans and built the high density monstrosity, Maple View Flats, an example of housing that disrupts the fabric, character, and residential nature of historical Anacostia.

So we are asking DHCD to hear the voices and concerns of the residents about this project. Both of us and -- there's, like two more paragraphs. Is that --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Go right ahead.

MS. SAPP: Okay. My third concern is parking.

We appreciated that the revised proposal for the project will have at least one parking space per unit. However, this could still mean significantly more vehicles on High Street and Maple View. Multiple cars per unit and cars that belong to visitors should be anticipated.

To address the parking issue, the developer plans to offer parking spaces for bikes. Maple View is a very steep hill of the street, and we rarely see bikers traveling to the top of the street and therefore do not believe that offering bike parking will alleviate the street park issue that will be created by this proposed project.

Number 4 is traffic. Maple View is a short, narrow street, and High Street is a one-way street. Several times a day, drivers drive up Maple View and make a U-turn at the top of High Street to go back down Maple View.

Also, several times a day, vehicles drive illegally up High Street, which again is a one-way, to the top of Maple View as a short cut. Such traffic has posed threats to vehicles parked along these streets. Therefore, additional cars will cause traffic issues on top of parking issues. The proposed project does not adequately address these potential traffic issues.

And my last concern is affordability. If the 28 units is approved, we do not want the long-term conditions of the property to be negatively impacted by a financially

1 dysfunctional condo association which Ward 8 has its share 2 of. Condo developments with units that sell for 3 \$50,000 to \$75,000 often have a bankrupt condo association behind them. A dysfunctional condo association will not be 5 able to sustain a building of this density. 6 7 terms of affordability, Also, in we balanced approach to development, an approach that does not work to concentrate any one income level in Ward 8. saturation will potentially hinder economic development of 10 11 historic Anacostia. And we already don't have a grocery store and 12 other amenities, for examples. So how will such development 13 attract other retail and amenities that our community needs? Thank you for your time and consideration. 15 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. 16 17 FULLER: Good evening. MS. МУ name is Greta 18 Fuller, former Commissioner of 8A06. here Ι am 19 I live on Maple View Place. 20 I have a couple of things that I want to address. 21 Holland and Knight said that they are not the owners of High Street and that DHCD actually owns High Street. 22 that's true, because I was at the disposition hearing that 23 everybody was talking about in 2018. 24

However, DHCD has admittedly, over, and over, and

1	over, told us, the community, that they refuse to put in
2	writing any agreement that says that what High Street, LLC,
3	is presenting to the community as the project, that they will
4	not sign onto that and that they cannot sign onto it.
5	And today, I have very conflicting stories. High
6	Street is saying one thing, and DHCD is saying we can't do
7	this. And if I smell a rat, it's usually a rat, and
8	something's wrong going on in here.
9	The next thing, it's a disposition hearing. It
10	has nothing to do with zoning. But what I know is at that
11	hearing because everything I'm saying right now is going
12	on record at that hearing that happened at DHCD that
13	everybody was talking about on November 5th of 2018, who ever
14	heard of them turning off the recording or stopping the
15	record when they did not want to hear what the community was
16	saying?
17	And if you read that, a lot of the disposition,
18	the residents there, as Mr., I think, Thompson, Ron
19	(Off the record comments)
20	MS. FULLER: No, that's what I'm saying. The
21	gentleman who said-
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Wait a minute, wait a minute.
23	Hold on a second. We'll just stop the clock.
24	MS. FULLER: Okay.
25	CHAIRMAN HOOD: We're not going to do that down
J	I and the state of

here.

MS. FULLER: Okay.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: When I'm in my neighborhood at ANC meetings we do some of that. So we're going to try not to do that down here. And I know they do it all over the city, it ain't just in my neighborhood. And I know it's probably your neighborhood and everywhere else. But let's not do it down here. Let's wait until we get home, and then we'll do it. But seriously, let's be respectful, Commissioner, I mean former Commissioner.

MS. FULLER: Yeah. What I was trying to say is the recording that he had, he probably has a complete recording of the hearing. That's all I was trying to say. But DHCD had the court reporter, not a court reporter, whatever the reporter is that does the disposition hearings, they turned it off when we start talking more than what they wanted to hear. That's that.

The next thing is we were told, I was told, and several of the -- and the community was told that the MOU would address the design, the changes, and it would also address that these units would stay the same and that the affordability would stay the same of what High Street, LLC, is presenting today.

But as I look at the MOU that's presented from March of this year, and the MOU from last year when I was the

actual commissioner in December, nothing's changed but Number 7 on the original verbiage. They took out the developer agrees that the architectural plans were considered and provided by ANC 8A.

Now the verbiage basically says that they agree to consider input provided by ANC. They totally removed Number 16 and 17. And I have both MOU's, one from December and one from March.

And the other thing, the reason why I support the affordability of the project, but that is not why we are here, we are here talking about a map amendment. We are here talking about changing R-3 zoning to RA-2 zoning.

And honestly, honestly, no one, not a commissioner, not DHCD, not Office of Planning, DDOT, or anyone has told me or written to us and showed us why R-3 does not work in a neighborhood where it's already properly zoned with single-family and single, I mean, semi-detached housing.

Why are we changing a perfectly zoned property and not trying to put houses for home ownership with affordability workforce on a lot that is properly zoned in a neighborhood that is residential?

I have huge concerns when I see words like institutional and semi-private -- semi-public with RA-2, where RA-3 definitely states that it's a residential lot.

So if the Board, DHCD, or anybody can tell me exactly what institutional or semi — here it is, permanent flexibility of design by permitting all types of urban residential development, if they conform to the high density and area requirements established for these districts, and permit the construction of those institutional and semipublic buildings that would be compatible with adjoining residential uses that are excluded from the more restrictive residential zoning.

And why are we changing to a RA-2 when RA-3 states semi-detached and detached homes in a residential area where that's what's surrounding it?

And I also want to be very clear, this is not the historic district, this parcel of land. But this parcel of land sits in the middle of the historic district, to the left and to the right.

As the ANC Commissioner, the former ANC Commissioner, we had a unanimous vote, of which I have it here. We voted seven to zero to oppose this project. And the reason we opposed this project, because nobody could tell us why RA-2 and not R-3.

We know the Comprehensive Plan wants to put more density, but can you tell me that the Comprehensive Plan is also there to help destroy, disrupt, and interrupt a community that's already residential? I'm very confused

about that.

1

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And at the end, I'm going to give you my testimony. But I've seen a large building, that Yetunde talked about at the bottom of the hill, move out historic homes. And I had to fight two extra years to get the homes that they moved restored.

I've seen an offsite affordable housing project placed in my community where they are going to put an expensive hotel and condos. But they gave us the offsite affordable housing. I'm not against the affordability of this project, I'm against this zoning. It does not make sense.

And finally, if I can just say this, I'm going to give you my testimony, because there's more, and I've said this before. Development should be a part of the community, not the community a part of the whim of the developer's development. It should be a part of the community.

And we don't want this project to look like 2620 Bowen Road which Neighborhood Development did in Ward 8. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Could you come to the table later to testify.

MS. DEBERNARDO: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Identify yourself, you may begin.

MS. DEBERNARDO: Sure. My name's Diane

DeBernardo. And I apologize, as I did fill out the forms, but I really hadn't originally intended to speak. A number of my neighbors, who would have been able to come Monday, were not able to come today. So I'm sort of filling in.

I also wanted to speak in opposition to this rezoning. And I wanted to -- I'm not sure what I'm allowed to say or not, but express my disappointment at how our voices, in historic Anacostia, the community, are not being heard, including by our own ANC voting in favor of this rezoning.

And I heard Mr. Washington say that the overwhelming attitude in the community is in favor of this building. Had Mr. Washington been to the three meetings, including that hearing that I'd been to, he would not be able to honestly say that.

I hope my perception, as a community member, of our government matters in this hearing. My perception was that, at all three meetings, this was a foregone conclusion. DHCD awarded the contract, knowing full well there would be a rezoning and that our voices wouldn't matter. That's how it seemed to me. And I'm not alone in that.

I want to echo the opinions of my community members here that it's an inappropriate project, it should be contested, that it will disrupt the fabric of the community.

We had a disastrous housing project there in the past. We should avoid recreating it and keep it as the current zoning with smaller homes. This is not saying I'm in opposition of affordable housing. I am not in opposition. I'm discussing the actual rezoning, the way by which it will happen.

And I'm encouraging our city officials to please listen to the community, please read those transcripts and perhaps, you know, take the time to have another meeting in which you can actually listen to the people who live on and near that street and the terrible impact that this rezoning will have on their homes and their well being. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Thank you all. Let me go back to Ms. Sapp. You're Ms. Sapp, right? Okay. Ms. Sapp, I want to commend you as well. You said you were 19. To me, that draws me in. That really attracts me.

Everybody else's testimony is fine too, but when I see young people, when I was your age, my father was dealing with a zoning issue. You know what I did, I walked right by him and went outside and moved to the basketball court. So I want to commend you. I want to commend you on getting involved.

Did you write your testimony, or did you have any assistance, or did you write it by yourself.

MS. SAPP: It was, like --

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: If you did, it's nothing wrong
2	with that. Because I couldn't have wrote that when I was
3	your age. And I can't do it now. But anyway, did you have
4	any assistance?
5	MS. SAPP: Yeah, I collaborated with my mom, like,
6	gave her some input and then kind of
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: And you all formed that together.
8	Okay.
9	MS. SAPP: She's out of town right now. So she
10	asked me to I'm actually on spring break, but she asked
11	me to come and deliver it for her.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So go back and watch this
13	hearing, and watch yourself. Because I think you've done a
14	great job. Actually, I was told that while I was sitting up
15	here. Sam (phonetic), you need to see what you do. So I
16	have viewed myself.
17	But I want you to watch yourself. Because I think
18	you're cut for the cause. You did a good job. And I want
19	to encourage you.
20	Regardless of how this Commission does, where we
21	fall out and I will tell you, a lot of people think that
22	we always agree. The other night I came out here, I think
23	we all in five different areas. But we try to balance and
24	then try to come together.

So I know that sometimes communities don't agree,

66 1 because the five of us don't. I never know sometimes where 2 And, you know, we're passionate too about trying to make the best decision possible. 3 4 So I want to commend you as well to keep doing what you're doing, regardless of what side of the issue you 5 fall down on. Because remember, everybody has an opinion, 6 7 okay? All right. 8 Ms. Fuller, you mentioned about the ANC report. 9 And I was listening to you. This is a consistency case. 10 I was listening to your argument. I'm not going to get into a whole lot of it, because I would just encourage you to, you 11 said nobody told you to come down. 12 A map amendment is one of the tools of the Zoning 13 Commission. We have tools that we use. And this Applicant decided to do a map, I'm sorry, a rulemakings. 15 And we set 16 this down. 17 And I want to go to Mr. -- I hate to pronounce your name wrong, because after I heard it from viewing one 18

And I want to go to Mr. -- I hate to pronounce your name wrong, because after I heard it from viewing one of your court proceedings the other night, because I study you too, so I just want you to know that I put that on the record. So I want to come to you. But I want to make sure I pronounce your name correctly. And I think I've been mispronouncing your name, and I apologize.

MR. THERESA: Theresa.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Theresa.

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	MR. THERESA: Yeah.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I don't know. I've been calling
3	it Theresa, so Mr. Theresa, I'm going to come to your
4	shortly.
5	But I would encourage you to, first, the ANC took
6	another vote. And you were not on that ANC, correct?
7	MS. FULLER: That is correct. But I live on that
8	street.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well, but I'm just saying, the ANC
10	
11	MS. FULLER: And none of them do.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. But the ANC took a vote.
13	MS. FULLER: Uh-huh.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So that's their vote now. I know
15	they took a vote prior when you were a commissioner. But
16	they took another vote. That's what's in front of us. But
17	I would also encourage you to work with our director to find
18	out what a zoning consistency case is, I mean
19	MS. FULLER: That wasn't my question.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I know it's not your question, but
21	it came across like that. And I think that will help you get
22	to your question. Not to be inconsistent with the comments
23	
24	MS. FULLER: That's not my question. My question
25	was

1 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well, I see you're not going --2 MS. FULLER: -- what does RA-2 mean? I didn't 3 understand that. 4 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Well, even if that was your 5 question, again, my same response is check with the Office of Zoning. We do tutorials for ANC commissioners as well as 6 7 community members. And I think that will be very helpful for 8 you. 9 My question was still why does RA-2 MS. FULLER: 10 mean more than -- why is this property zoned correctly and 11 needs to go to something that it isn't? 12 CHAIRMAN HOOD: So it went back to my original 13 comment to you, a zoning consistency case. 14 MS. FULLER: Oh, okay. 15 Yeah. See, that's what I was CHAIRMAN HOOD: trying -- all I'm trying to do is help. 16 Ms. Fuller, I've been knowing you a long time. We can disagree, but I've been 17 knowing you a long time. I'm just trying to help you get the 18 19 answers to your question. 20 Okay, now, Mr. Theresa. Did I get it right that 21 time? 22 MR. THERESA: Yes. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Now, you know how this works. 23 set this down in September of 2018, I believe. I believe I 25 have the dates. I may have the dates kind of -- and we set

it down as rulemaking.

So your questioning is you don't believe that this is the proper context for us to set that. We made that decision months ago. So I'm not -- and actually, I don't know if you know this or anybody told you, but we held your response that we got this evening in abeyance. We still are going to have a conversation about that, even though we made a decision on that six months ago. So why now, through all of this, why now we're bringing it right back up?

MR. THERESA: Well, I think when strategies change it takes a while to catch up. I feel like we're playing a game of cat and mouse here. And so it just took a while to understand the implications of all of these things.

So when I understood it was a rulemaking, when I understood that Poplar Point was going to be a rulemaking, when I understood that Chicago Street was a rulemaking, and High Street was rulemaking, and K Street in Northeast was a rulemaking, I became much more concerned with the direction things were heading and so looked into this more specifically.

Because in the beginning, I was okay with the project, personally, as a person who lives in the neighborhood. I'm okay with the affordability and what they're offering there.

What I'm not okay with is this pattern of taking

away the power of people in their communities. And so when I heard there was another hearing, and that there actually were still people opposed to it, I felt like, whether or not I agree with them substantively, this isn't a substantive proceeding. This is not about the project. I feel like they are entitled to be heard.

And so this is a question of governance to me. And so when you ask me why it took a long time to respond, who knew? Who knew what was happening.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: So, Mr. Theresa, you don't think this is a proceeding where they're being heard?

MR. THERESA: I think that the ANC negotiated from a deleveraged position. I know that they came to an agreement. But I feel like they did not have the sort of leverage that they would have if they weren't under the impression that kind of, like, this was a done deal, and this is just kind of what's going to happen.

I feel like people in the neighborhood deserve the opportunity to present testimony and evidence about what's happening on their block and on their corner, whether I agree with them or not. Like, this is just a question of governance for me.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: So again, I want to go back to my question. You don't think this is a proceeding where people can be heard?

MR. THERESA: We know, we both know that the rulemaking proceeding is a very different proceeding from a contested case. And so I do not believe a rulemaking proceeding is adequate in this situation. I believe that this calls for a contested case and all of the protections that go along with it.

I think that you guys are listening to them, taking time out of your evening on this rainy night, appreciate it. I've come down here twice in two weeks, and it sucks. You guys are here every week, I guess, so yeah, appreciate you for that.

But, like, in terms of the law, there are certain things that people are entitled to. And I believe that the way this is being handled is inappropriate.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I noticed in one of your arguments in front of the courts, because I'm asking you a specific question, like I notice how they ask you the question. And I'm asking you that for a reason.

Because you said that this, your first initial statement -- now, you've given me a number of answers to the same question which I respect, but I'm asking you.

You've made the statement that people are not being heard. And it's not necessarily that we are sitting here. We take what we can do, and we listen to what they say. And we take it and deal with it in the context which

is before us, as you already know. But what I'm asking you,
you said that people were not being heard. So I'm asking you
again, is this proceeding where people are not being heard?
MR. THERESA: I think that there's a difference
between being heard, like, you know, you're hearing us. And
there's a difference between that and actually being heard
in a manner where there's some consequence to being heard.
And I don't think that there's much consequence to being
heard right now.
Like, people sat up and talked for a long time
about the affordable housing in this project. That's neither
here nor there. So what's it matter if you're listening to
them? I believe that you listen to them, I believe you were
moved by that testimony. I was moved by the testimony. But
we both know it doesn't matter.
We're here about ten feet of height on a 35,000
square foot lot. And what they build there, no one knows,
no one can guarantee. This isn't what this process is about.
CHAIRMAN HOOD: But, you know, also this is a
consistency case as well, right?
MR. THERESA: Yeah, whether it's consistent with
the Comprehensive Plan but also whether it's supposed to be
a contested case or rulemaking. And so in my eyes, this is
not appropriate for rulemakings.

And I don't understand how it ever was set down

that way. Because, really, we're talking about 10 feet of 2 height, a little bit of density, on a 35,000 square foot 3 singular lot with one property owner. 4 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. We could probably go back and forth and have a lot of conversation. 5 Because I really appreciate the conversation. But for now, I'll put that in 6 7 the parking lot, and I will hear from others. 8 I saw somebody raising their hand. And I want to 9 see if my other colleagues have anything that they want to 10 say. 11 (Off the record comments) CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, I'm going to allow that, but 12 13 typically this is our chance to ask the questions. 14 MS. SCOTT: Well, maybe I will skip it. 15 CHAIRMAN HOOD: No, I'm going to allow it. You know, is it ---16 17 I'm just looking at -- listening to MS. SCOTT: my perception, and I'm listening to the back and forth 18 19 between Mr. Theresa ---20 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Theresa. 21 -- and Greta, and yourself. MS. SCOTT: I work all day, and I have a profession, and I'm not in the legal field. And just all the red tape just to keep up with this, 23 we do not have, like, a lot of lawyers to even defend what 24 25 we are doing.

	74
1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well, you have a pretty good one
2	
3	MS. SCOTT: We have a pretty good one.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: who I was just talking to.
5	MS. SCOTT: But I don't have 100 of them or 1,000
6	of them like maybe Georgetown. Therefore
7	PARTICIPANT: No.
8	MS. SCOTT: No?
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I don't have 100 either. I take,
10	well anyway, I don't want to get into that.
11	MS. SCOTT: Which speaks to the vulnerability and
12	being able to properly, and timely, and rightfully stand up
13	for the things that we, as residents, think we are due.
14	That's all I wanted to say.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
16	MS. SCOTT: Thank you. Thank you for listening.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So I'll just leave it at
18	this without going back and forth. Because I'm sure there'll
19	be plenty of other opportunities.
20	We take what we do very seriously. We listen to
21	all groups, groups in favor, groups against, groups who blame
22	us, groups who like us. We listen to it all. And we make
23	the best decisions we can. And I've said that before, and
24	I'll say it again. And I'll leave it at that.
25	Let me give my colleagues an opportunity to ask

1	this panel, any questions or comments?
2	(No audible response)
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, so I guess it was just me.
4	All right, so thank you all very much.
5	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: No, I would just
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, Mr. Turnbull?
7	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I would just add that Mr.
8	Theresa's raised a lot of good points about what's a
9	contested case and what the issues involve, and what's
10	rulemaking. I think it's something that has to be thought
11	about and pondered. But I think he's raised a lot of good
12	points.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
14	MS. FULLER: Mr. Chairman?
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes?
16	MS. FULLER: This is very brief, the only thing
17	that I'd like to say is that, well, the final thing, is that
18	the ANC, the MOU that they have, and the 28 units, and all
19	of that, that was done on my watch. Like, I negotiated most
20	of that.
21	But the one most important thing, that's why I'm
22	saying I'm for this, is about the map amendment and DHCD, the
23	government, not being willing to sign on to what they have
24	High Street, LLC, here doing today. That I want on the
25	record. They're not willing to sign on.

1 CHAIRMAN HOOD: I think it's on the record twice. 2 remember you said that previously. I it's definitely on the record. 3 4 All right, thank you all very much. We appreciate 5 it. Was there anybody else? 6 (No audible response) 7 CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. I think this concludes --- colleagues, do we have any follow-ups? We do have an 8 issue that was given to us by Mr. Theresa. 9 Did I pronounce that right, Theresa, Theresa. I'm going to get it right. 10 11 So we do have that outstanding issue. And then I think we can come up with some basic advice. Chair Miller? 12 13 VICE CHAIR MILLER: In addition, thank you, Mr. Chairman, in addition to you had asked Mr. Freeman to provide us, I think, a written response to that preliminary question 15 which I think Mr. Turnbull would like to have. Well, I think 16 we'd like to have that ---17 18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yeah. VICE CHAIR MILLER: -- that written bullet ---19 20 Oh, I think he's already, he's CHAIRMAN HOOD: 21 already submitted the bullet. VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. So in addition to that, 22 I would like to know if any of my colleagues are interested 23 I recognize everything that's been said about this 24 in this. 25 not being about a project, that it is about a consistency

case.

But we know that there are several zones on the zoning map that can be not inconsistent with the moderate density residential on the Comprehensive Plan land use map.

And we have an analysis, a comparative analysis from the Office of Planning and, I think, from the Applicant maybe, I mean, from the Petitioner as well, comparing the existing R-3 and the proposed RA-2.

I would like to see what RA-1 would allow and whether, even though this isn't about a project, whether the commitments that have been made by the Petitioner about a potential project, whether that would fit into the RA-1, the development standards of the RA-2 -- of the commitments, the height, the stories, the density, not necessarily the other commitments that don't relate to development standards.

So I'd like to see the comparative with RA-1 which, I assume, also is not inconsistent with the moderate density and just to know whether or not the commitments that have been made about a potential project, whether that would be able to fit into that RA-1 category, especially since, as Commissioner Trumbull pointed out, there is RA-1 in the vicinity. And there are just many types of buildings in the vicinity. So that's what I would like to see.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: And maybe from both the

1	Petitioner and from the OP, because I guess there might be
2	a disagreement in there.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Anything else,
4	Commissioners?
5	(No audible response)
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right, Ms. Schellin, do we
7	have some dates?
8	MS. SCHELLIN: One week.
9	MR. FREEMAN: We can submit in a week.
10	MS. SCHELLIN: A week, okay.
11	MR. FREEMAN: So just so I'm clear, I can maybe
12	repackage our response that you already have with some
13	information about a comparison of RA-1 to RA-2, am I
14	understanding that correctly?
15	(No audible response)
16	MR. FREEMAN: Yes, we can have that in a week.
17	MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. So in a week, that would put
18	you by March 28th, 3 o'clock p.m. And so there are no
19	parties. So there's no responses other than OP would also
20	be able make a submission by the same time. And then we
21	could put this on for proposed action at the April 8th
22	meeting.
23	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Were testimonies for the record
24	from the young folks that I wanted
25	MS. SCHELLIN: We got

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: If not, I want to make sure those
2	are entered.
3	MS. SCHELLIN: Mr. Thompson's. We just need
4	the female.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: And Ms. Sapp.
6	MS. SCHELLIN: Ms. Sapp's. If she could hand hers
7	in.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let's make sure
9	MS. SCHELLIN: Her testimony.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yeah, let's make sure we get those
11	two.
12	MS. SCHELLIN: If she could hand hers in.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'd like to
14	MS. SCHELLIN: I've got
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right.
16	MS. SCHELLIN: I've got his. Yeah, I just need
17	hers.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, do we have anything else,
19	Ms. Schellin?
20	MS. SCHELLIN: That's it.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. I want to
22	MR. FREEMAN: So the record is otherwise closed?
23	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Other than, yeah, as long as we
24	have those.
25	MS. SCHELLIN: It's closed except for that.

1	That's why I need hers this evening.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Hold on one second before I close.
3	Also, Mr. Freeman, if you can respond, we're going to be
4	taking up first Mr. Theresa's rulemaking issue of whether
5	there's a rulemaking or contested case.
6	I'm told I need to afford you the opportunity as
7	well. I don't really need a book, we have enough to read.
8	But I'd like to keep it to one page and keep it simple. But
9	you know what, I can't really put a timberline or a time,
10	whatever it takes for you to respond.
11	MR. FREEMAN: Okay.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, so I think that's what the
13	Vice-Chair was kind of preferring that. But anyway, if you
14	could do that as well.
15	MR. FREEMAN: Thank you.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: okay. All right, anything else?
17	(No audible response)
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: We've got the dates. All right,
19	I want to thank everyone for their participation. And
20	tonight's hearing is adjourned.
21	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the
22	record at 8:17 p.m.)
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: Zoning Commission

Date: 03-21-19

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

near aus &