GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

REGULAR PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

THURSDAY

OCTOBER 23, 2025

+ + + + +

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

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

ANTHONY J. HOOD, Chairperson ROBERT MILLER, Vice Chairperson GWEN WRIGHT, Commissioner

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

SHARON SCHELLIN, Secretary
PAUL YOUNG, Zoning Data Specialist

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

JENNIFER STEINGASSER CRYSTAL MYERS MAXINE BROWN-ROBERTS

OFFICE OF ZONING LEGAL COUNSEL PRESENT:

JACOB RITTING, ESQUIRE



BRIAN W. LAMPERT, ESQUIRE

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Regular Public Meeting held on October 23, 2025

| T-A-B-L-E O-F C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S |
|---|
| OPENING STATEMENT Anthony Hood |
| PRESENTATION: Preliminary Matters Giving honors to Vice Chair Miller and Jennifer Steingasser |
| PRESENTATION: Case No. 23-08A - Wesley Theological Seminary of the United Methodist Church |
| COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS: Commissioners |
| PRESENTATION: Case No. 24-15 - 901 Monroe Street, LLC |
| COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS: Commissioners |
| PRESENTATION: Case No. 25-01 - Ward Memorial AME Church 24 |
| COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS: Commissioners |
| PRESENTATION: Case No. 15-20E - TBSC Master Owner One, LLC |
| COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS: Commissioners |
| PRESENTATION: Case No. 78-17A - Judiciary Plaza, LLC |
| COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS: Commissioners |
| PRESENTATION: Case No. 09-03I - Skyland Holdings, LLC |

| | T-A-B-I | E | O-F | C-O- | N-T-I | E-N- | r-s | (con | t.) | | |
|-------------------------|---------|---|-----|------|-------|------|-----|------|-----|---|------|
| COMMENTS AND QUES | | | | | | | • | | | • | . 39 |
| ADJOURN Anthony Hood | i | | | | | | | | | | .43 |

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

(4:00 p.m.)

2.0

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. We are convening and broadcasting this public meeting by videoconferencing. My name is Anthony Hood, and I'm joined by Vice Chair Miller and Commissioner Wright. We're also joined by the Office Zoning Staff, Ms. Sharon Schellin and Mr. Paul Young, as well as the Office of Zoning Legal Division, our counsel, Mr. Jacob Ritting and Mr. Brian Lampert.

I'll ask all others to introduce themselves at the appropriate time. 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 court reporter. It's also webcast live via Webex and YouTube live. The video will be available on the Office of Zoning's website after the meeting. According to all those listening on Webex and by phone will be muted during the meeting.

For hearing action items, the only documents before us this evening are the application, the ANC's set down 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 in our meetings unless the Commission requests someone to speak. If you experience difficulty accessing Webex with your phone calling, then please call our OZ hotline number 202-727-0789. For Webex, login or call-in instructions.

Before I go to the staff for any preliminary matters, I have a few preliminary matters, and I'm going to indulge -- I'm going to ask everyone to indulge us while we take care of these few preliminary matters, so I think we have to give honors too. But first, I want to wish Vice Chair Miller a happy birthday. Today is his birthday, and we want to wish him a happy birthday. And hopefully, we'll be out here in some time of fashion to maybe you'd go out and enjoy it. So again, a happy birthday. And I always remember that because today is also my daughter's birth -- my oldest daughter's birthday. So that helps me remember your birthday. But anyway, happy birthday to you, Robert.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: And many, many more.

The next thing I want to talk about is different leaders meet jurisdictional across the in the DMV, Montgomery County, Prince George's County, Fairfax, City of Fairfax, Arlington, and whoever -- Prince George's. And I was honored to go -- and this meeting, it was our third meeting. Thanks to Sharon Schellin, the Office of Zoning, we hosted the second meeting. This was our third one. And when I got there, the first topic for discussion was the design excellence award categories, the Gwen Marcus Wright design excellence award for exceptional urban design, architecture, and or landscape design. Hopefully, I got all that right. And I want to commend, we're honored to have someone who has an award named after him, and also with the --

some of the attributes in which we deal with daily.

So when I say that the Zoning Commission comes very well stocked, it comes very well stocked. So again, congratulations, Commissioner Wright, what a duly honor, and I can tell you it was talked about for the first five to six minutes in our session, so congratulations to you.

The next thing that I would like to do is to talk about a young lady, who I think is going to be leaving us. She has definitely left a mark on the city that's going to impact a lot of us for years to come. And that is Ms. Jennifer Steingasser. Ms. Jennifer Steingasser is going to be retiring from this and moving on to the next chapter of her life. We want to wish her and her family the best as she continues to move on. But I will say this about Jen. One thing I've always known, I've worked with Jennifer for years. And sometime and as I thought about her retirement, which made me appreciate her.

It's one thing I -- whenever I've asked her for something, I don't care how ridiculous it was, and sometimes it sounds ridiculous to me, and she probably thought, what is he really asking for? And I'm sure -- I'm going to just say "me." And she never said she couldn't do it. She always found a way to go out and try to find to do it. And after I asked for it sometime, I would say, I wonder if she understood it because I would -- after we get off the session, said, I really don't understand what I asked for, but she'll figure it out. And she

always comes back with an answer.

2.0

And this city was better, will be better served, and has been better served because Jennifer Steingasser has made the contributions to our planning program here in the city and has done a whole lot of legwork, some of the ways to get living and benefiting here in the city. Anyway, we can bring her up. And then I'm going to ask my other colleagues. I hope that she heard that, but I'm going to repeat some of this again on the 30th, but this was our last meeting that she's going to be at, I believe, unless she just wants to watch us in November.

So Ms. Steingasser, hopefully, you heard my comments. They were heartfelt. You have really done a lot for this city. And I can tell you.

MS. STEINGASSER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: And even though some may have disagreed with us and you, and I disagree with you, we're going to miss that. I can guarantee you because I've been thinking about it since I heard the announcement. I can tell you. You have definitely set the pattern in the city that we're going to benefit from for years to come.

So let me see if my other colleagues have something to say.

MS. STEINGASSER: Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'll start with Vice Chair Miller.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I

appreciate the opportunity to honor Jennifer Steingasser on her many decades of service to the District of Columbia and our fellow constituents and residents. I've enjoyed working with you, Jennifer, for decades, whether I was at the counsel, whether we were at NCPC together, whether we were both in the executive branch when I was there for a brief time period, and now at the Zoning Commission. And you've always been accessible, as the Chairman said, and responsive and patient with any questions that we have had or sometimes concerns we've had. The community has had -- you always are responsive and we appreciate all of your work as Deputy Director, is that right, of the Office of Planning & Development Review Division for all these years. The results of all of your good work are evident all around the city. hopefully, they will continue as a good part of your legacy. So we appreciate. We will miss you. We wish you good luck in your future endeavors in your life. Thank you.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. STEINGASSER: Thank you very much. I appreciate that.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: And Gwen, did you add something to add?

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: To just add, although I haven't worked with Jennifer for very long, I really have enormous empathy because, I have sat in her role in two different jurisdictions, and I know what a hard job it is. I know the struggles of balancing so many different expectations and goals, and that it is an extremely, extremely challenging job, which clearly, she

has been doing an outstanding job on for many, many years.

One of the things I will tell you that I have enjoyed having retired from that side of the table is being able to drive around and see projects that I know, look the way they look and then ended up the way they've ended up because of work that I did. And I hope you have that same pleasure as you, in your retirement, drive around and look at beautiful buildings and beautiful places, and remember that you were instrumental in making those happen. And that is the greatest sort of reward for a public servant to be able to say I made an impact, and I think that you clearly have. So congratulations on your retirement, and thank you for your many years of service.

MS. STEINGASSER: Well, thank you. I appreciate the kind words. I really do. Working with you all has been a real adventure for the last 25 years, you know. We've been through a lot.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: But let me say this.

18 MS. STEINGASSER: The administration, a lot of 19 cycles -- development cycles.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Jennifer, before you say too much, I want you to go last. I want to hear if -- I want to give the staff a chance.

MS. STEINGASSER: Oh, gosh. Okay.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Schellin and also Mr. Ritting -I'm not going to ask you, Mr. Lampert. I know you're heartfelt,

but you haven't been there as long. So I'm going to ask Mr.

Ritting to speak on behalf of our legal division, and I'm going to ask Ms. Schellin to speak on behalf of our directing the office.

MR. RITTING: Oh. I just wanted to say, it's been such an honor to work with you, Jennifer. Not only are you tremendously effective, but you've been so collegial and fun to work with. It's been a real pleasure. So thank you, and I hope you enjoy your retirement.

MS. STEINGASSER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: And Ms. Schellin, could you say something on behalf of the Office or you --

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. So on behalf of DCOZ, it definitely has been an absolute pleasure working with you. You have -- the relationship that was formed when you came and I know when I came, at that time, we worked together, OP and OZ, to form a better working relationship, an interagency relationship. A lot of that happened because of you. That really showed a lot of improvement in zoning, getting OP reports for every case because when I first came, and I know the Chairman remembers those days, we didn't always get reports for every case.

I'm feeling the loss already. And all the years I've had the privilege of talking to you, not only from a work standpoint, but also from a friendly standpoint. I've come to know you and your family and just, you know, animals and

everything else that we get to talk about on the side note. So I'm going to miss you tremendously, and I wish you lots of luck in what you get to do traveling back and forth to Texas or wherever, so enjoy.

MS. STEINGASSER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: So Jennifer, we will do this again. I know you said why don't you be quiet so I can say something, but I'm going to do something smaller, a different version on the 30 -- was trying to figure it out, but I know we usually do this on our meetings. Again, we thank you. And I'm going to say something again on the 30th, but I think we've covered everybody, so I'm going to now let you say a few words.

MS. STEINGASSER: Okay. I just want to thank everybody for the kind words because I feel the same way that a partnership was formed between our agencies and between the Commission and the staff, and our ability to work together, you know, stemmed a lot from trust and just collegial goodwill moving in the same direction. So I appreciate it and -- I don't know what else to say. Thank you. Thank you very much for those kind words.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you again, Jennifer. We appreciate all your hard work, and enjoy the next chapter. We'll probably do a little small smidgen on the 30th.

MS. STEINGASSER: Okay. I'll be a little bit more focused then. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: That's good.

Okay. All right. I do want to say this, and I'm going to turn over to Ms. Schellin for -- as we get ready for preliminary matters. The Zoning Commission, we voted to have a closed meeting on October the 20th to have it today. And this is just a reminder as I've been questioning asked to do, that we have had our closed meeting today to receive legal advice from our counsel regarding the cases that were noted on our agenda for today's meeting. And that's what our closed meeting is about. I'm announcing it as I've been informed that's what I should do. So with that, let's have any preliminary matters, Ms.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Schellin?

MS. SCHELLIN: No other preliminary matters.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let's move right into the agenda, colleagues. Let me close-up these files. And if I messed up with the sentiments to give to Ms. Steingasser, just let Ms. Schellin know between now and the 30th, and I will make up for it on the 3rd.

MS. SCHELLIN: Other than, Chairman Hood, I know that it has nothing to do with the cases on the agenda. just make an announcement for those that are listening and may be interested in Zoning Commission Case No. 25-12, which is I know you're going to announce it being one of the cases for next That case has now been broken into six hearings including next week. Those are -- have been posted in the case record. So if you want to take a look and we'll be -- it's been posted that

you can contact Ella Ackerman to sign up for one or all of those nights. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: And thank you, Ms. Schellin. As we got closer, we started focusing on it and not just a lot on the public, it's also a lot on us. We want to make sure that we do our due diligence and make the best decision possible. That's why we had to break it up and not put all that on ourselves at one time. And right now, it's just three of us. So with the -
VICE CHAIR MILLER: And that's -- and just for the public's sake, that's the omnibus tax amendments that have been proposed by the Office of Planning in many subject areas, so

proposed by the Office of Planning in many subject areas, so that's what the case is about and we've had requests to break it up into hearings and we're being responsive to that request.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yeah. And I thought about it, Vice Chair. Yeah. I'm being responsive to that request. I'm all so very responsive to us. And I think Commissioner Wright mentioned it earlier on, but it didn't register to me then, so I started looking at it. So wait a minute. Hold up. So anyway, we're well on our way, and Vice Chair is right. (Indiscernible).

Okay. All right. So Ms. Schellin, you said you didn't have any other preliminary matters?

MS. SCHELLIN: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right. Let's go to advanced party status. So on the Commission Case No. 23-08A, Wesley Theological Seminary of the United Methodist Church for the

2 Ms. Schellin? Yes, sir. This is a request from 3 MS. SCHELLIN: neighbors for a Livable Community and Spring Valley Wesley 4 5 Heights Citizens Association. They are asking for party status 6 in advance, in opposition. They are being represented by Dennis 7 Paul, and he is -- I'm trying to see, he may be called in because 8 he had to -- had an emergency with his wife being ill. But if 9 not, Mr. Smith, who is a member of the board is on. So I think 10 that they're covered is -- it's up to the Commission, of course, 11 make that decision whether they're covered or not about having a 12 representative here. I'm going to check and see if the call-in user is --13 14 CHAIRMAN HOOD: So it's no need to. 15 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. Okay. 16 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let's go ahead do that even if --17 MS. SCHELLIN: Thank you. 18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Even if nobody was not here because of 19 the emergency situation. We understand. 20 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. 21 CHAIRMAN HOOD: We will waive that rule. Mr. Paul --22 well, I don't have any objections to Mr. Paul being that his party, the neighbors for a Livable Community, Spring Valley, 23 Wesley Heights Citizens Association being a party in opposition 24 25 in this particular case. And I don't think we've got anything

processing of campus plan.

as of in opposition of that as well. 2 All right. So let me just hear from my colleagues. 3 Any objections? No objections. They've been a 4 VICE CHAIR MILLER: 5 party throughout all of the related cases, and others had been 6 too, and we may get later requests from others. 7 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. 8 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: No objection at all. 9 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So Dennis Paul will -- his group, 10 the neighbors for a Livable Community/Spring Valley Wesley 11 Heights Cities Association will be one part. And I appreciate 12 them forming together. I did notice that. So yes, we appreciate So okay. We will do that by general consensus. 13 14 Ms. Schellin, anything else on that? 15 MS. SCHELLIN: Nothing for that one. 16 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let's move right along with our agenda. Let's keep it moving. Let's go to final action. 17 Zoning 18 Commission Case No. 24-15, 901 Monroe Street LLC, consolidated 19 PUD, first-stage PUD map amendment at Square 3829, Lot 23. 2.0 Ms. Schellin. Yes, sir. 21 MS. SCHELLIN: So at the -- after the Commission took proposed action, the Commission asked for some 22 additional documents. And so at exhibit -- but before that, we 23 have Exhibit 143, NCPC, advising that the staff determined that 24 25 the project was exempt from NCPC's review. And so then the

additional responses from the applicant, we have Exhibits 144 through -- it looks like Exhibits 144-A4, and those are posthearing submissions. And then the party, the 200 footers responded at Exhibit 146 and I believe that's also their -- they responded early to the conditions and proffers because their representative was going out of the country. And then exhibits 145, 145-A, and 141, I'm sorry, were the applicants' proffers and conditions. And then, again, the 200 footers responded at 142 and 146.

And I believe that is it for this case to turn it over enough -- yep. That's all I have for it. So it is ready for you guys to consider whether you want to proceed with final action. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Ms. Schellin. I know that we did a lot of work, a lot of tussle and a lot of pullback, and going back and forth in our deliberations on the proposed action. Then on September 11th, 2025, the Commission took proposed action to approve the application on the proposed. But before doing so, some of the things we looked at, the PUD related map amendment to the MU-5B Zone, the general sense of PUD balancing tests, favored approval, which we did. Commission, we did not believe that the architecture was superior or that the architecture of the project qualified as a public benefit.

We also -- the Commission, we also have some questions

about whether the proposed building has sufficient articulation. Commission also requested more information about the proposed street trees and whether it was possible to plant trees of a larger caliber size. Accordingly, the Commission asked for the applicant -- asked the applicant to provide additional information about the Monroe Street articulation of the building and also more information about whether the applicant could plant larger sized caliber trees. They did so in those submissions, Exhibit 144, 144-A1, 144-A2, 144-A3, 144-A4, and 146.

And then as Ms. Schellin already mentioned, they had an NCPC report, which project was exempt from NCPC review.

Let me open up my colleagues and see if you have any issues and also responses maybe to the what the 200 footers raised, some of the things that they raised, some questions, and any comments without me going through all of them, but we hashed a lot of them. And I know that some of the things that the 200 foot is raised to me were still some of the same things they raised in which we've already addressed, but let me see.

Commissioner Wright?

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: I have expressed throughout the course of this project that I felt that there could have been other design solutions that would have been more sympathetic to the neighborhood, but we have gotten some refinements, particularly the stepping back near the 10th Street townhouses, and I think that is beneficial. It is -- I still hold to my

position that one of the PUD suggestions of superior architecture really hasn't been met, but you can still approve a PUD even if it's not superior architecture.

And I have been swayed by the level of support from other people in the community, particularly the ANCs. We are directed to give great weight to the positions of the ANCs and to their comments. So I am prepared to support this project. I do think one of the comments made by the 200 footers that in the applicant's proffer statement, they talk about the project including significant setbacks along all sides of the building. I do agree with them that the word "significant" should be removed. There are setbacks, but I really would not call them significant.

But I don't really agree with some of the other comments that the 200 footers made about the proffers. I think they would change and be a pretty big second bite of the apple on some of these proffers, and they are proffers that have been talked about and supported by the District Department of Transportation. So I think the other proffers are probably fine, acceptable. And I think we are ready to move forward with the project. Again, I have a lot of mixed feelings, but I think that the additional housing is important. And I think, again, I am very swayed by the positions of the two ANCs who've provided testimony. And I am giving their testimony great weight in moving forward with this project. So those are my thoughts.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner Wright.

Vice Chair Miller, any thoughts?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I fully concur with all of the comments that Commissioner Wright has made just now about moving forward and responses. And the sufficiency, maybe not -- the superior sufficiency, but sufficiency of the public benefits to outweigh any adverse impacts or inconsistency to the comprehensive plan. I think we had a long discussion with all persons and parties at the hearing, and maybe a proposed action amongst ourselves about the consistency with the comprehensive -- the not inconsistency with the comprehensive That's a standard for of this PUD and MU-5B map related amendment. And that the balance -- the PUD balancing test favored approval, as you said, Mr. Chairman, mainly because of public benefits in the areas of housing, affordable housing, family sized units, and the utility undergrounding on Monroe Street.

And I think I had a discussion with the applicant about, you know -- the 200 footers would have asked. They thought that each -- all the underground -- all the utilities that's surrounding the property, particularly on 10th Street, should also be underground. I think I had a question and answer with the applicant at the hearing about that. I would have preferred that as well. But it says a million dollar commitment on Monroe Street and that's where this the property is fronting. So I'm prepared to move forward, Mr. Chairman.

This is -- this site has been long vacant. The community -- there's a lot of support in the community despite the -- the 10th Street neighbor's opposition, which is understandable. The ANC support that Commissioner Wright mentioned, also planning support, would also give great weight too. There needs to be some revitalization here of this long vacant site that is a -- is so close to the metro and part of the community to make it part of the community. So I'm prepared to move forward, Mr. Chairman, with final action tonight.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. I would agree with both of my colleagues, especially Commissioner Wright and Vice Chair Miller, especially when you start talking about superior and significant. Those are words that really trouble me because that's a heavy lift. And anytime you use those kinds of words, I would agree with everything that's been said. And I'm hoping that the order reflects the comments about taking significant or whatever the word was -- I think it was significant. Let's make sure we take that out of there. Anything superior, let's make sure we take that out of there. Those kinds of words really give me the angst because it take -- you got to go an extra mile. It's almost like getting extra credit when you do a test, and I don't think that's been made. I haven't seen that maybe even once or twice. But anyway, I would agree with both the comments.

I would also want to say that when we were doing this case, and we had really fleshed this case out. I mean, even

previously, we have really fleshed this whole side out, and I would agree. Hopefully, this will happen on this vacant site.

But I appreciate both ANCs, particularly Chair or Commissioner Ra Amin and his cross-examination and his questions of asking and how he showed the -- he showed a lot of collaboration of how -- to me, he showed it and as well received it.

There was a lot of collaboration and working with everyone in the neighborhood. Whether you agree or not, everybody's point was valued. Everyone's position was valued, and they came to a win-win when they gave us their approval and they had stipulations of what they want to see, and I believe they work that out. So that was very well done by both ANCs as already mentioned by Commissioner Wright.

So with that, would someone like to make a motion to approve? Obviously, it sounds like this, too is a sense that you want to approve. And I can tell you that we do miss our two other colleagues. I can tell you, I do miss the two other. I'm glad to have these two, but we -- I do miss our two other colleagues, and I'm sure we all do.

All right. Somebody like to make a motion?

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: I can -- I do?

Mr. Miller, would you like to make a motion? Would you like me to? I'm glad to.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yeah. You can go ahead.

25 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Okay. So I move that we approve

Zoning Commission Case No. 24-15, 901 Monroe Street, LLC, consolidated PUD, first-stage PUD, map amendment at Square 3829, 2 Lot 23 with the changes mentioned including deletion of the word 3 "significant" under the discussion of the setback proffer. 4 5 that's my motion to move forward with approval. 6 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I'll second that motion. It's 7 removed and probably second. Any further discussion? 8 Not hearing, Ms. Schellin, would you do a roll call 9 vote, please? 10 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Wright? COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes. 11 12 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood? CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes. 13 14 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller? 15 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes. 16 MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is 3-0-2 to approve final action Zoning commission Case No. 17 24-15. The minus two being 18 Commissioner Stidham and Imamura not present, not voting. Thank 19 you. 20 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. The next case is on Commission 21 Case No. 25-01, Ward Memorial AME Church, map amendment at Square 5088, Lots 147, 852, and Square 5987, Lot 74. 22 Ms. Schellin. 23 24 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. Let me get down to this one. 25 Okay. So this is 25-01, and this one had a hearing on September

15th. And the new exhibits at Exhibit 29, NCPC was sent the referral for 30-day comment period. The applicant provided post hearing with the draft order. I'm sorry. Their draft order rather at Exhibit 30 and NCPC provided their response at Exhibit 31, stating that this proposal falls under one of the NCPC exceptions and their guidelines. And so that --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: So you disappeared. Technology is something. Let's give her a minute to come back.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: And the way it kind of works until it doesn't.

mentioned. Let me just go ahead and keep it moving. She said NCPC staff filed a letter stating that the proposal falls under the exception of NCPC's guidelines and exempt from NCPC review. One of the things that we did notice, colleagues, as we went through this, I see, plus is not recommended, and we agreed that it should not be applied because of the similar amount of dedicated affordable housing in the planning area. That's been a policy that that also plan has always presented to us, and we have basically accepted it. So with that, I think this was pretty straightforward. I don't necessarily have a whole lot of comments, but let me see if my colleagues do.

Commissioner Wright.

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: I don't really have any comments.

I think this is a very appropriate rezoning, and I know there

was community support for it. I also hope that it can -- I know there isn't a project sort of ending at this moment to use this new zoning, but I hope that the church can work successfully to actually get a good project moving forward under this new zoning, and I certainly do support the application.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

Vice Chair Miller.

2.0

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes. I agree with Commissioner Wright and support the moving forward with final action. The map amendment will facilitate more housing, more affordable housing, and allow the church to continue its mission in the city.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. I don't have anything to add. I appreciate and I agree with both of my colleagues and I appreciate all the work that was done by the community in this as well. All right. So Ms. Schellin's internet is cut out. She mentioned to me, so I'm going to do my best. I'm going to make a motion. Let me see. Motion made by who? I'm going to make a motion that we approve Zoning Commission Case No. 25-01, Ward Memorial AME Church map amendment at Square 5088, Lots 147 and 852, and Square 5987, Lot 74.

All right. Is there a second?

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Second.

23 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Give me one second. Second to

24 -- no. Any further discussion?

Not any. I think, can you do a roll call vote.



| 1 | So Anthony Hood? |
|----|--|
| 2 | Yes. |
| 3 | Vice Chair Miller? |
| 4 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes. |
| 5 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioner Wright? |
| 6 | COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes. |
| 7 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. The vote is 3-0-2, and the motion |
| 8 | passes. |
| 9 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: great job, Secretary Hood. |
| 10 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Hope I recorded it right, but anyway. |
| 11 | All right. So let's keep moving. So I'm sure she'll |
| 12 | join us if she can. |
| 13 | And I hope Mr. Ritting, you're taking notes too as well |
| 14 | to help me. |
| 15 | All right. Let's go time extension. Anthony Hood, |
| 16 | just time extensions. Anthony Hood. Okay. |
| 17 | So this is case Zoning Commission Case No. 15-20E, |
| 18 | TBSC Master Owner One, LLC, one year time extension of a second- |
| 19 | stage PUD at Square 620, Lot 254. This is a time to send you a |
| 20 | request for one year extension of a second-stage PUD approved by |
| 21 | the North Parcel and Zoning Commission Case Order No. 15-20B to |
| 22 | file a building permit application by November 10th, 2026. This |
| 23 | is before so let's do we have any discussions or any issues? |
| 24 | Let me ask Commissioner Wright. |
| 25 | COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: No. I think we all understand |
| | |

that given the economic climate we're in, that projects are needing a little more time and I have no problem with the one-2 3 year time extension. 4 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. 5 Vice Chair Miller. 6 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I agree 7 that good cause has been shown for the requested time extension 8 for this certain quarter project, which some a lot of stuff has 9 already been done there. 10 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I would also agree everyone's had time to opine, so I would agree I think this is ready for 11 12 approval. And with that, somebody make a motion to approve the extension as requested. 13 14 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I'll make a motion, Mr. Chairman, 15 that the Zoning Commission take -- approve the time extension for 16 Zoning Commission Case No. 15-20E TBSC Master Owner One, LLC, one 17 year time extension of a second-stage PUD at Square 620, Lot 254 18 and ask for a second. 19 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Second. 20 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. It's been moved and probably 21 second. 22 Any further discussion? Not hearing. 23 Ms. Schellin, are you back with us? 24 25 MS. SCHELLIN: Which case were you on?



| 1 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'll give you the recording of other |
|----|---|
| 2 | one. I move 15-20E. It's been moved and probably second. |
| 3 | MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. |
| 4 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Moved by Vice Chair Miller and seconded |
| 5 | by Commissioner Wright. |
| 6 | MS. SCHELLIN: Got that. |
| 7 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Schellin, could you do a roll call |
| 8 | vote, please? |
| 9 | MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. |
| 10 | Commissioner Miller? |
| 11 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes. |
| 12 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Wright? |
| 13 | COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes. |
| 14 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood? |
| 15 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes. The vote is 3-0-2 to approve |
| 16 | final action. Are we on set down? I'm sorry. I lost everything. |
| 17 | COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: This is the extension request. |
| 18 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Extension request. |
| 19 | MS. SCHELLIN: Time extension. I'm sorry. To approve |
| 20 | the time extension as requested. Commissioner Miller moving, |
| 21 | Commissioner Wright seconding, the minus two being Commissioner |
| 22 | Imamura and Stidham not present, not voting. I think we're trying |
| 23 | to get a storm down here. |
| 24 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Gotcha. So Ms. Schellin, right quick, |
| 25 | let me give you the one that we did your assistant took over. |

1 | Zoning Commission Case No. 25-01, the Ward Memorial Church AME.

2 The motion was made by Hood, seconded by Vice Chair Miller, and

3 | it was approved by all three of us including Commissioner Wright.

4 So the vote was 3-0-2. Okay. All right. So we got the votes

5 out the way. I think we're good for now.

21.

All right. Well, no, we're not. All right. Let's go to hearing action. Zoning Commission Case No. 78-17A, Judiciary Plaza, LLC, PUD modification with hearing at Square 489 and Lot

Oh. Ms. Myers. Go right ahead, Ms. Myers.

MS. MYERS: The Office of Planning recommends the Zoning Commission set down this PUD modification request by Judiciary Plaza, LLC at 450 5th Street, NW. This PUD would remain under its MU-8B Zone. The property is in Central Washington at the intersection of the Penn Quarter, Chinatown, Judiciary Square, and East End Neighborhoods. It is also approximately 0.25 miles from the National Mall, National Gallery of Art, and the National Archives. In 1978, the subject property was approved for an office building with a ground floor retail. So the original PUD was approved in the '78.

Next slide, please. This PUD proposes to adaptively reuse an office building by converting it into a residential building. The applicant worked closely with the Commission of Fine Art and the Historic Preservation Review Board and staff on the new design. The project would preserve much of the existing

massing, but still remove portions of the massing along the 5th Street frontage. Sunken courtyards would be created to allow for the additional light and air that is needed for a residential building. The new building would have approximately 500 residential units and 8 percent of the residential gross floor area would be set aside for household at the 60 percent MFI as IZ units. It also includes tree and landscape improvements. The project includes flexibility requests for open court width and building height.

Next slide, please. On balance, this PUD would not be inconsistent with the comprehensive plan maps. On the future land use map, the site is designated for high density commercial. High rise residential buildings are expected to be interspersed in areas with this designation. Adding residents to the central employment district would allow them the opportunity to live near their employment. On the generalized policy map, it is within the Central Washington area.

Next slide, please. When evaluated through a racial equity lens, the proposal would also not be inconsistent with this comprehensive plan. The Central Washington planning area has a high-income majority white population. Through the provision of approximately 500 units with IZ affordable units, this proposal could provide opportunities for more nonwhite residents to live in an employment district area that is well served by public transit and within walking distance of various

neighborhood services and amenities. And with that, I will conclude the OP presentation, but of course I'm here for questions. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Myers. We appreciate you. Let's see if we have any questions or comments.

Commissioner or Vice Chair Miller.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you, Crystal Myers for the Office of Planning report and bringing forth this case. The conversion of downtown office to housing is challenging, but so necessary in the economic climate that we are -- have been experiencing and probably will be experiencing for some time as articulated, not only in existing comprehensive plan and policies, but in more recent priorities and policies for downtown revitalization, continuing downtown activization envisioned by the mayor and by the city at large. So I think this is appropriate for a set down.

We can discuss the -- at the public hearing, a number of things. I'm glad the applicant, I think revised in this case the affordable housing requirement on the original median family income where it's asking for flexibility, but all of it -- all of the 8 percent, the minimum 8 percent will be at 60 percent MFI, which is meeting the minimum requirements if it's all rental. Do we know whether it's envisioned to be all rental? If it was -- some of it was going to be condominium. I assume that's not the case, but it could be 80 percent.

But do we know yet or maybe we can just have more information on that subject at the hearing. And whether the -- so that affordable housing commitment, which is commendable, is just meeting the minimum requirement of our zoning regulations for inclusionary zoning. So it's not considered a public benefit under the PUD evaluation. If the applicant wants to enhance that, we could then consider it as a public benefit, but I think we just need clarity that that is where they are or where they will continue to be.

I think that the -- your report stated that the application does not discuss how the project will comply with the Penthouse IZ set aside. And I think we just need more -- at the hearing, more explanation about that issue, and for more information from the applicant, which I think you're requesting about the penthouse set aside for households at the 50 percent MFI level, which is a deeper reportable level, which is also the minimum required for penthouse space. So we should see the plans that show the location and size of all the IZ units at the hearing or before the hearing. So with that, I'm prepared to set this down Mr. Chairman and appreciate this project coming forward.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Wright.

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: I agree with Vice Chair Miller.

I am excited to see a large office building that is, you know,
perhaps under-utilized being converted to housing. I think the

Judiciary Square area is a place that would benefit from housing mixed in with all of the offices that exist in that area to give the area a little bit more of a 24-hour kind of presence. It's pretty quiet there after 5 o'clock and I think having a large residential presence would be fantastic. So I think all of that is definitely a positive.

I know that we haven't heard a whole lot about the community outreach and we haven't heard from the ANC. So I would ask -- I'm definitely in favor of setting this down. I would ask, before the hearing, that the applicant make a very concerted effort to undertake the community outreach, work with the ANC, and report back on whether there is support or opposition, or whatever from the community about this project. I think that is something that is important to do, but it's also important to do under our racial equity analysis is to have that level of community engagement and outreach. So I would ask that the applicant work on that and be able to come back to us at the hearing with information on their outreach and what the input they've received has been, but that is my only comment. So thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Commissioner Wright. I think my colleagues have covered everything. I'm just looking forward to hearing. I, too, am in favor of setting this down. So Ms. Myers, thank you again for a well-done report and looking forward to comments that we've made and looking forward to having

2 arise. Also, thank you, Ms. Myers. 3 Would one of my colleagues like to make a motion? Vice 4 Chair Miller, would you make a motion? 5 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Sure. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 6 would move that the Zoning Commission set down for a public 7 hearing Case No. 78-17A, Judiciary Plaza, LLC, a PUD modification 8 with a hearing at Square 489, Lot 21. I think, if I'm remembering 9 correctly, that was 450 5th Street NW, and ask for a second. 10 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Second. 11 CHAIRMAN HOOD: It's been moved in and properly second. 12 Any further discussion? Not hearing. Ms. Schellin, could you do a roll call vote, please? 13 14 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes. 15 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Wright? 16 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes. MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood? 17 18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes. 19 MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is 3-0-2 to set down Zoning Commission Case No. 78-17A as a contested case. The minus two 20 being Commissioner Imamura and Stidham, not present, not voting. 21 Thank you. 22 23 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. I think the last thing on our agenda for tonight is Zoning Commission Case No. 09-24 25 03I, Skyland Holdings, LLC, first-stage PUD modification at

a productive hearing where we can flesh out all issues that may

Square 5633, Lot 22. And we're going to go to Ms. Brown-Roberts who I didn't see yesterday. I was looking with a smile. I did not see on the DJ. She didn't turn -- her camera wasn't working, which I was fine with. May I ask you, what was the joke about? I told him that's between you and I. So Ms. Brown-Roberts.

MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: We got it, Mr. Chairman. Good evening, Mr. chairman and members of the of the Commission.

Again, Maxine Brown-Roberts representing the Office of Planning and Zoning Commission, 09-031.

Next slide. The Skyland Town Center has been under development for a number of years and the original proposal has been through several modifications to be responsive to the market and community needs. The last modification was approved in late 2023 on blocks 1 and 4 for 126 road dwellings, a 75-unit all affordable senior apartment building with 1,000 square feet of ground floor retail. The in-center quest is to modify block floor -- block 4 by replacing the senior building with a 75-unit for sale condominium building at 80 percent MFI. Additionally, the applicant requests flexibility to place the long-term bicycle pocket outdoors in an enclosed structure and modify the JR calculations for block 1 and -- blocks 1 and 4.

Next slide. The applicant has proffered that the change from the senior housing building to a condominium building is due to several reasons mainly related to funding that has stymied their ability to move ahead with the senior housing,

including being unable to get funding through the housing production trust fund or any other district funds for affordable senior multifamily housing, and it is unknown when funding will be available. They've been unable to meet DCHD's (sic) 2025 low-income housing tax credit qualified allocation plan. And I'm sorry. It's the DHCD. They've been unable also to source private funding for affordable projects due to affordable collections concerns and are only interested in home ownership project. The snack of financing could result in an unknown period of delay to construct the senior housing leaving the lot open which could be an eyesore in the town center, as well as present security problems.

Next slide. The requested modification in the overall development would continue to be not inconsistent with the comprehensive plan, the future land use map, and the generalized policy map. Development is also not inconsistent with many of the policies of the far northeast and southeast area to provide much needed homeownership opportunities and to provide a mix of uses and housing types at Skyland. The property is within the far northeast southeast planning area which exceeds the 2025 affordable housing goal. However, although the area is on track to exceed affordable housing needs, a variety of new housing choices are not being provided. The proposed condominium units will provide another level of homeownership opportunities along with future townhouses and apartments currently at Skyland and

would help in addressing the need for variety of housing types in the area.

In general, the analysis of the data shows that the planning areas behind that of the district in most categories such as homeownership, median household income, and unemployment. The proposed development could further a number of plan policies related to equity and the applicant has provided a racial equity analysis.

Next slide. To continue review of the application, we have had conversations with the applicant and has requested that they address issues regarding the building design, materials, and colors, provide elevation for the bicycle parking structure and address emergency vehicle access. OP will continue to work with the applicant and recommends that the requested modification with hearing be set down for public hearing.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I'm available for questions.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Brown-Roberts. We appreciate a very well-done report. I know there were some things the applicant, in your report, that you all were asking for. I'm hoping the applicant make sure that they respond and have those ready for the hearing. But let me see if others have any questions or comments.

Commissioner Wright.

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Thank you. Although I understand

the challenges with providing a senior building for affordable units that it's really impossible to do that without some special financing. And so I certainly appreciate the issues that the applicant has addressed. I actually do think that providing some affordable for-sale condominiums in this development is actually a plus. I think the townhouses are also offers some ownership opportunities, but the condominiums also offer some real entry level ownership opportunities at an affordable level.

So I'm pleased that that was the applicant's choice in terms of changing out from the senior affordable to doing condominiums. And I think it's definitely a positive. I think in looking at the building as it comes forward, you know, there is quite a bit of retail adjacent to this building. I think it's important to keep the Streetscape activated, and I hope they can look at opportunities to either have individual entrances along the same sort of walking street where the retail is for this condominium or other ways to try to really keep the Streetscape activated since it would not have the retail that was contemplated in the senior building. But I do think there are some ways to do that, particularly with some individual entrances.

Again, I think they're going to rethink their sustainability and what types of sustainability programs and goals they're going to go for. I think that that's really important to have great sustainability. And I think that it's going to be important as always to understand if there is

community concern or support for this project's change. And so, I, again, very happy to set this down, but before the hearing, I'm hoping that the applicant will work closely with the community, with the appropriate ANC, and do their necessary outreach so that we can get information about the community's feelings about the project and get their input at the hearing. So those are my only comments.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

Vice Chair Miller.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Maxine Brown-Roberts for your presentation and your report on this case and all the work that you, I think, you've been involved with this Skyland project and some of the other projects in the city and your role with Office of Planning. Hang on. Sorry about that.

I agree with Ms. Brown-Roberts with all of your -- as the Chairman and Commissioner Wright said with all of your request for additional information prior to the hearing, which you outlined in on Slide 5 of your presentation tonight. And I appreciate the applicant just sticking to it with this Skyland project, which has been -- had its many challenges over the years. But the applicant has always come back working with the community to respond and come up with an alternative approach based on market or whatever financing challenges that have been. So I think this -- the homeownership opportunities are significant with the 10 percent set aside for affordable. So I'm prepared

to set it down and look forward to hearing more from the applicant 2 and the community and the Office of Planning at the hearing about 3 the project. So thank you. 4 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. 5 Again, Ms. Brown-Roberts, thank you for the report. 6 don't have any questions. I believe we'll be setting this down 7 for a hearing and looking forward to the further process. 8 also the request and things that my colleagues have mentioned, 9 especially community engagement here from the ANC and what has 10 already been mentioned by both my colleagues. All right. So thank you, Ms. Brown-Roberts. 11 12 MS. BROWN-ROBERS: You're welcome. 13 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Appreciate it. 14 All Colleagues, we'll right. make the last. 15 Commissioner Wright, do you like to make a motion? I always like 16 different people to make motions. 17 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Sure. I'm glad to. I move that 18 we set down Zoning Commission Case No. 09-03I, Skyland Holdings, 19 LLC, first-stage PUD modification with hearing at Square 5633, Lot 22 with the information that we have asked for at the hearing. 2.0 21 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Second. 22 CHAIRMAN HOOD: It's been moved and properly second. Any further discussion? Not hearing. 23 24 Ms. Schellin, could you do a roll call vote, please? 25 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Wright?

| 1 | COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes. |
|----|---|
| 2 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller? |
| 3 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes. |
| 4 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood? |
| 5 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes. |
| 6 | MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is 3-0-2 to set down Zoning |
| 7 | Commission Case No. 09-03I as a contested case. The minus two |
| 8 | being Commissioner Imamura and Stidham not present, not vote. |
| 9 | Thank you. |
| 10 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. We have nothing else on our |
| 11 | agenda for this evening, correct, Ms. Schellin? |
| 12 | MS. SCHELLIN: That is correct. |
| 13 | Did we did I also state that the two cases scheduled |
| 14 | for November 6th and 13th were being rescheduled? |
| 15 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: No. I don't believe so. |
| 16 | MS. SCHELLIN: I don't no. So because of those |
| 17 | dates that I gave for the omnibus text amendment, those two cases |
| 18 | will be rescheduled and a new notice will be sent out. So I just |
| 19 | want to put that out there as notice for people. |
| 20 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So the Zoning Commission will |
| 21 | meet again on October 27th on the same platforms at 4 p.m. Zoning |
| 22 | Commission Case No. 25-11. This is a text amendment from the |
| 23 | Office of Planning, so. All right. We'll meet at the same time. |
| 24 | So again, the honorable bill has been broken up. We heard your |
| 25 | voices, and we also thought about ourselves as well. I'll be |

frank and honest. But we heard your voices and also what you all -- and you all actually triggered us in the community to think about what we really need to do. So we appreciate -- that's why it's good to have community input. You all -- we do make a difference in the community, so thank you all for helping us see the light. So with that, there's nothing else in this meeting. Thank you everyone for their participation in this meeting. meeting is adjourned. You all take care. Have a good weekend. MS. SCHELLIN: Thank you. (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 5:03 p.m.)

| 1 | CERTIFICATION |
|----------|--|
| 2 | |
| 3 | This is to certify that the foregoing transcript |
| 5 6 | In the matter of: Regular Public Meeting |
| 7 | Before: DCZC |
| 8 | Date: 02-23-25 |
| 10 | Place: Teleconference |
| 11 | |
| 12 13 | was duly recorded and accurately transcribed under my direction; further, that said transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | Deboral B. Sauthier |
| 17 | Deborah B. Lawriec |
| 18 | Deborah B. Gauthier |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |