

Cochran, Patricia (DCOZ)

From: Schellin, Sharon (DCOZ)
Sent: Wednesday, September 17, 2025 12:54 PM
To: DCOZ - ZC Submissions (DCOZ)
Subject: ZC 24-15 | 901 Monroe Street LLC PUD | declined request for 1 more week to respond to further Applicant changes

From: Schellin, Sharon (DCOZ)
Sent: Wednesday, September 17, 2025 12:51 PM
To: Barbara Kahlow <Barbara.Kahlow@verizon.net>
Cc: ptummonds@goulstonstorr.com; Steingasser, Jennifer (OP) <jennifer.steingasser@dc.gov>; Jesick, Matthew (OP) <matthew.jesick@dc.gov>; Ozberk, Erkin (DDOT) <erkin.ozberk1@dc.gov>; Hagen, Noah (DDOT) <noah.hagen@dc.gov>; ANC 5B Office (ANC 5B) <5B@anc.dc.gov>; Amin, Ra (SMD 5B04) <5B04@anc.dc.gov>; brooklandcivic@yahoo.com; 'Dawn Amore' <dawnamore@gmail.com>
Subject: RE: ZC 24-15 | 901 Monroe Street LLC PUD | declined request for 1 more week to respond to further Applicant changes

Ms. Kahlow,

As you are aware, the record is closed except for the specific submissions requested by the Commission at its public meeting—specifically from the Applicant. Parties are permitted to respond to those submissions if they choose. However, your email is not in response to a submission from the Applicant (which has not yet been filed), but rather in response to the schedule that was set.

You did not submit a request to reopen the record to accept your email, nor did you file an official request for an extension of time to respond (which would require a Form 150 – Motion). Please understand that this response is not intended to assign blame, but rather to clarify the actions taken by the Commission/Chairman and myself. I want to make it clear for the record that your party was not denied any rights by the Commission. Any official requests for Commission's consideration must be made in accordance with the Zoning Regulations.

That said, because your email has been distributed into the record, I feel it is necessary to address certain statements promptly. Accordingly, I have taken the following steps on your behalf:

1. Requested that the record be reopened to accept your email and my response; and
2. Treat your email as a request for an extension of time for the 200-Footers to respond (should they choose to do so) to October 16th.

I am pleased to advise you that Chairman Hood has **APPROVED** your request to submit the 200-Footers' response by **3:00 PM on October 16th**.

Now, I would like to address the points raised in your email based on my recollection:

1. *On 9/11/25, during its business meeting, the Zoning Commission (ZC) set deadlines for the Applicant's further changes to ZC #24-15 (10/2), the 200-Footers' response (10/9), and the second ZC deliberation (10/23).*

Response: For clarification, the deadlines were set by me, the ZC Secretary—not by the Commission/Chairman.

2. *Chairman Hood recognized the Applicant’s attorney to set these dates, but did not recognize me as the 200-Footers’ representative, and I had no opportunity to comment.*

Response: I asked to confirm a date (how much time was needed) with the Applicant—not the Chairman—and he allowed me to do so. Based on that date, a one-week response period was set for all parties, as required by the Zoning Regulations (see below). Because the only documents requested were from the Applicant, I did not call on any other parties. The Regulations (see below for convenience) dictate the response period, which is up to seven days although the Commission has allowed the full seven.

Subtitle Z, Section 602.3

In a contested case, the Commission shall allow all parties to a case an opportunity to file written responses to any exhibits, information, or legal briefs submitted after the close of the public hearing. All responses shall be filed within seven (7) days following the date by which the exhibits, information, or legal briefs were due... [highlights added]

3. *Immediately after the ZC meeting, I emailed Sharon Schellin to request a one-week extension (from 10/9 to 10/16) for the 200-Footers’ response, as I will be out of the country until late 10/14. She reported that she had asked Chairman Hood and he said “no.”*

Response: That is accurate. I was on the phone with Chairman Hood after the meeting on an unrelated matter when I received your email. I read it out loud, and in that informal setting—since no official request had been submitted—he responded that, “we need to keep cases moving” and suggested that perhaps someone else could respond in your absence. Again, no formal request was made at that time. You continued to email me and I made a few suggestions, but nothing official.

4. *Since Wi-Fi may be unavailable to me from Machu Picchu (in Lima, Peru) before and on 10/9, I regret to inform you that the 200-Footers Party in Opposition will be unable to respond by 10/9. I believe the denial of my extension request is unfair to the 200-Footers.*

Response: When I asked if someone else could respond, you indicated that the group was “largely w/o any knowledge of zoning & DC procedures.” I interpreted this as your desire not to let the group down (as you had said before), rather than a complete lack of capacity among its members. In the end, Wi-Fi may be available to you, and I am aware that at least one member—Guy Durant—appears to be a capable and intelligent individual who could potentially respond in your absence.

As stated above, this is not meant to point fingers at anyone, but to clarify that an “official request” was not before the Commission until I sent your email to the Chairman asking for the approval above-mentioned. I hope that the one-week extension will accommodate you and the 200-Footers if you respond. I hope you have a safe and fabulous time on your trip to Peru.

Sincerely,

Sharon S. Schellin

Secretary to the Zoning Commission

Office of Zoning | District of Columbia Government

441 4th Street, NW | Suite 200-S | Washington, DC 20001

From: barbara.kahlow@verizon.net <barbara.kahlow@verizon.net>

Sent: Tuesday, September 16, 2025 1:58 PM

To: DCOZ - ZC Submissions (DCOZ) <DCOZ-ZCSubmissions@dc.gov>; Schellin, Sharon (DCOZ) <sharon.schellin@dc.gov>

Cc: ptummonds@goulstonstorris.com; Steingasser, Jennifer (OP) <jennifer.steingasser@dc.gov>; Jesick, Matthew (OP) <matthew.jesick@dc.gov>; Ozberk, Erkin (DDOT) <erkin.ozberk1@dc.gov>; Hagen, Noah (DDOT) <noah.hagen@dc.gov>; ANC 5B Office (ANC 5B) <5B@anc.dc.gov>; Amin, Ra (SMD 5B04) <5B04@anc.dc.gov>; brooklandcivic@yahoo.com; 'Dawn Amore' <dawnamore@gmail.com>

Subject: RE: ZC 24-15 | 901 Monroe Street LLC PUD | declined request for 1 more week to respond to further Applicant changes

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the DC Government. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know that the content is safe. If you believe that this email is suspicious, please forward to phishing@dc.gov for additional analysis by OCTO Security Operations Center (SOC).

Chairman Hood & Sharon Schellin:

On 9/11/25 during its business meeting, the Zoning Commission (ZC) set deadlines for the Applicant's further changes to ZC #24-15 (10/2), the 200-Footers' response to the Applicant's further changes (10/9), and the 2nd ZC deliberation date (10/23). Chairman Hood recognized the Applicant's attorney to set these dates, but he did not recognize me as the 200-Footers' representative and there was no way for me to comment. So, immediately after this ZC business meeting, I emailed Sharon Schellin to ask for a 1-week extension (from 10/9 to 10/16) for the 200-Footers' response since I will out-of-the-country until late 10/14. She reported that she had asked Chairman Hood & he said 'no.' Since Wi-Fi may be unavailable to me from Machu Picchu (in Lima Peru) before & on 10/9, I regret to inform you that the 200-Footers Party in Opposition will be unable to respond by 10/9. I believe that denial of my extension request is unfair to the 200-Footers Party in Opposition. – Barbara Kahlow (on behalf of the 200-Footers)