

GOVERNMENT OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

REGULAR PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

THURSDAY

DECEMBER 19, 2024

+ + + + +

The Public Meeting of the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened via teleconference, pursuant to notice at 4:25 p.m. EDT, Anthony J. Hood, Chairperson, presiding.

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

ANTHONY J. HOOD, Chairperson
ROBERT E. MILLER, Vice Chair
GWEN WRIGHT, Commissioner
TAMMY STIDHAM, Commissioner

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

PAUL YOUNG, Zoning Data Specialist
ELLA ACKERMAN, Secretary

OFFICE OF ZONING LEGAL DIVISION STAFF PRESENT:

HILLARY LOVICK, Esquire
DENNIS LIU, Esquire
JACOB RITTING, Esquire

HUNT REPORTING COMPANY
Court Reporting and Litigation Support
Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia
410-766-HUNT (4868)
1-800-950-DEPO (3376)

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

PHILIP BRADFORD
JOEL LAWSON
JENNIFER STEINGASSER

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the
Regular Public Hearing held on December 19, 2024.

HUNT REPORTING COMPANY
Court Reporting and Litigation Support
Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia
410-766-HUNT (4868)
1-800-950-DEPO (3376)

T-A-B-L-E O-F C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

Introduction - Chairman Hood	4
Preliminary Matters- Ms. Ackerman	4
Case No. 06-46F Half Street Residential PJV, LLC	6
Case No. 91-07A International Monetary Fund	8
Case No. 23-25 Office of Planning	10
Case No. 23-29 Martins View, LLC	11
Case No. 08-30E SCD 25 M, LLC	14
Case No. 14-12H EAJ 1309 5th Street, LLC	16
Case No. 24-09 The Wesley Theological Seminary of the United Methodist Church	19
Case No. 24-20 Office of Planning	36

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

2 (4:25 p.m.)

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Good afternoon, everyone. This is
4 the 1,604th meeting session of the DC Zoning Commission. Today's
5 date is Thursday, December the 19th, 2024, and the time now is
6 4:25 p.m. Again, we apologize for the lateness. Let me
7 introduce -- we have -- joining me this afternoon are Vice Chair
8 Miller, Commissioner Wright, Commissioner Stidham; also our
9 Office of Zoning Legal Division, Mr. Ritting, Ms. Lovick, and Mr.
10 Liu; our Office of Zoning Staff, our secretary this afternoon is
11 Ms. Ella Ackerman, and Mr. Paul Young, who will be handling all
12 of our virtual operations. We do not take public testimony unless
13 we ask someone to come forward. Be advised that this proceeding
14 is being recorded, and that will be available immediately upon --
15 following this hearing or the next day. So, with that, I will
16 start and go to Ms. Ackerman and ask her, do we have any
17 preliminary matters?

18 MS. ACKERMAN: Yes, we do. So tonight we are going
19 discuss and vote on the closed meetings for the 2025 calendar
20 year. This would include each Monday and Thursday, beginning at
21 3:15 p.m. This would be a closed meeting prior to the start of
22 a public meeting, and it would continue for the entire year on
23 Webex.

24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I'm going to read a statement.
25 Thank you, Ms. Ackerman. In accordance with 405C of the Open

1 Meetings Act, DC Official Code 2-575B, I move that the Zoning
2 Commission hold closed meetings on each Monday and Thursday that
3 is scheduled to hold a public meeting or public hearing for the
4 calendar of year 2025. The closed meeting will begin at 3:15
5 p.m. and are for the purposes of obtaining legal advice from our
6 counsel on all cases and to deliberate upon but not vote on the
7 contested cases scheduled on the Commission's agendas -- agenda.
8 "Agendas" is what they have. Is there a second?

9 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Second.

10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Will the secretary please
11 take a roll call vote on the motion before us now that has been
12 seconded?

13 MS. ACKERMAN: Yes. Commissioner Hood.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.

15 MS. ACKERMAN: Commissioner Miller.

16 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

17 MS. ACKERMAN: The result is four to zero to one to
18 approve having closed meetings in 2025, the minus one being
19 Commissioner Imamura, who is not present, not voting.

20 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So we're going to try that again,
21 Ms. Ackerman.

22 MS. ACKERMAN: Yeah, it's supposed to be just you two?

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: No. We're going to include
24 Commissioner Wright and do -- let's try that again.

25 MS. ACKERMAN: Oh, I do all four of you. I'm sorry.

1 It's my first time doing this. I'll redo it.

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let's just call for the vote again.

3 MS. ACKERMAN: Okay. Chairman Hood.

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.

5 MS. ACKERMAN: Commissioner Miller.

6 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

7 MS. ACKERMAN: Commissioner Wright.

8 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes.

9 MS. ACKERMAN: Commissioner Stidham.

10 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes.

11 MS. ACKERMAN: Okay. Now.

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. The vote is four to zero to
13 one. Thank you.

14 MS. ACKERMAN: Yes, four to zero to one, Commissioner
15 Imamura not being present.

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So I request that the Office
17 of Zoning provide notice of these closed meetings, in accordance
18 with the Act. So thank you very much. Let's move to our agenda.
19 Okay. Consent calendar, modifications without hearings, Zoning
20 Commission Case Number 06-46F, Half Street Residential PJV, LLC,
21 Design Review Modification without Hearing at Square 701. Ms.
22 Ackerman.

23 MS. ACKERMAN: Give me one moment here. So we just
24 have one note tonight. On December 3rd, the Office of Planning
25 filed a letter, at Exhibit 6, in support. Other than that, this

1 case is ready for the Commission to consider final action. Thank
2 you.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Let me see if my
4 colleagues are ready to move forward with this as a modification
5 without a hearing. Any objections?

6 (No response.)

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Not seeing any objections, let me
8 just recap quickly. The applicant revised its original filing,
9 which is our Exhibit 5, with Exhibit 5 -- I mean, with Exhibit 2
10 with Exhibit 5. Originally, the applicant was proposing to
11 convert the second-floor retail space to 16 residential units and
12 making minor exterior changes. Then the application only
13 concerns the south building, which is a nine-story building
14 containing approximately 463,854 square feet. So the updated
15 drawings that we have that we are voting on this evening are the
16 updated plans that show 16 lodging units, and if the applicant
17 later converts these units to residential units, one IZ unit will
18 be included, in accordance with ZR 16 requirements. Basically,
19 what the applicant is asking is to be able to do that and a little
20 flexibility. Any additional comments or statements?

21 (No response.)

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So, with that, I will approve
23 the request for modification without hearing for Zoning
24 Commission Case Number 06-46F, and ask for a second.

25 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Second.

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. It has been moved and properly
2 seconded. Any further discussion?

3 (No response.)

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Not hearing any, Ms. Ackerman, could
5 you do a roll call vote please?

6 MS. ACKERMAN: Commissioner Hood.

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.

8 MS. ACKERMAN: Commissioner Stidham.

9 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes.

10 MS. ACKERMAN: Commissioner Miller.

11 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

12 MS. ACKERMAN: Commissioner Wright.

13 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes.

14 MS. ACKERMAN: Staff records the vote four to zero to
15 one to approve Case Number 06-46F for final action, Commissioner
16 Imamura not present, not voting.

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Moving right along, our next
18 case is Zoning Commission Case Number 91-07A. This is the
19 International Monetary Fund, PUD Modification without Hearing at
20 Square 120. Ms. Ackerman.

21 MS. ACKERMAN: Yes. Tonight we have the ANC report
22 from ANC 2A at Exhibit 5, and there is a report from the Office
23 of Planning at Exhibit 6 recommending approval. This case is
24 ready for the Commission to consider final action. Thank you.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So we actually have a

1 request -- let's do this. We have a request from the ANC asking
2 for a delay so they can have more time to have interaction and
3 negotiations between the original parties and the applicant.
4 This is a fairly older case, so, I don't know, let me hear what
5 you all think. If not, we can proceed. And I will ask whether
6 this is a modification -- whether we believe this is still a
7 modification without hearing, but, first, let me see -- we've all
8 read the ANC's request for additional time and, certainly, we
9 always like to do that, but let me hear what others have to say.
10 Commissioner Wright.

11 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Thank you. I think we should
12 have a relatively short delay. I think it's important for the
13 ANC to speak with the applicant about the amenities, and, again,
14 I think that there wouldn't be any adverse impact with a brief
15 delay.

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. And Vice Chair Miller.

17 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I agree that as a courtesy to the
18 ANC 2A, which requested that delay, that it -- I'm not sure with
19 a 30 -- with a 25-year, or however many decades it is, PUD that
20 they're able to offer additional public benefits at this point,
21 but -- it's usually during construction and prior to
22 construction -- but I think a delay is appropriate.

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Great. And Commissioner Stidham,
24 any additional comments?

25 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: No. I also agree it's worth

1 providing the delay to allow the conversation to take place.

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. We will -- Ms. Ackerman, we
3 will take this case and delay it. I think we can do it at maybe
4 our next hearing, or I mean next meeting or the meeting after,
5 but I'll leave the scheduling up to the staff. Okay?

6 MS. ACKERMAN: Okay.

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And I'm sure it'll be after the ANC
8 has their time to negotiate this. All right. So let me go to
9 final action. And I should have announced this earlier,
10 especially for this case. I don't want to keep people waiting
11 around. Under final action tonight, the Zoning Commission had
12 Zoning Commission Case Number 23-25. It was an Office of Planning
13 text amendment -- amendments to create new Chevy Chase
14 neighborhood mixed-use zones. We're going to take this up at
15 our -- proposedly, I believe we're going to take this up at our
16 first meeting in January. The rationale is there's five of us.
17 Commissioner Wright was not participating on this case, and,
18 unfortunately -- well, fortunately for him -- Commissioner
19 Imamura is out enjoying his holidays, so we want to make sure we
20 have as many Commissioners as possible as we dig in and come up
21 with the best decision possible in this case, so this case will
22 be delayed until January -- let me get my calendar -- January the
23 9th on these same platforms. And, Ms. Ackerman, could you make
24 sure that this is on the agenda for January the 9th.

25 MS. ACKERMAN: (Nods head affirmatively.)

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Let's keep moving. All right.
2 The next case is -- my mouse is -- okay, there we go -- nope --
3 okay -- Zoning -- and my colleagues will let me know if I went
4 too far -- Zoning Commission Case Number 23-29, Martins View,
5 LLC, Consolidated PUD and Related Map Amendment at Parcel
6 252/0082, 252/0083, 252/0092, and 252/0086. And, again,
7 Commissioner Wright is not participating on this case. Let's go
8 to you, Ms. Ackerman.

9 MS. ACKERMAN: At the conclusion of the hearing on
10 October 24th, the Commission took proposed action. Upon referral
11 to the NCPC, they submitted a letter to the record at Exhibit
12 51, stating the application is not inconsistent with the
13 Comprehensive Plan. This case is ready for the Commission to
14 consider final action. Thank you.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Give me one moment please.
16 All right. One second. Okay. There were a number of things
17 that we did previously. As my colleagues know, I think we
18 talked -- we've hashed a lot of this out previously in our --
19 under "proposed". We had a summary of issues, if my colleagues
20 may remember; the impacts on infrastructure, more affordable
21 units, and indirect displacement of surrounding residents, and
22 we asked -- the applicant had responded to some of those as well.
23 I guess we can then address the remaining contested issues, as
24 well as discuss whether it finds the application to be not
25 inconsistent with the Comp Plan reviewed through a racial equity

1 lens that satisfies the PUD balancing tests. Again, those issues,
2 whether they're adequate or not -- and let me just start off, we
3 talked about impacts of -- impacts on infrastructure, whether the
4 project is too large for the existing water and sewer
5 infrastructure systems, and, basically, we had a response from
6 the applicant. I guess I'll just read that in the record. The
7 applicant's civil engineer found the current infrastructure
8 systems can support the project and also, with the concurrence
9 of DOE, stormwater requirements will be incorporated within --
10 into the project.

11 We also spoke about more affordable units. The project
12 should include more affordable units. The applicant's response:
13 The applicant is proposing a set-aside of 17 percent of
14 residential floor area to be reserved as IZ units for households
15 earning no more than 60 percent of MFI; the applicant cannot
16 increase the set-aside and keep the project sustainable
17 financially.

18 So then indirect displacement of surrounding residents.
19 The project will lead to displacement of surrounding residents
20 due to property tax increase. The applicant's response: The
21 project will be a mixed-income community that will not result in
22 materially higher costs to residents than the broader community.
23 And I think we discussed some of that previously, and we came up
24 with our conclusions. And let me -- let me just open it up first
25 to see if anybody has any objections to anything that I read or

1 anything they want to add on, and then we'll take it from there.
2 Commissioner -- Vice Chair Miller.

3 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just
4 wanted to acknowledge that the Bellevue Neighborhood Community
5 Association -- is that the right name -- submitted a statement,
6 as well as the applicant. We discussed -- they presented that
7 at the hearing. It summarized mostly what they said at the
8 hearing, which you said, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to emphasize
9 that the project's size and scale are not inconsistent with the
10 Comprehensive Plan and help promote policies that are in the
11 Bellevue Small Area Plan, including the housing goals, as well
12 as provide public benefits commensurate with the flexibility, as
13 you said. And I just wanted -- and, also, we had the ANC's
14 support I believe for this application as well. I just wanted
15 to emphasize those two points, which we previously have
16 emphasized, and so I'm ready to move forward with final action
17 this evening.

18 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Vice Chair Miller.
19 Commissioner Stidham, anything to add?

20 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: No, sir, nothing to add.

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Again, we hashed a lot of this out.
22 There were a few outstanding things that we needed too, but we
23 spent a lot of time hashing it out. I think we sent it back
24 once, so we have really exhausted and done the best we could with
25 what we had to work with. So I would move that we approve, as

1 noted and captioned, Zoning Commission Case Number 23-29, Martins
2 View, LLC, Consolidated PUD and Related Map Amendment at Parcel
3 252/0082, 252/0083, 252/0092, and 252/0086, and ask for a second.

4 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Second.

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

7 (No response.)

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Not hearing any, Ms. Ackerman, could
9 you do a roll call vote please?

10 MS. ACKERMAN: Commissioner Hood.

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.

12 MS. ACKERMAN: Commissioner Stidham.

13 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes.

14 MS. ACKERMAN: Commissioner Miller.

15 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

16 MS. ACKERMAN: Staff records the vote three to zero to
17 two to approve Case Number 23-29 for final action, Commissioner
18 Imamura and Wright not voting.

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Let's go to the
20 next, time extensions. Zoning Commission Case Number 08-30E, SCD
21 25 M, LLC, Two-year Design Review Time Extension at Square 700.
22 Ms. Ackerman.

23 MS. ACKERMAN: So the applicant is requesting a two-
24 year PUD time extension for more time to file a building permit
25 application for the design review case by December 3rd, 2026. At

1 Exhibit 5, we have a report from the Office of Planning in
2 support, and there is no report from the ANC tonight.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Ackerman.
4 Again, the applicant had provided justification us. The
5 extension request was served on all parties. The parties were
6 allowed 30 days. There has been no substantial change. And,
7 again, the crux of it or the -- to the point of it was, despite
8 these challenges the applicant remains committed to completing
9 the project, as evidenced by its expenditures already and
10 establishing an agreement with WMATA regarding future development
11 and advertising and marketing the site to further support
12 development among the efforts. I think the applicant's already
13 showed a good faith effort going forward and to continue -- and,
14 as mentioned, the request was 30 days. The response has elapsed
15 for the ANC. The ANC has not responded, so we can proceed, if
16 we wish. Let me hear from others. Let me go to Commissioner
17 Wright.

18 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: I'm in support of the two-year
19 extension.

20 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. And Commissioner Stidham.

21 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: I am also in support. They met
22 the requirements and should be allowed the extension.

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. And Vice Chair Miller.

24 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I agree that the criteria in our
25 regulations have been met for the extension.

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Would somebody like to make
2 a motion?

3 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: I'll make a motion, if I can
4 scroll back up. I move to approve the time extension for Zoning
5 Case Number 08-30E, SCD 25 M, LLC, Two-year Design Review Time
6 Extension at Square 700, and ask for a second.

7 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Second.

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

10 (No response.)

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Not hearing any, Ms. Ackerman, could
12 you do a roll call vote please?

13 MS. ACKERMAN: Yes. Commissioner Wright.

14 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes.

15 MS. ACKERMAN: Commissioner Hood.

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.

17 MS. ACKERMAN: Commissioner Miller.

18 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

19 MS. ACKERMAN: Staff records the vote four to zero to
20 one to approve Case Number 08-30E for final action, Commissioner
21 Imamura not present, not voting.

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Our next case is Zoning
23 Commission Case Number 14-12H, EAJ 1309 5th Street, LLC, Two-
24 year PUD Time Extension at Square 3591, Lots 801, 802, 7004,
25 7005, 7011, 7013, 7 -- what did I say - 7034, 7036, 7037, 7038.

1 Ms. Ackerman.

2 MS. ACKERMAN: The applicant is requesting a two-year
3 PUD time extension. The applicant has stated issues with
4 unexpected conditions beyond reasonable control and they are
5 requesting a waiver, which would allow more than two time
6 extensions as well. At Exhibit 4 we have a report from the Office
7 of Planning in support, and there is nothing in from the ANC.
8 That is all.

9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. As captioned, as we know the
10 applicant states that it's faced unexpected conditions beyond its
11 reasonable control and have slowed the development timetable of
12 the future south building, including challenges associated with
13 the post-pandemic economy we all faced, the office market, the
14 intended movie theater use, securing a development partner,
15 obtaining financing, high construction labor and material costs,
16 and we all know how true that is in this society today. So we
17 have two things going here. They've requested a waiver, and
18 that's the justification. So let me see if anyone has any
19 comments or any disagreement with what's being requested. Let
20 me just go around the hall. Commissioner Wright.

21 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: No. I support both.

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Vice Chair Miller.

23 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I support the waiver and the time
24 extension. I believe there's good cause.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. And Commissioner Stidham.

1 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: I support both also.

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Would somebody like to make
3 a motion? And if somebody makes a motion -- I think we all
4 support it -- if somebody makes a motion, could you include the
5 waiver, too, of the two time -- extending the waiver limit?

6 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: I can give it a try, if you'd
7 like.

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Go right ahead.

9 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: I move that we approve Zoning
10 Case Number 14-12H, which is EAJ 1309 5th Street, LLC, which is
11 for a two-year PUD time extension at Square 3591, Lots 801 and
12 802, 7004, 7005, 7011 through 7013, 7034, 7036, 7037, and 7038,
13 and included in my motion is also the waiver of our -- the fact
14 that this is a fourth time extension and is the third two-year
15 extension.

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I will second that. It's
17 been moved and properly seconded. Any further discussion?

18 (No response.)

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Not hearing any, Ms. Ackerman, would
20 you do a roll call vote please?

21 MS. ACKERMAN: Commissioner Wright.

22 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes.

23 MS. ACKERMAN: Commissioner Hood.

24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.

25 MS. ACKERMAN: Commissioner Miller.

1 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

2 MS. ACKERMAN: Commissioner Stidham.

3 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes.

4 MS. ACKERMAN: Staff records the vote four to zero to
5 one to approve Case Number 14-12H for final action, Commissioner
6 Imamura not present, not voting.

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Next we have, under proposed
8 action, Zoning Commission Case Number 24-09, the Wesley
9 Theological Seminary of the United Methodist Church at Square
10 1600, Lots 007, 008, 009, 0818, and 0819. Ms. Ackerman.

11 MS. ACKERMAN: Since the conclusion of the hearing on
12 November 18th, 2024, we have had some exhibits come in. At
13 Exhibit 54, there is a letter from ANC 3E with changes to the
14 proposed text amendments that they have. At Exhibit 57, there
15 is a response to these changes from ANC 3D. At Exhibit 60, there
16 is a report from the Office of Planning in support. And at
17 Exhibit 61, 61-A1, and 61-A2, there is a report from ANC 3E with
18 attachments. The ANC raised several comments through this
19 letter. The ANC -- sorry I've said it so many times now. The --
20 this case is ready for the Commission to deliberate. Thank you.

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Ackerman. And, as
22 we all know, this case has been around for a while. We have been
23 around and around and around and the snowball effect, and we've
24 come to -- and we are where we are here now. Ms. Ackerman, I
25 think, has pretty much calculated and mentioned everything that

1 has come in that -- some of the requests for and some of the
2 changes, some of the recommendations that have been made by the
3 ANC and others, but I guess, first, given all the testimony that
4 we've heard, are we still convinced that the text amendments to
5 facilitate construction of student and university housing on
6 Wesley's campus is an absolute necessity for Wesley to thrive in
7 place. And let me start with Vice Chair Miller first on that.

8 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let me
9 just say that this -- as we've said previously at the hearing,
10 that this is the third iteration of Wesley attempting -- third
11 application for Wesley attempting to build university housing on
12 its campus that would house both Wesley students, faculty, and
13 staff, as well as the immediately adjacent students, faculty, and
14 staff of American University.

15 There was a -- there's a Campus Plan held in abeyance,
16 there was a PUD, which the Commission determined in its
17 deliberations was not the appropriate way to go. And so the
18 applicant, Wesley, came back with this text amendment to clarify
19 exactly what they're proposing and not trying to interpret the
20 zoning regulations to permit housing that -- that's not only
21 going to do housing for its own students and faculty and staff,
22 but another institution's, which happens to be immediately
23 adjacent and has a history of being together there at that -- on
24 that site. So the applicant did say -- did testify extensively
25 that they were -- that this was necessary to house the non-Wesley

1 residents in this facility -- in this new -- in this proposed
2 building in order to have revenue to support their ability to
3 stay where they are. I don't really want to speculate as to
4 whether or not that is a true -- an accurate statement or not.
5 I don't want to speculate that they would leave, but I don't want
6 to be -- I think there's enough justification and clarity in
7 what's being proposed here that the zoning regulations would
8 allow for this use with this text amendment, and so I'm supportive
9 of this application moving forward, perhaps with the
10 amendments -- we'll go -- we'll hear the deliberations of my
11 colleagues and myself later on particular issues, but they have
12 testified that they need this revenue stream in order to be --
13 in order to stay in the city where they've been for many decades.

14 We know that seminaries and religious institutions have
15 struggled to remain in the city. We want them to remain in the
16 city. We know that Wesley's graduates serve vulnerable
17 communities after they graduate and during -- actually during
18 their time there as students, so I -- to answer that -- you were
19 asking, do we believe it's an absolute necessity for them to
20 thrive in place. I -- we don't have the economics to make that
21 determination, but I think that there's enough in the record to
22 support going forward. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. Commissioner Wright.

24 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: So I agree with Vice Chair Miller
25 that I support this case going forward. I'm not comfortable with

1 saying that it has to go forward because this is the only way
2 for Wesley to thrive in place, because I really don't feel that
3 we have all of the -- if we were going to make that judgement,
4 we would need a much more detailed economic study and evaluation
5 to understand the situation better. I think it's worth moving
6 it forward, because I think that in this case it makes a lot of
7 sense to provide student housing on a piece of land that can
8 support two institutions that happen to be next door to each
9 other, both of which have on-campus students who need housing,
10 and that it just makes sense for the two institutions to
11 collaborate, to use land that is available to build student
12 housing and to support the needs of both of the institutions. So
13 I definitely think this should move forward, but I'm not making
14 any judgement on whether it's an, you know, absolute essential
15 necessity for Wesley to thrive in place.

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. And Commissioner Stidham.

17 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: I really don't have anything to
18 add and prepared to move forward.

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. And, as you know, there were
20 some -- a summary of ANC 3, and I'm just going to try to rehash
21 some of this. And I would -- let me, first of all, agree with
22 my colleagues, as far as going forward. I do not want to put
23 out there or speculate what the future may hold and thriving in
24 place and all that, but I think we got to this point by trying
25 to come up with a fix, and I know the opposition has disagreed

1 with the way things were -- when we first started, how it came
2 in, and we've been trying -- so -- and long story short, we are
3 where we are. We're here. But I know that ANC 3 has given some
4 set-aside recommendations. I know the opponents have argued that
5 the Commission should not change the IZ set-aside, and I know
6 they say it is circumventing.

7 The ANC also would like to change the reference to
8 "dormitory" under Section C-1006.10. So I'm trying to recapture
9 some of the arguments. The petitioners I think disagree both
10 with requiring the higher IZ set-aside. The petitioner doesn't
11 agree. So it's a lot of going back and forth, and I want to
12 thank our counsel for kind of capturing all of this for us to
13 review, 'cause it's quite -- it's voluminous; there's quite a bit
14 going back and forth. But let me just ask my colleagues this,
15 that we want to make sure that we're clear, would we like to
16 increase the minimum IZ set-aside in the amendments above the
17 eight or ten percent required, depending on construction type?
18 If so, to what? And that's a question I think we need to spell
19 out or clarify here on the (indiscernible). Vice Chair Miller.

20 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Both the
21 applicant and the Office of Planning and I think both ANC 3E and
22 3D are supportive of saying that the -- in this text amendment
23 that the -- that the applicant should provide the minimum amount
24 of set-aside -- of affordable housing that would be required on
25 the -- under inclusionary zoning regulations, and that they can

1 provide that offsite, as the applicant has proposed. The Office
2 of Planning has agreed with that. The ANCs have agreed with
3 that -- with certain amendments. There is opposition testimony
4 that's been there all along that doesn't agree with any of that.
5 So I think that the text amendment should -- which is carving out
6 this exception to the zoning regulations to facilitate this use
7 by non-Wesley residents, the adjacent AU residents, the -- I
8 think that the applicant and the Office of Planning have agreed
9 that the minimum set-aside -- the minimum amount of affordable
10 housing that would be required under IZ could be provided offsite.
11 It's a unique situation, and I think it's appropriate that a
12 minimum set-aside -- the minimum affordable housing should be
13 provided, as proposed by the applicant.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. Commissioner Wright.

15 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes, I believe that the minimum
16 amount of IZ offsite, which is what has been offered by the
17 applicant, is appropriate. Again, I go back to the fact that I
18 viewed this as university student housing, otherwise known as a
19 dormitory in the old days. We can call it "university student
20 housing", if that's, you know, the language that everyone is
21 comfortable with, but that normally there would be no IZ
22 requirement, and that the applicant, in trying to work
23 collaboratively with the community, came up with this idea of
24 doing offsite IZ at an amount that would be required in a non-
25 university housing kind of project. And so I think that they

1 are being very cooperative, looking to find a sort of consensus
2 with the neighborhood, provide an important benefit that the city
3 is -- considers to be a high priority, to get additional IZ in
4 Ward 3. I think that is all great.

5 In terms of the language, I guess we'll hear more about
6 this and the detail of how it is going to be accomplished when
7 the Campus Plan is amended. And, you know, at that time, I think,
8 again, I would like very much to keep to the eight or ten percent
9 IZ, depending upon the construction type, but I also know we may
10 have to hear about some creative solutions for providing that
11 offsite IZ. I think the information that was provided from other
12 jurisdictions demonstrates that offsite IZ is hard. It's not an
13 easy thing to accomplish. And I think when we do come back with
14 the Campus Plan, we're going to have to, you know, listen to what
15 solutions they've been able to come to, to provide that offsite.
16 So I do not believe that we need to go above the eight or ten
17 percent, but I also think that when it comes back as a Campus
18 Plan, we need to be flexible enough to hear how they're going to
19 accomplish it.

20 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Commissioner Wright.
21 Commissioner Stidham.

22 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: I also do not believe we need
23 to increase it, but I do agree that we need to hear more when we
24 get to the Campus Plan stage of things and have more discussion
25 then.

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I would agree with my
2 colleagues as well. I don't think we need to require additional.
3 I think there's time for us to be able to deal with that, as
4 mentioned, when there's another Campus -- when the Campus Plan
5 comes back. Let me also mention -- I think Commissioner Wright
6 alluded to it -- there's a recommendation from OP and ANC 3,
7 which I am willing to adopt, and I want to hear from every
8 Commissioner. Vice Chair Miller. And that's the changing of
9 the -- from dormitory to university housing. I think that's
10 something that has been recommended, and I think OP and ANC 3
11 both agree. And I think, Commissioner Wright, unless I
12 misunderstood you, I think you don't have a problem with that.
13 I think I heard that already from you.

14 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: No. That change in terminology
15 is fine I think.

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. And, Vice Chair Miller, any
17 issues with that?

18 VICE CHAIR MILLER: No issues with the university
19 housing designation for what this is, because dormitory has
20 traditionally been -- well, I have no issues with that.

21 I would like to go back to the issue of the amount of
22 set-aside, because the language that's been offered by the
23 applicant, agreed to by OP, and supported by -- to one degree or
24 another by both ANC 3E and 3D, says "not less than the minimum",
25 which is what the IZ regulations provide, not less than the

1 minimum. So I'm not in favor of setting it at the minimum
2 necessarily, and I misstated that when I initially spoke. It's --
3 our regulations state -- for inclusionary zoning state "not less
4 than the minimum". It often is the minimum; it sometimes is
5 more. So, because of that, I -- the ANC 3E has offered as one
6 alternative -- I think it's called Option B -- that ANC 3D
7 supports -- well, let me -- ANC 3E asked for specifying more than
8 the minimum as the minimum. I think it was one-and-a-half times
9 the minimum. I'm not in favor of that. I'm in favor of not less
10 than the minimum, which is what our IZ regulations say, which
11 implies that it could be more than the minimum, but there was
12 concern by ANC -- both ANCs that it wasn't clear that the Zoning
13 Commission would have flexibility to adjust that amount when we
14 consider the Campus Plan, which we're not considering here this
15 evening, and all of the impacts that are associated with the
16 Campus Plan and the benefits to the community and the mitigations
17 for any adverse impacts. So I am -- I don't know -- I don't
18 think that there's -- I don't know if there's -- I doubt it -- I
19 don't think that there's -- based on what my colleagues have
20 said, that there's majority support for -- I don't support saying
21 that it should be more than the minimum -- more than -- not less
22 than the minimum now, but I'm not -- I don't want to foreclose
23 our discretion to consider that at the time that we consider the
24 Campus Plan application. That's the language that the ANC 3E
25 offered in its Option B, which 3D -- ANC 3D, which is the most

1 impacted neighborhood immediately adjacent to AU, has supported.
2 The Office of Planning and the applicant object because of
3 uncertainty that that may create going forward. But the not less
4 than language -- the not less than the minimum language implies
5 that it could be more than the minimum, so I want to -- I think
6 the clarity of saying that the Zoning Commission has the
7 discretion in the Campus Plan process for this unique case, where
8 the -- where this is the third iteration, almost three years
9 after the first one, was applied for by Wesley to accommodate
10 this university housing and provide a revenue stream to Wesley.
11 So I would be -- I am -- I would be supportive of, first,
12 making -- using language -- and our counsel can work this out
13 with the applicant, if we go forward with this case, the exact
14 language, but the language that's been offered by the applicant
15 and the Office of Planning says "not less than", which is in our
16 zoning regulations -- it says "not less than the minimum", so I
17 support that, and I support clarifying that that means we have
18 the discretion to increase it.

19 I would also include the discretion to decrease it, if
20 they provide a different way of producing the affordable housing
21 that's required and is needed in Ward 3. So I don't know if I
22 have -- if there's support for that concept, if I've made that --
23 if I've articulated that in a clear way, but that's where I am,
24 Mr. Chairman, on that issue.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Let me go back

1 to the other question; then I'll come to that, 'cause I agree
2 the Commission should have the discretion, but I want to hear
3 from others. Let me hear from Commissioner Stidham. I mentioned
4 about the university housing versus the dormitory. You don't
5 have an issue with changing to "university housing", right? So
6 we're all --

7 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Right. I think "university
8 housing" is actually more appropriate in this case.

9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Now, let's go back to what Vice
10 Chair Miller just was mentioning about leaving the Commission
11 discretion. I always want us to have discretion. And I agree
12 with you, actually, Commissioner -- Vice Chair Miller. I think
13 Commissioner Wright agreed too, unless I misunderstood. So I
14 think we're -- I don't know where that came from, where you
15 thought we were disagreeing. Am I correct, Commissioner Stidham;
16 do you agree with what Vice Chair Miller said?

17 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes. Yes.

18 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Commissioner Wright, do you agree?

19 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: I do. I think it may be
20 worthwhile to look at the exact language, which is on -- the
21 Office of Planning's proposed language is on page 50 of our staff
22 report.

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let's all get that up in front of
24 us. Give me a second. Let me open that file back up. And thank
25 you, Commissioner Wright. One second. Page 50. That's in our --

1 the supplemental, correct, or is it the regular report?

2 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: It's in the -- it's in the
3 regular report that we get, and I can just read it out.

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Why don't you read it, since
5 you got it.

6 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: It says, "Wesley Theological
7 Seminary" -- this is Office of Planning's proposed revisions to
8 the language. It says, "Wesley Theological Seminary shall
9 provide offsite IZ located in Ward 3 as an enforceable condition
10 to its 2022-2032 Campus Plan further processing to construct a
11 dormitory" -- I guess we'll change the word "dormitory" to
12 "university housing" -- "provided that the requirements of
13 Subtitle C, 1006.1 to 1006.3, A through G, may be waived by the
14 Zoning Commission for the offsite IZ. Depending on construction
15 type, the offsite IZ provided shall be no less than Subtitle C,
16 1003.1 or 1003.2 requirements, as applicable, and subject to the
17 requirements of Subtitle C, 1006.5 to 1006.9."

18 Now, the main differences between the applicant's
19 proposed language and the Office of Planning's proposed language
20 is that it requires the applicant to provide offsite IZ in Ward
21 3, which I think we definitely want, with a waiver of some offsite
22 IZ requirements, and it does not give Wesley an option to provide
23 a financial contribution in lieu of providing offsite IZ in Ward
24 3. So Office of Planning's language, you know, specifies Ward
25 3, does not give an option for doing a fee in lieu -- a financial

1 contribution in lieu, and it talks about the fact that the amount
2 shall be no less than what's provided in Subtitle C, the IZ law.
3 So I think, in terms of quantity, I'm comfortable with it, because
4 it says "shall be no less than Subtitle C", which does leave it
5 open that it could be more. That may not give the applicant the
6 certainty that they're looking for, but I think the comments made
7 on the record thus far, at least by a couple of the Commissioners,
8 seems to indicate that, at least at this time, we're thinking the
9 eight to ten percent is appropriate, but it does remove the option
10 for a financial contribution in lieu. So I just want to make
11 sure that we're all looking at the same language and agreeing
12 that this is the language that we want.

13 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Well, I will tell you, I agree with
14 that language. I'm definitely not in favor of in lieu. I want
15 it to be exactly specific to what's proposed. I am not in lieu
16 (sic) of giving a contribution and putting it somewhere else.
17 I'm not in -- I'm not in favor of that. So I don't know where
18 others are, but I think -- I'll just leave it at that for now.
19 I think -- Vice Chair, are you fine with that or you want in lieu
20 too? So then we have to vote.

21 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I guess, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to
22 make clear that the Zoning -- and the wordsmithing of this would
23 have to be done by our counsel, in conjunction with the applicant,
24 but I -- in effectuating what we're talking about, but in terms
25 of effectuating what I'm talking about, I wanted the flexibility

1 to provide that offsite housing in Ward 3 through not less --
2 not -- and have the not less than language in this text amendment,
3 but to make clear in an additional sentence or proviso that the --
4 that makes clear that the Zoning Commission has discretion as to
5 how that not less than offsite housing in Ward 3 could be
6 accomplished.

7 I, personally, have no problem -- or I don't have a
8 problem with Wesley, which is not in the construction --
9 affordable housing business, to make a contribution to somebody
10 in Ward 3 who would produce the offsite -- the amount of
11 housing -- the amount -- provide the sufficient monies, certified
12 by our Department of Housing and Community Development or some
13 appropriate authority -- not us, but to certify that the amount
14 that they -- I don't have a problem if they do it through a
15 financial contribution, as long as it's meeting the amount that
16 we think is appropriate, that we determine in the Campus Plan
17 process.

18 I think it initially just should say "not less than the
19 minimum requirements", but I, personally, would like us to have
20 the discretion and spell it out that we have the discretion to
21 effectuate that not less than amount through a means -- through
22 whatever means is developed or evolves, 'cause it hasn't been
23 developed or evolved sufficiently at this stage, in the Campus
24 Plan process. So I wanted the -- I wanted the flexibility to
25 either go up or go down or provide a contribution that meets the

1 amount that we think is appropriate -- that DHCD certifies would
2 produce the amount that we think is appropriate in that Campus
3 Plan process for offsite affordable housing. But I think the
4 majority of my colleagues -- I don't know if the majority of my
5 colleagues are arguing for that type of language that clearly
6 spells out that we have that discretion -- the type of discretion
7 that I'm talking about.

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let me -- let me refine my comment.
9 My comment was, I wanted to make sure that whatever happens -- I
10 didn't want them to give a financial contribution and put it over
11 in Ward 7. That's all I'm saying. I don't want -- 'cause that
12 seems to be what happened. And I know the folks in Ward 3 are
13 upset with me about other cases when I say this, but if affordable
14 housing's going to happen in Ward 3, it needs to happen in Ward
15 3. Don't give me a financial contribution and send it over here
16 and put it over here in my neighborhood -- while we would like
17 it -- but I think what the Mayor and I think what the city and
18 the administration -- what we have been trying to do all these
19 years was put affordable housing so people that look like me can
20 live all across the city. That's what it's all about for me. So
21 the last comment that you said, I agree with, Vice Chair. I do
22 want us to have the discretion. I do want it to be in Ward 3.
23 I don't want a financial contribution and you put it somewhere
24 over in Ward 2 or something. I want it in Ward 3, so I can go
25 with that.

1 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I agree.

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I can go with that.

3 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: I also agree. I mean, I think
4 that Vice Chair Miller has sort of put all the pieces together
5 that I'm comfortable with. I just don't think we have the actual
6 words in front of us.

7 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: I agree as well.

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So we have a very sophisticated
9 counsel. I'm sure they heard it, and I'm sure they're going to
10 be able to fine tune it. We'll give them that discretion. All
11 right. So thank you, Vice Chair, for walking us through that
12 again. I want it in Ward 3. And I agree, Wesley is not in
13 affordable housing.

14 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I appreciate -- I appreciate
15 that -- your comments, and I agree with them.

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. All right. Anything else on
17 this? Did I leave anything out? I don't see our counsel's light
18 coming on, so I guess we're all right.

19 (No response.)

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

22 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: I can, if I can scroll back up
23 to the top of the page. I move to take proposed action on Zoning
24 Case Number 24-09, the Wesley Theological Seminary of the United
25 Methodist Church at Square 1660, Lots 0007, 0008, 0009, 0818, and

1 0819, and ask for a second.

2 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I would second that, and just say
3 "as consistent with our discussion here today".

4 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Thank you, Vice Chair.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. It's been moved and
6 properly seconded, consistent with our discussion today. Any
7 further discussion?

8 (No response.)

9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Not hearing any, Ms. Ackerman, could
10 you do a roll call vote please?

11 MS. ACKERMAN: Yes. Commissioner Stidham.

12 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes.

13 MS. ACKERMAN: Commissioner Miller.

14 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

15 MS. ACKERMAN: Commissioner Hood.

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.

17 MS. ACKERMAN: Commissioner Wright.

18 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes.

19 MS. ACKERMAN: Staff records the vote four to zero to
20 one to approve Case Number 24-09 for proposed action,
21 Commissioner Imamura not present, not participating.

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Give me one second.

23 MS. ACKERMAN: Did you hear that clearly? I know there
24 was a truck driving by.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: No, we heard you, we heard you.

1 MS. ACKERMAN: Okay.

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All good. Thank you. I'm just
3 scrolling to my next case. I need to get a better mouse or
4 something. Okay. Hearing action I believe is next. Hearing
5 Action, Office of Planning, Zoning Commission Case Number 24-20,
6 Office of Planning Text Amendment to Subtitles B, D through F,
7 A -- I mean, I'm sorry, B through F and I, for Clarification of
8 Rear Yard Measurements in the R, RF, and RA Zones. Who do we
9 have? Is that Mr. -- Ms. Steingasser? Oh, Mr. Bradford, Mr.
10 Bradford.

11 MR. BRADFORD: Good evening, Chairman Hood, members of
12 the Commission. Philip Bradford with the DC Office of Planning
13 here to present Case 24-20. The Office of Planning is
14 recommending the Commission set down the proposed text amendment
15 to Subtitles B, D through F, and I to provide clarity to the rear
16 yard standards.

17 Next slide please. The key modifications to the Code
18 include the following: Revisions to the definitions and rules of
19 measurement for rear yard that clarify that the measurements are
20 taken from the rear of the structure towards the rear lot line;
21 permitting accessory buildings in the rear yard by removing
22 language that prohibits accessory buildings in the rear yard; a
23 return to the ZR 58 standard that previously allowed
24 standard -- that allowed accessory buildings to occupy up to
25 30 percent of the required rear yard area, which is likely to

1 reduce excess BZA cases; and these changes also help clarify that
2 when an accessory building occupies a portion of the rear yard
3 beyond what is proposed in these changes, the relief that's
4 required is from the accessory building rear yard standards and
5 not the rear yard development standards, which has been a point
6 of confusion with applicants in the past.

7 With the adoption of ZR 16, the Zoning Commission
8 directed staff to monitor the newly-adopted code for potential
9 issues, and OP has been working closely with the DOB and the
10 Office of the Zoning Administrator on this text amendment. Staff
11 from both agencies have noted difficulties in administering the
12 rear yard standards for residential zones. These changes seek
13 to bring consistency between zoning code and current ZA
14 interpretations regarding rear yards and accessory buildings.

15 As previously noted, the changes impact Subtitles B,
16 D, E, F, and I, but I wanted to note that the changes to the
17 downtown zone in Subtitle I are purely due to reference points
18 in the code to the rules and measurement sections in Subtitle B.
19 The primary changes as part of this text amendment are the same
20 across Subtitles D, E, and F, which remove the prohibition of an
21 accessory building in the rear yard, maintain the alley setback
22 that currently exists, and reimplements the ability to occupy 30
23 percent -- up to 30 percent of the required rear yard that was
24 in ZR 58, which adds flexibility for homeowners and reduces the
25 regulatory burden on adding accessory structures.

1 Next slide please. Community outreach for this text
2 amendment was limited, as the amendments are clarifications to
3 the regulations related to ZR 58 and ZR 16 transition that were
4 not captured clearly. The image on the left of the slide show
5 all the R, RA, and RF zones within the District, showing that
6 the text amendment has a citywide impact and does not impact a
7 specific planning area and, thus, has a neutral racial equity
8 impact. The amendment does further several policy items within
9 the Comprehensive Plan, which encourage monitoring development
10 requirements and updating land use controls and permitting
11 procedures.

12 Next slide please. If set down for a public hearing,
13 OP requests flexibility to work with the Office of Zoning Legal
14 Division on draft language for the public hearing notice. And,
15 with that, I conclude my presentation and am happy to answer any
16 questions.

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Mr. Bradford. Let me
18 also thank the Office of Planning. This is exactly what we
19 have -- the Commission has talked about for years, that when we
20 see that we have done some regulations and did some zoning
21 regulations which caused a problem, we asked you to come to us
22 immediately, so we can try to correct them, and I think this is
23 a win-win.

24 I will ask not you, Mr. Bradford, but Ms. Steingasser,
25 if you're available, I will ask the status of my RA -- I think

1 it was the RA zones, of where we are. Even though I appreciate
2 what you've done here, but I'm just curious in my RA zones that
3 we spoke about awhile, if you can help me with where we are on
4 that.

5 MS. STEINGASSER: You'll be happy to note, Chairman
6 Hood, that you'll be seeing that in January. We will be doing
7 our community outreach starting in January with the ANCs, and
8 then we'll be bringing it for set-down at the end of the month
9 or early February.

10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Steingasser,
11 for that update. And, again, I want to thank the Office of
12 Planning for doing this. I think this is very important, and
13 for years we have said this, so great and I really appreciate
14 it. Let me go see if my colleagues have any questions or
15 comments. Commissioner Wright.

16 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: No. I think this is a good thing
17 to set down, and it sounds like a good clarification.

18 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Commissioner Stidham.

19 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: No questions or comments. I'm
20 prepared to support as well.

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. And Vice Chair Miller.

22 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I agree with my colleagues and I
23 thank OP, along with -- I thank OP for presenting this
24 clarification.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Mr. Bradford, thank you again

1 and your team for all the hard work, and we're looking forward
2 to the hearing. Let's see if we have any -- could somebody make
3 a motion? I was about to say questions. Would somebody like to
4 make a motion?

5 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I'll move that the Zoning
6 Commission set down for a public hearing Zoning Commission Case
7 Number 24-20, the Office of Planning's proposed text amendment
8 to Subtitles B, D through F, and I for clarifications to rear
9 yard measurements in the R, RF, and RA zones, and ask for a
10 second.

11 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Second.

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

14 (No response.)

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Not hearing any, Ms. Ackerman, could
16 you do a roll call vote please?

17 MS. ACKERMAN: Yes. Commissioner Miller.

18 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

19 MS. ACKERMAN: Commissioner Wright.

20 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes.

21 MS. ACKERMAN: Commissioner Hood.

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.

23 MS. ACKERMAN: Commissioner Stidham.

24 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes.

25 MS. ACKERMAN: Staff records the vote four to zero to

1 one to approve Case Number 24-20 for final -- or sorry -- for set
2 down, Commissioner Imamura not present, not participating.

3 MR. LIU: I just want to clarify that it's a rulemaking,
4 right, this case?

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah, what we set down was a
6 rulemaking, yes. All right. Any -- I'm sorry. Any objections
7 to that being a rulemaking? I should have asked.

8 (No response.)

9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. All right. Ms. Ackerman, do
10 we have anything else before us?

11 MS. ACKERMAN: No, we do not, just that we will meet
12 again on January 9th, 2025 at four p.m. for a public meeting.

13 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. You stole my thunder, Ms.
14 Ackerman.

15 MS. ACKERMAN: Sorry.

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I was going to mention that, but
17 since you mentioned it, you know when we meet, at four p.m., as
18 Ms. Ackerman stated. Let me again wish everyone, as I did at
19 the top of the meeting, I'm going to wish it again -- a very,
20 very happy holiday and a happy new year. Be safe, and looking
21 forward to seeing everyone on the 9th, and enjoy your family and
22 friends. Enjoy. This meeting's adjourned -- hearing's
23 adjourned -- meeting, whatever it is.

24 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the
25 record at 5:30 p.m.)

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Public Meeting

Before: DC Zoning Commission

Date: 12-19-24

Place: Webex Videoconference

was duly recorded and accurately transcribed under my direction; further, that said transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.



Deborah B. Gauthier