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Chairman Hood: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. This is the Regular Public Meeting of the Zoning Commission, 1,383 meeting session for Monday, April 28, 2014. It’s 6:30 p.m. We’re located at Jerrily R. Kress Memorial Hearing Room.

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

We do not take any public testimony and readings unless we ask someone to come forward.

I do have one preliminary matter. This is on the Commission for the District of Columbia. This is for a closed meeting and
roll call vote for training.

In accordance with -- as Chairman of the Zoning Commission for the District of Columbia and in accordance with 45C of the Open Meetings Act, I move that the Zoning Commission hold a closed meeting on Tuesday, May the 13th of 2014, at 1:00 p.m., for the purpose of receiving training as permitted by D.C. Official Code 2-575(b)12.

The subject of this training is a residential parking permit program Code of Conduct and enumerable application.

Is there a second?

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Second.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Will the secretary please take a roll call vote on this motion before us now as it has been seconded?

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir.

Chairman Hood.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Aye.

MS. SCHELLIN: Vice Chair Cohen.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Yes.
MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Yes.

MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner May.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.

MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Turnbull.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes.

MS. SCHELLIN: Vote carries.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you.

As it appears that the motion has passed, I request that the Office of Zoning provide notice of this closed meeting in accordance with the Act.

Ms. Schellin, do we have anything on this issue?

MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Anything else?

Thank you.

Okay, next, let’s go to the Consent Calendar item, Zoning Commission Case Number 12-05B, Ballpark Square, LLC, request for minor modifications to PUD @ Square 701.
Ms. Schellin.

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. The applicant is requesting a minor modification in order to allow for flexibility regarding the design of the southern facade party wall. The applicant and applicant=s southern neighbor recently began coordinating their construction efforts, and as a result, the applicant wishes to request said flexibility.

There is an OP report in support of this request, and we=d asked the Commission to consider finalize my list.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let=s open it up.

Commissioners, any comments on this -- first, let me back up. Does anyone like to see this come off as the Consent Calendar item?

Okay, not seeing anyone. Let=s open it up for comments.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Turnbull.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I think we
knew that this would probably be coming before us, the request for this. We knew about this since the hotel, and I would think that the applicant stated in the record that since both projects are going to be going apparently under construction simultaneously, I don’t see a problem with this.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Turnbull.

Vice Chair Cohen.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I concur with the Commissioner, but I would like to see the cost savings. Actually, encourage the applicant to use it for upgrading green features of the project.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Is that just a request or is that something you would like to hold this in advance for -- is that a showstopper for you tonight, Vice Chair?

VICE CHAIR COHEN: No, sir, it’s not. I just believe though that there is going to be some substantial savings and I think it’s an
opportune time to add some green features, which in the long run will help the project with their operating costs.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

Any other comments?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Is there anyone who would like to make a motion?

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Chair, I would move that we, I guess, we approve the, the minor mod for Zoning Case 12-05B, Ballpark Square, LLC @ Square 701, with -- including the Vice Chair=s request for them to at least look at ways to add more green features to the project.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, it=s been moved.

Get a second?

MS. SCHELLIN: Second.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Moved and properly second of Vice Chair Cohen.

Thank you, Mr. Turnbull.
Any further discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN HOOD: All those in favor.

BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

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

MS. SCHELLIN: Staff will record the vote zero to zero to improve final action in Zoning Commission Case Number 12-05B. Commissioner Turnbull moving, Commissioner Cohen second, and Commissioners Hood, May, and Miller in support.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Next, let’s go to Hearing Action, Zoning Commission Case Number 10-26B, 3321 Georgia, LLC – PUD Modification @ Square 3040.

Mr. Mordfin.

MR. MORDFIN: Good evening, Chair Members of the Commission.

The applicant request modification to an improved PUD located in the southeast
corner of Georgia Avenue and Morton Street, Northwest. This PUD approved in 2011 and extended in 2013.

It was for an eight-story mixed use retail and residential building that incorporated an existing Post Office facility that was required to be retained into the design. The application proposed to increase the size of the structure by cantilevering the proposed building at over a portion of the Post Office as the applicant is not permitted to attach any floors onto this Post Office building.

Modifications include an increase in total FAR while decreasing nonresidential FAR, an increase in residential lot occupancy, and the number of dwelling units, including one additional IZ Unit, an increase in the number of bicycle parking spaces, a decrease in the number of vehicular parking spaces, and a simplification of the roof plan.

The application also proposes to
revise the benefits and amenities package.

The original PUD approved included as an amenity renovations to the Park View Kid Zone building.

Since then, the Department of Parks and Recreation has funded this project. If this application is set down by the Commission, the Office of Planning will work with the applicant on revisions to that package.

The revised proposal remains not inconsistent with the comprehensive plan. Therefore, the Office of Planning recommends that the Commission set down the application for a public hearing.

Thank you, and I’m available for questions.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Mordfin.

Colleagues, any questions, comments in this particular application?

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Mordfin, I had one question. In your report,
you talk about the upper floors expanded to
cantilever out approximately nine feet over the
Post Office.

MR. MORDFIN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I didn’t see
a section. Maybe if someone could point -- I
was looking for a section that might adequately
show that. Maybe I just glossed over that.

MR. MORDFIN: On drawing A 0.4, you
can see, where the red arrows are, you can see
the dotted line on the south side where it says,
AExisting Post Office.@ See above that is the
dotted line, and that=s indicating on there the
location.

It=s probably better seen on A 1.2
where it says, AResidential Building above.@
You see the Post Office in blue, but you see the
dotted line with, where it says, AResidential
building above.@

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: On -- on
which -- on 10 --

MR. MORDFIN: A 1.2.
COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: 1.2?

MR. MORDFIN: It's titled, AGround floor plan. On the March 20th submission, yes.

And, I --

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Twenty-first.

MR. MORDFIN: Twenty-first?

Twentieth.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Oh, we have so many sets of drawings. That's part of the problem. I want to throw out something here. All right, A 1.2. Okay. Well, I'm just curious how the March -- March 20 -- well, 2011. See, we got so many damn plans. Okay.

Well, can we get an actual section through -- I'd like to actually see a section through the building that would actually clearly show that.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Commissioner Turnbull, --

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Is there one? Did I miss it?
COMMISSIONER MAY: There=s a section at A 4.2 in the newest set, the March 20, 2014, set.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. It=s kind of a -- all right.

COMMISSIONER MAY: I mean, it doesn=t show the Post Office building, but it shows --

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes. I=d like to see something with the Post Office building on it.

COMMISSIONER MAY: I agree with you. That would be good.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other questions or comments?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Mordfin, I=m just asking, I=m trying to get my orientation. It=s been a while since we heard the original PUD. Is this the old site where Celebrity Hall
MR. MORDFIN: I’m not familiar where Celebrity Hall was.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. You’re not familiar with Celebrity Hall?

MR. MORDFIN: No.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, okay, okay. I want you to do your research and come back and tell me about Celebrity Hall. I’m going to ask that question at the Hearing.

Any other questions or comments?

Mr. May.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, so the reduction parking seems to have occurred between January and March. Is that right?

MR. MORDFIN: That’s correct.

COMMISSIONER MAY: So what -- what drove that?

MR. MORDFIN: The applicant elected to remove one floor of the parking garage. It was going to be two levels. They’re now proposing to construct it as one level.
COMMISSIONER MAY: They -- I mean, they just decided they don't, they don't need another -- that floor?

MR. MORDFIN: They determined that they wouldn't need that floor with the proximity to the Metro Station at Georgia Avenue, and bus service that they determined that this building would not have that much demand for parking.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. And, so I forget. Is this building eligible for residential parking permits?

MR. MORDFIN: I do not know. It's on -- it's zoned commercially.

COMMISSIONER MAY: I expect it probably isn't, but I think that the Hearing will want to have clarification on that and will want to understand because I'm sure, you know, like many neighborhoods in the city, there's a high demand for parking on the residential streets that are along this major thoroughfare, so, you know, the cross streets tend to get
quite filled up.

And, I’m sure there’ll be neighbors who are concerned about potential parking impacts if there is relief requested, so I think that’s the -- from my perspective, seems to be the biggest issue.

Just to clarify. The owner of this building does or does not own the property where the Post Office is?

MR. MORDFIN: They do own the property. I think that there’s something with the lease where they’re not allowed to add on and attached to the top of his building.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Right, okay. I mean, what I’m thinking about is 30 years in the future or whenever that lease expires, and the Post Office building goes away, what happens to all of these lovely south facing building -- south facing windows and units that are over the top of the, of the Post Office building?

MR. MORDFIN: Well, the south facing windows do not extend all the way to the edge
of the Post Office building, so unless you build on top of the rest of the Post Office --

COMMISSIONER MAY: At a certain point, the lease is going to expire on the Post Office.

MR. MORDFIN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MAY: And, so that= s what I=m -- I=m wondering what happens that far into the future.

MR. MORDFIN: To the windows?

COMMISSIONER MAY: Well --

MR. MORDFIN: If somebody else moves into -- or if they demolish the Post Office?

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, they build something new there.

MR. MORDFIN: Well, right now, it would still be part of a PUD. Part of the building would be under the -- part of the Post Office building is going to be under this --

COMMISSIONER MAY: Under the PUD, right, but -- so that means that the windows that face the Post Office site are essentially,
I don’t know, I mean, they’re not at risk.

MR. MORDFIN: No, they wouldn’t be at risk because they’re not --

COMMISSIONER MAY: What’s the protection though that they’re not going to -- the windows are not going to be -- you know, we’re not going to have a proposal to put a building, you know, three feet away from those windows?

MR. MORDFIN: I think -- well, --

MS. STEINGASSER: The PUD covenant -- whatever the approved PUD covenant would regulate that. The Post Office at the site is included within the PUD boundaries.

COMMISSIONER MAY: It is included?

MS. STEINGASSER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay, all right. All right. That’s what I wanted to know.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Thank you.

Vice Chair.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman.

I believe this property is very close to the Park Morton Public Housing property. You know, it=s within 200 feet, I believe. And, so I was hoping that you can look into what the plans are for that property because it was one of the so-called new community sites, and so it would be helpful to know what the city=s plans are for that because it does have an impact, I think, on this particular building.

And, then they are increasing the IZ by one. Is that correct?

MR. MORDFIN: The number of units is increasing by one.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: So, again, that=s eight percent. Is that correct?

MR. MORDFIN: Yes. It remains at eight percent, yes.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Okay, that=s -- those are my questions. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other questions?
COMMISSIONER MILLER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioner Miller.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would concur with Mr. May that the -- we're going to need information at the Hearing on, on how the -- there won't be spillover parking into the neighborhood because, I think, the ANC=s previous support for, for this a few years ago was partially based on they=are being satisfied that the amount of parking in the building would be sufficient to, to prevent any such spillover, so I think we'll need some more information on that.

The public benefit that was previously offered to replace the Park View Kid Zone as OP had noted, that apparently has already been funded in DPR=s budget, so I think we need to have a -- we need the applicant to have a substitute benefit identified prior to
the Hearing, and OP said they were going to be working with the applicant on getting such an identification, but I think we definitely do need have prior to the Hearing.

And, just following up on the Vice Chair=s comment because it is so close to the Park Morton new community, that would be a good place to -- one good place to focus on providing a public benefit associated with that new community. I=m sure it needs all the amenities it can get and extra funding.

And, even if they=re inside, inside this project, you could do more and deeper levels of affordable housing, which that new community also does need in the area, so that=’s just another -- or an amenity on the new community site itself is a possibility.

So, I would just make those points. And, then, finally, I know it was approved three, three or so years ago with the environmental proffers that were provided at the time, but they seem somewhat weak if I=m
reading, if I=m reading the score card correctly.

   It said 37 points. And, I think, recently, this Commission has been expecting that there would be LEED Silver equivalent projects, so I, at least for one, would be looking to see an upgrade in that area as well.

   But, other than that, I think it=s a great project. Thank you.

   CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Any other questions? I just want -- oh, Mr. Turnbull.

   COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I just had one, which has to do with the amenities unless you were going to talk about that.

   CHAIRMAN HOOD: Actually, I was going to echo Mr. May about the RPP, but you can go ahead about the amenities.

   COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well, there was just one question on the Park View Field-House. And, it looks like Parks and Rec are going to do that themselves.

   So, Mr. Mordfin, jump in if you have
any comment or info on that. It looks like we need a substitute.

And, did you already mention that?

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I think --

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Oh, you did.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: That=s all right.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: It went right over my head.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: That happens.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: You talk very quickly.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: He actually mentioned that, so -- but that=s fine.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I think --

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well, I=ll mention it again.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, you go right ahead.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: No, that=s all right. Well, I echo your concerns.

Thank you, Mr. Miller.
COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Turnbull, it happens to us all the time. I miss things too.

But, I do want to echo Commissioner May’s comments about RPP. I’m looking forward to hearing that. While it’s not a showstopper for me, I’m very concerned about the comments my colleagues have made and my own comments about spillover to the neighborhood what we’re asking for in this modification.

And, I also am concerned about what Mr. Turnbull said about the amenities, so I think we got that fully on the record, and we’re looking forward to set down for information on full fledge Hearing.

Somebody like to make a motion?

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Mr. Chairman, I will move to set down Zoning Case Number 10-26B, 3321 Georgia, LLC - PUD Modification to First Stage @ Square 3040, and ask for a second.

PARTICIPANT: Second.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, it’s been
moved and properly seconded.

Any further discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN HOOD: All those in favor?

BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Schellin, would you record the vote? Thank you.

MS. SCHELLIN: The staff records the vote five to zero to zero to set down Zoning Commission Case Number 10-26B as a contested case. Commissioner Cohen moving, Commissioner Miller second, Commissioners Hood, May, and Turnbull in support.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Next we have a correspondence item, a letter from Holland & Knight, Review/Amendments to Animal Boarding Regulations. This comes -- it=s not exhibit number that I know of yet.

Commissioners, we received this, I think, it was this evening?

MS. SCHELLIN: It came in last Thursday, I believe, it was.
CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Okay. We received this last Thursday. I'm sure we had a chance to review it. This goes back to something that I had asked for because of the BZA case that, I think, a number of us have sat on when it talks about animal boarding, the regulations and what the Zoning Commission interpretation was.

While I mentioned I was here when the Zoning Commission did this, this wasn't the only case that I've heard personally, so I need to know what was the intent when we talk about districts and zones and abutting. So, I need -- we need clarification.

We asked the Office of Planning to look into this. We never received a letter. I think we need to move -- what I'm getting ready to ask the Office of Planning after this is putting more work on their plate, but my issue with, with this issue is, is that I'm not sure what other cases are in front of the Board Zoning Adjustment, but we need to have some
consistency, and I’m not sure if that’s what we’re doing.

So, we had asked the Office of Planning to look into this, and I’d just like to get a status. If not, we’d like to push this and get this done as soon as possible, as soon as the work, workload allows. That means that we have to push something else back.

We really need to do this because I know there are other, other cases that may be in the pipeline and we don’t want to keep giving out different results. So, would someone like to give us a status? Mr. Lawson.

MR. LAWSON: Sure, quickly. We’ve had meetings with this applicant as well. We’re already working on this text amendment. We anticipate bringing it forward shortly. If not, at the meeting in May, then in the meeting in June.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: So, we see a potential -- we do see a potential issue here. Am I correct?
MR. LAWSON: You’ve asked us to provide a clarification, and that’s what we’re going to be concentrating on, a clarification about proximity issue. We’ll be discussing this obviously also as well with the Office of the Attorney General and the Zoning Administrator to make sure that everybody understands where we’re kind of coming at.

We understand from you that your intention is not to change the regulations per se, but are really to provide some clarification and consistency in the regulations for animal-related businesses, and that’s what we’ll be bringing forward. It’ll be pretty surgical. It’ll be pretty straightforward.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Other than this particular case, do we have any other -- do we know of any other projects that may be coming through about animal boarding that may be coming soon in front of BZA? And, that’s just my concern.
MR. LAWSON: I don’t know of any, but one of the things we’re looking at, of course, is taking a look at the regulations, the rest of the regulations, and see if we bring forth regulations that impact proximity requirements, how that might have a ripple effect through other regulations not related to dog boarding that also have a proximity requirement.

So, it’s one of the things that we need to look at, but --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

MR. LAWSON: -- but off hand, I don’t know of any other case that’s coming forward related to a specific dog boarding case in front of the BZA. There is the case, of course, that’s coming to the Zoning Commission, which is being filed by the applicant who submitted this letter.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. And, when -- when is that coming? Have we set that down with the applicant?
MR. LAWSON: We've not. We've advised the applicant that we think that that shouldn't proceed -- precede, sorry, the text amendment that we would bring forward to the Zoning Commission, but we expect that they'll come forward more or less concurrently, and then we'll let the Zoning Commission decide how they're comfortable moving forward with the, the two cases.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So, we only have one -- we have one meeting in May?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, all right. So, I guess we have to live with -- again, my concern is make sure that we're consistent --

MR. LAWSON: Exactly.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: -- with our rules.

MR. LAWSON: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Commissioner May.

COMMISSIONER MAY: I just want to say this was the subject for this issue came up at
a BZA case that was decided that I’ve sat on that was, I don’t know, four weeks ago or something like that.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: And, that’s my point. It also came up in the one I sat on, so we -- I don’t know what you all did, but I know what we did, okay. So --

COMMISSIONER MAY: I know what we did.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Well, you know what you did. I wasn’t there.

Okay. Any other comments?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, so we will look forward to seeing this sometime in June -- at the first meeting in June.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Next on the agenda -- I don’t think we have anything on the agenda.

I do want to bring up a process in moving forward pertaining to the Zoning Review,
ZRR process done review of the regulations.

What I=m going to ask is that the Office of Planning bring back comments at a -- give comments so we can discuss, if they can have comments, I think, by May the 5th, back to us. And, the reason why I=m saying the 5th because we need to have time to digest it.

We=ve received a lot of comments. We=re not closing the door. This is -- these are just comments that we=ve gotten thus far. I don=t want anyone who=s watching this on webcast live say, oh, they=ve already closed the record, why are we keeping the record open until the 15th?

No, please do not -- September 15. Please do not misunderstand. We have -- this Commission has received a lot of information from the public and we need to start by adjusting -- our human computers will be on overload, so we want to make sure that we at least start getting the Office of Planning to respond to some of the testimony.
I would like to actually get that, Commissioners, back by the 5th, and then we can have a dialogue at our next public meeting, which is the 12th. So, if we can get comments that would give us some time to start trying to review without human computers and come back so we won’t be on overload.

Not that we’re -- say, okay, this we’re going to start deliberating. And, also, please, nobody go out and start that rumor. Don’t, please, don’t say the wrong thing.

What I’m saying now, if my colleagues agree, so we’re asking the Office of Planning to do is give us their comments on public testimony we have received thus far, and then if we can get that by May the 5th, and then we will discuss that on May the 12th, okay?

Ms. Steingasser, does that sound okay?

MS. STEINGASSER: That does. We’ve been tracking with these since the Hearing started so that we wouldn’t get caught at the
end. We have over 900 comments.

We’ve tried to tag them with key words, so they’re sorted right now by the date of the Hearing that the testimony was provided. Excuse me. They’re also tagged with key words, so they’ll be by topic, as well as subtitle.

Is there any particular way you would want these sorted and given to you? So, we could do, like all parking, we could do it by, you know, parking, accessory dwelling. We could also do it by, by subtitle A, subtitle B, subtitle --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Commissioners, which --

MS. STEINGASSER: Or, we could just give them to you by --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: No, it would be better if we have some kind of format. I like either one of those, but let me open it up. Commissioners, how would you all like to see it?

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I don’t
really care to have it by date. I mean, I think, having the date -- knowing when they=are coming is fine, but I think we need a category of topic to, to when you break it down because that=es how we=are going to be grouping. That=es how I think we=ll talk about them.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, yes. We all in agreements with that?

Okay. Again, for the public -- so, Ms. Steingasser, you want to add anything?

MS. STEINGASSER: We could also copy them onto searchable disk, so you could resort them yourselves if you wanted. All right, so we could give you a paper copy of the first version sorted by, by, probably by subtitle, and then we could put them on a disk, and then you could do your own search and sort.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I think, I think both of those ways would be very helpful to us. We appreciate that, but, again -- oh, I=m sorry.

Commissioner May.
COMMISSIONER MILLER: No. I agree with that. I think that’s very helpful.

I think in addition to those, that categorization of it by subject matter, I think it might be useful to have a separate list which shows how many of the 900, or whatever number you come up, however you want to categorize it, that where the proposal was modified as a result of the comments just so we have an overall picture of how much modifications have been made -- you were recommending modifications let me put it that way.

MS. STEINGASSER: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: That’d be helpful.

MS. STEINGASSER: That is --

COMMISSIONER MILLER: We’ve seen throughout the hearing process that there has been a give and take on that issue, so I think that’d be useful for everybody to see it globally.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Any other
comments, colleagues?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN HOOD: So, I think, we -- we don't need to vote on that. This is process moving forward.

Commissioner May.

COMMISSIONER MAY: That's okay.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Again, for anybody who's watching this, please don't put it out there incorrectly. We're just trying to get the -- 900 comments I'm hearing -- is it 900-plus or 900 total?

MS. VITALE: Nine seventy-five.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, well, I shouldn't have asked. That's 75 more than what you told me. So, we will -- again, we are not closing the book. This is -- the record is still open.

This is comments we've heard and responses that we've heard thus far. We got to start somewhere because if we get 4,000, then we're going to be in trouble. So, anyway, I
think, going forward, that=s the way we=re going to do it.

Any questions or comments?

MS. SCHELLIN: And, just to --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Is anybody going to get that wrong though? That=s what I=m just curious.

MS. SCHELLIN: Just to clarify. That will be submitted to the record, so whatever is given to you guys, it=s being submitted to the record so that --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Right, it=ll be in the record.

MS. SCHELLIN: -- nobody thinks that you guys are getting something they=re not going to see.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Right, it=ll be in the record, so I=m hoping that everyone understands. If you have any questions, you can contact the Office of Zoning and they=ll be able to articulate what=s happening. So, hopefully, we=re not closing the book.
We=’re trying to get what -- the comments we=’ve heard thus far. And, I think I=’ve said that about five times, so I=’m not going to say it anymore because I=’m sure nobody is going to get that wrong.

Okay, do we have anything else? Does the Office of Planning have any comments? Anything else? Status report?

PARTICIPANT: No, sir.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

Ms. Schellin, do we have anything else?

MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I want to thank everyone for this Hearing and appreciate it -- I mean, this meeting. This meeting is adjourned.

(Whereupon, proceedings in the above-entitled matter concluded at 7:01 p.m. on April 28, 2014.)