

GOVERNMENT OF  
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

REGULAR PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

THURSDAY  
APRIL 10, 2025

+ + + + +

The Public Meeting of the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened via teleconference, pursuant to notice at 4:00 p.m. EDT, Anthony J. Hood, Chairperson, presiding.

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

PAUL YOUNG, Zoning Data Specialist  
SHARON S. SCHELLIN, Secretary

OFFICE OF ZONING LEGAL DIVISION STAFF PRESENT:

HILLARY LOVICK, ESQUIRE  
DENNIS LIU, ESQUIRE

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

SHEPARD BEAMON, Office of Planning

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Regular Public Meeting held on April 10, 2025.

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 .....	3
Preliminary Matters .....	4
Case No. 08-06R Office of Planning .....	5
Case No. 19-16 MCF WALP Phase 1, LLC .....	10
Case No. 24-18 Living Classrooms Foundation .....	15

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

(4:00 p.m.)

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. We are convening and broadcasting this public meeting by videoconferencing. My name is Anthony Hood, and I'm joined by Vice Chair Miller, Commissioner Wright, Commissioner Imamura, and Commissioner Stidham. We are also joined by the Office of Zoning staff, Ms. Sharon Schellin, as well as our Office of Zoning Legal Division, Mr. Dennis Liu, Ms. Hillary Lovick, and Mr. Jacob Ritting. I will ask all others to introduce themselves at the appropriate time for the meeting. Copies of today's meeting agenda are available on the Office of Zoning's website.

Please be advised that this proceeding is being recorded by a court reporter and is also webcast live via Webex and YouTube Live. The video will be available on the Office of Zoning's website after the meeting. Accordingly, all those listening on Webex or by phone will be muted during the hearing -- during the meeting. I'm sorry. For hearing action items, the only documents before us this evening are the application, the ANC setdown report, and the Office of Planning report. All other documents in the record will be reviewed at the time of the hearing. We will not take any public testimony at our meetings unless the Commission requests otherwise.

If you experience difficulty accessing Webex or with your phone call-in, then please call our OZ Hotline number at

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

1 202-727-0789 for Webex log-in or call-in instructions. At this  
2 time, the Commission will consider any preliminary matters. Does  
3 the staff have any preliminary matters?

4 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. There will be a joint training  
5 session for the BZA and the Zoning Commission on April 29th, so  
6 that's a closed session, because we do get legal advice for the  
7 BZA and Zoning Commission. And so if you guys could vote on  
8 that, I'd appreciate it.

9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Schellin. As  
10 Chairman of the Zoning Commission for the District of Columbia,  
11 in accordance with 405-C of the Open Meetings Act, I move that  
12 the Zoning Commission hold the following closed meeting on  
13 Tuesday, April the 29th, 2025, at 9:30 a.m., for the purpose of  
14 receiving training, as permitted by D.C. Official Code 2-  
15 575(b)(12). The subject of this -- of the training is discussions  
16 re rear-yard changes to the zoning regulations, raised versus  
17 demolition; when is a deck no longer a deck; adding screening,  
18 landing, stairs, et cetera, and -- oh, and when does an accessory  
19 building become a dwelling unit. Is there a second?

20 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Second.

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Will the Secretary please take a  
22 roll call vote on the motion before us now that has been seconded?

23 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood.

24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.

25 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller.

1 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

2 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Wright.

3 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes.

4 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Stidham.

5 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes.

6 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Imamura.

7 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.

8 MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is five to zero to zero to  
9 approve having the closed meeting for the purpose of training,  
10 pursuant to the Closed Meetings Act. Thank you.

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Schellin and  
12 everyone. As it appears the motion has passed, I request that  
13 the Office of Zoning provide notice of this closed meeting in  
14 accordance with the Act. Anything else on this, Ms. Schellin?

15 MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir.

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. All right. Let's  
17 go right into our agenda. Consent calendar; technical  
18 corrections, Zoning Commission Case Number 08-06R, Office of  
19 Planning technical corrections to 11 DCMR Subtitles A, B, C, I,  
20 K, U, and Y. Ms. Schellin.

21 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. As you stated, this is a  
22 filing from the Office of Planning requesting some technical  
23 corrections to the zoning regulations. This is -- this includes  
24 typographical errors and some minor errors when the Commission  
25 adopted this ZR-16 regulations. These corrections are a

1 continuing effort to clarify the regulations and make any  
2 corrections that need to be done. So you have the OP report at  
3 Exhibit 2. And so with that I'm going to turn it over to the  
4 Commission to decide. If you do believe that this is technical  
5 in nature, then the Commission can proceed with approving that a  
6 Notice of Proposed Rulemaking be published for a 30-day comment  
7 period. Thank you.

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. First of all, let me  
9 ask, does anyone believe this should come off the consent  
10 calendar? Any objections to this being on the consent calendar?

11 (No response.)

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Seeing none, let me ask Commissioner  
13 Wright to start us off, and then if anyone else has anything to  
14 add they can. If not, we can proceed. Let's see what  
15 Commissioner Wright -- Commissioner Wright.

16 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Sure. Thanks. These are very,  
17 very minor technical changes. They really have to do with  
18 updating terms, adding some -- a missing word, improving clarity.  
19 Even the perhaps biggest one to explicitly note, the building  
20 height for properties that do not front onto Pennsylvania Avenue  
21 is 130 feet, that was in the zoning regulation from 1958. It  
22 was inadvertently not explicitly included in the zoning  
23 regulation in 2016, but, you know, in essence, 130 feet is already  
24 the permitted height, pursuant to the Height Act, so this just  
25 reiterates that and offers additional clarification in the

1 current regulations, and it is consistent with the 1958 zoning  
2 regulation. So that is the only thing that's even what I would  
3 consider not like an editorial or typographical kind of change.  
4 These are very, very straightforward. So I do believe that this  
5 should be set down and that we should proceed with this as a  
6 rulemaking case and take it forward.

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner  
8 Wright. Commissioner Imamura, anything to add?

9 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: No. I agree with Commissioner  
10 Wright. Nothing further to add. I think these are appropriately  
11 technical corrections.

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Commissioner  
13 Stidham, anything to add?

14 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: No, nothing to add. I agree  
15 they are technical and extremely minor.

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And, Vice Chair, anything to add?

17 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. No. I  
18 agree with Commissioner Wright's explanation and just would add  
19 that that clarification of reinstating what was already in the  
20 regulations for the properties not fronting on Pennsylvania  
21 Avenue, that's in the D7 zone, which is a downtown zone. And  
22 this is a proposed -- this will be -- if we approve this, it'll  
23 be a proposed rulemaking, which people will have an opportunity  
24 to comment.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I don't have anything further

1 to add. I think Commissioner Wright and others have summed this  
2 up. Vice Chair, you just said something that I'm not clear on,  
3 but I can talk to legal on that later, but what I see -- have in  
4 front of me now, I'm ready to move forward. All right.  
5 Commissioner Wright, could you make a motion please?

6 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Sure. I move that we set down  
7 Zoning Case Number 08 --

8 MS. LOVICK: Sorry. Excuse me. You're not setting it  
9 down. You just need to vote to publish a Notice of Proposed  
10 Rulemaking please.

11 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Oh, okay. Thank you. So I amend  
12 my motion to say that I move that we publish a Notice of  
13 Rulemaking for Zoning Case Number 08-06R, Office of Planning,  
14 technical corrections to 11-DCMR Subtitles A, B, C, I, K, U, and  
15 Y.

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'll second that, but I do need  
17 to -- since Ms. Lovick opined, I want to ask a question. I'm  
18 going to go ahead and do it now. So I'm trying to understand  
19 the process, Ms. Lovick, if you could come up.

20 MS. LOVICK: Yes, sir. So --

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'm trying to figure out, when the  
22 Vice Chair said that -- okay. So I know it's going out for a  
23 proposed rulemaking -- I mean, it's going out as a proposed  
24 notice. So when the notice comes back, explain to me the process,  
25 because I didn't get -- I'm confused.



1 MS. LOVICK: So, historically, when you would do a  
2 technical correction, you would vote on the technical correction,  
3 and then we would just publish a final rulemaking of -- with a  
4 final order of whatever it was that you had voted to correct.  
5 But the process has changed, because the Office of Documents and  
6 Administrative Issuances wants for us to move forward with  
7 publishing a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, even when you're  
8 doing a technical correction. So what's going to happen is you  
9 voted to authorize the publication of a Notice of Proposed  
10 Rulemaking, and now what will happen is the Office of Zoning will  
11 refer the technical correction to the National Capital Planning  
12 Commission for a 30-day comment period, and the Office of Zoning  
13 will also publish in the Register a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking  
14 for a 30-day comment period, and thereafter, after that time has  
15 elapsed, then this will come back on to final action on the --  
16 on an agenda, and you will take final action. And after you take  
17 final action, a Notice of Final Rulemaking will be published in  
18 the Register.

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Got it. Thank you. I noticed  
20 there was something different here, but thank you very much for  
21 that explanation. Okay. So it's been moved and properly  
22 seconded. Any further questions?

23 (No response.)

24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Not hearing any, Ms. Schellin, would  
25 you do a roll call vote?

1 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Wright.  
2 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes.  
3 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood.  
4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.  
5 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller.  
6 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes. Sorry.  
7 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Stidham.  
8 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes.  
9 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Imamura.  
10 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.  
11 MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is five to zero to zero to  
12 approve the -- to authorize the publication of a proposed  
13 rulemaking on Zoning Case Number 08-06R. Thank you.  
14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. Thank you. And, again,  
15 thank you, Ms. Lovick, for that explanation. Let's go to final  
16 action, Zoning Commission Case Number 19-16 MCF WALP Phase 1,  
17 LLC, request of extinguishment of consolidated PUD in Square 481.  
18 Ms. Schellin.  
19 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. As you stated, on March 31st  
20 the applicant filed a motion requesting to extinguish the  
21 approved consolidated PUD that the Commission approved in Order  
22 Number 19-16, and they are requesting this, stating that as a  
23 result of the delays from the Court of Appeals process, the  
24 applicants decided to proceed with a matter-of-right development.  
25 Now, this PUD will expire November of this year, but rather than

1 waiting until then, they would like for the Commission to go  
2 ahead and approve extinguishment of the PUD, so that they can get  
3 started with a matter-of-right project and not lose those --  
4 whatever it may be -- few months. Thank you. Oh, I wanted to  
5 say there's also -- right now, as of now, there is nothing in  
6 the record from the ANC supporting this, but I believe -- I don't  
7 know if OP submitted -- I don't see that they did. Someone will  
8 correct me if they've submitted something since I last updated  
9 my notes, but it's before the Commission to make that decision.  
10 Thank you.

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Schellin. We  
12 have the request in front of us for extinguishment of Zoning  
13 Commission Case 19-16. I'm just sorry to see it going down this  
14 road. I think it's a missed opportunity, but that's not my call.  
15 So let me ask, Commissioner Stidham, could you get us started on  
16 this please?

17 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Sure. Absolutely. So this is  
18 a case where there was an interest -- where the applicant was  
19 going to be building a -- residential units, and through the  
20 delays, it has just taken too long. And I think it's a fairly  
21 straightforward case. You know, they are wishing now to  
22 just -- not asking for any relief and just looking to build  
23 as a matter of right, and I don't see any reason to deny this  
24 motion and let them move on and get started.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner

1 Stidham, for teeing that up. Commissioner Wright, anything to  
2 add?

3 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: No. I agree with what the Chair  
4 said; it is a missed opportunity, but you can't, you know, force  
5 someone to build something that they can't or don't want to build,  
6 so I think extinguishing the PUD is a good idea.

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Commissioner Imamura, any  
8 comments?

9 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: I'm in agreement and have  
10 nothing further to add.

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. And Vice Chair Miller.

12 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. No, I  
13 agree with all the comments of my colleagues. I went back and  
14 refreshed my memory of what we approved five years ago, when only  
15 you and me, Mr. Chairman, were the current -- the Commissioners  
16 on that case. You actually opposed going forward with that case  
17 because of the churches -- there two churches in opposition, and  
18 there was parking -- concerns about parking, which hadn't been  
19 worked out. It got a -- so it was approved on a four-to-one  
20 basis.

21 It was one of our first COVID virtual cases,  
22 interestingly enough, and here we are -- here we are five years  
23 later, and I think I was diagnosed with COVID today, interestingly  
24 enough. But it was appealed to the D.C. Court of Appeals, like  
25 many of our previous decisions, although it was affirmed three

1 years ago. So it would have provided a lot -- it was a very  
2 attractive development, and you noted that, Mr. Chairman, in your  
3 comments. There was just a concern that there hadn't been an  
4 accommodation to the parking. So, hopefully, if they proceed  
5 matter of right, it will be as -- hopefully as attractive. It  
6 was meeting the height -- the 50-foot height development  
7 standards of the current zone, so it's still going to be  
8 compatible with -- as a matter-of-right project with the church  
9 that's nearby -- churches that are nearby and the other RF zones,  
10 so, hopefully, they -- if there's a parking issue, they can try  
11 to work that out with the churches, as we did encourage them to  
12 do at the time.

13 So that was really more than we needed -- I needed to  
14 say, but this should -- this development should proceed in a  
15 downtown area that has been vacant and needs to be developed, so  
16 I'm ready to move forward.

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah. I was trying to be restrained,  
18 Vice Chair, about that parking, because that's why I voted against  
19 it. It was a very simple issue. I thought it could have been  
20 resolved, and I hate to rehash -- I don't want to relitigate, but  
21 since you brought it up -- let me just leave that alone. All  
22 right. I just -- again, it was a simple fix. We didn't have to  
23 go down this road, but we did, so I'm going to leave it at that.  
24 Thank you for your recap, Vice Chair Miller. All right. So,  
25 with that, I'm going to ask, Commissioner Stidham, if you could

1 make a motion to extinguish.

2 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Sure. I move to take final  
3 action on Zoning Case Number 19-16, MCF WALP Phase 1, LLC, who  
4 is requesting for an extinguishment of consolidated PUD at Square  
5 481, and ask for a second.

6 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Second.

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

9 (No response.)

10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Not hearing any, Ms. Schellin, would  
11 you do a roll call vote please.

12 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Stidham.

13 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes.

14 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Imamura.

15 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.

16 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood.

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.

18 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller.

19 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

20 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Wright.

21 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes.

22 MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is five to zero to zero to  
23 approve the extinguishment of the PUD in Zoning Commission Case  
24 Number 19-16. And that -- I don't know if I said five to zero  
25 to zero. And we'd ask the -- unless OZLD pipes up and says no,

1 that the applicant provide a draft order, so -- within two weeks.  
2 Thank you.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I think the last thing we  
4 have on our agenda is a hearing action, Zoning Commission Case  
5 Number 24-18, Living Classrooms Foundation, text amendment to  
6 Subtitle A, Section 301.3(h) and Subtitle K, Sections 200.6  
7 through 200.9, 230.5, 230.6, and 239.1. Mr. Beamon.

8 MR. BEAMON: Yes. Good afternoon, Commissioners and  
9 Chair Hood. Shepard Beamon with the Office of Planning. Thank  
10 you. This is Zoning Case 24-18. The Office of Planning  
11 recommends that the Zoning Commission set down this petition for  
12 Living Classrooms Foundation to amend Subtitle A, Section 301,  
13 and Subtitle K, Sections 200, 230, and 239 for Parcel P3 in the  
14 Yards.

15 The applicant requests a text amendment to allow Living  
16 Classrooms to locate its headquarters on the site. However, the  
17 applicant has not submitted a design or plans as part of this  
18 proposal. The proposed text amendment includes adding  
19 educational, institutional, and eating and drinking establishment  
20 uses to the SEFC-4 zone, expanding the SEFC-4 development area  
21 to include Parcel P3, amending subdivision requirements for non-  
22 record lots, and simplifying and clarifying the floor area ratio  
23 requirements for aggregated density across the zone.

24 Next slide please. So Parcel P3 is a part of the  
25 Southeast Federal Center Master Plan. The site is currently

1 vacant and an open space extension of the Yards Park; however,  
2 there is -- there's no current development or no landscaping on  
3 the site, and the parcel was approved for cultural and community  
4 uses.

5           Next slide please. The requested text amendment would  
6 not be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan Maps and other  
7 adopted public policies. The Future Land Use Map indicates that  
8 the site is appropriate for federal and parks and recreation and  
9 open space, which supports non-federal uses, including facilities  
10 dedicated to classes and services relating to health and  
11 wellness, culture, arts and crafts, or education.

12           The General Policy Map indicates that the site is  
13 appropriate for a regional center, which encourages in-field  
14 development that includes employment opportunities. The GPM also  
15 identifies the area as a resilience focus area, which the  
16 applicant has committed to insure flood-resistant new development  
17 and environmental sustainability.

18           The proposal would uphold several citywide and lower  
19 Anacostia Waterfront near Southwest Area elements relating to  
20 land use, economic development, parks and open space, urban  
21 design, historic preservation, education, and waterfront  
22 development. The proposed uses could offer hands-on after-school  
23 and supplemental education programs and adult workforce  
24 development using urban, natural, and maritime resources to  
25 residents of all ages and from all economic backgrounds



1 throughout the District. Any plans for new development is subject  
2 to mandatory design review by the Zoning Commission to insure  
3 compatibility with the surrounding historic context and  
4 waterfront. The proposal could potentially be inconsistent with  
5 some parks and open space elements; however, these policies would  
6 be greatly outweighed by other elements within the Comprehensive  
7 Plan.

8           Next slide please. When evaluated through a racial  
9 equity lens, the proposal should not result in direct or indirect  
10 displacement, as there are currently no businesses or residents  
11 on the site. The petition would not impact housing, as the Master  
12 Plan land uses do not permit housing, nor would the proposed land  
13 uses requested by the applicant. The zoning action could result  
14 in physical changes to the site, as the action would facilitate  
15 new development of a site that is currently not developed with a  
16 building or with park space.

17           Permitting the requested uses would increase access to  
18 opportunities for job and culinary training, health and wellness  
19 programs, and education programming for residents across the  
20 District. According to the applicant, ANC F -- 8F, Southeast  
21 Waterfront residents, users of the marina and waterfront are  
22 impacted communities. The applicant presented to ANC 8F in May  
23 2023, where no issues have been identified since. And the ANC  
24 also noted that the proposed workforce and educational facility  
25 would be an asset to the area. It is unlikely that the proposed

1 changes would negatively impact this aggregate data, as the  
2 planned area has higher educational attainment and income and  
3 lower vulnerable populations and unemployment, when compared to  
4 the District as a whole. This concludes OP's presentation, and  
5 I'm happy to take any questions.

6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you very much, Mr. Beamon.  
7 Very well done presentation and report. We may have a few  
8 questions. Let me ask, Commissioner Imamura, if you can start  
9 us off.

10 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and  
11 thank you, Mr. Beamon, for your report tonight. I don't have  
12 many questions, just some of the standard that you hear us ask  
13 often. First, I'm just kind of curious if you're aware of any  
14 opposition.

15 MR. BEAMON: Yeah. So, as of right now, no, I'm not.

16 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Okay. Great. This seems pretty  
17 reasonable and straightforward, and I'm interested to hear a  
18 little bit more, if the Commission decides to set this down. And  
19 should we decide to set it down, I would be interested in hearing  
20 from the petitioner a little more about their community outreach  
21 and engagement efforts. It has been awhile, and so I'd like to  
22 hear -- my dog would also like to hear a little bit more from  
23 the petitioner. But, with that, I'll -- those are my comments.  
24 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner

1 | Imamura. Commissioner Wright.

2 |           COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: I have no problem at all  
3 | proceeding with this. I'm familiar with some of the work that  
4 | the organization does, and I think that they would be an asset  
5 | to the area, and I really don't have any questions. I think it's  
6 | a great -- a great use in this location.

7 |           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. Commissioner Stidham.

8 |           COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: I am also very familiar with  
9 | Living Classrooms and the work that they do, which is amazing  
10 | educational work, and I do support setting this down. I would  
11 | be interested in, when they do come for hearing, to understand a  
12 | little bit more about, generally, their uses at the site, because  
13 | I know that they're already occupying space in the pump house,  
14 | or at least they were, so how they see that tying in and how a  
15 | site that is -- sort of the general idea of the uses of their  
16 | site. Their statement didn't really dig into that, and I guess  
17 | I'm rambling, but the point I'm trying to get to is we should be  
18 | really -- even though this organization does really great work,  
19 | our waterfront is such an important space, and really we should  
20 | only be allowing things that are water-dependent. And I know  
21 | they have a whole water-dependent function, so just understanding  
22 | the importance of this particular site on the waterfront as it  
23 | aids the work that they do, just understanding a little bit more  
24 | of that would be great.

25 |           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Vice Chair Miller.

1           VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yeah, I  
2 agree with my colleagues and everything they've said. It seems  
3 like a great use. And I think it was -- I think, as your report --  
4 thank you, Mr. Beamon, for your report. I think, as you noted,  
5 I think this particular use was even contemplated in the Southeast  
6 Federal Center Master Plan, at least that's what I recall reading  
7 somewhere, although I don't know if it was on this particular  
8 site, but it was contemplated in the Master Plan for this whole  
9 Yards area, so it seems like a great use. And it will be subject  
10 to a -- the mandatory design review that all of the projects in  
11 that area are subject to, so we will see whatever development  
12 comes back and see that it meets the objectives of the -- of the  
13 particular Southeast Federal Center 4 Zone Development District.

14           I guess I just have -- I don't know if I need to have  
15 the answer to this right now, but maybe at the hearing. When  
16 we're reviewing the -- what might be coming before us -- if we  
17 set this down for a hearing and we approve it and the project  
18 comes forward that provides a structure -- some kind of structure  
19 for this use, are we reviewing it -- we're reviewing it,  
20 obviously, against the objectives -- the criteria that are in the  
21 zone for this area. Will it be just design review or is it --  
22 will it be also Comprehensive Plan review, which you had a big  
23 analysis of, as part of this text amendment -- part of this  
24 amendment. Do you know whether the criteria will include beyond  
25 design compatibility with the -- which is important, obviously.

1 But will it include special exception adverse impact type of  
2 review or do you know? We don't need to know the answer -- I  
3 don't need to know the answer today.

4 MR. BEAMON: I'm not sure about that right now either,  
5 so --

6 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. So that's --

7 MR. BEAMON: But --

8 MS. LOVICK: So I was just going to comment. So this  
9 is a -- this would be a Subtitle K review, so the criteria is  
10 under Subtitle K, Section 241 and 242; that's the specific  
11 Southeast Federal Center Zone criteria. And in addition to that,  
12 Comprehensive Plan consistency does apply to this review, so you  
13 will be reviewing it against those design review standards as  
14 well that are under Subtitle X, Chapter 6.

15 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Ms. Lovick. That's very  
16 helpful to know, so I appreciate you piping in with that response.  
17 Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm ready to set this down.

18 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you all. I, too, am ready to  
19 set down. And I want to go back to Commissioner Stidham's  
20 comments. I'm hoping, through the hearing, that I can also come  
21 up to speed on Living Classrooms Foundation. I don't know a lot  
22 about what they do, but I know what they achieve -- what they're  
23 trying to achieve or what the Foundation's trying to achieve, but  
24 I'm trying to figure out the nexus. So I'm sure all that will  
25 be flushed out I believe in the hearing setting. It sounds like

1 we're going to be setting this down, so I thank everyone for all  
2 their comments and letting the applicant know -- or the  
3 presenters know that I want to -- I'm trying to understand the  
4 nexus. So, with that, again, Mr. Beamon, thank you very much  
5 for your well done report, and with that I would ask Commissioner  
6 Imamura if he could make a motion.

7 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Sure. Gladly. So I move that  
8 the Zoning Commission set down Case Number 24-18, Living  
9 Classrooms Foundation, text amendments to Subtitle A, Section  
10 301.3(h) and Subtitle K, Sections 200.6 through 200.9 and 230.5,  
11 230.6, and 239.1, and ask for a second.

12 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Second.

13 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. It's been moved  
14 and properly seconded. Any further discussion?

15 (No response.)

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Not hearing any, Ms. Schellin, would  
17 you do a roll call vote please?

18 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Commissioner Imamura.

19 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.

20 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Stidham.

21 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes.

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Commissioner Hood.

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.

24 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Commissioner Wright.

25 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes.

1 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Commissioner Miller.

2 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

3 MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is five the zero to zero to set  
4 down Zoning Commission Case Number 24-18 as a rulemaking case.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Ms. Schellin, do we have  
6 anything else before us?

7 MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir.

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I believe our next hearing  
9 is April the 21st.

10 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Our next hearing is going to  
12 be April the 21st on these same platforms. It's Zoning Commission  
13 Case 24-13, the McDonald's Corporation. And, with that, I want  
14 to thank everyone for their participation -- all my colleagues  
15 and everyone for their participation in this meeting tonight. I  
16 shouldn't have named nobody, but let me do it -- my colleagues,  
17 the Office of Zoning Legal Division, our Office of Zoning staff,  
18 the Office of Planning, DDOT -- who else -- the residents and  
19 everybody for their participation. With that, this meeting is  
20 adjourned. Good night.

21 (Whereupon, the above-entitled public meeting was  
22 adjourned at 4:34 p.m.)

23

24

25

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: D.C. Zoning Commission

Date: 04-10-25

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