

GOVERNMENT
OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

SPECIAL PUBLIC MEETING
1227th MEETING SESSION (7th of 2007)

+ + + + +

MONDAY

MARCH 26, 2007

+ + + + +

The Special Public Meeting of the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened in Room 220 South, 441 4th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20001, pursuant to notice, at 6:00 p.m., Carol J. Mitten, Chairperson, presiding.

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

CAROL J. MITTEN	Chairperson
ANTHONY J. HOOD	Vice-Chairperson
MICHAEL G. TURNBULL	Commissioner
GREGORY JEFFRIES	Commissioner
JOHN PARSONS	Commissioner (NPS)

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

SHARON S. SCHELLIN	Secretary
DONNA HANOUSEK	Zoning Specialist
ESTHER BUSHMAN	General Counsel

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

STEVE COCHRAN
JOEL LAWSON
JENNIFER STEINGASSER
TRAVIS BARKER

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL:

ALAN BERGSTEIN, ESQ.

This transcript constitutes the minutes from the Special Public Meeting held on March 26, 2007.

C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

<u>AGENDA ITEM</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
<u>CALL TO ORDER:</u>	
Carol J. Mitten	4
<u>PRELIMINARY MATTERS:</u>	5
<u>Z.C. CASE NOS. 03-12D/03-13D:</u>	5
<u>VOTE ON MOTION TO APPROVE</u>	
<u>MINOR MODIFICATION:</u>	8
<u>Z.C. CASE NO. 06-03A:</u>	8
<u>VOTE ON MOTION TO APPROVE</u>	
<u>MINOR MODIFICATION:</u>	17
<u>Z.C. CASE NO. 06-27:</u>	18
<u>VOTE ON MOTION TO REOPEN THE RECORD</u>	
<u>TO RECEIVE ADDITIONAL FILINGS:</u>	19
<u>VOTE ON MOTION TO APPROVE PROPOSED</u>	
<u>ACTION IN Z.C. CASE NO. 06-27:</u>	34
<u>ADJOURN:</u>	
Carol J. Mitten	35

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

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

(6:09 p.m.)

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. This is a Special Public Meeting of the Zoning Commission of the District of Columbia for Monday, March 26, 2007.

My name is Carol Mitten, and joining me this evening are Vice Chairman Anthony Hood, and Commissioners Mike Turnbull, John Parsons, and Greg Jeffries.

Copies of our meeting agenda are available to you, and they're in the wall bin by the door. I'd just like to remind folks that we don't take any public testimony at our meetings until the -- unless the Commission specifically requests someone to come forward.

I'd like to advise you that this proceeding is being recorded by the Court Reporter and is also being webcast live. Accordingly, we ask you to refrain from making any disruptive noises in the hearing room.

1 And for the same reason, I'd ask you to turn
2 off your beepers and cell phones at this time.

3 Mrs. Schellin, any preliminary
4 matters before we --

5 SECRETARY SCHELLIN: I just passed
6 out an OP additional report on Case Number 03-
7 12/13D.

8 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. We'll
9 get to that in a second.

10 I'd just like to amend the agenda,
11 the fourth item under Final Action, Case
12 Number 06-41. We received additional
13 submissions today. The Commission has not had
14 an opportunity to digest that, and we will be
15 deferring that until our April meeting, which
16 is on the 9th. April 9th.

17 So the first item on the Consent
18 Calendar is Case Number 03-12D/03-13D, which
19 is the minor modification request in the
20 Capper Carrollsburg PUD. Just for the
21 Commission's benefit, to remind you, we had
22 this on our agenda as a minor modification

1 item in March, our regular public meeting, and
2 the Office of Planning was not prepared to
3 support the request, and they also did not
4 oppose the request. They requested more time.

5 And we have just been handed the
6 OP report, so I'm hoping that Mr. Cochran or
7 Ms. Steingasser will be able to summarize it
8 for us.

9 MR. COCHRAN: Thank you, Madam
10 Chair. Yes, we would be happy to.

11 I believe that you received a
12 filing from the applicant on Friday afternoon,
13 which you probably saw earlier today.

14 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes.

15 MR. COCHRAN: The Office of
16 Planning and the applicant have agreed on the
17 following recommendations. If you flip to
18 page 2 of this report, essentially it's very
19 similar to what the applicant had proposed,
20 with the following exceptions.

21 Thirty-three spaces would be
22 onsite, 33 parking spaces would be onsite.

1 Twenty-one parking spaces would ultimately be
2 offsite within three blocks, and then there
3 would be 16 shared parking spaces ultimately,
4 also within those three blocks. this would
5 get you up to the total of 70 parking spaces
6 in a two-to-one parking ratio.

7 The applicant has also agreed to
8 provide two flex-car spaces within two blocks
9 of the subject building.

10 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And you're
11 representing to us that the applicant has
12 agreed to those conditions.

13 MR. COCHRAN: Yes, Madam Chair.

14 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. So if
15 you remember, this was to relieve the
16 applicant from the requirement to have Senior
17 Building Number 2 be exclusively for seniors,
18 because they're having trouble finding
19 qualified seniors for Senior Building Number
20 1. Are there any questions for Mr. Cochran?

21 (No response.)

22 All right. Then, I would move

1 approval of the minor modification request in
2 Case Number -- well, the Capper Carrollsburg
3 PUD and including the conditions outlined in
4 the Office of Planning's report dated today.

5 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Second.

6 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Any
7 discussion?

8 (No response.)

9 All those in favor, please say
10 aye.

11 (Chorus of ayes.)

12 Those opposed, please say no.

13 (No response.)

14 Mrs. Schellin.

15 SECRETARY SCHELLIN: Staff will
16 record the vote five to zero to zero to
17 approve the minor modification as modified by
18 the OP report submitted today in Zoning
19 Commission Case Number 03-12D/03-13D,
20 Commissioner Mitten moving, Commissioner
21 Turnbull seconding, Commissioners Hood,
22 Jeffries, and Parsons in favor.

1 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.
2 Next, we have a minor modification request
3 that I think we had gotten a piece of
4 correspondence in our March meeting, and we
5 put this on for the Special Public Meeting.
6 This is in the case of 100 M Street, S.E.,
7 Case Number 06-03A.

8 I think since it's a little bit
9 complicated, if anyone had any questions for
10 the Office of Planning, we might start with
11 any questions about the request. Anyone have
12 any questions? Mr. Jeffries?

13 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Yes. Page
14 2 of the -- of your report, I just want you to
15 walk me through the second showing sort of
16 what we previously approved and what is being
17 currently proposed now.

18 MR. LAWSON: Sure. For the
19 record, my name is Joel Lawson with the Office
20 of Planning. I assume you're referring to the
21 bottom section.

22 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Yes.

1 MR. LAWSON: Yes. Essentially,
2 the top solid line is what they're currently
3 proposing. Underneath that, you can see a
4 dotted line, which shows what was approved.
5 And, remember, this is very conceptual. It's
6 not to scale or anything like that.

7 But essentially, under the
8 previous approval, the area between the curb
9 and the building was much wider. So they were
10 proposing an area of space outside the
11 building, which would be at the same level as
12 the retail, and then that would slope up as
13 you get closer to the street in this section,
14 and there would be stairs, at the other end --
15 at the top end, to take you from that lower
16 level back up to the sidewalk again.

17 So it is basically a change of
18 grade within essentially the public space,
19 between the curb and the building itself.
20 Because that area has shrunk because the
21 cartway, the paved portion of 1st Street is
22 going to be wider than what the applicant had

1 anticipated, the area they have to work with
2 is just smaller. And it makes providing those
3 changes in grade difficult and probably
4 impractical and still maintain adequate
5 circulation space and tree box space and all
6 that kind of stuff.

7 So now it is simply going to be
8 level, and the sidewalk will essentially slope
9 up as the property slopes up from M Street as
10 you go north.

11 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: So, but
12 when you walk into the building, you step down
13 into the retail.

14 MR. LAWSON: Yes. Under this
15 current proposal, there would have to be a
16 landing. There would have to be stairs, and
17 there would have to be ramps inside the
18 building to take you from the level of the
19 street down to the level of the retail. The
20 retail level is not being proposed to be
21 changed.

22 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay. And

1 what is your thought in terms of how retailers
2 feel about that kind of configuration?

3 MR. LAWSON: Well, we certainly
4 questioned the applicant on this, and we
5 raised concerns. I think we noted in our
6 report as well the applicant is certainly well
7 aware that it obviously presents a marketing
8 difficulty. It's certainly not impossible,
9 and an applicant can make it work. But, yes,
10 we certainly raised those issues as well with
11 the applicant. they feel that they would be
12 able to market the space.

13 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: I have to
14 just say for the record I am somewhat
15 disappointed that we -- you know, this has
16 happened in terms of, you know, being able to
17 have seats and, you know, have activity, a
18 restaurant, and outdoor seating, and so forth,
19 and losing that. I think that's, you know,
20 pretty critical to the area. I wish there was
21 some other way that we can get this done
22 besides this.

1 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Can you tell
2 us what prompted the change in the width of
3 the road bed for 1st Street?

4 MR. LAWSON: I'm going to be
5 speaking for DDOT here, but my understanding
6 is that, as DDOT refined their plans for the
7 streets throughout this kind of -- this, you
8 know, part of the city, that 1st Street was
9 identified as being a street that is going to
10 carry more traffic than maybe they had -- than
11 the applicant or maybe some of the earlier
12 DDOT plans had indicated.

13 So in order for DDOT -- or, sorry,
14 in order for the street to accommodate traffic
15 going in two directions, parking on both sides
16 of the street as well as bike lanes, the width
17 of the street -- it simply becomes wider than
18 they had originally thought.

19 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Is this
20 going to be consistent all the way down 1st
21 Street?

22 MR. LAWSON: I believe that's the

1 plan, that 1st Street will be consistent from
2 I Street in the north down to the waterfront.

3 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Isn't this
4 going to affect all of the properties along
5 it?

6 MR. LAWSON: Well, I think south
7 of M Street it was always anticipated that 1st
8 Street would have this kind of a width. I
9 think north of M Street, probably the plans
10 weren't completed and it wasn't quite as clear
11 just what the nature of 1st Street would be.

12 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.

13 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Anyone else
14 have questions for Mr. Lawson?

15 (No response.)

16 Okay. Thank you very much.

17 I agree with the fact that it is
18 very unfortunate that the -- that there seems
19 to be in this case more sensitivity to
20 vehicles than to creating a good pedestrian
21 environment there. But I don't want to
22 penalize the applicant because of

1 circumstances that are really beyond their
2 control and they're just trying to cope with
3 those as best they can.

4 And I will, to get any discussion
5 started, move approval of the minor
6 modification request in Case Number 06-03A and
7 ask for a second.

8 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Second.

9 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you,
10 Mr. Jeffries. Any discussion?

11 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I just
12 want to make one more run. Mr. Lawson, is
13 there any possibility we could persuade DDOT
14 that this is not good urban design? I mean,
15 this is a critical corner here at 1st and M.
16 I mean, it was going to be a special place,
17 and now we're going to walk down a ramp into
18 retail. It's wrong.

19 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: And we're
20 making increased accommodation for more
21 vehicles. I mean, we said we want people
22 walking more. I just -- it didn't seem to be

1 correct. But, again, I agree with Madam
2 Chair. I mean, I just second her here.

3 You don't want to penalize the
4 applicant, but it would be -- is there any way
5 that we can revisit this?

6 MR. LAWSON: Well, we would
7 certainly be happy to raise the issue with
8 DDOT. I'm not unsympathetic to the concerns
9 that the Commission is raising right now.

10 We'd be happy to raise it again
11 with DDOT. I think DDOT is under some real
12 constraints with how they accommodate a fair
13 amount of traffic in an area where the streets
14 are intended to be -- many of the streets are
15 intended to be, you know, relatively narrow
16 and neighborhood-serving.

17 They also need to accommodate, of
18 course, all the traffic as an interim measure
19 while South Capitol Street is being rebuilt.
20 And I think that they had pegged 1st Street as
21 being one of those streets that is going to
22 accommodate some of the traffic -- while 1st

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Street will accommodate some of the traffic
2 that would normally be on South Capitol Street
3 while that is under construction, recognizing
4 that I -- well, I think that is one of the
5 other issues that they are trying to grapple
6 with as well.

7 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Anyone else?

8 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Does that
9 mean this is a temporary problem, that --

10 MR. LAWSON: I don't believe it's
11 a temporary problem.

12 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Oh.

13 MR. LAWSON: It has never been
14 addressed that way to us, to Office of
15 Planning anyways.

16 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: All right.
17 I guess we'll hold our nose and vote.

18 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Then,
19 all those in favor --

20 (Laughter.)

21 -- please say aye.

22 (Chorus of ayes.)

1 Any opposed?

2 (No response.)

3 Mrs. Schellin.

4 SECRETARY SCHELLIN: Staff will
5 record the vote five to zero to zero to
6 approve the minor modification in Zoning
7 Commission Case Number 06-03A, Commissioner
8 Mitten moving, Commissioner Jeffries
9 seconding, Commissioners Hood, Turnbull, and
10 Parsons in favor.

11 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.

12 And the last item on the agenda
13 for our Special Public Meeting is proposed
14 action in Zoning Commission Case Number 06-27,
15 and this is the PUD and related map amendment
16 in Square 54.

17 And I just want to say at the
18 outset that at the end of our discussion on
19 Square 54 when we gave our feedback to the
20 applicant, Mr. Feola had come forward and
21 asked us to consider converting this to a
22 first stage approval. And if -- depending on

1 how the discussion goes tonight, we may do
2 that, or we may be able to retain this in its
3 currently consolidated form.

4 So there is -- but there is one
5 piece of technical business that we have to
6 take up, which is to reopen the record to
7 receive the filings that we had requested from
8 the applicant, which I guess I had neglected
9 to do that at the meeting when we discussed
10 this.

11 But just to make sure that we're
12 in order, that we would reopen the record to
13 accept the applicant's filing as well as the
14 filing from the Office of Planning and the
15 parties in the case. I move to reopen the
16 record for that purpose. Can I have a second,
17 please?

18 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Second.

19 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you,
20 Mr. Parsons. Any discussion?

21 (No response.)

22 All those in favor, please say

1 aye.

2 (Chorus of ayes.)

3 Those opposed, please say no.

4 (No response.)

5 Mrs. Schellin.

6 SECRETARY SCHELLIN: Staff will
7 record the vote five to zero to zero to reopen
8 the record in Zoning Commission Case Number
9 06-27, to accept the filings requested,
10 Commissioner Mitten moving, Commissioner
11 Parsons seconding, Commissioners Hood,
12 Jeffries, and Turnbull in favor.

13 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you
14 very much.

15 All right. So if you remember, we
16 gave the applicant some sense of direction as
17 best we could about -- largely about building
18 heights, and there was some concern about
19 materials as well. But the bulk of the
20 discussion really centered on the building
21 heights, and the applicant has responded, and
22 so I think the easiest thing for me to do is

1 to open it up for discussion.

2 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I would
3 just note, Madam Chair -- excuse me. I would
4 just note that I didn't see anything in the
5 submittals, unless I overlooked it, about the
6 unit mix. We talked about the residential
7 being on the circle.

8 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Right.

9 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So I take
10 silence as being -- no response as we're not
11 considering it. That's just for the record.
12 I appreciate them thinking about it.

13 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I'm sure they
14 did. Anyone else? Mr. Parsons?

15 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Well, I
16 think we've got a good response here. I think
17 the concern I have, of course, which probably
18 won't surprise you, is on Washington Circle in
19 order to recapture density they've gone from
20 seven floors to eight, and I have difficulty
21 with that.

22 I had hoped they'd capture that on

1 the courtyard side, as I said during the last
2 meeting. But I think overall the submission
3 is good. I think on the residential on the
4 other end along 22nd Street we've dropped down
5 to a reasonable level, so I think we're there,
6 but I still have problems with the eight
7 stories on the circle.

8 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mr. Jeffries?

9 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: But I
10 thought that the concern that was expressed by
11 a few of us was that there was too much
12 distance between -- I mean, between the
13 setback, between the first piece and the piece
14 that was behind it, and that they were trying
15 to decrease that. I thought -- was there
16 comments from the Commission on that?

17 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: We did
18 discuss that it was a very abrupt transition.

19 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Yes,
20 abrupt. That's the word -- abrupt.

21 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And I think
22 that maybe there was a subtext that never got

1 articulated, which is, why don't you bring
2 part of it down, and they brought part of it
3 up to meet it, but, you know, I mean --

4 (Laughter.)

5 I would agree with Mr. Parsons
6 that I think this is a responsive submission,
7 and I know that there are lingering concerns.
8 You know, Mr. Hood had, you know, a preference
9 for putting housing on the circle, and I
10 think, you know, some of the Commissioners
11 shared that, you know, preference.

12 But I think in the overall context
13 I think it makes better sense to have office
14 development. I think that the concerns on the
15 part of the party in opposition -- one of the
16 parties in opposition and the ANC about sort
17 of having Washington Circle reserved for
18 residential uses is not based -- that might be
19 a coincidence of history, but I didn't find
20 any evidence in the comprehensive plan that
21 that in fact was intended, because we don't
22 have -- the generalized land use map doesn't

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 indicate residential uses around the circle.

2 And I think I'm happy with the
3 response from the applicant, and I'm glad that
4 the amenities package is intact, because I,
5 frankly, thought they might compromise that.

6 Anyone else, comments?

7 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I would
8 agree 100 percent. I think we could argue
9 about the fine points of the architectural
10 design, which we have in the past. But I
11 think that there has been a genuine attempt
12 here to at least try to ameliorate some of our
13 concerns and to put something in that still
14 represents their interests and ours at the
15 same time.

16 And I think the sketches that have
17 been showing in their latest package with the
18 revised designs I think are an attempt to
19 placate and at least to address some of the
20 concerns we raised. So I think it's -- I
21 would agree with Mr. Parsons that there has
22 been a really nice submission here, and I

1 think it's very good.

2 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Anyone else?

3 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Well, I'm
4 anxious. Everybody is agreeing with me, but
5 I'm disagreeing with the proposal, so I -- I
6 really feel strongly about the eight stories
7 on --

8 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.

9 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: -- the
10 increase in height on Washington Circle, so
11 maybe I was too enthusiastic in my opening
12 remark.

13 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Well, I
14 thought that Commissioner Turnbull addressed
15 you. He said that there could be some changes
16 around some architectural features, and so
17 forth, although you were dealing more with
18 density there, but -- I'm sorry.

19 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mr. Hood?

20 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes, I was
21 just going to ask Mr. Parsons -- and I don't
22 have it right off -- what was the height

1 initially around Washington Circle? I know we
2 went from 90 to -- I know it jumped up.

3 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: It went up
4 one story, from seven to eight stories.

5 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

6 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I think it
7 was 90 feet, so it must be 100.

8 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Well, it
9 went from 90 to 91 something, didn't it? 90
10 -- did I not read that?

11 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So, Mr.
12 Parsons, you'd like -- you would rather stick
13 with what's submitted to us. You want those
14 --

15 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I think --

16 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: It might have
17 increased a story, but it didn't increase the
18 equivalent of a story in overall height, I
19 think is the --

20 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: It
21 certainly feels that way --

22 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Oh, I

1 thought --

2 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: --
3 graphically.

4 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: I have
5 here 91 foot, 3 inches. Did I not get that
6 correct? It went from 90 -- yes, the first
7 bay along Washington Circle, which was raised
8 slightly to 91 foot, 3 inches. Is that
9 correct? Office of Planning, is that correct?

10 MR. PARKER: The front bay, you're
11 talking about, on Washington Circle?

12 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Yes.

13 MR. PARKER: It has only gone up
14 about three or four feet in height. They
15 lowered the floor to ceiling heights between
16 each floor. They compacted the floors
17 throughout the office portion on all three
18 sections. So they gained a floor here, they
19 lost one along 22nd, and they maintained the
20 same number of stories I think in the center
21 part.

22 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: What did

1 the floor to ceiling in the office drop, went
2 from what to what?

3 MR. PARKER: There you have me. I
4 think it went down about four or five inches,
5 but I don't know exactly what.

6 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: It started
7 off at nine, or you don't know --

8 MR. PARKER: Yes, nine to like
9 eight, seven, something along those lines, or
10 maybe 10. Yes. I'm not sure.

11 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Well,
12 specifically referring to an unnumbered page,
13 which shows the revised design from Washington
14 Circle and the relationship between -- it's a
15 little bit different angle, but not too much,
16 the relationship between that front facade or
17 that front bay and the rest of the building,
18 somehow the front building dominates.

19 And I would hope we could consider
20 lowering that by a floor. It would seem to me
21 it would be a better relationship with the
22 building behind as well.

1 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: But, I
2 mean, it sounds like these drawings are
3 somewhat -- you know, I mean, they're just
4 representational. They're not -- are these to
5 -- these are any --
6 are they to scale or --

7 MR. PARKER: The perspectives --
8 it's hard to say.

9 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Yes. I
10 mean, it's -- I mean, I can clearly see the
11 difference. I mean, it's definitely on an
12 angle, and so forth, but -- but when you look
13 at the dimension, it really is not reflected
14 here.

15 In fact, quite frankly, the
16 revised design looks like the floor to ceiling
17 is greater than the submitted. Do you hear
18 what I'm saying? I mean, it looks like, yes,
19 the revised design, the floor to ceiling looks
20 greater than the original one. They look like
21 they should --

22 MR. PARKER: Yes, they may have --

1 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: -- flip
2 them around.

3 MR. PARKER: They may not be to
4 the same scale, in other words. Correct.

5 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, I have
6 to say that, you know, through the combination
7 of lowering the overall height of the
8 building, and then raising the front part a
9 little bit, I think that the transition looks
10 more proportional than -- if they had -- so
11 taking off a floor -- granted, with the
12 compressed height -- I just -- this transition
13 doesn't look good to me in the original.

14 And so the solution of lowering
15 the floor that front part to me makes it look
16 out of proportion and doesn't accomplish very
17 much, given how shallow the setback is.

18 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES:
19 Commissioner Parsons, I'm wondering if we
20 decide to go forward with this tonight if
21 final action we could get sort of revised --
22 you know, something that looks more

1 representational, what -- I mean, that
2 reflects what they're saying in their
3 application.

4 I don't know if what's here really
5 reflects sort of the difference, if we could
6 request that.

7 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So we're
8 looking for something that shows very clearly
9 --

10 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Yes.

11 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: -- the
12 difference in the floor to floor height
13 between the two.

14 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Yes. It
15 almost seems like it should have -- it should
16 be reversed here a little bit, because the
17 floor to ceiling clearly in the revised design
18 -- I don't know what page this is -- looks
19 like -- I mean, those are -- there's more
20 distance between floor to ceiling.

21 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I agree.
22 Let's call it computer error.

1 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: And it
2 should be corrected.

3 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: And see if
4 we can find a better depiction of this.

5 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: So, Madam
6 Chair?

7 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes.

8 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: I'd like
9 to make a motion that we approve Square 54,
10 Boston Properties, under a consolidated PUD,
11 Case Number 06-27, with the caveat that we
12 should get revised drawings to reflect the
13 changes on the bay along Washington Circle.
14 And anything else you want to add?

15 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I'll second
16 the motion. Just to clarify, you just mean a
17 more accurate representation of the
18 perspective that's shown from Washington
19 Circle, sort of the original and the revised?

20 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Yes. I
21 mean, it's not a page here. Yes, yes, yes.

22 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.

1 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And, Madam
2 Chair, can we get different angles? Because,
3 I mean, when I look at this, I'm trying to see
4 if I'm coming around the circle, how would I
5 see that? And it's -- to me, it's not really
6 clearly defined to me, because I see one car
7 going one way. Maybe that's the -- I'm not
8 sure. I need to see different angles. I
9 would prefer --

10 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. So
11 you'd like a perspective from more to the west
12 side of the circle, as if you're going --

13 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: As I
14 approach.

15 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Right.

16 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Right.

17 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And then, one
18 that would be more or less in your rear-view
19 mirror from the east side of the circle.

20 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: It looks
21 as though what we have in front of us is the
22 rear-view mirror, the way I see it.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: It is.

2 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Well, as I
3 approach, I would like to see it.

4 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Right.

5 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Because
6 preferably I like the 90 feet, because I was
7 looking at the relationship of the buildings
8 around it. But I would say that maybe the
9 applicant -- they make a good effort. I'm not
10 really sure about the ceiling height and the
11 stepdown, where my colleagues are, I'm not
12 there yet. But I just need to see it as our
13 approach.

14 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.

15 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: I'm just
16 dealing with the -- you know, Commissioner
17 Hood, just -- I mean, four feet difference, I
18 mean, I just -- I mean, from this huge circle,
19 I just don't think it's going to have very
20 little impact as to --

21 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: As I'm
22 going around the circle, I'm not going to get

1 out of the car and measure. But I'm just --

2 (Laughter.)

3 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. So we
4 will reopen the record for two weeks, until --
5 just to get those revisions in.

6 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I just
7 want to clarify. We're not asking them to
8 change the design --

9 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Right.

10 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: -- one
11 bit.

12 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes, I'm
13 sorry, not the revision -- not to get
14 revisions in, but to get these depictions of
15 the revision in.

16 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Because I
17 think the compactness of the design, as it is
18 now, I think is 100 percent better than what
19 it was. I just think it fits the circle
20 better.

21 SECRETARY SCHELLIN: Two weeks
22 would be April 9th.

1 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: April 9th.
2 Okay, great. Okay. So that's -- and then,
3 there will be no need for responses from any
4 of the parties, because we're not changing
5 anything. We're not asking anything to be
6 changed.

7 Okay. Any further discussion?

8 (No response.)

9 All those in favor, please say
10 aye.

11 (Chorus of ayes.)

12 Those opposed, please say no.

13 (No response.)

14 Mrs. Schellin.

15 SECRETARY SCHELLIN: Staff will
16 record the vote five to zero to zero to
17 approve proposed action in Zoning Commission
18 Case Number 06-27, Commissioner Jeffries
19 moving, Commissioner Mitten seconding,
20 Commissioners Hood, Parsons, and Turnbull in
21 favor.

22 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.

1 And the Commission will recess for five
2 minutes, and then the Public Hearing will
3 begin. Thank you.

4 (Whereupon, at 6:37 p.m., the
5 proceedings in the foregoing case
6 were concluded.)

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22