

GOVERNMENT OF  
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

REGULAR PUBLIC HEARING  
CASE NO. 24-12

+ + + + +

MONDAY

JULY 14, 2025

+ + + + +

The Regular Public Hearing of the District of Columbia Board of Zoning Adjustment convened via teleconference, pursuant to notice at 3:46 p.m. EDT, Anthony J. Hood, Chairperson, presiding.

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS:

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

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF:

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

OFFICE OF ZONING LEGAL DIVISION:

JACOB RITTING, ESQ.

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

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Regular Public Hearing held on July 14, 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

## OPENING STATEMENT

Anthony Hood . . . . . 4

## PRESENTATION:

Case Number: 24-12 - Harrison,  
 Wisconsin Owner, LLC, consolidated PUD  
 and related map amendment  
 to square 1666 lots 809, 810,  
 4201 Harrison Street, Northwest. . . . . 5

## COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS:

Anthony Hood . . . . . 35  
 Commissioners . . . . . 39

Presentation by Mr. Kane..... 64

Presentation by Mr. Ozberk ..... 69

Presentation by Mr. Bradford ..... 70

Presentation by Ms. Cort ..... 75

Presentation by Mr. Skibo ..... 77

Presentation by Ms. Repp ..... 79

Presentation by Mr. van Leer ..... 83

Presentation by ANC 3E Commissioner Quinn ..... 91

## CLOSING REMARKS

BY MS. SHIKER ..... 97

VOTE BY COMMISSIONERS ..... 99

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

(3:46 p.m.)

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. Mr. Young, could you start the recording, please? Thank you.

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. We are convening and broadcasting this public -- hold on. I have the wrong statement open, naturally. One second. All right. Let's go to take two.

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. We are convening and broadcasting this public hearing by videoconferencing. My name is Anthony Hood. I'm joined by Vice Chair Miller, Commissioner Wright, Commissioner Imamura and Commissioner Stidham, as well as from the Office of Zoning Staff, Ms. Sharon Schellin and Mr. Paul Young. Our Office of Zoning Legal division, Mr. Jacob Ritting. I will ask all others to introduce themselves at the appropriate time.

The virtual public hearing notice is available on our Office of Zoning's website. This proceeding is being recorded by court reporter is also Webcast Live, via Webex, and YouTube Live. The video will be available on the Office of Zoning's website after the hearing. Accordingly, all those listening on Webex or by phone will be muted.

During the hearing, and only those who have signed up to testify will be unmuted at the appropriate time. When called, please state your name before providing your testimony. When

1 | you're finished speaking, please mute your audio. If you  
2 | experience difficulty accessing Webex or with your telephone call  
3 | in, then please call our OZ hotline number at 202-727-0789 to  
4 | receive Webex login or call in instructions, or if you have not  
5 | signed up to testify.

6 | All persons planning to testify must sign up in  
7 | advance, and will be called by name at the appropriate time. At  
8 | the time of signup, all participants will complete the oath or  
9 | affirmation required by Subtitle Z48.7. If you wish to file  
10 | written testimony or additional supporting documents during the  
11 | hearing, then please be prepared to describe and discuss it at  
12 | the time of your request when submitted.

13 | The subject of this evening's hearing is Zoning  
14 | Commission Case No. 24-12, Harrison, Wisconsin Owner, LLC,  
15 | consolidated PUD and related map amendment to Square 1666, Lots  
16 | 809, 810, 4201 Harrison Street, Northwest. Again, today's date  
17 | is July the 14th, 2025.

18 | So my reviews of the record, it looks like there's a  
19 | lot of support especially from those who examined the regulations  
20 | and making recommendations to us. I would ask that the -- unless  
21 | my colleagues disagree, I would ask the applicant be brief, hit  
22 | the highlights, hit the important points, and we'll go from there.

23 | Again, the hearing will be conducted in accordance with  
24 | provisions of 11-Z DCMR Chapter 4 as follows: preliminary  
25 | matters, applicant's case. Applicant has up to 60 minutes, but

1 please keep in mind what I've just mentioned. Report of the  
2 Office of Planning and Department of Transportation.

3 First, though, we'll have a report of other government  
4 agencies. In this case, we'll have the report of ANC and I  
5 believe it's ANC 3E. And then we'll have testimony of  
6 organizations and individuals. Organizations, 5 minutes;  
7 individuals, 3 minutes respectively. We will hear in the order  
8 from those who are in support, opposition and undeclared. Then  
9 we'll have rebuttal and closing by the applicant.

10 At this time, does the staff have any preliminary  
11 matters?

12 MS. SCHELLIN: Very quickly. Proffered expert  
13 witnesses. Most of them -- actually, all of them have been  
14 previously accepted except for one. So if the Commission would  
15 just accept the previously accepted Sarah Alexander, project  
16 architect; Jamie Milanovich, in traffic consulting; Brandice  
17 Elliott, land use and zoning; Kyle Oliver, in planning; and Tim  
18 Bragan is the landscape architect.

19 They have all previously been accepted by the  
20 Commission. If you would accept them, in this case, by general  
21 consensus.

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Are there any objections? Do we  
23 have any objections to that status? We will continue that status.  
24 Let's go with the one, Ms. Schellin.

25 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. And keeping up -- I think every

1 hearing, we mess up at least one name. So there is one other  
2 expert Sunil (phonetic) Charles, civil engineering, and Exhibit  
3 14C, page 10.

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Schellin. I will  
5 have you to know -- and I probably shouldn't say this and I know  
6 you don't mind, because that's what I'm going to say it, but last  
7 week, we didn't have any problems with names. So I'll just leave  
8 it at that.

9 MS. SCHELLIN: Oh, okay. So because I was on vacation,  
10 you didn't have a name problem. Okay. I got you.

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So let me go to my colleagues. And  
12 I believe they're being process. Civil engineer Sunil -- I think  
13 I got it right. Sunil Charles. We'll see. All right. Let me  
14 go to my --

15 Any objections? Do we do civil engineers? I get  
16 confused now with that.

17 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.

18 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: We do. Okay. I see.

19 MS. SCHELLIN: We do.

20 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Ms. Schellin would say yeah.

21 Any objections? I'll give everybody a moment. I'm  
22 looking at heads.

23 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Sorry, Mr. Chairman. Just give  
24 me -- I'd like to take one extra minute, if that's all right.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Sure. No problem. We'll

1 wait.

2 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: All right. Thank you, Mr.  
3 Chairman. It appears as if Mr. Charles here, he is not, in fact,  
4 licensed yet though it's in progress, both in the District of  
5 Columbia and in Maryland. So I know that he has extensive years  
6 of experience here. And I know we often balance both time and  
7 practice as well as registration, which is both equally  
8 important. And there have been instances in the past where,  
9 well, somebody may not be licensed. They have met the time  
10 requirement or vice versa. So I guess, I'm just curious to know  
11 how close Mr. Charles is to passing his PE. If that's a question  
12 we can ask.

13 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah. Let's bring --

14 Ms. Schelling, can we bring the applicant up, counsel  
15 and also, Mr. Charles. We may have some questions.

16 MS. SCHELLIN: Sure.

17 Mr. Young, if you could bring Ms. Shiker up and Mr.  
18 Charles.

19 MS. SHIKER: We'll easily solve this for you. We are  
20 not going to be offering Mr. Charles. We did not believe that  
21 there were any civil issues that we needed to do tonight. So we  
22 can dispose of this. We do not need to discuss whether or not  
23 he would be an expert. Thank you very much.

24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I do see that he has a degree  
25 and some others. I was ready to peruse that and go through that,



1 but thank you. We will take that off the agenda for now, but  
2 thank you Commissioner Imamura.

3 Other than that, do we have any other preliminary  
4 matters, Ms. Schellin?

5 MS. SCHELLIN: Just very briefly. Jonathan Bender  
6 and/or Tom Quinn will be representing ANC 3E. And their report  
7 is at Exhibits 38, 38A in support. OP's reported Exhibit 35 to  
8 approve. DDOT has no objection with some conditions at Exhibit  
9 36, and they do have someone here to testify. Also, we have  
10 someone here from the Office of the Attorney General to testify,  
11 I believe, this evening. And their report in support or  
12 recommending approval at Exhibits 34 through 34B and 47. And  
13 within the OP report, there is a recommendation in support from  
14 DOEE at Exhibit 35, page 29.

15 So I will turn this over to the Commission. Thank you.

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Schellin. We  
17 appreciate it.

18 Ms. Shiker, before you get started, how do you  
19 pronounce Mr. Charles's name? I'm just curious.

20 MS. SHIKER: It's Sunil.

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Okay. I think I was close.

22 Anyway --

23 MS. SHIKER: You are very close.

24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I was. Thank you.

25 It goes to my point.

1 MS. SCHELLIN: That he stumbled over Charles.

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right.

3 MS. SCHELLIN: So the one Z and C, and he stumbled.  
4 Okay. Just saying.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

6 All right. Ms. Shiker, you may begin.

7 MS. SHIKER: Well, thank you.

8 Good afternoon, Chairman Hood, members of the  
9 Commission. My name is Christine Shiker with the law firm of  
10 Holland & Knight representing the applicant. And I'm joined by  
11 Chris Cohen and members of our panel. We have a few people. But  
12 in the interest of keeping our testimony to the highlights, we  
13 will -- after I make an opening statement, we will have Jad  
14 Donohoe from Donohoe Development Company, who, representing the  
15 owner, make a brief statement. Sarah Alexander, the architect,  
16 will then walk through the project. We will leave Ms. Milanovic  
17 for questions that you may have, and we will then go straight to  
18 Ms. Elliot to do a high-level review of the comprehensive plan.

19 Mr. Young, could you please bring up our PowerPoint  
20 presentation at Exhibit 81? Thank you. If you could go to the  
21 next slide.

22 We are here today to present an application for  
23 property located at 4201 Garrison Street, which is just east of  
24 Wisconsin Avenue in Northwest D.C. The requested PUD will permit  
25 the development of a residential building on the site of an

1 existing parking lot that houses a 705-foot-tall television  
2 tower.

3           Next slide please. The project results in a well-  
4 designed infill development containing 126 new residential units,  
5 of which one-third will be reserved for affordable units. This  
6 affordable housing is achieved through a combination of  
7 inclusionary zoning units and affordable housing units under the  
8 HANTA program. The result is 42 units provided at varying levels  
9 of affordability. Specifically, 13 units will be provided  
10 through the IZ program at 50 percent and 60 percent MFI, with  
11 the remaining 29 units reserved for households at or below 80  
12 percent MFI.

13           In addition to meeting the base IZ requirements, the  
14 applicant has committed to providing two three-bedroom units.  
15 One at 50 percent MFI and one at 60 percent MFI. And the applicant  
16 has committed to provide more than twice the base square footage  
17 required at the 50 percent MFI level, leading to greater  
18 affordability. In addition to that, we also have the commitment  
19 of the total 33 percent of the units.

20           Next slide, please. As part of the PUD, the application  
21 request as related zoning map amendment for Lot 810 and a portion  
22 of Lot 809. For this case, the lot configuration and the rezoning  
23 deserves just a moment of explanation. I typically wouldn't have  
24 a detailed slide, but this is a bit unique. So the square, which  
25 is Square 1666, is a record lot comprised of three ANT lots. And

1 that can be seen in the upper photo.

2           Lot 809 is known as 5151 Wisconsin Avenue, and it's  
3 outlined in black in each of the two photos. It extends for the  
4 full length of Harrison Street and all the way south to Garrison.  
5 It has been approved by the Board of Zoning Adjustment in Case  
6 No. 26-38 for the construction of a six-story residential  
7 building, approximately 210 units and ground floor retail.  
8 Building permits have been issued for this building. As shown  
9 in the lower image, the significant majority of Lot 809 is zoned  
10 MU4, with only a very small portion shown in light yellow zoned  
11 R-2.

12           Lot 810 is the more triangular shaped lot and that is  
13 zoned R-2. So the application before you today, requests a  
14 rezoning to RA-3 of all of Lot 810 and a very small portion of  
15 lot R-2 -- excuse me, of Lot 809, which lies immediately to the  
16 west of Lot 810. The area to be rezoned is shown in dark yellow.  
17 The remaining portion of R-2 at the top at the northeast corner  
18 is not being rezoned. This is important because the project only  
19 uses density that is generated from this rezoned portion of the  
20 site. Again, the portion in dark yellow. That is the RA-3  
21 portion, and it results in an FAR of 4.308 based on the lot area  
22 of the RA-3 portion of the of the PUD site.

23           The building, however, will be situated across the  
24 entirety of the PUD site, which is outlined in red. This allows  
25 the project to have a more regular shape and that the density

1 can be spread over a greater area, resulting in more of an  
2 apparent FAR of 3.06. Importantly, it also results in a building  
3 that steps away from the low-density residential areas to the  
4 east.

5           Next slide, please. The project complies with the  
6 development standards for the RA-3 zone. There are only two  
7 small areas of flexibility that we will touch on at a highlight  
8 in our testimony by Ms. Alexander. We've also requested a special  
9 exception for offsite parking, which allows the garage to extend  
10 under that R-2 portion of zoning at the very top for the extension  
11 of the garage. And we have specifically stated how we meet the  
12 standards for that special exception.

13           Next slide, please. The proposed zoning is not  
14 inconsistent with the future land use map, which designates the  
15 site for moderate density residential and mixed-use for medium  
16 residential -- medium density residential and moderate density  
17 commercial. The rezoning is also not inconsistent with the  
18 recently adopted Wisconsin Avenue Development framework plans  
19 designations. And as Ms. Elliott will discuss, this project  
20 furthers many goals of that development framework plan.

21           Next slide, please. We are pleased to have broad  
22 support from the D.C. agencies. In its supportive report, the  
23 Office of Planning did request that we provide additional details  
24 regarding the sustainability aspects of the project, which we  
25 will include in our presentation. DDOT recommended us indicated

1 no objection based on two conditions. The applicant will agree  
2 to those two conditions, which are set forth on page 2 of the  
3 DDOT report. And if there are any questions about that, Ms.  
4 Milanovic is happy to answer those or she can answer any other  
5 transportation related questions.

6 Next slide, please. We are also very pleased to have  
7 strong support from the community on this project. The ANC voted  
8 unanimously to support the project based on an agreed upon MOU.  
9 Mr. Donohoe will talk briefly about that and about the very robust  
10 community engagement process. As you saw, there are many letters  
11 of support in the record. We have over 40 letters of support  
12 filed as of this afternoon. But I think it's very important to  
13 take a moment to note that we did see a letter from the property  
14 owners on the block, the 5100 block of 42nd Street.

15 These are residents immediately across the street, and  
16 the applicant has met many times with nearby neighbors including  
17 residents from this block during the community outreach process  
18 that spanned over 18 months. However, this letter that was filed  
19 yesterday is the first time we've seen this specific list of  
20 questions. Although, many of these issues have been resolved  
21 through other formats. So we've revised our presentation just  
22 to make sure we answer all of those questions and ensure that we  
23 are addressing those concerns as I believe that the neighbors  
24 will be here and that will help them.

25 So with that, I would pass it off to Mr. Donahoe to

1 talk briefly about the community engagement, and then we'll go  
2 to Ms. Alexander. Thank you.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Shiker. Do you know  
4 what exhibit number that is? I must have missed that.

5 MS. SHIKER: It's Exhibit 80.

6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

7 MS. SHIKER: And it is -- it's called witness testimony  
8 of immediately adjacent homeowners. And they listed a variety  
9 of questions at the end of it. So we're going to answer the  
10 significant majority, if not all of those questions through our  
11 testimony today.

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I see it. Thank you.

13 MS. SHIKER: You're welcome.

14 MR. DONOHUE: My name is Jad Donohoe on behalf of the  
15 applicant and on behalf of The Donohoe Companies. Donohoe  
16 Companies is a company that's been in Washington, D.C. Actually,  
17 founded in Washington in 1884 as a real estate company. We've  
18 been an owner -- continuously been an owner of property here in  
19 Friendship Heights for more than 50 years. We are a builder. We  
20 are a developer. We are a manager of residential properties.  
21 We've had extensive engagement on this.

22 Let's go ahead and skip to the next slide if we could.  
23 This is a sample of some of the community engagement we've done  
24 on this property over the last seven years. In fact, engagement  
25 in particular with the ANC goes back even further than that. I'd

1 | like to thank the ANC at this moment for that engagement. And  
2 | in fact, over the last -- more than 10 years, almost 15 years,  
3 | we've had the same two commissioners who have been SMD and chair  
4 | for us over that period of time.

5 |           And that kind of continuity has been really, really  
6 | helpful in getting feedback and learning more about how we can  
7 | meet issues of community interest. So, yeah. This is a  
8 | representative list of some of our meetings with individuals and  
9 | with organizations.

10 |           If we can skip to the next slide, please.

11 |           In particular, we have earned the unanimous support by  
12 | resolution of our ANC. We've also signed a memorandum of  
13 | understanding with them. I believe that has been submitted both  
14 | in this -- in a first version and then end as a signed and  
15 | countersigned version. Among the various things, I am not going  
16 | to go through everything on the slide, but the affordable housing  
17 | is perhaps one of the two signature proffers for this project.  
18 | One-third of all units in the project are going to be designated  
19 | at various levels of affordability 50 percent, 60 percent, and  
20 | 80 percent.

21 |           And that is a product of conversations that we had with  
22 | Office of Planning. But then intensive negotiations that we also  
23 | had with the ANC and with DHCD about that. As you'll learn part  
24 | of that affordable housing component is through a -- what's  
25 | called the HANTA program that DHCD has come up with, as well as



1 other interested groups. In addition, the ANC and others have  
2 weighed in very carefully on other issues, including design  
3 features of the building and transportation commitments for the  
4 operation of the project.

5 Let's go ahead and go to the next slide, please.

6 In addition, there's further parts that are -- that  
7 were part of proffers for that, including improvements to nearby  
8 Fessenden Park through an agreement with DPR, where we will  
9 provide two bocce courts, additional landscaping and the like as  
10 part of that, installation of street trees all around. And then  
11 this is one of the bullet points on here, but perhaps the other  
12 true signature proffer of this project, a proffer that really no  
13 other project would have been able to offer, it's the removal of  
14 that TV tower that we'll talk more about on the site there. That  
15 705-foot-tall TV tower, the second tallest structure in  
16 Washington, D.C. after another tower over on Georgia Ave. So  
17 those being the two things that people have almost universally  
18 expressed interest in affordable housing and the removal of that  
19 TV tower, and then various construction related commitments.

20 Next slide, please. This, in a somewhat different  
21 format, lays out a few more of the different proffers and  
22 amenities that the project provides. Again, I won't try to go  
23 through all, but there's massing that we'll talk about more in  
24 the architecture piece that we consider to be very important to  
25 the project and about how we step down from Wisconsin Avenue.

1 Site planning speaks to that as well. Keeping all those truck  
2 turns off site rather off of those the city streets and the like.  
3 And then the affordable housing component, which includes both  
4 the IZ at 50 and 60 percent in excess of what is otherwise  
5 required of as IZ for projects providing more at 50 percent.

6 And then also providing enough additional units that  
7 we are also able to provide a full one-third of the units as  
8 affordable units. And then various environmental and  
9 sustainability features that were important to both residents and  
10 to the ANC, including all electric in units and green roofs,  
11 solar, et cetera.

12 I think we can we can move ahead to the next slide.  
13 Thanks. Most of these are things that are otherwise addressed  
14 in the MOU. So I'll go ahead and let's move on to the next piece.

15 And now, I'll turn it over to our architect, Sarah  
16 Alexander.

17 MS. ALEXANDER: Thank you. Good afternoon.

18 Can everyone hear me okay? All right. Well, as you  
19 can see here, this is our site in context. We paid a lot of  
20 attention to the neighborhood and the surrounding area when we  
21 were designing this building. It is in that unique site where  
22 it's a transition between the commercial corridor on Wisconsin  
23 Avenue and the single-family homes to our east. So we wanted to  
24 make sure that our building addressed that transition in a  
25 sensitive way.

1           To our west, we do have the 5151 permitted building,  
2 which is a six-story building plus penthouse, and then the 5101,  
3 five-story office building. And then to our north and east,  
4 there's primarily two to three story residential homes. And to  
5 our south, they're a little bit taller, three to three and a half  
6 story, some adjacent condo, townhouse-style homes. So all of  
7 that comprising -- there is an institutional use of the Church  
8 of Saint Louis directly to our east as well, but primarily single  
9 family homes. So making sure the massing of our building was  
10 respectful of that. As we go through, you'll see how we did  
11 that.

12           Next slide, please. So this is standing on 42nd,  
13 looking toward the north. Our project is the four different  
14 colored facades as you see marching up the hill. We did that  
15 intentionally when we wanted it to seem like it wasn't one large  
16 building descending upon the neighborhood, but instead inspired  
17 by the Wardman historical style you find throughout D.C. A series  
18 of smaller, more sensitively scaled buildings that knit together  
19 and enter the neighborhood in a really sensitive way.

20           So some of the things we use that would help it even  
21 further break down the scale or the element of the roof, which  
22 brings down that apparent heights of the brackets, the detailing,  
23 the horizontal banding, the bays, which you can see drop the  
24 building an additional story and then just the character of the  
25 proportion of the windows. They're very residential in nature.

1 It's an all-glass building or something that would really be  
2 jarring in this residential context. It's something that really  
3 does seem like it was intentionally placed here.

4 We also see how -- by doing these individual pavilions  
5 with the bays and the smaller increments, that rhythm of the  
6 building heights and the building elements is sympathetic to the  
7 rhythm of the five residential and the church across the street  
8 on 42nd. So it's not creating a wall on that street. The  
9 original plan that was in the Office of Planning report did have  
10 a more U-shaped building with the courtyard facing towards the  
11 west, which would have actually separated the other property  
12 owned by Mr. Donohoe.

13 A little bit more and given a little more light and air  
14 to that building, but it was decided that instead of doing that  
15 approach, we would create the courtyard spacing for a second, so  
16 that that light and air would better be able to access to the  
17 adjacent homes. And we would concentrate our height and our  
18 penthouse height and everything on the western side, which you'll  
19 see as we move forward. There is 15-foot change in grade, which  
20 you can see in this image as you go from Garrison up to Harrison.  
21 And that is important when you're seeing the relative elements  
22 of the building. So you'll see that as we move through.

23 Next slide, please. So here, you're standing on  
24 Harrison Street looking towards the west. Just on the little  
25 right-hand side, you can see a bit of 5151. That's the permitted

1 building, the gray piece there, slightly taller than our project  
2 here. And you can see, because of that 15-foot change in grade,  
3 we've really gone from what appears to be a five-story building  
4 to really a three and a half story building with the penthouse  
5 beyond. So having that building kind of nestled into the hillside  
6 that way.

7           We're still employing the same device as you saw in the  
8 previous slide of the roofs, the bays, the brackets, the  
9 horizontal banding, the individual elements all breaking down  
10 that building into smaller increments in a more residential  
11 style. So that continues up on this side as well. Here, we did  
12 employ balconies in addition facing the north and that larger  
13 setback that we have on the north.

14           Next please. So this is our garage level in residential  
15 lobby level. The reason it kind of looks dark and hazy on the  
16 top is that the building kind of going into the hillside. So  
17 where you see that darker color is where it goes below grade. So  
18 we are fully exposed on the very southern portion, and it pretty  
19 much immediately starts to dive into the hillside from Garrison  
20 as it moves up 42nd. But we did want to make sure we activated  
21 Garrison. And so, we did locate our lobby entry and our amenities  
22 on that street. So that you could really start to bring some  
23 activity to that street.

24           We made sure the garage is fully below grade. You'll  
25 see that. And our loading and trash and garage entry are all

1 off of the private drive, which is north, south, immediate to the  
2 west of our building. And that pulls off of the private drive  
3 that was established with the permitting of 5101. So there are  
4 shared private drive.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Ms. Alexander, hold tight for a  
6 second. Let me ask my colleagues.

7 Is anybody having a problem hearing her or are we okay?  
8 Are you all having a problem hearing her?

9 Okay. All right. You can keep going.

10 MS. ALEXANDER: I can speak louder if you're having  
11 problems.

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: No, no. You got it. You got it  
13 very well hooked up now. You're good. Thank you.

14 MS. ALEXANDER: Okay. Great. Okay. So we are  
15 providing 82 parking spaces, 42 bike parking spaces, and of those  
16 bike parking spaces, we are providing the larger size for the e-  
17 bikes as well.

18 Next please. So here, you can see our really first  
19 level that's completely above grade. So you have the individual  
20 four pavilions. You have the 126 all electric units. They're  
21 all of the energy is electrical for all those units. We have a  
22 mixture of junior ones through three bedrooms. So we are offering  
23 some of the larger three-bedroom type units, which we've heard  
24 is a high demand in -- just general in the city. You can see  
25 that adjacent context of those five residential and the church

1 being the southernmost on that 42nd Street, east side of 42nd  
2 Street. How we, on our four pavilions, helped to emulate that  
3 rhythm. And I think that's really it for this one. Thank you.

4           And then our penthouse level. I think this pretty  
5 clearly shows how we have concentrated the height on that western  
6 portion of the site. It is due to the setbacks. I did -- that's  
7 why I skipped over. On the north side, we have a 21-foot setback  
8 from the property line adjacent to Garrison. On the eastern  
9 side, we have a 15-foot setback on 42nd. And on the southern  
10 side, there's a wider right of way and then a setback across the  
11 street. So with all of that, we're about an average of 90 feet  
12 away from any of our adjacent buildings just to our building  
13 face.

14           And then beyond that, we have setback 28 feet from the  
15 northern side to our penthouse, 36 feet from our -- the edge of  
16 our building plus that 15 feet. So really about 50 feet from  
17 our property line to our penthouse from the 42nd Street side and  
18 then another 18 feet from the south. So again, pulling that  
19 height as far as we could away from the adjacent neighborhood --  
20 neighbors to make sure that we were able to be as sensitive as  
21 we could.

22           That did result in us asking for relief on the western  
23 side because we are not showing a setback there at all. But  
24 that's the side that abuts our permitted 5151 residential  
25 commercial building and the adjacent building. So we felt the

1 | hype being generated in that location was the best location for  
2 | the height.

3 |           There is a small other amenity and rooftop terrace on  
4 | the southern portion, the southern pavilion, which you can see  
5 | here in yellow and that little kind of white hatched area. And  
6 | that would provide some amenity space for the residents. It will  
7 | be restricted for use after 10 p.m., so it should not be  
8 | disruptive to anyone in the neighborhood. And there are green  
9 | roofs shown in all locations possible as one of our sustainability  
10 | measures.

11 |           Next, please. And here, you can see a little bit more  
12 | of our upper roof plan with the green roof in all locations  
13 | possible.

14 |           Next. So this is really taking that rendering you saw  
15 | and showing you the elevation of it. So you can see those four  
16 | individual pavilions, each with their own character but  
17 | respectful of each other and harmonious. We feel like in their  
18 | design with each other. We have employed, like I mentioned  
19 | before, the bays, the very facade design pavilions. They have  
20 | shown entry stoops for the units along the street so we can  
21 | activate the street. There's also a connection between the  
22 | courtyards, which are for residential use and the street, but  
23 | there's a connection there.

24 |           But that allows the project to wrap -- to really  
25 | articulate itself along that streetscape in a way we feel is



1 really appropriate for the context and neighborhood. You can  
2 also see the change in grade across the site. In terms of the  
3 building height measuring point, this is important. One of the  
4 concerns we heard was regarding the building height measure --  
5 or the building height. We have measured our building at the  
6 middle of this facade. So the top of the screen. The middle of  
7 that frontage on 42nd. So the 50 foot 3 is measured from the  
8 grade at the middle of that frontage. And then that's 10 houses  
9 obviously, in addition to that setback, as I mentioned  
10 previously.

11 On the bottom of the slide, you see the private drive  
12 facade. So that really is facing the buildings immediately to  
13 the adjacent alley. But we did make sure to wrap the facade  
14 character a good distance back on either corner, so that that  
15 building will feel as a complete building when viewed from the  
16 street.

17 Next slide, please. And then here, this is, I think,  
18 helpful because you see a little bit of the context on either  
19 side. So the top slide here shows our Garrison Street facade.  
20 And you can see the 5151 and 5101 buildings on the left. And  
21 you can also see the Church of Saint Louis highlight and white  
22 on the right. So you can really see how our project does relate  
23 in character and scale sensitively to those elements.

24 And then on the bottom, similarly, you see residential  
25 homes on the left, our facade in the middle, and then the 5151

1 building to the right. So the relationship, all of those  
2 elements.

3 And I did want to ask if you were able to pull up A07  
4 of our PUD document. I could go through some of the street  
5 sections, if that's possible.

6 MS. SHIKER: Sarah, I think you did testify to that.  
7 Why don't we wait and we can finish up our presentation, and then  
8 we can see if the Commission has any questions and we can pull  
9 that up at that time, if that's okay, Chairman Hood.

10 MS. ALEXANDER: No problem.

11 Okay. Then the last thing, really quickly, we have the  
12 materials for the project. We did pick different color bricks  
13 for each of the buildings and different window colors to try and  
14 add to the authenticity of the different building identities.  
15 And you can see those in the next page as well. And then the  
16 final page. And then for landscape, I can go to a brief element  
17 of that.

18 If you go to the next slide, please. Next.

19 All right. So this is the landscape approach for our  
20 project, which is intended to enhance the pedestrian experience  
21 and to help blend and project -- the project into the surrounding  
22 neighborhood. So all of the streetscapes include a 6-foot-wide  
23 sidewalk with street planting zones and are in line with those  
24 throughout the neighborhood. We have a generous planting zone  
25 between the sidewalk and our building facades, ranging from 10

1 to 21 feet, which include decorative planting, rain gardens, and  
2 a variety of canopy and ornamental trees.

3 And there's a wide entry walk on Garrison that provides  
4 access to our main entrance and a smaller paved walk on Harrison.  
5 And nestled between the planted areas of several residential  
6 scale walkways, providing access to individual units along 42nd  
7 and Harrison Streets.

8 Next, please. And the trees and planting around the  
9 building are enhancing the streetscape experience while buffering  
10 areas and providing privacy for the units.

11 Next. We have the three small courtyards, which are  
12 intended for use by the residents, which face Garrison Street,  
13 face 42nd Street. Each courtyard includes several small terraces  
14 for residents and adjacent units, and all the courtyards are  
15 planted in order to enhance views from the streetscape.

16 Next one, please. And lastly, the planting palette  
17 throughout the project, which includes a variety of native plants  
18 related to the scale and character of the surrounding  
19 neighborhood while providing year-round seasonal interest. Thank  
20 you.

21 MS. ELLIOTT: Good afternoon. Good afternoon.

22 MS. SCHELLIN: All right. I think we had a little bit  
23 of feedback. I think we're okay now.

24 MS. SHIKER: I think you're going to need to unmute  
25 yourself. Will do mine.

1 MS. ELLIOTT: Okay.

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: If everybody else can go on mute, I  
3 think Ms. Elliot will be just fine. If all of the rest of us go  
4 unmute.

5 MS. ELLIOTT: Yeah. Can everyone hear me? Only one  
6 time now? Okay.

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.

8 MS. ELLIOTT: Thank you. I feel like there's always,  
9 always a trial and error. Okay.

10 Good afternoon, Chair Hood, members of the Commission.  
11 My name is Brandice Elliott. And for a change, I'm pleased that  
12 my name wasn't the troublemaker today. So I'm going to be walking  
13 through how the project meets the PED standard of review, delivers  
14 meaningful public benefits and mitigates potential impacts  
15 through careful design and planning.

16 As stated previously, we're going to provide a high  
17 level of presentation here. That said, I'm happy to walk through  
18 any additional slides and answer any questions when we get to  
19 that point.

20 So Mr. Young, I'm going to be asking you to skip around  
21 a little bit for me. And if you wouldn't mind, could you go to  
22 Slide No. 38, please.

23 This is about the FLUM. We're going to be talking a  
24 little bit about density. This site is designated for moderate  
25 density residential at 1.8 FAR, and mixed-use, medium density

1 residential and moderate density commercial. Both allow density  
2 of up to 4.0.

3           The proposed R-A3 zone, when it is implemented through  
4 PUD with IZ, aligns with these designations. The project's FAR  
5 of 4.308, which averages at 3.06 across the site is within the  
6 FLUM's range and it supports a smooth transition to the adjacent  
7 lower density neighborhood.

8           Next slide, please. We're going to continue talking  
9 about how the R-A3 zone is not inconsistent. I think one thing  
10 that we all can agree on is that the existing R-2 zone is  
11 inconsistent, is a low-density designation. The proposed R-3  
12 zone, however, allows a base density of 3.6 FAR with inclusionary  
13 zoning and then a higher 4.32 FAR through the PUD process. This  
14 range falls between the comp plan's guidance for moderate density  
15 residential, which again is the 1.8, and the mixed-use  
16 designations, which allows up to 4.0.

17           So importantly, the comp plan allows flexibility for  
18 PUDs and projects with IZ. And it states that zones other than  
19 those listed in the framework may apply. Additionally, the  
20 comprehensive plan also permits higher density on parts of the  
21 site, so as long as the overall FAR stays within the limits of  
22 the land use designation then that would be acceptable to the  
23 comp plan. This project, proposed FAR of 4.308 includes bonus  
24 density from IZ and the PUD, and it's average FAR of 3.06 across  
25 the site fits within the FLUM's intended range for PUD with IZ.

1           Next slide, please. Continuing with this -- the R-A3  
2 zone not being inconsistent, the comp plan explains that the  
3 purpose of a PUD is to allow greater flexibility than matter of  
4 right zoning, such as increased height or density. So when a  
5 project delivers high quality benefit -- excuse me, high quality  
6 public benefits and supports public health, safety, welfare and  
7 convenience, then that is what is anticipated in exchange for the  
8 height or density.

9           It also emphasizes that the PUD public benefits should  
10 directly address the district's most pressing challenges. And  
11 among these, the creation of new affordable housing beyond what  
12 is legally required is identified as a top priority. So this  
13 proposed PUD uses that zoning flexibility to deliver long term  
14 public benefits, most notably by dedicating 33 percent of the  
15 residential units to affordable housing. This level of  
16 affordability, targeting households earning 50, 60 and 80 percent  
17 MFI would not be possible without the additional density allowed  
18 through the PED process.

19           This project also includes other significant benefits  
20 that haven't gotten quite as much attention, including the high-  
21 quality design and the removal of the 705-foot television tower.  
22 This project also advances key housing goals that are outlined  
23 in several plans and reports, including Housing Equity Report,  
24 the Rock Creek West Roadmap, and the Wisconsin Avenue Development  
25 Framework. These plans all call for increased housing and

1 affordable housing in this part of the district. So the R-A3  
2 zone helps to meet these policy goals while maintaining the  
3 intents of moderate and medium density residential areas, which  
4 is to reinforce neighborhood character, walkable neighborhoods,  
5 stable residential areas, and improvements to the overall  
6 environment.

7           Next slide, please. So we just have a quick note on  
8 this one. The proposed 4.308 FAR is less than the maximum that's  
9 permitted for a PUD, and the apparent FAR is consistent with the  
10 matter of right. These projects would only be using 50 feet  
11 through -- excuse me. This project would only be using 50 feet  
12 3 inches of height, which is less than the matter of right height  
13 of 60 feet and the allowable PED height of 75 feet.

14           Mr. Young, can we skip to Slide 44, please?

15           So now, we're just going to go into a little bit of  
16 detail about the framework. I do believe this is the first case  
17 that you all have reviewed using the framework. So you know, I  
18 have to introduce it a little bit, I think. So the purpose of  
19 the framework was to provide further guidance on how to implement  
20 the comp plan changes for the Wisconsin Avenue corridor, and  
21 particularly, how to provide more housing and affordable housing.

22           The subject property is specifically identified in the  
23 framework as part of a concept to break down larger blocks with  
24 pedestrian connections and to activate vacant spaces, of which  
25 this is one in Friendship Heights. The proposed PUD mirrors a

1 | concept in the framework that shows potential development as a  
2 | transition between Wisconsin Avenue and the lower density on 42nd  
3 | Street.

4 |           Next slide, please. So there is a two-zone strategy  
5 | on this property. The PUD site spans both the Friendship -- the  
6 | proposed Friendship Heights transition zone to the east and then  
7 | the mixed-use corridor zone to the west. On the east side, where  
8 | we have the transition zone, it's intended to be a moderate  
9 | density residential. The framework recommends 50 feet of height  
10 | plus penthouse. And the PUD matches this with 50 feet, 3 inches,  
11 | plus an 18.5 feet penthouse. The FAR recommendation for this  
12 | side is 2.16.

13 |           Now on the west side, which is the mixed-use corridor  
14 | zone, that's intended to be medium density mixed-use closer to  
15 | Wisconsin Avenue. And for this zone, the framework recommends a  
16 | height of 75 feet plus penthouse and then FAR 5.4. So the PUD  
17 | proposes a lower FAR of 4.308 for the property and the 3.06 across  
18 | the full site. The higher density allows for the PUD to exceed  
19 | affordable housing goals that are also recommended by the  
20 | development framework, which allows it to maximize affordable  
21 | housing at varying levels of affordability. The project's bulk  
22 | and scale is also consistent with what is illustrated in the  
23 | development framework. So it meets the expectations of both  
24 | proposed zones.

25 |           Next slide, please. All right. So the development



1 framework supports higher density for the PUDs. The proposed FAR  
2 of 4.308 falls within the range of density specified in the  
3 proposed zones, which is 2.16 and 5.4. And the project's outcomes  
4 advance the development frameworks goals of housing, affordable  
5 housing, equitable growth, and neighborhood compatibility.

6 We're going to be skipping ahead again, Mr. Young, to  
7 Slide No. 59, which is the balancing test. We want to be able  
8 to hit on the requirements of the PUD and demonstrate that we  
9 are -- we're complying with those. So the balancing test -- for  
10 the balancing test I think that we have demonstrated within the  
11 record. The documents that have already been submitted and as  
12 well as within this presentation that the proposed PUD is not  
13 inconsistent with the racial equity lens, the future land use  
14 map, generalized policy map, the elements of the comp plan, the  
15 Wisconsin Avenue Development Framework. I think we can also add  
16 the housing equity report in there.

17 The project results in no unacceptable impacts. And  
18 any of the effects are either beneficial, mitigatable or  
19 justified by the proposed benefits package, which was discussed  
20 earlier by Jad. And it does deliver robust benefits. The project  
21 does include a related zoning map amendment to support the  
22 proposed development, and it requests minor flexibility for  
23 penthouse side setback on the west elevation and rear yard  
24 requirement along the PUD site boundary.

25 So when you're looking at these scales, we suggest that

1 | these elements all satisfy the balancing test because the public  
2 | benefits, amenities, and the alignment with the adopted plans  
3 | outweigh the development incentives and zoning flexibility that  
4 | has been requested.

5 |           And I believe we were going to skip ahead to the  
6 | conclusion, Slide No. 66, where I'll just summarize that in  
7 | conclusion. This PUD offers a well-balanced, policy-aligned  
8 | proposal that delivers meaningful public benefits particularly  
9 | when it comes to affordable housing while respecting the  
10 | neighborhood context. And that concludes my presentation. I'll  
11 | turn it back over to Christy.

12 |           MS. SHIKER: Thank you. And just a couple of final  
13 | points to address some of the questions that were in the letter  
14 | that I mentioned. There was a question about whether a PUD map  
15 | amendment could be used for matter of right development. And it  
16 | is -- we all understand that a PUD map amendment is only available  
17 | to implement an approved PUD plan. And if there are any changes  
18 | to that PUD, the applicant must return to the Zoning Commission  
19 | for review and approval. And secondly, a PUD is not good forever.  
20 | It is only good for two years by which time a building permit  
21 | application must be filed, or the Zoning Commission considers a  
22 | time extension application.

23 |           So those are just two of the final questions that have  
24 | been asked. And so therefore, based on our testimony herein and  
25 | the reports of the district agencies, we believe that the

1 applicant meets the standard of review for PUD and related zoning  
2 map amendment. And we would request that the Zoning Commission  
3 approve the application. We're happy to answer any questions  
4 that you have. Thank you.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Shiker. I do have a  
6 quick question before I go to Commissioner Imamura.

7 On the letter from the neighbors, I was reviewing it,  
8 and I think it's -- some thoughtful questions and concerns and  
9 very polite and I appreciate that. But have you all had a chance  
10 to kind of answer some of those questions to them, or have you  
11 all been meeting with them, or to give them some kind of  
12 assurances, or have you had a chance to respond? That's all I  
13 need.

14 MS. SHIKER: So we only received the letter yesterday.  
15 It was just filed in the record yesterday. Over the past 18  
16 months, Jad and his team have met with many of these neighbors.  
17 I believe the neighbor who authored the letter is a newer  
18 neighborhood, but we have presented to the ANC. This is the  
19 first time -- and Jad, if you want to mention a couple other  
20 things that you've done, you've met with others on this block,  
21 but this is the first time we've heard from this neighbor in all  
22 of the different outreach.

23 MR. DONOHOE: Yeah. As I said, we've been meeting with  
24 the neighborhood, both individually and under the ANC for going  
25 on about seven years now on this block. And we have made changes

1 based both on ANC interests including providing, you know,  
2 finding out ways to maximize the amount of both housing and  
3 affordable housing in those locations. It's not lost on us that  
4 Rock Creek West is the one planning area, which has done the  
5 least both on housing and affordable housing to meet the goals  
6 that the district has set out for each planning area.

7 But more specifically have had conversations with  
8 individual neighbors that led to some very fine-grained changes  
9 for one, things like a 10 p.m. limitation on use of the roof  
10 deck. But also from the beginning, informed kind of the overall  
11 massing of the project, doing things as Christy mentioned, like  
12 presenting the courtyards onto the 42nd Street facade so that  
13 that openness and that porosity faces that that side of the  
14 project rather than being internal to the project.

15 Other changes we've made, we've tried to balance  
16 people's concerns about lots of other issues including parking,  
17 green and low impact design elements that we've incorporated  
18 throughout the project. And in general, tried to create something  
19 that that fits in with the neighborhood. Another thing not  
20 mentioned that was of interest to some neighbors was creating  
21 some sense that it's connected to the neighborhood. One of the  
22 things we did with regard to that was along 42nd and Harrison  
23 Street.

24 We have individual units that have front stoops and the  
25 ability to walk out directly into the neighborhood so that they

1 | feel like they are better knit into the neighborhood rather than  
2 | just being, you know, if you would, the backside of a larger  
3 | building.

4 |           So those are among the things, I would say, the one  
5 | thing that every single person asked me about was, are you going  
6 | to be able to take down that tower. That is, as an owner, I  
7 | would say local landmark, but yeah, it's -- it is an eyesore.  
8 | I'll give you that. So removal of the tower is one of the real  
9 | signature things that we're able to do here in addition to the  
10 | provision of one-third of all units as affordable housing.

11 |           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So let's talk about the tower.  
12 | Because I've been involved with that tower now for some years.  
13 | Are we going to relocate it, or is technology -- to the point  
14 | where we can do away with the tower. What's going on with the  
15 | tower?

16 |           MR. DONOHUE: Yeah. So Commissioner Hood, the  
17 | situation with the tower is that the Donohoe Companies now does  
18 | own this property. The previous tenant, which was Fox Channel 5  
19 | and going back really far, the headquarters of Metromedia. If  
20 | you can remember when that was a small independent outlet that  
21 | was there -- that was where Wash-FM was broadcast from. That was  
22 | where Fox 5 was broadcast from. And at least one additional  
23 | local outlet besides that Fox Channel 5 has moved on to brand  
24 | new offices up the street in Bethesda. And they now broadcast  
25 | off of a tower over on River Road, that used to be that -- and

1 still is where they broadcast Channel 20 from.

2 If I'm taking you back too far, stop me. But long and  
3 short of it is, is that the Donohoe Companies owns this property  
4 free and clear now. And as part of the planning and as part of  
5 the proffers for this, we would be removing that tower in full  
6 and not rebuilding it or replacing it elsewhere in the district.

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I will tell you. Somebody who's  
8 involved with that with a current council member now, and that  
9 discussion going on between Ward 5, they wanted to put it in Ward  
10 5. And that was a big issue then, and that was about 10 years  
11 or so, that may predate some of this, but I just want to make  
12 sure that's -- but I'm glad to hear what you said. I'm not going  
13 to go into that, but I'm glad to hear what you said on that.

14 Ms. Shiker, I do have one other question before I go  
15 to Commissioner Imamura. I do have some other ones after that.  
16 I see Mr. Cohen here. Is he here getting experience? Is he  
17 going to be test -- I mean, is he going to be presenting soon?  
18 He used to work with us, and I'm just curious. I'm always  
19 interested in the -- what people are doing as they leave and how  
20 good they're doing. So I'm just going to ask you in public.  
21 What is he doing? Is he going to soon be the one presenting?

22 MS. SHIKER: He is. He is doing a fantastic job. So  
23 you will soon see him. And I will say, I think the BZA sees him  
24 fairly often presenting here. So he will be presenting before  
25 you, Chairman, in no time at all.

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Well, that's one strike. He  
2 went to the BZA first Mr. Cohen, but I won't hold that against  
3 you.

4 Okay. Commissioner Imamura?

5 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: All right. Thank you, Mr.  
6 Chairman.

7 So I've got a couple questions, a few comments. Mr.  
8 Donohoe building off your comment about the TV tower, I imagine  
9 other property owners, property developers wish they had a tower  
10 to remove, because that's a great starting point for community  
11 outreach to say you're going to remove this tower. So I imagine  
12 that was probably just a great start for your community outreach  
13 and made everything much easier after that. So briefly, Ms.  
14 Elliot, thank you for walking us through the Wisconsin Avenue  
15 Development Framework. That was very helpful.

16 Let's see, Ms. Alexander, I guess most of my comments  
17 focus on the architecture. And Holland & Knight did a great job  
18 in prepping you. I noticed that you had talked a little bit  
19 about rhythm different iterations that you had gone through.  
20 Those are things that are always of interest to me. You went  
21 through setbacks and talked a little bit about sensitivity of  
22 height. Appreciated the elevations or the site sections. I  
23 think there was some additional slides that you had wanted to  
24 refer to.

25 I'm not opposed to pulling those up if we can to giving

1 the public a little additional time or visual here to demonstrate  
2 how this sits within the context of the neighborhood. Is that  
3 something that we can do? Which slides did we -- did you want  
4 to pull up, Ms. Alexander?

5 MS. ALEXANDER: The architectural plans.

6 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Great.

7 MS. ALEXANDER: Thank you.

8 So would you like me to just walk through these?

9 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Just go ahead. I know that you  
10 prepped for this, and certainly happy to hear what you had  
11 prepared, Ms. Alexander.

12 MS. ALEXANDER: Sure. Hopefully, you guys can see  
13 this, but the dimensions are pretty important. Essentially, we  
14 have the right of ways of each of the streets listed, and then  
15 we have the setbacks as well. So the total width of that street  
16 is shown. And the first image is of Garrison Street. So that  
17 is the southernmost street. That's where the building is at its  
18 tallest. And you can see the adjacent homes across the street  
19 are also a little taller on that street, and we are about 87 feet  
20 building phase to building phase at the closest parts on that  
21 street, which is a pretty good distance given we are only about,  
22 I think 59 feet to the parapet at that location.

23 Then moving to the right image that is at Harrison  
24 Street. Our building has stepped down and so has our contextual  
25 building, so they're both shorter. We were about 38 feet, I



1 believe, at that side. And then our distance is about 93. It's  
2 a little hard to read on my screen, but that's what I remember.

3 And then going down on the bottom image, that is on  
4 42nd Street. This is actually cutting through the courtyard. So  
5 again, making those courtyards had a big impact on the street.  
6 But even that the building face, given the 15-foot setback, the  
7 right of way and the setback across the street were still greater  
8 than 90 feet setback from those adjacent residences. And this  
9 one is cutting through one of the homes across the street from  
10 us. So you can just get a sense of the scale of the relationship  
11 and how we were trying to be as sensitive and contextual as we  
12 could.

13 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Terrific. Thank you. That's  
14 exactly what I wanted to hear and see. So I appreciate the  
15 additional explanation. This project is certainly laudable with  
16 a number of benefits here. Of course, the three-bedroom at 50  
17 and 60 percent. A total of nine three-bedrooms, 33 percent  
18 affordable housing is just remarkable. All electric.

19 Did I understand that right? This is all electric?

20 MS. ALEXANDER: The units are all electric, correct.

21 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: The units are all electric.  
22 Very good. I'm curious. And LEED Silver. I did see that.  
23 You're awfully close to LEED Gold. So what would it take to pull  
24 you over for that point and a half? I thought I saw a 58 somewhere  
25 around there, close to 60. So what would it take to pull you

1 over to LEED Gold?

2 MS. ALEXANDER: I think we have every intention of  
3 trying to reach there. We just didn't want to make promises we  
4 wouldn't be able to keep. So the goal was really to ensure that  
5 we endeavored to do that, but the promise was LEED Silver.

6 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Okay. Well, you're resting  
7 pretty well at LEED Silver for sure. Would like to see you  
8 achieve LEED Gold. I'm cheering for you all to do that. Working  
9 across, I guess, this would be a comment just for the entire  
10 project team working across agencies DCH, HCD, DPR, the bocce  
11 courts. Right. What a great amenity there.

12 Just kind of going through some of my notes. I think  
13 how you broke up the bays was really successful. In fact, one  
14 of the perspectives I originally thought that maybe that was --  
15 when I first took a look at this project and I think that might  
16 have been the very first perspective I saw of this project, I  
17 originally thought -- and I saw the 15-foot grade change, which  
18 is pretty significant. But I think it's successful because I  
19 thought it was a different project at first. But the way it was  
20 rendered then I looked and I thought, oh, wait a minute.

21 What then that led to a curiosity about how your  
22 materials transition into those courtyards, sort of against that  
23 plane that runs the entire length of the site. So just curious,  
24 if you could just describe for me -- because I didn't see that  
25 in any of the elevations or any of the perspectives, really.

1           And I would say the one comment that I have are the  
2 three courtyards. I would like the landscape architect to have  
3 a minute to -- for a little bit of shine on the landscape. The  
4 plans were too small in scale. And while the courtyards  
5 themselves really and the programing is rather simple, there's  
6 more to it than that. And would have been great to see some  
7 larger blown-up plans for that and then some perspectives, Ms.  
8 Alexander.

9           Just to see where -- how that material changes that  
10 transition as it wraps around the corners would have been great.  
11 So I'm just -- so that's something perhaps that you might be able  
12 to touch on a little bit and articulate.

13           MS. ALEXANDER: Sure.

14           COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: That material looks like along  
15 that long elevation -- that long plane.

16           MS. ALEXANDER: Correct. Similar to how it transitions  
17 at the private drive side, our intention is that that facade  
18 would wrap interior to the courtyard back to that plane. That  
19 is the kind of setback courtyard façade. And so complete itself,  
20 almost as if they were four buildings got linked at a later point  
21 by a newer addition that brought them all together.

22           COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Okay. Very good.  
23 Architecturally, I don't have a lot of other comments or  
24 questions, which I think is probably a good thing from my notes  
25 here.

1           But I would like Mr. Bragan to talk a little bit about  
2 the three courtyards. What those look like seasonally. I know  
3 that your plant palette looks pretty similar to all the other  
4 plant palettes that we see. I would like to know a little bit  
5 about your involvement, perhaps maybe in the green roof. And  
6 then either you or Ms. Alexander talk a little bit about what's  
7 unique or exceptional about some of your sustainability goals or  
8 features here that might not -- rather than sort of just the  
9 standard here. What is exceptional about this project?

10           MR. BRAGAN: Well, thanks for asking and letting me  
11 have a chance to speak about the landscape a little bit. I  
12 appreciate that. I guess I'd start with the -- let's start with  
13 the easy one, which is the plant palette, I guess. And as you  
14 probably know, we're often threading quite a few needles in terms  
15 of criteria both in terms of city requirements and maintenance  
16 as well as using native plants as much as possible. We like to  
17 think about biodiversity and how we can support native  
18 pollinators and other insects and animals like that.

19           So I tend to agree. There is kind of an agreed upon  
20 sort of family of plant materials that we often end up using.  
21 Happy to push that a bit, but also stay within what's reasonable  
22 and what's acceptable. So I think there's those criteria. And  
23 then also trying to find materials that do provide seasonal  
24 interest year-round. Again, pretty standard idea. It's not  
25 always that easy to pull off.

1           And we do have, I think a good palette here. We're  
2 dealing with at grade planting, stormwater management planting,  
3 and some on structure as well. So there's some pretty challenging  
4 conditions there. And I think the ones that we've sort of chosen  
5 as a family here address those various conditions pretty well.  
6 But we can certainly develop that as we move forward.

7           The courtyards are another interesting and challenging  
8 aspects of the project. Just worth noting there on structure on  
9 top of a parking garage, which is something that we see quite  
10 often in the districts, but it's an important condition and set  
11 of criteria. So I guess to kind of bridge from planting. The  
12 notion is to plant them as lushly as we can, given that criteria  
13 both provide some level of privacy for the units there. Right.  
14 There are residential units that circle or that exist on the  
15 edges of those. And also provide visual relief and enhance the  
16 streetscape as people walk by. So we envision a range of sort  
17 of shrubs and small trees in those areas. I think you can see  
18 some of that in the plan.

19           But the other component is, is how they're used, right.  
20 And I think we were really trying to think about how we can make  
21 them feel like they're part of the neighborhood, but  
22 typologically, they are kind of different from what's happening  
23 across the street, right. So how do you find a way of encouraging  
24 those residents that are in the units to use those spaces in an  
25 appropriate way.

1           I think Sarah mentioned that there are small stoops and  
2 terraces associated with individual units to encourage engagement  
3 with the neighborhood, having people use those edges and sort of  
4 feeling like that's -- like they're part of the neighborhood is  
5 an important component. But also, not encourage intensive use  
6 that might be inappropriate on a residential street. So we think  
7 we've done a good job of, again, sort of use expressions threading  
8 that needle of providing activation at an appropriate level, and  
9 then planting and making sure they feel lush. I think it's  
10 important to the way the building functions. Also, that there  
11 is quite a bit of planting around it to help break down the scale.  
12 And we talked about canopy trees as well as ornamental trees in  
13 that zone, but that there's also planting in the courtyards to  
14 help reinforce the sort of rhythm of the massing that that Sarah's  
15 team has developed.

16           Did that answer?

17           COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes, it does. I appreciate the  
18 compelling response there. And I'm certainly supportive of this  
19 PUD and look forward to hearing what my peers have to say about  
20 it. But I wish it would have been great to see some larger plans  
21 to highlight the landscape plan a bit more. I'm always looking  
22 to see how the architect and the landscape architect are working  
23 together. I'd also like to ask your level of involvement in  
24 stormwater management with your civil and certainly hope that you  
25 were involved in that as well.

1           MR. BRAGAN: Absolutely. We worked -- we've actually  
2 worked with Sunil on a number of projects and the rest of the  
3 design team. And in fact, he mentioned the 15-foot grade change  
4 on the site, and we're working with rain gardens. So sort of  
5 how to -- we worked pretty carefully at the grading at this point  
6 to make sure that those are functional and that they fit pretty  
7 seamlessly. It's not the easiest thing. But we were, in fact,  
8 very careful to look at the grading with Sunil, the civil and  
9 his team, to make sure we didn't have to build too many or  
10 really -- very many at all additional retaining walls to  
11 accommodate stormwater. So the thinking is that those stormwater  
12 structures, which are rain gardens on 42nd Street are just that  
13 rain gardens with sloped edges not -- with as few sort of  
14 retaining walls as possible, but retaining that character. So  
15 anyway, short answer is yes, we did work closely with Sunil.

16           COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: No, that's great. That's  
17 terrific. Thank you. Those are the things that I like to hear.  
18 And again, I wish we could have seen more of those -- more  
19 drawings to highlight some of that work, that important work.  
20 That said, I'm pleased to hear that the project team was well  
21 integrated here. And it shows. It comes through in your design  
22 solution. I appreciate it. I don't think that I have any other  
23 questions, no, from my notes.

24           So Mr. Chairman, I yield back and applaud the design  
25 team and their work.

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

2 Commissioner Wright, any questions, comments?

3 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: I really have a lot of positive  
4 reaction to the design of this project. I think in recent Zoning  
5 Commission meetings, we've been talking about sculpting buildings  
6 to try to have the building achieve greater compatibility with  
7 the surrounding lower density neighborhoods. And I think this  
8 is a very good example, both in terms of the courtyards and the  
9 big moves to sort of break up the facade along 42nd but even the  
10 smaller moves.

11 And in fact, maybe we could just pull up the image of  
12 Garrison Street, which is the biggest facade that we're dealing  
13 with. I wonder if Mr. Young, if you could pull up from the  
14 PowerPoint, the Garrison Street facade.

15 Yeah. I mean, I think what's -- that's actually the  
16 Harrison Street, I think. Yep. There we go. That's Garrison  
17 Street.

18 So that's, again, a very large and sort of imposing  
19 building. But there are a lot of architectural moves such as  
20 the -- it's not a total deep setback of the top floor, but at  
21 least a sort of watercourse or line that helps break up the top  
22 floor. So you have the feeling of sort of base, middle, top.  
23 The treatment of the entryway that is sort of popped out a little  
24 bit. And I just think as a Commission, we should keep some of  
25 these ideas in mind even as we look at other projects. This is



1 a really, really good example of how a building that is sort of  
2 imposing has been sculpted to make it more compatible with the  
3 adjacent lower density neighborhoods. And I think that's, again,  
4 something to keep in mind.

5 One thing I wanted to also do was in going through the  
6 comments from the neighbors across the street. I want to sort  
7 of give you all a chance to address each of them very  
8 specifically. And one of the things they keep talking about. I  
9 want to just put it out there as a 75-foot-tall structure, when  
10 actually, I think the measurement for the majority of the  
11 structure is 50 feet. And even if you include the penthouse,  
12 it's another like maybe 16 feet from what I could see. So I just  
13 want to give the applicant a chance to address this issue that's  
14 being been put out there about a 75-foot-tall building.

15 MR. DONOHUE: Sure. Thank you, Commissioner Wright.  
16 And I'll take a first crack at it, but I think our design team  
17 and legal team can offer additional thoughts on that. And also,  
18 I think Commissioner Wright, you're probably the one person who  
19 has seen and reviewed everything on both sides of Western Avenue  
20 as it relates to Friendship Heights. So I know the neighborhood  
21 intimately. Thank you. Thank you for that.

22 Yeah. So as you said, it's a 50-foot, 3-inch building  
23 as measured from the midpoint of 42nd Street. That face of the  
24 building and four stories as we count stories in the district.  
25 This facade is the one that does kind of show the size of the

1 building more. And you see that that full walkout basement, if  
2 you will, on this phase where we've placed our lobby so as not  
3 to expose the parking garage or anything any of those kind of  
4 less attractive uses.

5           So it gives more of the appearance of a five-story  
6 building on this side. Although, again, it is a four-story  
7 building as we define it. On the three different phases of  
8 Garrison here and then going up 42nd Street and Harrison, we're  
9 facing a variety of different uses. Some single family of two  
10 and three stories, but also attached dwellings as Sarah mentioned  
11 an institution, a church.

12           And then on this facade, we're actually facing the  
13 taller residential structures across Garrison. So that house  
14 that you see there to the left on the corner is a three-story  
15 structure. As you move there along Garrison across from our  
16 building, you then come to where there's now -- it was previously  
17 a two-story house, but is now actually a three-story plus  
18 daylighted basement. So call it three and a half story with its  
19 own roof deck as well.

20           And that's a -- gives the appearance of being two  
21 townhouses, but is actually a two over two -- a pair of two over  
22 two townhouses. And then stepping up to where the corner of  
23 Garrison and Wisconsin is, where you have a five-story mixed-use  
24 building with condos atop of office. So we're really trying to  
25 address as much as we can the sort of mixed nature of these

1 different street frontages and be responsive to them across the  
2 different typologies along those different phases.

3 Can I offer you an architect, or?

4 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Well, and I think --

5 MR. DONOHOE: Well, land use attorney to answer that  
6 better.

7 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: No, I think also the important  
8 point was in some of the sections, building sections that you  
9 showed where the building is stepping down from Wisconsin -- from  
10 whatever new buildings will be on Wisconsin to these buildings  
11 to the street, and then ultimately, to the church and the single-  
12 family homes. And I think some of those building sections were  
13 very useful in demonstrating that there is not a 75-foot-tall  
14 building in the way people traditionally think of a 75-foot-tall  
15 building up along 42nd Street.

16 And I think -- I just want to sort of emphasize that  
17 point, because there's a lot of discussion in this letter about  
18 a 75-foot-tall building. In reality, there is significant  
19 stepping from the taller building on Wisconsin down towards 42nd  
20 Street. And I just wanted to sort of -- and it is as I think  
21 Mr. Donohoe was saying, it's a varied kind of neighborhood.  
22 There's lots of different kinds of buildings surrounding this  
23 site. So I think those are both important points.

24 But I did want to, you know, again, give you a chance  
25 to sort of go through each of the -- and respond to each of the

1 | comments that were being made. I think you already have responded  
2 | to the question that was raised if the plans could be altered or  
3 | development rights transferred after the approval of PUD. And I  
4 | think you've already answered that, and the answer is no. That  
5 | is not something -- if there was a significant change, you'd have  
6 | to come back and amend or even file a new application. So again,  
7 | that's the answer to that.

8 |           The next thing they brought up was whether the  
9 | applicant conducted a shadow study. And I wanted to give the  
10 | architect a chance to talk about that.

11 |           MS. ALEXANDER: Yes. Unfortunately, since we just got  
12 | the response yesterday, we weren't able to enter that into the  
13 | record, but we did look at that today quickly. The majority of  
14 | the year, there would be no impact to any of the adjacent homes,  
15 | given the way the height is concentrated on the western side and  
16 | is pulled back as far as we can from the adjacent homes. That  
17 | lends itself to that conclusion.

18 |           In the winter months, in the late afternoon, there  
19 | would be some impact to the northern and western neighbors, but  
20 | that would be after 3 o'clock in the winter. So again, it should  
21 | be of any great impact to any of the adjacent residences.

22 |           COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: That's great. And I don't know  
23 | the proper protocol, but if you've actually done the shadow  
24 | studies, if they could be added to the record just as a point of  
25 | information, I think that would be helpful to do.

1           Another question they raised is, how do you feel about  
2 the residents of the development not being allowed to get  
3 residential parking permits? That is something that happens on  
4 a number of multifamily projects.

5           Do you have any feelings about that?

6           MS. SHIKER: -- could address that issue?

7           MS. ELLIOTT: Sure. So as we had worked with the  
8 community as Jad mentioned, for a very long time. One of the  
9 issues that they had raised early on was ensuring that we had  
10 sufficient onsite parking. And so that's what we've done is to  
11 provide what we believe is the amount of parking that this project  
12 needs, so that we can limit the amount of parking that would need  
13 to occur on the street. But at this time, I don't think there's  
14 been any commitment or certainly, we've not been asked by the ANC  
15 to restrict -- to self-restrict the building from the residential  
16 parking program simply because we've provided that sufficient  
17 amount of onsite parking to accommodate our needs.

18           COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: I looked at your parking ratio.  
19 It was about 0.7 in the ballpark. And that is definitely  
20 consistent with what's happening with a lot of multifamily  
21 buildings in the district. And it's consistent with, I think  
22 what we've seen in terms of actual utilization rates, parking  
23 garages. So again, I'm just sort of laying out the questions  
24 here and giving you all an opportunity to address them.

25           The next question was when would the television tower

1 | be removed? Once you get your entitlements and your approvals.  
2 | Would you be starting in a sort of rapid way? Obviously, probably  
3 | the tower would have to be the first thing to come down so that  
4 | you could actually start site grading and improvements.

5 |           What would be the timeline?

6 |           MR. DONOHOE: I think, Commissioner, you said that,  
7 | right. I believe in our MOU with the ANC, I think the commitment  
8 | is that we remove it by time of CFO. But in actuality, the tower  
9 | lands or a foot of the tower is on the site that we would actually  
10 | be building upon for grading and many other reasons. I would  
11 | anticipate it would happen either by separate permit directly  
12 | before the main building permit. It's a freestanding demo permit  
13 | or along with the mobilization in the beginning of construction.

14 |           COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Do you have -- the next questions  
15 | that were in the letter really had to do with construction  
16 | timeline. Do you have a general sense of assuming your  
17 | entitlements move forward when you'd break ground and how long  
18 | construction would take?

19 |           MR. DONOHOE: That is quite a question for any project  
20 | in the DMV right now. So that that is a bit of a challenge.  
21 | We've, obviously, rather carefully thought about this overall  
22 | city block with that in mind going so far as to have already  
23 | pulled. We have the permit in hand for 5151 Wisconsin. The  
24 | project there on Wisconsin Avenue at the old Fox 5 building.  
25 | This would -- we anticipate be a couple years following that.

1 But really as anybody is, you know, we're little bit prisoners  
2 of the larger macroeconomic economy about when we can start.

3 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Very true.

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let me just interrupt. I had already  
5 have on my notes. Ms. Shiker and Mr. Cohen that I want you all  
6 to respond to that that came in yesterday. But certainly, I  
7 don't want to stop Commissioner Wright's line of questioning, but  
8 I need something in the record pertaining to everything I'm  
9 hearing verbally. And I want to also caution us. I don't know  
10 where you all are, but we're getting ready to storm. And when  
11 we get those storms, all of us may cut off. So I'm just give  
12 you all a heads up. So anyway, Commissioner Wright, you can  
13 continue with your line of questioning, but I just want you to  
14 know, when it got to me, I was going to ask for those -- for that  
15 in writing as well.

16 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: And I was basically at the end  
17 of their list of points anyway. My only last question is what  
18 is the width of the driveway, the private drive that would be --  
19 or alley that would be between the two buildings? So 20, but I  
20 don't -- didn't know exactly.

21 MS. ALEXANDER: That is either 20 or 24 plus the setback  
22 on both sides from there. If you give me a second, I can confirm  
23 exactly.

24 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: That's okay. I just wanted to  
25 get a ballpark idea, but it looked just in eyeballing it like it

1 was about 20 feet or so.

2           Okay. Those were my questions. I think it's actually  
3 a very important project. I think the fact that you're doing a  
4 third of the project with housing that is market rate is really,  
5 really laudable and it's quite an exceptional offer in a PUD.  
6 And I think, again, you've really addressed a lot of the  
7 architectural issues to assure compatibility again by sculpting  
8 the building. And so, I think it's great. Congratulations on  
9 such a well-thought-out project. That's it for me.

10           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

11           Ms. Stidham, any questions or comments?

12           COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Of the two Commissioners didn't  
13 leave me much room for a lot, which is great. But I have to say  
14 and I have to agree with Commissioner Wright. In your efforts  
15 to break down the massing especially on 42nd Street, the  
16 individual bars, the use of different materials. So they appear  
17 to be four separate buildings with the courtyards in between.  
18 And the fact that it's stepped down makes that transition to the  
19 neighborhood and in my opinion, perfect.

20           You really have considered how these fits into the  
21 neighborhood and did not create a wall, a massive wall of  
22 building. You are considerate to the existing residents and  
23 their need for that transition to take place. And that really  
24 should be a lesson to many on how to incorporate such a large  
25 building into a neighborhood where it doesn't feel such a large



1 building. So thank you for those efforts.

2 And then the only one question that I had, and this is  
3 really based on the questions that we received as a late addition.  
4 It seems a lot of those questions are related to construction  
5 management type efforts. Have there been any conversations  
6 regarding -- and maybe I missed it, a construction management  
7 agreement with the existing residents in the ANC?

8 MR. DONOHOE: Sure, Commissioner. I'll take a first  
9 crack at that. Yeah. Thank you for the question. We do, as  
10 part of the memorandum of understanding with the ANC, have some  
11 language in there that's specific to the construction period,  
12 concerns that that they raised and that are covered in there  
13 include things like construction period, parking for workers and  
14 the like. But also we -- with ANC as we get closer to construction  
15 about things like hours of operation and the like, during the  
16 construction period. So those will be topics that we've got in  
17 there as well, but topics that can be further addressed as we  
18 come closer to permit.

19 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Okay. Great. Thank you. I  
20 really, strongly encourage you to have those discussions as you  
21 get closer, to make sure that the expectations -- the existing  
22 residents, so they understand what you're doing, when you're  
23 doing it, how things will process, and who to contact if there's  
24 a problem.

25 MR. DONOHOE: Right, right. And you're exactly right,

1 Commissioner. And we do, in that MOU, have an agreement for a  
2 single point of contact, and then also to do photographic surveys  
3 for residents to the extent they wish of their properties, just  
4 to ensure that everything is just as it was.

5 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Great, great. Thank you. And  
6 with that, very nice job on the work with the transition building,  
7 really is. And with that, Chairman Hood, send it back to you.

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. Vice Chair Miller, any  
9 questions or comments?

10 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have  
11 my video off because, as usual, I'm having connectivity problems,  
12 and the thunder is happening here as well. And I need to get to  
13 Apple, because my Mac is just unreliable at this point. But  
14 thank you.

15 And thank you to the applicants team, Jad Donohoe,  
16 Christy Shiker, Mr. Cohen, Sarah Alexander, all the Torti Gallas  
17 team, and Brandice Elliott and Jami Milanovich, and whoever else,  
18 Tim Bragan, all of you who have provided information to us.

19 And I appreciate all the responsiveness that you've had  
20 throughout this process to Office of Planning, DDOT, DOEE, and  
21 maybe other agencies, and to the ANC, most importantly. I know  
22 you've had a lot of community engagement with them and you've  
23 entered into, or about to enter into agreement with them.

24 And that's all very commendable, and this project is  
25 very commendable. All my colleagues, I appreciate all of your

1 | comments. You've made my job easier, and that's better because  
2 | I might lose connectivity.

3 | I agree with everything that each of you have said  
4 | about the design, the transitional setbacks and step downs that  
5 | are supposed to happen in this kind of neighborhood, in the  
6 | Wisconsin Avenue development framework.

7 | It's certainly more consistent with the comprehensive  
8 | plan policies and all those other Rock Creek West Road and  
9 | Wisconsin Avenue development framework policies that have been  
10 | developed to try to get the kind of affordable and market rate  
11 | housing that is needed and should be along this amenity-rich  
12 | neighborhood.

13 | And so I appreciate the 126 units of housing, the 42  
14 | of which are affordable. 13 of the 42 are IZ. The rest are, I  
15 | guess, subsidized by or assisted by the mayor's and the council's  
16 | tax abatement program for high need areas that haven't met their  
17 | housing equity targets in the housing equity report.

18 | So I appreciate the transportation infrastructure  
19 | improvements, the playground improvements, all the public  
20 | benefits and amenities. So thank you. I don't really have any  
21 | questions.

22 | I appreciate all the work that's been done. Do you  
23 | know, Mr. Donohoe or Ms. Shiker, is this the first project that  
24 | is taking advantage of the HANTA tax abatement program? Or you  
25 | don't know that? I just had a curiosity.

1 MR. DONOHOE: Thank you for asking the question,  
2 Commissioner. I'm not aware of any other project that's come  
3 before the zoning commission with the HANTA. I believe there may  
4 be up to, well, several other projects that could be utilizing  
5 it via a matter of right approach, but thank you. Thank you for  
6 that, and thank you for all of your comments.

7 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Well, thank you for that response.  
8 So yeah, we all feel like we're participating then, in this  
9 project. So we will take partial credit, if it gets built. The  
10 adjacent project that you built on is your project too, right?  
11 At 5151 Wisconsin?

12 MR. DONOHOE: Yes, sir.

13 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I have gone by there a million  
14 times, but that's out of the ground? What's the status of that,  
15 just out of curiosity?

16 MR. DONOHOE: The status of that is that we have a  
17 permit in hand and, as soon as it's practical, would want to move  
18 forward with it. We own the property. We have paid to design  
19 it and have permit in hand. So we are, I think you would say,  
20 highly motivated.

21 VICE CHAIR MILLER: All right. Well, good luck with  
22 both of these projects adjacent to each other, and I think they  
23 will contribute to the continuing revitalization of the Wisconsin  
24 Avenue corridor. So thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Sure, thank you. And I'll be very

1 quick. I think my colleagues have exhaustively went through this  
2 and I think have done a very good job, as well as the actors  
3 coming forward. Again, I want to reiterate what Commissioner  
4 Wright went through.

5 I would like that, Ms. Shiker, in writing. And Mr.  
6 Cohen, if we can get that in writing, for the record? Also, the  
7 Committee of 100 wrote something and I'm more interested, Ms.  
8 Shiker and Mr. Cohen, scoring in the last part of this submission,  
9 about process.

10 The question about why wasn't this all a PUD, and the  
11 other part that was done by the BZA and I'm just curious. I'd  
12 like you to answer that. I don't need answers now, but if you  
13 can just do me a soundbite of the process. And I know you have  
14 rights to do it the way you have to do it, Mr. Donohoe, so I get  
15 that, but I'm just curious.

16 I think they raised up some great points and I  
17 appreciate you all using the HANTA. And it talks about the IZ,  
18 and I think that that is very thoughtful. And with the Committee  
19 of 100, I'm not sure if they're here to ask their own questions,  
20 but I also want to be able to digest their thoughts and then also  
21 hear the responses that you all have. Sure. Somebody's going  
22 to say something?

23 MS. SHIKER: Oh, Chairman Hood, I was just going to  
24 answer your question. Or did you want us to put it in writing  
25 in the --

1           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: If you can answer, but I'd like it  
2 in writing, too, to go on the record.

3           MS. SHIKER: We can put it in writing as well. The  
4 multifamily use for that project was a matter of right, with  
5 limited exception for the BZA. The BZA process is a quicker  
6 process, and there was the goal to move forward with that project  
7 as quickly as possible.

8           And so which, as Mr. Donohoe just said, we have the  
9 permit in hand, ready to go whenever we can. So it was more of  
10 a time consideration than anything else, but we can supplement  
11 the record with that information.

12           In this case, the R-2 needed to be rezoned in order to  
13 allow multifamily use and to be consistent with the FLUM. As  
14 you know, we didn't rezone the other site, so that is primarily  
15 the reason. But we'll put something further in the record about  
16 it.

17           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: But in the Committee of 100's  
18 letter, I think they cited that, but they said that that project  
19 is not going forward yet. But I'm hearing now from Mr. Donohoe  
20 you have permits in hand. So I'd just like a soundbite. We  
21 don't need a book, a dissertation, just maybe a half a paragraph  
22 kind of explaining some of the issues that the Committee of 100  
23 brought up, and I appreciate it.

24           My last comment is I really want to thank Mr. Chuck  
25 Elkins (phonetic). I thank everyone who participated in this,

1 but Mr. Chuck Elkins, really, I think, hit the nail on the head  
2 when he talked about what's trying to be achieved here. I said  
3 that in another case and I got in a whole lot of trouble.

4 So I'm going to associate myself this time with Mr.  
5 Elkins. And then that way, he and I both may be in trouble. So  
6 I don't have any other questions on that. I appreciate all the  
7 work that's been done here.

8 It looks like you have got a lot of support, and even  
9 the people who had some still questions, you've still got a lot  
10 of support. So we appreciate that. And thank you for all your  
11 hard work. Let's go to ANC 3. I think it was 3E. Right, Ms.  
12 Schellin? Is it 3E? Okay.

13 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. Commissioner Quinn?

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Quinn, or Mr. Bennett? One of  
15 them.

16 MS. SCHELLIN: Tom Quinn.

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Let's focus on Quinn.  
18 Commissioner Quinn, do you have any cross-examination? Just  
19 cross right now, not your presentation. Is he up, Ms. Schellin?  
20 Okay. Commissioner Quinn, if you can unmute and let us know if  
21 you have any questions, any cross? Ms. Schellin, are we able to  
22 get a hold of him?

23 MS. SCHELLIN: I think he can hear us. He may be having  
24 issues unmuting.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: We're all going to probably have

1 | issues in a minute.

2 |           MS. SCHELLIN: Yeah. This storm is coming, I know.  
3 | I'm on the river, and I'm definitely having connectivity issues.  
4 | Let's see. I have sent him a couple requests to unmute. I'm  
5 | not sure if he's getting them or not. Let me check my email.

6 |           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. If not, I'll move on and we  
7 | can come back to him.

8 |           MS. SCHELLIN: Yeah, we don't have another party.

9 |           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Well, no, I was just going to move  
10 | on to the government witnesses. I mean, the government, to the  
11 | office of attorney general.

12 |           MS. SCHELLIN: Yeah, if you want to do that, and I'll  
13 | give Commissioner Quinn a call, and we could always come back for  
14 | his cross --

15 |           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah, let's come back to that.

16 |           MS. SCHELLIN: -- for the candidate, if he has some.  
17 | I'll try to call him.

18 |           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let's move on to Ms. Kane. I believe  
19 | Ms. Kane is here from the Office of Attorney General. Haven't  
20 | seen her in a while. Welcome Ms. Kane back. Let's bring her  
21 | up.

22 |           MS. KANE: Good members of the Commission, it is good  
23 | to be back. I'll ask Mr. Young if he can pull up our presentation,  
24 | which is very quick, so I will go through this very quickly. But  
25 | yeah, so OAG. So first of all, introductions. My name is



1 Alexandra Kane (phonetic).

2 I'm here tonight on behalf of the Equitable Land Use  
3 Section of the Office of the Attorney General. OAG is very  
4 pleased to be in support of the PUD. If you can go to the next  
5 slide, Mr. Young?

6 So OAG is in support of the PUD, principally on the  
7 basis of its affordable housing proffer, which we believe  
8 advances a number of key comprehensive plan policies, and also  
9 significantly outweighs the PUD's requested development  
10 incentives, thereby satisfying the PUD balancing test.

11 PUD's affordable housing proffer is significant in its  
12 scale. At 33 percent, it significantly exceeds a 10 percent base  
13 IZ requirement, as well as the 20 percent IZ requirement that  
14 would be required for a map amendment requesting the same amount  
15 of density and subject to the IZ-plus program.

16 In addition to the sheer quantity of units, the PUD is  
17 also proffering additional affordability benefits that we wanted  
18 to highlight. First of all, there are the two additional 50  
19 percent MFI units. Now, that is beyond what the zoning  
20 regulations would require.

21 In addition, one of those 50 percent MFI units is going  
22 to be a family-sized unit, which addresses the critical need  
23 district-wide for family-sized units at those lower levels of  
24 affordability.

25 And then finally, the fact that the applicant is

1 proffering those HANTA units at the 80 percent MFI level. With  
2 HANTA, you have a slight range of affordability that can be  
3 offered. To the fact that they are offering it at that slightly  
4 lower level, we believe is also very commendable.

5 Now, this proffer would be commendable on its own, but  
6 the fact that it is being provided in Rock Creek West, where  
7 affordable housing and new housing is critically needed, is worth  
8 highlighting. As was noted, Rock Creek West is significantly  
9 behind its affordable housing goals.

10 To date, only 230 units have been produced towards its  
11 goal of 1,990 under the mayor's order. So any project that  
12 provides affordable housing at this scale really is commendable.  
13 Next slide please, Mr. Young.

14 In addition, the PUD is providing this housing in a  
15 manner that is consistent with the comprehensive plan's guidance  
16 for how to provide additional density and housing density, as  
17 well as the more specific guidance that we've seen from the Rock  
18 Creek West roadmap and the Wisconsin Avenue framework. So both  
19 of those planning documents are focused on increasing housing in  
20 Rock Creek West.

21 And the Wisconsin Avenue framework, in particular,  
22 identifies that stretch of Wisconsin Avenue between Friendship  
23 Heights and Tenleytown that we can see in the upper right there,  
24 which comes from the framework, as being a critical location for  
25 adding additional density for housing, with the idea that you

1 | would focus on density along the corridor and then step it down  
2 | as you move into the lower density neighborhoods or surrounding  
3 | it.

4 |           So the PUD is obviously right there. It is supporting  
5 | those goals, as well as the broader goals of the comprehensive  
6 | plan concerning locating density and housing along transit  
7 | corridors and near metro stations. The PUD is just set off of  
8 | that Wisconsin Avenue corridor.

9 |           It is within walking distance of both the Friendship  
10 | Heights and the Tenleytown metro stations, with all of their  
11 | surrounding development and amenities, including grocery stores,  
12 | retail, schools, public libraries.

13 |           All of those are within walking distance of the PUD.  
14 | And then finally, as we've heard, I think everyone has sort of  
15 | taken tonight with the way in which the PUD is transitioning that  
16 | requested density down into the surrounding neighborhood.

17 |           As we've seen through a number of renderings, including  
18 | the one that you see there on the bottom right, the PUD is using  
19 | a number of truly creative design features to do that. Again,  
20 | in line with what the various planning documents call for,  
21 | including stepping back penthouse setbacks, and then also that  
22 | facade articulation and differentiation through the bays and the  
23 | different pavilions that we've seen.

24 |           So again, we think that it is really a phenomenal  
25 | project that is advancing a number of the comprehensive plan's

1 policies, especially those related to affordable housing in an  
2 area of the city where they are most crucially needed.

3 And we also think that what the PUD is offering more  
4 than compensates for the development incentives that it has  
5 requested. With that, I promised to be brief. That is the end  
6 of my testimony, but I am happy to answer any questions. And in  
7 addition, our written statement is in the record at Exhibit 34-  
8 A.

9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you again, Ms. Kane. We  
10 appreciate your examination in this case and in the system, as  
11 we continue to move forward. Let's see, any of my colleagues  
12 have any questions, comments? I'm looking at your heads, not  
13 seeing any. Okay. No questions of OAG? Okay. Ms. Shiker, do  
14 you all have any questions of OAG?

15 MS. SHIKER: We do not. Thank you.

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. And Ms. Schellin, have we  
17 been able to get Commissioner Quinn?

18 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Quinn sent me an email  
19 saying that he was sorry, he was in another call, and he would  
20 be off at 6:00.

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: He was in another call? I missed  
22 that.

23 MS. SCHELLIN: He would be off at 6:00. So I don't  
24 think he's available.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Oh, okay. Oh, okay I got it. Okay.

1 All right. Thank you, Ms. Kane. We appreciate your examination  
2 again, as I mentioned previously. All right. So we need to  
3 move. We'll come back at 6:00 to the ANC, if we're still able  
4 to get him on. Ms. Schellin, let's go to the District Department  
5 of Transportation and Office of Planning.

6 MS. SCHELLIN: Sure.

7 MR. OZBERK: Good evening, Chairman Hood and members  
8 of the Commission. For the record, my name is Erkin Ozberk  
9 (phonetic) with the District Department of Transportation. DDOT  
10 is supportive of the applicant's PUD application to develop the  
11 property at 4201 Garrison Street Northwest.

12 In our July 3rd, 2025 report, which is in the record  
13 as Exhibit 36, we recommended approval with two conditions. The  
14 first is implementation of the applicant's transportation demand  
15 management plan with two minor revisions.

16 The second condition is infrastructure improvements in  
17 the public space to include intersection daylighting, also known  
18 as curb extensions, and a speed hump on 42nd Street. As you  
19 heard in the applicant's presentation, they have agreed to these  
20 conditions and, with those included in the zoning order, DDOT has  
21 no objection to the approval of the PUD application.

22 We look forward to continuing to work with the  
23 applicant on the streetscape design and public space improvements  
24 and curbside management plan as they go through the public space  
25 permitting process. Thank you. That's all for me, and I'd be

1 happy to answer any questions.

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Mr. Ozberk. Let me see  
3 if we have any questions or comments from any of my colleagues.  
4 I'm looking at you. I don't see any. Okay. I'm looking. Okay.  
5 No comments. Okay. Should I call on Mr. Cohen? (Indiscernible  
6 0:18:21)

7 MS. SHIKER: Whether you call on him or me, we do not  
8 have any questions. Thank you.

9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Sounds good. All right.  
10 Again, we don't have Commissioner Quinn. I guess we'll hear from  
11 him at 6:00. All right. Ms. Schellin, I could do the report,  
12 but I'll wait to see what happens at 6:00. Do we have anyone  
13 who's here in support, opposition, or undeclared?

14 MR. YOUNG: (Indiscernible)

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Who said that, Mr. Young? Thank  
16 you, Mr. Young, for your help. Let's go to the Office of  
17 Planning. I'm trying to push. Let's go to the Office of  
18 Planning.

19 MR. BRADFORD: Good evening, Chairman Hood, members of  
20 the commission. For the record, this is Philip Bradford  
21 (phonetic), Development Review Specialist with the Office of  
22 Planning. The Office of Planning recommends approval of the  
23 requested PUD and related map amendment, along with the special  
24 exception request and zoning flexibility.

25 The PUD site, as previously mentioned by the applicant,

1 is 40,357 square feet, and rezones the 28,654 square foot portion  
2 of the R-2 zone to the RA-3, as part of the map amendment request.  
3 The staff report incorrectly notes the area not subject to the  
4 PUD is the property size. A building this size obviously cannot  
5 fit on a lot that small.

6 So during set down, no major questions were posed to  
7 the applicant by the commissioner or OP, other than to provide  
8 additional information and clarity about the demographic trends  
9 in the neighborhood and the project's potential impact to the  
10 neighborhood, and the applicant has submitted an exhibit  
11 regarding the potential impacts to the neighborhood and  
12 demographic trends, which is in the record in Exhibit 23-C.

13 On balance, the project would not be inconsistent with  
14 the comprehensive plan, especially when viewed through a racial  
15 equity lens.

16 The project is noteworthy in that, given its size and  
17 affordable housing contribution, it could play a transformational  
18 role in adding new housing, especially affordable units, to the  
19 Rock Creek West planning area, which, as of September 2024, has  
20 produced the lowest percentage of affordable units targeted for  
21 all planning areas in the district. The applicant is requesting  
22 several areas of design flexibility, all of which are supported  
23 by OP, except for the sustainable features.

24 OP recommends the applicant provide additional details  
25 on the benefits of the proposed sustainability features before

1 the Commission takes final action on this case.

2 In the applicant's opening statements, it was stated  
3 that additional detail would be covered tonight, but I do not  
4 recall hearing that during the presentation, other than the  
5 discussion with Commissioner Imamura regarding LEED Gold, which  
6 OP would support, as the minimum standard noted in the PUD public  
7 benefits section in the zoning regulations is LEED Gold.

8 The applicant is requesting two areas of zoning  
9 flexibility, one for the penthouse side setback along the west  
10 elevation from the private alley, and from the rear yard setback  
11 from the PUD boundary, which OP also supports. The applicant is  
12 requesting special exception relief for off-site parking, as six  
13 spaces are located underground and extend into the R-2 zoning  
14 district.

15 The applicant meets all the criteria for the Commission  
16 to grant the special exception relief. And in summary, OP finds  
17 the benefits of the project commensurate with the flexibility  
18 sought through the PUD, and we hope the Commission concludes that  
19 the PUD meets the criteria for approval. And thank you, and I'm  
20 available for any questions.

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Mr. Bradford. Mr.  
22 Bradford, was the correction made? I think you said in the  
23 report, the correction. Was that submitted, the correction, what  
24 you stated earlier about the size of the PUD?

25 MR. BRADFORD: Chairman Hood, could you repeat the



1 question, please?

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: You said at the very beginning, I  
3 can't remember exactly what it was, and something was incorrect  
4 in the report?

5 MR. BRADFORD: Oh, yes. In the table at the beginning  
6 of the report, I noted the area not part of the rezoning as the  
7 square footage of the site, which is very far off from the actual  
8 PUD boundary.

9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: But do we have something in writing?

10 MR. BRADFORD: But it's correct in the applicant  
11 submissions, but it's incorrect in the staff report. So I just  
12 wanted to note that, in case anyone saw that.

13 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So I get it, but let's correct it  
14 in the Office of Planning's report, too, and just submit the  
15 sheet, if you don't mind to do that. Because years later, none  
16 of us will be here and something may come up like that. So we'll  
17 make sure we have all the correct material there.

18 Also, Commissioner Imamura, I think, has really pressed  
19 on trying to make LEED Gold. But if he has a comment on that,  
20 he can. But let me look at all my colleagues and see if they  
21 have any questions or comments. Okay, none. All right. Ms.  
22 Shiker, do you have any? You or Mr. Cohen -- I like saying  
23 that -- have any questions for the Office of Planning?

24 MS. SHIKER: We don't have any questions. We have felt  
25 that the different sustainable features were discussed during the

1 presentation, but we would be happy to submit it for the record,  
2 if that's what the Commission would like.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah, I think we really want to, and  
4 I'll let Commissioner Imamura speak for himself. I think he said  
5 we weren't far off. I don't want to put words in his mouth.  
6 He's a commissioner, he can speak. But we're trying to go to  
7 where he -- I think all of us would agree with Commissioner  
8 Imamura. I'm looking. Okay. All right, I think we all do.

9 So whatever he said, that's what we're going to do,  
10 we're trying to achieve. All right. All right. Mr. Bradford,  
11 thank you very much. We appreciate your report and everything.  
12 It's not 6:00 yet. Ms. Schellin, do we have anyone here in  
13 support, opposition, and undeclared? Ms. Schellin? Oh, we do?  
14 Okay. Can we bring them all up at the same time, or we have too  
15 many? Okay.

16 MS. SCHELLIN: I think we have too many for that.

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Let's bring four.

18 MS. SCHELLIN: Let me double check.

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let's bring four in support first.

20 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. Four. Okay. Sure. All right.  
21 That would be in support. Well, actually, we might be able to.  
22 Cheryl Cort (phonetic)? She's part of the applicant team. Cheryl  
23 Cort is the only one. Actually, we might be able to get them  
24 all up, if you'd like --

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah, let's see if we can get them

1 all out.

2 MS. SCHELLIN: -- in that case. Cheryl Cort is the  
3 only one in support.

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. We'll start with Ms. Cort,  
5 but let me see if we can get them all up first.

6 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. Jedd Skibo (phonetic), and Andrea  
7 Fishman (phonetic) in opposition.

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

9 MS. SCHELLIN: Shelly Repp (phonetic), and Jacob van  
10 Leer (phonetic), undeclared.

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. All right. So they'll all  
12 come up. But what we'll do, we'll continue. You can go ahead  
13 and start, please. Thank you.

14 MS. CORT: Good evening, Chairman Hood and members of  
15 the Commission. I'm Cheryl Cort with the Coalition for Smarter  
16 Growth. We are the leading organization advocating for walkable,  
17 bikeable, inclusive, transit-oriented communities as the most  
18 sustainable and equitable way for the Washington, D.C. region to  
19 grow and provide opportunities for all.

20 We're quite pleased to be offering our strong support  
21 for this proposal. We are excited that we are going to add 13  
22 inclusionary zoning, permanently affordable units, affordable at  
23 60 and 50 percent median family income, and an additional 29  
24 units through this new tax abatement program at the 80 percent  
25 median family level.

1           This is urgent that we get more housing in the pipeline,  
2 because DC's housing production has dropped off dramatically in  
3 the last year or two. And so we want to move this proposal  
4 through as quickly as possible, to ensure that we're going to be  
5 producing homes at affordable levels and at market rate levels,  
6 especially in this high opportunity neighborhood, to address  
7 future housing needs for our city.

8           We recognize, as others, that Ward 3 has fallen far  
9 short of its equitable housing goals, and so this is an important  
10 contribution. This is really a rare opportunity to provide  
11 affordable homes two blocks from the Friendship Heights metro  
12 station.

13           Beyond the benefit of affordable housing, we commend  
14 the design of the building and the sensitivity and quality of the  
15 design, responding to the surrounding lower blocks off of  
16 Wisconsin Avenue. And we also commend the ANC 3E agreement  
17 reached with the developer for a number of additional benefits.

18           We would raise the question about the amount of parking  
19 provided here. DDDOT noted that it's three times what is needed.  
20 We see that it is all one level, which makes it a lot more  
21 economical to provide that, and we know that this is sort of a  
22 contested is it too much? Is it too little?

23           We would prefer to see less parking here and as a way  
24 to ensure that we're not cross-subsidizing that cost of parking  
25 across residents who don't own cars and aren't going to be renting

1 a parking space. But all in all, we're very excited to support  
2 this project and want to see it move forward as quickly as  
3 possible. Thank you.

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Cort, for all  
5 your work that you all continually do. Let's see if we have any  
6 questions. Colleagues, any? Okay. All right. If you can hold  
7 tight, Ms. Cort, we may have some questions. Now, Ms. Schellin,  
8 I think Mr. Skibo? I hope I didn't mess that up.

9 MR. SKIBO: Skibo is correct.

10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Skibo, okay. You may begin.

11 MR. SKIBO: Excellent, thank you. Good evening, and  
12 thanks for the opportunity to speak. We've heard an awful lot  
13 about this project, and it does have a significant number of  
14 benefits that it would bring to the neighborhood.

15 I appreciate that you all have taken time to review the  
16 letter that a number of the immediate neighbors have submitted  
17 on jointly, to raise a number of our questions. If I were to  
18 condense it down, the questions that I have really stem from the  
19 height, and we've heard an awful lot about the 50-foot height of  
20 the building.

21 But when you view the plans and the elevations that are  
22 shown, I think the way I see it, it looks like it's kind of  
23 obscuring the true, clear height of the building. That's why we  
24 referenced 75 feet.

25 If you look at the drawing as it shows down at the

1 Garrison Street from ground level to the clear point, where you  
2 wouldn't run into the roof if you were flying, it seems to be  
3 roughly 75 feet, and that drops to about 60 feet at the Harrison  
4 end of the building.

5           The question about a shadow study was raised roughly a  
6 year ago at the ANC meeting, and that's of particular concern to  
7 me, as I'm directly across the street. And if I've interpreted  
8 the comments this evening regarding the shadow study, it sounds  
9 that one has not been done, and we were told this evening that  
10 there would be no impact, except beginning at 3:00 p.m. in the  
11 winter.

12           I'd like to know, could a shadow study be done? And  
13 I'd like to know what time the sun will set behind this 60 to  
14 70-foot, 75-foot building. So that's one of the big questions  
15 that that I have, is what the true impact of such a tall building  
16 on a residential street will have?

17           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Mr. Skibo. I think that  
18 I'm getting feedback, maybe. I don't know if there's any. But  
19 was that in the letter? Because we do have a response, that  
20 we've asked them to respond to the letter of the immediate  
21 neighbors. If that was there, we will all get that response. If  
22 that's okay, can we wait on that response?

23           MR. SKIBO: No. So the response keeps highlighting the  
24 50-foot measurement of the building, but that's measuring the way  
25 it's been presented. That's measuring from the center of the

1 building to the parapet. But that is not representing the  
2 remaining 12 to 18 feet beyond the parapet.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I got you. And also the  
4 applicant, I'm going to ask you to respond, Ms. Shiker, if you  
5 can respond. You don't have to do it now, but hold tight, if  
6 you all can respond. I'm being told people are having problems.  
7 Ms. Fishman?

8 MS. FISHMAN: Hi, thank you. I'm happy for Jedd to  
9 represent the questions we have from the neighborhood.

10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So you've given me your  
11 rights. Mr. Shelly Rep?

12 MR. REP: Good evening, Chair Hood and commissioners.  
13 My name is Shelly Rep. I'm testifying on behalf of the Committee  
14 of 100, where I am Chair. I signed up as an undeclared for this  
15 application, for the simple reason that there's positives and  
16 negatives in this proposal.

17 So I'll start off with what's good about this proposal.  
18 What's good about this proposal is that Donohoe has worked with  
19 the city to secure tax abatement that allows them to provide 33  
20 percent affordable housing on the site. And that, as Jad said  
21 earlier, he believes this is the first commitment the city has  
22 made under this proposal, at least the first one for a PUD. So  
23 that's a positive.

24 Also a positive, as we've heard many of the  
25 commissioners talk this evening or this afternoon, is that this

1 is an attractive design that is compatible with the neighborhood.  
2 So I commend Jad and Torti Gallas for the work that they've done  
3 on this proposal. So that's what I see is the positives, or at  
4 least some of the positives. There's probably more.

5 What could be better? And what we have asked for, and  
6 it's in my letter, is that we think there should be more  
7 affordable housing at the 60 percent median family income. What  
8 we have here is two affordable housing programs.

9 First of all, there's the HANTA program, where a  
10 developer is compensated, basically paid to deliver affordable  
11 housing in high-need areas. And as we've just said, that Donohoe  
12 has been able to secure this tax abatement.

13 Under HANTA, one-third of the units have to be at an  
14 average of 80 percent of median family income. The second  
15 affordable housing program is IZ. Under the IZ program,  
16 affordable units are provided by the developer, not subsidized  
17 by the city, out of its own resources.

18 And here, there's two different formulas for IZ, but  
19 right now, Donohoe is providing the bare minimum affordable  
20 housing, with slightly over ten percent under the bonus density  
21 arm of the IZ formula.

22 Once again, under IZ, the affordable units are  
23 basically sourced by the developer, not through the City. Under  
24 HANTA, IZ still applies. The HANTA application specifically  
25 states that any housing units required under inclusionary zoning



1 are counted toward meeting the 33 percent HANTA requirement.

2 And that's what this proposal provides, is that the  
3 slightly more than ten percent is included within the 33 percent  
4 HANTA requirement. Which leads to this is a PUD. This is not a  
5 matter of right. This is a PUD. IZ-plus does not apply. However,  
6 under a PUD, the developer needs to provide amenities.

7 One of the amenities that can be provided, and probably  
8 the preferred amenity provided, is more affordable housing than  
9 is required under matter of right. With respect to other  
10 amenities under this -- and I'll come back to that in a minute.

11 With respect to other amenities, I know that it's been  
12 proffered that Donohoe is going to take down the tower. But as  
13 Jad said, they need to take down the tower. First of all, there's  
14 no service on the tower right now. They need to take down the  
15 tower to go ahead with this project.

16 So I think it's hard to claim that this is an amenity,  
17 when they really need to do it in order to carry forth with this  
18 project. So once again, under the PUD rules, only affordable  
19 housing that exceeds matter of right development can be  
20 considered an amenity.

21 Here, only the minimum IZ is being provided. We would  
22 suggest that one standard here might be IZ-plus, and the Office  
23 of the Attorney General showed in their chart that, under IZ-  
24 plus, there would need to be 20 percent affordability under the  
25 IZ program.

1 I'm not saying you have to go all the way to 20 percent,  
2 but I think it should be slightly more than ten percent. So we  
3 suggest that the Commission raise, basically, as part of the  
4 required minimum package, raise the amount of affordable housing  
5 that's required under the IZ program, basically on the  
6 developer's nickel rather than the city's nickel.

7 Finally, and as Chair Hood mentioned before, both the  
8 Fox 5 building itself and the Fox 5 parking lot, two separate  
9 lots, are owned by Donohoe Development. And they've been owned  
10 by Donahue Development for years, for a number of years. We  
11 think that this should have been approached originally --

12 MS. SCHELLIN: Sorry, his time is going past.

13 MR. REP: -- as a single PUD, and if it was a single  
14 PUD, that would have --

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Closing thought. I know that's what  
16 you're trying to do.

17 MR. REP: I will. As a single PUD, that would have  
18 allowed for a stronger amenity package. Thank you.

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Rep. Again,  
20 I'd ask for responses to that. I don't know if that's sufficient  
21 for you now, because at least part of the letter, I think you  
22 all brought up some points that are at least worth examining or  
23 doing a little more discovery or hearing from the applicant.

24 But let me first do any rebuttal, if we can get to  
25 that. Let me see if my colleagues have any questions or comments.

1 Okay, none? Okay. I'm missing one person, Jacob van Leer?

2 MS. SCHELLIN: He's on there. I see him at the bottom.  
3 He's on the bottom of my screen.

4 MR. SKIBO: Not to interrupt, I live next to him. We  
5 briefly lost power here on the street, so he may need a moment  
6 for his Wi-Fi to reboot.

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

8 MR. VAN LEER: Can folks hear me?

9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah, we can hear you now. Go right  
10 ahead.

11 MR. VAN LEER: Okay. I'm on a hotspot on my phone. I  
12 was texting Jedd to say, "Think of the irony if, right before  
13 they call on us, we lose power." And of course, that's exactly  
14 what happened. My apologies. I'm going to keep my camera off,  
15 just to try to maintain connectivity.

16 So my name is Jake van Leer. For the last 20 months,  
17 almost two years, my wife and I have lived on the 5100 block of  
18 42nd Street, directly opposite the subject property. I heard a  
19 couple of mentions about the last-minute nature, the letter that  
20 adjacent neighbors had sent, and I certainly want to make clear  
21 that that wasn't of any intent.

22 My wife and I haven't gotten any outreach, including  
23 any written notice of this hearing, which we, of course, are  
24 entitled to. So we'd love if, in the future, there is a way to  
25 give us appropriate notice of updates.

1           Second, as folks have referenced, we submitted a  
2 detailed letter that gives the position of all the families that  
3 currently reside on this block, and we really appreciate the  
4 applicant and the Commission's attention to the letter and  
5 thorough review of it.

6           I just want to talk about a couple of things. First,  
7 just to say, I hope it's clear in our letter how strongly we  
8 support the thoughtful development of the property and how much  
9 we appreciate many of the proposed benefits that are already  
10 included in the plan.

11           We sent the letter to raise some very specific thoughts  
12 and concerns and honest questions that we had. As Jedd mentioned,  
13 the main concern that we note is the height of the building. The  
14 comp plan talks about in Friendship Heights, insisting the new  
15 development along Wisconsin Avenue, that the scale and height of  
16 that development on the corridor should transition appropriately  
17 to nearby single-family homes.

18           The proposed structure is very tall. As others have  
19 mentioned, the application claims that the building is 50 feet,  
20 but regardless of how it's measured in a zoning or a legal  
21 perspective, it's very misleading, as a layperson, to look at  
22 that. Mr. Donohoe mentioned that the building next to it is a  
23 three-story building.

24           If that's a three-story building, because that's the  
25 number of floors that you can see above the ground of that

1 building on Garrison Street, this is a 75-foot building. And I  
2 note as well, that nobody from the applicant has denied the fact  
3 that, from the lowest exposed point to the highest exposed point  
4 of the building, that's how tall this building is.

5 It's from a real-life perspective, that those parts of  
6 the building, the penthouse, the residential and mechanical  
7 penthouses, the lobby, they exist. The design itself, therefore,  
8 is comparable to the pretty massive residences at Mazza building,  
9 that face directly onto Wisconsin's corridor.

10 We have a photo there showing the same number of floors,  
11 primary residential floors, a lobby level, a setback penthouse,  
12 et cetera. And notably, the adjacent property here at 5101  
13 Wisconsin, which is, my understanding, not being redeveloped by  
14 the same folks, is only a five-story building.

15 Or if you take out the lobby level on the top level,  
16 you could say it's a three-story building, but whatever it is,  
17 however you measure it, it's substantially less than what this  
18 proposal has, which suggests that this is actually a transition  
19 upward from the main corridor, at least on Garrison.

20 But as we explain the letter, we're super grateful,  
21 extremely grateful for the use of the mixed material, the  
22 marginally shorter stacked flats on 42nd. We appreciate that.

23 But I think we also tried to explain why, from our  
24 understanding of prior proposals in other areas that are  
25 similarly situated, that that can't alone suffice to bring it in

1 | harmony with the comp plan.

2 |           So we pointed to some of the earlier proposals for this  
3 | development that showed only a five-story structure, three-story  
4 | stacked flats on 42nd. And I think we just wanted to see if the  
5 | commission was willing to ask what those additional stories are  
6 | adding in terms of benefits that are then requiring these  
7 | tradeoffs with other priorities of the comp plan.

8 |           We note that, based on the secondhand materials I was  
9 | able to get my hands on, that eliminating a floor takes away  
10 | maybe 25 units. Eliminating one floor of the stacked flats in  
11 | the front, to bring it back to that original proposal, might  
12 | reduce eight units, two affordable housing units or something  
13 | like that.

14 |           And it's hard to say that disrupts plan-wide goals when  
15 | Donohoe alone has over 500 units across other buildings, not  
16 | including this one, under development right now in the same  
17 | neighborhood. And there are literally thousands of units under  
18 | development in Friendship Heights right now.

19 |           So we just wondered whether the Commission was able to  
20 | ensure that Donohoe had met the burden of proving the sacrifices  
21 | to the plan's priorities. Like I said, I appreciate the attention  
22 | to the other priorities and questions we had asked in our letter.  
23 | Thank you.

24 |           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. Let me look at my  
25 | colleagues and see. First, Ms. Schellin, can we find out -- no.

1 Let me ask you, Mr. Jacob van Leer. Are you within 200 feet?

2 MR. VAN LEER: I could trip and fall into the wall on  
3 that building. Again, I don't want to say there's anything  
4 intentional. Maybe they're going to the wrong person, because  
5 this project has been going on for seven years and we only moved  
6 here two years ago. But --

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I'm going somewhere else with  
8 this. Ms. Shiker and Mr. Cohen, can you all submit or tell me  
9 where it is in the submission, so I can go right to it? I want  
10 to see if Mr. van Leer's name is on the 200-foot list that went  
11 out. We don't have to do that right now. Just let me know where  
12 it is in exhibits. (Indiscernible)

13 MS. SHIKER: We obtain the list from the Office of Tax  
14 and Revenue. We do not put this list together. So it is based  
15 on the district records. We obtained the list the first time  
16 before we submitted the notice of intent to all the property  
17 owners and to the ANC.

18 And then because there had been some time between that  
19 period of time, we actually obtained a new list right before we  
20 filed our pre-hearing submission, which would allow the most up  
21 to date information for the hearing, to go out to the 200-foot  
22 property owners list.

23 We will let you know. Mr. Cohen's finding out exactly  
24 where that is. But again, Chairman Hood, we do not prepare that.  
25 We obtain that from the district. So it is based on the

1 district's records, and they draw the 200-foot line based on the  
2 lines.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So Ms. Shiker, thank you. I'm very  
4 well aware of that. I'm very well aware of the 200 feet. I just  
5 wanted to know if his name was on the list. That's all I was  
6 trying to figure out.

7 MR. SHIKER: I believe that his wife or partner, Melanie  
8 Bornstein (phonetic), is on the list at that address.

9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. van Leer, do you know Ms.  
10 Bornstein?

11 MR. VAN LEER: Yes, that's my wife.

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So you all got notice. Okay.  
13 Let me go to the next question. Any other questions? So let me  
14 say this, Mr. van Leer. You all got notice.

15 Now, you might not have noticed it, you might have  
16 thrown it away. But I'm always concerned when people tell me  
17 they don't get notice. But according to the records of the  
18 district government, you all had notice. And we don't --

19 MR. VAN LEER: Right. I'll just say, I know quite  
20 well, from talking with Jedd Skibo next door, when he gets notice  
21 of things and I don't. And this was one of those situations, I  
22 think.

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So he got notice --

24 MR. VAN LEER: I'm not saying there's anything  
25 intentional there, but if there's any way to get a little asterisk



1 next to my name and, the next hearing that comes around, we can  
2 get stuff sent, that'd be fantastic.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I just was trying to make  
4 sure that we have dotted all our I'd and crossed our T's. And I  
5 do know sometimes things happen. But if Mr. Skibo got it and  
6 you didn't, we'll apologize. Okay.

7 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Right. But there is also the  
8 posting on the property, which we see in the record. I'm sorry  
9 that Mr. van Leer did not see that posting of the property.

10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah, okay.

11 MS. SHIKER: Chairman Hood, if I may?

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.

13 MS. SHIKER: Her notice was returned.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

15 MS. SHIKER: If that is her name. I'm sorry?

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah, that's fine. Thank you. So  
17 the notice was returned, okay.

18 MS. SHIKER: It was, if that is the name, Melanie A.  
19 Bornstein, 770 P Street Northwest, Apartment 419. It was  
20 returned.

21 MR. VAN LEER: And that would be why. The apartment  
22 that's listed is not where we live. We live on the 1500 block  
23 of 42nd Street.

24 MS. SHIKER: Yeah, it says that the forwarding time has  
25 expired.

1 MR. VAN LEER: Understood.

2 MS. SHIKER: So that's the address with Tax and Revenue.  
3 You need to --

4 MR. VAN LEER: Apologies. I don't have to take up the  
5 time of the Commission to deal with this issue. We can reach  
6 out to the Office of Tax and Revenue to try to figure out why  
7 the wrong address is there. Apologies.

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. That's where I'm trying  
9 to go, Mr. van Leer, because I know this city does all it can to  
10 give notice. I'm dealing with something else in my neighborhood  
11 about notice, so I get it. I appreciate what the city does, and  
12 let's just make sure we have ourself correct.

13 And we'll again apologize. But the Vice Chair is right.  
14 There are other ways to be properly noticed as well, which is by  
15 law. So we'll leave it like that for now. Any questions of this  
16 panel? Anybody? In the panel, I'm talking about from Ms. Cort,  
17 Mr. Rep, any questions?

18 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you for your testimony.

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. Thank you all for your  
20 testimony. And then I will say, Mr. Rep, we have asked for some  
21 questions. I'm not sure if they're going to respond in rebuttal,  
22 if they have rebuttal.

23 If not, the Commission has asked for some things to  
24 clarify. Not your whole letter, but some of the letter I want  
25 some responses to, especially with the two programs and

1 everything that you mentioned. So all right. Do we have the  
2 ANC commissioner yet, Ms. Schellin?

3 MS. SCHELLIN: Oh, yes, he was here earlier. Let me  
4 see. Did he leave, Commissioner Quinn? He was up. He's actually  
5 up.

6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

7 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Quinn is up.

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Commissioner Quinn, I know you  
9 missed a few things, but I wanted to let you do your report, and  
10 if you had any questions. I don't know if you've heard anything,  
11 but I don't know if you had any questions of anyone. Hopefully  
12 they stay here and you can ask. Commissioner Quinn, you can go  
13 right ahead. I can see you, but I can't hear you right now.

14 MR. YOUNG: Yeah, he's unmuted, but we can't hear, so  
15 he might need to change his microphone settings.

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Can you change your  
17 microphone settings? I don't know whether it's me or Vice Chair  
18 Miller. There you go. I heard something.

19 COMMISSIONER QUINN: Okay.

20 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: There you go.

21 COMMISSIONER QUINN: So what I was saying is I was  
22 apologizing for missing my earlier appointment. My wife was held  
23 up by the weather, and I had to get a prescription for one of my  
24 children urgently refilled. So I apologize for missing the  
25 earlier calling.

1           So good afternoon, members of the Zoning Commission.  
2 My name is Tom Quinn (phonetic). I'm an advisory neighborhood  
3 commissioner representing single member District 3E04, which  
4 covers both sides of Friendship Heights along Wisconsin Avenue  
5 from Harrison Street North to Western Avenue.

6           But this project is actually in Commissioner John  
7 Bender's (phonetic) district. But I am testifying on behalf of  
8 ANC 3E today. I apologize, I have the wrong testimony up. Hang  
9 on. Apologies. All right.

10           As this commission is well aware from our many  
11 appearances, especially in the last year, ANC 3E has long  
12 advocated for and sought from applicants affordable units and  
13 development projects exceeding the minimum required.

14           And in this instance, we are proud that, out of this  
15 application, our ANC will be hosting the first HANTA project in  
16 the district that we are aware of. Mr. Donohoe went into great  
17 detail about all the amenities in the projects.

18           I won't completely revisit those, but I think from our  
19 perspective, the most important benefit is converting what is  
20 currently essentially a surface parking lot surrounded by an  
21 imposing brick wall immediately adjacent to the sidewalk, capped  
22 by the second tallest structure in the district, and replacing  
23 it with an attractive residential project that we believe is the  
24 appropriate scale, the transition between the single-family homes  
25 on the east side of 42nd Street to the higher density buildings

1 on Wisconsin Avenue.

2           We believe replacing the surface parking lot with the  
3 myriad green building features of this project, which include a  
4 green roof and hopefully a gas-free building, is an important  
5 step for our neighborhood, and to be able to do that while adding  
6 badly needed affordable and market rate housing is a win-win.

7           Consistent with other projects our ANC has supported,  
8 this project also includes proximate public space improvements  
9 in the form of the publicly accessible bocce Courts a block away,  
10 which are something we currently have none of in our community,  
11 and the bulb-outs at 42nd and Garrison the applicant is working  
12 with the ANC and DDOT to deliver, which will have built to DDOT's  
13 standards, including stormwater retention features, and be  
14 another green component of this project.

15           As in the case of previous projects where we have  
16 negotiated additional affordable components, we are strongly  
17 supportive of the two three-bedroom units in the IZ program at  
18 the 50 and 60 percent IZ level, which we believe will enable two  
19 families to live in our resource and transit-rich neighborhood  
20 who otherwise would not have been able to.

21           We also appreciate the inclusion of two fully  
22 accessible units built to ANSIA, which are ADA-standard units.  
23 The applicant has embodied the reference to amenities, among many  
24 others, in a memorandum of understanding that we have submitted  
25 to the record, along with our formal resolution, and we

1 respectfully ask the Zoning Commission to embody the terms of the  
2 MOU and any CC order regarding this matter.

3           ANC 3E enthusiastically supports this project, which  
4 we believe will enhance our neighborhood in the district, and we  
5 urge you to support it as well. I'm happy to answer any questions  
6 about the process by which we came to unanimously support this  
7 project.

8           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Commissioner Quinn.  
9 Let's see if we have any questions. My colleagues, any questions  
10 of Commissioner Quinn? Okay. Not seeing any. Thank you,  
11 Commissioner Quinn, of all the work that you all continually do  
12 in your area. Thank you, and across the city. Ms. Shiker, Mr.  
13 Cohen, do y'all have any questions of Commissioner Quinn?

14           MR. SHIKER: No.

15           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. All right. Thank you again,  
16 Commissioner Quinn. All right. Ms. Schellin, I think we've  
17 finished, right?

18           MS. SCHELLIN: Unless Commissioner Quinn -- he didn't  
19 have any questions. I think I heard him say he had no cross from  
20 anybody?

21           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah, I've asked him, did he have  
22 any questions? I asked him at the beginning.

23           MS. SCHELLIN: You did ask him. So then, yes, you are  
24 correct. Rebuttal, closing.

25           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Okay. Do y'all have any

1 rebuttal or are we closing?

2 MS. SHIKER: Chairman Hood, yes. Just a couple of  
3 points. I'd like just to reiterate that IZ-plus does not apply  
4 to PUD, specifically so that applicants can go work with the  
5 community to come up with a bundle of public benefits and  
6 amenities that satisfy various needs.

7 And as Ms. Elliott testified, looking in this case,  
8 with the benefits, the amenities, the advancement of the many  
9 policies of the district, those substantially outweigh the  
10 development incentives and flexibilities that are requested with  
11 this PUD.

12 So we do believe that we meet that burden of proof.  
13 With respect to the questions that were asked about the height,  
14 I believe that Ms. Alexander would like to pull up sheet A06. We  
15 just, again, certainly not doing anything that is not standard.  
16 Building height measuring points are identified in the zoning  
17 regulations.

18 We do establish those at the midpoint. That means that  
19 a building can get taller or shorter, based on its zoning height.  
20 And I think that, if we show the sheet A06, Ms. Alexander could  
21 maybe make one or two points about that. But it really does  
22 clearly show the heights for everyone involved. So Ms. Alexander,  
23 I'll let you say a couple of sentences and then I'll move on to  
24 my closing.

25 MS. ALEXANDER: Sure, yes. Hopefully, you can hear me

1 over the lightning and rain. So the top image here does show  
2 that little bull's eye right in the center. That's the building  
3 height measuring point in the middle of the frontage of our  
4 building, at the street.

5 This is a section, obviously, but it shows you how it's  
6 in the middle. As you go down the hill, the building is a little  
7 taller. As you go up the hill, it is a little shorter. The  
8 balance is about 50 feet. But that is how you measure, as you  
9 guys know, how you measure height in the district.

10 It also does identify, on the left-hand side there, how  
11 the penthouse is set back. In that side, it's 18 feet. As I  
12 went through on the northern side, it's even greater. And on  
13 the eastern side, facing the homes, it's even more. Sorry,  
14 thunder.

15 So while I completely understand if you are flying like  
16 a bird straight, you would hit it, the way the height is  
17 perceived, as was shown in the perspective, since it is set back,  
18 it is set back for a reason. And why it was designed that way  
19 is so that it is less of apparent height.

20 So we are only proposing to have a twelve-foot-high  
21 penthouse for the majority of our penthouse. We are showing a  
22 mechanical zone that goes up to that 18-foot for an override of  
23 our elevator overrides, and for any mechanical equipment, which  
24 we do not believe will be nearly as large as what we're showing  
25 here.



1           We're just allowing ourselves that flexibility until  
2 we get to a point where we can design all the way through with  
3 mechanical and determine the true amount we need for that  
4 mechanical zone.

5           And then just on the bottom image quickly, that just  
6 shows the 5151 on the left-hand side. So our penthouse is lower  
7 than its penthouse, and our measuring point is lower than its  
8 building height measuring points. So it is not a true statement  
9 to say that our building is taller than 5151. Thank you.

10           MS. SHIKER: With that Commissioner Hood, members of  
11 the commission, we do believe that, based on our testimony and  
12 the reports of the district agencies and the strong support of  
13 the ANC, we believe that the application meets the standard of  
14 review for the PUD and map amendment.

15           And while we understand we do have some documentation  
16 to submit in the record of the many topics that we talked about  
17 today, we would ask for the Commission to consider taking proposed  
18 action at its earliest convenience, to allow the project to  
19 continue to move forward while we continue to document this  
20 information. Thank you so much. We appreciate your  
21 consideration.

22           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Colleagues, I  
23 think we have a number of issues. We can either move forward  
24 tonight or wait to submission, because I'm always in the mindset  
25 of, even if I take proposals, I don't have a problem. We've done

1 this, stopping it final.

2 But I want to leave it up to my colleagues on this. I  
3 know the weather's making us push, but I want us to be thoughtful  
4 as we continue to move. And I believe some of the submissions  
5 we have could or may not possibly change our minds.

6 I don't know, but I wanted to see some of it. And I  
7 do know that this has an abundance amount of support. So that's  
8 kind of what I'm hearing. But let me hear from others and see  
9 how you all want to proceed. I can go either way. Commissioner  
10 Imamura?

11 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm  
12 pleased to take proposed action tonight. As you said, that  
13 doesn't preclude us from having a change of point of view, final  
14 action. But there are a number of benefits and, as you noted, a  
15 number of letters in support, as well as a number of agencies,  
16 district agencies that have also recommended approval.

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Commissioner Wright?

18 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: I agree. We have gotten a lot  
19 of information this evening, and I know we're going to receive a  
20 few other pieces that will be added to the record.

21 However, I really do feel that what questions there  
22 were, were answered to my satisfaction, and that this is an  
23 important project to add housing and 33 percent, which is a  
24 remarkable number, of lower than market rate housing.

25 I think that this is a project we should definitely

1 support, and I would be happy to take proposed action tonight.  
2 Again, with the caveat, as Commissioner Imamura and Chair Hood  
3 mentioned, that, if we get additional information in the record,  
4 that we can reopen a conversation.

5 But really, everything I've heard, this is a very, very  
6 laudable project with a lot of support, and I think we should  
7 take proposed action.

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Commissioner  
9 Stidham?

10 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: I'd like to take proposed action  
11 tonight.

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And Vice Chair Miller?

13 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, yeah.  
14 Thank you. Can you hear me? Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, I  
15 agree with my colleagues.

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I have no problem moving  
17 forward. Commissioner Imamura, could you make a motion?

18 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Mr. Chairman, I move that the  
19 Zoning Commission take proposed action for Case No. 24-12,  
20 Harrison, Wisconsin Owner, LLC, consolidated PUD and related map  
21 amendment at Square 1666, Lots 809 and 810 at 4201 Garrison Street  
22 Northwest, and ask for a second.

23 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Second.

24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: It's been moved and properly second.  
25 Any further discussion? Not hearing any. Ms. Schellin, would

1 | you do a roll call vote, please?

2 |           MS. SCHELLIN:    Note my camera, because I am losing  
3 | connectivity here.   Commissioner Imamura?

4 |           COMMISSIONER IMAMURA:   Yes.

5 |           MS. SCHELLIN:    Commissioner Stidham?   Commissioner  
6 | Hood?

7 |           COMMISSIONER HOOD:   Yes.

8 |           MS. SCHELLIN:    Commissioner Miller?   Commissioner  
9 | Wright?

10 |          COMMISSIONER WRIGHT:   Yes.

11 |          MS. SCHELLIN:    The vote is five to zero to zero to  
12 | approve proposed action in Zoning Commission Case No. 24-12. I'm  
13 | sorry?   Commissioner Imamura moving that, as we know, and  
14 | Commissioner Stidham seconding. Do you want me to set some dates  
15 | for the items?

16 |          CHAIRPERSON HOOD:   Can we do this quickly?   Because I  
17 | don't like to play with lights.

18 |          MS. SCHELLIN:    Yes.   Okay.   All right.   So if we could  
19 | have the applicant make their submissions, can you do that, Ms.  
20 | Shiker, by the 21st?

21 |          MS. SHIKER:   With the first part of our BAFO submission  
22 | as well.

23 |          MS. SCHELLIN:    Okay.   So if you can get those additional  
24 | submissions by the 21st and the ANC, if they choose to do so,  
25 | can respond by the 28th.   And then, of course, you'll go through

1 | what we call our proffer and conditions process. And we'll put  
2 | this on probably for the first meeting in September for final  
3 | action. Thank you.

4 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay, anything else? Anyone?

5 | MS. SHIKER: Thank you.

6 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you all for all your hard work  
7 | and participation in this case tonight. Looking forward to  
8 | getting the additional information for our final action. The  
9 | Zoning Commission will meet again July the 21st on these same  
10 | platforms. You all have a great evening. Have a safe night.

11 | MS. SCHELLIN: I think that we meet on --

12 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Did I get a wrong date?

13 | MS. SCHELLIN: Are we not meeting Thursday? Did we  
14 | cancel?

15 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: What's Thursday's date? Oh, yeah.  
16 | I'm sorry. We meet July 17th.

17 | MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Okay.

18 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: The lightning makes me move faster.

19 | MS. SCHELLIN: I'm back from vacation. You're  
20 | confusing me.

21 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah, July 17th. I'm sorry. Okay.  
22 | All right, thanks.

23 | MS. SCHELLIN: Good night.

24 | (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the  
25 | record at 6:36 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 Hearing

Before: DCBZA

Date: 07-14-25

Place: Washington, D.C.

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

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael Galate