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CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Are we ready to get started? Good evening ladies and gentlemen. This is the regular public meeting of the Zoning Commission, the 1,382 Session. This is the seventh of 2014. We're located here in the Jerrily R. Kress Memorial Hearing Room.

My name is Anthony Hood, Chairman. Joining me are Vice Chair Cohen, Commissioner May, Commissioner Miller, and Commissioner Turnbull. We're also joined by the Office of Zoning Staff, Ms. Sharon Schellin, the Office of Attorney General, Mr. Bergstein, the Office of Planning, Ms. Steingasser, Mr. Lawson, and Mr. Goldstein.

I almost called B- Mr. Goldstein I'll be honest. I almost called you Mr. Mordphin. Okay, so anyway, all right. So, anyway, I want to first state that we do not take any public testimony unless we ask someone to
come forward.

    We ask that we do not have any display of signing or any disrupting noises as we move through our hearing process.

    Ms. Schellin, do we have any B- oh, we do have a preliminary matter, but we do we have any other B-

    MS. SCHELLIN: No.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I'm one of the Zoning Commission B- oh, okay. Thank you. Okay. Consent calendar, Zoning Commission Case Number 06-11K/06-12K. This is George Washington University request for a minor modification to a PUD at Square 39. Ms. Schellin.

    MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. In this case the applicant is requesting a minor modification to add a new sign to the upper portion of the project. Exhibit 4 is an OP Report in support. We've asked the Commission to consider action on this case.

    CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank
you, Ms. Schellin. Commissioners, again the applicant is requesting a minor modification to add a new sign to the upper portion of the project. The Office of Planning report, which is our Exhibit 4, is in support. Let's open it up for any comments.

Oh, first of all, you know what let me back up. I'm speed balling. It must be volleyball night. Does anyone have a problem with this being on the Consent Calendar?

MS. SCHELLIN: No.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. No objection. All right, so let's open it up for any comments. Any concerns? In not seeing any, I would move that we approve the minor mod request, placement of the sign, is Zoning Commission Case Number 06-11K/06-12K George Washington University, request for a minor mod to PUD at Square 39. And I ask for a second.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Second.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: It's been moved and properly second. Any further discussion?
All that's in favor, aye? Not hearing any opposition, Ms. Schellin, would you record the vote?

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Staff records the vote at five to zero to zero approve final action in Zoning Commission Case Number 06-Statute 11K/06-12K. Commissioner Hood moving. Commissioner Cohen, second. Commissioners May, Miller, and Turnbull in support.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Next we have a final action, Zoning Commission Case Number 13-06, Office of Planning Text Amendment, Re Retaining Walls. Ms. Schellin.

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. This was put back on the Commission for the B- back on the agenda, I'm sorry, for the Commission to review some changes made by OP and OAG. And so we'd ask the Commission to consider those changes to Section 413.8.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay, again Commission, this is back before the Commission
for use, to review the revisions made to 413.8 by the Office of Planning, Office of the Attorney General.

I want to thank the Office of Planning for their hard work and also Ms. Alma Gates, I want to thank her for her stick-to-it-ness in this particular case.

Let me open it up for any questions or comments.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chairman, you know, I think that we pretty much agreed on this in principle before. It was just that the language wasn't before us.

So I'm prepared to make a motion to approve Zoning Commission Case Number 13-06 Retaining Walls, Office of Planning, Text Amendments Chapters 4 and 4, Definition of Retaining Wall.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, it's been moved. Can I get a second?

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Second.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: It's been moved and
promptly seconded. Any further discussion?

All those in favor? Aye.

Not hearing opposition, Ms. Schellin, would you record the vote?

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, staff records the vote, five to zero to zero to approve the changes to Case Number 13-6 as proposed by OAG and OP. Commissioner May moving, Commissioner Turnbull seconding, Commissioners Cohen, Hood and Miller approving.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let's move on. Zoning Commission Case Number 11-08, Palazzo, LLC Two-Year PUD Time Extension at Square 2578. Ms. Schellin?

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, the applicant in this case is requesting a two-year PUD time extension of the order to extend to March 8, 2016.

The applicant states that despite the efforts it has made it will miss the deadline for filing for its permits by approximately two weeks, due in part by change
in the structure of the ownership entity.

At Exhibit 4 we have an OP Report in support of this request and we'd ask the commission to consider final action.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, I think Ms. Schellin has teed that up pretty good for us. Any comments? Commissioner May?

COMMISSIONER MAY: I just had a question for the Office of Planning. I'm a little confused because the applicant said in their submission on March 7th that they would miss the submission date, or the date to get the permit by two weeks. And it's now been five weeks since that time, and the extension request is for two years.

So I'm wondering, I mean, have they actually gotten the permit at this point? Do we need to extend it for two years, or is some lesser period acceptable? Do you all know?

MR. LAWSON: We don't know the status of the current permit application. As far as we know it's not being issued. Two years
is the standard amount for an extension. So we're not opposed to that.

I suppose if the commission wanted to establish a shorter time period, we'd also not be opposed to that. But we have no update on the status of their permit application.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. I mean, it just seems a little funny they need an extra couple of weeks and so we give them two years.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Yes, I actually concur with you that I don't even believe that two years is necessary. Unless there's some reason that is unclear in the submission that I don't see why can't just give it six months to a year.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I guess I would concur on just the one time we got an extension where it's not for financial reasons. They're basically 80% along on the construction drawings. So it sounds like they're close to being able to go for a permit. So I would be looking at a lesser time if it's simply merely
filing all those drawings.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Any other comments? So what are we proposing?

COMMISSIONER MAY: Well, you know, it might be actually helpful to understand from the applicant whether, if we give them six months or a year, whether that would be sufficient. But I don't know how far you want to go with that.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I think this one of those cases where we'll call Ms. Prince right on up and she can be able to expound, to help us move this along. She may just be back in six months, I don't know.

Oh, I'm sorry. Chairman Jordan must be using this button quite a bit because it was off.

MS. PRINCE: Good evening, members of the Commission, Allison Prince from Goulston & Storrs. I've heard from the applicant that they intend to file for permit by the end of May, but I have heard that for a few months now.
It seems to be taking a little longer. It is an incredibly complicated site that's been in play for a long time. I think a year would be more than adequate, but six months I would be uncomfortable with because I'm afraid I might be right back before you.

They are well underway though. They are heavily invested in the process, but it's involved continued dialogue with the Historic Preservation Office on some minor changes to the plans. A lot more complications with the permit set than they expected, and I think it's all laid out in the affidavit, all the effort they've put into it. But a year should be adequate.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Well I'm fairly in support of giving an extension. If a year is adequate then I'd be happy with that. So I would make a motion to grant a one year time extension on Zoning Commission Case 11-08.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: I'll second it.
CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. It's been moved and properly seconded. Any further discussion, to one year? All those in favor? Aye. Any opposition? Not hearing any, Ms. Schellin, would you record the vote?

MS. SCHELLIN: Just clarifying that the Case Number is 11-08A. Commissioner May making the motion to approve the extension for one year in Case Number 11-08A. Commissioner Miller seconding. Commissioners Hood, Cohen, and Turnbull in support of the extension.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, thank you. Let's go to proposed action Zoning Commission Case Number 13-07. This is David Belt Map Amendment at Square 5081. Ms. Schellin?

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. Exhibits 50-54 are some post hearing submissions, and we've asked that the commission consider taking proposed action on this case this evening.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, thank you. Commissioners, as you know, the Commission held
a hearing on OP's recommendation to rezone Square 5081, Lots 14, 15, 22, 804, 805, and 806 from the C-3-A to the R-5-B Zone District, and to rezone Square 5081 Lot 52 from the C-3-A to the R-5-C District.

The petitioner at that time contended that all the property should be zoned identically. And at that time they were requesting they should be zoned to R-5-B.

Potentially, there was a compromise, and the petitioner and others opposed at that time thought it was split zoning. Or they opposed, I'm sorry, I thinking. They thought, they were opposed to the split zoning which would have, and would accept the R-5-C zoning if it applied to all properties.

OP indicated while it continues to support the R-5-B, R-5-C split, it would not oppose all properties being re-zoned to R-5-C. And the story goes on.

And I think that was captured also
in Mr. Belt's letter. And I want to make sure I understood this because I highlighted it. He even states what I heard of the compromise, I think that at I first I thought that Mr. Belt and the community wanted to stick with R-5-B. And, Ms. Schellin, I asked you to look at Mr. Belt.

The way I understand this last sentence it says, "With that being said, after careful consideration, we will accept whichever zoning the Commission sees fit whether it is R-5-B or R-5-C. We request the Zoning Commission Zone all properties the same."

Let me make a statement first before I go any further. I understand that the Office received, I'm not going to say a complaint, a concern. I know a lot of people in this city. I know Reverend Young. I know of Reverend Young. Reverend Young and I don't hang out. I don't go to his church. I just know him.
I know a lot of people in the city. I know Kyrus Freeman. I know a whole lot of other B— I just use you because you because you was sitting there. But I know a lot of people in the city.

If I had to recuse -- and all of us, if we had to recuse our self for the people we know, we wouldn't be sitting up here. So I want you to know that I have not discussed this with Reverend Young. Haven't seen him in some time, since he preached at -- and that was a couple of years ago. And he walked out before anybody could say anything to him.

It might have been what he said, but, anyway, I will tell you that that's a concern. Mr. Belt, you can let Ms. Schellin know, and I will recuse myself happily. So, unless I hear otherwise from my colleagues or Mr. Belt, I will proceed.

Okay, all right, where was I? Okay, again, Ms. Schellin, if you could look Mr. Belt, because he says whether it is R-5-B or
R-5-C, we request that the Commission zone all properties the same. Is that a true statement?

So he will accept either R-5-B or R-5-C as long as they're both the same?

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, I mean it's B-

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well, that's what his letter says, but I see him doing something different.

COMMISSIONER MAY: So what --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: And I, when I read this, let me just say this, the reason why I'm asking that question, if you see I highlighted it, we do read your letters Mr. Belt. See the green? But, no, I can't, I just want you to shake your head if what I read here is actually true.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes?

COMMISSIONER MAY: I'm sorry to interrupt but I just think there should be some clarification. I think that Mr. Belt still
believes the entire set of properties should be
R-5-B. But if we're inclined to allow some of
it be R-5-C I think he'd rather see it all R-5-C
rather than split between R-5-B and C.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: That was my
interpretation.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Right, okay.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: But I wanted to
make sure that was my B- not open to either one.
That's kind of where I was.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Right, I mean,
it, you know, to say that he's open to either
one means that, you know, he's okay with either
R-5-B or R-5-C. I think he'd prefer to have
R-5-B.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well, Commissioner
May, the reason I'm asking, because the way I
read it?

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: He's okay with
either one.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
CHAIRMAN HOOD: That's why there's five of us up here.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I just want some clarification from my standpoint.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, I'm seeing a nod. So he'd rather stick with R-5-B. And I thought that was the case.

Okay, I'm going to open it up for comments. Vice Chair Cohen?

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I have absolutely no objection to move forward on a proposed action. However, prior to final action there is something that was in Mr. Belt's letter that's of concern to me.

And I would like Mr. Voudrie, et cetera to respond to something that was said with regard to, Mr. Voudrie advised me that they had not spent considerable resources as represented to the Zoning Commission. They
only had a concept drawing, not working plans.

And they had not received their
funding at that time as represented to the
Commission. And that's a concern to me that
statements were made to us. Some of us relied
on those statements. And I would like, prior
to final action, to the parties to respond to
that letter. Or whatever they're called.

MR. GOLDSTEIN: It might be helpful
if you identified the person.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Mister, well, I
said Mr. Voudrie, but, you know B-

MR. GOLDSTEIN: Right, so you'd
like Mr. Voudrie B-

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Yes.

MR. GOLDSTEIN: -- or his
representative to respond to the B-

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Yes.

MR. GOLDSTEIN: -- assertion made
by Mr. Belt, but you would not allow any
responses to Mr. Voudrie's. You're just
basically asking for opportunity for Mr.
Voudrie to respond?

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Yes, I am.

Thank you for clarifying that. No responses.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, any other comments? Commissioner Miller?

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I certainly support one zone rather a split zoning. And I think the R-5-C facilitates the housing development that's in plan for the block. So I'm prepared to support the R-5-C at the appropriate time.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, any other comments?

COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chairman, I would definitely prefer R-5-B. And I'm not a big fan of the housing project as it was designed, but this case is not really about that case in particular.

I mean I certainly have comments about that case, but I think that the, in the Office of Planning and others, and the applicant, I believe have already said these
things before about the concerns that we have about that development.

And I think that the better, I mean, I think what would be more consistent with the comprehensive plan, and would be better for the adjacent parkland and for the adjacent neighbors, and the scale of development in the neighborhood, which is largely single family homes, R-5-B makes a lot more sense.

But if it's the consensus of the Commission that R-5-C is the best that we're going to do in this circumstance then I will go along with that.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, Mr. Turnbull, do you want to add anything?

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes, I would just echo Commissioner May's concern. I think that R-5-B would be more appropriate, but considering the inconsistency in the zoning map and the Comp plan as to what this property is really zoned at, I think there is some reliance that has been set upon that map.
And unfairly or fairly or however you want to look at it, but I think that we have to be careful when someone looks at one of our maps and decides to go ahead from a business venture so that there's a certain reliability that people look at when they look at our maps.

And I think that that's my problem. I would prefer R-5-B, but I understand the reliability issue here.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Turnbull, I would actually concur with you. I've been back and forth on this. I thought when I first, because as you know, I didn't hear the first case, and I was not going to participate but because of where we were and all the other misnomers that were going on.

I, too, think that the city and what we present to anyone should be predictable, and that is a problem. I think Mr. Belt brings a good case, and I grappled with whether I was, which way I was going to go on this.

But if I B- I know personally if I
went downtown and did something, I want it to be predictable. I don't want nobody to second guess. So, anyway, that's just where I am.

I think I would be in favor of moving, since the letter states, all R-5-C, I think the way I hear, I hear unanimous, but I think B- I don't know how got here. Well I know how we got here. But I think Mr. Belt makes a case.

And this is unfortunate that the applicant relied on, well not the applicant, but someone relied B- and we don't really talk about cases when we're doing stuff like this. But I think that someone relied on information that was provided. And this city should be predictable.

COMMISSIONER MAY: And, Mr. Chairman, if I could add to that, I mean I think one of the things that is a concern, while the zoning map is, should be, the most reliable source for information about how you can develop your property I think the role of a
comprehensive plan and the changes that it advocates isn't always clear, particularly to the neighbors.

I think that some of the neighbors looked at that and thought, oh, well, you know, this is what the destiny of the property is likely to be. It's likely to wind up being zoned for single family homes like what's there now, and, or that that's what would result in terms of development.

And there's a, you know, there was a gap between the comprehensive plan and a change in zoning that. I mean, it's hard to say that somebody should have acted on that, but at least, I think, a stronger effort to make sure that people are informed that the comprehensive plan is not necessarily the last word, that there has to be zoning to follow that.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And I think this commission has been faced with something of this issue previously. I'm not sure how long ago it was. And, again, I think you'll find a
consistency of the information that citizens rely on should be predictable.

So that's where I am on this. Any other comments? Okay, would somebody like to B-

COMMISSIONER MILLER: I B-

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Vice Chair, I mean, I'm sorry. Commissioner Miller?

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Okay, all right. Thank you. I would move that the Commission take proposed action to approve Case Number 13-07 consistent with the compromise described by Office of Planning such that Square 5081, Lot 14, 15, 22, 52, 804, 805, and 806 would all be re-zoned from the C-3-A to the R-C Zone District, and with the caveat that, prior to final action, Mr. Voudrie respond to the assertion in Mr. Belt's letter as requested by the Vice Chair.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: And I will second that motion.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, it has been
moved and properly seconded. Any further discussion? All those in favor? Aye. Any opposition? So it is. Staff, would you record the vote?

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. Staff records the vote five to zero to zero to re-zone all of the lots to R-5-C as listed by Commissioner Miller, per the motion made by Commissioner Miller. Commissioner Cohen second. Commissioners Hood, May, and Turnbull in support.

And as far as the response requested by Vice Chair Cohen, if we could have that in B- since it's something that they are aware of, I think in one week, if we could have that by 3:00 p.m., April 22? And no responses to that? Mr. Freeman, can I get a nod from you, since you're the attorney? Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: And I feel compelled to say this since I said what I said earlier about me knowing people in the city. I think, when we're doing zoning and people go out
and solicit help, I think people need to respect
the commissioners' wishes.

When we ask people, and I'm doing
this for those who we are a looking to, we ask
you not to talk to us about a case, we don't need
to hear that you went to somebody's meeting and
we were asked to support that and you tried to
talk to them because we live in this city too.

You know, we are out there engaging
in other activities as others. And sometimes
it becomes very appalling when you ask people
not to talk to you about a case and they continue
to try to. So, anyway, I just wanted to put
that out there. That goes along with this case
and I'll leave it at that.

Okay, next. Zoning Commission
Case Number 13-10, ZP Georgia Consolidated PUD
Related Map Amendment at Square 2892. Ms.
Schellin?

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. On this
case we have Exhibits 43-47 post-hearing
submissions. And we'd ask the Commission to
consider proposed action on this case.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Schellin. Would somebody like to get us started on this one? Vice Chair Cohen?

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say for the record that I did not participate in this zoning hearing. So I will not be participating in any actions.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Was the record not provided, or you just didn't have a chance to read it?

VICE CHAIR COHEN: I didn't have a chance to read it.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Would you like to participate?

VICE CHAIR COHEN: No, sir.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: It's not necessary.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I figured that would be the answer. Would somebody like to get us started off? Commissioner May?
COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, first I would just comment on the, you know, we were provided with new drawings in response to comments that were made at the hearing that simplified the rooftop structures a bit, and, you know, connected some things so that the number was reduced.

And, you know, I think that's helpful. I'm not, I'm still not really super enthusiastic about the way the penthouse on the south side of the building is right up on the party wall.

And I know that's not really B- I know that it's allowed because it is on the property line and not an exterior wall, but I still don't like it. And we're likely to see it for a really long time before anything else happens on that block that might lead to a development of it to that same height.

And so, I mean, I guess, I just throw that out there for the lawyers in the room and the architects in the room that this is the sort
of circumstance we should work very hard to avoid. And I think it is avoidable with a very careful design effort, but I've beaten that horse. It's thoroughly dead.

So, now, with regard to the other issue as to whether there's some sort of easement there I find that it's not. I think that we have to go on what we have on paper that says that the, you know, the applicant owns the property. And we haven't see anything to indicate anything to the contrary. So I don't think it's really an issue for us to decide. I think we can act on what we see before us.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay, any other comments? Questions?

CHAIRMAN TURNBULL: Mr. Chair, I don't think we've had any other submittals that would convince us that we need to worry or act upon the theoretical easement here. So I think, without having that before us, it's not in our jurisdiction to act on that, I think.

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I would concur...
with what I've heard about the easement. While it's a very rough situation, I'm not sure if we can go down, I'm not going to say that alley, but I'm not sure if we can go down that road in this particular case because I think my question at the hearing about what was presented to us, I thought that it was very unusual.

It was rather unusual. But I don't think the evidence has been provided to us to move. And I think to err on the side of caution we need to stay away from making easements in the city, so.

CHAIRMAN TURNBULL: Well, my only comment is that I thought putting another fence up without advising the neighbors about their cars and everything was a little unfortunate. I don't think that was in the best practice of any developer to do that.

I think there should have been more a careful consideration of proceeding, but I think they were within their rights. But I
think, as a good neighbor, they should have been able to have gone out and advise those people.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I would concur with your comments, Mr. Turnbull. Any other comments, anything? Commissioner Miller?

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would concur with Mr. Turnbull's comments about the easement. On the inclusionary zoning requirement the applicant is requesting a map amendment from a PDA related map amendment, from C-2-A to C-2-B.

And under the IZ regulations, the project, had it been developed under C-2-A, would have been required to set aside 5,249 square feet of floor area for affordable units, and half would have been low income, and half would have been moderate income.

It's my understanding that under the proposed re-zoning the property's IZ requirement would be a greater square footage of affordable housing. But all of it would be set aside for moderate income housing as
permitted under the C-2-B zone. And none of it would be low income.

So while there's an overall growth, where there's an overall increase in low and B-
overall increase in affordable housing under IZ it's, there's a reduction of, I think it's 2,000, over 2,000 square feet of, or is it over 3,000 square feet? Over 3,000 square feet. There's a 3,000 square feet loss of low income housing as a result of the map amendment if we were approve it.

So I think what we need from the applicant unless we have it and I've missed it is some kind of a balancing of the net gain of affordable housing against the net loss of low income housing before we can B- I don't know if we need that before we take proposed action, but certainly before final action.

So that's, in that kind of balancing, you know, we would need to know from the B- we would need to get from the applicant the likely number of total IZ units that would
result from the C-2-A set aside, the number of low income units that, that would result, and the likely square footage of low income units.

And then the applicant should then balance that, the 2,431 square feet of moderate income housing gained from the re-zoning against the loss of low income housing that would have resulted under existed zoning, and explain why. The applicant should explain why the net gain should be considered a public benefit.

So I would just ask that if we make a motion tonight to approve, which I'm prepared to support, that we ask for that information.


COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Chair, I would move that we take proposed action on Zoning Case Number 13-10, CP Georgia Consolidated PUD and related map amendment at Square 2892, considering the items that we've
already mentioned, especially Mr. Miller's comments there regarding the IZ, and look to a second.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: I second.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, it's been moved and properly second. Any further discussion? All those in favor, aye. Not hearing opposition I'll close voting. Ms. Schellin, would you record the vote?

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. Staff will record the vote four to zero to one, to approve proposed action in Zoning Commission Case Number 13-10.


And I actually left the room for the items that were asked for. But I'm sure that Mr. Freeman knows what was asked for. So how much time do you think? A week? Two weeks? One week? So we'll give him until 3:00 p.m.,
April 22.

And then we have to allow the party in opposition one week to file a response to those items only that are provided. So that would until 3:00 p.m., April 29.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, let me just state I saw Mr. Morgan come in as we were deliberating, especially on the easement.

I would suggest two things you can touch base with staff another day, or you can look at us on, what is it, Web Stream Live? Well, it won't be live, but video on demand and see how we dealt with that first issue because there was some discussion that went on before you walked in.

MS. SCHELLIN: And also I would just remind the parties that this was, since proposed action was taken that B- and I do, I should have a copy B- since this was a PUD that they need to abide by Section 2403, 15-2403, 21. If they need a copy of that, they can obtain that from me.
CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, anything else on this?

MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, next we will go to hearing action Zoning Commission Case Number 14-04 Professional Associates & the International Finance Corporation, Consolidated PUD at Square 74. Mr. Goldstein?

MR. GOLDSTEIN: Good evening Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission. The applicants in this case, Professional Associates & the International Finance Corporation have filed a consolidated plan unit development to add an office addition to the IFC's existing office building at the southwest corner of 21st and K Streets Northwest.

The addition would replace an older and less dense detached office building with new office space, be 11 stories and 130 feet tall, and measure about 154,000 square feet, representing a net increase of about 89,000 square feet on the site.
The overall FAR for the entire site would rise to 10.48 FAR. And the new space is intended to provide room for IFC expansion.

Other details of the proposal include ground floor and mezzanine retail. The addition would have its own lobby entrance, and four levels of independently accessible underground parking containing 48 vehicle parking spaces. And the addition would extend above an existing private alley.

Areas of flexibility that are requested include the ability to eliminate the mezzanine portion of the retail, although not the ground level, if the mezzanine space proves unsuccessful, the typical design flexibility that you see in most cases, and finally the ability, under Section 1709.24 to exceed the 10 FAR for a proposed additional .48 FAR.

This point perhaps needs a bit more emphasis that only 10 FAR is a matter of right with TDRs, but the .48 requires PUD flexibility.
On this point OP notes that there may be a difference of opinion with the applicant regarding how the regulation is interpreted. It appears to OP that the flexibility must be approved by the Commission for the additional density and that TDRs also must be purchased for the square footage.

This is something that we will continue to work to clarify prior to public hearing. The OP report also raises a few additional topics that we'll continue work with the applicant on, namely the roof structure and tower design, maintenance of a meaningful connection, the housing linkage calculation, benefits and amenities proffer and the justification for the separate garage access.

The comprehensive plan future land use map designates the site as high density commercial as detailed in the OP report. The applicant's proposal is not inconsistent with this designation or the Comp Plan's land use policy guidance.
Consequently, OP recommends that the Commission set down the application for a public hearing. And I'm happy to answer any questions that you may have.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, we're going to have some questions, Office of Planning. And then after that I would like to take a three-minute break. And then I'd like for us to come back on the record. So, any questions of the Office of Planning?

COMMISSIONER MAY: I have a question. Well I mean, it's sort of a question. But when you raise the issue of the "tower" and I don't understand really how something that is so extensive could actually be considered a tower per se, and I hope that that's one of the questions that you're trying to resolve.

MR. GOLDSTEIN: We'll try to resolve that question.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay, because, I mean, in my view anything that's going to go
B- I mean particularly since this is expressed as, you know, basically two-thirds of the facade of this building is, has this elevated height, I mean there's just no way.

It just doesn't, it's not a tower to me, and, you know, maybe they can, maybe some elements of this can be, you know, can be part of the final design, but there's just no way that I'm going to support something that has a "tower" that's all along that, I guess the K Street, facade. It just, it doesn't work.

I also, I guess I'm a little unclear on the meaningful connection. Is there, I mean, is there going to be a connection at each floor? Or a future connection to each floor, or?

MR. GOLDSMITH: What it's showing now is that, yes, there would be connections on each floor. It would be expansion space for the IFC. But it is being built with its own separate lobby, its own separate parking.

The application references, I
believe, a 40-year lease. So at some point the lease could expire and the building could operate independently.

So what we're encouraging the applicant is to have some firm, meaningful connection, if walls are put up and this building operates independently, that something remains to make it consistent as an addition under zoning.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Right, okay. Good. And I also like the idea of trying figure out if there's a way for this building to operate without putting in another garage ramp. It seems kind of silly. It's for the footprint you've got, the amount of ramp there is just ridiculous. I mean, it may be the only thing you can do, but it just seems like an awful lot. Thanks.

COMMISSIONER HOOD: Vice Chair?

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. When you're exploring the connections for the, sort of, second building,
I guess there's a disconnect for me, when you have a 40-year lease, why you even need a separate lobby. Because after 40 years, should they withdraw from further leases, you're going to renovate the building anyway to upgrade it and modernize it.

So if you can get the applicant to elaborate more on the need for that second lobby. And then I don't, have never found mezzanine retail to really work well. And, again, I think there needs to be a greater explanation as to B- and they're even asking that if it's not leased within two years to substitute it. But why are, can they provide us with information that, you know, mezzanine retail in this location is feasible.

I know that a lot of other buildings have had to modify the retail space that's been on the mezzanine into office space.

And then, of course, I think you covered a number of other things with regard to the housing and affordable housing. You know,
and I'd like, maybe, somebody in, the expert in OP to, you know, check out to make sure that they are maximizing the payment. Thank you. Who else? Mr. Turnbull?

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Thank you, Vice Chair. I would agree with your comments. I mean, I think the retail aspect is something that's a little troubling. It has been problem in other areas. So I think we need some more talk about what they see as possible options, how they're going to develop that, and what kind of uses could go in there.

I would also agree with Commissioner May that it seems like the term embellishment is a bit of stretch. They have the whole facade, but, and you're nodding your head Mr. Goldstein. I figure you're well aware of our concerns.

And the other part. I guess the third part is the blending of the two buildings. And so, we're morphing from a zoning issue to a building code issue whether you're going to
have a firewall. I mean, this is, in theory, it's going to be an addition.

So there's going to be a separation, I mean, ideally you're building a separate lobby so that this thing can function separately at some other point. So there are those kinds of issues. So it would be good to hear some analysis of what they really involve to how they really are going to set this thing up. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thank you. I would like to just, I'm prepared to support setting down this for a hearing.

I would, I agree with all of the requests made by the Office of Planning in their set down report dated April 4, 2014 asking for more information from the applicant prior to the public hearing, and on the roof structure and tower design, the meaningful connection, the housing linkage, the benefits, amenity proffer, and the separate entrance.

And then there's some additional
items that they had in there in the body of their report. I think all that information would be useful and necessary for us to have prior to the hearing.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, I don't have any comments. Anything else commissioners?

VICE CHAIR COHEN: No.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, somebody can make a motion.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: I would like to move to set down Zoning Commission Case Number 14-04, Consolidated Plan Unit Development at 21st and K Street Northwest, and ask for second.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Second.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: So moved and proper second. Any further discussion? All those in favor? Aye. Not hearing opposition, Ms. Schellin, would you record the vote?

MS. SCHELLIN: Staff records the vote five to zero to zero to sit down Zoning Commission Case Number 14-04 as a contested case. Commissioner Cohen moving.
Commissioner Miller second. Commissioners Hood, May, and Turnbull in support.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioners, I have a request that has come in this evening about the Z.R.R. and I think we have to do B—we need to do this at this time. So what I'd like to do is take two minutes. I'm not foreclosing you, Mr. Bergstein, or anything.

I'd just like to take two minutes so I make sure I have the information. This request comes from the Mayor of the District of Columbia. So I want to make sure that I get this right. So if we could take two minutes, I appreciate it.

And I'd like for those who are here to stay because this is very important. You can help us get the word out if there's going to be a word to get out. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off the record at 7:18 p.m. and went back on the record at 7:21 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay let's go back
on the record. This is a request coming from
the Mayor of the District of Columbia that the
Zoning Commission leave the record open in the
Z.R.R. process until September 15th. Wait a
minute.

It says September 15, 2015. Okay, September 15, 2014. He is, he's asking B- this is a request coming directly from him. So that the Office of Planning Director, Ms. Ellen McCarthy and her staff will work with the residents of this city to provide information and, those who want to provide input, to assist with input.

From colleagues that we have heard a lot of discussion about we don't understand, we don't know. And I think for the request to come from the Mayor of the city at this time, I think is, I would say it's definitely in order.

I think the residents have spoken, a number of them. Some of them may take a little longer to kind of get intrigued at what
we're doing. I think they should be afforded an opportunity.

And I can just tell you that this is the first time on the Commission, well, no. I take this back. Maybe the third time in my years on the Commission that we've had a request come from the Mayor of the District of Columbia. So let me open up for discussion. Any discussion?

COMMISSIONER MAY: No, I was going to say I'm, you know, I'm sure that many people would support having the record open for a longer period. And I have been open to the idea of getting more input. I think we should also recognize the fact that we heard a lot of testimony from people that we should move ahead, and move ahead quickly.

So I'm sure there are going to be some people who, you know, who will not be so thrilled about keeping the record open longer. But, on balance, I would say that more input would probably be beneficial.
And while it has taken many years to get the zoning regulation rewrite to this point, if it's like the last writing of the regulations it's going to last 50 years or more. And so if it takes a few more months, I think that's probably okay.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Any other B- Vice Chair?

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Yes. I understand that a lot of people felt that they did not have an opportunity to participate. I think a lot of it is regarding to what happens in a democracy. Some people are engaged and other people are not.

And although I concur that it's always best to be as inclusive as possible I don't think it's a fair B- I don't think it's fair for the people who did take the time and effort to study the zoning rewrite. It has been around a very, very long time.

And I really do believe that a lot of people will feel very concerned that their
efforts now are also pushed back. And I just
don't think that that is appropriate for the
Mayor to have asked the Zoning Commission to
push further into the future. But that's my
own opinion.

And, again, I know that being
inclusive is very, very, very important. I
think we've even gone beyond the what the Office
of Planning had done. We've encouraged the
Office of Planning to meet with a lot of people.

I think they have taken their, the
direction very seriously and have done so. So
I just am not in favor of postponing it any more.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, thank you.
Any other comments? Commissioner Turnbull?

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well, I
guess I have mixed feelings about it. I think
we heard over the last couple years a lot of
people's input. Some Wards were more engaged
than others. And I think a lot of them are
really, and a lot of professionals are waiting
for us to move forward on this.
And I want to say that the Office of Planning, Ms. Steingasser, Mr. Lawson, and their teams, I think really did do a lion's share of a lot of work on this. Is it satisfactory to everybody? Does everybody B— you're not going to please everybody all the time.

It's like trying to get people out to vote. You can tell them it's their God given right, it's the right of every citizen in this country to vote, but not everybody's going to do it.

So I think we're having this throwback of a lot people have not been paying attention. And now it's come to the point where B— if the Mayor feels that he's got input from enough people that he'd like to postpone it, or to do more, I don't know how many more meetings we're going to be able to do.

And I don't know if the attendance is going to be any greater at all if we do 50 more meetings. But I'm willing to go along
with that.

I mean, I think if we want to do it, then let's do it and give the new Interim Director a chance to work, and see what other ideas that she has. And if it plays on a little better, then I think that it's good for the city.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Any other comments? Commissioner Miller?

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, I would concur with the comments of my colleagues, particularly the Vice Chair about, on the issue of when we get to September 15, and the people who are still concerned about specific provisions say, well, you know, we're going to have a new Mayor. And, you know, they'll come up with some argument for delay.

One would likely be we're going to have a new Mayor. Let's let the new Mayor decide whether or not to go forward. And I just wanted to share with you my familiarity with
that dynamic. During the last three comprehensive plan amendment cycles that I was involved with the Council in 1998, in December of 1998, in December of 2006, and in December of 2010 which is when the council acted on those last three comprehensive plans.

And the new Mayor was going to be coming in. And the people who were concerned asked, let the new Mayor deal with it. And the Council did not wait. There had been a lot of public hearings.

And, you know, in the end there was a lot satisfaction with the comprehensive plan from even the people who were concerned about it, and many of the people who have expressed concern about the Z.R.R. have cited the comprehensive plan process as a model of public engagement and how, even though they were critical, many of them were critical at the time.

But I think it's B- it is a unique opportunity with Ellen McCarthy coming in as
Acting Director of OP being familiar with that
dynamic and that comprehensive planning
process, and her own fresh perspective.

And so I think it is a useful thing
for us B- or not a destructive thing for us to
do to allow more time. Let me put it that way.
I know not useful, but I think it's not, I don't
think any harm is done having, being going
through this Z.R.R. process for seven years.
What's another six months?

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I will say
that as someone -B I think Mr. Turnbull and I,
I think we've been in it from the long haul. I
don't know about you, Commissioner May. Have
you been in it from the long haul? I'm not too
concerned about the seven years. I'm more
concerned about proceeding with caution and
doing it right.

I've never been concerned, from day
one, I've said this in front of the Council,
about 7 years or 10 years. I'm more concerned
about doing it right. And if some people have
a level of uncomfortableness, I understand what the Vice Chair is saying. I don't particularly agree with it. Because there are a few people who may be more engaged than others.

At the end of the day, even when I look at this dais, when I think about the Z.R.R. B- and this is something that I thought about even yesterday when I was, when it was coming out of my mouth to the Chairman. We're going to have a last meeting on the 24th and the record's closing on the 25th.

Where's the opportunity for the folks who on the 24th, to provide something on the 25th? They don't do this full time. They don't do this full time. They do more than just zoning. Some of us do more than just zoning.

So I think, in all fairness, I appreciate the Mayor's suggestion. And I appreciate allowing that opportunity. I think if we started deliberating, some of that may have happened anyway. I'm not sure. I can't predict it.
But I just think that this request B- and I hear Commissioner Miller's concerns. Because I can tell you, this Commission and the changeover, the Office of Planning report in December, or maybe it was in October 1998 said support a project. In January of '98 it said, deny the project.

So, and that was my first time experiencing that. I'd just got on the Commission, and I was confused. I said, okay, well what changed? And then it dawned on me. Okay, this is what changed. But I think that the concerns that we have heard from those who B- and I don't want to take anything from Office of Planning.

And I think the Office of Planning will agree, they're getting more invitations now. It might have took us, to get to this point, seven years and a lot of invitations and going out to the public. They do more now than ever. People are getting engaged more now than ever.
If it took us this long to get to where we can get people engaged, because guess what? The people who live here are the ones who's going to have to endure to a certain point.

Now some of our neighborhoods are historic. So we're not going to pretty much be affected to a certain point. I mean I'm just going to put it out there like that. And then some of us are going to be affected by certain things going on in our neighborhood.

So I think allowing this opportunity, I think from what I've heard from my colleagues, I think allowing this opportunity, and Ms. McCarthy was here previously, I think she worked well with the residents of this city. And I think she will bring an added value as we move forward. Not taking anything away from the Office of Planning.

I've been out there to the communities with them. I've been out there
with them to different wards, and Ward 7 when it was about the police report. It wasn't nothing about zoning. I don't think people understood the magnitude of zoning.

And I think Ms. Schellin will tell you, I start off in certain wards in this city, when I go out and speak, I say we are 40 to 50 years behind in this community in zoning. And I mean that. And that's how I'm going to start off on Thursday night when I go to Ward 4. And when I'm in Ward 5. Two places on Thursday night.

People are getting engaged. I think this is a valid request. I think that B-I'm not sure who all, I guess this is what the Mayor's heard. He represents the city. He's still the Mayor regardless of what happened he's the Mayor until January 2nd, and the new Mayor's sworn in.

So I think we need to honor his request. We don't get many from any Mayor. But I think when we get it we need to take heed
to it.

So I am in support of his request. And I would move B- the only thing that concerns me is what I have written here today says 2015. I know that he's not asking for 2015.

So I would go with this motion and say, I would make a motion that we keep the record open until September the 15th, 2014 and allow for the new Director McCarthy along with the Office of Planning staff to continue to provide information to those who want to make input.

And also, with that, I would move that we council and we ask the staff and everyone to get out the message that the hearing for the 21st be counseled. 21st and the 24th, right?

MS. SCHELLIN: I believe the one for the 24th will continue. It's only the 21st B-

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. That the --

MS. SCHELLIN: -- that will be
cancelled.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: The 21st is when we go out to Wards 7 and 8?

MS. SCHELLIN: Wards 7 and 8. Yes.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let me take that. Let's talk about the cancellation next.

MS. SCHELLIN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let me break it up.

I was trying to B-

COMMISSIONER MAY: Can we B- I mean, we don't need to determine what our meeting schedule will be at this moment. That's not something we normally just B-

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well we have B-

COMMISSIONER MAY: -- on.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: We don't have another hearing until the B- the 21st is when we go out to Wards 7 and 8?

COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.

MS. SCHELLIN: And we need to publically announce it.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: -- we need to
decide. Because here's the thing, when we have
a hearing because of all this education that's
going on we want to make sure that people are
in tune. Let me just finish.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: People are in tune
to the subject as opposed to going out and then
having to go back again. Unless we want to go
out. But let me break it up. Let me do that.
Let's first vote on the motion to extend, leave
the record open to September 15, 2014 for the
reasons provided. And I ask for a second.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Second.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: It's been moved and
properly seconded. Any further discussion?
All those in favor? Aye. Any opposition?

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Nay.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, one opposed.
All those in favor, four, one opposed.

MS. SCHELLIN: Staff records the
vote four to one to zero. Commissioner Hood
moving. Commissioner Turnbull second.
Commissioners May and Miller in support.
Commissioner Cohen opposed.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, now let's talk about the hearing. Do we want to continue the hearing on 21st and the 24th or B-

COMMISSIONER MAY: I'm sorry, state again what they are?

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, they B-

COMMISSIONER MAY: The 21st is what?

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Wards 7 and 8.

MS. SCHELLIN: Correct. And my understanding, and if Ms. Steingasser is at liberty to state, my understanding is that the B- it was stated that the Wards 7 and 8 hearing that they were okay with that one being cancelled.

MS. STEINGASSER: That is correct. I was at the meeting with the representative of ANCs and the Mayor this afternoon. And Commissioner Holly Mohammed, who had requested the special meeting on the 21st, was vocally
supportive of cancelling that meeting.

COMMISSIONER MAY: And then what was on the 24th?

MS. SCHELLIN: That was the one that was going to be held in this hearing room open to anyone who wanted to come and testify from any Ward that had not previously testified.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay.

MS. SCHELLIN: So therefore anyone who wanted to testify from Wards 7 and 8 could come on that evening.

COMMISSIONER MAY: So Mr. Chairman are you proposing that we cancel both? Or one or the other? I don't understand.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'm proposing, due to these latest developments with Council both. But I will tell you from what I heard from Ms. Steingasser I'm very concerned. And I will say this at the hearing. And I will tell the Mayor, anyone. I'm very concerned about Ms. Mohammed.
And I will tell her B- I'm going to
tell her at the next hearing. And publically
I'm going to tell her. We have done
everything, and I'm B- actually I think I've
already told her this. And I'm going to repeat
it. We have done everything she's asked for.
What concerns me is we're cancelling this.
We'll do it because of the other results.

And apparently Ms. Mohammad is
asking us to cancel it. What about the rest of
the residents of this city? This city doesn't
operate just on one person. That's my issue.
But I think, to the developments, and I would
like to have heard that the group wanted us to
maybe cancel 7 and 8 as opposed to just Ms.
Mohammad. Ms. Steingasser, then we'll come
back to Ms. Schellin.

MS. STEINGASSER: There was
consensus with the group that was in the Mayor's
office today. They were B- that this would be,
that the meeting that was focused on 7 and 8
would be cancelled. It was B- I explicitly
asked Commissioner Mohammed, since she was the one who specifically requested it and it had been granted to.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well thank you, Ms. Steingasser. I withdraw my comments. And Commissioner Mohammed, if you're looking at it, I apologize. I do make mistakes. Okay, you're right. She did ask for 7 and 8.

I just don't want, like, Commissioner Jackson, people I know, who live in 7 to say, well why did you cancel it? Why did you all do that? And, you know, we run into a lot of that. And it's kind of hard when you're balancing competing interests.

So I will withdraw my comments about Commissioner Mohammad, and I will actually publically apologize to her even though she may not be watching. She might look at it later. Ms. Schellin?

MS. SCHELLIN: I just wanted to add one thing, that we did not have anyone signed up for Monday night's hearing, but we did have
a few people signed up for the 24th's hearing already, registered to testify. So, I did want to state that before you cancel that one.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So we can B-

MS. SCHELLIN: I mean not that we couldn't B-

CHAIRMAN HOOD: We can save B-

MS. SCHELLIN: -- notify them.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: -- Metro fare down, or riding our bicycles, or however we're going to get there. Okay. Vice Chair?

VICE CHAIR COHEN: No, I was just going to say, it's sort of B- it just boggles my mind that people want to cancel meetings yet they want to postpone it to September. Either you want to, you know, sit down with us and tell us what your concerns are, or you don't.

And that's just, I guess, a frustration that I have felt when people are, you know, saying one thing and then they're doing another thing. So, I would suggest that we go ahead and get as much feedback as
possible.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I really don't think that argument is valid. That's just my opinion. Yes, but that's why it's five of us up here. I don't think your argument is valid, Vice Chair. I think that the problem with what you're saying about going ahead. I think what the Mayor's asked us to do, and the commissioners have asked us to do, so they can come up to speed. Yes, we've been through this, we've been here, but I think we owe this city that.

So they can come up to speed. And when they do come down in front us, they can talk about parking. They can talk about come of the 880. They can talk about some of the pressing issues as opposed to saying, we haven't had time to read it.

And I think that's more helpful to this Commissioner than it is anything else.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chairman, I mean, I think since we have a clear message that
Ward 7 and 8 meeting, some group presumably representing the folks who really wanted that have indicated that they would prefer to have that cancelled, that's fine. But I think the other one that was going to be open to everybody, why wouldn't we just go ahead and hear what people have to say?

People may have reactions to the schedule that we need to hear. And, you know, we need, we probably need input on how to move forward between now and September. I mean, I think we should go ahead with the second one, and cancel the Ward 7 and 8 one.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I can go with that. I think that's a good move, thank you, Commissioner May. Does anyone have any objections?

VICE CHAIR COHEN: No B–

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Hold on, hold on, Vice Chair, let me let Commissioner Miller.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: I think Commissioner May's suggestion is a good one.
If the Ward 7 and 8 hearing was going to be a second opportunity that no other combination of Wards' second opportunity in this round, was going to get, for, to comment on Z.R.R.

So we B- and undoubtedly, due to our prior actions have put it off until September. We're undoubtedly going to have more than one hearing if we B- we go ahead with the 24th. And there may be new testimony, not just from people from who we've heard before, besides the ANCs. So I'm supportive of what Commissioner May has suggested.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Vice Chair?

VICE CHAIR COHEN: I'm supportive of what Commissioner May has said as well. But I also want to state for the record because when you said that we were going to get more information and people talking about, let's say, parking I just want to remind everybody that we have a great deal of feedback from many, many people across the entire city on many issues.
At least I know that there's stacks of it in my own home that I, you know, have briefly looked at before every single meeting. So, I just wanted to state that for the record.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, thank you. Again, let me ask this. And I don't want to muddy the waters any more, due to this latest development. Are we going to still keep the same processes in place as far as B- do I want to B- do we want to talk about that tonight?

COMMISSIONER MILLER: I don't think we do. Well I think we should keep the process in place and then going forward we can open it up again.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Otherwise B-

COMMISSIONER MAY: I think it's too much for us to figure out right at the moment based on this. I mean, this is, you know, this is a really kind of an abrupt development.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'll withdraw that.
COMMISSIONER MAY: So let's, I mean, let's give it some thought.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: So the meeting's still on for the 24th. I want to thank my colleagues for doing that, and also, I'm sure that the residents who have expressed concern to the Mayor will thank us.

Now, we're doing this at some point B- and I said this yesterday. At some point we need to start deliberating. But I want to make sure that we have vetted and heard from as many as possible. This will help us hear from different folks on these issues.

I think it will be helpful, to help us. So, anyway, the 24th is still on. And we start at 6:30. And now what did we set aside for the 24th? Is it --

MS. SCHELLIN: I have to check whether that one was, I believe B-

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, I don't want to put no times. I can check with the office.

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Whatever was
scheduled.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes --

MS. SCHELLIN: I don't have it in front of me.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right B-

MS. SCHELLIN: I thought it was 6:00, but B-

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, do we have anything else?

MS. SCHELLIN: Just want to verify that you B- do they need to vote on cancelling that hearing since it was, it's just, it's consensus? Okay.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I want to thank everyone for their participation in this meeting tonight, and also for this latest development which we've been asked to do I want to thank all of us for chiming in. Whether we agree or disagree, that's why there's five of us, and that's what causes a great process because we can all disagree, right?
VICE CHAIR COHEN: Right.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So with that, this meeting is adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting in the above-entitled matter was concluded at 7:43 p.m.)