

GOVERNMENT OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

MONDAY

DECEMBER 1, 2025

+ + + + +

The Public Hearing of Case No. 25-09 by the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened via videoconferencing 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
TAMMY STIDHAM, Commissioner
JOSEPH S. IMAMURA, Commissioner

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

SHARON SCHELLIN, Secretary
PAUL YOUNG, Zoning Data Specialist

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

MAXINE BROWN-ROBERTS

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PRESENT:

HILLARY LOVICK, ESQ.
BRIAN LAMPERT, ESQ.

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the
Public Hearing held on December 1, 2025

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

OPENING STATEMENT	
Anthony Hood	3
PRESENTATION:	
Preliminary Matters	
Rulemaking Case	6
PRESENTATION:	
Case No. 25-09 - Office of Planning, Zoning Map and Text Amendments to create the Cleveland Park Neighborhood Mixed-Use Zone and the new Woodley Park Neighborhood Mixed-Use Zone, Squares 2068, 2069, 2082, 2218, 2219, 2222, 2202, 2203, and 2204	9
COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS:	
Commissioners	20
ADJOURN	
Anthony Hood	169

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

2 (4:00 p.m.)

3 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen.

4 We are convening and broadcasting this public hearing by

5 videoconferencing. My name is Anthony Hood. Joining me this

6 evening are Vice Chair Miller and Commissioner Stidham -- soon

7 to join us will be Commissioner Stidham and Commissioner Wright.

8 Also joining us are Vice -- Commissioner Imamura. We're also

9 joined by our Office of Zoning staff, Ms. Sharon Schellin and Mr.

10 Paul Young. Mr. Paul Young will be handling all of our virtual

11 operations, as well as our Office of Zoning legal division, Ms.

12 Hillary Lovick and Mr. Brian Lampert.

13 I'll ask others to introduce themselves at the

14 appropriate time. Copies of today's virtual public hearing

15 notice are available on Office of Zoning's website. Please be

16 advised that this proceeding is being recorded by a court

17 reporter, also webcast live via Webex and YouTube Live. The

18 video will be available on Office of Zoning's website after the

19 hearing. Accordingly, all those listening on Webex or by phone

20 will be muted during the hearing. Only those who have signed up

21 to participate or testify will be unmuted at the appropriate

22 time.

23 Please state your name before providing oral testimony

24 or your presentation. Your presentation should be limited to the

25 summary of your most important points. When you are finished

1 speaking, please mute your audio so that your microphone is no
2 longer picking up sound or background noise. If you experience
3 difficulty accessing Webex or your telephone call-in, then please
4 call our OZ hotline number at (202) 727-0789 to receive Webex
5 login or call-in instructions or if you need assistance to sign
6 up to testify.

7 All persons planning to testify in favor, opposition,
8 undeclared must sign up in advance and will be called by name.
9 If you wish to file written testimony or additional supporting
10 documents during the hearing, then please request that the
11 submission be entered into the record and prepare to described
12 at the time of your testimony.

13 The subject of this evening's hearing is Zoning
14 Commission Case Number 05 -- I'm sorry, Zoning Commission Case
15 Number 25-09. Office of Planning, Zoning Map and Text Amendments
16 to create the Cleveland Park Neighborhood Mixed-Use Zone and the
17 new Woodley Park Neighborhood Mixed-Use Zone, Square 2068, 2069,
18 2082, 2218, 2219, 2222, 2202, 2203, and 2204. And again, today's
19 date is December 1st, 2025.

20 The hearing will be conducted in accordance with the
21 provisions of 11-Z DCMR Chapter 5 as follows. Preliminary matters
22 presentation, in this case, will be the Office of Planning, report
23 of other government agencies, report of the ANC, testimony of
24 organizations and individuals. Organizations, five minutes.
25 Individuals, three minutes. And we're here in order for those

1 who support opposition are undeclared.

2 While the Commission reserves the right to change the
3 time limits for presentations, if necessary, it intends to adhere
4 to the limits -- time limits as strictly as possible, and no
5 single time shall be seen. My preliminary matter tonight is that
6 we will stop -- I'm hoping we'll be finished, but we will stop
7 at 9 o'clock. And I appreciate my colleagues going on the 10
8 and 10:30 the other night, but we also have to be fresh and we're
9 hearing information as well. It has nothing to do with nothing
10 else that's going on this evening, but we will stop at 9 o'clock
11 because I know what the joke is always out there about. But we
12 will stop at 9 o'clock for the sake of us being able to get rest
13 because we do have other things that we do in the morning, early.

14 At this time, the Commission will consider any
15 preliminary matters.

16 Does the staff have any preliminary matters?

17 MS. SCHELLIN: Just a couple of brief ones. First of
18 all, as you stated, this is a rulemaking case. We do have an
19 ANC report. It is at Exhibit 161 from ANC 3C in support. They've
20 made some other statements in that. I'm sure you've read that.
21 The OP Hearing Report is at Exhibit 118. And there is a DDOT
22 report at Exhibit 150 showing no objections. There was one other
23 exhibit I wanted to bring to the Commission's attention. At
24 Exhibit 230, even though this is a rulemaking case and no one
25 has standing, Renee Bowser, an attorney for a single member

1 district gentleman, and I believe some others filed suit in
2 Superior Court, I believe, with regard to the comp plan.

3 And she is asking that the Commission postpone/delay
4 this hearing until a decision is made whether the comp plan --
5 the current comp plan is appropriate or whatever she has stated
6 in her letter. I don't think that there was an environmental
7 study or something that she is referring to. So you have that
8 exhibit before you. And like I said, there are no parties, but
9 I did want you to note that that exhibit is in there. Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Schellin, what exhibit is that
11 again? I did not see anything from --

12 MS. SCHELLIN: 230.

13 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, okay. I see it's 230. Yeah. Okay.
14 I did not -- I missed that.

15 Okay. As you've stated, Ms. Schellin, there's no
16 parties in this case. If they -- whoever she's represented, the
17 ANC or whoever she represented, they chose to present tonight.
18 I mean, it shows no problem, and we're a go by rulemaking
19 regulation. So we will hear from whomever would like to testify;
20 and whatever proceeding she has going up in another venue, then
21 they will deal with that accordingly. But I think what's in
22 front of us is what's in front of us, and I -- unless I have some
23 objection with my colleagues, I think we'll just go ahead and
24 move forward where we have.

25 Any objections? All right. No objections.

1 Okay. Ms. Schellin, anything else?

2 MS. SCHELLIN: I have nothing else.

3 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let me just say this before --

4 MS. SCHELLIN: There was one other ANC in this area, I
5 wanted to say, 60.

6 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let me say this.

7 MS. SCHELLIN: I don't have a report yet in the record
8 from them. I do want you to know, so that was the other ANC and
9 there's no report yet.

10 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. And also, I just want to make
11 sure that Renee Bowser knows that she has a right -- her group
12 has a right to testify this evening and continue to do whatever
13 they're doing in another venue. And we'll wait to get anything
14 from any other ANCs as well.

15 Anything else, Ms. Schellin?

16 MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir.

17 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right. Let's bring up the
18 Office of Planning. I think it's Ms. Brown-Roberts. And again,
19 colleagues, I appreciate those who stayed overnight to 10:30, but
20 we will stop at 9.

21 So Ms. Schellin, you might want to start looking at
22 another date. I want to see where we are. I mean, I want to
23 see where we are at 8 o'clock. And we'll do an assessment, and
24 then we'll do another assessment at 8:30, and then we'll talk
25 about it probably about 8:15 or 8:30 to see where we are or how --

1 what we need to do, but we will stop at 9.

2 Go right ahead, Ms. Schellin -- I mean, I'm sorry. Ms.
3 Brown-Roberts, whenever you're ready.

4 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Okay. Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman
5 and members of the Zoning Commission. Maxine Brown-Roberts
6 representing the Office of Planning on Zoning Commission Case 25-
7 09.

8 Thank you, Mr. Young.

9 OP is pleased to present the proposed text and map
10 amendment to you this evening. The revitalization of the
11 Connecticut Avenue corridor has been a priority for the
12 residents, property owners, and businesses in the area, as well
13 as the city. As will be discussed later, they have been involved
14 and participated in the recommendations of the 2021 Comprehensive
15 Plan, the Connecticut Avenue Development Guidelines, and the
16 instant proposed text and map amendment processes. They have
17 also emphasized moving the proposal forward to expand housing and
18 affordable housing and retail and service uses to revitalize the
19 corridor.

20 Next slide. The process began with the housing equity
21 report which encourages housing affordability throughout the city
22 and the D.C. comeback plan which encourages the removal of
23 barriers to the production of affordable housing.

24 Next slide. The Rock Creek West map identify -- the
25 Rock Creek West road map identify three areas within Rock Creek

1 West. One of which is the Connecticut Avenue corridor, which
2 efforts should be made to increase the production of housing and
3 affordable housing supported by vibrant public spaces, retail
4 services, and other amenities.

5 Next slide. The process consists of three steps which
6 builds on each other. The planning process begins with the
7 council adopted a comprehensive plan which includes a citywide
8 and area elements and the maps. The comp plan recommended
9 increased density within the Cleveland Park and Woodley Park
10 areas and also specific policies regarding increasing housing and
11 affordable housing. The comp plan also recommended Connecticut
12 Avenue as a future planning analysis area.

13 Based on these recommendations of the comprehensive
14 plan, OP in conjunction with the community and others prepared a
15 more detailed planning document to study -- went through another
16 planning process to study and develop the neighborhood or area
17 plan, which is the Connecticut Avenue Development Guidelines.
18 Now, based on the recommendations outlined in the comp plan and
19 the Connecticut Avenue Development Guidelines, the zoning is
20 being proposed to implement the comp plan and the specifics of
21 the neighborhood plans which is to be approved by the Zoning
22 Commission.

23 Next slide. OP proposes zoning text amendment to
24 create a new Cleveland Park Neighborhood Mixed-Use Zone, which
25 is the NMU-8A/CP for properties fronting on Connecticut Avenue

1 Northwest between Porter Street and Macomb Street and the Woodley
2 Park Neighborhood Mixed-Use Zone, which is NMU-9A/WP for
3 properties fronting on Connecticut Avenue between Woodley Road
4 and Calvert Street.

5 In both areas, there are a few properties fronting on
6 side streets. The proposal includes map amendments to map these
7 zones. The proposed new zoning text and map amendment are not
8 inconsistent with a comprehensive plan, including when viewed
9 through a racial equity lens and incorporates land use and
10 building massing, design, and use guidance from the Connecticut
11 Avenue Development Guidelines.

12 Next slide. Going back to the comprehensive plan, the
13 generalized policy map designates both areas as main street
14 mixed-use corridors. The corridors are also within the future
15 planning analysis area which has been accomplished through the
16 Connecticut Avenue Development Guidelines.

17 Next slide. The future land use map designates the
18 Cleveland Park corridor for mixed medium-density residential and
19 moderate-density commercial, and high-density residential and
20 low-density residential, high-density residential and low-
21 density commercial for the Woodley Park corridor. The proposed
22 zones are not inconsistent with the generalized policy map and
23 the future land use map as they would allow a mix of uses
24 particularly ground floor commercial uses and upper floor
25 residential uses including affordable housing. The citywide

1 elements of the comprehensive plan also recommends -- the
2 comprehensive plan recommends Cleveland Park and Woodley Park as
3 policy focused areas.

4 Next slide. The Connecticut Avenue Development
5 Guidelines were developed following extensive community outreach
6 meetings and conversations. The plan was also reviewed by HPRB
7 as the corridors are within the Cleveland Park and Woodley Park
8 Historic Districts. The guidelines also address revitalization
9 of public spaces and compatibility to adjacent lower density
10 residential uses. The guidelines provide guidance to supplement
11 the comprehensive plan direction regarding density and use mix
12 for new zoning for the area. And the proposed zones incorporate
13 many of the guidelines pertaining to building use and form.

14 The guidelines do not recommend specific zoning
15 designations, but gives guidance for density, high lot occupancy,
16 or guidelines to implement the policies of a comprehensive plan.
17 Not every provision of the guidelines are relevant to zoning or
18 could be implemented through zoning. Provisions that are outside
19 the scope of the Zoning Regulations would be relevant to other
20 approval processes.

21 Next slide. Currently, both areas are designated as
22 neighborhood mixed-use zones, but the proposal would create two
23 new neighborhood mixed-use zones at higher densities to reflect
24 the land use policy direction of the comprehensive plan and with
25 more air specific zoning provisions for construction and

1 additions through the specific guidelines of the Connecticut
2 Avenue Development Plan. Based on the recommendation of the comp
3 plan for medium and high-density development along the Cleveland
4 and Woodley Park corridors and the recommended height and density
5 in the development guidelines, the proposed zones were created.
6 In both Cleveland Park and Woodley Park commercial corridors,
7 there again, there's a small number of residential uses, but
8 mostly there are a variety of restaurants, retail, and service
9 uses which serve the local community.

10 Next slide. For Cleveland Park, the NMU-8A/CP zone is
11 based on the MU-8A zone and would allow mixed-use, medium-density
12 residential, and moderate-density commercial uses, which is
13 generally ground-floor retail and residential uses above with a
14 FAR of 5.0 and subject to IZ, a height of 75 feet, rear yard
15 setbacks to protect adjacent residential uses, along with the
16 base MU-8 development standards. As seen on this slide, the
17 guidelines provide illustrations of recommended building heights
18 and with setbacks for protection along Connecticut Avenue, as
19 well as for adjacent lower density uses where applicable.

20 When you're about in an alley, a 12-foot minimum
21 setback is required above 40 feet in building height. Where
22 there is not an alley and adjacent to R zones, a 12-foot setback
23 and a one-to-one setback above 40 feet is required. On the east
24 side of Connecticut Avenue, there are some garden apartments in
25 the RA-1 zone and an alley, then the setback is above 40 feet.

1 On the west side of Connecticut Avenue, where there may not be
2 an alley and the properties are in R zone with rear setbacks and
3 one-to-one setback, over 40 feet described.

4 Next slide. This slide shows the setbacks along the
5 rear depending on its adjacency to an alley and lower density
6 uses or higher density uses. So this is just a cross section to
7 show an illustration, again just to show what the height of the
8 building would be and how the setbacks would work against
9 especially along the lower density residential uses which are
10 separated by an alley.

11 Next slide. This illustration shows the additions
12 above existing buildings looking north along Connecticut Avenue
13 from the Uptown Theater. This is an illustration only to show
14 the heights of the existing buildings and not indicative of any
15 development. We did not recommend setbacks or articulations on
16 the front facade as requested and recommended by HP staff to give
17 HP the flexibility to analyze each addition in the context of the
18 building on the ground floor, adjacent buildings, and the overall
19 historic district.

20 Next slide. In addition to the requirements of high-
21 load occupancy, density, and setbacks, there were additional
22 guidelines for new buildings. These include requiring that at
23 least 75 percent of the street wall on the street level is
24 constructed to the lot line. Entrances are provided every 30
25 feet on average for the linear frontage of a building. Not less

1 than 50 percent of the surface area of the street wall at the
2 ground level would be devoted to display windows. And display
3 windows, entrances to commercial uses, or to buildings should
4 have a clear or clear-to-low emissivity glass. Display windows
5 should also have a minimum visibility depth of 10 feet into retail
6 uses.

7 Entrances along Connecticut Avenue should be directly
8 at grade with the sidewalk. And also, residential entrances
9 should be placed along the side street on a corner lot that fronts
10 on Connecticut Avenue in this side street. Regarding vehicle
11 parking and loading and trash, this should be done from the alley
12 or a side street, and vehicular parking spaces should be located
13 below grade or at grade. If they're provided at grade, no portion
14 of the parking lot should be within 20 feet of Connecticut Avenue
15 and should be screened along Connecticut Avenue with designated
16 uses.

17 Next slide. Similarly, in Woodley Park where the comp
18 plan recommends high-density residential and low-density
19 residential and low-density commercial uses, the proposed NMU-
20 9A/WP zone is based on the MU-9A zone and would allow a mixed-
21 use high-density residential and low-density commercial uses with
22 a FAR of 6.0 with IZ and a height of 90 feet for the west side
23 of Connecticut Avenue that is between Connecticut Avenue, Calvert
24 Street, and 24th Street, and a FAR of 5.5 with IZ+ and 75 feet
25 in height for buildings on the east side of Connecticut Avenue.

1 Again, rear yard setbacks to protect adjacent
2 residential uses are provided along with the base MU-9A
3 development standards. Buildings on the east side of Connecticut
4 Avenue are separated from the rear yards by properties in the RF-
5 zone. A rear yard setback of minimum 12 feet is required above
6 20 feet of building height. On the west side, no side back is
7 required as the properties are separated by 24th Street and those
8 properties are in the RA and -- are in the RA-2 and RA-4 zones,
9 which allow up to, say, between 50 and 90 feet in height.

10 Next slide. This illustration shows, again, additions
11 above existing buildings looking north along Connecticut Avenue
12 from Calvert Street.

13 Next slide. Similar design guidelines to those in
14 Cleveland Park were provided to activate Connecticut Avenue
15 frontage by having at least 75 percent of the front facade and
16 new buildings built to the front lot line, minimum door
17 separations on the ground floor of new buildings requiring retail
18 space to be accessed from Connecticut Avenue and at grade with
19 the sidewalk, and parking and loading would be accessed from side
20 street or alleys.

21 Next slide. Other changes proposed include rezoning a
22 property in Cleveland Park that is split zone R1-B and NMU-4/CP
23 and is developed with a single-family detached house. Due to the
24 size of the lot and the existing house, it seems unlikely that
25 the NMU-4/CP portion of the lot could be developed with a higher

1 density recommendation; and therefore, it is recommended that
2 this entire lot is placed in the R1-B zone.

3 Secondly, in Woodley Park, there are two properties
4 along Woodley Place that are developed with residential uses on
5 and/or unlike other properties in the neighborhood commercial
6 areas with front on Connecticut Avenue or Calvert Street. OP is
7 therefore recommending that these properties be rezoned to the
8 RF-1 zone. I must say these are properties also that the property
9 owners contacted us and made their case about not being in the
10 high-density zones. So both neighborhood mixed-use zone
11 corridors have eating and drinking establishment restrictions
12 which limits that use to 75 percent of the linear street frontage
13 along the corridor.

14 The Connecticut Avenue Development Guidelines conveyed
15 that this was an issue to be reviewed. We also heard from the
16 ANC and the Cleveland Park Main Street Organization, which
17 conveyed to us that the retail market has changed since the
18 restriction was adopted and only serves to dissuade entrepreneurs
19 from establishing a business along the corridor. As part of this
20 process, we also heard from residents who are in support and
21 those who would like it to be retained.

22 In our conversations with the Department of Buildings,
23 which track and forces the calculation of linear frontage
24 available, they also conveyed to OP that there's a history of
25 information being difficult to track as businesses transition in

1 and out of the market. And at times, there's no clear definition
2 of uses which qualifies. It seems that allowing the marketplace
3 to take the uses along the corridor is a better option. And
4 therefore, OP is recommending that the new zones be exempted from
5 the requirement.

6 Next slide. As outlined in our report, there's a
7 history of discriminatory land use practices that has led to the
8 racially segregated Rock Creek West planning area. Homeowners
9 in the areas are overwhelmingly White and wealthy compared with
10 the district as a whole. New housing would provide new
11 opportunities to diversify the neighborhood. During the planning
12 analysis for the Connecticut Avenue commercial corridor, outreach
13 included community engagement and participation through virtual
14 and in-person activities. A dedicated project website to promote
15 engagement activities and share information was established. OP
16 attended or led community events and meetings related to topics
17 covered by the plan.

18 HPRB also held a public meeting to review the
19 recommendations. Prior to and since sat-down, OP continued the
20 community engagement process and has had 15 engagements with the
21 ANC, ANC representatives, community organizations and their
22 representatives, and individual residents during the text and map
23 commitment process. Again, the properties are in a historic
24 district and all new construction will be reviewed by HPRB
25 regarding materials, design, and compatibility with historic

1 resources and is open for public comment and input.

2 For this proposed text amendment, we are thankful that
3 the committee members have been generally supportive of the
4 proposed changes while others expressed concerns about the
5 heightened density and their impact on the historic district.
6 Many of those concerns could be mitigated as each development
7 will be reviewed by HPRB. At set-down, we requested that the
8 Zoning Commission waive the requirements to post notices on
9 properties regarding the proposal.

10 In this case, the applicant is office -- OP and none
11 of the properties to be rezoned are owned by the government, and
12 OP cannot post signs on private property. Similarly, we are not
13 permitted to post signs on electrical or light fixtures. However,
14 we have taken steps to notify the public through many meetings
15 with the ANC and other community organizations. Although not
16 required, we also send notices to owners of the property to be
17 rezoned, as well as owners within a radius of 200 feet of the
18 properties proposed to be rezoned.

19 Next slide. In summary, the proposed text and map
20 amendment would provide new opportunities for the provision of
21 new housing, as well as housing for more moderate- and low-income
22 residents of all racial and ethnic backgrounds. Overall, the
23 proposed text and map amendment would advance many of the policies
24 related to racial equity in the provision of housing, job
25 creation, the advancement of arts and culture, and encourages the

1 expansion of neighborhood, retail, commercial, and service uses
2 and addresses potential impacts on the adjacent residential uses.

3 The proposed tax amendment is not inconsistent with the
4 comprehensive plan and the Connecticut Avenue Development
5 Guidelines and OP therefore recommends that the proposed tax and
6 that amendment be approved.

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

9 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Brown-Roberts. I am
10 going to -- before I go to Vice Chair Miller, I just want to --
11 I want you to take me through some because -- let's just walk
12 down this help Anthony Hood lane.

13 So I know we've been here a few times, and I know some
14 people right now in Cleveland Park are not happy with me over
15 the Commission, particularly me. My name seems to be named in
16 the lawsuit. But what I've noticed that we have done and what
17 the city keeps doing is trying to get rid of some of the
18 inequities so people that look like me will be able to get this.

19 Is that kind of, again, we're making another attempt?
20 It seems like we're making another -- we're trying to get Rock
21 Creek West for affordable housing. And I've been hearing that
22 now for a couple of years, and so far, we've failed. And the
23 reason we failed is not -- it's not because the city and the
24 Commission and others have not tried. It's because there's a lot
25 of pushbacks. I see a lot of support this time. So I'm just

1 wondering, again, is this another attempt to try to balance out
2 and give it -- as you mentioned on page -- slide 18, do away with
3 some of those racial disparities that happen in our city and give
4 other people an opportunity to live if they're able to be able
5 to have an opportunity to live in some of these areas as well.
6 Is that what we're trying to do again? Because we've tried many
7 times.

8 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Yes. And I mean, it goes back, as
9 I said, from the housing equity report where they did the analysis
10 and we came up with results that that was an area that was lacking
11 in affordable housing. We did the further study of the Rock
12 Creek West Roadmap that laid out, you know, some of the -- and
13 again, laid out the inequities and how many units we should be
14 generating. Further to that, the comp plan also goes in details
15 about it, and that was one of the reasons why they were providing
16 additional density in these areas so that developers could see
17 their way through having -- you know, give them extra density and
18 providing affordable housing. So this is sort of the next step
19 in that before it goes out to the developers. So this is a zoning
20 that is being put in place now so that they -- with the additional
21 density so that they can go from there.

22 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Thank you, Ms. Brown-
23 Roberts, for answering that. And also thank you for all that
24 you all have done over the years that I've been around, because
25 I know this is just something we've been trying to tackle. At

1 least being able to afford all walks of life the opportunity to
2 be able to -- and I think that's key and -- you know, and people
3 are mad because of what I'm saying. This is not the first time.
4 I'm already in court now, so just add that to the case, but I
5 think this is very key for this city to be able to do that, and
6 I want to applaud the administration, Office of Planning every
7 month for trying to do it.

8 Now, does it probably need some tweaks? Yes. But is
9 this an attempt? I applaud you. Because I know that in Cleveland
10 Park and other areas, I know some other areas who have been --
11 and I think, you know, feel aware of it too that -- that want a
12 mixed-use zone, want this kind of zone, but there are some things
13 missing. So Cleveland parks are getting all the attention. And
14 I know the other areas as well, but some of these areas would
15 welcome what you all are doing. So let's continue to keep
16 pushing. And I know it's a overwhelming support here, and I
17 would hope that we -- and I'm going to listen to everybody, and
18 I hope that we can balance it out for those who may have some
19 opposition, some tweaks, and make it work for all residents of
20 the city, all walks of life, and all racial equity so we can be
21 consistent with our racial equity too.

22 So what I'm going to do --

23 And thank you again, Ms. Brown-Roberts, and --

24 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: You're welcome, Mr. Chairman.

25 CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'll say more on this as we proceed.

1 I'm going to go to Vice Chair Miller and then
2 Commissioner Wright. And then I'm going to go to Commissioner
3 Imamura and then Commissioner Stidham, and then I'll follow up
4 if I have any additional comments.

5 Vice Chair Miller.

6 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank
7 you, Maxine Brown-Roberts for very comprehensive report and
8 testimony here today and all of the planning efforts by the Office
9 of Planning over the years, really many years that have led to
10 this zoning hearing beginning -- I don't know what's the
11 beginning. But the Rock -- well, there's 2021 Comprehensive Plan
12 amendments, most importantly, including the land use map changes
13 made by the council and mayor to both of these areas, basically
14 upping the density and including by mix of uses. I think it
15 might have been only low-density commercial in the Cleveland Park
16 area. It's now moderate commercial, medium residential.

17 And then Woodley Park -- I forget what it was, but it's
18 now high-density residential and low-density commercial. And
19 then -- I mean, you all of OP did the Rock Creek West Roadmap
20 several years ago, and then I think you did an update to it a
21 few years ago. And there were the Cleveland Park and Woodley
22 Park Design Guidelines and then the Connecticut Avenue
23 Development Guidelines. There also was the housing equity report
24 citywide that that did have emphasis how Ward 3 was not making --
25 meeting its affordable housing targets as set forth by the mayor

1 several years ago.

2 So I appreciate all the community engagement that
3 you've done particularly with the -- in conjunction with the
4 Advisory Neighborhood Commission 3C. As I think most people
5 know, I am a Cleveland Park resident. I lived here for 35 years,
6 and I respect all of my neighbors' views.

7 Ms. Sharon, you're not the only one being sued. Entire
8 Zoning Commission and the mayor, I think, is being sued but in
9 those lawsuits, but your name is there.

10 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Our name is always up.

11 VICE CHAIR MILLER: For the chair, that's why I don't
12 like to being the chair among many other reasons. Anyway, I do
13 respect all of my neighbors' viewpoints, and I can empathize with
14 your comment, Mr. Chairman, of people being mad at you because
15 lot of people are sometimes mad at me.

16 So there's a lot of information here. We have a lot
17 of public testimony that's going to come -- that's been entered
18 into the record already. And I look forward to hearing the public
19 hearing testimony this evening. And hopefully, we'll get through
20 most if not all of it. The Office of Planning report as we ask
21 as part of the comprehensive plan analysis, particularly
22 through -- well, the comprehensive analysis, we ask for you to
23 identify potential inconsistencies of a proposal, whether it's
24 coming from you or anybody else with a comprehensive plan. And
25 I know you had a section in there. I think it was on page 19,

1 but -- yeah.

2 They only mentioned one potential inconsistency, the
3 commercial avoiding displacement of small, existing, particularly
4 minority, and local businesses choosing due to rising real estate
5 costs. And I think you provided an appropriate response to that.
6 But I think there were -- there are other inconsistencies with
7 some of the public testimony that we'll hear from later has
8 pointed out that should be acknowledged by Office of Planning and
9 addressed either here in this hearing or in a post-hearing
10 submission. I'll just point out too that stood out to me from --
11 I'm going with -- my SMD Commissioner, which Rick Nash Exhibit
12 229. No, that's Committee of 100. That's the -- I'll go with
13 the Committee of 100 first, then, since that's in front of me.

14 So the framework element of the comprehensive plan
15 describes the density levels that are on the map. And as I said,
16 for example, in Cleveland Park, the land use map was changed to
17 moderate commercial to a medium residential. It was previously
18 only low commercial, I believe. And the framework element
19 describes what the consistent zoning categories would be with
20 those future land use map density levels. And it calls out for,
21 I believe, moderate commercial density, MU-5 and MU-7. It does
22 say, as it always says, other zoning categories may be consistent
23 as well, especially if an IZ -- if IZ is being applied and/or
24 PUD is applied.

25 But it does call out MU-5 and 7 for moderate commercial,

1 and it calls out which has a lower FAR density than MU-8 and then
2 the MU-8A that you're recommending here, which is 5.0, and I
3 don't know if it goes up if you have IZ+ or if it's just 5
4 point -- if it maxes out 5.0. Does it max out at 5.0? Yeah.

5 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Yes.

6 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. So I think the others max
7 out at 4.0 generally. And the medium residential, I think, is
8 only -- it's called out as 1.8 to 4.0 FAR. So it's just I think
9 that -- but it says other zoning categories may apply. And this
10 is a new -- this is another zoning category and it's a higher
11 one. And IZ is being required here -- as I understand, IZ+ is
12 being required here. But I think that OP either verbally, today
13 or in a post-hearing submission, should acknowledge at least that
14 potential inconsistency with the density levels between comp plan
15 and zoning and just address it like you did with the commercial
16 small business displacement that might occur because of rising
17 property values, which would probably happen whether or not we
18 have -- it does happen whether or not we have a proposed zoning
19 case in front of us. That happens all the time throughout the
20 city. That's just the nature of a growing city that hopefully
21 continues to grow and be prosperous.

22 I don't know if you want to say anything on that
23 potential. And since you have one other to bring up, but you --
24 I'll give you an opportunity to address that one if you like.

25 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: I'd prefer to maybe do a written

1 answer, but I think one of the things where the comp plan also
2 recommends that this area be a -- you know, that the planning
3 analysis was done for this area, and so further planning was done
4 and a number of scenarios were looked at for the FAR intensity.
5 And these were the ones that we thought, you know, that the
6 density at -- and height, they thought were appropriate and were
7 within the recommendation of the comp plan. So I think that,
8 yes, I can do the -- I can do that -- I can give you that analysis
9 of why we think that it will not impact the comp plan
10 recommendation.

11 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yeah. Right. And we're looking
12 at all of the comp -- you're looking at all the -- as we are,
13 all the comp plan --

14 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Right.

15 VICE CHAIR MILLER: -- and plan policies. That's --

16 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: That exactly is.

17 VICE CHAIR MILLER: That's what I'm -- yes. So I'm
18 just asking for --

19 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: For a written, I can give it to
20 you.

21 VICE CHAIR MILLER: -- for acknowledgement of that --
22 the potential inconsistency which those who oppose are pointing
23 out. We need to have a planning response --

24 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Address it, yes.

25 VICE CHAIR MILLER: -- which I think there is an

1 appropriate response. But as we've all been asked in other cases,
2 we said, why didn't you do this zone versus that zone if that
3 can be part of the analysis as well. And I realized all the
4 planning analysis that's gone into the sites cited some of the
5 planning that you've done over the last six years, I think.

6 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Okay.

7 VICE CHAIR MILLER: If not, before that with the --
8 yeah, six years. So the other one was -- the other specific
9 policy that I ask you to address, which I think can be addressed
10 as I said with the first one, was the Historic Preservation
11 Element Policy HP 0.4, 0.6, Preservation Standards for Zoning
12 Review. And it reads -- I'm quoting -- I'm not reading from the
13 comp plan. I'm reading from my SMD Commissioner's statement of
14 opposition, Rick Nash.

15 "Zoning for each historic district shall be consistent
16 with the predominant height and density of contributing buildings
17 in the district. Where needed, specialized standards or
18 regulations should be developed to help preserve the
19 characteristic building patterns of historic district and
20 minimize design conflicts between preservation and zoning
21 controls."

22 There's a lot in that. But I think it just needs to
23 be acknowledged and, you know, there's going to be -- as you've
24 stated in your report many times in today, it's going to be
25 Historic Preservation Review Board approval with -- review with

1 public participation of most, if not all, of the projects that
2 come forward in this historic district.

3 I know our little -- any window replacement in our
4 master bathroom had to go through it even though I don't know if
5 any street can even see that. So I know that there is HP review
6 religiously in this district and in all historic districts. But
7 I think this is calling for compatibility with the predominant
8 height and density. It doesn't even cite the comprehensive plans
9 density. It's just the predominant height and density that exist
10 in the neighborhood, preserving the characteristic building pack.
11 This is historic preservation element. So we would expect it to
12 be emphasizing that historic preservation priority, which are
13 counterbalanced by other policies, the increasing density to
14 provide affordable housing, which is our whole inclusionary
15 zoning policy both in the comp plan and in our zoning regulations.
16 So I just think that -- that if that could be part of your
17 submission, I think that would be helpful.

18 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Okay.

19 VICE CHAIR MILLER: But if you want to say something
20 about it now?

21 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: No.

22 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. The IZ+ is being required
23 with the 20 percent -- up to 20 percent affordable housing set
24 aside is being required for all projects in this zoning -- both
25 zoning in both Woodley Park and Cleveland Park zoning districts

1 is or --

2 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: That's correct.

3 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes. There was one comment someone
4 made. I don't know if it was Committee of 100 or not, that it
5 wasn't explicitly -- it might have been Laura Richard. It said
6 it wasn't explicitly required; that it's implied. It's in a
7 table, but it's not explicitly required in the text. I didn't
8 go back to look and see if it's actually explicitly required.
9 But I would think if it's in a table that says IZ+ and we're
10 going to -- if we move forward, we would say that the map not
11 gets the zone with the IZ+ designation as we've done in other
12 cases. But I would just have you look at that just to make sure
13 or reassure those who think that it isn't being explicitly
14 required. I thought it was and you're saying it is.

15 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Yes, it is. And we can say it
16 again.

17 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay.

18 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: I'll write it down again.

19 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Our PUDs -- I realize we're
20 creating a zoning framework so that we can facilitate development
21 maybe without going through a plan you develop approval process,
22 which is expensive and time consuming, but also involves a lot
23 of public participation, but this has involved a lot of public
24 participation -- this whole planning exercise leading to this
25 zoning case. And every -- and as I said, every project will

1 require historic preservation review, which would also allow have
2 the opportunity for public input. But are PUDs possible with
3 this zoning, or is it already maxed out that there's nothing
4 you'd get from a PUD that you wouldn't want to -- there's
5 nothing -- there's no advantage for a project applicant to go
6 forward with a PUD because you're getting the maximum height or
7 density that a PUD would have provided. PUD would not provide
8 an additional amount, which I think was implied or stated in one
9 of the opposition statements, that the PUD would even give more
10 height on top of whatever maximum --

11 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: They wouldn't. Right.

12 VICE CHAIR MILLER: But PUDs theoretically could apply?

13 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: I'm not sure if PUDs are allowed
14 in neighborhood commercial zones. That was something that I'd
15 have to check on.

16 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. And as I said, I'm not sure
17 I see what the -- what any advantage would be to an applicant to
18 come forward necessarily. Although sometimes they need relief.
19 Well, that would be probably a BZA case.

20 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: That's correct. Yes.

21 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Relief from some requirement that
22 doesn't meet the need --

23 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Need, right.

24 VICE CHAIR MILLER: -- for the project. I've already
25 gone too long, so I won't go on too much longer. There are five

1 of us here now. I was used to the last six weeks. It's just
2 three of us. We could go on. We welcome back our federal
3 furloughed members, previously furloughed members. And we're
4 happy to have you. We missed you, but I have to cut my comments
5 shorter then.

6 So there's been a lot of comment about -- so you have
7 the rear-yard required setbacks in both Woodley Park and
8 Cleveland Park zoning districts -- proposed zoning districts.
9 Cleveland Park, I think it's a one-to-one setback above 40 feet
10 in the rear yard. But you did -- you declined to do the front
11 facade in the zoning proposal. The front-facade setbacks and
12 stepbacks and set -- and all the -- yeah, setbacks and stepbacks
13 or stepdowns that were in the illustrative -- clearly, the
14 illustrative drawings in the Connecticut Avenue Development
15 Guidelines. I think largely because -- I think you said today
16 HP asked that they historic preservation asked -- they adopted
17 those guidelines as a guide to their review of future cases. I
18 guess if we adopted -- well, they adopted those, as I understand;
19 is that correct?

20 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: They reviewed them.

21 VICE CHAIR MILLER: They did not adopt them as a guide?

22 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: They did not, no. They reviewed
23 the proposal and basically gave them -- gave their blessings,
24 yes.

25 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yeah. I should acknowledge that I

1 watched that hearing, Mr. Chairman. And I hope that doesn't
2 bring another -- but I thought they had adopted it, but they --
3 in any event, so you declined to do it because they will review
4 it and they can do an, each, case-by-case, project-by-project
5 basis, make the appropriate compatibility with the character of
6 the district or the adjacent properties. They can make that
7 judgment themselves.

8 But I wonder, there's nothing to prevent us from
9 adopting some of them. I happen to think that the illustrations
10 are helpful and give some reassurance to those who are concerned
11 about the height and density and changing the historic character
12 of the neighborhood. I think the front facade setbacks gives
13 some reassurance to neighbors that it's not going to be this
14 canyon effect. Not that seven -- six or seven stories. Only in
15 Washington, D.C., six or seven stories, or five or whatever it
16 is, considered a canyon or a tower, but it is. So we have it on
17 Wisconsin Avenue all over the place, but eight stories, I believe,
18 two blocks from my house.

19 But so anyway -- but can you elaborate again why you
20 didn't adopt the front-facade setbacks which we have adopted in
21 other cases. I think Chevy Chase, they're -- which have a
22 historic district, so they wouldn't get that extra review and
23 public input. I think we did something in the 12th and new police
24 fire station case as well where we had the -- whether it's the
25 angle or just adjacent to their -- that's adjacent to the

1 residential neighborhoods. I'm not sure we did it on the front
2 facades in either of those places. But can you comment on why
3 you're why you don't think it's appropriate to --

4 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Again, I mean, you know, the HP
5 staff strongly encouraged us not to do that, because they --
6 again, the illustrations in the development guidelines are just
7 that: illustrations. And when the plan was being done, they
8 looked at several options of what sort of setbacks they were
9 doing. And again, at that time, you know, HP said they were
10 concerned about that. And so you know, we took the guidance from
11 them because it's hard to know, you know, if you're trying to be
12 compatible to not only the building over which it stands, but the
13 adjacent buildings, how do we know at this time that 15 feet, 20
14 feet, 5 feet is sort of the appropriate setback?

15 The designs that are shown there, again, are
16 illustrative. I mean, the property owner can come in with
17 something completely different. And so that would hamstring them
18 because, if that doesn't work, then they would have to come back,
19 you know, into the Zoning Commission or to BZA to explain or ask
20 for some relief as to maybe why that setback that we said isn't
21 working for them. So that was the sort of the main thrust in
22 this and us not -- again, people compare it to what we did in
23 Chevy Chase, which again, it's a completely -- Chevy Chase is not
24 a historic district. And so we were able to do those, but this
25 is a completely different scenario.

1 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Well, I understand that response.
2 I would be interested, though, to have the specific setbacks that
3 are shown in those illustrations. I think it's slide 11 of your
4 presentation today. I mean, it's in the Connecticut Avenue
5 Development Guidelines. They're everywhere, the illustrations.
6 So I would be interested to know at what height level you're
7 proposing? What setbacks? I can't really -- it might be in the
8 Connecticut Avenue Development Guidelines specified. But I would
9 just -- the -- in terms of the illustrative, I would be interested
10 to know what that setback was or stepdown at each level going
11 forward, because I would be interested to know that.

12 I'm open to still considering that even though I think
13 I do understand and think your explanation for not including them
14 has some logic in this case. But if you're able to provide the
15 specific floor levels for Woodley Park and setbacks at each level,
16 I think it would be helpful, to know them, if they exist. And
17 maybe they're in the development guidelines. I didn't go back
18 again to look at -- to read it again, but they may be there.

19 Mr. Chairman, I took up too much time and I think my
20 colleagues will certainly cover a lot of questions that I still
21 have, but that's it for me for now.

22 Thank you, Maxine Brown-Roberts for your --

23 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: You're welcome, Mr. Miller.

24 VICE CHAIR MILLER: -- all your work on this case.

25 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Thanks.

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

2 CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Thank you, Vice Chair
3 Miller.

4 Commissioner Wright.

5 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Thank you. I'm going to try to
6 be very brief because I know that we want to hear from the folks
7 who are here to testify and that we are going to have additional
8 work sessions and meetings on this topic in the future.

9 The things that would be helpful to me -- well, let me
10 say this first. I absolutely do support increasing the density
11 and height along Connecticut Avenue in both Woodley Park and
12 Cleveland Park. I think that it's important to do. And from a
13 good land use perspective, additional density should be placed
14 along corridors where there is a metro station. So from a bottom-
15 line perspective, I do support increasing the density and height
16 in both Woodley Park and Cleveland Park.

17 Now we get into the details. Everything gets down to
18 the details.

19 So I would -- number one, at our next meeting where we
20 have a work session on this discussion, I actually would like the
21 Office of Planning staff who deal with historic preservation to
22 attend that work session because I would like to ask them some
23 specific questions. And I know they are Office of Planning staff
24 in the historic preservation section, they may not typically come
25 to Zoning Commission meetings, but I would like to request their

1 representative from that staff come to have a discussion and
2 answer some specific questions.

3 Secondly, I would like a spreadsheet of building
4 heights that exist in the corridor today. I do understand that,
5 in parts of the corridor, the typical height is one to two
6 stories, but there are also quite a number of taller buildings
7 up and down the corridor. When you look at the Kennedy Warren,
8 which is just a block south, I believe that that's a total of 11
9 stories, although only eight stories are facing Connecticut
10 Avenue. They also have parts of it that face the park at the
11 rear.

12 I would like information about the new building that
13 is in Van Ness on the east side where the Sfoglina -- I don't
14 know how to say it, the Italian restaurant. And it looks like
15 the Kennedy Warren, very typically similar architecture to the
16 Kennedy Warren. I would like information about -- and that's a
17 recently built building, so we should be able, from the building
18 permits, to easily hold the building height of that. So I'd like
19 a little spreadsheet explaining what the building -- today, what
20 the building heights are sort of up and down the corridor. I
21 don't even know, for example, how tall the Uptown Theater is. I
22 would like that information.

23 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Can I just ask a clarifying
24 question? Do you mean for every building?

25 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes.

1 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: You're talking about different type
2 of every building?

3 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes, please. I would like to
4 understand, again, the -- this is similar to Vice Chair Miller,
5 the front stepbacks, what the different options were in the design
6 guidelines and to explore whether there could be language saying
7 there -- I understand the need for the historic preservation
8 review process to have flexibility in figuring out what the right
9 setback is for each building. But I think there needs to be
10 language somewhere in the zone, not just in the guidelines, that
11 says -- that there will be a setback. I don't want, five years
12 from now, an applicant to come in and say, well, you really didn't
13 even mention that I had to do a setback. So you're surprising
14 me by telling me I have to set back 10 feet or 15 feet or whatever.

15 So I think that there should be some language that says
16 there needs to be a setback that will be determined at the time
17 of the historic preservation review. I also agree with Vice
18 Chair Miller that the two inconsistencies that he mentioned need
19 to be addressed directly in a written response from the Office
20 of Planning. And we haven't talked about it, but I want to say
21 that I actually understand the reason that the provision was
22 included years ago to not -- to limit the number of restaurants
23 in these corridors. And I do understand the goal of wanting to
24 maintain a neighborhood serving area.

25 But since that provision was created, the world of

1 retail has changed so dramatically that I do think it is
2 appropriate to exempt these corridors from that requirement. I
3 do think it was an important requirement when it was created, but
4 there is significantly less types of neighborhood-serving retail
5 going in on corridors like this. And I think it's hard to
6 maintain the proportions that were in that law back when it was
7 created. So I do support exempting from that. And I do worry a
8 lot about the vacancies in Cleveland Park and about the general
9 decline of that corridor.

10 I think that's it for now. I may have other thoughts
11 after I hear testimony from the public, but I just wanted to sort
12 of lay out some of my thoughts and ideas for when we meet again
13 to discuss this, and that's it.

14 CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Thank you.

15 Commissioner Imamura. Okay. There you go.

16 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
17 My apologies. For some reason, my camera seems to go in and out
18 on its own. So I apologize if that's a distraction for anybody.
19 Certainly not of my own doing.

20 I really appreciate Commissioner Wright's comments and
21 her requests, her detailed requests, very specific requests.
22 Also, I appreciate Vice Chair Miller's thorough comments. And
23 while I don't have very many questions of my own, I will yield
24 the remaining balance of my time back to Vice Chair Miller with
25 any additional questions that he might have.

1 Ms. Brown-Roberts, thank you for your report tonight.
2 Just the question that I have -- I think, Commissioner Wright and
3 Vice Chair Miller have pretty much fleshed out a lot of issues
4 or comments. I just wanted to give you an opportunity to
5 reiterate how -- we know that some members of the community
6 express either reservation or have a little heartburn over this.
7 And I think that this map and text amendment certainly has a lot
8 of potential, positive potential, to benefit the community. I'm
9 curious to hear a little bit more from you about how the historic
10 preservation office in the HPRB might have been involved in or
11 helped develop the Connecticut Avenue Development Guidelines.

12 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: I know that they met with the --
13 our neighborhood planning division who actually did the plan.
14 And they also attended the ANC meetings. They attended open
15 house, committee open house meetings to explain. That's sort of,
16 in a nutshell, what I know right now.

17 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Okay. Well, thank you for that.
18 I think what's important here is a comment that the Chairman had
19 made earlier at the outset about striking a balance, and that's
20 really important here. And how the community can get involved
21 and do that is through -- you know, each stage of the HPRB review,
22 we have multiple agencies here that have some level of influence,
23 whether it's our own Zoning Commission, the HPRB, BZA. And so
24 zoning is an imperfect science or art. And I think that here
25 the focus is striking a balance to the Chairman's point earlier.

1 With those additional reviews, and I think -- I appreciate the
2 fact that the intentionality about not specifying setbacks, but
3 I think to Commissioner Wright's point that developer will come
4 in and assume or presume that they didn't have any and would need
5 a setback. I think it's important that there's at least some
6 language maybe perhaps that would help developer at least
7 anticipate that.

8 Otherwise, I think that's not all that I have to share,
9 Mr. Chairman, and yield the balance of my time back to either
10 Vice Chair Miller, Commissioner Stidham, or Commissioner Wright.

11 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I'll wait for Commissioner Stidham
12 and Chairman to do their questions before I do any further
13 questions if I do any.

14 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

15 Yeah. Commissioner Stidham, any questions, comments?

16 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: I agree with much of the
17 questions and request for additional information that have
18 already been mentioned. My main questions were really on the
19 HPRB review of the individual projects as they move forward. And
20 I think between what was prepared in the written response and Ms.
21 Brown-Roberts, your responses here today, that is now much
22 clearer to me and hopefully clear to the public too that there
23 is additional opportunities, as individual projects move forward,
24 for their participation and what those processes look like, so
25 that is really helpful. Thank you for that.

1 And I do believe that is a very good point related to
2 the setbacks and a need to be -- I understand the flexibility and
3 the need that is intended, but I think there will be significant
4 issue or pushback if developers aren't aware that there is --
5 there will be a setback to be determined during the HPRB process
6 or some definition of a range that they can expect so that they
7 don't come into this blind. I think that's only fair to know
8 upfront what the requirements of the process would be. So
9 understanding more about that would be great. It's really my
10 only request.

11 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Okay.

12 CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. I'll probably ask some
13 questions as we move through it. I've been looking at -- I mean,
14 I'm reading some of the submissions, and I really want to get to
15 the public, but let me see if we have to do a second round. It
16 sounds like, Vice Chair, you may have a second round, but let's
17 try a second round. I basically said my beginning comments at
18 the beginning. I do want to hear from -- maybe have a
19 conversation with people like Ms. Richards, Ms. Barker, and some
20 of the others once I hear the testimonies. I appreciate all the
21 thought that's went into these submissions that we have, and I'll
22 just leave it there for now. So I may want to come back to you,
23 Ms. Brown-Roberts --

24 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Okay.

25 CHAIRMAN HOOD: -- at a later time for myself. I'm

1 sure that was me as well. All right.

2 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Okay.

3 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Anybody else have any follow-up
4 questions?

5 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Well, I'll just mention what
6 they -- I'll come back to it maybe later after the public
7 testimony. But first, let me just reiterate as Commissioner
8 Wright did. I support certain the general purpose and intent of
9 increasing density along both of these corridors to produce more
10 housing and affordable housing. That is the paramount goal of
11 the comprehensive plan and all of the planning documents that are
12 affiliated or associated with these neighborhoods and other
13 neighborhoods throughout the -- or three in the city.

14 But maybe the two questions I had, which we can get in
15 written submissions and because it's in public testimony, that I
16 just want to get a response to. And one is the push for more IZ
17 and greater set aside and a deeper affordability level. Not that
18 necessarily these two neighborhoods should be singled out for
19 when -- we're not doing a citywide inclusionary zoning amendment,
20 which may be necessary to revisit it again. But given the huge
21 density increase in zoning and FAR from 2.0 to 5.0 in Cleveland
22 Park, for example, that 150 percent increase, and given the huge
23 gap in this area of the city for beating its affordable housing
24 goals, I'm just wondering if you could provide in the written
25 submission a response to requests or deeper levels of affordable

1 housing in these zoning districts and a greater set aside given
2 the density increase that is occurring over existing zoning and
3 existing conditions. That's one.

4 And the other is on the infrastructure. I need to look
5 at -- we go back and read the infrastructure study. But I think
6 your report references that what the DC Water is at its capacity,
7 but they'll be reviewing each project as part of the permitting
8 process.

9 Either in the infrastructure study or in your
10 solicitation of comments from agencies for your report, do we
11 have any comments specifically from either DC Water or DC
12 Department of Environment and Energy on the water capacity in
13 this neighborhood, which has had some flooding conditions around
14 the metro -- those metro stations where we're increasing the --
15 where we will be increasing the density? Do we have any comments
16 at this time specifically from DC Water?

17 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: No.

18 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I would ask you to ask for
19 something. Yeah, that's it. So thanks, Mr. Chairman.

20 And thank you, Ms. Brown-Roberts.

21 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Okay.

22 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Ms. Brown-
23 Roberts. I appreciate all the conversation my colleagues have
24 had with you. Ms. Brown-Roberts, stay tuned. We may be coming
25 back. I'm sure we will.

1 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Okay.

2 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you.

3 Ms. Schellin, do we have any ANC -- no, let me -- before
4 I go to ANCs, do we have, like, the Office of Attorney General?

5 MS. SCHELLIN: I don't think we had anybody from OAG
6 to sign up.

7 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

8 MS. SCHELLIN: But let me look one more time. I am
9 not seeing anybody.

10 CHAIRMAN HOOD: That's fine. What about DDOT?

11 MS. SCHELLIN: DDOT. Let me see if they have signed
12 up.

13 CHAIRMAN HOOD: And if they're not there, Vice Chair,
14 could you -- if you have their report handy, could you just give
15 us the highlight?

16 MS. SCHELLIN: DDOT does not seem to be signed up
17 either.

18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I think they've submitted
19 something.

20 VICE CHAIR MILLER: They did submit an exhibit.

21 MS. SCHELLIN: They did.

22 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I mean -- correct.

23 MS. SCHELLIN: Exhibit 150.

24 VICE CHAIR MILLER: 150.

25 MS. SCHELLIN: Uh-huh.

1 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Which has no objection to the
2 approval of the requested text and related map amendment, which
3 jumped out at me just because there's a specific number that I
4 hadn't seen for -- was that, I guess, their analysis of the build-
5 out would allow for approximately 864 more residential units and
6 75,000 square feet of commercial on the properties than the
7 maximum allowed in the current neighborhood mixed-use zones for
8 both Cleveland Park and Woodley Park.

9 So the 864, that's a lot of residential units in a
10 high-transit -- high-opportunity neighborhood. And 20 percent
11 of those -- I think it's 173 or something -- would be inclusionary
12 zoning units, affordable units. So I think that's important.

13 There was -- DDOT, there's -- I think we're going to
14 hear criticism from some of the opposition of the DDOT report or
15 the infrastructure. I think it may need a response that whether
16 the -- it may need a response. We'll see at the end.

17 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

18 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Just a written response from DDOT.

19 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right. Let's see. And even
20 if we need a response, we'll ask for it. But you know, I hear
21 about affordable housing, and I hear about this is going to be
22 additional units, and I'm going to ask a question on particularly
23 to Ms. Laura Richards because I read her testimony. That's kind
24 of -- I'm kind of in line with her and I'm sure others as well.
25 Anyway, that's a whole another topic about affordable housing for

1 me.

2 And I want to say, Commissioner Imamura, I think they
3 changed the software on this web stuff because mine was cutting
4 off and on a couple of weeks ago. So I don't -- there may be a
5 way to go in there and change that, but I don't know -- I
6 shouldn't say this, but they try to improve it, and then they
7 make it -- maybe I'm getting older, but they make it even harder,
8 for at least for me, but I'm getting there. Maybe I have Archie
9 come over there. That was a side note.

10 All right. Ms. Schellin, let's go to the ANCs.

11 MS. SCHELLIN: I have ANC 3C. The chairman, I believe,
12 is Janell Pagats. I'm not sure I pronounced that correctly.

13 Do you see her, Mr. Young?

14 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, Ms. Pagats.

15 MR. YOUNG: Yes. I brought her in.

16 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Pagats.

17 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. Let me see if there are --

18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: I think there's one other -- two
19 others, I thought.

20 MS. SCHELLIN: We have some SMDs signed up, but not --
21 I'm looking to see if there are any full ANCs.

22 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let's bring -- typically, what I do is
23 bring out --

24 MS. SCHELLIN: The SMDs are --

25 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yeah, bring them up too.

1 MS. SCHELLIN: -- individuals.

2 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let's do four. Let's give a total of
3 four, allowing Ms. Pagats. Hopefully, I pronounce it correctly.

4 MS. SCHELLIN: Individuals?

5 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yeah. And the four ANC commissioners.

6 MS. SCHELLIN: You want to bring -- we don't have any
7 other full ANCs.

8 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Do we have any Single Member
9 District commissioners?

10 MS. SCHELLIN: We do.

11 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yeah. Let's bring --

12 MS. SCHELLIN: You want to bring those up out of order?

13 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yeah. Well, if they are in -- the ones
14 in -- is Ms. Pagat's in support?

15 MS. PAGATS: Yes.

16 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, she is. Yes.

17 MS PAGATS: Yes.

18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Let's bring all
19 commissioners up there in support. They're in the Single Member
20 District commissioners.

21 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. We have Samuel Littauer. He's
22 part of 3C.

23 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

24 MS. SCHELLIN: And Rick Nash. Nope. He's undeclared.

25 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

1 MS. SCHELLIN: So let's see. Proponent, we've got
2 Janell. Adam Prinzo. Jay Bose, he's also with 3C. We already
3 got Samuel Littauer. Looks like Gawain Kripke -- oh, I'm sorry,
4 not him. I thought he was signed up as ANC because he was
5 highlighted, but he is not. That is it, sir.

6 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right.

7 Ms. Pagats, I'm going to come to you. Are you going
8 to -- are you -- each commissioner's going to speak, or are you
9 speaking for the entire 3C?

10 MS. PAGATS: I'm speaking for the entire 3C and then
11 also authorized to speak for 3C on this matter or the
12 commissioners for 3C01, 3C02, and 3C06 because they're the ones
13 that represent the areas directly affected.

14 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Got you. All right. You may begin,
15 Ms. Pagats. You can start --

16 MS. PAGATS: Okay. Super.

17 Good evening. My name is Janell Pagats, and I'm here
18 tonight as the chairperson of Advisory Neighborhood Commission
19 3C. We represent Cleveland Park, Woodley Park, Massachusetts
20 Avenue Heights, and Woodland Normanstone. And I speak with the
21 full formalized authority of our Commission on Zoning Commission
22 Case Number 25-09.

23 At our public meeting on November 17th, 2025, ANC 3C
24 voted 6-1-0 to submit a letter of strong, unwavering, and
25 unequivocal support for the proposed text and map amendments

1 necessary to establish the new Cleveland Park and Woodley Park
2 Neighborhood Mixed-Use Zones.

3 We understand fundamentally that zoning is not just
4 about lines on a map. It's about shaping our daily lives. And
5 the built environment is a profoundly powerful influence in
6 everyone's daily lives. As the architect Michael March,
7 architectural design is never neutral. It either helps or it
8 hurts. For decades, the existing zoning has hurt our community's
9 vitality. Case 25-09 is the essential zoning map and text
10 amendment conclusion that will allow the built environment of
11 Connecticut Avenue to help our residents and businesses.

12 Our support is the product of years of radio -- rigorous
13 community-driven planning. Case 25-09 is not a deviation. It's
14 the essential conclusion to the policies we have spent half a
15 decade developing. We formally initiated this change in 2021
16 with resolution 2021-002, advocating for a fundamental shift in
17 the future land use map. The previous low-density commercial
18 designation has functionally acted as a break, contributing to
19 the economic stagnation and the decay of our commercial
20 corridors. The changes to density is not just an option. It's
21 an imperative. It reflects the reality of our corridor as being
22 anchored by two metro stations and is the prime location for
23 transit-oriented development.

24 This policy is laser focused on addressing the critical
25 lack of missing middle- and family-sized units, a deficiency that

1 prevents socioeconomic diversity and undermines the long-term
2 viability of our local businesses. Following the comp plan, we
3 endorse the Connecticut Avenue Development Guidelines via
4 Resolution 23-012 setting the framework for implementation. The
5 proposed new zones are not one instruments. They are meticulously
6 crafted zoning tools. They serve as a necessary bridge between
7 the high-level goals of the comprehensive plan and require on-
8 the-ground details for compatibility within our historic context.

9 These zones are designed to mandate mixed-use
10 development and diverse housing while simultaneously ensuring
11 compatibility through detailed mandatory requirements, the rules,
12 government stepbacks, massing transition, and ground-floor
13 design, respecting our adjacent and low-density residential
14 neighborhoods in historic districts. The Historic Preservation
15 Review Board has already unanimously adopted these guidelines as
16 a formal tool for their review process. Therefore, in C-3-C, ask
17 the Zoning Commission not to delete the effect of these zones by
18 further adding step-up or design requirements.

19 The project-by-project review and approval process at
20 HPRB is the proper and sufficient venue to evaluate designs for
21 compatibility within our historic districts. ANC 3C has engaged
22 the community extensively as is detailed in our written report
23 at Exhibit 161 in the record. The results are clear and mandate
24 or clear mandate for action. The community is in strong consensus
25 on three points: the critical need to increase housing supply

1 in our metro stations, the urgent necessity of commercial
2 revitalization including lifting the cap on eating and drinking
3 establishments, and the requirement of inclusionary zoning to
4 ensure genuine racial and economic diversity.

5 While some concerns were raised about maximum height,
6 the proposed zones with their built-in mandatory stepbacks and
7 stepdowns represent the most appropriate response to achieve the
8 essential goals of density and affordability without sacrificing
9 historic compatibility. We acknowledge infrastructure
10 assessment, and we insist that any further infrastructure
11 evaluation be conducted as is customary on a project-by-project
12 basis during the permitting and review process.

13 Some have said in the comments that the IZ requirements
14 are too high or too low. The reality is that 5 percent, 15
15 percent, or 50 percent or 85 percent or 100 percent of zero units
16 at any AMI will always equal zero units. ANC 3C has taken a
17 position, though not explicitly, that perfect should not be the
18 enemy of the good. Zoning Case 25-09 is the essential final step
19 to translate community by the policy into legally enforceable
20 zoning. The time for deliberation has passed. The time for
21 implementation has arrived. Granting prompts approval will
22 immediately open the door for development proposals that align
23 with the community's vision, address the citywide housing
24 shortage, and secure the long-term viability of the Connecticut
25 Avenue corridor.

1 ANC 3C urges the Zoning Commission to act favorably and
2 immediately to approve Case Number 25-09 in its entirety. The
3 Commission has authorized the Chair, that's me, and the
4 commissioners for 3C01, 3C02, and 3C06 to represent the
5 Commission on this matter. As a reminder, consistent with D.C.
6 Code subsection 1-309, only actions of the full Commission voting
7 in an improperly noticed public meeting have standing and carried
8 greatly the actions, positions, and opinions of individual
9 commissioners insofar that they may be contradictory or otherwise
10 inconsistent with the expressed position of the full commission
11 in a properly adopted resolution or letter, have no standing and
12 cannot be considered as in any way associated with the Commission.

13 Thank you. I just also want to note (indiscernible)
14 for questions. The 3C is the only ANC affected. I think somebody
15 had mentioned there might have been other associated ANCs, but
16 these zones are fully contained within ANC 3C.

17 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Chair Pagats. And I
18 appreciate you, reminding us of who gets great weight. I
19 appreciate that. I always like that to be reminded, but I
20 appreciate when people do that to make sure we stay on course.
21 I was the one who mentioned other ANCs. I see so many. I want
22 to make sure I covered them, and I appreciate the clarification
23 about 3C. I'm going to go in order. I'm going to try to go in
24 order that I saw in Commissioner Pagats or Chair Pagats, if you
25 could stick around, we may have some questions for you.

1 Mr. Littauer, I may have messed your name up, but if
2 you can help me with the pronunciation. I didn't hear Ms.
3 Schellin, what she pronounced it, so I couldn't have anybody to
4 follow behind. So we'll go to 3C01 first, and we'll go to 3C02,
5 and then, I think, Commissioner, both of 3C06, I think. So we're
6 going to go in that order.

7 COMMISSIONER LITTAUER: Great. Yeah. Thank you so
8 much for the floor, Mr. Hood, and the pronunciation was pretty
9 good.

10 My name is Samuel Littauer. I am the advisory
11 neighborhood commissioner for Single Member District 3C01, which
12 is up in Woodley Park, bordering Connecticut Avenue, going all
13 the way down to Calvert Street and up to 28th. And I am here to
14 testify in strong support of the D.C. Office of Planning's
15 proposed Connecticut Avenue Development Guidelines as documented
16 in the Case Number 25-09. I'm going to spend my allotted time
17 primarily talking about the spirit of historicity within our
18 neighborhood, as well as this tends to be the point in which we
19 walk back some of the commitments that we've made across the
20 district. And I think it ought to be the reason that we support
21 the development of more housing and investment in our local
22 community.

23 Woodley Park was first designated as a historic
24 district back in 1990, but the period of historic significance
25 was marked between 1908 and 1938. But during those three decades,

1 the neighborhood underwent remarkable change. The Taft Bridge
2 had just been completed in 1906, just two years prior, and what
3 was once a relatively disconnected community across Rock Creek
4 Park grew into a really vibrant corridor of row homes, single-
5 family homes, condominiums, apartment buildings, small
6 businesses, churches, parks, you name it. All of these came
7 during this period of historicity.

8 And for too long, it feels to me that the rigidity of
9 the existing zoning code in Woodley Park has suppressed its
10 vibrancy, and it's blocked the very spirit of development that
11 first made the neighborhood worthy of that historic recognition.
12 The current regulatory environment has resulted in a much, much
13 slower pace of investment than the rest of the city. And in both
14 Woodley Park, Cleveland Park, and the district at large, dramatic
15 underdevelopment of these neighborhoods has resulted in increased
16 prices of homes of all types, not just single-family homes or row
17 homes, but also apartments and condos.

18 And what this has done is it's pushed out families who
19 have called these neighborhoods home for generations. And it's
20 currently robbing the current residents of the same spirit of
21 opportunity and liveliness that was made possible by the time
22 that we now deservedly deem as historic. So yes, if we want
23 Woodley Park's historic vibrancy to continue and thrive, we have
24 to make sure that we enable the neighborhood to be able to act
25 on that same spirit, allowing for growth in a way that builds

1 community, that honors our community's history, yes. But we also
2 have to make sure that the outcomes unleash opportunity for its
3 residents and to the city, which we all belong to.

4 As my fellow commissioners and Chairperson Pagats have
5 outlined, the Connecticut Avenue Development Guidelines, they
6 enable the same kind of housing investment in our neighborhood
7 that we need urgently across the entire city by making smart
8 measures like increasing the allowable height along Connecticut
9 Avenue or adjusting the FAR on several key blocks. These
10 guidelines, as proposed in Case 25-09, they unlock a path for
11 really smart, context-sensitive, and specific growth that also
12 aligns with Woodley Park's historic vibrancy.

13 The vibrant spirit of the neighborhood that the
14 historic designation was first designed to protect,
15 unfortunately, is robbing us of that vibrancy. The changes that
16 were implemented from 1908 to 1938 embody the best of the
17 neighborhood. And I think that more people ought to be able to
18 access that same spirit now. So for myself and for the sake of
19 everyone who's called Woodley Park home, everyone who's benefited
20 from the opportunity that was once ever present by this changing
21 neighborhood and landscape, but also for the sake of everyone who
22 currently lives in the community, and we want that opportunity
23 to be realized again. And especially for the sake of everyone
24 who will one day call this neighborhood home, long after I'm
25 gone, I wholeheartedly endorse the measures proposed by the D.C.

1 Office of Planning as outlined in Case 25-09.

2 So thank you so much for your time. I look forward to
3 answering any questions you may have.

4 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Commissioner Littauer. I
5 hope that we may have some questions for you.

6 Let's see if I get the next name right. Commissioner --
7 I'm going to get this one right. Commissioner Prinzo. Did I
8 get that right?

9 COMMISSIONER PRINZO: Yes.

10 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. You go right ahead.

11 COMMISSIONER PRINZO: It's a very easy name.

12 Good evening, Chairperson Hood and members of the
13 Commission. My name is Adam Prinzo, and I serve as the ANC
14 commissioner for 3C02 and vice chair of ANC 3C. I have been
15 authorized by the Commission to represent ANC 3C on this matter
16 in our letter voted on and dated November 17th, and it is Exhibit
17 161.

18 I'm here today to present the detailed community
19 feedback we have gathered on the proposal -- proposed zoning
20 amendments along the Connecticut Avenue corridor reflecting the
21 composition of Woodley Park. I speak in strong support of Case
22 25-09. Our analysis of the local feedback leads to a clear,
23 data-backed conclusion. In Woodley Park and the adjacent areas,
24 there is significant and compelling support for these zoning
25 changes. In the three core Woodley Park SMDs -- 1, 2, and 3 --

1 we received 28 responses in support versus only 9 in opposition.

2 I'm very proud to say that, in my own SMD 3C02, we were
3 unanimous in support among respondents, reflecting a strong
4 consistent theme centered around housing availability,
5 affordability, and sustainability. When we factor in the
6 bordering SMD 3C07, the total support rises dramatically to 44
7 in favor with only 14 opposed. This is a clear and overwhelming
8 sign that residents we represent are ready to adopt policies that
9 address D.C.'s housing prices. We have a recent powerful lesson
10 in Woodley Park that demonstrates exactly why these amendments
11 are necessary.

12 The redevelopment of the former Marriott Wardman Park
13 Hotel into two residential apartment buildings, that project, a
14 massive partial situated directly adjacent to the Woodley Park
15 Zoo metro station, was a pivotal moment for our neighborhood.
16 Under the existing and restrictive zoning framework, the
17 community and the city had limited power to push for the maximum
18 public benefit. While I personally was not a commissioner at the
19 time of this transaction, I know from my predecessor and other
20 commissioners still on the ANC that the developer was not
21 interested in seeking zoning relief that would have allowed for
22 a grocery store, childcare, or other uses on this parcel.

23 The risks to them was simply too high. Building
24 anything in Ward 3 comes with extensive costs and risks that are
25 not able to be mitigated. We need this to change the zoning to

1 mirror the comp plan changes and the FLUM. We should have had a
2 grocery store here, but it is impossible to do given the
3 circumstances. I would also like to note that exactly zero
4 affordable units existed here previously, and now there are 74-
5 ish. A far cry from zero, again, not perfect, but good. The
6 rationale behind the support is deeply rooted in citywide
7 priorities and local needs. These are just some of the comments
8 from our survey that we did.

20 The message from Woodley Park is decisive. We believe
21 that upzoning Connecticut Avenue is not just good planning, but
22 it is a moral and practical necessity. It addresses the city's
23 housing shortage, supports our local retail corridor, promotes
24 transit use, and ensures that an affluent amenity-rich
25 neighborhood contributes equity to the future of the District of

1 Columbia. We urge the Commission to approve these amendments and
2 allow Woodley Park to embrace a more vibrant, inclusive, and
3 sustainable future. Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. If you can hold tight, we
5 may have some additional questions or comments.

6 I'm going to try hard to get your name right because
7 somebody else spells your name the same way, but they pronounce
8 it [Base], and I don't think you do that. Commissioner Bose. Is
9 it Bose?

10 COMMISSIONER BOSE: You got it right.

11 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

12 COMMISSIONER BOSE: Thank you, Chairperson Hood and
13 members of the Zoning Commission. My name is Jay Bose. I'm the
14 ANC commissioner for SMD 3C06 here in Cleveland Park. I also
15 co-chair ANC 3C's Planning, Zoning, Housing, and Economic
16 Development Committee.

17 I'd like to first express my strong support for the
18 proposal on the table today and also share some of the feedback
19 from our last round public engagement, specific to neighbors in
20 Cleveland Park. Starting with my SMD 3C06, which sits within
21 Cleveland Park and includes the east side of Connecticut Avenue,
22 20 out of 25 residents that provided handwritten comments to us
23 supported some or all of the proposed changes.

24 Over in 3C05, which includes the west side of
25 Connecticut Avenue within Cleveland Parks Commercial District,

1 22 of 29 respondents supported some or all of the proposed
2 changes.

3 In 3C04, just further to the north and touches
4 Connecticut Avenue, 12 out of 17 respondents to our online
5 feedback supported some or all of the proposed changes.

6 And in 3C08, which is within Cleveland Park but does
7 not touch Connecticut Avenue in any part, four out of eight
8 respondents supported the proposed changes.

9 What we heard in all of these supportive messages over
10 and over again was that people want more housing options in this
11 community. They want more opportunities for more people to live
12 here. They want a more vibrant commercial strip, and they want
13 more transit-oriented development. The zoning changes on the
14 table today are necessary to make any of that possible. So this
15 is something that the overwhelming majority of our community
16 wants, and frankly, it's something that's long overdue.

17 As a lot of people have talked about this evening,
18 we're three legs far behind the rest of the district in housing
19 capacity and affordability, largely due to decades of
20 discriminatory policies which have intentionally limited our
21 housing supply and kept this neighborhood out of reach for many
22 Washingtonians. That failure or even refusal to build has hurt
23 everyone. We have thousands of residents here in Cleveland Park
24 and Woodley Park who are renters and who have been permanently
25 priced out of buying property in the neighborhoods that they

1 already call home.

2 I have personally rented in Cleveland Park for the past
3 four years, and while I can comfortably pay my rent, I could
4 never afford to buy a home here in Cleveland Park, especially not
5 one of the larger homes on the west side of Connecticut Avenue.
6 That's not a single story that applies to thousands of people
7 here in our community. Our current zoning is hurting this
8 neighborhood's vitality by forcing renters like myself and others
9 to move out of our neighborhood in search of homeownership. It's
10 also hurt our business community. I think somebody already
11 mentioned the incredible number of vacancies on our commercial
12 strip. Last time I counted, it was over a dozen.

13 We have an incredibly high turnover rate for our
14 neighborhood businesses here in Cleveland Park, and that is
15 largely because there just aren't enough people living here.
16 Adopting these zoning changes will help revitalize our community
17 by removing the cap on restaurants and bars, increasing our
18 business customer base. More importantly than any of that, it
19 will create new opportunities for people to live here in this
20 community and build their families here. And it'll make Cleveland
21 Park and Woodley Park a more vibrant and affordable place to
22 live.

23 And I'd like to just end with one note on process.
24 Commissioner Pagats already mentioned this, but ANC 3C voted
25 decisively at our November 17th meeting to support these changes.

1 I know there's one commissioner who is speaking in opposition
2 tonight. I want to make it abundantly clear that that person is
3 not speaking on behalf of ANC 3C. Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

5 Let's see if we have any questions or comments in this
6 panel. Let me start with Vice Chair Miller.

7 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank
8 you, Janell Pagats and Samuel Littauer, Adam Prinzo and Jay Bose,
9 for all of your testimony here today.

10 Your very comprehensive report, Chair Pagats, including
11 all of the planning analysis and community engagement that your
12 ANC has worked on for years, that, I appreciate -- we all
13 appreciate that effort and the comprehensiveness of the report.
14 And you've used an expression which has been used by another
15 applicant, I think, a week ago in another case, which is one of
16 my favorite ones. It says to not let the perfect be the enemy
17 of the good. And I certainly always agree with that. And as
18 you always can make perfect enemy of the good. It's easy to do
19 that, but it's harder to just go with the good.

20 So anyway, thank you all. I have no questions.

21 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Great. Thank you.

22 Commissioner Wright. I move around my screen.
23 Commissioner Wright.

24 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: I don't really have any
25 questions. I think you all have been very, very articulate in

1 why you support this text amendment. I appreciate the amount of
2 work you have done to reach out to people in the community to
3 get their input. I think that's really, really laudable, and I
4 congratulate you on that. I know it's very hard to get people
5 engaged, and I think that's great that you've done that.

6 And I really am, again, impressed by the strong support
7 from the ANC, and I agree we need to take that with great weight.
8 That is very, very important. So if we're asking questions and
9 looking at some of the details, it's not to say that we are trying
10 to dispute anything the ANC has brought up. We are trying to
11 just make sure that we are crossing every T and dotting every I,
12 and we're going to have the best text amendment possible. So no
13 questions, just those few comments. Thanks.

14 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you.

15 Commissioner Imamura.

16 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

17 I echo Commissioner Wright and her comments and
18 appreciate the work that you all do on behalf of your
19 constituents, but don't have any questions, so thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN HOOD: And Commissioner Stidham.

21 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: I echo all my fellow
22 commissioners on all of your hard work, and I appreciate the
23 amount of time that you spent coordinating with the people in the
24 neighborhoods, so thank you. I don't have any questions. Just
25 thank you for your work.

1 CHAIRMAN HOOD: I too want to thank ANC 3C. I think
2 you -- the heavy hit is all of you all came for the most part.
3 You have the chair. You have some of the district commissioners
4 in support of something that you all have worked on for such a
5 long time, and that that does not go lightly on me. And I
6 appreciate all the work that you all have voluntarily done, not
7 just for ANC 3C, but for the city. The decision is your impact,
8 not necessarily zoning or other decisions, sometime have the echo
9 effect, and it trickles down across the city to other ANCs, a
10 product of mine as well. So thank you for all the work that you
11 all do. I don't have any questions, but thank you for what you
12 all do as my colleagues have already mentioned. Thank you.

13 All right. Ms. Schellin, let's go to those -- let me
14 ask my colleagues. Does anybody need a five-minute break? Okay.
15 I see. Yes. Let's take a five-minute break. We'll come back
16 at let's come back at -- let's come back at 6 o'clock. That's a
17 ten-minute break. Come back at 6 o'clock. Okay.

18 (Recessed at 5:50 p.m., reconvening at 6:00 p.m.)

19 CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right, Ms. Schellin, while
20 everybody's coming back, could you call the first four people and
21 proponents, please?

22 MS. SCHELLIN: Did you want to start with people in
23 support now?

24 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes. Everyone in proponent support,
25 yes.

1 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. You want five at a time?

2 CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'll just do four at a time.

3 MS. SCHELLIN: Four at a time. Okay.

4 Okay. Mr. Young will start the list. I have Cheryl
5 Cort, Bob Ward, Edward Rodriguez (phonetic), and Dennis Sendros.

6 MR. YOUNG: I got three of those.

7 MS. SCHELLIN: You got three of those. Okay.

8 How about Tammy Gordon? Okay. Great.

9 CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Let's begin with Ms. Cort.

10 You may begin.

11 MS. CORT: Thank you, Chair Hood.

12 My name is Cheryl Cort. I'm with the nonprofit
13 Coalition for Smarter Growth, advocating for walkable, bikeable,
14 inclusive, and transit-oriented communities as the most
15 sustainable and equitable way for the D.C. region to grow and
16 provide opportunities for all. We are pleased to express our
17 support for Case Number 25-09, which creates new mixed-use zones
18 for the commercial areas on Connecticut Avenue in the Cleveland
19 Park and Woodley Park main streets and historic districts.

20 This action implements the comprehensive plan, the Rock
21 Creek West Roadmap, and the Connecticut Avenue Development Plan.
22 These are all planning efforts which engage local and D.C.
23 residents to craft larger goals and specific implementation
24 actions for Cleveland and Woodley Park. We support the proposed
25 rezoning because it will help D.C. meet its both district-wide

1 and community goals of increasing housing, including affordable
2 housing. This is especially needed in Ward 3 right at two metro
3 stations.

4 The rezoning also improves the mix of uses while
5 ensuring building forms that integrate with the historic
6 districts and foster a people-friendly streetscape around the
7 Cleveland Park and Woodley Park metro stations. We advocate for
8 building more housing here because it helps to relieve pressures
9 on other parts of the city, at the same time delivering new
10 opportunities in these neighborhoods. This is part of the way
11 D.C. combats displacement of residents in other neighborhoods,
12 and also allows more opportunities for people to live in this
13 expensive neighborhood.

14 For these reasons, we urge the Zoning Commission to
15 approve the proposed changes, which will allow much-needed
16 housing, including affordable housing, while also improving
17 public spaces for residents and visitors and help sustain a
18 thriving commercial corridor. Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you

20 Let's go to Ms. Gordon.

21 MS. GORDON: Hi. Thank you.

22 My name is Tammy Gordon. I live here on Ordway Street
23 in Cleveland Park. And I used to serve on ANC 3C as the
24 commissioner for 06. So that's Connecticut Avenue from Macomb,
25 Quebec that Commissioner Bose is actually representing now.

1 I just want to, I think, speak today to some continuity.
2 I've worked on this issue for years. When I ran and I served,
3 my main focus was bringing vibrancy back to our neighborhood.
4 You know, really love what the community's done around the
5 Cleveland Park promenade and opening new restaurants, but the big
6 picture here is simple.

7 We are a metro neighborhood. The right place to add
8 more homes and the best way we can support our local businesses
9 is along Connecticut Avenue near our metro station, which was
10 built for exactly this type of growth. We've heard a lot of data
11 tonight, and it tells a clear story. I know from all the time
12 that I've served, and I'm sure that you guys have all served,
13 that there's this perception based on a long history that anything
14 going into Cleveland Park is just anti anything new or any kind
15 of change. When the Office of Planning was going to show the
16 designs for this at the Cleveland Park Library a couple years
17 ago, I expected disagreement and people really, like, fighting
18 over this. And I think the thing that shocked me most that day
19 was how much consensus there was.

20 You know, people are going to disagree about what one
21 building looks like versus another building, and I think there's
22 certainly a place for that as it goes through the process through
23 ANC and Historic Preservation Board. But I think what I heard
24 over and over was that people were stopping me to say, like, I
25 thought I was going to be against this, but when I look at these

1 designs, I see how it could look and that that could be really
2 viable. They know they need more housing options. They know
3 they want more people to be able to live here.

4 I live in an area where a lot of people own condos or
5 rent, but as soon as they have kids, they have to move out of
6 the neighborhood because they're priced out of homes, and I hate
7 that. I want more opportunities for more people to be able to
8 live here, and we want to have a vibrant main street.

9 So as Commissioner Bose also mentioned, business
10 turnover can be really high on that corridor, and that's obviously
11 not just because, like, businesses aren't doing a good job. It's
12 because we don't have enough neighbors living close enough by to
13 sustain them.

14 So these zoning changes, I think, are a really good
15 step to help fix that by bringing in more residents to support
16 our shops and restaurants, really opening the door to gathering
17 places that we always say we've wanted, and most importantly,
18 creating new opportunities for people and families who want to
19 stay in this community. I think the proposal is smart, it's
20 fair, and it's long overdue. I strongly urge the Zoning
21 Commission to ask Case 25-09 in full. Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Hold tight. We may ask
23 some questions for you, Ms. Gordon, if you all can hold tight.

24 MS. GORDON: Sure.

25 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Dennis Sendros.

1 MR. SENDROS: Hello. Can you hear me all right?

2 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, we can hear you.

3 MR. SENDROS: All right. Good evening, Chairperson
4 Hood, members of the Commission. Goodness. I managed to lose
5 my talking points just as I started speaking. I'm sorry about
6 that.

7 CHAIRMAN HOOD: You need time to get them together? I
8 can go to the next person and come back.

9 MR. SENDROS: That that would be really great. Thank
10 you so much.

11 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right.

12 Bob Ward.

13 MR. WARD: Good evening, Chairperson Hood, members of
14 the Commission. My name is Bob Ward. I'm a board member of
15 Ward3Vision, and the organization has asked that I speak on their
16 behalf in full support of proposed map and text amendments in
17 this case. We're here to say yes to more neighbors, more
18 shoppers, more transit riders, and more vitality in Cleveland
19 Park and Woodley Park.

20 Ward3Vision is a group of residents who can imagine our
21 neighborhood as better urban places, more walkable, sustainable,
22 and vibrant. And the amendments before you will help to do just
23 that. Ward3Vision has supported the mayor's housing goals and
24 the Rock Creek West Roadmap, especially its intent to provide
25 more housing options for people of all incomes, something which

1 Ward 3 has historically fallen short.

2 I think the Zoning Commission has done great work
3 providing new housing and retail opportunities throughout D.C.
4 over the past few decades, breathing new life into D.C.
5 neighborhoods that were underutilized, But much of that growth
6 has been concentrated in areas outside of Ward 3. Ward 3 still
7 significantly lags the housing goal set back in 2019. Let me
8 dig a bit deeper into our history and you'll find that these
9 communities were designed to exclude from the start.

10 Some would say it's well past time Ward 3 took on its
11 share of the burden of the district's growth. We see that a
12 little bit differently. We believe Ward 3 has waited too long
13 to enjoy the benefits of growth. Welcoming new neighbors,
14 embracing new families, calling Connecticut Avenue home, adding
15 new shoppers for our main street, more riders for our resilient
16 transit system, more people from a range of incomes sharing the
17 opportunities that our neighborhood provides, like a great
18 library, the zoo, access to parks and playgrounds, access to
19 grocery stores, dry cleaners, pharmacies, eateries, things that
20 make for easy daily urban life, opportunities that should be open
21 to everyone.

22 Our advocacy for walkable communities means taking on
23 legacy planning mistakes. Imagine a surface parking lot directly
24 above an urban metro station right on Connecticut Avenue and
25 surrounded by several blocks of one-story retail. You have the

1 opportunity to correct these mistakes, to provide places for
2 people to live car free or car light, steps from the metro,
3 multiple bus lines, and shops, ideal opportunities for new homes.
4 So in addition to the big picture benefits of this rezoning, I'd
5 like to call out three specific provisions of the zoning
6 amendments that are unique and beneficial to the community:

7 One, providing a second-floor commercial use by
8 changing the nonresidential FAR from 1.0 to 2.0. This will, over
9 time, allow for greater possibilities for second-floor uses such
10 as larger format retail that doesn't require street frontage,
11 coworking space, childcare, other activity spaces for kids and
12 grownups. Opportunities for second floor outdoor spaces for
13 restaurants and bars like we used to have when the Cleveland Park
14 bar and grill patio was opened upstairs.

15 Second, the removal of the eating and drinking
16 establishment cap will send a signal to entrepreneurs and
17 commercial real estate brokers that these neighborhoods are open
18 for business and removes the uncertainty and added expense that
19 the cap imposed and, from reports we heard, caused many
20 restaurants not to consider the neighborhood.

21 And third, the form-based elements incorporated into
22 the text amendments provide good predictable urban design from
23 frequent street-door, fronting openings to big windows to
24 stepdowns and setbacks in the rear of the properties. These
25 actually were suggested by Ward3Vision members, and we're glad

1 that the Office of Planning included that.

2 And lastly, I'd like to point out, as someone who's
3 been involved in this process since the submission of the comp
4 plan amendment that initiated this process back in June of 2017
5 and the many ANC, D.C. council, planning, HPRB, and now Zoning
6 Commission engagements that have happened since, how much I
7 appreciate the overwhelming level of support this effort
8 continues to receive from the community. Saying yes so many
9 times over eight years is remarkable. And while this case came
10 to you in June, for many of us, it has been a year's long process
11 requiring continual engagement.

12 So to wrap up, Ward3Vision supports these amendments
13 and urges the Commission to adopt them so our neighborhood can
14 say yes to our neighbors, shoppers, transit riders, and vitality.
15 Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Mr. Ward. If you can hold
17 tight, we may have some questions.

18 Mr. Sendros, are you ready?

19 MR. SENDROS: Yes. Thank you.

20 Good evening, Chairperson Hood and members of the
21 Commission. I'm testifying on behalf of DC YIMBYs, a volunteer-
22 led pro-housing group with members across all eight wards, over
23 a hundred of whom have submitted letters in support of this
24 proposal. We advocate for more homes of all types, especially
25 in high-opportunity areas like Ward 3.

1 We're here tonight to support OP's proposal to upzone
2 Connecticut Avenue. D.C. is in a serious housing shortage.
3 Friends remain out of reach for many residents. Home prices have
4 climbed far faster than incomes, and long wait lists for
5 subsidized housing show how many people are being left behind.
6 If we don't create substantially more homes in parts of the city
7 with best access to jobs, schools, and transit, we're effectively
8 saying that these neighborhoods are only for the lucky few who
9 can already afford them.

10 In 2019, Mayor Bowser set a goal of creating 36,000 new
11 homes, 12,000 of which were to be affordable. D.C. exceeded the
12 36,000-unit production goal ahead of the 2025 deadline, but we
13 fell short on the 12,000 affordable unit goal. And the geography
14 of what got built really matters. Ward 3 was assigned roughly
15 2,000 new affordable homes by 2025 that had built only -- sorry,
16 2,000 new homes by 2025 that had built only 230 as of the
17 beginning of this year. This was the weakest performance in the
18 city, and the shortfall means thousands of lower income
19 households and any households who should have had the option to
20 live near strong schools and metro simply never got the chance.

21 Connecticut Avenue is a high-opportunity transit-rich
22 corridor. It has red line stations, frequent bus service, and a
23 walkable main street pattern that already supports living car
24 light or car freight. If we are serious about equitable growth
25 and meeting our climate and mode shift goals, this is where more

1 people should be able to live. This proposal does that in a
2 targeted, reasonable way. It allows mid-rise growth on the
3 commercial corridor. It encourages replacing underused
4 buildings, parking lots, and one-story retail with mixed-use
5 buildings that put homes on top of neighborhood surfing shops.
6 That's how you get more neighbors, more foot traffic for small
7 businesses, and more riders for metro and buses.

8 I also want to speak briefly about IZ+ because it's an
9 important part of the story here. As best as we can tell from
10 the public data, the IZ+ program itself has not yet produced many
11 units. It was finalized in 2021, so it's hard to separate its
12 impact from the broader slowdown in multifamily construction in
13 D.C. over the last few years, but the early pattern raises a
14 question. If we ratchet up the affordable housing requirements,
15 we may end up with less housing overall and, ironically, fewer
16 affordable units than a lighter touch program would produce.
17 We're also concerned about how IZ+ interacts with a historic
18 district.

19 HPRB review has the power to quietly shrink what
20 actually gets built. If every project that's theoretically
21 allowed 75 or 90 feet ends up in practice one or two stories
22 shorter after design review, then we will not get the total homes
23 or the IZ+ units, the math assumes. It's important to note that
24 at least according -- at least as far as I can tell, based on
25 reading the regulations, the IZ+ set aside is calculated based

1 on the FAR increase, not the actually built structure. So HPRB
2 shrinkage can reduce the size of the building without reducing
3 the affordable housing set-aside requirements.

4 We urge OP to monitor how many total units and how many
5 affordable units are actually produced under this and other IZ+
6 rezonings. If IZ+ or the combination of IZ+ and historic district
7 constraints is scaring off projects, that should show up in the
8 data and trigger adjustments. For decades, zoning decisions from
9 Ward 3 have effectively told lower income families, service
10 workers, and even many middle-income households, you don't belong
11 here. This proposal is a concrete step towards finally changing
12 that message by allowing more neighbors to share in the
13 opportunities along Connecticut Ave. On behalf of D.C. YIMBYs,
14 I urge you to approve OP's Connecticut Ave. rezoning and help
15 welcome new neighbors to our city while staying attentive to
16 whether IZ+ and implementation choices are helping or hindering
17 the homes we need.

18 Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

19 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Let's see if we have any
20 questions in this panel. I'm looking at all my colleagues.

21 Any questions in this panel?

22 VICE CHAIR MILLER: No questions, but I thank each of
23 them for their advocacy.

24 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right. I too -- we all
25 thank you all for your participation in coming down and provide

1 your testimony, so thank you.

2 Ms. Schellin, can we call the next floor, please?

3 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir.

4 Mr. Young, Peter Lom, L-O-M, Ronan McNulty, Aidan
5 Grissell-Siders (phonetic), Maximilian Colombina. We have four
6 now.

7 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, we had three.

8 MS. SCHELLIN: Three. Okay. One more. Let's see.
9 Peter Miles.

10 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. We're good. Now we have four.

11 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I think you called Ronan McNulty
13 first. If not, I'm just going by the order I see you. So you
14 may begin. Ronan McNulty.

15 MR. MCNULTY: Hello, Chair, members of the
16 organization. Thank you so much. I speak in favor of this, and
17 I yield the rest of my time. Thank you very much.

18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Good man. You just don't know how to
19 do a job. Good man. Thank you.

20 Mr. Lom -- Lom, I believe -- hopefully, I don't -- you
21 can correct me.

22 MR. LOM: Yeah. That's correct. Thank you.

23 Good evening, Chairhood and Commissioners. My name is
24 Peter Lom. I live on Connecticut Avenue in Woodley Park, and I
25 strongly support the rezoning of the Woodley Park and Cleveland

1 Park commercial districts. I've never testified at a public
2 meeting before, but when I heard about the zoning changes from
3 my friend and ANC Commissioner Samuel Littauer and the
4 opportunity they present to help make my neighborhood more
5 affordable, I knew I needed to speak up.

6 With little new housing stock in decades, Woodley Park
7 and Cleveland Park are predictably out of reach as a place to
8 live for most people. It's a time that we change that and the
9 proposed zoning changes before you would help do just that.

10 I welcome the 25 percent lift -- lifting on the 25
11 percent cap on restaurants and the greater mixed-use
12 opportunities that the rezoning would enable, but I particularly
13 wanted to emphasize the additional housing that the zoning
14 changes would allow. This would help tackle a serious crisis of
15 affordability in our city and particularly in Ward 3. As a major
16 thoroughfare with excellent transit connections, as you've been
17 hearing this evening, the Woodley Park and Cleveland Park
18 commercial districts are exactly where we need more housing and
19 where more housing makes the most sense.

20 If we as a city can't say yes to more housing here, it
21 really calls into question how we could ever solve D.C.'s
22 affordability problems. I experienced the city's lack of
23 affordability personally when I was searching for a place to live
24 several years ago. I'm an attorney at a federal regulatory
25 agency, and on my salary, I was restricted in my housing search

1 in Woodley Park to rent-controlled buildings from the 1920s to
2 '50s roughly, and even those are a stretch as I spend almost half
3 of my take-home pay on rent. It doesn't have to be this way,
4 and more housing is the answer. So for that reason, I urge you
5 to support this rezoning and help make my neighborhood a more
6 affordable place to live. Thanks.

7 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Mr. Lom. Hold tight. We
8 may have some questions for you.

9 Let's go to Maximillian Colombina. And if I messed
10 that up, please correct me.

11 MR. COLOMBINA: Hello. No, it's fine.

12 Good evening, members of the Commission. My name is
13 obviously Maximillian Colombina. This is my first time
14 testifying before the Zoning Commission or testifying in general
15 to any public body. I grew up in Ward 3 right next to AU Park
16 and Tenleytown, and I'm here to express my strong support for the
17 upzoning proposal on -- for the Woodley Park and Cleveland Park.
18 As a young person who wants to stay close to my family here in
19 Ward 3, hard to admit that this part of the city feels
20 increasingly inaccessible to people my age.

21 It's only expensive, but the cost is already a major
22 barrier, but it also lacks the kind of amenities, gathering
23 places, and kind of third spaces and housing options that make a
24 neighborhood feel alive and accessible for young adults. You
25 know, I love Ward 3. It's my home, but it's getting increasingly

1 difficult to imagine building a life here where the current
2 housing stock is almost entirely single-family homes or older,
3 limited, you know, apartment buildings.

4 There's not enough studios, small apartments, or, like,
5 affordable entry points for someone at beginning of their career.
6 And it results in a neighborhood where people my age don't really
7 have a place either financially or socially necessarily. And I
8 think that really matters, because a neighborhood thrives when
9 it has a plethora and diversity of age groups, incomes, and some
10 stuff like that. And I feel that the lack of third places in
11 Ward 3 in general is really concerning. I think that's really
12 important to have. And I think that allowing more mixed-use
13 development isn't just about adding housing units. I think it's
14 also about restoring neighborhood vitality. It's about
15 supporting small businesses that rely on city foot traffic, and
16 it's about creating those kind of places, whether it's cafes,
17 bookstores, places like politics and prose, community spaces that
18 people actually want to spend time in and not leave Ward 3 to
19 experience.

20 Finally, I think it's also important to rebalance the
21 district's growth. For years, Ward 3 has contributed -- as was
22 mentioned earlier by other people, has contributed far less
23 housing than any other planning area. And I think that amounts
24 to create a lot of pressure for -- you know, with rent increases.
25 And yeah, I think the proposal here is really meaningful, and I

1 think it interests the type of homes that are missing and the
2 kinds of retail opportunities that help neighborhoods feel
3 welcoming to all ages and that it gives people like me a chance
4 to imagine ourselves not just visiting family here, but also
5 actually living here and growing here as a young adult and
6 benefiting from a community that I love. And yeah, for those
7 reasons, I approve the map amendments and strongly support it.
8 Thank you for your time.

9 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

10 I think one person must have met --

11 Mr. Miles -- Peter Miles, did I call on you?

12 MR. PETERS: Not yet.

13 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Go right ahead.

14 MR. PETERS: Okay. Hello, members of the Commission.
15 My name is Peter Miles. I have lived in Cleveland Park, just
16 two blocks from Connecticut Avenue, since 2016, and I really
17 enjoy the area's mix of green space parks in more dense, urban
18 places. Just to be clear, as resident of Cleveland Park, I'm
19 very happy with the Zoning Commission and OP staff and really
20 appreciate all the time and effort that goes into this process.
21 I walk to the shops along Connecticut Avenue on an almost daily
22 basis, and I've witnessed, over just about the last decade, the
23 slow decline of the commercial corridor as other areas in the
24 city receive new investment and redevelopment.

25 I also have recent experience trying to find the next

1 type in housing within the neighborhood and the city, and the
2 neighborhood desperately needs more housing options between
3 large, single-family homes that are millions of dollars and
4 small, starter apartments. I strongly support the proposed
5 zoning changes because they will improve upon the things that
6 make the neighborhood desirable, local shops and restaurants and
7 a variety of other businesses, as well as a variety of housing
8 types in a way that is consistent with historic development
9 pattern of the area.

10 The keyword here is the pattern, right? A single
11 building or even a handful do not make a pattern. As such, a
12 few one-story buildings are hardly representative of the pattern
13 that already exists, which is many taller buildings in greater
14 density along Connecticut Avenue. I live in a coop on Porter
15 Street, which is much more dense than the surrounding. They were
16 built in 1924. So many of the tallest buildings in the area are
17 actually some of the oldest buildings that are in the area. So
18 density and a variety of building sizes are not historically
19 incompatible. And I think -- I am a practicing architect, so I
20 do think that, from that professional perspective, if we only
21 look at buildings in isolation, then we kind of miss the pattern.

22 And what makes this neighborhood desirable is the
23 development pattern and the variety of uses and different
24 densities. I also think that greater density of main transit
25 corridors in walkable communities such as Cleveland Park and

1 Woodley Park is historically appropriate and necessary. We must
2 help our neighborhoods and cities grow and prosper. New housing
3 has to go somewhere, and along a historic transit corridor with
4 the metro station is the ideal location. So I think people will
5 say they want affordable housing and mean it. Well, let's build
6 it, and I think this is a great first step, so I strongly support
7 the proposed changes. Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Let's see if we have any
9 questions or comments. I'm looking at my colleagues.

10 VICE CHAIR MILLER: No questions. But again, thank
11 each of you for your engagement with the process, especially the
12 first-timers. We hope to see you again.

13 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I too want to thank you on behalf
14 of the Commission. We appreciate you coming down, and I'll echo
15 what the Vice Chair has already said. Thank you all.

16 All right. Ms. Schellin, can we bring up the next
17 four, please?

18 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. We have Martin Kleinbard,
19 Brina Seidel, Scott Schuler, and Brian Ricketts. I think that --
20 is that four? You have a four? Looks like we do.

21 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yeah. I think we have four now. Yeah.
22 Four.

23 All right. Let me go with Mr. Kleinbard.

24 MR. KLEINBARD: Hi. Is everyone able to hear me?

25 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.

1 MR. KLEINBARD: All right. Thanks so much for your
2 time. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and the rest of the Zoning
3 Commission. I appreciate the opportunity to testify in this
4 important matter.

5 My name is Martin Kleinbard. I'm a Cleveland Park
6 resident and member of the Board of Cleveland Park Smart Growth,
7 a neighborhood advocacy group supporting policies of economic
8 vibrancy, environmental sustainability, and social inclusivity.
9 The Board of Cleveland Park Smart Growth endorsed in this proposal
10 by the Office of Planning to rezone the commercial areas of
11 Cleveland Park and Woodley Park to accommodate more opportunities
12 for housing and business vitality. We ask the Zoning Commission
13 to approve the proposed amendments.

14 But before I get the reasons behind our support, I want
15 to provide a little more background behind our group. Cleveland
16 Park Smart Growth was formed back in 2017 as the outgrowth of
17 community support to amend the comprehensive plan. We advocate
18 for better neighborhoods in our part of D.C. that are vibrant,
19 walkable, and inclusive. Our members have been engaged in this
20 issue ever since at many ANC meetings. Advocacy of the mayor
21 and the council through the planning process that resulted in the
22 Connecticut Avenue Development Guidelines before the HPRB to
23 adopt design guidelines and now before you today. That's a lot
24 in eight years and there's plenty more to come.

25 There are many reasons why these zoning amendments make

1 sense, but for the sake of time, I'll focus on three:
2 revitalization, sustainability, and equity and growth. First,
3 revitalization. Benefit itself -- evident is the positive
4 economic impact of greater density of residents in the commercial
5 area would have. Density would -- that density that was once a
6 sustained vibrant neighborhood serving commercial corridor no
7 longer carries that same economic throughput for our brick-and-
8 mortar stores. Adding more customers is not a sure-all
9 neighborhood retail fluff, but when coupled with the opportunity
10 new development gives to place making in our major organizations,
11 the potential for revitalization increases significantly.

12 Second, sustainability. High density boosts our effort
13 to combat climate change. Transportation is the single greatest
14 contributor to carbon emissions in the United States. Adding
15 housing by virtually anywhere in D.C. for someone who works in
16 DC or nearby metro areas at any price point is green. But in
17 closer work rather than suburbs reduces vehicle miles traveled,
18 putting housing out of transit next to Cleveland Park and Woodley
19 Park commercial area is extremely green. Locating housing where
20 people can live car free or car light is the best public policy
21 as people can walk in transit, shopping, and entertainment.

22 And third, equity and growth. There is an equity
23 benefit of adding more housing here. Adding high-density
24 residential anywhere in Ward 3 will make up for the lack of
25 development in Ward 3 compared to other parts of the city where

1 housing construction has been more intense for the past decade,
2 adding pressure of displacement on low-income residents.

3 On a personal note, as a father of two young girls who
4 spent many an afternoon in the Cleveland Park Library, I've seen
5 the promise of a truly vibrant nature corridor. At that library,
6 people of all walks of life come together to study, learn,
7 congregate, and, yet of course, read. It's one of those rare
8 third places outside of home and work, like another speaker
9 mentioned, where people can engage in a variety of personal and
10 social activities in the public sphere. My hope and dream is
11 that, even after they age out of the children's room in the public
12 library, my daughters will have a bevy of other third place
13 options to engage in specific life along the Connecticut Avenue
14 corridor. You can all help make that possible with the decision
15 to take that you face now.

16 I thank you very much for your time, I yield the rest
17 to the Chair.

18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

19 Let's go to Brina Seidel.

20 MS. SEIDEL: Hi. My name is Brina Seidel. I live on
21 30th Street in Cleveland Park, so that's about one block west of
22 Connecticut, and I'm here in support of the proposed changes.

23 I'm going to use a word that a lot of other people use
24 tonight. I really want to see our neighborhood become more
25 vibrant.

1 I also have my toddler here. You might hear her say
2 hi.

3 So I moved to Cleveland Park a few years ago because I
4 wanted to live somewhere convenient and walkable and on the red
5 line, and that's what I found. I do have a toddler. I work full
6 time. My husband does as well. We're expecting our second.
7 We've had no problems here without a car, so the neighborhood has
8 worked really well for us.

9 And for that reason, all the retail on Connecticut
10 Avenue is super important to me. I would love to see more
11 exciting retail options within walking distance of my home. And
12 on the flip side, I, like many others, am worried about all of
13 the empty storefronts, especially since the Target closed
14 recently, worried about what the neighborhood can support. And
15 I feel strongly that we need these zoning changes in order to
16 encourage investment in the neighborhood. I'm really excited
17 about the taller buildings and having more retail on the second
18 floor and removing the food and beverage cap. And I think that
19 these changes would support all of that. I think having more
20 potential customers right on top of a business has got to be a
21 great way to help them, and I would love to see that happen.

22 The other reason I'm really excited about these changes
23 is because I want to see more new neighbors in Cleveland Park.
24 I know a lot of other young families who have specifically told
25 me they love to move where we live, but they're priced out of

1 it, and it's not an option for them. We're really lucky that we
2 get to live here, but I want other people to enjoy that too. And
3 if we had more housing stock, more diverse housing stock, then
4 that would be on the table for more people, and that's what we'd
5 love to see.

6 And my daughter just figured out how to make noises
7 with this toy, so I'm actually going to end my testimony there
8 and mute. Thanks so much.

9 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Does the little one have something they
10 want to tell us?

11 MS. SEIDEL: Oh, she loves to answer housing too.

12 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right. All right. And
13 congratulations to you.

14 All right. Let's go, Mr. Schuler.

15 MR. SCHULER: Hi there. My name is Scott Schuler. I
16 live in the Saratoga building on Connecticut Avenue. I used to
17 live in the Chesapeake building, and my girlfriend used to live
18 in Quebec House. So we've been here for, I think, about two
19 years. I am here -- this is my first time ever testimony -- or
20 testifying to anything like this, but I'm here to support the
21 regulation and encourage us to build more housing and to address
22 the affordability crisis that strikes not just the United States
23 broadly, but D.C. specifically. I am working -- I personally
24 work -- like a lot of people in the city, will work in politics
25 and digital marketing.

1 And affordability is something we've talked about
2 literally all year. It's decided basically every election. And
3 I'm working on Tennessee-specific election that's happening
4 tomorrow. So I'll be working after this too. But I took a
5 specific break to come to this meeting to just talk about the
6 need for affordability within our city and within our ward.
7 Because, while this is a problem everywhere, historically, our
8 ward has been -- has had exclusion really built into its policies.

9 I live in an apartment with my girlfriend, and my --
10 sort of father-in-law -- or her father was visiting this past
11 weekend. And we drove her around, showed them how beautiful our
12 ward is, and 100 percent, we're going to have to move if we want
13 to be able to up upgrade, if we want to be able to buy property,
14 if we want to be able to do anything. There's no way that we'll
15 be able to stay in this ward. We've lived here for two years
16 already. Connecticut Avenue was so wonderful. Wisconsin Avenue
17 was so wonderful. I've been building my life here, but it's --
18 I don't particularly want to move or care to move. And I -- and
19 we collectively have so many advantages. So the idea that -- you
20 know, to continue to upgrade our, I guess, livelihood we would
21 need to move for is terrifying at the idea of how many people
22 have less and who are just excluded from living in this
23 neighborhood. They've been historically excluded, and I think
24 it's about time that we address this problem.

25 This is a nationwide problem, and if people want to

1 continue to elect Democrats, want to continue to support leaders,
2 we have to be able to solve the problems in our cities.
3 Otherwise, you know, I think, we just suffer to the red states
4 where people go because they have no zoning anything, and they
5 just build whatever and then they, you know --

6 So anyway, truly, I really appreciate you taking time
7 to listen to my testimony. I really don't want to move, and I
8 hope you'll consider all of the support in first-timers who've
9 come out just to support this, so thank you so much.

10 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Hold tight if you
11 can. We have some questions for you.

12 Let me go to Mr. Ricketts.

13 MR. RICKETTS: Hi, everybody. My name is Brian
14 Ricketts. Thanks so much for the opportunity to speak with you
15 tonight, and thanks for all the work you do.

16 I am a three-year resident now of Cleveland Park. And
17 for what it's worth, I may be the only person speaking -- or at
18 least one of the few who is actually within the boundary of the
19 proposed upzoning. I live in the Klinge Apartments on the corner
20 of Macomb and Connecticut, which are within the new mixed-use
21 zone in -- in the Cleveland Park area. And I do think it's
22 interesting that we are discussing this as an upzoning of a
23 traditionally low-density area. And then maybe it's true that
24 the commercial buildings are relatively short, but I live in a
25 five-story apartment building with no setbacks that looks across

1 the corner to two other apartment buildings with no setbacks.

2 You know, alone in my building, we have 40 people. I'm
3 sure there are many -- more in the in the other folks around.
4 And you know, these are the people that I run into everyday when
5 I'm down, you know, walking around the shops in the commercial
6 strip, you know, as Martin said, when I'm going to the library,
7 like -- and this, you know, upzoning represents a great
8 opportunity to do -- to bring that on a much larger scale that
9 is consistent with what this neighborhood used to be. Like, it's
10 a little strange we're talking about upzoning or relegalizing
11 what we used to be able to do here. And I hope that we can --
12 you know, the Zoning Commission will sort of bring that back, you
13 know, in a way that is actually -- is very consistent with the
14 character of this neighborhood, you know, if you go any distance
15 up or down Connecticut Avenue.

16 I wanted to especially focus on something we discussed
17 a little bit: the equity piece in the neighborhood. There are
18 many people in my position. I moved here three years ago after
19 graduating from school to come work in policy in the city. There
20 are many people my age who do the exact same thing, and it's sort
21 of like a growing balloon as residents come into the city. And
22 Cleveland Park and Ward 3 have kept their hands very tightly
23 wrapped around in that balloon, but it doesn't stop the air from
24 going in. It just goes elsewhere. And so we buy not building
25 housing. We create, you know, expand the pressure on other areas

1 of the city to pick up the slack.

2 And that means that people start buying up houses and
3 subdividing them. They start gentrifying out residents who can't
4 afford to be there. If we don't do our part to build the housing
5 here, like, that pressure only increases elsewhere. So strongly
6 support the zoning. Wish it to go even further, but you know,
7 it is what it is. So we'd certainly encourage you to approve
8 this, and thanks so much for your time.

9 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

10 I want to thank this panel. Let's see if we have any
11 questions. I'm looking. Questions.

12 Vice Chair Miller, you want to thank everybody?

13 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, everybody, for your
14 thoughtful testimony and engagement. Yeah. It's important that
15 young adults be able to afford to live in this neighborhood. My
16 daughter and son-in-law and grandchild are living in this
17 neighborhood only because we can still manage to afford to have
18 our house and have enough rooms for them to live in. And I think
19 more people are doing that, which is great, but not everybody has
20 that opportunity. It is a great neighborhood and should be
21 affordable to all types.

22 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Again, we want to thank this
23 panel. We appreciate it. And again, the first-timers,
24 (indiscernible) so we'll make sure we thank the first-timers, and
25 don't make that the last time. Stay engaged and appreciate you

1 all coming out.

2 All right, Ms. Schellin, can we get the last -- not the
3 last, the next four?

4 MS. SCHELLIN: Yeah, not the last.

5 Okay. Moving on, we have Matthew Kaywood (phonetic),
6 Sam Sankar, Olivia Osborne, Beau Finley. Was that four?

7 MR. YOUNG: I got three of them.

8 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. Joshua Peacock.

9 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. That's four.

10 Mr. Sankar, if you could go, and then Ms. Osborne, then
11 next, and then Mr. Finley, and then Mr. Peacock in that order.

12 MR. SANKAR: Hey, folks. Thanks for having me on today.
13 My name is Sam Sankar, and I live at Rodman in Connecticut, so
14 just barely out of the zone here. I live here with my wife who's
15 chopping vegetables over here, my 16-year-old down there, the
16 little labradoodle down there, and a 22-year-old who's just
17 graduated from college.

18 We moved here 17 years ago, which at the time, you
19 know, this seemed like a huge jump, to move into a house with
20 a -- it's a duplex, and the neighborhood seemed like it was super
21 vibrant. It's got a metro station. It's bike-commutable downtown
22 to where my wife and I work. I'm wearing a bright yellow thing
23 because I literally just came out of the freezing cold, wearing
24 my -- on my bike. And those were the attractions to this
25 neighborhood, a place that was walkable, that was -- had public

1 transportation, that had grocery stores and convenience stores
2 and places where you could go to restaurant, get things done in
3 a neighborhood, and actually live in an urban environment. I've
4 probably driven downtown to work, three times or four times in
5 17 years of living here and the entire time I've been working
6 downtown. That's a pretty magic thing. That's a definition of
7 the way you want to live your life as an urban resident, but it's
8 not really accessible to most people.

9 This is an expensive place right now to buy a home.
10 Even a little -- like, this is about the closest thing to a
11 starter home you can get here, and it still costs a lot. We need
12 more affordable housing on the strip, and we need it for two
13 reasons. We need it to bring more people to the neighborhood.
14 A neighborhood like this can't exist like this in stasis. We
15 need to have more foot traffic to support the businesses and to
16 keep the neighborhood vibrant. As I've watched the city grow,
17 I've seen other neighborhoods in this -- in the city grow and
18 develop, and it brought a lot of the energy and young people and
19 mixed-income people and different and much more diverse
20 populations to those areas, and we have not gotten the benefit
21 of that. I really want that.

22 So when I learned about Cleveland Park Smart Growth and
23 the great work of the ANC folks who you've talked to, people like
24 Bob Ward and others, I really joined up, and I decided I wanted
25 to testify. I've never done this before, but this is because

1 this is a constant topic of conversation for me and my wife. We
2 walk up and down the strip literally every day, and every day we
3 say we need to change the zoning. We need to make more space
4 for people to live here. This is an amazing neighborhood. It's
5 sustainable. It's vibrant. It's livable. There's great people
6 who live here. We need to give more people the chance. And with
7 those people, the businesses will have a greater chance to thrive.

8 Just one closing note. I run one of the nation's
9 largest public interest environmental law firms. We make a living
10 stopping bad development like oil and gas wells and chemical
11 plants and things like that coming in places. And those tools
12 can get weaponized to prevent sensible development that makes
13 things more affordable and equitable for everybody. And I don't
14 want that to happen here. I want the Zoning Commission to allow
15 this to go forward and to really make this a model for the kind
16 of urban environment that people will want to live in.

17 Thank you very much.

18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Hold tight. We may have
19 some questions for you.

20 Olivia Osborne. Olivia Osborne. Okay. We're going
21 to come back to you.

22 Beau Finley.

23 MR. FINLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the
24 Commission. My name is Beau Finley. I've served as chair of
25 the ANC 3C, and I served as chair of the Ward 3 Democrats. I'm

1 currently on the board of Cleveland Park Smart Growth, but I'm
2 here representing myself.

3 At first, it's really cool to see so many neighbors
4 taking their time out tonight to support these map and text
5 amendments. I fully support the proposed amendments. I've lived
6 or worked in Cleveland Park for the past 27 years. My wife, my
7 son, and I rented the Quebec House Apartments, which you actually
8 have heard about already this evening. I've lived here for 20
9 years. I've seen firsthand how the constraints on zoning have
10 stifled housing business opportunities in the neighborhood, both
11 just as a resident and as a commissioner.

12 In 2017, I worked with Bob Ward and Emma Hirsch
13 (phonetic) to develop proposed amendments to the comprehensive
14 plan and the fund. We surveyed the community via the Cleveland
15 Park Listserv, one of the largest listservs in the district, and
16 received resounding support for our proposals to increase
17 density. These proposals are later incorporated -- this is 2017,
18 right? These proposals are later incorporated by -- into the
19 Office of Planning's proposed amendments to the comp plan, which
20 OP said in 2020 received about 78 percent support in the comments
21 they received.

22 As chair of ANC 3C, we then supported OP's proposed
23 amendments 6-3 in 2021. These amendments were later supported
24 by then Councilmember Mary Cheh and supported by council.
25 Councilmember Cheh reduced our ask from high-density residential

1 to medium-density residential, which received council support.
2 I mean, every step over these eight years, I've really been
3 impressed by the Office of Planning's outreach and engagement,
4 by staff's commitment to ensuring that all voices are heard.
5 They participated in charrettes. They held dedicated public
6 meetings on topic, attended ANC meetings. I believe former
7 Director Andrew Trueblood attended at least two and have been
8 consistently responsive over email and phone to folks who have
9 comments, questions, trying to understand the whole process. I
10 mean, so it's over eight years. They've done a really great job.

11 Earlier this year, Chairman Hood, you noted that -- I
12 think you said we've been here before with regards to Rock Creek
13 West and racial equity, and you asked if this is another attempt.
14 I'd say it's not another attempt. It's more the same attempt
15 that's been going on, an effort for eight years now, to address
16 racial disparities in Rock Creek West in Ward 3 and to bring
17 about more affordable housing and ensure that long-overdue
18 opportunities finally move forward. You also mentioned that some
19 people are upset with you over other decisions regarding
20 Cleveland Park and that you might want to find ways to appease
21 them, but they've already received a lot of concessions that have
22 not historically been offered in other more diverse parts of the
23 city.

24 As I mentioned, this has been going on for eight years,
25 right? But we also have the design guidelines. Where else do

1 design guidelines happen but in Ward 3? The initial proposal for
2 high density was reduced to medium density. So we've had --
3 we've seen for opponents of this proposal. We've seen lots of
4 bites to the apple and lots of -- you know, what I'm worried
5 about is death by a thousand cuts, which we sometimes see in the
6 historic area -- historic preservation area.

7 So yes, the Zoning Commission is being sued in the
8 last-ditch effort. We've already seen these significant
9 compromises, so I urge you not to adopt any more.

10 And finally, some people will always be upset about
11 change. This is not new. We witnessed many compromises so far
12 between those who want to meaningfully address racial equity
13 issues and those who prefer to preserve current conditions. And
14 that being said, I just ask you not to compromise further, and
15 that's the entirety of my comments.

16 Oh, one more thing. You might hear a sick toddler in
17 the background. I wasn't able to file my comments in time, and
18 I ask for your forgiveness and permission to file them belatedly
19 this evening.

20 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yeah. We'll take Mr. Finley's
21 comments, Ms. Schellin. He's asked for us to take his comments
22 and (indiscernible) different times.

23 MR. FINLEY: Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Let's go -- Joshua Peacock.
25 I think that's the last one, yes.

1 MR. PEACOCK: Yes. Can you hear me?

2 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.

3 MR. PEACOCK: Hi, community members of the Zoning
4 Commission. My name is Joshua Peacock, and along with some others
5 here today, I'm a resident of Cleveland Park on Porter Street,
6 and I live adjacent to the area being upzoned. And I'm testifying
7 to encourage you to approve the upzoning of both Cleveland and
8 Woodley Parks.

9 After years of living all over the city, my wife and I
10 chose to live in Cleveland Park because of its access to transit,
11 rich amenities, and proximity to Rock Creek Park. Both of us
12 hold advanced degrees and work in full-time professional careers.
13 We would love to live in Cleveland Park permanently and settle
14 down, but even for us, the neighborhood is difficult to afford.
15 The number of two-bedroom properties listed in Cleveland Park for
16 less than \$1 million can be counted on one hand. And if people
17 like me cannot afford Cleveland Park, there is not a single rule
18 or regulation that is going to make it affordable for average or
19 working-class Washingtonians.

20 Affordability isn't just about renters like myself
21 either. It has real effects right now. As others have said,
22 businesses are closing around the neighborhood with three
23 businesses closing in the last six weeks due to lack of customers
24 or lack of retail space. Numerous buildings have been laying
25 empty for months or even years with garbage gathering in front

1 of historic plaques because the possible revenue does not justify
2 the cost of renting renovation. Increasing the population,
3 building more retail options, and injecting new energy into the
4 neighborhood will change the character, but it will do so for the
5 better.

6 Finally, I would like to thank the Office of Planning
7 for all of their hard work on this and thank the Commissioners
8 in ANC 3C, which is my ANC, for listening to the residents of
9 Cleveland and Woodley Parks and providing their near-unanimous
10 support for the upzoning and for their years' long advocacy for
11 all of us to get here. Thank you for your time.

12 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. And if you can hold tight,
13 we may have some questions of you.

14 Let's go back to Olivia Osborne. I see you back.

15 MS. OSBORNE: Hi. Good evening, Chairperson Hood.
16 Apologies for the technical issues. I'm joining from my office,
17 so working late tonight and really wanted to hop on here to
18 testify in support of these resolutions, so I appreciate all of
19 your time.

20 As you mentioned, my name is Olivia Osborne. I'm a
21 Woodley Park resident. I've lived in D.C. for nearly eight years.
22 I'm speaking today in strong support of the rezoning proposal for
23 Woodley Park and Cleveland Park main streets and the commercial
24 corridors along Connecticut Avenue.

25 Washington D.C. and the region at large is in midst of

1 a housing crisis. The construction of new units -- both
2 affordable and market rate -- near transit, jobs, and local
3 businesses is essential to alleviating that shortage. Ward 3
4 continues to fall short in construction of new units as compared
5 to other wards in the city, leading to increased displacement of
6 residents citywide. This upzoning proposal would represent a
7 modest but critical step in alleviating the housing shortage as
8 every new unit constructed in this area works to close the housing
9 gap in Ward 3.

10 And on a personal level, my husband and I, we're both
11 renters, and we live in multifamily apartment building. And
12 that's given us access to this incredible neighborhood that we
13 love, where we built a home and become part of the larger
14 community. The proposed rezoning of Woodley Park and Cleveland
15 Park would allow for people of a variety of incomes the
16 opportunity to live in the -- one of the region's most desirable
17 and connected neighborhoods.

18 Cleveland Park and Woodley Park are phenomenal places
19 to live in large part due to our small and local brick-and-mortar
20 businesses from newcomers like Sofra and Rose Avenue to legacy
21 businesses like Vace. These local businesses, many of them are
22 struggling. They're still struggling from the effects of the
23 pandemic, slowing economy, layoffs in the federal government, and
24 they need to see increased foot traffic just to survive. And
25 we've all seen the waves of business closures people have talked

1 to at length, the vacant storefronts throughout Connecticut
2 Avenue. And these amendments would bring new life to our
3 commercial corridors and help ensure existing businesses have a
4 fighting chance against all the other market pressures and to
5 encourage new investment in our vacant store fronts. As other
6 nearby commercial corridors like Wisconsin Avenue continue to
7 draw in Ward 3 customers with new amenities like gyms and
8 specialty grocery stores, increasing housing supply will better
9 position our businesses to succeed with more residents and
10 customers within walking distance.

11 Thanks for your consideration. I urge the Commission
12 to support this zoning proposal near the commercial areas of
13 Woodley Park and Cleveland Park and help keep the Connecticut
14 Avenue and Corridor a thriving community for years to come.
15 Thanks so much.

16 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you.

17 We want to thank this panel.

18 Let me see if we have any questions or comments. Okay.
19 We want to thank this panel and just really hope the little one
20 gets better.

21 Ms. Osborne, Mr. Peacock, and all, we want to thank you
22 for your testimony, and the first-timer, just want to thank you
23 as well. So we appreciate you all coming in and provide us your
24 testimony.

25 Ms. Schellin, can we get the next floor, please?

1 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. And we have -- we have
2 Christopher Martin, Mark Teschauer, Ian Grace, Dennis Jing.

3 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yeah. We got four.

4 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay.

5 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let's go to Mr. Martin, then Mark
6 Teschauer, Ian Grace, and then we'll go with Dennis Jing in that
7 order.

8 You may begin, Mr. Martin. Christopher Martin.

9 MR. TESCHAUER: Right. Thank you. Can you hear me?
10 Okay. Great.

11 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Is that Christopher Martin?

12 MR. TESCHAUER: No. This is Mark Teschauer. Were you
13 calling on Chris?

14 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yeah. I'm calling Christopher Martin
15 first and then you, Mr. Teschauer, second.

16 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Martin?

17 MR. TESCHAUER: Oh, my apologies.

18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: No. No problem. Christopher Martin?
19 Well, Mr. Teschauer, I guess you must have known what's
20 going on. Let me go to you, Mr. Teschauer, and I'll come back
21 to Mr. Martin. I'm sorry.

22 MR. TESCHAUER: That's okay. And thank you for your
23 understanding. This is actually my first time testifying, so
24 appreciate your patience.

25 And good evening, Chairperson Hood and Commission

1 members. My name is Mark Teschauer. I've been a resident in
2 Near Northeast for about five years, so I support the proposed
3 rezoning along the Connecticut Avenue corridor. This proposal
4 will encourage more housing options, including affordable housing
5 in this high-opportunity neighborhood. It will also support the
6 district's climate goals by supporting more transit-oriented
7 community development and make it more convenient for D.C.
8 residents to meet daily needs using more affordable, active, and
9 public transportation.

10 There are many aspects of this rezoning that speak to
11 my concerns as a district resident. One of these is around
12 affordability and cost of living. I would love to remain a
13 district resident and become a homeowner someday, but housing
14 costs are very high and are delaying my ability to pursue
15 homeownership in the district. We need to do more to encourage
16 more housing production in the district in order to increase
17 supply and keep housing costs in check. Increasing housing
18 potential in high-opportunity areas such as along the Connecticut
19 Avenue corridor gives all D.C. residents better options. More
20 people can live there, and it released some development pressure
21 on other parts of the city and reduces displacement pressures
22 there for lower income residents.

23 Additionally, building housing near transit and
24 amenities like shops and retail make it easier for residents to
25 be less car dependent, meaning they can reduce transportation

1 expenses by driving less or even giving up their car.

2 Another reason to support this proposed rezoning is as
3 it relates to climate change. I have long cared about that
4 climate because of the ways, both big and small, the climate
5 crisis would harm me and the people in places I care about.
6 However, we are living in a time where we're all experiencing
7 these changes firsthand. The need for action across all levels
8 of government to address the climate crisis is more urgent than
9 ever. Welcoming more homes and people to Connecticut Avenue is
10 part of the climate solution to reduce how a bunch of people need
11 to drive, meaning they can live closer to transit, make it easier
12 to walk and bike to where they need to live, and just have more
13 options and opportunity. And this type of rezoning, it even
14 supports the realization of the district's own carbon-free D.C.
15 and sustainable D.C. 2.0 plan goals.

16 I urge you to approve this proposed rezoning. And
17 also, since this is my first time testifying, I only learned
18 about this opportunity right before the Thanksgiving holiday and
19 did not have opportunities to submit written comment before the
20 Thanksgiving holiday. So I would like to ask for a gift to the
21 Zoning Commission to accept my written comments at this point in
22 time. Thank you for your consideration.

23 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Certainly. We will accept that,
24 Ms. Schellin. Please add Mr. Teschauer's testimony to our list
25 of things we want to accept.

1 Let me go now to -- and hold tight. We may ask some
2 questions.

3 Ian Grace.

4 MR. GRACE: Hello, members of the Zoning Commission.
5 I support this proposal to upzone along Connecticut Avenue on the
6 commercial areas of Woodley Park and Cleveland Park. I live in
7 Woodley Park, one block away from the commercial corridor. I
8 believe we need more housing opportunities in these sought-after
9 neighborhoods close to job services and transit. We should not
10 be keeping families out of our neighborhood. In addition, there
11 are many vacant storefronts in our neighborhood. If more people
12 lived along the corridor, we could support local businesses and
13 have a more vibrant neighborhood. Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you

15 Let's go to Mr. Jing.

16 And then Mr. Martin, I see you back. We'll come to you
17 after Mr. Jing.

18 Go right ahead, Mr. Jing.

19 MR. JING: Hello. Good evening to the Zoning
20 Commission. Thanks to the Commissioners for being here, for
21 listening to the public. My name is Dennis Jing. I'm currently
22 a renter up in Van Ness along Connecticut Avenue. I'm here to
23 speak my personal capacity for my unequivocal support for the
24 upselling of Connecticut Avenue in Woodley Park and Cleveland
25 Park. I've been a D.C. resident since 2016, and the city has

1 actually afforded me opportunities to work at a think tank, go
2 to GW Law School, and now work full time as a civil rights
3 attorney. So I've been a work through residence since late 2021.

4 So I'm sure the Commissioners already know, there's a
5 housing shortage of hundreds of thousands of units in the greater
6 DMV region. That's why Mayor Bowser set housing production goals.
7 And you know, it's true that the collective district met these
8 goals. But as other members of the public who have already
9 testified, Ward 3, while dramatically short of feeding its share
10 by thousands and thousands of units, I think that this is a huge,
11 if not the main reason why, D.C., the broader district, is
12 collectively 60 percent minority, but Ward 3 is the opposite, in
13 fact, even worse. It hovers around 70 percent White.

14 And people have talked about racial equity -- you know,
15 when we talk about upzoning Cleveland Park and Woodley Park, for
16 me, it's very hard to divorce that from the historical context
17 of the greater work for the area. And as you may know, there
18 was a prominent Black community in Reno Park that was displaced
19 in the early 20th Century. Chevy Chase Land Trust was exclusively
20 founded to keep Black Americans out. They carved out the land
21 into prohibitively expensive single-family home lots about a
22 century ago, and Chevy Chase still largely looks the way that it
23 looks.

24 Ward 3 has always been out of touch with the rest of
25 D.C. in terms of who is allowed in this ward. And that, quite

1 frankly, is unacceptable. The truth is that the wealthiest and
2 whitest ward in D.C. must do more to be actually inclusive and
3 accessible to all people who are looking for all types of housing
4 options. It cannot continue to rely on the legacy of exclusionary
5 zoning and only single-family homes to keep people out. As a
6 result, many of the younger generations are hurting and have
7 basically given up homeownership, as well as the fact that Ward
8 3 remains predominantly homogenous.

9 Upzoning these two neighborhoods is something that,
10 quite frankly, should have been done a long time ago, and now we
11 have the chance to fix it and, hopefully, make homeownership and
12 Ward 3 more reflective of the broader district. By approving
13 Case Number 25-09 and building more homes, this Commission has
14 the opportunity to make Ward 3 more diverse, more affordable, and
15 more supportive of small businesses by increasing foot traffic.

16 Many residents of all incomes, whether they are renters
17 or young families, would benefit from this upzoning, and this
18 might even help us bring more public transit in service into the
19 area. I, for one, would like D70 to have a greater frequency
20 and having more residents where it only bolstered an argument.

21 Thank you for your time. And I can't wait to see the
22 many positives that will flow from upzoning Woodley and Cleveland
23 Park. Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

25 Mr. Christopher Martin.

1 MR. MARTIN: Thank you very much, Chairperson and
2 Commissioners. I apologize for the technological issues earlier.
3 I'm picking my daughter up from practice.

4 I'm speaking today in support of Case 25-09. I live
5 with my family in Cleveland Park on Lowell Street, where I've
6 been heavily involved as a parent leader and volunteer in our
7 local school. I'm also a small businessowner who owns several
8 buildings, both in Cleveland Park and Woodley Park. They're home
9 to 23 different small businesses, primarily retail.

10 I just want to start by thanking the Office of Planning
11 and the ANC and commending them for running an open, transparent,
12 and thorough process over many years. They asked really good
13 questions, and they really stepped up to understand the
14 challenges that all constituents are facing to craft this text
15 amendment. So through that lens, I have three different points
16 I'd like to comment on.

17 The first is that we all know that there's a housing
18 affordability crisis for Cleveland and Woodley Park. However,
19 from the viewpoint of our schools, we have a lot of families who
20 want to be in the neighborhood because of our schools, and they
21 have to rely on the lottery to be able to come to our schools.
22 And I think the addition of housing production could make a big
23 difference to allow those students to be able to walk to school
24 and not have to commute from other parts of the city.

25 The second point is our small businesses have just

1 faced headwind after headwind after headwind since COVID and are
2 all struggling. In a survey by the Restaurant Association
3 Metropolitan Washington earlier this year, 44 percent said that
4 they were at risk of closing the next 12 months. Woodley Park
5 and Cleveland Park are amenity-rich neighborhoods. But as we've
6 heard, there are some real struggles that these businesses are
7 having, and additional people and additional investment could
8 make a really strong impact on their success and the vibrancy of
9 our neighborhoods.

10 The third that I wanted to call out is the HPRB process.
11 I commend the process of trying to include design guidelines. I
12 actually think that the design guidelines are very important. I
13 had several projects that I've tried to identify in other parts
14 of the city that have not received approval from HPRB because of
15 ongoing setback after setback after setback, which resulted in
16 the core to the buildings, for the elevators and for the stairs,
17 not physically working and rendering the product unusable. I
18 would strongly encourage the design guidelines to have minimum
19 setbacks, so there are clear expectations for developers so that
20 we know what we're working with to try to propose the best
21 possible project to maximize housing production.

22 I want to thank you for your time and for your support
23 of OZ C 25-09. Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I want to thank this panel.
25 Let's see if we have any questions or comments. Looking.

1 Looking.

2 All right. Again, we want to thank you for you
3 providing your testimony and your viewpoints and also all you're
4 doing, even the gentleman, Mr. Martin's picking up his daughter
5 from practice, for taking the time out of your business schedules,
6 coming out, and give us input. That's very important to us. So
7 thank you all for doing that.

8 Ms. Schellin, can we do the next four, please?

9 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. We have Shalom Flank, Aidan
10 Simpson (phonetic). Let's see. We've already got here Barbara
11 Kraft, Theodor Liazos. We've gotten zeroes that far.

12 CHAIRMAN HOOD: No. We have three so far. I'm just
13 (indiscernible).

14 MS. SCHELLIN: Oh, we do? Okay. How about Randy Brown?
15 Rabbi Randy Brown.

16 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. We have four now. We're going
17 to go ahead and begin.

18 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay.

19 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let's start off with Shalom Flank.
20 Then we'll go to Barbara Kraft and Ted Liazos. Hopefully, Ms.
21 Schellin messed it up first. And then we'll go to Rabbi Randy
22 Brown, in that order. Thanks.

23 MR. FLANK: Good evening. My name is Shalom Flank.
24 I'm speaking to you from our hundred-year-old two-story row house
25 on the 2700 block of Woodley Place, and I'm here to offer my

1 strong support for Case 25-09.

2 Woodley Park is a great neighborhood. That's why we've
3 lived here for 30 years, but it would be even better if we had
4 more neighbors. You guys know the overarching policy reasons
5 covered beautifully by our ANC reps. Our thanks to them. Know
6 the benefits for new residents who would ultimately be able to
7 move to this neighborhood even though for obvious reasons,
8 they're not explicitly represented here tonight.

9 But I want to talk about the selfish reasons from the
10 perspective of a current resident for why me and my neighbors
11 will benefit from these changes. We want better retail. We want
12 the new, finally, full-service grocery store in Woodley Park,
13 Capital Grocers, to survive in the spot where we lost the hardware
14 store because there weren't enough customers. We want my -- our
15 favorite bakery, Yael's, to thrive. We'd love to have a bookstore
16 come back to the neighborhood. All of that only happens with
17 more customers within an easy walk.

18 It's the same dynamic for transit. We've been happily
19 car free for more than 20 years even though we have two parking
20 spaces in the back. So we really want a high-frequency bus
21 service on these new routes: the D70, the C51, the C53. We'd
22 love to get back a one-seat ride to Columbia Heights in Mount
23 Pleasant, which we lost when the circulator went away. All of
24 that only happens with more residents and preferably residents
25 who use transit. So we'd love for the proposed zoning to also

1 remove parking minimums for any new development.

2 Now that, of course, reduces costs for new housing like
3 everybody's talking about. And I would note that a developer has
4 to request an individual parking waiver. That's still an added
5 cost especially during the preliminary development phase when
6 money is scarce. But adding more transit-oriented, new
7 neighbors would mean less traffic congestion, which we all love,
8 and also more voices added to the rising chorus for better bike
9 infrastructure. And I get around by bike, so more car-free
10 neighbors could literally save my life.

11 So yes, please, whatever changes you might further make
12 to these proposals, make sure they're in the direction of more
13 neighbors. I also wanted to mention the issue of stepbacks in
14 the rear. We disagree that there's really any benefit from that.
15 I have the stepbacks facing into the residential neighborhoods.
16 So we're right on an alley that is shared with buildings on
17 Connecticut Avenue, including two eight-story buildings that I'm
18 pointing to now, right across from us. And they have simple
19 vertical facades, no stepbacks, no modulation, and it's fine. It
20 doesn't bother us at all. Both of those buildings also have
21 balconies facing into the alley, and the lack of setbacks means
22 that they can see right down to the alley. That's more eyes on
23 the street. That's better safety for us. It's also cheaper to
24 build and more room for new neighbors. Thank you.

25 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

1 Barbara Kraft.

2 MS. KRAFT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the
3 Commission. My name is Barbara Kraft. I'm speaking on behalf
4 of the WIN, Washington Interfaith Network, Ward 3 affordable
5 housing work group, which includes affordable housing supporters
6 from five Northwest D.C. congregations: Temple Sinai, Chevy
7 Chase Presbyterian, Adas Israel, St. Columba's Episcopal Church,
8 and National United Methodist Church. We support the new-mixed
9 zones in this case.

10 And as I'll explain in a moment, I'm also testifying
11 on behalf of myself. Our WIN Ward 3 work group was inspired by
12 Mayor Bowser's October 2019 housing equity report and her goal
13 of building more affordable housing in Upper Northwest D.C. We're
14 far from the goal of 19 -- 1,990 new dedicated affordable units
15 in Upper Northwest. But the changes OP is proposing here would
16 at least open the door to building more homes here. OP's proposal
17 would allow taller buildings with deliberate and careful
18 transitions to the adjacent neighborhoods. New buildings would
19 have to meet historic preservation guidelines. Building designs
20 would have to be compatible with our historic neighborhoods.

21 The proposal would allow more restaurants and that
22 would help fill in the vacant storefronts and attract more people
23 and businesses. This is exactly what the 2021 comp plan
24 amendments contemplated, that we make room for more residential
25 density along our commercial corridors. Our WIN Ward 3 work

1 group was among many advocates during the comp plan amendments
2 process who supported more residential density. I say all this
3 wearing my WIN hat. I also want to speak as a Ward 3 resident.
4 I would love to see more people, more life, and more energy in
5 our neighborhoods.

6 I live three doors from Connecticut Avenue near Edmund
7 Burke School on a block that's a mix of small, medium, and large
8 duplexes, many of them home to more than one family. Our windows
9 look out upon apartment buildings on Connecticut Avenue. My
10 family, my neighbors, and I enjoy the restaurants, shops, fitness
11 studio, retailers, the Cleveland Park Public Library. We love
12 the convenient bus routes in the metro. All of us are looking
13 forward to the new uptown theater. The theater and the adjoining
14 retail spaces have been vacant for years. In other words, there
15 is room for more.

16 Creating more homes for more people is something I'm
17 excited to support and be part of. My fellow WIN affordable
18 housing activists and I will continue to work for more affordable
19 housing in Ward 3, and we will continue to support proposals like
20 OPs in this case that make it easier to build more homes in Ward
21 3 neighborhoods.

22 Thank you for the Commission's work and for this
23 opportunity to express our views.

24 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Hold tight. We may have
25 some additional question.

1 Let's go to Ted Laizos. If I mispronounced your name,
2 you can correct this, please. You're still on mute. So if you
3 correct me, I can't get corrected.

4 MR. LAIZOS: Sorry about that. No. Thank you. You
5 got my name right.

6 So I'd like to thank the Committee for hearing from us,
7 and I'd like to thank the commissioners and some of the other
8 groups for coming forward and presenting what I think are clear
9 and compelling reasons to support this proposal. The reasons we
10 should build here for more equity and more affordable housing and
11 the benefits to us if we get more density and vitality in these
12 neighborhoods, we see some of the businesses that have emptied
13 out.

14 And I've been living in Cleveland Park for 25 years,
15 and I will tell you, it has always surprised me. It continues
16 to surprise me and even shock me that we have this parcel right
17 along Connecticut Avenue. We've got two metro stations. We've
18 got this main thoroughfare, and we've got one story there and no
19 housing above it. And it just is shocking to me, and I hope that
20 we can do something about it.

21 I think as some other people have said, my main concern
22 really is that there's going to be delay and dilution of the
23 plan. It's already been a long, long time, and it's probably
24 going to be a long time further until we can go forward. So I'm
25 just going to sort of echo and try to associate myself with the

1 | remarks in support of this proposal and urge the Committee to the
2 | extent that you can to try to move this forward so that we can
3 | all see the benefits of a new zoning rule and see the new
4 | development. Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Hold tight. We may
6 | have some questions.

7 Let's go to Rabbi Randy Brown. Randy Brown.

8 All right, Ms. Schellin, let's bring three more up.

9 And hopefully, Mr. Brown, if you want to go back off
10 | and come back, we'll bring you back up.

11 MS. SCHELLIN: Yeah. I think he just needs to unmute
12 | himself. He's having difficulties, it looks like.

13 CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Let's give him a few
14 | minutes.

15 MS. SCHELLIN: All right. So you've already asked
16 | questions of the others, or you just --

17 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. I'm sorry.
18 | We took him down too.

19 Did anybody have any questions? And hopefully, I
20 | think -- anyway, I want to thank everyone --

21 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. No questions. Okay.

22 CHAIRMAN HOOD: -- who testified in that panel. We
23 | appreciate it. Appreciate your testimony.

24 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. All right. We have Ron Basimolek
25 | (phonetic). I'm sure I messed that one up. Corrigan Salerno.

1 We had someone on by phone, but I don't see him anymore. If Mr.
2 Young wants to look for him, see if maybe he logged back on.
3 Gawain Kripke or [Krip], K-R-I-P-K-E, Mr. Young, Max Funge-
4 Ripley. Second is our four, and we need one. Hannah Woolf. I
5 think that gets us there.

6 Mr. Young -- I mean, Mr. Chairman Hood, you're on mute
7 if you're talking to us.

8 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Give me one second.

9 We'll go with you, Mr. Salerno, and then we'll go to
10 Max Funge-Ripley and then Ms. Hannah Woolf, and then we'll try
11 to come back to Randy -- Rabb Randy Brown. Okay. Good. In that
12 order. Thank you.

13 MR. SALERNO: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

14 So good evening, members of the Commission. Like many
15 others, it's my first time testifying, so bear with me.

16 My name is Corrigan Salerno, and I'm a resident of
17 Woodley Park on 28th Street in ANC 3C01. And I also want to
18 thank the ANCs for their great testimony earlier this evening.
19 I've been a resident in the neighborhood for nearly five years
20 now with my wife, and it's been a lovely time being here. I
21 think as many people put forward tonight, this neighborhood has
22 fantastic amenities that are really life changing and bring
23 forward such incredible opportunities for people.

24 And I've heard a lot just about -- of the people
25 testifying here, where we're -- I think we're seeing a theme with

1 a lot of the people working here. They work in downtown. They
2 work in things like policy, and they're able to attend things
3 like Zoning Commissions. So I think it's really important that
4 we move forward with this proposal. I'm a strong supporter of
5 the proposed rezoning here in 25-09 mainly because this could
6 bring so much of that opportunity to other new neighbors and new
7 types of neighbors to join this neighborhood and enjoy those same
8 opportunities.

9 And them being here does not diminish my own ability
10 to enjoy the benefits of living here, take transit, and enjoy the
11 walkable neighborhood and all the different urban amenities and
12 restaurants locally here like Vace, but instead actually supports
13 the success of all of those different assets that we have as a
14 community. So like others, I echo the benefits for
15 sustainability, housing affordability, racial equity, transit-
16 supportive development, and the health of local businesses that
17 this proposal would help support.

18 However, I also want to mention that, while this plan
19 is a great step forward and I understand why compromises have
20 been made so often in Ward 3, I do wish that this plan could go
21 further to meet the long-term needs for housing in our community.
22 And I echo the comments from other supporters tonight who noticed
23 that many of the overly prescriptive elements of the zoning
24 proposals here could lead to some delays, as well as reduced
25 ability for developers to work with and build these new projects

1 and housing at a reasonable time frame to meet the community
2 needs today. We're probably not going to achieve full
3 affordability in a neighborhood with -- as in high demand as
4 this. But with these proposals, we take a little bit of a step
5 towards that, and I'm strongly in favor, so thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Thank you.

7 Let's go to Max Funge-Ripley, I believe.

8 MR. FUNGE-RIPLEY: Hi. Can you hear me?

9 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes. We can hear you.

10 MR. FUNGE-RIPLEY: Okay. First, I just wanted to thank
11 you all so much.

12 I have lived in Woodley Park almost my whole life, and
13 specifically, I would say I'm pretty tied to this issue because
14 I have worked part time in childcare in one of the buildings
15 under the Woodley Park Mixed-Use Zone for three years. And yeah,
16 I'm so grateful to the Zoning Commission, to be honest, because
17 I'm a huge fan of cities and growth, and I would go to school in
18 Northeast and Fort Totten every day and take the metro and see
19 what was happening in NoMa and see what was happening in areas
20 like Rhode Island Avenue.

21 And I knew that that was helping people to, like, grow
22 and find more spaces in their community without having it break
23 the bank. And if you look at the ways that downtown has spread
24 out over the last 20 years, I think there's a clear gap north of
25 Dupont Circle. Like, you see Shaw. You see growth in NoMa,

1 Rhode Island Avenue. You see growth south of there and, like,
2 southwest in Navy Yard, but then it just all stops at Dupont
3 Circle. And I'd strongly argue that area isn't saturated. So
4 I'm here to support the proposal.

5 And I actually -- I do have a pretty specific question
6 about the Woodley Park zone specifically. I'm curious why the
7 west side of Connecticut is zoned at 70-feet height limit and the
8 east side is zoned at 90. I'm just wondering because it feels
9 like, if anything, that might make the architectural landscape a
10 bit uneven. And honestly, it would be a little bit -- I think
11 it would be better if they're both at 90. I mean, personally, I
12 think it could -- it should all be higher, and I think that's a
13 sentiment that's been echoed by other people. But let's keep it
14 short, and I'd just argue that this should go even further. I
15 think we see that the sort of regulatory environment right now
16 leads to a situation where no one is building in D.C., and that's
17 been the case for around two years.

18 So I actually think, like -- I agree that we don't want
19 perfect in the way of good, but I think that there's currently
20 time to workshop this proposal a little better given that, like,
21 no areas are seeing growth or construction. There's no cranes
22 up in the sky right now. I think this is a perfect time to
23 workshop our proposal a little more, and I just argue this is a
24 great proposal and it can be even better by raising height limits
25 even higher. I'd argue specifically for Woodley Park. Cleveland

1 Park, I think, should also experience that. I think it should
2 be diverse. But if they want to get left behind, that's up to
3 them.

4 And my last question is just if there are any places --
5 plans in place for increased educational infrastructure? Because
6 I went to Oyster-Adams as a kid, and I know that it's pretty
7 packed. So I am just curious. Like, I think growth is perfect.
8 I'm just curious if there's any coordination with Department of
9 Education of D.C. to see if there's any room to expand there.

10 Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. I'm sure Office of Planning
12 for those comments, and we will probably want to deliberate and
13 talk. We will bring up some of those issues -- mentioning them
14 back to us. So thank you.

15 Let me come to you, Mr. Rabbi Randy Brown.

16 And then, Ms. Woolf, let me come to you after that
17 because we're having problems getting Mr. Brown.

18 Mr. Brown?

19 MR. BROWN: Yeah. Thank you, Chair Hood and all the
20 leaders devoting their time.

21 It seems to me that there's broad support. It's been
22 a transparent process, but someone said before, we need to move
23 from deliberation over several years to execution. So I come to
24 this as a parent, as a resident, as a faith leader, and a business
25 owner. My wife and I, we moved to Cleveland Park from Los Angeles

1 13 years ago for career opportunities and getting back home to
2 the East Coast. And I had three unsuccessful trips of trying to
3 buy a house, and we wound up renting in -- actually in Kennedy-
4 Warren.

5 I'm a chaplain at Arlington National Cemetery in Walter
6 Reed, so it's excellent to have metro accessibility in Cleveland
7 Park. Later, we did move over by Van Ness in a smaller townhome,
8 and now we live on Klinge Trail. We're blessed to do that. But
9 I want to give some attention here now with some specific numbers
10 anecdotally so you can understand the impact as a business owner.

11 Besides my military work, something that's you can do
12 good and do well. I own Gymboree Play & Music in Woodley Park.
13 With the help of the city and the government and also my landlord,
14 I've been pivoting, pivoting, and pivoting, but I need some new
15 high tops. I mean, we -- when we moved here 13 years ago, my
16 oldest son who's now 13 was a customer, we now -- our prices are
17 nearly 12 percent higher than they were because of COVID and
18 people moving away. Just to give you hard numbers, 85 percent
19 of my customers come by walking with their strollers. And then
20 as they get older or they want another career and they want to
21 stay, they can't stay because they can't afford it. So there's
22 a lot of customer turn.

23 In addition, it's difficult to maintain good, qualified
24 staff because they have to commute, and it costs money to park
25 and costs money to commute. I would love for there to be an

1 opportunity in the new dedicated housing to have ability for
2 teachers to be able to come and move in here. But the bottom
3 line is it's a wonderful community. We're blessed to be here.
4 We needed to be in walking distance because my wife works at Adas
5 Israel. So we are very familiar with both the metro line and
6 the walking distance. But it is simply unconscionable to have
7 only one story in such a high-dense area right by the metro that
8 can't be utilized for retail and to maintain customers.

9 So what -- I have one question after giving you those
10 hard details of, really, the foot traffic, how it is: Where are
11 we now? What's the bottom line of timing of decision as you
12 deliberate privately? And then what it will then be the next
13 process in historical preservation. Because to be perfectly
14 frank, this is not my first zoning meeting. I was in real estate
15 before. And even though there's broad consensus and it's been
16 transparent for eight years, my fear is, in two years from now,
17 I'm going to be on one of these calls again. So if I could please
18 just understand the inner workings, how are you after all this
19 excellent constructive deliberation going to make your decision?

20 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I'm just going to ask you real
21 quick. First, we're not going to do it privately. We're doing
22 it publicly. Everything we do, deliberations, we make sure that
23 it's out and open. So I would just encourage you to follow.
24 There's a process we have to go through, notification, and
25 everything else again, but I would encourage you to stay tuned

1 with what we're doing because deliberations will be public. So
2 I'm -- that's all I'm going to say on that. If you have any
3 other question, call the office.

4 But let me go to Ms. Woolf, and then we'll come back
5 to you if we have questions.

6 Ms. Woolf. Hannah Woolf?

7 MS. WOOLF: Hello. Can you hear me?

8 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, we can hear you.

9 MS. WOOLF: Hello. My name is Hannah Woolf, and thank
10 you, Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission.

11 I strongly support the proposed zoning changes. I live
12 in Woodley Park in the Calvert Woodley on Woodley Place, and I've
13 really enjoyed my time here. I have seen a lot of people mention
14 vitality tonight, and I think that word perfectly encapsulates
15 what I love about this neighborhood. There are so many wonderful
16 amenities and businesses that the people who live here are
17 privileged to have access to, and I agree that there's room for
18 even more.

19 In particular, the nearby metro station makes such a
20 big difference to someone like me who chooses to live car free.
21 I would love it if we can make it easier for more people to
22 benefit from living in this neighborhood. Building more housing
23 here would allow us to do that, not just by increasing the total
24 number of available units here, but also by decreasing upward
25 pressure on prices by increasing supply. Woodley Park and

1 Cleveland Park have the potential to show off the best of what
2 D.C. living has to offer to many new neighbors and families if
3 we approve the zoning plan.

4 And thank you for the opportunity to testify.

5 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Let me see if anybody
6 has any questions in this panel.

7 Vice Chair Miller, you look like you want to say
8 something? Sorry, man.

9 VICE CHAIR MILLER: No. I guess, thank each of the
10 witnesses for their engagement and testimony. And as the chairman
11 said, Rabbi Brown, we will have -- everything we do is public.
12 And if we don't get to this public hearing tonight, we're going
13 to have to continue to another evening. But at some point
14 thereafter, we probably would be scheduling when we get back
15 additional submissions that we've requested from Office of
16 Planning and others that we might request.

17 And there will be a -- there probably would be a
18 proposed action to take proposed rulemaking. The chairman's
19 outlined this. There's going to be notice of that and then
20 there's final action. So it's a process. It's been a long-time
21 planning as you and others have pointed out, but it's moving in
22 that direction to its fruition. And we will ask the Office of
23 Planning about the Woodley Park questions that the other witness
24 asked about as well.

25 MR. BROWN: I appreciate the leadership. Can you give

1 me an estimated timeline of when you think you're making
2 decisions?

3 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well, let's see. Here's what I'm going
4 to do. At the end of the -- stay on if you can. At the end of
5 the meeting, you will hear some dates and some things that we've
6 asked for, because we haven't gotten everything right. But here's
7 another thing I want you to listen to. After this is -- after
8 you all finish the proponents, we're going to have the other
9 side. So I would -- a lot of people get off after they finish,
10 and which I understand. I appreciate them coming down, but we
11 have to deal a little more than proponents. We have to deal --

12 MR. BROWN: That's fair.

13 CHAIRMAN HOOD: -- proponents. We have to deal with
14 undeclared. We have to deal with the statute.

15 MR. BROWN: That's fair.

16 CHAIRMAN HOOD: So many days. So it's not all the
17 nuances, and I appreciate your question because I like the way
18 you asked it, right?, the phrase, because basically, what you
19 were saying was, let's get it done. I appreciate that. But what
20 I'm also saying is I think the best thing for you, Mr. Brown, is
21 to follow the work with the Office of Zoning and make sure you
22 watch our schedule because we're going to, you know -- the part
23 that that struck me: in private. We'll do anything in private.
24 That's why sometimes it's all over the place because we do it
25 right out of nowhere.

1 So anyway. Let me thank this panel.

2 Thank you, Mr. Brown.

3 Appreciate all of you all on that last panel. Thank
4 you.

5 All right. Ms. Schellin, can we get the last -- or not
6 the last. I keep saying last. Let's -- can we get the next
7 four?

8 MS. SCHELLIN: It will be the last of the proponent.

9 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Give me the last four.

10 MS. SCHELLIN: And I will. It is going to be Tom
11 Lalley, Ian Glaser (phonetic), Christy Kaiser. Let me make sure
12 nobody else has signed up since I put in my list, and that is
13 it.

14 CHAIRMAN HOOD: So it looks like we have two. So we're
15 going to go with Christy Kaiser and then Mr. Tom Lalley. Did I
16 call that in reverse?

17 Okay. Mr. Lalley, you --

18 MR. LALLEY: Good evening. Thank you, Chairman Hood
19 and members of the Zoning Commission for the opportunity to
20 testify today.

21 My name is Tom Lalley. I'm a lifelong resident of Ward
22 3. I live with my wife and my two kids in the house I grew up
23 in and now own in the 3700 block of Yuma Street. I'm grateful
24 to the Coalition for Smarter Growth, Ward3Vision, and the DC
25 YIMBYs for alerting me to this issue. And I'm heartened to hear

1 tonight so many who, like me, support this proposal to allow more
2 height and density along Connecticut Avenue and to remove the
3 restaurant cap. I grew up in Ward 3 in the '70s and '80s, a time
4 when the city's population was declining, and many businesses
5 were long gone or struggling. In those days, there wasn't much
6 need to think about, accommodating growth, because there wasn't
7 much growth.

8 Obviously, D.C. is a very different place now, and we
9 urgently need more new development in Ward 3. In the last 20
10 years, more than 100,000 people have moved to the city and home
11 prices are up tenfold. The run-up in housing prices was great
12 for folks like my parents, who bought my house in 1966, but have
13 created a housing crisis where an increasing number of people
14 can't afford to live in D.C. and especially in Ward 3.

15 The proposal before this Commission creates
16 opportunities for greater equity, affordable housing, and new
17 life and vitality to Cleveland Park and Woodley Park. It focuses
18 development in the most logical and appropriate places and
19 includes design guidelines suitable for the neighborhoods. The
20 proposal also supports greater mobility. My family owns a car,
21 but we love not having to use it. Like many of our neighbors in
22 Ward 3, we walk, bike, or take the metro or bus nearly every day.
23 Mobility is an enormous asset for D.C., and this proposal would
24 invest in it.

25 I want to flag some non-zoning concerns, none of which

1 diminish my support for this proposal at all. The first is school
2 capacity. I have a kid at Hirsch and another at Deal. So I know
3 the overcrowding problem firsthand. The city needs to act to
4 accommodate additional students in Ward 3. Also, DDOT and the
5 Public Space Committee needs to improve infrastructure to
6 accommodate more pedestrians, cyclists, and greater use of public
7 transportation.

8 Thank you for this opportunity to testify today.

9 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Just hold tight.

10 Let's go to Christy Kaiser.

11 And then I see Spencer Dettwyler. We'll come to you
12 after Ms. Kaiser.

13 Christy.

14 MS. KAISER: Hi.

15 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Kaiser. Hi.

16 MS. KAISER: Yeah. This is Christy Kaiser. Hi. I
17 live in Ward 3, and I've been here now for the last 13 years.
18 This is my first time testifying at a public hearing, and I'm
19 testifying in favor with a proposal, both for the Cleveland Park
20 area and the Tenleytown neighborhoods. I used to live along
21 Connecticut Avenue, and now I'm in Tenleytown, but I'll be working
22 during the Tenleytown meeting.

23 One reason I support the proposal is because of
24 improving housing availability and affordability. My story is
25 that I initially moved to D.C. to finish my medical training and

1 after three years completed the training and started work as an
2 attending physician. At the time, I lived in a studio apartment
3 and wanted to stay in the area to be near my sister. And because
4 of the high cost to both rent and buy, I decided to stay at the
5 studio apartment for another three to four years before upgrading
6 to a bigger place. And my point is not to say poor me for living
7 in a studio, because it was perfectly nice, but that if I, as a
8 doctor, didn't feel like I afford more than a studio, then what
9 does that say for others who earn less? And of course, what it
10 says is just that they can't live here.

11 Currently, I work at Georgetown Hospital and Washington
12 Hospital Center, and it is not all uncommon for many of my
13 nondoctor coworkers to commute over an hour one way to get to
14 work. In particular, the sonographer team I work with at
15 Georgetown, the most common reason they leave to work somewhere
16 else is they just can't take the commute anymore. So I realized
17 this proposal cannot fix all of that in one fell swoop, but I
18 think it's one more step to move in the right direction towards
19 improving housing, and it comes with a perk of just having a more
20 vibrant, walkable neighborhood. So to me, it's a win-win. Thank
21 you, guys, so much for your time.

22 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Hold tight. We may have
23 some questions for you.

24 Let's go to Spencer Dettwyler. Hopefully, I pronounced
25 the last name right. Can you unmute?

1 MR. DETTWYLER: Hi. Can you hear me?

2 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, we can. Go right ahead.

3 MR. DETTWYLER: Hi. My name is Spencer Dettwyler. I'm
4 a Ward 3 resident. I live in Van Ness right by Cleveland and
5 Woodley Park. Cleveland Park's my metro station. I get off
6 there, I take the walk to Van Ness, even though getting out of
7 Van Ness would be faster.

8 I love Ward 3. I've been living here for about a year.
9 I've been living in D.C. for about seven. I love taking walks
10 around here. I love the farmers markets in Van Ness and Cleveland
11 Park. I love the businesses here. I love the restaurants. And
12 I could go into a whole spiel about the housing shortage and
13 housing prices, and I might later.

14 But when it comes down to it, I want more people to be
15 able to experience this, this place that I love. I want more
16 neighbors. I want more people to be able to go to the farmers
17 markets. I want -- the place that used to be at Target right by
18 the Cleveland Park Metro. And Metro, it closed down, and I want
19 enough people here for that -- for another business to feel
20 comfortable opening up there, knowing they'll get enough
21 customers to keep their lights on. I am frankly a little bit
22 jealous that Cleveland Park and Woodley Park are getting the
23 upzonings and not Van Ness. I would love to see upzonings in
24 Van Ness in the near future after we got this done.

25 I do want to get back into the elements about the

1 housing shortage because I love D.C. And I want to be able to
2 own a home one day, and I also want to be a D.C. resident for
3 the rest of my life. And one other point, I want to be on -- I
4 want to be a homeowner while also being able to pay D.C. taxes
5 and fund D.C. services. I don't want to have to go into Maryland
6 or Virginia to buy a home. And unless we do these upzoning and
7 build more housing, get more supply all over the district,
8 especially in places like Cleveland Park and Woodley Park and Van
9 Ness in Ward 3, that will never happen. So I'm going to echo
10 every other piece of testimony today about how we need more
11 housing, and I want to be able to see other friendly faces when
12 I take my walks around Cleveland Park and Woodley Park and Van
13 Ness.

14 Thank you very much.

15 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. I'm looking at my
16 colleagues here.

17 Any questions or comments to this panel?

18 Okay. We want to thank this panel. We appreciate you
19 all coming out and providing your testimony to us, so thank you.

20 Ms. Schellin, let's go to those in opposition.

21 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. So in opposition, we will
22 move to that. We have 11 total. So the first one we have is
23 Carol Aten, Andrea Pedolsky, Susan Gallucci, and Deidre Brown.
24 That will make four if they're all here.

25 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I see them all here. Let's go

1 over to Ms. Carol Aten first.

2 MS. ATEN: Good evening, Chairman Hood and members of
3 the Commission. I'm Carol Aten representing the Northwest
4 Opportunity Partners Community Development Corporation. We
5 oppose the proposed map and text amendments for Cleveland Park
6 and Woodley Park because they neither maximize the amounts of
7 affordable housing nor target to those most in need. As advocates
8 for more affordable housing, Ward 3, we are particularly focused
9 on the inclusionary zoning provisions of the proposed upzonings.

10 The Rock Creek West planning area has been repeatedly
11 designated as an area of high opportunity with a high need for
12 affordable housing. The overview at the beginning of the Rock
13 Creek West planning area element of comprehensive plan identifies
14 the areas high opportunity with a substantial unmet need for new
15 affordable units. The HANTA program recognizes Rock Creek West
16 as an area of high need eligible for tax abatements for projects
17 with one-third affordable housing. And Ward 3 is the only board,
18 as has been mentioned, where the mayor's affordable housing goals
19 have not been met.

20 The proposed changes in zoning present a rare
21 opportunity to create greater economic and racial diversity in
22 Ward 3 by maximizing inclusionary zoning in these special zones.
23 I would just note that we've been talking about, as you all know,
24 the IZ+ is a formula and it goes up to 20 percent, but it only
25 does 20 percent in PDR zones. So the top housing -- the top

1 percentage in a housing residential zone is 18 percent, I believe.
2 And once you calculate the formula on the basis of the FAR,
3 Cleveland Park would be 18 percent, Woodley Park would be 16
4 percent, and Woodley Park West would be 14 percent, just, you
5 know, if it's -- if the zoning is adopted.

6 So we anticipate that market-rate housing rental rates
7 in Cleveland Park and Woodley Park will remain high because of
8 their exceptional access to public transportation, shopping,
9 schools, libraries, parks, and neighborhood services. More
10 housing is not likely to exceed demand or to lower rents.
11 Therefore, high-end market-rate housing should subsidize or
12 offset greater amounts of affordable housing and lower levels --
13 and some lower levels of affordability. To achieve a key purpose
14 and intent of the text amendments are to ensure greater diversity
15 through additional residential development. IZ+ is insufficient.

16 Therefore, we recommend the following. Set the
17 eligibility for IZ in these zones at 30 to 50 percent MFI. The
18 median family income for Black D.C. residents is less than 40
19 percent of area MFI. Therefore, IZ 60 percent MFI rental level
20 is too high and should be changed to 30 to 50 percent in these
21 special zones. The IZ requirement should be 30 percent for the
22 increased FAR as in the upzoning. In many cases, there will be
23 very significant increases in density in these new zones. This
24 increased density is analogous to disposition of public land that
25 requires 30 percent IZ. And if both public land and disposition

1 of -- and the potential zoning envelopes, and in fact, air rights
2 are public assets.

3 In addition, we would note that HANTA program requires
4 33 percent of IZ in exchange for tax abatements, which are akin
5 to the benefit of the extra density. Breaking IZ+ could apply
6 to the existing FAR with a 30 percent requirement applied to the
7 increase. The cap on IZ+ at 125 percent increases in density
8 should be removed. Whatever the rationale for capping the density
9 increase for IZ at 125 percent, all bonus density should be
10 included in the IZ requirements and continue to ladder up the IZ+
11 requirements above 125 percent.

12 The IZ requirements to encourage family-size units to
13 address the critical shortage of larger units and to foster
14 community cohesion and long-term tenancy. The upzoning along
15 Connecticut, Wisconsin Avenues are likely to be the best
16 opportunities we'll have for making significant progress in
17 creating a Ward 3 that is more racially and economically diverse,
18 and we urge the Zoning Commission to aggressively pursue housing
19 equity in this case. While housing displacement is not an issue
20 in this case, we are concerned about the small businesses that
21 will be displaced and unable to return because of the likely
22 higher rents and taller buildings.

23 In addition, we noticed that the lack of prescribed
24 stepbacks in the text is a great disservice to the existing
25 community and nearby residents. The visuals presented to the

1 neighbors that showed the stepbacks are now described as
2 illustrative, but they were certainly not understood that way
3 when they were presented. The zoning tech should prescribe the
4 minimum stepbacks that the neighbors should relied -- that the
5 neighbors relied upon. HPRB can adjust them further if needed.

6 Finally, we're opposed to the upzoning that creates
7 matter of right densities essentially foreclosing any further
8 community involvement and development projects, including ANCs
9 and affected neighbors. We urge the Zoning Commission to
10 condition building permits at higher densities under the new
11 zoning on process summary of a PUD to ensure that the public is
12 not excluded from shaping their neighborhoods.

13 Thank you for your consideration, and I'd be happy to
14 answer any questions.

15 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Aten. Let's hold tight.
16 We may have some questions for you.

17 MS. ATEN: Okay.

18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Schellin, could you make a note for
19 me that I want the Office of Planning to tell me why -- I want
20 them to respond to Ms. Aten's test with me, all of them, but --
21 particularly this one? Because I think they bring up some good
22 points of exactly where I'm trying to go. And I need to know
23 why not -- why we can't do it. So I had to do that then because
24 I may forget. I asked my other colleagues, if you have something
25 like that, do it right now because we may forget because we have

1 a lot going on.

2 MS. ATEN: Okay.

3 CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Let me go to Andrea
4 Pedolsky. Andrea Pedolsky. Okay. We're going to come back to
5 you.

6 Let's go to Suzanne Gallucci. Third time's got to be
7 a charm.

8 Let's go to Deidre Brown.

9 MS. BROWN: I am here. One second.

10 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. There we go. All right.

11 MS. BROWN: I'll get started. Good evening. My name
12 is Deidre Brown. I'm testifying today as a Ward 3 resident and
13 on behalf of the Ward 3 Democratic Committee, which formally
14 adopted a resolution opposing the current rezoning proposal for
15 the Connecticut and Wisconsin Avenue corridors unless they're
16 strengthened to deliver meaningful, affordable housing. The
17 resolution is enclosed with our testimony.

18 Ward 3 is the only planning area in the district that
19 has not met Mayor Bowser's affordable housing production goals.
20 Residents were told that upzoning these avenues, especially in
21 the IZ+, will finally correct this imbalance. Unfortunately, the
22 current rezoning proposal does not do that.

23 First, proposal stops the IZ+ ladder at 125 percent.
24 Under IZ+, each additional increment of density is supposed to
25 come with a higher affordable housing set aside. That is the

1 entire logic and promise of IZ+. Capping the ladder early leaves
2 significant affordable housing on the table and undermines public
3 expectations. And developers are being granted more density, the
4 corresponding affordability requirements must apply to all that
5 density, not just some of it.

6 Second, affordability must be truly accessible to the
7 families who need it most. The proposal leans heavily on 60
8 percent of MFI, but many Black households in D.C. have income
9 close to the 36 percent MFI. A unit price of 6 percent MFI is
10 not affordable to the very families the district says it wants
11 to include in high-opportunity neighborhoods like Ward 3. To
12 advance racial and economic equity, we need a tiered
13 affordability structure from 30 to 60 percent of MFI. So low-
14 and extremely low-income households can actually qualify for the
15 new housing this rezoning will produce.

16 Third, Ward 3 cannot meet its equity goals without
17 family-size affordable units, particularly along Wisconsin
18 Avenue. That means two- and three-bedroom units intentionally
19 set aside at affordable levels. Without them, families with
20 children will remain shut out. Collectively, these changes are
21 not radical. They're aligned with what the public was told IZ+
22 would deliver, and they are necessary if the district intends
23 this rezoning to produce real progress rather than simply taller
24 market rate buildings.

25 In closing, I urge the Commission to strengthen this

1 case so it advances racial equity, economic inclusion, and long-
2 promised affordability, not just density for density's sake. Do
3 not miss this once-in-a-decade opportunity to correct the
4 longstanding housing imbalance in Ward 3.

5 Thank you for your time and for your commitment to fair
6 and equitable District of Columbia. Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Brown. If you hold
8 tight -- if you can hold tight, we may ask some additional
9 questions.

10 Ms. Pedolsky, I know you can come off mute. There you
11 go. You may begin.

12 MS. PEDOLSKY: Hello. Can you hear me?

13 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, we can.

14 MS. PEDOLSKY: Okay. Great. I've tried working my
15 video, but for some reason, that's not coming up, so I will have
16 to be anonymous looking.

17 Thanks for the opportunity to participate in this very
18 important hearing. I'm Andrea Pedolsky and president of the
19 Cleveland Park Historical Society. And this year, we're
20 celebrating our 40th anniversary. I'm also a resident of
21 Cleveland Park and have lived here in an apartment on Connecticut
22 Avenue for over 20 years, and I love it. CPHS is a proponent of
23 balancing preservation and growth. We want Cleveland Park to be
24 a contributor to affordable housing so we can become more diverse
25 racially and economically. As has already been mentioned,

1 covenants and redlining prevented this from happening many years
2 ago.

3 As it stands now, the Office of Planning's rezoning
4 proposal for Cleveland Park will result in unprecedented increase
5 in density for the historic district's commercial area. The
6 neighborhood could see building heights of seven stories or more
7 with penthouses added on top. I suggest you take a walk through
8 Cleveland Park and take note that the apartment buildings look,
9 ending and within the neighborhood, are four stories high, not
10 including the ground floor. Provide lots of apartment options
11 and possibly businesses on the second story and don't overwhelm
12 the streetscape. CPHS believes that that building no higher than
13 five stories would yield plenty of additional apartments. And
14 we also hope that this means plenty of apartments for families
15 and not just studios and one bedrooms.

16 Unfortunately, we know there's no guarantee these will
17 be affordable. Consider the prices in The Macklin development:
18 over a million dollars for the townhouses and the condos start
19 at mid \$500,000. Perhaps I don't really understand what
20 affordable is supposed to mean. Our recommendation is consistent
21 with a comprehensive plan's density designations and our own
22 design guidelines for the Cleveland Park commercial area. I
23 invite you to revisit or perhaps read for the first time the
24 design guidelines CPHS developed for the commercial strip. While
25 they're available on OP's website, you can find them easily if

1 you go to ours and click on the preservation button.

2 And so we encourage the Zoning Commission to consider
3 heights no more than five stories for the commercial strip. Let's
4 call it smart preservation. More housing can be achieved with
5 less height and more attention to the massing and scale to be
6 compatible with existing contributing structures. We know that
7 you often employ buffers, setbacks, and stepbacks, as well as
8 consider adjusting base zone dimensional standards. Why not for
9 Cleveland Park?

10 Since the rezoning of the Cleveland Park Historic
11 District is a city initiative, we also suggest you consider
12 infrastructure needs as part of your decision-making before
13 building begins. How will these additional stories, the very old
14 structures, handle greater demand for water, sewage, electricity,
15 and parking? And those are all things that businesses and
16 apartments will need. In addition, just two other concerns in
17 terms of getting rid of the restaurant cap, how do we keep
18 Cleveland Park from just becoming restaurant row? And how do we
19 keep from losing all the other services since renting will be up
20 to the building owners themselves?

21 And I also understand it's really hard for businesses
22 to even start. I know a few people who went through over a year
23 and a half trying to open a business. So helping businesses open
24 in Cleveland Park is something the city should be helping.

25 So in summary, CPHS opposes the current proposal set

1 forth by the Office of Planning. We do support smart preservation
2 and the effort to bring affordable housing to the neighborhood.
3 This can be achieved with less height than proposed and more
4 creative building approaches.

5 Thanks for your time.

6 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you.

7 Let me see who I've now -- then I call Susan Gallucci?

8 MS. GALLUCCI: I got my technology to work now.

9 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. It's okay. Thank you.

10 MS. GALLUCCI: Thank you so much.

11 Good evening, Chairman Hood and members of the Zoning
12 Commission. I will keep this brief. Thank you so much for the
13 time to testify.

14 My name is Susan Gallucci. I'm a former resident of
15 Cleveland Park. I currently live in Clover Park. I'm a licensed
16 clinical social worker and also a member of the Ward 3 Housing
17 Justice Group. I am opposing the rezoning plan until it is
18 modified to provide a larger amount of affordable housing. So a
19 lot of what I'm going to say is echoing what Carol and Deidre
20 said, as well as, for 18 years, I worked in D.C. and ran a
21 transitional housing program for pregnant women experiencing
22 homelessness. So I worked with them on all the life skills and
23 getting on their feet. And it was always difficult for them to
24 find somewhere to go that they could afford. But up until I
25 worked there last year, it became more and more challenging for

1 them to find anywhere in the city to live that was affordable,
2 let alone deeply affordable, and particularly in Ward 3.

3 What I'm asking for is that this plan be changed in
4 regards to IZ+. So two of the changes would be, number one,
5 increase the quantity of affordable housing proportional to the
6 full extent of the final density changes with no ceiling at 125
7 percent. These proposals, as written, assume the current IZ+
8 ladder, which pairs each 25 percent increase in density with a 2
9 percent affordable housing requirement but now stops at 125
10 percent density increases without justifiable reason. The Zoning
11 Commission should use the existing ladder formula for incremental
12 increases and to continue affordable housing set aside for the
13 entire range of density increases.

14 Number two, create lower income eligibility tiers for
15 IZ+ renters in these ward zones, targeting households below 50
16 percent of the DCMFI to ensure more equitable access to new
17 permanently affordable housing units. So looking at those
18 because the people who are the working poor, the people who are
19 trying to get on their feet and stay on their feet are not able
20 to afford the higher scales on that.

21 So thank you so much for the opportunity to testify.

22 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you so much.

23 I think we have gotten everyone.

24 Looking at my colleagues, any questions or comments?

25 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yeah. Thank you, each of you, for

1 your testimony. As the chairman asked, we're going to ask and I
2 think earlier asked Office of Planning to respond to some of the
3 testimony about inclusionary zoning increased set aside removing
4 that cap if that exists, and family-sized units as well.

5 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Also, I thought -- Ms. Brown, I thought
6 I saw something from Ward 3 of you in here. I thought I saw the
7 area. I don't know if I'm hallucinating or not, but did you
8 provide something, Ms. Brown?

9 MS. BROWN: I emailed it to -- what was it? D.C. --
10 what was it -- something submissions@dc.gov.

11 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. We got it. That's good. I was
12 looking for it in what I have here. Okay. Thank you, Ms. Brown.

13 Let me, first of all, thank each and every one of you.
14 We appreciate your testimony and your comments.

15 Commissioner Wright, do you have any questions?

16 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yeah. Just a quick question
17 particularly for the folks affiliated with the -- and I'm sorry.
18 I am going to do -- not do justice to the name of the organization,
19 the Ward 3 housing group.

20 Do you have any access to any economic studies about
21 what kinds of subsidies end up having to go into providing the
22 30 to 50 percent AMI housing? From the experience that I had,
23 which I will admit was in Montgomery County, we had done a lot
24 of economic analysis and found that our -- we call them MPDUS,
25 not IZ, but that we could get a certain percentage, usually about

1 12 to 15 percent, not like 65 percent, AMI without having to
2 offer an additional subsidy for the project. But that when we
3 got to the three -- to the 30 to 50 percent AMI, we had to start
4 looking at additional subsidies. And if you all have any
5 information or any studies that you have looked at that might be
6 helpful, we'd appreciate seeing that.

7 MS. ATEN: Noted.

8 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right. You know, Ms. Brown,
9 I was -- I do understand what we're trying to get to some years
10 ago. My experience was in D.C., and I do know that they fought
11 we one -- some years ago about 30 percent of MFI. And maybe two
12 weeks later, we came back with a project with 30 percent of MFI.
13 So you know, I'm curious here. And what better place to do it
14 in this area? So that's why with Office of Planning to come --
15 that's why, Ms. Brown, I was looking for you.

16 I'm still -- I'm going to -- Ms. Schellin, I need you
17 to help me remember that I need to get one three-position paper
18 on this. And you know, I look at all of them, but I'm particularly
19 interested in 36 percent because I -- Ms. Aten mentioned the 30
20 percent was kind of where I'm at, and I want to talk to and have
21 those conversations the vice chair has already mentioned.

22 Okay. I thank this panel. And then I know Ms.
23 Wright -- Commissioner Wright has asked for something as well.
24 We're going to go from there. We appreciate the information,
25 because all we can do is we're not showing it up. We're going

1 to hopefully try to make it even better. That's the goal.

2 All right. Ms. Schellin, can we get to the next four,
3 please?

4 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. Laura Richards, Mary Alice
5 Levine, Judy Chessler, Aidan Jones.

6 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Since the names are recognized, Ms.
7 Laura Richards first. Then we go to Ms. Mary Alice, Ms. Judy
8 Chessler, and then Aidan Jones in that order.

9 Ms. Richards?

10 MS. RICHARDS: Good afternoon, Chairman Hood and
11 members of the Commission. I am Laura Richards from Ward 7, and
12 I have limited my statement to issues that have citywide impact.

13 For the past 40 years, I have urged neighbors and
14 friends to testify on various issues, and I'm often met with the
15 response, what's the point? It's a done deal. I've argued
16 otherwise, insisting that the public voice matters, but not
17 anymore.

18 The procedure OP is using in this case and proposes to
19 employ citywide will silence public participation. OP wants you
20 to impose a maximum matter of right building envelope that will
21 govern block-by-block growth for years into the future. D.C.
22 residents have watched Congress repeal laws it doesn't like. We
23 are forced to acquiesce as the White House floods our streets
24 with out-of-town national guard troops. Now OP has decided to
25 join the anti-democracy effort and shut us out of decisions

1 affecting our neighborhood. The Commission doesn't have to go
2 along with this. You can say no to a development envelope so
3 encompassing that anything can go forward as a matter of right.
4 You can state that future developments must be reviewed case by
5 case.

6 And I think I have heard some of that in the hearing
7 where you said, okay, you're going to put in a requirement for
8 maybe setbacks and then you have to bring your setback forward,
9 at least to HPRB.

10 Now, housing diversity. As others have testified, this
11 proposal in its current form will not achieve meaningful racial
12 diversity, which is one of its stated purposes. Indeed, one of
13 the key reasons cited for the incredible amount of upzoning is
14 to know the Ward 3 supposed history of exclusionary zoning. But
15 everyone, including OP and all of you, knows that upzoning as it
16 has been applied in D.C. is a vehicle for displacement, not
17 inclusion. Why pretend otherwise?

18 Although here there are no Black people to displace,
19 but you sure are not going to get them in. Black people can't
20 afford IZ units. Sixty percent of HUD's MFI is 93,000. The MFI
21 for African Americans is 60,000. The numbers speak for
22 themselves. The only way to reach more African-American
23 households is to require deeper levels of affordability. Since
24 IZ's inception, just three units have been produced at 30 percent
25 MFI. In 2023, more units were produced at 80 percent MFI than

1 at any other level. Also, since IZ began, just 140 units, 6
2 percent have had three or four bedrooms. The need for family-
3 sized units is raised every time a major case comes before the
4 Commission. There's a lot of talk, and talk is cheap. Please
5 use this case with its citywide implications to set a new
6 direction that, one, encourages and facilitates and mandates
7 public participation and, two, applies IZ in a way that might
8 actually live up to its name.

9 Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you.

11 Let's go to Mary Alice.

12 MS. LEVINE: All right.

13 CHAIRMAN HOOD: There you go.

14 MS. LEVINE: All right. My name is Mary Alice Levine,
15 and I'm testifying in opposition to the Office of Planning's
16 proposal for the upzoning of Connecticut Avenue in Cleveland
17 Park.

18 Cleveland Park is an ideal venue for family housing.
19 Yet OP's zoning set-down reports makes no provision for family
20 housing among the many housing units it is proposing in Cleveland
21 Park. And yet unlike most areas of Ward 3, Cleveland Park
22 residents are assigned to school districts that can accept new
23 students without taxing the D.C. public school's infrastructure.

24 Cleveland Park's John Eaton Elementary School is a top-
25 rated D.C. elementary school that is able to accommodate new

1 families, as is Hardy Middle School and MacArthur High School
2 where John Eaton students are assigned upon graduation. And it's
3 not just current availability of public schools that will be
4 attractive to new families. Both Eaton and Hardy are projected
5 to have capacity in ten years' time, and MacArthur is expanding
6 to serve more students than the 542 students it can handle now.
7 Eaton's enrollment is currently at 79 percent capacity, and it
8 is projected for 75 percent capacity in school year 2025 through
9 '36.

10 Both percentages represent a comparatively high amount
11 of empty capacity among Ward 3 schools. Hardy's enrollment
12 capacity is currently at 83 percent and it is projected for 80
13 percent in 2035/'36. MacArthur's enrollment capacity is
14 currently at 72 percent. Because MacArthur is expanding, there
15 is reasonable expectation for needed student capacity in ten
16 years. Of course, some nearby schools like Hearst Elementary
17 School are very crowded and will remain so, but it is a fallacy
18 that all Ward 3 neighborhoods are unable to handle new students;
19 that is, new families.

20 Cleveland Park is a rare case and they can welcome new
21 students and provide excellent academic opportunities for them.
22 The presence of great schools with room for new students should
23 be a mandate to build family housing. Families build community
24 and stability. OP should be encouraging family housing in order
25 to attract families who can enjoy the outstanding educational

1 opportunities available to residents of Cleveland Park. In
2 addition, building affordable family housing will promote a
3 stable, diverse community. I urge the Zoning Commission to
4 require the Office of Planning to plan for family housing and
5 especially affordable family housing in Cleveland Park.

6 Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

8 Judy Chessser.

9 MS. CHESSER: Hello. I am Judy Chessser.

10 First of all, I'd like to direct you to the testimony
11 that was submitted by Marilyn Simon (phonetic). It's only three
12 pages long. The first half is on IZ zone -- IZ+. The second
13 half is on DDOT, and it gives a really good analysis of the
14 numbers and the need to put things in the text. It's only three
15 pages long. Please look at it, and please ask OP to respond to
16 it.

17 Now to my own testimony. I know why we're trying to
18 upzone 101 lots all at one time here in Connecticut, because we'd
19 like to keep this train moving. But let's, for a moment, look
20 at the economy. These are all observations that the D.C.
21 officials said: poor conditions, federal contraction, delay in
22 construction, mild recession driven by federal spending cuts,
23 layoffs, and government shutdowns. The D.C. chief finance --
24 excuse me, chief finance officer projected a recession in 2026,
25 that's next year, followed by a gradual recovery but significant

1 uncertainty due to federal policy decisions.

2 The total D.C. revenue is expected to be lower next
3 year, 2026, than this year, with a forecast of a total revenue
4 loss of a billion through 2028 compared to previous estimates.
5 Most businesses are pessimistic about their local economy and are
6 not firing or expanding. The D.C. Office of Revenue Analysis is
7 forecasting a slight population decrease in 2027, which is
8 expected to further impact tax collection, particularly property
9 and business taxes.

10 The D.C. Office of Planning states -- and I put their
11 memo in my testimony that you have -- that actual development and
12 growth for these upzones, that you have in front of me -- in
13 front of you, excuse me, is "not expected to occur for decades,
14 if ever." Although this quote was actually a memo regarding
15 Wisconsin Avenue, I don't think a case can be made that the
16 economy is different a few blocks down the hill.

17 And now we get to immediate tax implications, which
18 potentially is increases for these areas you are upzoning. I
19 turned to the D.C. code, and I put the entire statute in my
20 testimony. 47-820, assessments, it says the assessed value of
21 real property, the valuation date shall be listed annually. The
22 assessed value for all real property shall be estimated market
23 value of blah, blah, blah. The mayor shall take into account
24 any factor that may have a bearing on market value including
25 zoning. The assessment is revised as a result of any of the

1 following: a change in the zoning area in which the real property
2 is located.

3 In conclusion, I am concerned that you may trigger tax
4 increases immediately even though development is very unlikely
5 to occur for some time to come. Okay.

6 CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Thank you, Ms. Chesson. We
7 do have your statement as we (indiscernible) --

8 MS. CHESSER: Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN HOOD: -- submitted.

10 Then I go to Aidan Jones?

11 MR. JONES: Yes. The video options, I guess, so it was
12 other --

13 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Turn your video on. Just turn your
14 video on. If not, we can hear you.

15 MR. JONES: Okay. It says show with others. Do you
16 see me or not yet?

17 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not yet. But you can go ahead and
18 provide your testimony.

19 MR. JONES: Okay. Thank you.

20 So I'm a D.C. resident for about 55 years, starting at
21 Dupont Circle on a 4th Floor (indiscernible), then in Friendship
22 Heights. And now I live about halfway between Wisconsin and
23 Massachusetts Avenue in the upper area below Friendship Heights.
24 I had a daughter who, for many years, lived in an apartment
25 building, rent-controlled apartment building at Broadmoor in

1 Connecticut, so I'm very familiar with the area. So that's sort
2 of my background.

3 My principal concern and the reason for why I testify
4 tonight is that I think you really -- as a Zoning Commission,
5 you need to be careful what you pray for because, as Judy Chesser
6 said, development that's going to occur is not going to take
7 place for a while, and circumstances change. The very title of
8 the comprehensive plan implies taking into consideration changes,
9 circumstances, and passage of time. And if you think about the
10 changes we've had just in the last five years -- five years ago,
11 we -- five and a half years ago, we did not have a pandemic or
12 we just started a pandemic.

13 So think about, if you look five years ahead, how
14 different things will look in five years. If the Zoning
15 Commission freezes out its own opportunity by establishing
16 upzoning at this point in time without having developers in place,
17 you're forfeiting the ability to insist on the kinds of
18 information that you're asking for now including equally
19 affordable housing, for example.

20 And so I think I would ask you to take into
21 consideration whether that this is the right way to proceed.
22 It's not only going to be an issue with Ward 3, but if OP insists
23 upon handling vast areas of the city where they have guidelines
24 in place and they have the ability with a comprehensive plan to
25 let developers come in and make an application, that would be a

1 much more appropriate time. And ANCs and neighbors and businesses
2 would have an opportunity to have the public participation in the
3 process.

4 And in any event, given the comprehensive plan, the
5 future land use map, there's already the ability in the hands of
6 developers along with guidelines like the Connecticut Avenue
7 Guidelines to achieve the kinds of things that people and that
8 we've heard about in the neighborhood a lot. So I think it's
9 premature to upraise the zoning at this point in time when we're
10 talking about how quickly and vastly things can change in this
11 city even in a year or two as we've seen in the last year. I
12 would urge you to keep those things in mind as we move forward.

13 Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you.

15 Do we have any questions at this panel? Any questions?

16 All right. Well, thank you. I thank this panel for
17 your presentation to us and also give us your viewpoints. So
18 thank you all. Appreciate you all taking the time to do that.

19 Ms. Schellin, can I have the -- about how many people
20 do we have left?

21 MS. SCHELLIN: Not too many. Just three.

22 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

23 MS. SCHELLIN: We have -- are you ready? Yes.

24 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yeah.

25 MS. SCHELLIN: Yeah.

1 CHAIRMAN HOOD: That was my assessment because we --
2 say we're going to stop at 9.

3 MS. SCHELLIN: Yep. All right. We have three. We
4 have Shelly Repp --

5 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

6 MS. SCHELLIN: -- Margaret Lenzner, and Nancy MacWood.
7 And then we have only one under undeclared.

8 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let's bring that one up, and I think --

9 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. That would be Rick Nash.

10 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Now, have we gotten everybody with
11 that?

12 MS. SCHELLIN: That would be it, yes.

13 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right. So this will be our
14 last panel, Ms. Schellin, and we'll do another one, so on our
15 list.

16 And Mr. Repp, you may begin.

17 MR. REPP: Thank you. Good evening, Chair hood and
18 members of the Zoning Commission. My name is Shelly Repp and
19 I'm testifying on behalf of the Committee of 100 in opposition
20 to the Office of Planning's current proposed text and map
21 amendments for the Cleveland Park and Woodley Park.

22 Our written comments on this case can be found at
23 Exhibit 229 following some highlights. There are significant
24 issues with OP's proposal including the short-circuiting of
25 public participation, lack of consistency with the comprehensive

1 plan including the FLUM, disregard for the historic districts,
2 and low-density surrounding neighborhoods, omission of zoning
3 tools presented in the Connecticut Avenue development framework,
4 and insufficiency of IZ+ criteria to address the goal of racial
5 diversity, the immediate and the immediate adverse impact on
6 existing small businesses and failure to assess the adequacy of
7 existing infrastructure to handle projected growth.

8 In more detail, first, OP is asking the Zoning
9 Commission to approve the proposed amendments as a rulemaking.
10 Rulemaking precludes affected individuals and neighborhood
11 organizations from seeking party status, thus limiting their
12 participation. Further and perhaps more importantly, following
13 approval, any proposed development will be matter of right, which
14 means this major corridor could be built out for a generation
15 without meaningful public review.

16 Second, OP is overreached in proposing a base zone of
17 MU-8A for the Cleveland Park commercial area. The FLUM designates
18 Cleveland Park for medium-density residential and modern-density
19 commercial. The framework element states that medium-density
20 residential has a FAR of 1.8 to 4.0. MU-8 has a residential FAR
21 of 5.0 before applying IZ. Since IZ is required, the premium
22 FAR will be 6.0. A FAR of 6.0 is consistent with high density
23 but is inconsistent with the FLUM designation or the law for
24 Cleveland Park.

25 OP compounds this zone choice by asking for a height

1 of 75 feet, which is inconsistent with a comprehensive plan. The
2 Committee of 100 recommends MU-5 with a cap on height of 60 feet
3 because of the very low density of the existing historic district.
4 For Woodley Park, none of the zoning codes, high-density mixed-
5 use zones contain limits on height and FAR. Nevertheless, OP
6 proposes height limits on the east side of Connecticut at Woodley
7 Park. This seems to suggest that even OP believes the high-
8 density FLUM designation is not compatible with the area.

9 Third, OP is ignoring the projected setbacks and
10 stepdowns highlighted in the development standards for Cleveland
11 Park and Woodley Park in the Connecticut Avenue Development
12 Framework. These standard tools for mitigating bulk and
13 establishing transitions were presented to the public in
14 illustrations. However, none of these typical devices are
15 included in the zoning proposals being considered this evening.
16 This is a remarkable omission that needs to be corrected. All
17 of Cleveland Park's commercial area is in historic district as
18 is half of Woodley Park. It is not credible for OP to say that
19 the Historic Preservation Review Board will determine setbacks
20 in its design review. This is the Zoning Commission's job.

21 Fourth, the commitment to truly affordable housing
22 needs to be strengthened. OP has included an unprecedented
23 statement in the purpose and intent section which we support of
24 the proposed new rule, new zones. They're allowing for more
25 housing destruction will accommodate a greater range of resident

1 diversity to advance the district's housing equity goals. To
2 achieve the diversity that OP says is the main purpose of the
3 new zones, the income criteria standard needs to be lowered. The
4 medium-family income for African American households in D.C. is
5 well below the median family income used for IZ+. To achieve
6 the diversity that OP says is the purpose of the new zones. The
7 income eligibility standards need to be revised.

8 In conclusion, there are significant issues with OP's
9 proposed new zones. We urge the Zoning Commission to advise OP
10 how it wants each of these issues handled and that any new
11 submission by OP be subject of an additional hearing in an open
12 record. Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Hold tight. We may have
14 some questions.

15 Margaret Lenzner. You're still on mute.

16 MS. LENZNER: Okay. Is that better? Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.

18 MS. LENZNER: I did submit my testimony in writing, but
19 I was a little bit late. I'm sorry. And I hope that you will
20 allow my testimony as written to be in the record.

21 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Schellin -- let's accept that into
22 the record, Ms. Schellin. Thank you.

23 MS. LENZNER: Thank you. Like others testifying in
24 opposition, I am testifying, as a resident of Cleveland Park and
25 a member of Ward -- today as a member of Ward 3 Housing Justice

1 in opposition to the proposed rezoning of Connecticut Avenue in
2 Cleveland Park because it does not provide an adequate amount of
3 inclusionary of affordable housing. I urge the Zoning Commission
4 to revise the requirements for inclusionary zoning in this once-
5 in-a-decade opportunity to address diversity and to realize
6 equity in rezoning Ward 3 corridors.

7 Since the mayor announced her goal of 12,000 new
8 affordable housing units by 2025, Ward 3 housing justice has
9 worked to increase affordable housing in our community. Although
10 thousands of new luxury apartments have been built along Ward 3
11 corridors recently, fewer than 9 percent of those apartments are
12 designated affordable. Of 2,618 new units at Wardman Park, City
13 Ridge, Upton Place, and the Residences at Mazza, only 233 are
14 designated affordable through inclusionary zoning.

15 Rezoning Ward 3 will allow greatly increased height and
16 density, but the proposal fails to require commensurate
17 affordability through IZ+. The quantity of affordable housing
18 should be proportional to the full extent of the density increases
19 with no ceiling at 125 percent. In Cleveland Park, the proposed
20 IZ+ requirement does not apply to the entire proposed 150 percent
21 density increase. Low-income residents are also disserved by
22 requiring 60 to 80 percent MFI income for IZ eligibility. Black
23 households whose income is only 35 percent of the D.C. MFI should
24 have access to permanently affordable homes through IZ+ in new
25 residential development. Realizing the city's goal of equity,

1 diversity, and inclusion in Ward 3's resource-rich community
2 demands lowering the income eligibility for affordable units to
3 30 percent -- to 50 percent MFI for renters and no more than 60
4 percent for home ownership. Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you.

6 Nancy MacWood?

7 MS. MACWOOD: Good evening, Chairman Hood and members
8 of the Commission. I thank you for your holding this hearing,
9 and I know it's been a long night. I'm Nancy MacWood. I'm a
10 30-year resident in Cleveland Park, and I served as it's ANC
11 commissioner for over 20 years. I want to comment on what I find
12 are misleading statements in the Office of Planning's updated
13 report filed on November 21st. The community asked, can OP's
14 recommended heights and densities be lowered? Wouldn't the lower
15 density be more compatible with the surrounding residential
16 neighborhoods?

17 OP told residents that lowering its recommended heights
18 and densities would not be consistent with the comprehensive
19 plan. That is wrong. Plainly wrong. There are a range of
20 densities associated with the applicable FLUM medium residential
21 designation for Cleveland Park that correspond to more than one
22 zone, and height is not subject to comprehensive plan
23 consistency.

24 For example, MU-5A zone is consistent. That is the
25 zone used for Reed-Cooke and Dupont Circle where the FAR is 3.5,

1 which is consistent with medium residential density, whereas the
2 5.0 FAR proposed by OP for Cleveland Park is not consistent.
3 Reed-Cooke has a height limit of 40 feet, allows 50 feet with
4 IZ. DuPont Circle has a 65-foot limit -- height limit increasing
5 to 70 feet with IZ. In contrast to what OP told the community,
6 the Zoning Commission has options regarding height to align with
7 the comprehensive plans guidance to consider the scale of
8 adjoining uses.

9 With the current proposal, OP has not shown any
10 consideration of the low and moderate density neighborhoods that
11 are as close to the commercial area as you will find in the city.
12 The community also asked, why aren't there required front facade
13 setbacks as illustrated in the design guidelines. The response
14 from OP that the HPRB will handle setbacks and mitigations is
15 disingenuous and frankly, news to me. I've been working on these
16 matters for decades. The Zoning Commission is empowered to
17 regulate the location, height, bulk, number of stories, and size
18 of buildings and other structures, the percentage of lot which
19 may be occupied, the size of yards, courts, and other open spaces,
20 the density population.

21 Setbacks are a zoning tool and are partly used to ensure
22 compatibility between land users. The HPRB reviews are narrowly
23 focused on building alterations in their compatibility with
24 character of the historic district. The Zoning Commission makes
25 laws. The HPRB makes recommendations. The Zoning Commission has

1 never transferred its responsibility to the HPRB, but that is
2 what OP is telling the public the Zoning Commission will do in
3 this case.

4 In particular, OP doesn't want you to pay attention to
5 the illustrations in the design guidelines showing a series of
6 setbacks that the public relied on. I relied on. When the design
7 guidelines chapter heading says guidelines for zoning changes
8 followed by building design guidelines followed by zoning
9 envelope consistency with residential and commercial densities,
10 why didn't that occur to me that the illustrations have nothing
11 to do with zoning. The only disclaimer I saw was below the
12 illustration for noncontributing buildings at the end of the
13 chapter. Let's face it. OP did not -- did intend for us to rely
14 on the illustrations. What OP is recommending is remarkable
15 about phase of the line between zoning process and historic
16 preservation review process. Is the Zoning Commission going to
17 delegate its zoning authority to the HPRB for all development and
18 historic districts?

19 Finally, the inclusion of residential diversity as a
20 goal of the new zones in the purpose and intent section is not
21 implemented with -- must be implemented with tailored IZ+
22 provisions. What does the statement and the purpose and the
23 intent section which states that a goal of rezoning is to
24 accommodate a greater range of residential diversity mean? Does
25 it mean more lower income households? Does it mean more black

1 households? OP didn't support ANC 3C when we asked for 20 percent
2 IZ set aside during large track review of Fannie Mae in 4000
3 Wisconsin.

4 (Indiscernible) and the mayor weren't interested in
5 supporting an affordable housing development at Thurman
6 (phonetic). There is no mention of adversity in Chevy Chase
7 zone, but now there is this phrase in the Connecticut Avenue,
8 Wisconsin Avenue rezoning for(indiscernible). It is meaningless
9 unless the Zoning Commission lowers the income maximum for IZ+
10 to enhance the ability of black households to live in the zone
11 area. IZ+ could and should leverage unearned bonus density for
12 more affordable housing. The Zoning Commission has arbitrarily
13 capped the IZ set aside at 18 percent for all the PDR zones no
14 matter how much unearned density is awarded. The cap should be
15 lifted for the Ward 3 zones so that there is measurable public
16 benefit in the form of affordable housing where there are huge
17 increases in density. Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. And if you hold tight.
19 We're going to go to Commissioner Nash. There you go.

20 COMMISSIONER NASH: Can you hear me?

21 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, we can hear you. You may begin.

22 COMMISSIONER NASH: Okay. Chair Hood and the Board for
23 your service, the district, and your time tonight in all endeavor
24 to let you end by 9 p.m. I testify in my capacity as commissioner
25 for SMD-3C-08, which includes much of the Cleveland Park Historic

1 District, and I will limit my testimony to the NMU-8A/CP zone.
2 And I want to stress while I oppose the current OP proposal
3 because it contributes a clear policy that you see in
4 comprehensive plan. I support additional housing and infill
5 density and particularly more affordable housing on Connecticut
6 that sensibly balanced with the "preservation enhancement of the
7 district's historic resources," as the comprehensive plan
8 directs.

9 First, the comp plan is clear. Zoning historic
10 districts shall be consistent with the predominant height and
11 density of contributing buildings. That's policy HP 246, not a
12 suggestion, not discretionary guidelines, not a hand-off to
13 another agency a mandate, but a mandate which the council
14 reaffirmed who had amended the comprehensive plan. OPs on the
15 set-down report affirms this area is what mostly went to story
16 buildings. Yet OP didn't address or even acknowledge HP 246
17 presumably because the proposed own flag would contradict its
18 clear requirements by allowing heights of 75 feet by right, 90
19 feet with penthouse, and potentially still higher with a PUD.

20 That's a massive job, doubling current 40-foot allowed
21 height limits, increasing matter of right to four to eight times
22 prevailing height of most contributing buildings, increasing
23 density by 150 percent, an increase in the FAR from 2 to 5.0.
24 It's simply not consistent with the predominant height and
25 density of contributing buildings on the subject area of the

1 Cleveland Park district, not in isolation, but the predominance
2 not on the entirety of the corridor, not Van Ness or Chevy Chase
3 D.C., but the historic district itself is policy 2.46 directs.

4 Second, context matters. Cleveland Park's commercial
5 strip is an aesthetically unified and unusually intact art deco
6 corridor described in the National Register as one of the best
7 examples in D.C. with the Uptown Theaters as the centerpiece.
8 The deputy SHPO has stated that no other sort of district in the
9 city has this kind of low-scale commercial fabric. If the zones
10 adopted these buildings will be overwhelmed becoming mere
11 pedestals for new construction, and their integrity would be
12 lost.

13 Now some perspective, OP's huge, proposed change in
14 height and density in Cleveland Park with no mandated setback is
15 also significantly exceeds. With former Ward 3 Councilmember
16 Cheh stated it's appropriate infill development, which he voted
17 for the amended comprehensive plan in FLUM. They did view the
18 number of historic contributing structures in the subject blocks
19 of Connecticut Avenue. She believed that resulting infill
20 development comprised of one floor commercial and up to four
21 additional floors of residential is appropriate here as reflected
22 in some four to five story apartment buildings on the edges of
23 the subject area. The scale that's clearly below that permitted
24 by NMU-8A.

25 Third, setbacks. OP's proposal includes no legally

1 required setbacks or stepdowns as others have testified. This
2 is a common established zoning toolkit. The Connecticut Avenue
3 Development Guidelines, which OP cited or advisory guidelines
4 only, informational according to HPRB. They don't carry the
5 force of law, and they're not zoning. That's the purview of the
6 zoning board. Vice Chair Miller and Commissioner Wright had some
7 questions about OP on this.

8 They don't provide minimal clarity to the applicants
9 like zoning board. They don't preempt or preclude HPRB from
10 providing additional setback if they deem it appropriate. But
11 these mere guidelines will be completely meaningless if a bill
12 introduced in the council to curtail HPRB's authority is
13 successful. Without setbacks in zoning, developers can build
14 matter, right, glass boxes flush with the historic facades even
15 on the Uptown Theater. That would erase the visual privacy of
16 these landmarks.

17 Other zones like Chevy Chase D.C. require setbacks, and
18 that's not even in the historic district. At a minimum, the
19 zoning here should mandate a 20-foot front setback for new
20 construction above contributing structures. Bottom line, NMU-8A
21 is huge, inconsistent with the comp plan's clear policy mandate,
22 and would damage the fabric of Cleveland Park's historic
23 commercial district. I urge you to reject OP's proposal or at
24 least approve a zone like MU-5, which would be more consistent
25 with predominant height and density. I support Councilmember

1 Cheh's vision of five stories, and I said so when I ran for the
2 ANC. That would strike a balance as Commissioner Imamura said,
3 which -- with legally binding setbacks to provide more infill
4 housing, affordable housing, while preserving this unique
5 historic risk resource. And thanks again for your consideration.

6 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

7 And I want to thank this panel. Let's see if we have
8 any questions from the commissioners, comments. Let's see.

9 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I would just comment, Mr. Chairman.
10 (Indiscernible). Thank you for your testimony. It's good to see
11 some of my immediate neighbors here. I did ask at the outset,
12 I've referred to some of your testimonies, whether it's regarding
13 potential -- asking the Office of Planning to provide a response
14 in a post-hearing submission about whether it's potential
15 inconsistencies, the setback issue, the IZ formula and affordable
16 housing, so we hope to get more information which -- on that.
17 But appreciate your testimony and that's it, Mr. Chairman. I
18 have no questions.

19 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Anybody else?

20 All right. I don't have any questions, but we heard
21 you loud and clear like we've heard all those in opposition. We
22 appreciate you all coming in and give us a point of view. And
23 with that, I think we can --

24 Ms. Schellin, we don't have anybody else, right?

25 MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir.

1 CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. I want to thank everybody --
2 pro or con, undecided, wherever you were -- and all the work
3 that's been put into this, and we will see where we are. There
4 are a few things that we've asked for. I'm sure our staff and
5 the Office of Planning has heard.

6 And Ms. Schellin, other than that, do we have any dates
7 of when we're going to publicly deliver it so we begin discussing
8 it?

9 MS. SCHELLIN: I would look to the Office of Planning
10 and see how much time they think they need. I know that
11 Commissioner Wright asked for quite a bit of stuff that we don't
12 typically get. So I have to ask OP how much time they need.

13 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Before that, let's go to Commissioner
14 Wright.

15 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: To add to the many things I asked
16 for, I think that we heard a lot about how simply doing IZ+ did
17 not provide a deep enough level of affordability. And I know
18 there are -- there's work that's been done and it may require
19 coordination with DHCD. But when you get into the 30 to 50
20 percent level of affordability -- and I've been involved in a lot
21 of these projects. It typically does require additional
22 subsidies like the HUD program, which is for a both a higher
23 percentage of IZ and also lower levels of affordability, but you
24 get a major, major tax break.

25 So I think in responding to some of the comments that

1 we heard from folks saying we need a deeper level of
2 affordability, I really ask that maybe you work with DHCD and
3 really analyze the economic repercussions of that, because I
4 think, you know, nothing from nothing equals nothing. If we put
5 enough restrictions on the housing that is proposed, we will end
6 up with no housing. So we can be, you know, say, gee, we didn't
7 end up with 60 or 80 or whatever percent AMI, and that's -- you
8 know, that was too low, we may end up with zero units. So I
9 think we have to focus on the economics of what's doable. And I
10 I'm sure folks at DHCD have looked at that. So just another
11 thing to add to the list.

12 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. And I do want us to have a
13 conversation on that unless you all -- whether it's something
14 legal that we need to do or is legislative change or something
15 for us, but that is something that I'm interested in as well. So
16 I just -- want to have a conversation as well, and I'm not sure
17 what the nuances are about doing that, Ms. Brown-Roberts, or what
18 you have to do.

19 I'm not trying to put a whole lot of work because I do
20 know that all the tips is already been mentioned and have to go
21 on the place, so I get that, but I'm just -- we got to make a
22 difference. If we're going to make a difference, it's going to
23 make a difference, it's going to make a difference, and that's
24 where I am.

25 All right. Anybody else? I don't even know what

1 everybody asked for, but, you know, we got a great staff like
2 Office of Planning, the community knows. So we will be able to
3 deliver anything that's missing. We'll just have to ask for it
4 again.

5 MS. SCHELLIN: So Ms. Brown-Roberts --

6 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other -- Maxine.

7 We'll let Ms. Schellin go ahead and finish with what
8 she's doing.

9 MS. SCHELLIN: How much time do you think you need?
10 You've heard what they asked for.

11 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: I think we're going to need, you
12 know, quite a bit of time --

13 MS. SCHELLIN: So January?

14 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: -- with the -- yeah. It's a late
15 January.

16 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. We have a second meeting in
17 January. I can tell you that date. It will be -- the second
18 meeting in January is the 29th.

19 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: 29th. Okay.

20 MS. SCHELLIN: Do you think that would work for you if
21 you submit everything by, say, January 15th?

22 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: That's going to be close.

23 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. So how about the 22nd?

24 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Okay. Let's try for that. Yeah.
25 Let's try that, 22nd.

1 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. So if you can submit everything
2 by the 22nd, and then we can put this on for the 29th at 4 p.m.
3 for proposed.

4 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Okay.

5 MS. SCHELLIN: Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Do we have anything else, Ms.
7 Schellin, on the 29th?

8 MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir.

9 CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. I want to thank everyone
10 for your participation. Also, we beat the 9 o'clock deadline,
11 and I appreciate my colleagues for the last days. I just normally
12 went to 10:30, you know, whatever time it was.

13 The Zoning Commission will meet again on Thursday,
14 December the 4th, 7 -- no, not 7, 4 p.m. Zoning Commission Case
15 24-20 -- I'm sorry. 25-10, Alturas, LLC.

16 So with that, again, I want to thank everyone for
17 participation tonight, and with that, this hearing is adjourned.
18 Good night, everyone.

19 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the
20 record at 9:00 p.m.)

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: DCZC

Date: 12-01-25

Place: Teleconference

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

Chris Hofer
Chris Hofer

Chris Hofer