

GOVERNMENT OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

REGULAR PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

THURSDAY

SEPTEMBER 11, 2025

+ + + + +

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

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

SHARON SCHELLIN, Secretary
ELLA ACKERMAN, Staff
PAUL YOUNG, A/V Operations

OFFICE OF ZONING LEGAL DIVISION:

JACOB RITTING, ESQUIRE

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

ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT:

Paul Tummonds, Goulston & Storrs

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the
Regular Public Hearing held on September 11, 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

| | |
|--|----|
| Case No. 24-12 | |
| Harrison Wisconsin Owner, LLC Consolidated PUD & | |
| Related Map Amendment..... | 7 |
| Case No. 24-15 | |
| 901 Monroe Street, LLC Consolidated PUD & | |
| Related Map Amendment..... | 14 |
| Jacob Ritting, Esquire..... | 34 |
| Paul Tummonds, Esquire..... | 36 |
| Jacob Ritting, Esquire..... | 37 |
| Questions/Comments from Commissioners: | |
| Vice Chair Miller..... | 9 |
| Commissioner Wright..... | 11 |
| Commissioner Wright..... | 15 |
| Commissioner Miller..... | 15 |
| Chairperson Hood..... | 16 |
| Commissioner Wright..... | 17 |
| Commissioner Stidham..... | 20 |
| Commissioner Imamura..... | 21 |
| Vice Chair Miller..... | 23 |
| Chairperson Hood..... | 25 |
| Commissioner Wright..... | 27 |
| Commissioner Imamura..... | 28 |
| Commissioner Stidham..... | 30 |
| Vice Chairperson Miller..... | 31 |
| Chairperson Hood..... | 31 |

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

(4:00 p.m.)

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. We are convening and broadcasting this public meeting by videoconferencing. My name is Anthony Hood. I'm joined by Vice Chair Miller, Commissioner Wright, Commissioner Imamura and and Commission Stidham. We're also joined by the Office of Zoning staff, Ms. Ella Ackerman and Ms. Sharon Schellin, and well as Mr. Paul Young who will be handling all of our virtual operations and our Office of Zoning Legal Division this evening for this meeting, Mr. Jacob Ritting. I will ask all others to introduce themselves at the appropriate time if needed.

Copies of today's meeting agenda are available on the Office of Zoning's website. Please be advised that this proceeding is being recorded by a court reporter and is also webcast live via Webex and YouTube Live. The video will be available on the Office of Zoning's website after the meeting. Accordingly, all those listening on Webex or by phone will be muted during the hearing. For hearing action items the only documents before us this evening are the application, the ANC setdown report and the Office of Planning report. All other documents in the record will be reviewed at the time of the hearing.

We do not take any public testimony at our meetings unless the Commission requests someone to speak. If you're

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

1 experiencing difficulty accessing Webex or with your telephone
2 call-in, then please call our OZ hotline number at 202-727-0789
3 for Webex login or call-in instructions.

4 Additional note, the Board voted on September the 9th
5 to enter into a closed session on September 11 to receive legal
6 advice from our counsel regarding the cases noted on the agenda
7 for today's meeting and preserve the attorney/client privilege
8 between the Commission and its attorneys pursuant to D.C.
9 Official Code 2-575(b)(4) and (a) and to deliberate but not vote
10 on the contested cases pursuant to D.C. Official Code 2-
11 575(b)(13). We voted on September the 9th. There were no
12 objections today as we entered into the closed session. This is
13 to notify everyone that we just actually just exited and came out
14 of closed session, as we noted on September the 9th. For now
15 I'll just leave it at that.

16 All right. So, Ms. Ackerman, do we have any preliminary
17 matters?

18 MS. ACKERMAN: Yes, we do.

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

20 MS. ACKERMAN: Okay. At the conclusion of the public
21 hearing on July 14th, the Commission took proposed action to
22 approve this case and it was referred to the NCPC for 30 day
23 comment period.

24 On August 28th the NCPC staff filed a letter at Exhibit
25 93 stating the proposed project falls under an exemption listed

1 in Chapter 8 of the NCPC Submission Guidelines. During the July
2 14th public hearing, the Office of Planning noted four
3 corrections to the hearing report. The Commission requested a
4 memorandum be submitted to the record outlining any corrections
5 and this is found at Exhibit 87. On July 21st, the Applicant
6 submitted its initial list of proffers and conditions and on
7 August 1st the Applicant submitted its final list of proffers and
8 conditions. On August 18th, 2025 the Applicant submitted its
9 draft order. This case is ready for the Commission to consider
10 final action.

11 Thank you.

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Ms. Ackerman, I can understand how
13 things can get kind of confused because sometimes I even get that
14 way. Let's call the case first.

15 MS. ACKERMAN: Oh, I'm sorry.

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: That's okay. Let me come up there.

17 MS. ACKERMAN: Okay.

18 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'm having computer problems and
19 they're stuck.

20 MS. ACKERMAN: Do you want me to say it?

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Can you call the case? Yeah, yeah.
22 If you can call the case number and everything. Oh, no, hold
23 on. I got it. I got it. It came up. Hold on, I got it. One
24 sec.

25 MS. ACKERMAN: Okay.

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. First on the agenda is Zoning
2 Commission case No. 24-12. This is the Harrison Wisconsin, LLC
3 Consolidated PUD and Related Map Amendment at Square 1666, 4201
4 Garrison Street, Northwest, and I think, Ms. Ackerman, you've
5 already teed it up. Do you want to tee it up again for us since
6 I called the case now, and now you can do what you just did.

7 MS. ACKERMAN: Okay. I'll say it again. Going to take
8 a sip of water.

9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah. It was quite a bit.

10 MS. ACKERMAN: At the conclusion of the public hearing
11 on July 14th, the Commission took proposed action to approve this
12 case and it was referred to the NCPC for its 30 day comment
13 period. On August 28th, the NCPC staff filed a letter at Exhibit
14 93 stating the proposed project falls under an exemption listed
15 in Chapter 8 of the NCPC Submission Guidelines.

16 During this public hearing, OP, the Office of Planning,
17 noted four corrections to the hearing report. The Commission
18 requested a memorandum be submitted to the record outlining any
19 corrections and this can be found at Exhibit 87. On July 21st,
20 the Applicant submitted a post-hearing statement found at Exhibit
21 88 and they also submitted an initial list of proffers and
22 conditions.

23 On August 1st, the Applicant submitted its final list
24 of proffers and conditions and on August 18th, the Commission,
25 oh sorry, the Applicant submitted its draft order. This case is

1 ready for the Commission to consider final action.

2 Thank you.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Ackerman. I know
4 that, let me just say that we discussed a lot of this previously.
5 We asked for a lot of things and I'm going to go down a few items
6 which have been listed to make sure we have. I'm sure we have
7 read it already, and see if anybody has any concerns, the issues
8 or any problems, any corrections or some of the responses we had
9 for some of the information we received at the hearing.

10 So one of them was the response at the hearing, and
11 also when we took proposed action. One of the responses that we
12 heard was the testimony of, there were some immediate neighbors
13 who are in opposition. One of the things they requested was the
14 shadow studies which is our Exhibit 88A. Any comments or
15 questions about the shadow studies? I know I reviewed them and
16 I was able to look at the solstice and I didn't have any questions
17 after those were submitted. I'm not sure who asked for the shadow
18 studies. Okay.

19 Any questions or comments on the shadow studies?

20 (Pause.)

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Also, I will say the response to the
22 comments from the Committee of 100, I thought the Committee of
23 100, and I appreciate the Committee of 100 bringing that up.
24 Bringing up about the two affordable housing components being
25 pushed out there in this particular application. I think that

1 the response from the Applicant at least helped me to come to
2 come to reality, helped me to focus and understand exactly. I
3 think the Committee brought up a good point but the Applicant
4 responded and the way they responded a lot had to do with
5 financing and other issues of that nature. Any other comments
6 on that? Okay.

7 All right. Next thing is LEED. Office of Planning had
8 requested related to the LEED and the other environmental
9 commitments including the updated LEED scorecard and that was
10 Exhibit 88B. Any comments on that? All right.

11 And the MOU. I know basically the Mou, but when I
12 looked through the MOU between (audio interference) and the
13 Applicant, I think in our order we just point to the MOU. We
14 don't necessarily get into the logistics of the MOU, and what I
15 like about the MOU was that the ANC said even if the Zoning
16 Commission leaves something out that MOU will cover anything
17 that's left out of our order and I think that covers their MOU.
18 Even all we basically point to MOUs, and there's one other thing
19 I think. That's it. That's all I have.

20 Any comments or questions from anybody? Vice Chair
21 Miller.

22 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Yeah. I agree with you, Mr.
23 Chairman, that the Applicant was responsive to requests by the
24 Zoning Commission and witnesses who testified at the public
25 hearing, and the Office of Planning. The, you know, the biggest

1 public benefit of this project is its significant affordable
2 housing component in a high cost high opportunity area of Rock
3 Creek West which we know has had its challenges of meeting the
4 housing equity targets that the Mayor set several years ago.

5 Because, as the Office of the Attorney General
6 testified, we'll transform a service parking lot, an inactive
7 television tower which they're going remove that 750
8 dysfunctional, 750 foot high television tower. We'll transform
9 that site into a new residential building easily accessible to
10 the metro. More than a third of the building, 126 units, will
11 be affordable under both our inclusionary zoning program and
12 under the District's high, affordable housing for high needs
13 areas tax subsidy program, I think it's one of the first ones
14 maybe in the PUD that we've seen. There might have been some
15 matter-of-right ones. So, and the response to the ANC they will
16 include amongst those units, and some very low income units and
17 three bedroom units as well.

18 So on the LEED they did, in response to Commissioner
19 Imamura amongst others pushing them to get to their goal since
20 they were just two points shy, they did make it, at least in
21 their commitment now. So they are at LEED Gold so thank you
22 everyone who pushed for that. It's a very attractively designed
23 building that will contribute to the continuing and necessary
24 revitalization of the Wisconsin Avenue corridor. So I'm in fully
25 support of this project going forward.

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. And, again, I'm afraid
2 sometimes to open up files because it messes up my computer but
3 I did want to say I appreciate, I mentioned it quickly, Committee
4 of 100, Shelly Repp, with the affordable housing or IZ and the
5 HANTA support. So I think, you know, that's the whole give
6 (phonetic) and I appreciate the argument that the Applicant made
7 when it came to dealing with both parts of affordable housing
8 because to gather support of units provide a meaningful and
9 enhanced affordable housing benefit under the PUD and I
10 appreciate that. So I think it's key, especially for this area
11 in the city.

12 Anything else? Anything else? All right. So,
13 Commissioner Wright.

14 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: I just sort of want to sort of
15 echo what Vice Chair Miller said. I think this project is pretty
16 special in that it has a really strong articulated design that
17 focuses on trying to create a smooth transition between the higher
18 density buildings on Wisconsin Avenue and single family
19 residences that are directly adjacent across the street and I
20 think it does that very successfully.

21 I also think that, you know, between the normal IZ and
22 the HANTA which is I think the program, again, Vice Chair Miller
23 was talking about, the fact that this project is providing 33
24 percent affordable units is extraordinary and is really, you
25 know, we frequently struggle to get, you know, anywhere over the

1 base ten percent or so. It's very, very exciting.

2 You know, and then of course the benefits of removing
3 the, you know, radio tower and using a -- we always have an
4 expression that we used when I worked in Montgomery County which
5 is we want to turn parking lots into places and I think that's
6 what they're really doing here. They're taking essentially a
7 parking lot and they're making it a great place.

8 So I just wanted to say a few more positive things
9 about this project. It's a PUD. It's one that we really are
10 asked to balance the benefits of the PUD against the density and
11 I think in this case it's really successful. So just wanted to
12 throw in a couple of good words.

13 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Commissioner Wright. I
14 will tell you that I need to put it all together and connect the
15 dots. Years ago we used to look to Montgomery County, especially
16 here in the city when it came to affordable housing. You all
17 were the model. So now we got you here with us, so thank you.
18 Thank you.

19 All right. So any other questions or comments? All
20 right. Commissioner Imamura, would you make a motion, please?

21 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd
22 be glad to.

23 I move that the Zoning Commission approve Case No. 24-
24 12 Harrison Wisconsin Owner, LLC, Consolidated PUD and Related
25 Map Amendment from R-2 for the eastern portion of the RA-3, 4201

1 Garrison Street, Northwest, Square 1666, Block 810 and portion
2 of Lot 809, and ask for a second.

3 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Second.

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. It's been moved and properly
5 seconded. Any further discussion? We're not going to do all in
6 favor yet, we want to get clarification on that. So, Ms.
7 Ackerman, could you do a roll call vote?

8 MS. ACKERMAN: Commissioner Imamura?

9 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.

10 MS. ACKERMAN: Commissioner Wright?

11 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes.

12 MS. ACKERMAN: Commissioner Hood?

13 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.

14 MS. ACKERMAN: Commissioner Miller?

15 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Yes.

16 MS. ACKERMAN: Commissioner Stidham?

17 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes.

18 MS. ACKERMAN: Staff records the vote five to zero to
19 zero to approve Case No. 24-12 for final action. Okay. And
20 would you like the Applicant to work with OZLD to provide a
21 summary order?

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. I think this, we didn't
23 have any -- well, we had opposition. I'll leave that up to, if
24 they can do a summary, fine. I'll leave that up to OZLD to make
25 that decision.

1 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. This won't be a summary order at
2 all.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

4 MS. SCHELLIN: (Indiscernible).

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Because we had opposition.
6 Okay.

7 MS. SCHELLIN: Or neither of these I don't think, no.

8 MS. ACKERMAN: Okay.

9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. All right. Thank you, Ms.
10 Ackerman. All right. When you get ready, you can call the next
11 case?

12 (Pause.)

13 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: You know what, Ms. Ackerman? I
14 don't want to confuse you. I'm the one that's confused this
15 time. Let me call the case. Hold on a sec.

16 MS. ACKERMAN: Okay.

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. I had moved on to
18 something else. We've been off the mark of all, this has taking
19 a minute to get straight. Okay.

20 Next on our agenda proposed action, Zoning Commission
21 Case No. 24-15, 901 Monroe Street, LLC, Consolidated PUD and
22 Related Map Amendment at Square 3829, Lot 23.

23 Ms. Ackerman.

24 MS. ACKERMAN: Since the conclusion of the hearing on
25 July 7th, the Applicant submitted a statement at Exhibit 135 with

1 information that was requested by the Commission. The 200 Footers
2 party responded to these comments at Exhibit 136 and at Exhibit
3 137 the Applicant submitted a draft order. This case is ready
4 for the Commission to deliberate.

5 Thank you.

6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. There are a lot of moving
7 parts to this case. This case, something similar has been going
8 on for a while here on this case but I would like to start off
9 having our discussion and basically three points.

10 First, let's talk about the intensity of the map
11 amendment. Does anyone believe that this site should only be
12 eligible -- should be looked at as a lower intensity. I know
13 we've talked about this in other cases before but I'm just curious
14 from my colleagues, does anyone believe, can we take that off the
15 mat? Let me open it up for discussion.

16 Commissioner Wright?

17 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Thank you.

18 Yes, no I believe that the proposed general height and
19 density in the application is appropriate and I don't think it
20 should be, you know, a different height, general height and
21 density in this PUD.

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Anyone else like to comment
23 on that or are we all?

24 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Yeah. I would just agree
25 with Commissioner Wright that the proposed height and density is

1 not, are not inconsistent with the medium density residential,
2 moderate density commercial in its due destination on the
3 comprehensive plan and future land use map which was intensified
4 in the last comprehensive plan amendment cycle by the Council and
5 the Mayor.

6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. All right.

7 The next two things, and I'd like to take these in
8 order. Let's talk about the concerns about the proximity of
9 light and air and the height and bulk of the building,
10 particularly as it relates to the 10th street townhomes and let's
11 talk about the concerns that were raised about the traffic
12 congestion and related adverse effects pertaining to package drop
13 off and loading.

14 And I'll just say this and then I'll come to you,
15 Commissioner Wright. Any time we have a project we already know
16 that there are impacts. It's highly mitigated and I believe that
17 this will be mitigated and I believe it will be adapted too. And
18 I know that the community had a problem with the height and some
19 of the bulkiness of this and I will tell you when we looked Monroe
20 Street some years ago we had problems with some of the other
21 buildings.

22 But to me it's like (audio interference) right in, and
23 I understand those who live close by. I think this Applicant
24 has, probably could have done a little more in the sessions to
25 some of the units that are in the area but I think that they have

1 done -- I believe what they could do, especially with the
2 topography in the area that they were dealing with. So I'll
3 leave it, even though I'll say it again. I like the project. It
4 was remanded twice years ago better than this one, and I'll just
5 leave it at that.

6 Let me open it up. Commissioner Wright.

7 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Thank you.

8 I think I was one of the Commissioners that really
9 promoted the idea that the building needed some additional
10 sculpting and I do appreciate the effort that the Applicant has
11 made, particularly adjacent to the 10th Street townhomes. I
12 think that the work to sculpt the building and pull the building
13 back a little bit more on the upper floors adjacent to the 10th
14 Street townhomes is definitely a good move and I do appreciate
15 that.

16 I guess I am a little disappointed that there wasn't
17 an additional effort made, particularly along the Monroe façade.
18 From the renderings that we had seen at the previous meeting
19 showing the building dropped in along Monroe Street I felt that
20 that façade in particular was not sufficiently articulated and
21 was too boxy, and I would sort of have wished that the Applicant
22 could have looked at some architectural elements that would not
23 have necessarily decreased the square footage but would have
24 articulated that façade more than what they've done.

25 So for me what I'm sort of struggling with and balancing

1 is, you know, do the benefits that this PUD offers outweigh some
2 of the areas where it could be better and I think having
3 additional affordable housing going from ten percent to fifteen
4 percent is a big benefit.

5 I also really want to emphasize that the benefit of
6 undergrounding the utilities is an enormous benefit. I said that
7 at the last hearing and I want to, you know, emphasize that again,
8 and the improved streetscapes. Again, I had asked about larger
9 caliper trees and the information provided by the Applicant was
10 not as helpful as I had wished it might be.

11 I think they noted that this is the standard that the
12 Department of Transportation uses for street trees but what I
13 didn't get from that is is this the maximum caliper that the
14 Department of Transportation recommends for street trees or is
15 it the minimum caliper that the Department of Transportation
16 recommends for street trees. At the end, I'd love to actually
17 know more about that, if we have someone from Department of
18 Transportation here I'd love to find out what the answer to that
19 question is.

20 You know, this is not a project as I understand it that
21 is offering as one of their amenities superior architectural
22 design and I think that's true. I don't think this is superior
23 architectural design and I wouldn't say that that would be an
24 amenity of this PUD.

25 I also take quite seriously, as we're supposed to give

1 great weight to the ANC, and in this case it's actually the
2 directly impacted and the adjacent ANC. So there are two ANCs
3 and they both support this project and there have been a lot of
4 letters of support from the community. There's also been concerns
5 expressed. I mean, you know, the, you know, the 200 Footers have
6 expressed their concerns and the Applicant, again, giving them
7 credit. They've been trying to work through some of those
8 concerns, like the construction management issue and I was very
9 happy to hear that it sounds like they've come to some meeting
10 of the minds on construction management.

11 So, you know, I know I sound a little schizophrenic
12 here but I'm trying to sort of lay out what I see as the pros
13 and the cons of this project. You know, I know everyone knows
14 this project has a really long history and some people are just
15 ready to see it done. I'm new to the group so I have a little
16 more energy maybe to, you know, talk about some of these issues
17 for those of you who've been through it already for a number of
18 years.

19 But, you know, again, for me I'm still in my mind, even
20 as we speak, weighing, you know, the issue that we're asked to
21 weigh in a PUD. Does the benefits that are provided by this
22 project, you know, the affordable housing, the improved
23 streetscape, the undergrounding of utilities, do those outweigh
24 some of the, you know, less refined parts of the project and I
25 would say, you know, the massing particularly along Monroe Street

1 is part of the less refined part of the project.

2 So, those are my thoughts. I'm still, you know, I'm
3 still balancing and weighing some of that.

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

5 Commissioner Stidham.

6 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: I do appreciate the longevity
7 of this project and I appreciate the fact that this has been a
8 vacant lot for some time and I do also appreciate all the public
9 benefits, especially the public housing piece. But frankly I am
10 still struggling with this project in terms of the massing of
11 this building. I do not feel that the Applicant took the comments
12 that they received in our last hearing to heart.

13 While the improvements they made on that corner of the
14 building is an improvement, it's not really in the location where
15 improvement really needed to happen. It really needed to happen
16 in the bar that is located on Monroe Street, specifically at the
17 edge of the building along the alley where it abuts up against
18 the existing structures.

19 There could have been a lot of consideration on how to
20 reduce the effects of such a boxy overpowering building in this
21 neighborhood. I think if this project was located a few blocks
22 away closer to the metro station where things are taller, it
23 would make more sense but it's not. This is in a location where
24 there are smaller structures here and dropping this building in
25 is very imposing and I do not think the Applicant has done enough

1 to make it less imposing.

2 And as Commissioner Wright, I am struggling with the
3 balance of the public benefits, the amount of support this project
4 has from the ANC and from the community. But this is still not,
5 in my mind, the right massing for this neighborhood.

6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

7 Commissioner Imamura.

8 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and
9 thank you, Commissioner Wright and Commissioner Stidham.

10 I had almost thought, I thought Commissioner Wright was
11 rather polite about her comments in terms of some of the design
12 moves that were made to make improvements based off of the
13 comments of the Commission. I think more bluntly, I think to
14 Commissioner Stidham, I think those moves at the corner were
15 modest. Clearly I think along Monroe Street there probably could
16 have been some more improvements along that façade there
17 architecturally. I do appreciate the comment that Commissioner
18 Wright made about just the articulation of the façade or the
19 elevation there. Certainly the variability or the various
20 materials there certainly helps but I can agree that maybe some
21 more articulation in the façade probably would have helped.

22 However, I think in terms of the program of the
23 building, the particular site, it's not an offensive design.
24 It's within, you know, it's modest. I can certainly, you know,
25 it is within, it's 4.2 FAR at MU-5B, so within the matter-of-

1 right certainly could have been much higher and still not
2 inconsistent with the comprehensive plan and the FLUM and, you
3 know, with the MU-7. The public benefits here, 233 units, 12 of
4 which are three bedroom, I think is significant here.

5 So that being said, I think, I saw the shadow studies
6 and appreciate that, the additional submission there. What I saw
7 was everything that I expected to see so, you know, I think it's
8 consistent to say that in the winter time we're going to see long
9 shadows everywhere and on an empty lot right now that's going to
10 seem probably a little more extreme than what the surrounding
11 residents are familiar with now with an empty lot.

12 But, and I will say, I will lament with Commissioner
13 Wright in terms of the caliper trees. Certainly would have liked
14 to see something a little more mature there but that's not enough
15 to stop a project and, you know, of course of anybody on the
16 Commission here I think I would certainly say I'm right up there
17 to advocate for better streetscapes and more vegetation and more
18 trees. But that's just not, then when balancing all the public
19 benefits here that's not something that I think would be
20 sufficient enough to stop this project, so.

21 Again, I think architecturally probably Monroe Street
22 is less successful than maybe the moves that were on the 10th
23 Street side but otherwise I think that the project itself meets
24 the program and is certainly within the height and massing and
25 the right designation that's not inconsistent with the

1 comprehensive plan and the FLUM.

2 That's all I have to share, Mr. Chairman.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you.

4 Vice Chair Miller, any comments?

5 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

6 I appreciate all the public hearing testimony that we
7 got from the community, both those who are in favor and those
8 who are opposed, and like my colleagues have mentioned I recognize
9 and give great weight to the Office of Planning's recommendations
10 and ANC 5B and 5F recommendations to support this project with --
11 I think one of them did have conditions and I think those
12 conditions, some of which related to the construction management
13 agreement which has since been executed since our hearing, and
14 so I think those conditions have been generally satisfied.

15 This project does have a long history. It's a long
16 vacant site that a lot of people want to see developed, including
17 I think the opposition, they just didn't want it as big. And
18 the comp plan, as I mentioned earlier, was amended in 2021 by
19 the Mayor and Council specifically to increase density and to
20 increase the density here and to facilitate this development
21 frankly. They didn't have an exact, they didn't have any project
22 in front of them but so I would have preferred to have seen more
23 sculpting that Commissioner Wright was pushing for and I think
24 could have been done without compromising the program, and they
25 did do some sculpting in the upper corners of the fifth and sixth

1 floor without compromising the program.

2 They reduced some square footage of the units but they
3 didn't reduce the units which are I think over 230 units of
4 housing, market housing. I think 36, I've probably got these
5 numbers not exactly right, 30 some of which are affordable under
6 our inclusionary zoning program and 12 of which of those
7 inclusionary zoning units are three bedroom units, all the three
8 bedroom units, which the ANC also pushed for as well as some of
9 us, and others, OP. They did accommodate.

10 So I think we can get an answer to the, if we move
11 forward with proposed action which is a big if, but if we do, we
12 could get an answer to Commissioner Wright's question about the
13 caliper trees. I agree, it seems that the response to your
14 question could they do larger trees and the response about the
15 DDOT, that it met the DDOT standards, it probably met the DDOT
16 minimum standards and so we (indiscernible) to get an answer from
17 DDOT if they're not here, which I don't think they are before
18 final action if we move forward with proposed action.

19 I don't think we can, I'm not sure we could get much
20 change in the architecture. Our disappointment or shared
21 disappointment in the architecture change in that without
22 compromising the program of the housing, affordable housing which
23 I think is a big public benefit and I think does, with the
24 undergrounding of the utilities on Monroe Street and I wish they
25 had undergrounded them on the other streets as well because when

1 | you see those pictures of those utility poles they look horrible
2 | and so I appreciate, it's a very expensive proposition and that
3 | is part of the public benefits here as well as others.

4 | So I'm prepared to move forward today, Mr. Chairman.

5 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you.

6 | I too am prepared to move forward. I think that for
7 | me when I look at this and taking everything under consideration
8 | what helped me get through looking at some of the issues from
9 | the opposition, I really appreciate the way ANC 5B, I think
10 | Commissioner Ra Amin, was able to answer those questions and the
11 | way he articulated from a community standpoint, the way he
12 | represented the community standpoint and the ANC where we're
13 | supposed to give great weight. I appreciated the way he was
14 | responsive in that cross-exam exercise to answering the questions
15 | from the opposition which gave me a point that this has been
16 | fully vetted.

17 | I do know that clearly, clearly, it's a larger building
18 | with some adverse impacts. I mean, I get that. I'm not
19 | discarding that. That's clear. But I believe it could be
20 | mitigated and it's acceptable, as I think Commissioner Imamura
21 | has alluded. I think it's acceptable. I think it'll work.

22 | Also, even though the subway is not right across the
23 | street, it's not that far. And so I think it all works together
24 | and ultimately I think it's going to be a better project, and I
25 | hear the issue about the underground of utilities which I think

1 is great until they go bad. I know a neighborhood right now
2 that's having problems with underground utilities. But I think
3 it starts off being good and I'm hoping this will be more of a
4 modern day as opposed to some of the folks that are in another
5 part of the city right now who are devastated because they they
6 cut their power lines.

7 So I'm sure things have progressed since then. I think
8 this project while, again as I stated earlier, I would have liked
9 the one that we remanded back two or three times. I think this
10 is more of a consensus from a community. While everybody's not
11 agreeing I know that the DCNA and the 200 Footers and others may
12 not fully agree, but I think we have something that I think that
13 is acceptable and I think when you look at our regulations I
14 think that it's doable.

15 And I get it about the sculpting. I'm not sure where
16 Commissioner Miller, I mean, I'm sorry, Commissioner Wright and
17 Commissioner Stidham. I was thinking about pushing it back, I
18 mean going back to the asking and asking to try and resolve that.
19 I will ask the Applicant to consider what's been heard from our
20 colleagues.

21 I'm not sure how the vote's going to end up but I think
22 my colleagues, I don't know if they're still on the fence at this
23 point, but I would ask the Applicant to give us a submission of
24 why you can or cannot do with what we're hearing from Commissioner
25 Wright and Commissioner Stidham now. I know, I'm not putting

1 words in your mouth, but I don't know if that's acceptable to
2 you two, but I would like for us to always have a complete record.

3 Let me just ask you all that. Is that acceptable or,
4 Commissioner Wright?

5 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: I mean, I would love to have the
6 Applicant explore particularly along Monroe Street some
7 additional tweaks, not to lose significant square footage, not
8 to remove a floor of the building, but additional tweaks that
9 would help to articulate that façade a bit more.

10 It could be a change in brick color or material on the
11 upper floors. It could be, you know, an architectural element
12 that even if it can't be set back, maybe something of, you know,
13 a water table type element could project out. You know, there
14 could, or, you know, a cornice type element could project out to
15 help sort of make the upper floors visually appear to step back.
16 I would love to see, if DOT would agree to slightly larger trees.

17 But, you know, I guess I am comfortable moving forward
18 although I would like to have in any motion where we are being
19 asked in the Applicant's statement they lay out, you know,
20 pursuant to Subtitle X, 304.3 the Commission should balance the
21 relative value of the public benefits and project amenities
22 offered with the degree of development incentives requested and
23 any potential adverse impacts.

24 And they offer eight amenities and one of those
25 amenities is superior urban design and architecture. I would

1 | like to remove that as one of the amenities just to be clear.
2 | The remaining amenities would be housing, affordable housing,
3 | site planning and land use, the streetscape plan, the
4 | environmental and sustainability benefits, the uses of special
5 | value and the comprehensive plan consistency. And so those all
6 | would absolutely remain as amenities and I think, again, the
7 | significant number of amenities that helped to do that balance
8 | that is requested or required in reviewing a PUD, but to eliminate
9 | the third one mentioned which was superior urban design and
10 | architecture.

11 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Let's deal with that right
12 | now. Any objections to that? I actually have never liked that
13 | but especially not in this case. I would wholeheartedly agree.
14 | But I'm going to go to the experts on this, Commissioner Imamura,
15 | but I can tell you that I don't like that either, Commissioner
16 | Wright.

17 | Commissioner Imamura.

18 | COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and
19 | thank you, Commissioner Wright.

20 | You probably saw me smile widely with a big grin. I'm
21 | not opposed to removing that unless, I'll put an unless in there,
22 | I think that is a challenge. I said this in the hearing that,
23 | you know, I think good design can solve almost any problem and I
24 | think what Commissioner Wright and Commissioner Stidham have
25 | expressed, particularly along Monroe Street, seems reasonable

1 enough.

2 I think as I said before Commissioner Wright was very
3 polite in terms of the design moves that were made were incredibly
4 modest based off of what was expressed in the hearing. So I
5 think that there's probably some room without compromising the
6 program and I think here I would hope that the Applicant wouldn't
7 come back and just say, well, it just doesn't pencil out. Because
8 I think what Commissioner Wright and Commissioner Stidham are
9 asking and I think is reasonable enough is really about a
10 treatment on the façade along Monroe Street.

11 So, again, to emphasize what Commissioner Wright said
12 ana maybe I think you also mentioned, Mr. Chairman, perhaps
13 forgive me if I get this wrong, but nobody's asking for a floor
14 to be removed here. What they're asking for is such that the
15 architect's not so locked in to this design solution, that there
16 is a solution here for that particular façade and Commissioner
17 Wright had suggested some ideas but leave it up to the architect,
18 but certainly one of those I thought that was reasonable enough
19 is a change in materiality. That could potentially help but we
20 will leave that to the design team to resolve.

21 So the challenge has really been put out there I think
22 by Commissioner Wright to say, well, and it's reasonable enough
23 to say, all right, well without, you know, remove the urban design
24 benefit here, but I believe and convinced that the architect and
25 the project team can come up with a solution that would bring

1 | this project into better urban design.

2 | So, and we are taking, if we so choose to take proposed
3 | action tonight, there is time and space for those refinements,
4 | design refinements to be made and, again, it's just a design
5 | refinement. It's not a significant move, a design move here. So
6 | it's really an aesthetic is what we're looking for to help offset
7 | the feeling or the impression of height and mass there. And so
8 | it's really about the optics of this along Monroe Street.

9 | So with that, that's where I stand and certainly
10 | amenable to removing that for now, that public benefit, but hoping
11 | the project team can come back with something a little more
12 | improved here.

13 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner
14 | Imamura.

15 | Before I go to the Vice Chair, Commissioner Stidham,
16 | you also were in that line of your thought pattern. Does that
17 | sound like, do you agree first of all, I think you do, with
18 | Commissioner Wright, about taking out the superior architecture
19 | which I definitely agree? But if it comes back with something,
20 | but let me let you, I'm not going to try rephrase it. Let me
21 | turn it over to you and see if you are fine with the path that
22 | it seems like we're going to go down.

23 | COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: I completely agree with removing
24 | superior architecture and I do agree that no one is asking to
25 | remove a floor or change the programming. You know, I've seen

1 great big gigantic buildings imply a fabulous design where that
2 building does not feel like a gigantic building and I know the
3 team has the capacity to look at this and come up with a great
4 way to articulate the building in such a way as that it's not
5 imposing to the neighborhood.

6 And so I sort of challenge them to take a look at that
7 because frankly from a benefit side of things I'm all on board.
8 But I do not feel comfortable with imposing this building on this
9 neighborhood. So if they can make it better, I'm all for seeing
10 it better.

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. Okay, Vice Chair, let
12 me come to you and see where you are.

13 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

14 I fully support removing superior architecture as a
15 public benefit or amenity, or however it's characterized of this
16 project. Although I can see how they could make it worse, and
17 they have made it better throughout the iterations that have
18 evolved here, although they're not better necessarily than the
19 lower scale building from 15 years ago but there was a different
20 comp plan designation then.

21 So, yes, I concur with my colleagues on that point.

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. And I'm going to say something
23 and I just want to see what my colleagues agree. I think we can
24 see how we're going to, we can take a proposed action, well,
25 proposed action if we all agree and then what we've discussed

1 we'll look for final. And one thing I've always said I don't
2 mind staring at proposed forever because sometimes you can do
3 that. Proposed can last indefinitely, so that's just kind of
4 where I am. Does anybody disagree with that process going
5 forward?

6 Okay. I'm seeing everybody's head nod. Okay. All
7 right. Anything else we need to discuss on this? Do we have
8 anything left to discuss on this? All right. Would somebody
9 like to make a motion? I don't know if Commissioner Wright would
10 be willing to do that. Commissioner Wright, will you make a
11 motion on this?

12 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: I just need to find my case
13 number. I know it's case No. 24-15 but I have to find the
14 official language so.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

16 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: I didn't print the -- I didn't
17 print things out today, so I'm, but I'm getting there. I'm
18 getting to the right spot on my phone.

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: We've got plenty of time. There's
20 no games (indiscernible). We've got plenty of time.

21 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: So.

22 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I don't think you'll be
23 watching that game.

24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Hey, Rob. I know you want to say
25 something --

1 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: (Indiscernible).

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I know you want to say something
3 about Sunday. I know you really do.

4 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I'm not going to say anything
5 like that but I know you'll be watching the game that is on
6 tonight.

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah, I will be. Got a good team.

8 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Okay. So I'll make a motion that
9 we approve Zoning Case No. 24-15, 901 Monroe Street, LLC
10 Consolidated PUD and Related Map Amendment at Square 3829, Lot
11 23 with the understanding at this time, at least, that we would
12 remove superior architecture as one of the eight public amenities
13 that is offered in the PUD and that we would encourage before
14 final action for the Applicant to explore some additional
15 architectural methods of trying to minimize the appearance of the
16 massing, particularly along Monroe Street and for them to, again,
17 perhaps look at whether the minimum caliper that DOT requires for
18 street trees could be, whether they could propose something above
19 that minimum and work with DOT to find out if that's possible,
20 so. That's my motion.

21 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Second, with the friendly
22 amendment to clarify we're not approving the project but taking
23 proposed action which allows time for some of these refinements.

24 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Thank you. Yes, that's exactly
25 right.

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So what I heard the friendly
2 amendment's accepted in the motion and it's been seconded. Any
3 further discussion?

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

6 MS. ACKERMAN: Yes. Commissioner Imamura?

7 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.

8 MS. ACKERMAN: Commissioner Hood?

9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.

10 MS. ACKERMAN: Commissioner Miller?

11 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Yes.

12 MS. ACKERMAN: Commissioner Stidham?

13 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes. Sorry, my light just went
14 off in my office.

15 MS. ACKERMAN: Staff records the vote five to zero to
16 zero to approve Case No. 24-15 for proposed action.

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Do we have anything else before us?

18 MS. ACKERMAN: No.

19 MR. RITTING: Chairman Hood and Ms. Ackerman, I suggest
20 you set some dates for the response from the Applicant and for
21 the other parties to respond so the Commission can consider both
22 those things before proposed action.

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Before final action.

24 MR. RITTING: Before final action, thank you. Sorry.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. All right. Thank you, Mr.

1 Ritting.

2 Ms. Ackerman, let's come up with some dates. If you're
3 not, if you have some dates?

4 MS. SCHELLIN: Not that we prepared. You guys asked
5 for a lot of stuff. It sounds like they may need quite a bit of
6 time. Do you want to give, Commissioner Imamura, based off of
7 your architectural experience, what do you think they need? Two
8 weeks? Three weeks?

9 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Well, I relish the --

10 MS. SCHELLIN: On what they want.

11 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Sure. I relish to be in the
12 spot to dictate the urgency of this for the project team, the
13 Applicant, to move on this. To be fair, I think they will need
14 some significant time.

15 MS. SCHELLIN: Could we bring Commissioner, I mean
16 could we bring Mr. Tummonds up?

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let's bring Mr. Tummonds up. I
18 don't want --

19 MS. SCHELLIN: I believe he's the attorney on this, I
20 believe.

21 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: So, yeah. And to be fair just
22 for the Applicant and knowing that the adjustments that need to
23 be made, two weeks is (indiscernible).

24 MS. SCHELLIN: Thank you, Commissioner Imamura. I
25 thought maybe.

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: He might have to help them get it
2 done so we're going to put Commissioner Imamura on the spot. So
3 let's bring Mr. Tummonds up. Mr. Tummonds, very good discussion.
4 Good afternoon, well it's still afternoon basically.

5 MR. TUMMONDS: Good afternoon. Yes, I think we can
6 provide the requested materials in three weeks.

7 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. So working from that, sorry,
8 let's make sure. Okay. So working from that, let's see, today
9 is the 11th, so one, two, three, that would put us at October
10 2nd, 3 p.m., for your submissions and then the parties would have
11 until 3 p.m. October 9th to provide a response, including OP and
12 DDOT.

13 Were there any other government agencies you guys
14 needed updates from, Commissioners?

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: No, no.

16 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay.

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I don't think we have
18 (indiscernible).

19 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. So it's just OP and DDOT if they
20 needed to respond to the provided updated information and then
21 we could put this on, that would allow our legal team to provide
22 some review and updates for our October 23rd meeting. Does that
23 work?

24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Are we all on the same page?

25 MS. SCHELLIN: And, Mr. Tummonds, I take it you will

1 work with the ANC, the other parties, in serving them and letting
2 them know they can respond?

3 MR. TUMMONDS: That's correct.

4 MS. SCHELLIN: Thank you.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Schellin and
6 thank you, Ms. Ackerman. Mr. Ritting?

7 MR. RITTING: Yes. Just one other reminder to Mr.
8 Tummonds that because they're taking proposed action that
9 triggers the automatic proffers and response process, so you can
10 do that on a parallel track with the other response and stick
11 with the deadlines that are set forth in the regulations.

12 MR. TUMMONDS: Perfect. Seven days and, yeah.

13 MR. RITTING: Yeah.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So we all on the same page?

15 MR. RITTING: Yes.

16 MR. TUMMONDS: Yes.

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. And just for the record,
18 I'm sure, I believe that Commissioner Imamura was going to say
19 three weeks anyway, so that's fine.

20 MS. SCHELLIN: That's where we were was three.

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right.

22 So, with that the Zoning Commission will meet again on
23 September the 15th, 2025, Zoning Commission Case 25-01. This is
24 the Ward Memorial AME Church and that will be in front of us on
25 these same platforms. Again, I want to thank everyone for their

1 participation tonight and, Ms. Ackerman, always doing a great job
2 and thank you, Ms. Schellin. With that, and colleagues, a great
3 job. Everybody great job.

4 With that, this meeting is adjourned. Good night.

5 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the
6 record at 5:02 p.m.)
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

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

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Public Hearing

Before: DC OZ

Date: 09-11-25

Place: Via Videoconferencing

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



Vanessa Gonzalez