

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
Zoning Commission

Regular Public Meeting
1457th Meeting Session [8th of 2017]

6:40 p.m. to 7:34 p.m.
Monday, March 27, 2017

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

1 Board Members:

2 ANTHONY HOOD, Chairman

3 ROBERT MILLER, Vice Chair

4 PETER MAY, Commissioner

5 MICHAEL TURNBULL, Commissioner

6 PETER SHAPIRO, Commissioner

7

8 Office of Zoning:

9 SHARON SCHELLIN, Secretary

10

11 Office of Planning:

12 JENNIFER STEINGASSER

13 JOEL LAWSON

14 MATT JESICK

15

16 Office of the Attorney General:

17 ALAN BERGSTEIN

18 JACOB RITTING

19 CHRISTOPHER COHEN

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: This meeting will please
3 come to order. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen.
4 This is the public meeting of the Zoning Commission
5 for the District of Columbia.

6 My name is Anthony Hood. Joining me are Vice
7 Chair Miller, Commissioner Shapiro, Commissioner May,
8 and Commissioner Turnbull; Office of Zoning staff,
9 Ms. Sharon Schellin; as well as the Office of the
10 Attorney General, Mr. Bergstein, Mr. Ritting, and Mr.
11 Cohen; Office of Planning staff, Ms. Steingasser, Mr.
12 Lawson, and Mr. Jesick.

13 Copies of today -- we are located in the
14 Jerrily R. Kress Memorial Hearing Room. Copies of
15 today's meeting agenda are available to you and are
16 located in the bin near the door. We do not take any
17 public testimony at our meetings, unless the
18 Commission requests someone to come forward.

19 Please be advised that this proceeding is
20 being recorded by a court reporter and is also
21 webcast live. Accordingly, we must ask you to
22 refrain from any disruptive noises or actions in the
23 hearing room, including the display of any signs or
24 objects. Please turn off all electronic devices at
25 this time.

1 Does the staff have any preliminary matters?

2 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. We have one piece
3 to add to the agenda as a preliminary matter, Zoning
4 Commission Case No. 13-14, Vision McMillan partners,
5 LLC, and the Department of Planning and Economic
6 Development, and that's with regard to a submission
7 that was made on Thursday evening. Would ask the
8 Commission to consider that submission from D.C. for
9 Reasonable Development.

10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Ms. Schellin, are
11 you asking that we do that first?

12 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir.

13 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay, Commissioners. As
14 you noticed, there was some misinterpretations, I
15 guess, or some discrepancy of how our process went,
16 and that proved to be by one particular witness. But
17 I think that the witnesses, when I looked -- the
18 witness, I think, one of the things that we can do
19 which was consistent with our rules, with our
20 procedural rules that as well as what everybody else
21 abided by, we asked each individual to provide their
22 testimony when they came down. So, I would be
23 willing to open the record up for Mr. Chris Otten's
24 testimony only.

25 There were a number of submissions, but I

1 think for his testimony only, that would be right in
2 conformity with everything that everyone else who had
3 the following procedures did. So, let me open it up
4 for any discussion or comments.

5 MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chair, I would concur with
6 you. Based upon our procedures and our rulings on
7 this case, I would permit allowing his own personal -
8 - I would not allow the whole submission, just that
9 part that he talked about.

10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: His testimony. Okay.

11 MR. TURNBULL: His testimony, right.

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Any other comments? All
13 right. Do we need to make a motion on that?

14 MR. BERGSTEIN: No, it's your ruling, sir.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. And also, what I'm
16 going to ask the Office of Attorney General, as well
17 as the Office of Planning, we need to look at some
18 language so we can nail down some of the processes,
19 or some of the things that happen when it comes to
20 our kiosk. It's no sense in putting 20 names up
21 there on the kiosk, and they're not here. I think in
22 the opening statement that I read, it specifically
23 says, "If you're present, we ask that you put your
24 name in the kiosk, and if you need assistance, that
25 you need to see Ms. Schellin."

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.

1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington, DC 20036

Washington: 202-898-1108 • Baltimore: 410-752-3376

Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1 So, I don't know what you call it when
2 somebody comes down and put 12 people, or 15 or 20
3 peoples' names and they're no longer here. So,
4 that's something I would like for the Commission soon
5 to put in our rules, because I think that's -- it's
6 not respectful of the process and also it's not
7 respectful to the public to add 12 names and we know,
8 automatically, they're not here. So that's something
9 we need to look at.

10 Anything else on this issue?

11 [No audible response.]

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Let's go right to
13 our agenda. We ready to move on, Ms. Schellin?

14 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Under the consent
16 calendar, modification of consequence, Zoning
17 Commission Case No. 09-03D, Skyland Holdings, LLC,
18 modification of consequence at squares 5633, Ms.
19 Schellin.

20 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. On this case, at
21 the Commission's February 27th public meeting, March
22 20th was the date set for the ANC to provide its
23 response to the applicant's application per the
24 request for more time. While the ANC did vote to
25 support the application, they did not provide any

1 issues or concerns, and the SMD signed the letter
2 instead of the chairman or vice chairman.

3 I had advised the SMD that the ANC would have
4 to vote to authorize her to act on their behalf,
5 however, the letter was still submitted with her
6 signature. I don't know if it's appropriate to say
7 that I did speak to the ANC chairman today, and she
8 said basically it -- she was not going to submit
9 another letter today. She did not have time to do
10 that.

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

12 MS. SCHELLIN: And so, other than that, there
13 were no other new submissions.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. All right. And I
15 think in this case we basically held it open for the
16 -- to get something from the ANC, typically. And
17 while this is addressed from the single-member
18 district, and they don't have any issues, I don't
19 think we need to -- we can point and just say that
20 the single-member district, but I mean, the great
21 weight and all that stuff is not germane in this case
22 because they did not follow the proper way. And I
23 aptly know Ms. Marlin, and I know she has some
24 concerns. Been knowing her for a while and I can
25 tell you that Ms. Marlin would have made sure that

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.

1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington, DC 20036

Washington: 202-898-1108 • Baltimore: 410-752-3376

Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1 she submitted a letter.

2 While we appreciate the single-member
3 district and all the efforts and works that they do,
4 but our procedures again, are -- we need to make sure
5 they're predictable and we have a process laid out.

6 And with that, we left them time enough, I
7 think we left it open for 30 days or so, but we left
8 it open long enough for the ANC to respond. And I
9 think that was our only hold-up, I believe. But let
10 me open it up. Anything else? Vice Chair Miller?

11 MR. MILLER: No, I think that is -- thank
12 you, Mr. Chairman. I think it is what we held it
13 over for and even though the ANC single-member
14 district commissioner letter doesn't necessarily
15 follow the correct format in terms of being able to
16 be at a great weight, I think it's helpful to have
17 that information that the ANC voted five to zero to
18 support it so that this block too can move forward,
19 and so I'm ready to move forward as well.

20 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Somebody like to
21 make a motion?

22 MR. TURNBULL: Well, Mr. Chair --

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Turnbull.

24 MR. TURNBULL: -- I just had one comment.
25 One of the things I was concerned about was the

1 voltaic cells that they were going to add into the
2 center of the complex, and I was just worried about
3 whether or not because of the height of the buildings
4 that it would -- it would even work.

5 They did provide some shadow studies, and it
6 would look like that probably for three quarters of
7 the year they are going to have full sun on them.
8 But there's a period of about a quarter of the year
9 where it would be lacking. But, I think it's a --
10 it's something worthy that they're trying, so I'd be
11 in favor of it.

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Any other comments?
13 Somebody like to make a motion?

14 MR. MILLER: I would move that the Zoning
15 Commission take action on Zoning Commission Case No.
16 -- favorable action on Zoning Commission Case No. 09-
17 03D, Skyline Holdings, LLC, modification of
18 consequence at Square 5633 and ask for a second.

19 MR. TURNBULL: Second.

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

22 [Vote taken.]

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Ms. Schellin, would you
24 record the vote?

25 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. Staff records the

1 vote five, to zero, to zero to approve final action
2 in Zoning Commission Case No. 09-03D, Commissioner
3 Miller moving, Commissioner Turnbull seconding,
4 Commissioners Hood, May, and Shapiro in support.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Next, Zoning
6 Commission Case No. 06-46D, Half Street Residential
7 PJV, LLC, modification of consequence to design
8 review at Square 701. Ms. Schellin.

9 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. The applicant requests a
10 modification of consequence to a previously approved
11 design review. They are making this request to
12 permit a bowling alley as part of an eating and
13 drinking establishment used to make refinements to
14 select building facades and to make refinements to
15 Monument Place, a pedestrian thoroughfare.

16 Exhibit 5 is an OP report supporting the
17 request as a modification of consequence. Exhibit 7
18 through 7B, the applicant supplemented their filing
19 with a request to amend the application, to include
20 refinements to approved -- to the approved loading
21 area to supplement the record with additional
22 information regarding the mezzanine level, and the
23 GFA and FAR ranges.

24 I'd like to ask the Commission this evening
25 to decide if this is one, in fact, a modification of

1 consequence. And if so, to set the schedule for the
2 parties to respond to the application, and then for
3 the applicant to reply, and the date to deliberate on
4 this request.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Colleagues, we have
6 in front of us whether or not we believe this request
7 is a modification of consequence, which is a design
8 review and some changes that are being made to this
9 project. So, let's open it up. Any discussion.
10 First of all, anyone disagree that this is a
11 modification of consequence? Any disagreement?

12 [No audible response.]

13 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So, you all must be
14 bowlers.

15 Okay. What do we do after that? I don't
16 know, I'm still learning the rules like everybody
17 else.

18 MS. SCHELLIN: If you agree that it's a
19 modification of consequence, do you have any
20 discussion on it, or are we just going to go straight
21 to scheduling a time for the parties to respond, and
22 the applicant to then -- they have an opportunity to
23 respond to the -- or reply to those responses.

24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

25 MS. SCHELLIN: So, it's just basically for

1 scheduling.

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let's see if there's any -
3 - let me see if there's any further discussion.
4 Commissioner Turnbull.

5 MR. TURNBULL: Yeah, thank you, Mr. Chair.
6 Well, the first thing that struck me is on page A7,
7 the rendering of the proposed corner with Half
8 Street. The first -- the previously approved
9 drawings showed a very kind of like exciting little
10 corner.

11 The second one shows something really toned
12 down. It doesn't -- I mean, this is supposed to be
13 an entertainment area. Now, maybe it's just the
14 terrible rendering that they've done, but also I'm
15 looking at two, I don't know if they're electronic
16 signs with people, or they're just posters with -- I
17 don't get that. I mean, before you had an open
18 balcony with glass all the way round it, showed a
19 very vibrant exciting scene with people on the second
20 floor.

21 And now you've got this rather opaque looking
22 poster, big boards. Maybe they're electronic, maybe
23 they're not. But, I really don't care for that. I
24 think that totally destroys the whole intent of the
25 entertainment and this vibrant little corner. And I

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.

1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington, DC 20036

Washington: 202-898-1108 • Baltimore: 410-752-3376

Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1 just think it looks, it looks really done down. It
2 does not look attractive. It's not the vibrant
3 exciting feel that we had on the first one with the
4 overhang on the second floor. It just looks -- it
5 just looks very, like they've lightened it up to the
6 point where I don't think it's doing what they want
7 it to do as far as the entertainment area, try to
8 make this an exciting corner. I just don't think it
9 works.

10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I first, Mr. Turnbull,
11 would hope that it's electronic, because envision
12 myself stopping to look at a game, standing on the
13 corner. Maybe that's what they were trying to do,
14 but I'm not sure and I don't know if --

15 MR. TURNBULL: Well, they don't talk about --
16 that's not mentioned any -- nowhere in this thing
17 does it talk about they want electronic digital
18 signage that they're going to put up here. There's
19 nothing in here, and to me, it's a foreign element
20 that doesn't seem to work with what they're trying to
21 do with this whole complex. Whether it's a bowling
22 alley, I mean, they still have like a lounge area, a
23 bar on the first floor. But this looks really --
24 this could be any kind of an intersection anywhere
25 that's not -- it does not speak to what it's doing by

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.

1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington, DC 20036

Washington: 202-898-1108 • Baltimore: 410-752-3376

Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1 the ballpark.

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I think in this
3 proceeding, and let me ask Mr. Bergstein and Mr.
4 Ritting, or Mr. Cohen, or whoever can help me, in
5 this proceeding can we ask for clarification along
6 with the dates as we move forward?

7 MR. BERGSTEIN: Yes, absolutely. That's one
8 of the good things about a modification of
9 consequence is that it allows you to, at this point,
10 ask the applicant to respond to things. So, you
11 absolutely can do that.

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So, Mr. Turnbull,
13 would you -- I guess as we move forward, you find out
14 if they respond, and I think you put your position
15 out there.

16 MR. TURNBULL: Yeah, I think that they need
17 to respond to what they're trying to achieve and why
18 it's any better than what they did before. And
19 again, my question upon what these opaque signs are
20 on the corner that just sort of diminish the whole
21 intent of a very open vibrant exciting corner that
22 you would find in an area like this that's -- I mean,
23 if the original proposal just showed this as a very
24 exciting place, exciting corner of the building, with
25 people coming across, either around game time, after

1 game, and now it just looks, it could be any street
2 corner in Washington that has nothing to do with
3 anything and to me it's just -- I think it falls
4 short of what the intent is trying -- of what we
5 always thought that we were trying to do at this
6 corner, and this whole intersection, this whole half
7 street.

8 And I think this is not representative of
9 what we are trying to do. And I think they need to
10 open it up and get back to, at least what they were
11 trying to do in the previously proposed. Or at least
12 they need to explain what they're trying to do.

13 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So, maybe if we can
14 ask for that submission as we give out the dates.
15 Anything else? Commissioner May?

16 MR. MAY: Yeah, I am curious about the sign
17 and want more of an explanation of that, what's
18 intended in terms of that sign.

19 As far as the architecture goes, you know, I
20 was never a big fan or, I don't -- maybe my memory is
21 wrong, but I don't remember being a big fan of this
22 design the way it was. I'm not a big fan of the way
23 it is proposed. I understand, you know, it's not as
24 lively. I'm not sure -- I mean, the whole
25 neighborhood is plenty lively on game days and you

1 know, there's certainly -- I think there's going to
2 be plenty of action in that area, but it is
3 definitely a bit more subdued. So, I don't have any
4 objection to the applicant submitting either some
5 revisions or some explanation, and certainly want to
6 know more about the sign.

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Anything else? Vice Chair
8 Miller?

9 MR. MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yeah,
10 I would concur with Mr. Turnbull that we definitely
11 need an explanation and that the previous rendering
12 did look a lot more activated. I think they left off
13 the people and the outdoor tables and I think they
14 just were trying to show the brick in that --
15 replacing that.

16 MR. TURNBULL: Yeah.

17 MR. MILLER: I think they left off -- but we
18 need an explanation of that.

19 MR. TURNBULL: Yeah.

20 MR. MILLER: As to -- and maybe there is an
21 explanation, or maybe there is a change. But, so, I
22 just wanted to say I agree.

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Commissioner Shapiro.

24 MR. SHAPIRO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would
25 also agree and I would agree with Vice Chair Miller

1 that that was my read on it, they just left out the
2 people and the, you know, the street life, the
3 umbrellas that go with it. I mean, it is a different
4 design and I think it's perfectly appropriate for us
5 to have them come and explain it.

6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah, okay. All right.
7 Ms. Schellin, do we have any dates?

8 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. If we could have
9 the parties -- I don't recall if there is more than
10 just the ANC, but I think it was just the ANC,
11 respond by 3:00 p.m. on April 10th. And then the
12 applicant can respond by 3:00 p.m. on April 17th,
13 even though this office will be closed, wonderful
14 IZIS will be ready to take their submission. And
15 then we can put this on the Commission's April 24th
16 meeting agenda.

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. So, that's it?

18 MS. SCHELLIN: That's it.

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: That's all you needed.
20 All right, so we're going --

21 MR. MAY: Can we pick the date? When is the
22 date that it's going to be heard?

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Twenty-fourth.

24 MR. MAY: Twenty-fourth.

25 MS. SCHELLIN: Twenty-fourth. April.

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. Let's move to
2 final action. Zoning Commission Case No. 14-11B,
3 Office of Planning text amendment to Zoning
4 Regulations, Subtitle B, definitions; Subtitle D,
5 Zones R-3, R-13, R-17, R-20; Subtitle E, RF Zones;
6 and Subtitle U, use permissions RF Zones. Ms.
7 Schellin.

8 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. This case was
9 deferred from the Commission's last meeting to allow
10 OP to follow up on some questions the Commission had
11 from the hearing, and also to look at the comments
12 that were received from the proposed rulemaking that
13 was published, and we have OP's report in the record
14 at Exhibit 14.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay, Commissioners. I
16 know some of us may have had some questions.
17 Commissioner May.

18 MR. MAY: Yeah, I'm satisfied with what the
19 Office of Planning has submitted in terms of the
20 responses to the additional questions that had come
21 up and I agree with their recommendation that we not
22 make any changes in response to the latest set of
23 comments with regard to -- well, with regard to
24 reconsidering the 10-foot setback limit and so on. I
25 mean, I you know, we are allowing for changes to be

1 made through a special exception process and I think
2 that's sufficient.

3 And I am not inclined to incorporate the
4 vesting provision that was suggested. I think, you
5 know, again this is something that's been part of our
6 public discussion for some time and I fear that if we
7 were to have a vesting period through July 1st, that
8 there might be a rush of applications for pop-backs
9 that we're trying to have some controls over and I
10 think that the -- I mean, I think this is something
11 that we were -- we recognized was an issue back in
12 the original 1411 case, and unfortunately didn't
13 fully address it, and came back to address it and I
14 think that we're, you know, we're taking the right
15 steps and I just don't see a reason to allow any
16 further vesting. I think we simply need to you know,
17 complete this rulemaking. And then if folks need to
18 push back further than 10 feet then they would need
19 the special exception.

20 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Any other comments
21 on this? Does everyone agree about Commissioner
22 May's vesting? I sure do because I had an issue with
23 interpretation, and that's what's killing us now
24 about some interpretation that people give.

25 My issue, it kind of goes in line. I

1 wouldn't want to necessarily throw the whole thing
2 out, but I can go with that, where it says July the
3 1st, 2017, accepted as complete by the Department of
4 Consumer Regulatory Affairs and not substantially
5 changed after filing. What does substantially
6 changed mean? I'm sure that there's some rules,
7 substantial, what's substantial to me may be
8 substantial differently to somebody else. And that
9 was my concern, but I can go away with -- I can go
10 along with Commissioner May and throw the whole thing
11 out.

12 Okay. Any objections?

13 MR. MAY: I am, just to clarify in terms of
14 the effective date now, without that vesting
15 provision the effective date would be --

16 MR. BERGSTEIN: The date is published in the
17 D.C. Register.

18 MR. MAY: Okay.

19 MR. BERGSTEIN: Which will be in about a week
20 and a half. In other words I'll --

21 MR. MAY: Okay.

22 MR. BERGSTEIN: -- I'll prepare a filing.

23 MR. MAY: All right. Very good.

24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Anything else?
25 Somebody like to make a motion or --

1 MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chair, I would move that
2 we take final action on Zoning Case No. 14-11B,
3 excuse me, Office of Planning text amendment the
4 Zoning Regulations, Subtitle B; definitions, Subtitle
5 D, Zones R-3, R-13, R-17, and R-20; Subtitle ERF
6 Zones and Subtitle U Use Permissions RF Zones, and
7 ask for a second.

8 MR. MAY: Second.

9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay, it's been moved and
10 properly seconded by Commissioner May. Any further
11 discussion?

12 [Vote taken.]

13 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Ms. Schellin, would you
14 record the vote?

15 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Staff records the vote
16 four, to zero, to one, to approve final action in
17 Zoning Commission Case No. 14-11B, Commissioner
18 Turnbull moving, Commissioner May seconding,
19 Commissioners Hood and Miller in support,
20 Commissioner Shapiro not voting, having not
21 participated.

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Next. Zoning Commission
23 Case No. 15-27, KF Morse, LLC first-stage and
24 consolidated PUDs and related map amendment at Square
25 3587. Ms. Schellin.

1 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. At Exhibit 71 through
2 72F, and 74 through 75B, we have the applicant's
3 post-hearing submissions. Exhibit 73 is an NCPC
4 delegated action which found that the project would
5 not be inconsistent with the National Capital Comp
6 Plan for the National Capital Comprehensive Plan, so
7 we'd ask the Commission to consider proposed action
8 on -- no, final action on this case this evening.

9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay, Commissioners. Any
10 further discussion or anything that we were looking
11 for?

12 MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chair, I think I'm okay
13 with everything. I think we had some comments on the
14 order that was drafted and prepared, and I think we
15 submitted comments to OAG for correction and all of
16 those have been included.

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Anything else?
18 Commissioner May?

19 MR. MAY: Yeah, a few things. One is that
20 with regard to the IZ unit distribution and the
21 actual units that were indicated as IZ, and some of
22 the corner units and so on, looks like that was all
23 straightened out. And the corner units, it looked
24 like they didn't have sufficient windows for the size
25 of the unit. I think the IZ units were moved away

1 from those, or in some cases there was some
2 modification of the drawings to clean them up.

3 So, I think that was addressed successfully.
4 For the most part, they addressed the setback issues
5 on the rooftop. I say for the most part because
6 there's still a couple of minor circumstances where
7 I'm not sure that they fully understand that, you
8 know, at every point the roof structure has to be set
9 back at one-to-one because the way some of the --
10 where it's dimensioned in certain circumstances, it's
11 not dimensioned at the point where, you know, across
12 the sort of the perpendicular from the curved form.

13 But I'm not going to keep fussing about this
14 because we're not granting any relief related to
15 this. They're just going to have to comply, and if
16 they have to tweak the dimensions of the penthouse
17 structure in order to do it, in order to get their
18 permits and whatever, they'll have to do that because
19 we're not granting relief related to setback.

20 But it is rather annoying that we had to, you
21 know, after several times, try to explain why it
22 should be corrected, that it's still not corrected.

23 The last thing is that the drawings --
24 there's still a problem with the depiction, or the
25 labeling of the second floor of the top floor units

1 of the lower wing being called mezzanines, because
2 apparently, it is not clear to whoever is doing these
3 drawings, what a mezzanine is. Mezzanine is defined
4 as a floor space within a story between its floor and
5 the floor or roof next above it, and having an area
6 not more than one third of the area of the floor
7 immediately below and which shares a common ceiling.

8 There is no common ceiling in these spaces.
9 This is a first-floor like that, and a second floor
10 like that. And the second floor does not share the
11 same air space. It does not have a common ceiling
12 with the first floor.

13 I mean, do I need to like, bring in a
14 PowerPoint and demonstrate this? I don't know. But
15 it doesn't meet the definition of a mezzanine.

16 Now, why it has to be called a mezzanine, I
17 don't know. I don't think it does, right? There's
18 no reason. It's not like they escape FAR
19 calculations with that. So, Mr. -- go ahead, you
20 have an opinion on this?

21 MR. JESICK: Only that I concur with your
22 opinion.

23 MR. MAY: Okay, thank you.

24 So, you know, I don't want it to show up in
25 the drawings labeled this way because this is

1 something that we dealt with in another case and it
2 took several iterations for that architect to
3 understand that it was not a mezzanine that they were
4 drawing, it was a second floor. And so, these are
5 duplex units, and that you know, it's just the top
6 floor. It's the next floor. And it should be
7 labeled as such.

8 So, I don't know what that means in terms of
9 our decision making, but --

10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So, Commissioner May, let
11 me just ask you, and that's where I was going. Would
12 you like to see another set of drawings depicting
13 exactly --

14 MR. MAY: Honestly, I would like this thing
15 to just be done with. Is there a way that we can,
16 you know, approve it with this modification?

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: With the modification, but
18 the order won't be released until we reviewed it.

19 MR. MAY: Until we receive that --

20 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Right.

21 MR. MAY: -- revised drawing that indicates
22 that the top floor is a floor and not a mezzanine.

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I think that's
24 fair.

25 MR. MAY: Okay.

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Anything else? So, what
2 I'm going to do, I'm going to get Commissioner May
3 and the person -- the ANC commissioner who told me
4 that they get a measuring stick and they go out and
5 actually measure some of the things that we approve.
6 And I really -- actually, I was very impressed, and I
7 was very impressed when they mentioned that to me,
8 fussing at me about something else. But I really
9 think that that is important and that's part of
10 DCRA's enforcement to make sure the things we sit
11 down here and do all the time, that they're being
12 followed. That goes along exactly with --

13 So, the two of you so far on the agenda, have
14 provided somebody else. So, anything else on this?

15 [No audible response.]

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. So, with the
17 caveat of what Commissioner May mentioned about the
18 approval, I mean, the order not going out before
19 approval -- did I say that right? Okay. I'm going
20 to put my glasses back on. Maybe they'll help me
21 think.

22 Okay. Somebody like to make a motion?

23 MR. MILLER: With that caveat that was just
24 mentioned by you, Mr. Chairman and Commissioner May,
25 I would move that the Zoning Commission take final

1 action on Case No. 15-27, KF Morse, LLC, first-stage
2 and consolidated PUDs and related map amendment at
3 Square 3587, and ask for a second.

4 MR. SHAPIRO: Second.

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

7 [Vote taken.]

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Ms. Schellin, would you
9 record the vote?

10 MS. SCHELLIN: Staff records the vote five,
11 to zero, to zero to approve final action in Zoning
12 Commission Case No. 15-27 with caveat stated by
13 Commissioner May, Commissioner Miller moving,
14 Commissioner Shapiro seconding, Commissioners Hood,
15 May, and Turnbull in support.

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Next, let's go to
17 proposed action, Zoning Commission Case No. 15-24 and
18 15-24A, Gallaudet University and the JBG Companies,
19 first-stage PUD and related map amendment at Square
20 3591, and Parcels 129/70, 129/103, 129/106, and
21 129/112. Ms. Schellin.

22 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. The only thing that
23 I have on this one is that at Exhibits 46 through 46B
24 are the applicant's post-hearing submissions. So,
25 we'd ask the Commission to consider proposed action

1 on this case this evening.

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay, Commissioners. Is
3 there anything that we need to further discuss on
4 this? Commissioner May?

5 MR. MAY: Oh, you heard me say that?

6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah. My ears are clean.

7 MR. MAY: So, you know, I appreciate the fact
8 that the applicant has taken substantial time to try
9 to work through the issue and come to agreement with
10 the Office of Planning, and we have their revised
11 submission and an increase in the IZ proffer. But my
12 question at this point is what the opinion is of the
13 Office of Planning. So, if I could ask.

14 MS. STEINGASSER: The Office of Planning is
15 happy to say that we have accepted this as a proper
16 commensurate benefits package and we recommend its
17 approval.

18 MR. TURNBULL: Well, Ms. Steingasser, I'm
19 wondering. You also said that they had not addressed
20 about the utility question.

21 MS. STEINGASSER: That's true. The utilities
22 have not been addressed and that's still being worked
23 out from what we understand with several developers
24 within the market.

25 MR. TURNBULL: So, do you see that as a

1 hindrance or do you see that as going to be worked
2 out going forward?

3 MS. STEINGASSER: Well, it will have to be
4 worked out or they won't be able to build the
5 necessary -- get the necessary permits. But it's not
6 being worked out as part of this PUD, the larger --

7 MR. TURNBULL: Okay.

8 MS. STEINGASSER: -- issues.

9 MR. TURNBULL: Okay.

10 MS. STEINGASSER: This particular PUD has
11 access to utilities from 6th Street and different
12 venues on different sides of the streets, which is a
13 little bit different than some of the other --

14 MR. TURNBULL: Yeah. Okay. Thank you.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Ms. Steingasser. Oh, I'm
16 sorry. Vice Chair Miller, you have --

17 MR. MILLER: Oh, thank you, Mr. Chair. No, I
18 was just going to concur with Commissioner May in
19 appreciating the applicant and OP working on agreeing
20 on increasing the affordable housing IZ set aside at
21 the -- at a greater percentage at the 50 percent AMI
22 level, so I was happy to hear OP is okay with that.

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Ms. Steingasser help me.
24 You all supported this, right, without those issues?

25 MS. STEINGASSER: We did support the PUD over

1 all. I would think it adds tremendously to the
2 market, it furthers the mission of the university, it
3 creates, you know, great spaces. We were concerned
4 mostly with the commensurate Inclusionary Zoning and
5 affordability proffer, and certain other aspects of
6 the proffer and benefits package which we've now
7 worked out. But we've always been supportive of the
8 PUD based on finding that resolution.

9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Would it be too much
10 trouble for me to get a paragraph of what you just
11 stated to go on the record, because we have a council
12 members who is up on stuff, and I want to make sure
13 that the record reflects exactly the -- if there was
14 a significant change. But I know you all supported
15 it, and I know there was some issues about those one
16 or two things. If we can just get a paragraph to
17 summarize that and just put it in the record, I would
18 appreciate it.

19 MS. STEINGASSER: Yes, sir. Absolutely.

20 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you very much.
21 Okay. Anything else, Commissioners? All right.
22 Somebody like to make a motion? Thank you, Ms.
23 Steingasser.

24 MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I would move that
25 the Zoning Commission take proposed action on case

1 numbers 15-24 and 15-24A, Gallaudet University and
2 the JBG Companies, first-stage PUD and related map
3 amendment at Square 3591, and parcels 129/70,
4 129/103, 129/106, and 129/112, and ask for a second.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Second. Commissioner
6 Miller, can --

7 MR. MILLER: We're being advised that the
8 applicant had requested time to update their draft
9 order. And so, I think OAG has suggested that that
10 should be filed at the same time as the applicant's
11 list of final proffers and proposed conditions are
12 due, which would be April 3rd, if the commission
13 takes proposed action at its meeting tonight.

14 So, with that caveat, that was part of my
15 motion, not to make that --

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Okay. So, we'll
17 include that.

18 MR. MILLER: Yes.

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: That was the amendment.
20 Who seconded it?

21 MS. SCHELLIN: You did.

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Who? I did?

23 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.

24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Oh, well, I'll accept
25 that. Okay. It's been moved and properly seconded,

1 with the amendment by the Vice Chair, and I second it
2 and I agree with that. Any further discussion?

3 [Vote taken.]

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Ms. Schellin, would you
5 record the vote?

6 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Staff records the vote
7 four, to zero, to one, to approve proposed action and
8 to also allow the applicant to submit the revised
9 draft order, Commissioner Miller moving, Commissioner
10 Hood seconding, Commissioners May and Turnbull in
11 support, Commissioner Shapiro not voting having not
12 participated.

13 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay, next, hearing
14 action, Zoning Commission Case No. 05-28Q, Parkside
15 Residential, LLC, first-stage PUD modification of
16 significance, and second-stage PUD at Square 5041 and
17 5056. Mr. Lawson.

18 MR. LAWSON: Hi, good evening, Mr. Chair and
19 members of the Commission.

20 OP recommends that the Zoning Commission set
21 down for a public hearing, Zoning Commission Case 05-
22 28Q for Parcel 9 of Block F, generally located
23 towards the center of the broader Parkside stage-one
24 PUD, which was approved in 2006.

25 A history of previous and other current

1 Parkside applications provided in the OP report,
2 which is Exhibit 15.

3 The stage-one approval for this site included
4 two residential buildings ranging from 72 to 90 feet
5 in height, with some ground-floor retail and an open
6 space pedestrian way between the two new buildings to
7 connect the park, which is located to the northwest
8 of the subject site, and that connection is to the
9 pending new pedestrian bridge to the Metro station to
10 the southeast.

11 The current stage-two application for this
12 site would include a residential building of 74 to 85
13 feet in height, an office building of 77 to 90 feet
14 in height, expanded ground-floor retail, and the open
15 space connection between the two buildings which now
16 before pedestrians and limited vehicular traffic,
17 including some on grade parking to serve the retail
18 businesses.

19 Parking spaces for the development would be
20 provided below grade. As such, the proposal
21 represents a deviation from the stage-one approval,
22 particularly in the provision of an office building
23 and additional retail, and the applicant has
24 accordingly requested a modification of the stage-one
25 approval. However, a modification to the approved C-

1 3-A zoning would not be needed to accommodate the
2 uses.

3 The original stage-one PUD predated the
4 District's Inclusionary Zoning program, but through
5 the PUD the applicant committed to a program for the
6 entire site, the entire Parkside site, reserving 20
7 percent of the residential units at 80 percent AMI
8 and an additional 20 percent for workforce housing at
9 80 to 120 percent AMI.

10 To date the applicant has provided affordable
11 units on the broader Parkside site, and in this
12 current application is proposing that 20 percent of
13 the units be set aside at the workforce housing rate.

14 Since the original stage-one approval is
15 being modified significantly, however, IZ does apply
16 and the applicant has stated that flexibility from
17 the IZ provisions will be requested.

18 OP finds that the proposed development with
19 the modifications to the stage-one approval to be not
20 inconsistent with a holistic reading of the
21 Comprehensive Plan maps and policy statements. The
22 OP report, as well as the applicant's original filing
23 and a subsequent filing at Exhibit 14, addressed the
24 Comprehensive Plan. Clearly the main issue here is
25 the proposal to include an office building within

1 this portion of the PUD, which is designated on the
2 Comp Plan future land use map for medium density
3 residential development, and in the stage-one
4 approval for predominantly residential use.

5 This is despite the approved C-3-A zoning
6 which allows mixed use development. As noted in the
7 framework element, the future land use map includes
8 land uses defined in broad terms, noting typical, not
9 prescribed uses. It provides a generalized depiction
10 of intended uses only, and it is not a zoning map,
11 and that's from the Comprehensive Plan itself.

12 The Parkside PUD, as a whole, would remain
13 generally not inconsistent with the Comp Plan land
14 use map designation by providing exclusively
15 residential uses on the remainder of the portion of
16 the site designated for medium density residential
17 use, and by furthering numerous policy statements
18 within the land use, housing, environmental
19 protection, environmental development, and urban
20 design city-wide elements and the far northeast and
21 southeast area element.

22 Many of these policy statements are
23 potentially addressed to a greater degree with the
24 inclusion of the office building, particularly ones
25 in the land use economic development and far

1 northeast and far south -- and far northeast and
2 southeast elements.

3 In particular, the office space would
4 potentially further policies related to the provision
5 of business and employment opportunities for local
6 residents, and would help to make the desired
7 neighborhood serving retail space more viable by
8 augmenting daytime population.

9 On balance, the proposal would not be
10 inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan when read as
11 intended, with the generalized direction contained in
12 the policy and future land use maps balanced with the
13 many policy statements which support the proposal.
14 The proposed office use is permitted by the
15 established PUD zoning, including the limitation on
16 nonresidential FAR, and is consistent with the intent
17 to the original stage-one PUD approval to provide a
18 mixed-use development.

19 OP anticipates that as other parcels are
20 brought forward, the overall development program for
21 the broader Parkside site, which included 500,000 to
22 750,000 square feet of office space, maximum, would
23 be adhered to.

24 As such, OP recommends that this application
25 be set down for public hearing. OP will continue to

1 work with the applicant to address issues and provide
2 additional information or refinements as noted in our
3 report prior to the public hearing. And with that,
4 I'll be available for questions. Thank you.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Mr.
6 Lawson. Let's see if we have any comments or
7 questions. Anybody? Commissioner May?

8 MR. MAY: Okay. So, the thing that concerns
9 me about this overall PUD is that the first-stage was
10 planned so long ago and the project is so big, and
11 what's come forward in the second stage is a, you
12 know, a repeated sequence of stage-two with a stage-
13 one modification.

14 And so, you know, first of all I don't really
15 remember everything that stage-one was all about, it
16 was so long ago. And it's changed with almost every
17 stage-two. So, what I would really like to
18 understand as we get into the question of whether
19 this planned change of use for part of the site and a
20 few other aspects of it is, we look at it for
21 consistency with the Comprehensive Plan.

22 I think it's time to just take a look back at
23 the original phase one approval, and look at where we
24 are in the overall project, what is, you know, what's
25 been built out and what changed from phase one to,

1 you know, with the modified phase-two or stage-twos,
2 or rather modified stage-one plus a stage-two
3 approval, because there are a lot of things that have
4 changed, and we've got the medical building where
5 we're supposed to have, I don't know, an office
6 building. And then there was the UDC building that
7 didn't get built, and so on.

8 So, I just, I feel like it's changed so much
9 that we need to just take stock of the whole thing
10 and not just think in terms of what's happened since
11 it was originally approved, but also what's coming
12 because your report cites three or four more that are
13 coming. And hopefully they're not all requiring
14 stage-one modifications, but I think we need to
15 understand on balance how this thing compares with
16 what was originally approved.

17 So, you follow what I'm asking for there?

18 MR. LAWSON: Absolutely. Yes, very much
19 following what you're saying.

20 This has been a particularly kind of
21 protracted PUD. It has gone on for a long time.
22 There have certainly been a number of changes to
23 respond to a changing market and changing conditions
24 within this neighborhood. We'd be happy to work with
25 the applicant to provide a more kind of comprehensive

1 summary of --

2 MR. MAY: Uh-huh.

3 MR. LAWSON: -- what was originally approved
4 compared to what's being built and what might be
5 coming. Some of that is provided in the applicant's
6 proposal and we provide a summary in our report of
7 all the past cases, including modifications and
8 extensions and --

9 MR. MAY: Right.

10 MR. LAWSON: -- and everything. But I
11 totally get what you're saying, that you want
12 something a little bit more detailed than that with
13 some numbers and some background.

14 MR. MAY: And some pictures.

15 MR. LAWSON: Sure.

16 MR. MAY: Some pictures, because there are a
17 lot of words in there and it's just, you know, it
18 needs -- I think we need to see what it's looking
19 like, what it's shaping up to be.

20 MR. LAWSON: While we're on the subject of
21 what it looks like, I think that also the buildings
22 could use some work because I think that even though
23 -- I mean, I think even the residential building
24 looks like a fairly, you know, ordinary sounds too
25 strong. It just -- they all look like office

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.

1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington, DC 20036

Washington: 202-898-1108 • Baltimore: 410-752-3376

Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1 buildings and I think that, you know, there's like
2 one little column of inset balconies. It's not a
3 very -- they're not very friendly buildings. So, I
4 think that something that's a little bit more
5 residential in character.

6 Certainly, you know, I mean, I know that in
7 stage-one we weren't looking at the actual design of
8 those buildings. But what was shown there was the
9 sort of building you look at it and it very much
10 looked like it was residential in character. So, not
11 that the office building -- you know, if we approve
12 the office building, the office building has to look
13 like it's residential. That's not what I'm saying,
14 but I think that the residential building ought to
15 have a bit more residential feel to it, because I
16 think that the sort of hard sharp box of housing is
17 not quite right for this context. So, I think that
18 it needs some work softening it up.

19 Not that what we see is really bad. It's not
20 terrible. It's a little plain, but it's not -- it's
21 just not giving me the residential feel that I want
22 to see. So, that's about it.

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Commissioner Shapiro.

24 MR. SHAPIRO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would
25 just, first I would agree with Commissioner May's

1 comments and picking up on what was in the OP set
2 down report around the more creative design. And
3 also, I also appreciated Mr. May's comments about
4 missing the forest for the trees on this. It's just
5 hard to get a sense of how this fits into the bigger
6 picture. So, I think that would be very helpful.

7 But, I just wanted to pick on a specific
8 issue around the environmental sustainable benefits,
9 and to make sure that OP continues to -- and DOE
10 works with the applicant to make sure that it's LEED
11 Gold and Green Community requirements are met for the
12 -- respectively for the office and residential. And,
13 specifically, I'd like to see where the OP comment
14 says the addition of a green roof or solar panels on
15 the residential building, I'd like to see solar
16 panels on the residential building. And then if it
17 is also possible to have a green roof as well. But,
18 I'd like to see that LEED with solar panels.

19 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

20 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Vice Chair Miller?

21 MR. MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And
22 thank you, Mr. Lawson, for Office of Planning's
23 report.

24 I would agree with all the statements of my
25 colleagues thus far, and just in terms of the big

1 picture, in terms of the residential -- the
2 residential building needing more residential
3 character, and always like more balconies, and the
4 environmental strengthening that Commissioner Shapiro
5 talked about.

6 On the Inclusionary Zoning, so it's my
7 understanding that the applicant now agrees with
8 Office of Planning that Inclusionary Zoning is
9 triggered by this modification of the first-stage,
10 but it will be asking -- it may be asking for a
11 waiver from the IZ requirement, and the affordable
12 housing that they're offering for this site, for this
13 project is, to me a wholly unacceptable. They need
14 120 percent AMI. We've come a long way since when
15 this was a pretty IZ project when it first -- in an
16 area that needed to have a neighborhood created, so
17 they were doing a lot of stuff.

18 But, what would be the IZ -- or, I guess I
19 would need information on what the IZ requirement
20 would be if there were not a waiver. Would it be
21 half at 80 and half at 50?

22 MR. LAWSON: I'd have to --

23 MR. MILLER: Yeah, so I don't need that right
24 now. I need that from the applicant and addressed
25 in, maybe in your report that we get, your subsequent

1 report. And I would just like to see some of the
2 affordable units at the -- a good proportion of the
3 affordable units at the 50 percent AMI level.

4 I know this project does, even though it has
5 a set aside requirement that's at a high AMI level, I
6 think it's actually delivered on, or is delivering on
7 units, affordable units, at a lower level. So, I
8 guess I would want from the applicant what that
9 number, overall number is in terms of affordable
10 units being delivered at what AMI levels, or what
11 will be delivered when the overall project is built
12 out.

13 And I think that was the extent of my
14 comments, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. Any other
16 comments? Mr. Turnbull?

17 MR. TURNBULL: Yeah, thanks, Mr. Chair. I
18 would agree with all the comments made so far. I
19 especially appreciate Commissioner May's comments
20 about going back and revisiting the first stage and
21 trying to get an update as to as far as a graphic
22 representation of where we are and where we were
23 before and how it's changed.

24 I would also agree with the comments on the
25 architecture of the buildings. I mean, when you look

1 at the first-stage graphics now, in one way, they're
2 cartoons. But they set a -- they give you a scale,
3 they give you a sense of what is trying to be
4 achieved. And so, it was a very definitely a
5 residential character to them. Whether or not we
6 like them totally at the time is irrelevant, but they
7 did set an architectural bar as to what they were
8 trying to do.

9 So, and these buildings right now, as --
10 they're very commercial looking. They look almost
11 like they're both office buildings. And if they were
12 in the downtown and they were metal panels instead of
13 fiber cement, they would probably fit in very well.
14 Except for maybe, maybe a few more balconies.

15 But I think right here, in this context of
16 where they are, I really don't know if what we're
17 seeing with the fiber cement, two different shades of
18 gray for the fiber cement panels, is really
19 appropriate. I think it's maybe not in the same
20 context of what's being developed around it.

21 I would also agree with the Vice Chair in
22 revisiting the IZ element. I'm not so sure I'm ready
23 to jump on board any bandwagon offering flexibility.
24 I think this PUD has changed so much, and it's
25 changed. I think we need a lot more information as

1 to -- as the Vice Chair said about what's been done
2 so far, and I think we need to -- I think the
3 applicant needs to take a good hard long look at what
4 they can do with IZ, and to satisfy the Zoning
5 Commission.

6 But again, this project is -- you said, Mr.
7 Lawson, this has taken a long time. It's been a
8 protracted, I think your words, PUD. And we'd like
9 to see this go forward and finish in the way that I
10 think we all think it can finish. So, but I think
11 they need to provide a little bit more information
12 for us.

13 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: No comments? I don't
14 necessarily have any comments. Okay. Vice Chair
15 Miller, I forgot.

16 MR. MILLER: Yeah, I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman.
17 I had forgotten one comment I wanted to make about
18 the Comprehensive Plan. And I know there was a lot
19 of discussion by both the applicant and by the Office
20 of Planning in its report about it being -- the
21 project being not inconsistent -- not inconsistent
22 holistically with the Comprehensive Plan.

23 But this is a medium density residential
24 designation. They're asking for office building,
25 changing one of the residential buildings from an

1 office building. I realize that the previous C-3-A
2 zoning that this Commission did was deemed to be not
3 inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan at that
4 time, and may still be not inconsistent with the Comp
5 Plan. But I guess I just need some information from
6 the applicant or OP as to where the precedent might
7 be, where we've allowed a 90-foot office building,
8 90-foot high office building, or a 75-foot high
9 office building, whatever this one is, I forget now,
10 on a site that the plan designates strictly as
11 residential.

12 I'm not saying it's not a good use and
13 probably fits in with the overall Parkside project,
14 but I just need a better comfort level that a
15 commercial office building on a site that's
16 designated just for residential, medium density
17 residential, is something that is permissible.

18 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I don't have
19 anything to add, I just would echo what none of you
20 all have mentioned after Commissioner May. Let's
21 revisit and see where we are. What's going on.
22 Let's look at the whole thing again, first-stage, and
23 kind of get updates. So, I think that's definitely
24 in order.

25 So, any other comments? Somebody like to

1 make a motion and set it down? Or, not to set it
2 down. So, I don't think any --

3 MR. MAY: Motion, Mr. Chair.

4 MR. MILLER: I would move, Mr. Chairman,
5 that the Zoning Commission set down Zoning Commission
6 Case No. 05-28Q, Parkside Residential, LLC, first-
7 stage PUD modification of significance, and second-
8 stage PUD at Squares 5041 and 5056, and ask for a
9 second.

10 MR. SHAPIRO: Second.

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

13 [Vote taken.]

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Ms. Schellin, would you
15 record the vote?

16 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Staff records the vote
17 five, to zero, to zero to approve set down for Zoning
18 Commission Case No. 05-28Q as a contested case.
19 Commissioner, excuse me, Miller moving, Commissioner
20 Shapiro seconding, Commissioners Hood, May, and
21 Turnbull in support.

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Ms. Schellin, do we
23 have anything else?

24 MS. SCHELLIN: I have nothing.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Office of Planning, do you

1 have anything else?

2 MS. STEINGASSER: No, sir.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Commissioners,
4 anything else?

5 MR. SHAPIRO: No, sir.

6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. So, with that
7 I want to thank everyone for their participation in
8 this meeting and those who attended, and this meeting
9 is adjourned.

10 [Whereupon, the meeting adjourned at 7:34
11 p.m.]

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25