GOVERNMENT
OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

REGULAR MEETING

+ + + + +

THURSDAY

JULY 17, 2014

+ + + + +

The Regular Meeting of the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened in the Jerrily R. Kress Memorial Hearing Room, Room 220 South, 441 4<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20001, pursuant to notice at 5:06 p.m., Anthony J. Hood, Chairman, presiding.

## ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

ANTHONY J. HOOD, Chairman
MARCIE COHEN, Vice Chair
MICHAEL G. TURNBULL, FAIA,
Commissioner (AOC)
ROBERT MILLER, Commissioner

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

SHARON S. SCHELLIN, Secretary

## OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

JENNIFER STEINGASSER, Deputy Director, Development Review & Historic Preservation

JOEL LAWSON KAREN THOMAS

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PRESENT:

JACOB RITTING, ESQ. ALLISON MYERS, ESQ.

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Regular meeting held on July 17, 2014.

## Table of Contents

Case Number Z.C. Case No. 10-32B, 6
Final Action, Georgetown University
MedStar Campus Plan Amendment and
Further Processing for Proton
Therapy Addition
Vote to Approve Z.C. Case No. 10-32B 8
Approved - Four to Zero to One
7 C Cago No 06 00D Fort Lingoln/ 11
Z.C. Case No. 06-08D, Fort Lincoln/ 11 Gateway Village, LLC, Request for
Minor Modification to PUD @
Square 4325 - Deferred until
January 2015
Z.C. Case No. 08-14C, Kelsey Gardens, 14
Request for Minor Modification to PUD
@ Square 421
Vote for Z.C. Case No. 08-14C
Proffers - Delayed to 28 July 28
Rooftop Structure Changes, Approved 28
Five to Zero to Zero
7 G G N. 07 067 G'I N. 1-1 21
Z.C. Case No. 07-26F, City Market at 31
O Condo, LLC, Modification to PUD @
Square 398
Vote to Set Down for a Hearing 39
Approved Five to Zero to Zero
inproved five to delo to delo
Z.C. Case No. 14-11, Office of 40
Planning Text Amendments to Chapters
1 and 4, Definitions and R-4 Zones
Vote to Set Down - Approved99
Five to Zero to Zero

## 1 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 5:06 p.m. 2 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. This 3 4 meeting will please come to order. Good evening ladies and gentlemen. This is a Public 5 6 Meeting of the Zoning Commission for the 7 District of Columbia. My name is Anthony Hood. Joining me this evening are Vice Chair Cohen, 8 Commissioner Miller and we'll be joined shortly 9 10 by Commissioner Turnbull. We are also joined by the Office of 11 Zoning staff, Ms. Sharon Schellin, Office of 12 13 the Attorney General, Mr. Ritting and Ms. 14 Myers. Office of Planning staff expected 15 16 shortly, Ms. Steingasser and Mr. Lawson and also Mr. Jesick and Ms. Thomas. 17 Copies of today's meeting agenda 18 19 are available to you and are located in the bin 20 near the door. We do not take any public testimony in our meetings unless the Commission 21

requests someone to come forward.

1	Please be advised this proceeding
2	is being recorded by a Court Reporter and it's
3	also web cast live. Accordingly, we must ask
4	you to refrain for any disruptive noises or
5	actions in the hearing room including display
6	of any signs or objects.
7	Please turn off all beepers and cell
8	phone.
9	Does the staff have any preliminary
10	matters?
11	MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. What I'm
13	going to do is move some things around. We're
14	going to start, colleagues, with one case on
15	final action so we can allow some time for Mr.
16	Turnbull to get here to participate in the rest
17	of the actions.
18	And, Ms. Schellin, can you tell me
19	which case that is?
20	MS. SCHELLIN: It would be Final
21	Action on Zoning Commission Case Number 10-32B,

1	Amendment and Further Processing for the Proton
2	Therapy Addition.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let me call
4	Zoning Commission Case Number 10-32B as stated
5	by Ms. Schellin, Georgetown University/MedStar
6	Campus Plan Amendment and Further Processing
7	for the Proton Therapy Addition.
8	Ms. Schellin, do you have anything
9	else?
10	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. At Exhibit
11	28 as the Commission will recall at the end of
12	the hearing the Commission had left the record
13	open to allow the ANC to provide its report
14	because they had not yet met. They have
15	provided their report that's from ANC-2E. The
16	report is in support of the project.
17	And then at Exhibits 29 and 30 we
18	have the Applicant's post-hearing submissions
19	and we'd ask the Commission to consider action
20	on this case this evening.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you,
22	Ms. Schellin.

1	Commissioners I have looked at the
2	ANC report and I can tell you we've come along
3	with anything dealing with Georgetown and the
4	ANC and I want to commend that ANC especially
5	for working along with Georgetown. I think
6	this case is pretty straightforward. There
7	were some other submissions but I was more
8	interested in the comments from the ANC. I
9	think most of us were. I'm not sure.
10	Anybody else want to open up any
11	comments?
12	VICE CHAIR COHEN: Mr. Chairman, I
13	think the modifications that were made by the
14	Office of the Attorney General have satisfied
15	any kind of concerns that I had and so about the
16	project, I would move if that's acceptable to
17	approve Zoning Commission Case No. 10-32B,
18	Georgetown University/MedStar Georgetown
19	University Hospital Proton Therapy Addition.
20	COMMISSIONER MILLER: Second.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. It's been
22	moved and properly seconded. Any further

1	discussion?
2	Hold on one second. I had
3	something I wanted to say. I might have
4	already said it. Anyway. I want to also add,
5	I think I wrote down a note to commend Mr. Moy
6	in what they've done with that ANC. So, I had
7	my notes here somewhere but anyway.
8	It's been moved and properly
9	seconded. Any further discussion?
10	All those in favor?
11	(AYES)
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing any
13	opposition of those present. And we also have
14	a proxy.
15	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Schellin, would
17	you record the vote?
18	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Staff records
19	the vote, four to zero to one to approve Final
20	Action on Zoning Commission Case Number 10-32B,
21	Commissioner Cohen moving, Commissioner Miller
22	seconding, Commissioner Hood in support.

1	Commissioner May in support by absentee ballot.
2	Commissioner Turnbull not voting, having not
3	participated.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Do we have
5	anything else that Mr. Turnbull did not
6	participate in?
7	MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So, at this
9	point let's give Mr. Turnbull about I was
10	trying for the sake of efficiency try to get
11	started. Let's give him a few minutes, maybe
12	five minutes or so to join us so I'll ask
13	everyone to indulge us for about another five
14	minutes.
15	(Whereupon, the above-entitled
16	matter went off the record at 5:10 p.m. and
17	resumed at 5:11 p.m.)
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Staff has
19	just informed me that we can do another one.
20	First of all, let me ask. Is there
21	anyone who would like to see anything? We have
22	two items on the Consent Calendar, Zoning

1	Commission Case No. 06-08B and Zoning
2	Commission Case No. 08-14C. Right on time.
3	Mr. Turnbull, we didn't take any
4	actions on any cases that you heard. We did the
5	one that you didn't hear so right on time.
6	Did you do BikeShare or did you walk
7	over? I'm sure you didn't drive.
8	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I couldn't
9	find out how to get in the garage.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, okay.
11	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: They moved
12	it.
12 13	it.  CHAIRMAN HOOD: They moved it?
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: They moved it?
13 14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: They moved it?  COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Moved the
13 14 15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: They moved it?  COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Moved the entrance. And I couldn't even never mind,
13 14 15 16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: They moved it?  COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Moved the entrance. And I couldn't even never mind, you don't need to know.
13 14 15 16 17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: They moved it?  COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Moved the entrance. And I couldn't even never mind, you don't need to know.  CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well, when you find
13 14 15 16 17 18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: They moved it?  COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Moved the entrance. And I couldn't even never mind, you don't need to know.  CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well, when you find the answers could you let the rest of us know
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: They moved it?  COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Moved the entrance. And I couldn't even never mind, you don't need to know.  CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well, when you find the answers could you let the rest of us know just in case we may need to use it?

1 Steingasser and Mr. Lawson as we mentioned Also, Commissioner Turnbull. 2 earlier. Okay. So, let's go back to -- well, 3 4 we'll go in order. Let's go the Consent Calendar item, 5 6 colleagues. We have two now. As you know, one 7 has been approved to Hearing Action. We have two on the Consent Calendar. Does anyone see 8 a need for anything -- now, I understand about 9 10 the request. But does anyone see a need for anything to come off the Consent Calendar? 11 12 Okav. Let's Zoning qo to 13 Commission Case Number 06-08D. This is the Fort Lincoln/Gateway Village, LLC, Request for 14 Minor Modification to PUD at Square 4325. 15 16 Ms. Schellin? Yes, sir. 17 MS. SCHELLIN: The Applicant has supplemented their request at 18 19 Exhibit 13 asking for a further deferment to in order to work 20 January 15th out contribution that they were going to provide 21 from information as far as the use of what that 22

1	contribution would be for. They have also
2	stated that OP is agreeable to this deferment.
3	And so that they're asking for this evening is
4	that the Commission defer action on this case
5	until January, after the January 15th date,
6	whatever meeting that might be.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Does anyone
8	have any problems with deferring? We can just
9	do that by general consensus.
10	I think that there are a lot of
11	programs and I see we have a letter from Single
12	Member District Commissioner King.
13	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: There are a lot of
15	things going on before Lincoln got youth
16	baseball so I'm sure they will find something.
17	I'm not directing to anything but I think we
18	should come back with something hopefully this
19	next time we come back.
20	How long are we deferring it?
21	JUDGE JAMES: If we could have a
22	solution from the Applicant by 3:00 p.m.,

1	January 15th. I'm assuming that's a weekday
2	and then whatever meeting is after that, the
3	meeting after that I'll put it on the agenda.
4	VICE CHAIR COHEN: January?
5	MS. SCHELLIN: January. It's six
6	more months.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Again, get
8	with Commissioner King and all the rest of them
9	up there. There are a lot of things going on
10	at Fort Lincoln and I'm sure that could be well
11	utilized.
12	Okay. So, we will defer that until
13	January the 15th.
14	MS. SCHELLIN: The meeting after
15	January 15th.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Or the meeting
17	after, somewhere around that time. Okay. So,
18	we did that by general consensus.
19	So Commissioner May is an
20	agreement. Okay.
21	Zoning Commission Case No. 08-14C,
22	Kelsey Garden, Request for Minor Modification

1	to PUD at Square 421.
2	Ms. Schellin.
3	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. If the
4	Commission will recall, this case was on the
5	Commission's last meeting for the Applicant to
6	provide further information on the \$22,500
7	contribution and to allow the ANC to submit a
8	letter. The Applicant has supplemented its
9	information at Exhibit 7 which includes an
LO	attachment of a letter from the Friends of
L1	Kennedy Playground, Inc., and also a letter
L2	from ANC-6E and we'd ask the Commission to
L3	consider action this evening.
L4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
L5	Commissioners, let's open it up for any
L6	comments. Anybody have any? Okay.
L7	Commissioner Miller.
L8	COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thank you, Mr.
L9	Chairman.
20	The Applicant has come back with
21	more details and the corrected figures that the
22	allocation of the \$22,500 for the different

1	programs over a different number of years at the
2	Kennedy Recreation Center. And with those
3	additional details and with the letter that we
4	got which we requested from the ANC itself on
5	ANC stationary for support yesterday.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Vice Chair
7	Cohen.
8	VICE CHAIR COHEN: I just want to
9	state that I think we - I won't object to this
10	but I think we need to tie up some of the
11	proffers and, you know, as Commissioner May had
12	said earlier, the holiday party and get
13	distribution. I don't now if this is the most
14	appropriate use of funds but I won't stand in
15	the way. I'd just like to be on the record
16	saying that in the future I think that that type
17	of ephemeral use of money, I'm not sure is the
18	best and most effective way of spending tight
19	dollars.
20	
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I would associate
22	myself with the Vice Chair but I'll go another

step further. I can tell you what I see here
in front of me Friends of Kennedy Playground,
Inc., Mr. Padro and also Chair of the ANC,
Mr. Padro, I know that when we heard this case
awhile back there were going back and looking
through the transcript there were civic
associations and other groups that
participated like East Central Civic
Association. My concern is in line with the
December holiday party that was mentioned
earlier. I think that the community as a whole
needs to be on board because my concern, and I
know Mr. Padro. He and I worked on committees
together and I'm not saying anything about him.
I'm just talking about perception here. When
I look and see and I appreciate his advocacy,
what he's done for Friends of Kennedy
Playground and also as the Chair of the ANC,
agree to this that I think it needs to be more
vetted. I am not ready to move with these
amenities.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

I would like for the Applicant to go

out and make sure that those other groups in support of this application -- while I know that the ANC and Friends of Kennedy Playground are looking for these changes, but there were some other groups that supported this application. I am not in favor of moving forward with this until it's well vetted because these are some of the types of issues that have caused this Commission problems or we heard about problems in the past. And I don't want to be a creator of issues.

Now, the architectural roof top changes as one of my colleagues has mentioned, some of that I don't have a problem with voting for tonight and I would suggest that we do this in two votes because I would like for them to make sure. I would like something to come back to this record that this has been vetted fully with the community. Because when I look at Mr. Padro, again, and I know him so I'm not saying anything negative about him and I know the great work that he does in this city. But when I see

his name on both, I mean, also it says that he's a very good community person. But also we got to make sure the perception is clear and I think this needs to be vetted through those other supporters and the issue for me still is the holiday party. The holiday party.

So, that's where I stand. I'm not ready to move on this, this -- I'm not ready to move, but I'm not sure, I know another one of my colleagues -- we have an absentee ballot for concern of the holiday party. But everything else, I think, again, like I stated. and modeling acting program. Ι don't necessarily have an issue with but I'm more concerned about the holiday party and making sure that it reaches where it's supposed to reach and it's actually a viable way of doing things is my colleague -- I think that's where the Vice Chair was coming from.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Chair, I wonder would you be interested in splitting approval between the rooftop changes and then

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	looking at the proffers as a secondary item?
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I would like to give
3	the Applicant some certainty about the rooftop.
4	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I don't an issue with
6	that. I just have an issue with this holiday
7	
8	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: The
9	proffers, yes.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: and the way this
11	is going.
12	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: yes.
12 13	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: yes.  CHAIRMAN HOOD: I don't want to be a
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I don't want to be a
13 14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I don't want to be a creator of problems. But I think Commissioner
13 14 15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I don't want to be a creator of problems. But I think Commissioner Miller is fine with and, I think, Vice Chair,
13 14 15 16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I don't want to be a creator of problems. But I think Commissioner Miller is fine with and, I think, Vice Chair, you're fine with it as it is?
13 14 15 16 17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I don't want to be a creator of problems. But I think Commissioner Miller is fine with and, I think, Vice Chair, you're fine with it as it is?  VICE CHAIR COHEN: Yes, I
13 14 15 16 17 18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I don't want to be a creator of problems. But I think Commissioner Miller is fine with and, I think, Vice Chair, you're fine with it as it is?  VICE CHAIR COHEN: Yes, I  CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I don't want to be a creator of problems. But I think Commissioner  Miller is fine with and, I think, Vice Chair, you're fine with it as it is?  VICE CHAIR COHEN: Yes, I  CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.  VICE CHAIR COHEN: To support the way

1 support of your method, too. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Good. Commissioner 2 Miller, you have a problem with allowing a 3 little more time? 4 COMMISSIONER MILLER: No, I don't 5 6 have a problem but I would note just a few things 7 just for our record that I think the \$22,500 for Friends of Kennedy Playground is just one 8 amenity out of a larger amenity package. 9 Ι 10 don't have it in front of me right now but I think there were other amenities that were 11 associated with this project. 12 13 In terms of being vetted with the community both letters are signed by Mr. Padro 14 but the ANC letter states that it was a five to 15 16 zero vote by the unanimous vote by ANC-6E. I think that is a vetting with the community. 17 He is Chair and is a single-member district with 18 19 the Friends of Kennedy. And then the only other thing I 20 would note about the holiday party. 21 It is to serve low to moderate income children in 22

and although there are other programs that might be more beneficial, it does provide some benefit to the surrounding communities.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I think though it goes back to what this Commission decided some years ago about how things are being administered. This puts us back I think to what we got away from and that's why I checked off and I have an issue with the December holiday party and gift distribution.

anyway, not to belabor the It just looks so typical of some of the point. things some years ago that we got away from and how things were administered. So, anyway, I would like for them to go back and make sure that some of those other civic associations and other groups that were in support have all worked on this about this holiday party and the way it's administered. If you don't go back and do all that you can come back and show us how it's going to be administered other than to party includes the а catered meal,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 entertainment. Okay. Is the Applicant going to get the caterer? I mean, you know, how is 2 this going to be administered? Okay. 3 That's 4 kind of where I am. Ms. Giordano, we're not actually 5 6 turning you down. Okay. Can we finish the 7 action first because it's probably not going to affect the way we're getting ready to move. 8 Come on to the table, Ms. Giordano. 9 10 MS. GIORDANO: Yes, I'm not here to talk to the merits of the contribution, only 11 that the building it's finished and this is 12 13 going to hold up the Certificate of Occupancy because it's a prerequisite to getting the 14 Certificate of Occupancy. There's a way to 15 16 sort of unleash that so that the building can open and we'll, you know, take the time to vet 17 it further in the community or --18 19 CHAIRMAN HOOD: How much longer? 20 It's already been vetted it shouldn't take -what's today? Could we do it by the 28th? 21

Could you come back with some assurances of how

1	this is going to be administered?
2	MS. GIORDANO: I probably could do
3	that but in terms of
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So, that's okay. A
5	couple more days is not going to hurt.
6	MS. GIORDANO: Right.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: A couple more days
8	won't hurt.
9	MS. GIORDANO: Okay. In terms of
10	just contacting other civil associations, I
11	have no idea how long that could take and
12	whether they're, you know, during the summer
13	whether they're really available to take a
14	vote. That's the concern that I have.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well, if you try to
16	reach out to the Executive Board or whoever
17	maybe Mr. Padro could help assist with that.
18	And here's the other issue. We
19	need to re-look at how this holiday party and
20	gift donation is going to be administered. Who
21	is going to administer it? Because I know you
22	can't give it to the ANC. Is it going to

1	Friends or who administers it now? Is it
2	Friends who does it and
3	MS. GIORDANO: Yes, that's my
4	understanding.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I think if you can't
6	reach out to everybody, I'd like for it to be
7	vetted. And also let's just itemize and show
8	how it's going to be administered and I think
9	that sets of the standard of what this
10	Commission is moved to.
11	MS. GIORDANO: Okay. I can just
12	tell you that it took a long time to get this,
13	I mean months.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
15	VICE CHAIR COHEN: Can I just make a
16	suggestion.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: If it helps. Is it
18	going to help?
19	VICE CHAIR COHEN: Well
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: If not then
21	VICE CHAIR COHEN: I don't have
22	the history that you have so you can respond

1	because can we approve this subject to so
2	that all the processing of the voting order can
3	be done and then when the information is
4	provided to the Office of the Attorney General
5	we can release it so that they know the sense
6	of the Board is a little bit
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let me just say this.
8	I tried that once before as your recommendation
9	and I don't mean to bus you out, but that got
10	us in trouble once before. So, I think what we
11	need to do is stay in line with our procedures
12	and, Vice Chair, that was a good try. I
13	actually agreed with you the last time.
14	VICE CHAIR COHEN: You agreed the
15	last time?
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, and I got
17	slapped on the wrist for that. So this time,
18	I think we need to stay in the 28th, a few
19	more days, Vice Chair, I don't think would hurt
20	us. I don't want to make it hectic. But a few
21	more days, Ms. Giordano.

Ms. Giordano, you didn't go away

1	you're not mad are you?
2	MS. GIORDANO: No.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. We try to
4	make everybody happy. Okay.
5	So, what do we need to do, Ms.
6	Schellin?
7	MS. SCHELLIN: I think, Ms.
8	Giordano, you want them to go ahead and vote on
9	the rooftop. She would like for you to go ahead
10	and vote on that and then come back on the 28th
11	to vote on the proffer so they can go ahead and
12	move forward with the rooftop issue.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: And especially if we
14	can just point out how it's going to be
15	administered.
16	MS. SCHELLIN: Right.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Any other
18	questions? Comments? Okay.
19	I would move that we separate the
20	votes, the amenities and the proposed
21	modification that we approve the proposed
22	modification to the rooftop structure changes

1	and ask for a second.
2	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I would
3	second that, Mr. Chair.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. It's been
5	moved and seconded. Any further discussion?
6	Let me amend my motion that we will
7	take this up July the 28th.
8	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, the rest of it.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: The rest of it on
10	July 28th.
11	MS. SCHELLIN: The proffers.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So, it's
13	moved and properly seconded. Any further
14	discussion? All those in favor?
15	(AYES)
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing any
17	opposition, Ms. Schellin, please record the
18	vote.
19	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, staff records
20	the vote five to zero to zero to approve the
21	requested rooftop changes and to take up the
22	requested proffers at the July 28th meeting.

1	Commissioner Hood moving, Commissioner
2	Turnbull seconding, Commissioners Cohen and
3	Miller in support. Commissioner May in
4	support by absentee ballot.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Next, let's
6	go to Final Action. Zoning Commission Case
7	Number 14-01, Jemal's Hecht's LLC,
8	Consolidated PUD and Related Map Amendment at
9	Square 4037.
10	Ms. Schellin.
11	MS. SCHELLIN: At Exhibit s 32
12	through 35 we have Applicant's post-hearing
13	submission and we ask he Commission to consider
14	Final Action this evening.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let's open it
16	up, colleagues. Any questions or comments?
17	We have some submissions which is
18	Exhibit 32. Did we get a NCPC Report? We
19	didn't get an NCPC? Okay.
20	I'm not sure who asked for some of
21	the drawings that we have showing some of the
22	changes and the union mix. I want to make sure

	<b>1</b>
1	everybody is satisfied.
2	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I think
3	Commissioner May may have asked for something
4	on green I'm not sure and on the roof units.
5	I can't remember how that fell out. But I think
6	we got everything that we asked for.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. No other
8	comments. I think it's pretty
9	straightforward. Again, I would have thought
10	that the Applicant and how they work with the
11	ANC and the community, they all come down
12	holding hands. And I mentioned that at the
13	meeting. So, I would move that we approve
14	Zoning Commission Case Number 14-01 and ask for
15	a
16	COMMISSIONER MILLER: Second.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you,
18	Commissioner Miller.
19	All those in favor say aye.
20	(AYES)
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing any
22	opposition, Ms. Schellin, would you record the

1	vote and the proxy.
2	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. Staff
3	records the vote five to zero to zero to approve
4	Final Action on Zoning Commission Case Number
5	14-01. Commissioner Hood moving,
6	Commissioner Miller seconding, Commissioners
7	Cohen and Turnbull in support. Commissioner
8	May in support by absentee ballot.
9	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Chair,
10	I'd just to add that more projects should go
11	forward like this when the Applicant is
12	involved in the community, I think was very
13	good.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Right, I would agree
15	100 percent.
16	Let's go to Zoning Commission Case
17	Number 14-11. This is an Office of Planning
18	Text Amendment to Chapters 1 and 4, Definitions
19	and R-4 Zones.
20	Mr. Lawson? Oh, I'm sorry, Ms.
21	Steingasser.
22	MS. STEINGASSER: Thank you,

1 Chairman Hood. I'm going to step a little out of order 2 and ask if the Commission would consider the 3 4 next case first because it's going to be a much small presentation than what we have coming for 5 6 R-4. And Ι know there's people in the 7 audience. CHAIRMAN HOOD: That's a good idea. 8 I started to do that but I figured I would --9 that was a good idea. 10 Okay. Let's go to Zoning Commission Case 11 Number 07-26F, City Market at O Condo, LLC, 12 13 Request for Minor Modification to PUD @ Square 398. 14 Schellin. 15 Ms. I'm sorry, Ms. 16 Thomas. MS. Good evening, 17 THOMAS: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission. 18 19 The O Street Market Project 20 nearing completion and the final represents the build-out of the west building 21

E as described in the plans and our report.

1	The Applicant has made some changes
2	to the height and massing which we believe
3	should be reviewed by the Commission at a public
4	hearing. As you recall, concerns expressed by
5	the Commission in the original case regarding
6	height along the 9th Street frontage and really
7	into the row house district across the street.
8	That said, we requested the
9	Applicant to supplement the record with
10	additional plans and put us in for a better
11	perspective of what that addition may look like
12	at various locations along 9th Street in the
13	present day situation.
14	So, while we're not opposed to the
15	general direction of the modification, for the
16	reasons discussed in our report we're asking
17	that the Commission set this down for a public
18	hearing.
19	Thank you.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.
21	I don't want to start this. Every
22	time I think about this case, this is the famous

case that I think I mentioned where when things
didn't go exactly right for height someone in
that administration at that time called me
well, they called Greg Jeffries and then called
me for my resignation. And every time I see
this case it doesn't irritate me because I think
it's going to turn out to be great. I think the
Commission made a good decision but I'm
concerned. And as you mentioned, Ms. Thomas,
in your report, it seems like we're creeping
back up. We haven't got to the height that was
proposed and the Commission asked them to bring
it down. It seems like every time we're
creeping back up some kind of way. So, I'm not
sure what my colleagues I don't have an issue
with setting it down, but I don't want us to
creep back up to where this Commission had
I don't think we can at this point. Creep back
up to where this Commission had objected to to
begin with and then set it down and ask to reduce
the height.

I call this the famous resignation

1	case. But anyway, let me open it up,
2	Commissioners. I probably always talk about 0
3	Street when Roadside
4	VICE CHAIR COHEN: Mr. Chairman?
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, okay. Vice
6	Chair and then I'll go to Mr. Turnbull.
7	VICE CHAIR COHEN: Yes, I just want
8	to state that I concurred with OP's
9	recommendation and that it should go through a
10	public hearing.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Turnbull?
12	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I would
12	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I would agree with your comments entirely before. I
13	agree with your comments entirely before. I
13 14	agree with your comments entirely before. I think this project has a lot of positive aspects
13 14 15	agree with your comments entirely before. I think this project has a lot of positive aspects to it. I think we were thrilled to see it there.
13 14 15 16	agree with your comments entirely before. I think this project has a lot of positive aspects to it. I think we were thrilled to see it there. We had some issues and that's part of our job
13 14 15 16 17	agree with your comments entirely before. I think this project has a lot of positive aspects to it. I think we were thrilled to see it there. We had some issues and that's part of our job is to make sure that we feel that this from a
13 14 15 16 17 18	agree with your comments entirely before. I think this project has a lot of positive aspects to it. I think we were thrilled to see it there. We had some issues and that's part of our job is to make sure that we feel that this from a zoning standpoint and neighboring context
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	agree with your comments entirely before. I think this project has a lot of positive aspects to it. I think we were thrilled to see it there. We had some issues and that's part of our job is to make sure that we feel that this from a zoning standpoint and neighboring context standpoint fits in and that the development we

the massive drawings that we got on P and H
Street and P and 9th Street, I'm a little
concerned with what I'm seeing. I'm seeing
these little orange bumps out there. To me it
just looks like they're not really thinking
about what they're really doing from the
standpoint of how the massing of this building
and what it really looks like. So, there's
going to be a lot of explanation going on here.
I'm not really satisfied with the way I'm seeing
this thing developing and how it's being
presented. But I'm in favor of setting it down.
Let's get it on the table. Let's talk about it.
But right now I have some issues with what I'm
seeing with these little bumps going on on the
roof or the setback and the development of the
extra floor and everything else. I just don't
like the and they've clearly illustrated
these little orange bumps sitting on the top of
the building which to me looked totally tacked
on and not thought out well at all.

So, we're going to need some very

1 good explanation at the hearing on this. I just don't think it agrees with development. 2 They're getting away from what we talked about 3 4 earlier. HOOD: Anything 5 CHAIRMAN Okay. 6 else, Mr. Turnbull? Okay. Commissioner Miller, any comments? 7 COMMISSIONER MILLER: Yes, I would 8 9 support setting it down for a public hearing. 10 I generally agree with OP's -- I agree with Commissioner Turnbull's comment 11 that this project has a lot of positive aspects. 12 13 already bringing -- the completed portions are bringing a lot of benefits to the community and 14 to the city as a whole. But I generally agree 15 16 with OP's comments in their report and then would support a public hearing on it. 17 HOOD: 18 CHAIRMAN Okay. And 19 Commissioner May -- Vice Chair, you already. 20 Okay. Commissioner May's comments, information provided for the request is really 21

quite minimal. I hope that in the hearing the

Applicant will address the necessity of making the changes that affect the height of the building and roof structures and necessitate setback relief. Again, we're kind of going back to where we thought we were going away from.

Commissioner Miller?

COMMISSIONER MILLER: If I could add,
I think the Office of Planning stated this in
her presentation. One of the things they asked
for which might help us understand. They asked
the Applicant to provide additional information
including improved elevation drawing and photo
simulations of the proposed changes. And I
think if we see how it looks to the neighborhood
around it that might address or it may not. But
it may help us understand how that height does
bleed to the neighborhood.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: And just for the record, the person who called and asked for my resignation is a very good friend of mine. The conversation went very well. We had a good time. We laughed about it and kept moving.

1	Okay. So, I move that we set down
2	Zoning Commission Case Number 07-26F. Set down
3	07-26F and ask for a second.
4	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Second.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: It's been moved and
6	properly seconded. Any additional comments?
7	All those in favor, aye?
8	(AYES)
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing any
10	opposition, Ms. Schellin, would you record the
11	vote and the absentee?
12	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Staff records
13	the vote five to zero to zero to set down Zoning
14	Commission Case Number 07-26F as a contested
15	case.
16	Commissioner Hood moving,
17	Commissioner Turnbull seconding, Commissioners
18	Cohen and Miller in support. Commissioner May
19	in support by absentee ballot. And I've
20	advised Mr. Glasgow that if this case were set
21	down that he should then initiate this case in
22	ISIS since it now considered a full modification

1 and he stated he would do that. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. 2 Let's go back to Hearing Action now 3 4 Zoning Commission Case Number 14-11. Office of Planning Text Amendment to Chapter 1 5 6 and 4, Ms. Steingasser. 7 MS. STEINGASSER: Thank you, Chairman Hood Commissioners. We thought we'd 8 have a little PowerPoint to go along with this 9 10 presentation because there's so many nuances 11 and details that we just thought it would help to keep it all straight of both what we're 12 13 proposing and why we're proposing and some of the research behind it. 14 So, this case sprung from the ZRR 15 16 Public Hearings that were in both November and then again in January and February of this year 17 where the issue of pop-ups kept being raised 18 19 before the Commission and the inappropriate additions. 20 The Commission asked us to look at 21 22 the issue, no particular direction given but

just that you would OP to investigate the issue a little bit. As we did look at it we started to focus in more on the R-4 Zone as we found these pop-ups. The ones that were in commercial zones seemed to be, while they are out of character today, they were mid-block and the expectation was that they would be developed around it and then their context would be filled in with future. So, we started looking at the R-4 Zone which was raised during, especially the hearings that involved Wards 1 and 2 as well as some in Ward 6 where there is a real predominance of the R-4 Zone.

So, our recommendations in summary are on the slide and it proposes to change the matter of right height in the R-4 for row houses. And these are the residential structures, the semi-detached, the row house, the flat from 40 feet to 35 feet and that's a reduction of five feet.

We propose also that the Commission set down a 40-feet be permitted as a special

exception and the design criteria for that analysis would be similar to what we call the Section 222 -- 223 in the Zoning Regulations right now which establish an issue more of appropriate light and air privacy for non-conforming addition.

We've also proposed a change to the definition of mezzanines and that they would be included in the number of stories.

And then finally, probably the most controversial of the recommendations is to limit conversions -- limit them to only non-residential buildings in the R-4 Zone.

So, that's the summary.

So, we started looking at an extensive sampling. We looked at a little over 10,000 R-4 row house structures. We did both field surveys, GIS survey and tax record surveys. So, as needed we could look at the block faces. We were able to look especially with the help of our historic preservation office at some of the historic districts and we

found that 94.4 of the 10,000 blocks that we looks at were 35 feet or less.

We provided this table here. It's also in the report that kind of breaks down the number of stories that the row houses are also built to. In the R-4 Zone right now you're restricted by 40 feet and 3 stories. mezzanine does not count as a story. So, it's three stories plus you can have a cellar, plus you can have a mezzanine and then also the 40 So this is an analysis of the number of stories that we looked at. And, again, our recommendation here is to maintain a by-right of 35 feet with special exception for 40 feet and keep the 3-story maximum.

This is just a picture of the mezzanine and the reason I put it in here this is not a mezzanine in D.C. We were careful not to use D.C. examples because they are people's homes and we didn't want to make any kind of judgment on that. But this shows the issue of the mezzanine. This, what you're looking at

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

would be considered one story. And whether
that's the second or third story but it would
only be one story because the mezzanine floor
is less than one-third of the overall floor
space. And while from the inside that seems
comfortable, from the outside it clearly looks
as if it's two stories. There's windows and it
allows for the raising of the roof to create that
habitable space on that mezzanine. And so that
part gets to the issue of character and the
inappropriate height that can sometimes result
as buildings are popped up a little bit adjacent
to their neighbors and they're still consistent
with the three stores, it would appear very much
to be a four-story from the outside of the
property. So, the mezzanine definition as it
exists today limits it to one-third of the area
of the floor immediately below and it also says
it shall not be considered a story in
determining the maximum number of stories. So,
in the R-4 Zone where it's limited to three, the
mezzanine, although it maintains its smaller

size we're proposing that it be considered a story because it does affect the height and the usability of the floor space.

The next slide that you'll see in your document just kind of lays out the current definition of stories. We're not proposing any changes to this but it does explain why some of the changes that we are proposing are necessary. A story by definition does not include cellars. It does not include penthouses or other roof structures and it is limited -- I'm sorry. the roof structure shall not exceed one-third of the total roof area. So, you have stories. You have a mezzanine. You have a cellar and then you can have roof structures. And while this situation does exist in several locations it's the most egregious and it's also the It's not something we see where people rarest. really layer it up like this but there are one or two cases where it has been. And so we thought to begin to reduce some of that pressure would be through some of these changes to the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

definitions.

Which brings us to the roof
structure height. We're proposing that also be
limited. And this is what's proposed in the
zoning revisions as well that we've considered
under the ZRR that the roof structures for
single family and row house homes be limited to
10 feet. And that would only be for the
residential structures. Obviously, there are
a lot of non-conforming apartment buildings.
There are churches, schools, institutional
uses, commercial uses inside these zones and we
would propose that they maintain their 18.5 foot
permission which is what exist today. We don't
want to cause them to be non-conforming. We
also don't want to mess with the building code
that would apply differently to those type of
structures. But the 10 feet is what we are
proposing for the row house, the single-family
detached. And as part of this proposal we
thought we would bring it forward as part of the
R-4 changes as well.

So, the conversions in R-4 we want to talk a little bit about the R-4 Zone itself. There are currently about 37,600 R-4 record lots. These are not tax lots or condominium It's a rough estimate that we've gotten lots. using the Office of Tax and Revenue in our GIS computer systems to figure out -- to give us a These include detached, semi-detached count. and attached. And I call those for the sake of these DSA lots. And there's about 35,600 of those.

Now, in the R-4 there's also a lot of small walk-up apartments building in the late 18 up to the 1920s. You'll see those. There's also school lots. There's properties that are built on more than one lot. So, these really are focused on what we typically think of as a residential house detached row or semi-detached. The other lots there's about 1,250 properties on about 2,000 additional lots and these again especially with schools and churches they will be built on multiple lots but

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

they would still be within the R-4 Zone. These lots represent about 22 million square feet of land. So, there's quite a bit of that land in the R-4.

As an alternative to the recommendation, because we are proposing that the conversions be restricted only from the detached, semi-detached and attached lots, but those that are not, these larger institutional lots, these larger lots that do exist that the Commission might consider in the alternative that it be advertised simultaneously with our proposal that that minimum land area of 900 square feet be removed or reduced. We'll talk about that again in a second.

So, how does this recommendation fit in with the zoning context and with the housing context and the efforts that we are all very supportive of creating more housing? And what's really important here to realize what is the R-4 and what is its intent? So, I'm kind of set up here -- this is straight out of the

zoning regulations. The R-1 is supposed to be a one-family detached dwelling and we allow They are a very limited, accessory apartments. internal type apartment. They're of definitely subservient to the main dwelling. They're limited by size. They do not have their The R-2 is a semi-detached. own entrance. It's developed with one-family detached and semi-detached dwelling. The R-3 Zone then goes to row house dwelling, again, with only one single principal dwelling unit. And through the ZRR we are proposing that that be expanded to allow also accessory apartments in those zones.

Now, the R-4 Zone is rally a hybrid zone. It's kind of a lynch-pin between the single-family detached, whether it's R-1, 2 or 3 in the multi-family zone. And it recognizes its position both in the zoning regulation, especially the second -- it's primary purpose is to be the stabilization of the remaining one-family dwelling. And we've seen a whole

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

lot of pressure on this zone to become a small type of apartment zone. And the regs are very clear that the R-4 shall not be an apartment zone. We've tried various ways to limit how the apartments and the conversions take place but when we look at the issue of the conversion in the context of pop-ups and the pressures of what those -- that is putting on those building to become more than just a flat, that's where it all kind of came together and we started to say, okay. Maybe that is really the relief route we need to take a look at.

So, the regs are very clear that the R-4shall not be an apartment district. There's the R-5 districts which talk about the conversions and so we started to focus more on how do we look at the R-4, how do we distinguish out those properties that should be converted and redeveloped and that have the capacity to carry multi-family and those that are stabilized and serve stabilizing fact and then we've talked loud in our report about what we

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

think to be the economics of preserving family-size housing. And the R-4 we're not saying is a single-family zone, but it is one of the few zones that by its nature has larger family-sized units that a family can get into that's not a single-family detached with a large 7,500 square foot or 5,000 square foot lot. And that ability to have flats whether it's an English basement or an equal sized second principal unit allows the type of affordability to the homeowner that we see now has become competitive with they're competing against developers for those same properties.

So, we've done a quick -- this is just a quick analysis that kind of lays out what the different zone groups. There are one, two, three, four and the R-5 lumped together, the amount of principal units that are allowed and the amount of accessory units. And, again, this is to clarify that the R-4 is not the same as the single-family detached R-1, 2 and 3 with an accessory apartment. It is intended to have

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

two principal units. And the R-5 can have any number of principal units. So, you go from an R-4 to the R-5 there's absolutely no limit. And the amount of residentially zoned land, the R-4 represents 15-1/2 percent, whereas the R-5 which is the apartment zones and that's R-5A, B, C and D and E represents almost 30 percent.

And then in addition to that, there's 3,500 acres of mixed-use zone, also that either permits of incentivizes residential zones. So, taking efforts to maintain and protect the character of the R-4 still allowing the flats does not, we don't feel and should the Commission set this case down, does not diminish the amount of housing that will be produced in the District with a Capital "D".

So then we also went to the Comprehensive Plan and the Comprehensive Plan gives very clear direction about the protection of the row-house neighborhoods, the heights, the scales being consistent with the pattern, all of which we think we've addressed through

the recommendations to lower the height. It also talks about the subdivision of the row house and the multiple dwellings and taking steps to consider additional efforts towards that and how the design and scale should be discouraged and so we feel these recommendations in total address not only this comp plan recommendation but also the issue of inappropriate pop-ups that we heard about in the residential zones.

We also looked at the additional floors and roof structures, again, a policy right out of the Comprehensive Plan that talks very directly to these row houses and how they go up and how they go out.

We have also looked at the variety of neighbor types which is another policy in the comp plan that talks how the single-family neighborhoods and maintaining that variety of neighborhoods and the positive elements that create those characters. And, again, that was something we looked at. And, you know, we have

to recognize that zoning is a very heavy tool for this kind of character protection. Historic preservation is a much better tool, but there's limits to how much historic and how preservation can take on much a neighborhood wants to subject itself historic preservation. So, we tried to look at reducing that development box that created the incentive and reducing the pressure that was put on that develop box in this particular zone since this is where we were hearing the main concern from residents about the inappropriate additions.

And then housing for families and we discussed this in our report about, you know, the pressure we see on families. Again, we'll provide additional information should the Commission set this down. Again, the people working on our inclusionary zoning are looking at this issue, provided a lot of background to us about how to protect family size units. We're not seeing the creation of three-bedroom

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

units and apartments. We're not seeing affordable housing built in the R-1-A and R-1-B. We're seeing a real focus in the R-4. And that's where that confluence of events starts to happen.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

So, proposals are before you. recommend that they be set down for public hearing. We've heard a lot. We actually filed this report a week earlier so it was filed I think 17 days ahead as opposed to 10. We heard a lot of concern in the meantime. A lot of support from residents. A lot of concern from some of the smaller developers. So, regarding the issue of affordability, one the alternatives that suggesting we're be advertised along with our recommendation is that these R-4 conversions be subject to IZ. They're not subject to IZ. So, the argument of affordability is really one based on price per square footage. They're not part of the IZ program, but if we want to really look at the

issue of conversion and its value for affordable
units, let's put it into the IZ mix. And so
we've proposed some additional language that we
would work with the Office of the Attorney
General to refine and advertise in the
alternative. And that would be looking at two
different standards in the R-4. There's not a
right conversion. And those are for properties
that are 2,700 square feet, 3,600 square feet
or more, you know, that have a matter of right
ability under the current regulations to go
forward and provide, you know, a multiple number
of units. And if we went forward with that we
would say at that fourth unit. So, you would
have your two units by right now. If you had
more than 2,700 square feet you would have a
third unit. But if you provided a fourth unit
even as a matter of right that fourth unit would
be subject to the inclusionary zoning and it
would have a 60 percent AMI. Obviously, we
would have to also amend the IZ regulation.

If it's a conversion by variance

which we're seeing a lot of and we're seeing a
lot of this that begins to concern us because
there's beginning to be a mathematical
equation. Density in the R-1 through R-4 zones
is based on units per lot area. It's not an FAR
and we're starting to see cases where people are
coming in saying, well, if I maxed out and I did
all the development standards to what would be
the maximum matter of right it would give me this
FAR, therefore, I want to take that FAR and apply
it to a conversion. As part of that conversion
I'm going to demolish most of the principal
building and put an addition on to the garage
and that will be considered the conversion.
And that's really an R-5 operation. That is an
apartment operation. That is not what we would
consider an appropriate application of the way
low and moderate density residential is
calculated or expected to be calculated both
under the comp plan and under the zoning
regulations.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

if you get this conversion

So,

through a variance process we would say all the units that you get through the variance process should be subject to IZ because we're really asking a lot of the Board of Zoning Adjustment and a lot of the city's regulations to allow that kind of variance outside of what's expected in the zoning. So, if that's going to be the case, then the balance to that would be that all of those units beyond 2 which would be the matter of right would be subject to IZ.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

And then the other alternative is what we mentioned earlier that the conversion for these non-residential lots which there are quite a few of them. Some of them are very These would be things like converting large. schools, fire houses, institutional uses. even see a lot of embassies that are in these longer used for zones that are no purposes. The developers have a hard time converting those structures, especially if they're in a historic district. The schools

are built with a very different floor plate.
They are usually pre-air conditioning so
they've got thick walls. It's hard to maneuver
that. So, the layout becomes very defined by
the structure. Often times there's
playgrounds or parking lots. We want to
encourage the in-fill of that space to maintain
that street wall and that neighborhood
character. So, they end up having to get a
variance. It's often very difficult to make
which requires them to have more units to have
an appropriately designed and neighborhood
character structure than the zoning allows. So,
we would propose that that minimal of 900 square
feet either be reduced significantly and we did
a survey of the cases we were aware of for the
last four or five years and it was around 300
or 400 square feet per unit. And, again, it's
because of those institutional buildings and
how they have to or that it just be removed
altogether since the project would be going
through a special exception. And that would

1 allow the developer to or the builder to work with the neighborhood and figure out what is the 2 best design that the site would yield. 3 So, 4 those two alternatives we're proposing that they be included in the advertisement and then 5 6 we are recommending these be set down for public 7 hearing. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank 8 you, Ms. 9 Steingasser, and Mr. Lawson for being the male 10 version of the Vanna White, I think. So, thank 11 you. I really appreciate the effort that 12 13 went into this, Ms. Steingasser, and I really 14 appreciate the presentation. I know this 15 hasn't been easy and I'm sure I see 16 controversial issues but I'm actually looking forward to having the hearing. But let's open 17 it up and see what my colleagues have. 18 19 Commissioner Miller? 20 COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thank you, Mr. I have a lot of concerns with this Chairman. 21 22 particular proposed text amendment. Let me ask a question first. I know I've sat on several cases -- at several BZA cases where the BZA has approved a variance to allow an additional of one or two units in the R-4 Zone. I can't remember the number of cases but I wonder if you have data on that. But in all the cases though that I recall the OP Office of Planning was opposed. The ANC was for it and the neighbors were for it. And so in terms of neighborhood character, the neighbors weren't concerned about neighborhood character nor was the ANC.

Do you know how many cases there have been in the last two years or whatever time period that -- where the BZA has approved variances to allow for these additions of one or two units in the R-4?

MS. STEINGASSER: We do have that count and you are right. The Office of Planning recommends almost unanimously in opposition and the ANC almost always supports until something gets built that they don't like and then we have a pop-up issue. So, you know, we didn't get

1	here by going after preserving the R-4. We got
2	here by looking at what was the pressure causing
3	the pop-ups. But we do have those statistics
4	and your anecdotal memory is absolutely spot on.
5	COMMISSIONER MILLER: Do we have a
6	number of how many were done in the last year
7	or two years, just a ballpark figure? I think
8	I sat on five or six and multiply that by five.
9	MS. STEINGASSER: I don't have it
10	right on my finger tip, no.
11	COMMISSIONER MILLER: I don't know if
12	I'm getting the disproportionate share.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Here's another
14	thing. I think we should also look at how the
15	Commissioners who sit and vote, because I don't
16	think we always I know I don't always vote
17	for them. So, I think if we're going to get the
18	data, let's see how we vote so we make sure that
19	we're consistent with the regulation. I mean,
20	I know, that's not the territory we really need
21	to be going down, but it's there.

MS. STEINGASSER: It is there and you

have no idea how many hours we sat wringing our hands at the office going, okay. All these Commissioners voted for these so now we're recommending something opposite of that.

When you're sitting on the BZA you're seeing a lot more information than just the zoning regulations, right. You are seeing the unique character of the case. You are seeing what the ANC had. So, these regulations are not as uniquely focused as what you would see on a BZA case.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: So, I recognize the problems because we were having so many of these cases and the variance test is a very difficult test and the BZA was struggling how to get the conversion to meet that variance test. But I was hoping that you were going to come back with something that was going to make it easier to do these conversions by a special exception process so that the issue would be whether there are adverse impacts in the neighborhood, whether it is changing the character of the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

neighborhood. But if you have a case where the adjoining neighbors and the surrounding neighbors and the ANC are for it, the special exception process would bring that out and you could either go for it or against it based on that. So, you're running in the opposite direction as to what I was expecting you might come up with but you can react. But I would like answers to further, that's why I'm concerned about this direction.

MS. STEINGASSER: Okay. And that's certainly something we can go back and look at.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Okay. Му concern is that Ι think this proposal significantly constrains the ability of our existing housing stock, the buildings that we have in the R-4 Zones and the existing zoning code to accommodate a growing population, including a growing proportion of smaller household sizes. We are very fortunate to have an existing housing stock that can partially accommodate this change in growth in our city.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

And cities are dynamic and we need to manage the change and make sure it doesn't change the residential character of the neighborhood but I think we should do more to manage the change iust throw additional rather than out roadblocks. As I said, I thought that we might be getting a proposal that would move in the opposite direction such reducing as oreliminating the minimum 900 square foot land per unit regulation that the BZA has been jumping through various hoops to bring it in the row houses in those immediate neighbors in affected ANC have no objection.

MS. STEINGASSER: And we could certainly write that as yet another alternative. I mean, our stance was base don looking at the comp plan and the zoning regs. How do we protect while encouraging the row houses that development into the -- still in the R-4 but into properties that really could handle it opposed to a mid-block row house because, I man, our experience has been that with this market,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

you know, it's been 30 years since someone has bought a rooming house and turned it back into a single-family detached. The market is such that once it converts to a two bedroom or a one bedroom it doesn't convert back in the row houses. Not in those zones. And so that's why we thought, okay. We have zones where we want that growth to go. We want it to be in the R-5 We want it to be in the C Zones. Zones. a lot of these areas to be, you know, to have that kind of smaller unit. That's where we want to reduce all our parking standards and protect the character. But we can, if that's the direction the Commission wants to go, we could create a third option that addressed smaller than the 900 square feet. I don't know what we would do but if that's what you want us to do --

COMMISSIONER MILLER: No, I'm just one Commissioner and I don't know if my colleagues would agree with me. I mean, I just think it's really not exactly ready for prime time. This is a major significant down zoning

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

and it would go into effect immediately, right, upon set down?

MS. STEINGASSER: No, it's a text amendment. So, it would not be vested -
COMMISSIONER MILLER: Okay.

MS. STEINGASSER: -- onto property owners.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Okay.

MS. STEINGASSER: I mean, I'm not sure It's a diminution I think it's a down zoning. of certain uses based on that. But how that 900 square feet when you look at the history of the zoning regs it was never intended to allow for all this new construction. It was meant to allow for the conversion of truly large older buildings. And now what we're seeing is, the Washington Post asked me about today. The building is demolished down to four feet and then it's being reconstructed as a conversion with shipping crates. It's hard to think of that as a conversion the way we think of the conversion of a school or an old embassy. But I understand

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

and that's why we wanted to put in the context. If that's how we want to proceed we can certain provide those options and hear from citizens and here from the Commission on how you want us to look at that because there's -- we got rings of data that we can tell us all kinds of things on this.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Including data where you are showing, I mean, your report mentions that it's driving up the price. That was an aspect of the report which is was, you know, a fact which I had -- which I could see was a very good point, if it's true. You're saying that the R-4 Zones, the row house zones are tripling or increasing in value more than the rest of he That you have data that actually shows city. that that would be helpful and shows that it's not because for other reasons maybe because, you know, they're a close-in neighborhood that are That's where a lot of -- and because desirable. the growing population is disproportionately a smaller household, that's where the demand is.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

So, I was concerned, you know, your
report says that two aspects where your office
is not concerned about two aspects in ZRR which
your office mitigates against the turnabout of
affordable housing or the fact that ZRR is
aligned for accessory apartments in matter of
right. But you backed away from that in
accessory buildings. And the other aspect in
ZRR that you are that you created these two new
zones in the residential fact district to
accommodate three or four unit which I think is
a good proposal but as far as I know you haven't
evaluated what neighborhoods might be
appropriate to go into that. When I asked you
about this last week, you said we'll wait, you
know, we'll see if the neighborhoods want to go
into a three or four unit zone. But I think it
would be helpful for the office to do an
evaluation of which area. If we're going to go
with this kind of proposal, we should know where
which row house neighborhoods might be
appropriate to have that three or four unit.

Certainly, the BZA's finding with the ANC and neighbors support that it's appropriate to have it in particular neighborhoods, maybe not unanimously, Mr. Chairman. But in many cases there's been support for it.

But we don't have the data on which row house neighborhoods might be appropriate. The row house zones are very different in their character and so it's good. You're creating those two zones that would accommodate the three or four units which to me doesn't create, and that's just me, a tipping point that if somebody in an apartment house district because it has three units.

MS. STEINGASSER: Under the current zoning regulations an apartment house is defined as three units or more. We're proposing that that be slightly changed. And I wasn't here last week and I apologize because I really wanted to talk about the accessory apartments. And I want -- this is a really important nuance.

The R-4 allows two principal units.
It's very different than an accessory apartment.
But the proposal to look at and there's only 19
squares that could accommodate 19 squares in
the entire city that could accommodate the
external accessory apartment as a matter of
right. We coupled that. That doesn't stand
alone. It is part of the overall alternative
that also removed the 4,000 square foot lot
requirement from the R-2 and R-3 Zones which
freed up now probably about 90 percent of those
zones to have a matter of right and it also worked
in concert with the reduction in the minimum
house requirement which is also currently in the
regs. You have to have a 2,000 square foot house
and a 4,000 square foot lot to have an accessory
apartment. Those were brought forward and as
part of our alternatives, we're like. Okay.
Everybody seems very comfortable with the
internal. Let's get rid of that burden. That
created an enormous amount of opportunity for
accessory small apartments balanced against the

19 squares that have that opportunity. So, overall that has created much more opportunity than what we had existing before. And, I mean, you can go back through the reports and see the number of -- the different lots that are available.

So, we do look at it as part of an overall continuum of how do we accommodate -- how do accommodate Stanley Hub? Do we accommodate the growth and how do we do it where it's all we want it to be? Obviously, the R04 is some of the most districts in the city and, of course, that's where people want to live and you're spending your money on a building as opposed to land. You know, if I were to buy in Cleveland Park I'd be paying millions and I'd end up with a really large lot of, you know, parts of Chevy chase. If all I have is enough to be a structure then I would look in these R-4 zones. And that's what we want to make sure we protect. It's much more efficient and we put some of those numbers in. We can get them for you again.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

take a row house and convert it into three or four units then it is — and for developers and to sell those four units as four separate households than for a family to have to buy them and compete against those prices and make a single family house. So, that's what we're trying to preserve. But, you know, we were very aware of the Commission's concern about what this would do. And so it is part of a larger continuum of how all these things work together.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: I know I've monopolized a lot of time but I'd just like to conclude, Mr. Chairman, with two things.

One specific thing in the OP report you say that this would help address the concerns that we did hear during the ZRR hearing from residents of Mount Pleasant and Trinidad. If that does address that then I would suggest that maybe we should be proposing an overlay for Mount Pleasant or Trinidad and not the entire city. I think that was a particular problem because as I said there are dozens cases where the neighbors

don't have a problem.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

And the other thing is, you said this came out of the public hearing testimony in the ZRR and we're now pulling it out and may get on a track even faster than ZRR. There's a lot of testimony on a lot of topics that -- there's a lot of testimony on inclusionary zoning, for example, that they wanted a deeper affordability level which I think many of the commissioners have agree with, we're not pulling that out to do that except as an alternative that you're proposing here which looks like it's a good alternative, although I don't support overall proposal. But I would support the inclusionary zoning requirements triggering in and overall in the IZ that it should immediately from 80 percent to 60 percent. We are losing the opportunity to have affordable housing during this building boom that the city fortunate enough to experiences and percent AMI in that particular proposal is the It's not the affordable housing market rate.

that we want to see.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

So, I just think that if there's a crisis of affordable housing I don't see this as being the thing that pulls out to try to address it to the exclusion of something else that had a lot more public hearing testimony, concern about the IZ affordability levels. So, in its current form I would just not support setting it down at this time, Mr. Chairman.

MS. STEINGASSER: Well, if I could The reason that we pulled it out is just say. because it is so different than anything that was heard and because we felt it was too dramatic to be considered a slide amendment to the ZRR. Ιt needed the passion with which you're talking about it, the passionate head nodding I'm seeing from Commissioner Cohen. We knew this was an issue that needed focus attention. We're not trying to rush it. We're just trying to isolate it so that the Commission can consider separately. And you guys control the vote. you don't -- you could go forward with all the

1	hearings and still not vote on it. But we're not
2	trying to rush it. We're just trying to isolate
3	it so that it gets the focus and attention that
4	we think you guys need. Obviously, it would
5	have to be in partnership with the IZ and that
6	we hope to get to you now in September. They've
7	been working with the development community to
8	look at that AMI issue, to look at the production
9	issue. They've done some spreadsheets.
10	So, I apologize if you thought we
11	were trying to rush it. We weren't. We were
12	just trying to allow you to focus on it
13	separately because we know it is of importance.
14	COMMISSIONER MILLER: I agree with
15	you that it does need a separate focus and I'm
16	focused against it right now.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Any other
18	comments?
19	Vice Chair Cohen?
20	
21	VICE CHAIR COHEN: Thank you, Mr.
22	Chairman. Everybody recognizes that I support

much of what Commissioner Miller has said. When
I read the Office of Planning report I too
thought it was down zoning. One thing that
confused me that you might be able to explain is
the chart on row house height and I believe you
stated that 94.4 percent of the inventory is 35
feet or less, 94.4. So, I'm looking at that
number and saying, well, what is the problem, you
know? It's a much less number that seemed to
have height issues. And, again, as a proponent
of affordable housing, the one piece of
information that you provided is, again,
competing for a large, single family house. And
I guess my concern is that I don't think the city
has appropriate hosing policies that deal with
such issues and the we should be allowing the
continuum as you say of R-1 through R-5 A and B
that that to me provides a guideline of what we
could have in a neighborhood, that we already
have that type of guidance and that an R-4 would
be more of an opportunity to have denser houses.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

So, if we have issues in a few

neighborhoods let's deal with that but not move ahead and I don't see us providing density and any kind of multi-family areas other than density of small units. I just don't think we have a comprehensive housing policy in the city. So, I'm worried about all the unintended consequences tat put, you know, setting down this particular recommendation I personally prefer the alternative that you have in the back. And maybe I'm not visualizing it properly but I believe really do that have we must opportunities that are as Commissioner Miller said, supported by an ANC and supported by a neighborhood and the BZA to move ahead with higher density in an R-4 district. I sat on a BZA case or two as well that allowed for that.

The documentation I think I was very comfortable with when it was submitted probably maybe even before OP got an opportunity to look at it. But there are areas that, I think, are separate from and lower density than the R-4. I mean, R-4 to me provides a continuum of size

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

housing. And 40 feet is not that tall although it has stuck out. And that's another thing. That's kind of what everybody brings to our attention, the unique and unfortunate examples. You know, the <a href="Post">Post</a> will sensualize that. Whereas, I don't think it's based on your own calculations. It doesn't seem to be a major issue.

MS. STEINGASSER: Well, we didn't approach this, these recommendations to control density. We approached this to look at the issue of pop-ups. That's what we heard at all the meetings. And where we started looking at the relationship between the amount of feet so 94 percent are 35 feet or less but if you also look at the chart, you know, 84 percent of our row houses are only two stories. And that's two stories, typically there's a half cellar as well underneath that doesn't quite pop up more than the four feet. So, we started having to look at that dichotomy and that delta between what the

zoning regs allow at 40 feet and what the built
environment is at, you know, predominately two
or three stories created that opportunity for
that extra story, often times two stories, that
would then aggrieve the neighborhood. And so
then that led us to the question well, what's
causing that and seldom is it a single-family
that's deciding to put two stories on stop of
their row house. It's somebody who is doing it
to convert it for sale. And so that's how we got
there. We didn't sit down one day and say, you
know, what, we're going to go after density in
R-4. We started looking at the issue of pop-ups
as they were being testified to the Commission
during the public hearing. It kind of led to
looking at the development. Started with the
development standards, what's out there, what
are we seeing. Obviously, there are easy
boundaries. We started looking at Mount
Pleasant in terms of it as a historic district.
It's a well-defined area. It's historic
district. The pressure on Mount Pleasant was

resulting from conversions. So, we started looking at that, working with them on, okay. Well, maybe that area gets limited to two. So, we could go back to looking at discreet neighborhoods.

Trinidad was one we looked at. The interesting thing about Trinidad is it has the potential for over 20 percent of its lots to be It has one of the highest large row converted. house lots, concentrations in the city. that's the way the Commission wants us to go, we're happy to go there but, you know, we didn't go at this looking at it as a housing policy. tried to look at it. Once we realized there were housing policy implications then we also tried to balance some of those. And then after we filed it that's why we were focusing on the larger lots, the institutional lots and then we started thinking since we filed this also about, you know, well, why don't we make these projects subject to IZ, because they're not subject to IZ. IZ doesn't kick in at any AMI until there's 10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

units and we seldom see that in these zones, but 1 we're happy to --2 VICE CHAIR COHEN: Well, you talked 3 4 about Wards 1 and 2 where this conditions exists. Both of those wards are very, very dense wards. 5 6 MS. STEINGASSER: Yes, they are. 7 VICE CHAIR COHEN: And so again I know that there are issues and as I said I was appalled 8 9 at seeing the one that, you know, was in the 10 paper, every paper, but I don't know if it's a 11 problem that this is going to solve. I mean, it will solve it but I don't know how extensive it 12 13 I mean, I just didn't get that impression that we should set this down, have public 14 hearings without knowing a fuller idea of what's 15 16 happening in our city regarding the cost of housing, the cost of affordability and I don't 17 want to see unintended consequences with regard 18 19 to making a change that I don't feel comfortable with. 20 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Mr. Turnbull? 21 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Thank you, 22

Mr. Chair. I want to thank Mr. Lawson and Ms. Steingasser for an excellent presentation. Very clear, very concise and I don't think this is down-sizing. I think this is right-sizing. I had a look on you very first page, change the R-4 by right height for detached summary, detached row house, blah, blah, blah from 40 fee to 35 feet. You clearly show that 94 percent of the stock is 35 feet and under. I don't see anything wrong with setting that down. a clear relevance that shows what the character of the row house district is. I think it ought to be set down. It's closing a loophole.

I think allows up to 40 feet by special exception subject to conditions. I don't see a problem with that either. I think that's a very clear -- it's a very standard procedure we always do.

Include Mezzanine in the number of stories. That's also closing a loophole. I think you're right on. I think you've hit the high points that we've talked about with pop-ups

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

in preserving the character of row house area.

I think you're right on. I see nothing wrong with this. This is very clear.

From an architect standpoint, this is what we should be doing to preserve hosing stock and looking at it and avoiding pop-ups and

7 destroying the architectural character of these

8 neighborhoods.

Now, forget about density. If you want density it's going to come, but you want to preserve the character of these building areas, the neighborhood that these people grew up in and I think that's key. And I think you've hit right on it. I think this is a part of zoning. And as you said, HPRB can't cover all of this but through zoning if we can put a little bit in there to help protect these areas and the character of these neighborhoods, again, you're right on. This hits the point.

Limit conversions to non-residential buildings. I can set that down too. Only one of the questions I would have,

lost alternative.	Allow	conversion	n of
non-residential lots w	ith no mi	nimum land	l area
pre what's the poss	sible blow	w back on	that?
MS. STEING	ASSER: I d	lon't think	any.
We haven't seen any in	n the case	es that we	have
processed. We've see	en diffic	ulty from	n the
developers trying to	make the	case why	they
should be granted,	you know,	, it basi	cally
becomes an area or a	use vari	ance that	when
they're trying to fil	.l in the	open spa	ce or
connect the school to	the row ho	ouses that	would
be on the other side	of a par	king lot.	And
there's a lot of strugg	le in how	to make tha	at fit
into the technical zoni	ing regs a	nd then tha	at 900
square feet often is 1	not possil	ble becaus	e the
case I'm thinking abo	ut on Car	pitol Hill	they
really struggled wit	h how to	retrofit	t the
interior of the buildin	g. And be	ecause that	t wall
it ate almost all of	the nine	united pe	r 900
square feet and then t	hey were	still left	with
this big open space whe	ere everyb	oody agreed	d from
an urban design stan	dpoint t	he street	wall

needed to be connected. And they wanted to build row houses and they couldn't.

So, we have found no blow back in terms of not having it because they usually get approval. It usually creates a better design. It's the 900 square feet that makes it really difficult to get that better design.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. And I've sat on just like the others, a lot of BZA cases. I've come close to sea sponge in a lot of cases because I thought they were not done appropriately. Yes, I've sat on cases where some neighbors were okay for it. Maybe it's been an abandoned row house that's been there for awhile or vacant and they want to see developed so they're very much in favor of doing I got people down the street then were it. saying, oh, my God. It's going to add now all those extra traffic and parking. So, I've sat on these cases where I've had some people in support but I got a lot of neighbors down the street very concerned about what it's going to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

do with the character. But why can't you develop -- and I understand, oh, well, give these marketing studies, these real estate studies and say, well, you can't develop a three to four bedroom house anymore in that area. It's got to be, you know, a single family. It's got to be a one bedroom or studios and like this and that and that's what sells.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

And so I'm a little bit -- I'm not really convinced a lot of these marketing For every marketing study that says studies. one thing you can get another marketing study that comes back and say, well, you really can, we can sell a two bedroom unit in this area. it's a little bit self-serving to have some of these things. So, I always look askance at some of these things. I look at the area when I sit on a BZA case what's the impact, if there are any height changes. It's very difficult. But I think what you've done here by trying to define this more and putting the characteristics of it

down is very good. And I think you've done an
excellent job and I would be in favor of setting
it down and going at it because I think we need
to talk about this. We need to get it out on the
street and have feedback on it. So, I think the
alternatives and I like the IZ alternatives. I
think you're right on with the IZ and putting
those in. I'm 100 percent in favor of that
especially at the 60 percent level. So, I think
from this Commissioner's standpoint when you're
redefining or your better defining the R-4
neighborhood and the characteristics of it I
think you've clearly shown that there's evidence
out there that at least I could support this.
And at least get the input from the public on
this.
So, thank you again.
CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Turnbull, I could
stand up and applaud you because I would ditto
98 percent, no, 100 percent of what you said.

One of the things that I am concerned

about, again, in this city's pop-ups and one of
the things that I heard mentioned earlier is
about well, if it's only do for here or we should
just do it for here or there. I'm not a zoning
commissioner for Ward 1. When I took the oath
I was sworn in to be a zoning commissioner for
the city. And I think what we need to do is stop
that's what got us in some of the trouble we're
having now with another issue about doing
certain areas, doing something for certain
areas. I think the comments we heard were
resounding about do something with it. I'm also
even in favor of if Commissioner because one
thing about a Chair you have to be considerate
of all the Commissioners even though I don't
necessarily agree with everything I heard is if
some of those amendments or some of the
alternatives that were mentioned by
Commissioner Miller could be incorporated in
whatever public notice we do. I'm not saying I
agree with it. I agree with Mr. Turnbull. I
think we're going in the right direction, but for

me it's about putting it out in front of the city
as a whole and coming back with the best possible
issues, especially the pop-ups. We've heard
about po-ups. We've heard it, we've heard it,
we've heard it and we didn't just hear it from
one particular area. And if we're going to be
zoning commissioners for Ward 1 then that's
maybe the mayor should have sworn us in to be
zoning commissioners for Ward 1. But we are
city-wide and I think that, say we just treat it
where we hear the different issues, no. Zoning
is about across the city. We don't just do an
R-1 Zone in Ward 5. R-1 Zone goes across the
city. So, I would suggest that we set this down.
It's a start unless Mr. Turnbull and others and
Vice Chair want to incorporate some of the
alternatives that Commissioner Miller
mentioned. But I'm trying to be the Chair and
be considerate of it but if that would change him
to vote for the set down. If not, then we'll set
it down as is. Let me yield to Commissioner
Miller.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I think the only -- well, one alternative if it was added to the proposal that could lead me to support the set down would be if you look on the back of the OP Report where it has a section 401.12. I'm just using that because that would have -- that language I can use to structure my alternative which would be a special exception alternative for what currently requires a use or area variance to add a third or fourth unit to an R-4 Zone.

So, one alternative that I could support is in the advertisement if that read, any structure in R-4 district maybe converted to an apartment house. I would say to a three or four unit building. Any structure in the R-4 district may be converted to an apartment house with only three or four units by special exception subject to the following conditions. And then I would eliminate the first three and you can go with the remainder. And that would

be the alternative, if you included that as well
as the alternatives that OP recommended in terms
of inclusionary zoning for its proposal is that
can some how be incorporated into this
alternative as well, I would be able to support.
I think that would put all the issues out there
in a way that gives people the special
exception process would allow the community and
the Board of Zoning Adjustment with one of us
sitting on there to take an assessment whether
there are adverse impacts upon the neighborhood.
Whether the neighborhood character there's a
lot of language here about neighborhood
character. So, that would be one of the things
that would be looked at. If that's what we're
really concerned about these conditions will
mitigate will allow the board to say no and
allow neighbors to say no and there would still
be that public hearing process. Wouldn't be a
matter of right.

1	fly right up here but if that were included I
2	still would be more comfortable if this waited
3	until we had our IZ recommendation from you
4	because to me that was people were clamoring.
5	I think there was a lot more clamor about the IZ
6	for affordability levels during the ZRR and by
7	this Commission than there was about pop-ups.
8	So, I'd be comfortable putting it off but in an
9	effort to be accommodating, if that works for my
10	fellow Commissioners and for OP that would work
11	for me.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Ms.
13	Steingasser, is that doable? And, again,
14	that's advertising, not that we agree with it but
15	that's advertisement so we can put it all on the
16	table.
17	MS. STEINGASSER: I think it's an
18	excellent alternative because it does. It puts
19	all options out there, more or less variance,
19 20	all options out there, more or less variance, special exception, matter of right. They're

And the idea, I know we've been

saying, been going on almost a year, that we're
bringing you the idea in a few months. Bringing
you an idea in a few months. It is extremely
complex as you know and the staff has been
working with the development community running
all kinds of pro formas and different types of
spreadsheets to make sure as they deal with
different development sizes that they are
hitting the right mark and making it better and
not more onerous and what is the AMI. So, the
last date we got because we knew we would asked
about that this evening as well was that it would
be filed in it will be filed for the first
September meeting be set down for the first
September meeting.
CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I just got one question. Are we saying then that this, a nonresidential structure in the R-4 may be converted to an apartment house? Are we calling it an apartment house?

MS. STEINGASSER: Three to four

1	units.
2	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Three to four
3	unit building? Three to four? Four units, are
4	we allowing up to four? I just want to clarify
5	this.
6	MS. STEINGASSER: My understanding
7	was that there would be it would almost be like
8	a 401.13 and it would address any residential
9	structure or any structure could be converted to
10	three or four units and we would not have the
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: First three.
12	MS. STEINGASSER: residential
13	three, but it would be standard of adverse
14	impact.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well, Mr. Turnbull,
16	that's an alternative.
17	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: That's in the
18	alternative.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: It's not that we're
20	doing away with it.
21	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right,
22	right. Okay.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: We're just trying to
2	accommodate
3	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes, okay.
4	And are the special exception guidelines being
5	expanded or they're the same as they are now or
6	what?
7	MS. STEINGASSER: They would near or
8	reflect what's shown as .12.
9	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
10	MS. STEINGASSER: It say one of
11	nonresidential buildings and one for any
12	structure.
13	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. All
14	right. Okay.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Anything
16	else?
17	All right. Colleagues, I would move
18	that we set down Zoning Commission Case Number
19	14-11 with the comments the discussion had with
20	the amendment, as Commission Miller had
21	requested along with also being advertised as
22	proposed by the Office of Planning in its

1	submission presented tonight and ask for a
2	second.
3	VICE CHAIR COHEN: Second.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: It's been moved and
5	properly seconded. All those in favor, aye?
6	(AYES)
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any opposition? So
8	ordered.
9	Staff, would you record the vote.
10	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Staff records
11	the vote five to zero to zero to set down Zoning
12	Commission Case Number 14-11 as a rule-making
13	case.
14	Commissioner Hood moving,
15	Commissioner Cohen seconding, Commissioners
16	Miller and Turnbull in support. Commissioner
17	May in support by absentee ballot.
18	COMMISSIONER MILLER: Mr. Chairman,
19	thank you very much for inviting that
20	alternative so we could get a consensus of
21	getting this issue out there and with the whole
22	range of options.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Great. Thank
2	you. Thank you all for the input and we're
3	looking forward to the hearing, believe me.
4	Do we have anything else, Ms.
5	Steingasser? Do you have anything else?
6	MS. STEINGASSER: No, sir.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Again, I thank you for
8	all the work that you all do in the Office of
9	Planning. I know the ask gets larger and larger
10	so I'm thanking you because it's probably going
11	to get larger and larger. Okay. And also the
12	Office of the Attorney General and the Office of
13	Zoning all the work that you all do to help us.
14	I never want to leave you out. Ms. Meyers and
15	Mr. Ritting, Bergstein, everybody and Ms.
16	Schellin, Ms. Barton, everybody.
17	Okay. I'm sure I left somebody out
18	but the whole staff of all those respective
19	offices.
20	Ms. Schellin, do we have anything
21	else?
22	MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: We're going to meet
2	about five minutes for the next hearing.
3	MS. SCHELLIN: yes, we just need to
4	make a switch in the technical room.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So, we'll be
6	back in about six or seven minutes.
7	(Whereupon, the above-entitled
8	matter went off the record at 6:41 p.m.)
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	