

GOVERNMENT OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

REGULAR PUBLIC HEARING
CASE NO. 25-03

+ + + + +

MONDAY

FEBRUARY 23, 2026

+ + + + +

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

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

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

OFFICE OF ZONING LEGAL DIVISION STAFF PRESENT:

- BRIAN LAMPERT, ESQUIRE

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

ALSO PRESENT:

CARY KADLECEK, ESQUIRE, Goulston and Storrs
CINDY VONG, ESQUIRE, Goulston and Storrs
AMONI WOODBY, So Others Might Eat (SOME)
MARC FEINSTEIN, Miner Feinstein Architects, LLC
NOELLE WURST, DC Office of Attorney General
ERKIN OZBERK, DC Department of Transportation
SHEPARD BEAMON, DC Office of Planning

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the
Regular Public Hearing held on February 23, 2026.

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

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

Case No. 25-03 - So Others Might Eat (SOME)

Closed Meeting Announcement - Chairman Hood 4

Introduction - Chairman Hood 6

Preliminary Matters 8

Applicant's Case

 Mr. Kadlecek 10

 Ms. Woodby 13

 Mr. Feinstein 17

 Mr. Kadlecek 22

Questions/Comments from Commissioners

 Commissioner Imamura 22

 Commissioner Wright 29

 Vice Chair Miller 33

 Commissioner Stidham 39

 Chairman Hood 39

Presentation by Office of Attorney General - Ms. Wurst 42

Presentation by DDOT - Mr. Ozberk 50

Presentation by OP - Mr. Beamon 54

ANC 7D Report - Vice Chair Miller 57

Applicant's Closing Statement - Mr. Kadlecek 58

Deliberations and Vote by Commissioners 59

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

(4:00 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Good afternoon. This is Zoning Commission -- tonight's case is Zoning Commission Case Number 25-03. I am going to do a closed meeting before I even read into the case. So what I would like to do, let me introduce who's with me: Vice Chair Miller; Commissioner Imamura; Commissioner Wright; again, my name is Anthony Hood, Chairperson; soon to be joined by Commissioner Stidham; and we're also joined by our Office of Zoning Legal Division, Mr. Lampert and our Office of Zoning staff, Ms. Sharon Schellin. Mr. Paul Young will be handling all of our virtual operations.

This is the beginning of an announcement of a closed meeting. The closed meeting will be February the 26th at 3:15 p.m. And what I -- what I'm going to move -- colleagues, let me just say this. The next -- the first agenda item for this evening is a vote for the Commission to hold a closed meeting in executive session on February the 26th, 2026. The session is being held in order for the Commission receive legal advice from its counsel regarding the cases noted on the agenda for the February 26th, 2026 meeting and to preserve attorney-client privilege between the Commission and its attorneys, pursuant to DC Official Code 2-575(b)(4)(A), and to deliberate but not vote on the contested cases, pursuant to DC Official Code 2-575(b)(13). On that agenda will be Zoning Commission Case -- first, we will have an

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

1 | election -- well, we won't really talk about that much, but on
2 | the election of officers will be the Chairman and Vice Chairman.
3 | That election will be on our agenda for this coming Thursday.
4 | Also, Zoning Commission Case, 25-04, Ed Villard map amendment;
5 | for final action, Zoning Commission Case 25-10, Alturas, LLC text
6 | amendment; time extensions -- we have three time extensions,
7 | Zoning Commission Case Number 15-21G, Zoning Commission Case 22-
8 | 16A, and also Zoning Commission Case Number 23-15A. Then we have
9 | proposed action, Zoning Commission Case 24-11 and Zoning
10 | Commission Case 25-08. And under hearing action, we have Zoning
11 | Commission Case 25-15. These are what we'll be scheduled to talk
12 | about. We may not discuss them in length, and I'm saying this
13 | for the record. So, at this time, I would move that we vote on
14 | having a closed meeting. Is there a second?

15 | COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Second.

16 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. It is moved -- it has been
17 | moved and seconded that the Commission hold a closed meeting --
18 | thank you, Commissioner Wright -- that the Commission hold a
19 | closed meeting on February 26th, 2026. Ms. Schellin, would you
20 | do a roll call vote please?

21 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood.

22 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.

23 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Wright.

24 | COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes.

25 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller.

1 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

2 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Imamura.

3 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.

4 MS. SCHELLIN: And Commissioner Stidham hasn't arrived,
5 so the vote is four to zero to one to approve the closed meeting
6 to be held at 3:15 p.m. on the 26th, and that the minus one being
7 Commissioner Stidham not present, not voting. You're on mute,
8 Chairman.

9 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I tried it that way this time.
10 Let's see how that works, and, if not, we'll go back to the other
11 way. Okay. Let's get into zoning. Tonight's case is Zoning
12 Commission Case Number 25-03. Good afternoon, ladies and
13 gentlemen. We are convening and broadcasting this public hearing
14 by video conferencing. My name is Anthony Hood, and I'm joined
15 by Vice Chair Miller, Commissioner Wright and Commissioner
16 Imamura. We'll soon be joined by Commissioner Stidham. We're
17 also joined by the Office of Zoning staff, Ms. Sharon Schellin
18 and Mr. Paul Young -- I want to welcome him back -- who will be
19 handling all of our virtual operations; also, our Office of Zoning
20 Legal Division, Mr. Brian Lampert. I will ask all other to
21 introduce themselves at the appropriate time.

22 The virtual public hearing notice is available on the
23 Office of Zoning's website. This proceeding is being recorded
24 by a court reporter and is also webcast live via Webex and YouTube
25 Live. The video will be available on the Office of Zoning's

1 website after the hearing. Accordingly, all those listening on
2 Webex or by phone will be muted during the hearing and only those
3 who have signed up to testify will be unmuted at the appropriate
4 time. When called, please state your name before providing your
5 testimony. When you are finished speaking, please mute your
6 audio. If you experience difficulty accessing Webex or with your
7 telephone call-in, then please call our OZ Hotline number at 202-
8 727-0789 to receive Webex log-in or call-in instructions or if
9 you have not signed up to testify.

10 All persons planning to testify must sign up in advance
11 and will be called by name at the appropriate time. At the time
12 of sign-up, all participants will complete the oath or
13 affirmation required by Subtitle Z-408.7. If you wish to file
14 written testimony or additional supporting documents during the
15 hearing, then please be prepared to describe and discuss it at
16 the time of your request when testifying. The subject of this
17 evening's hearing is Zoning Commission Case Number 25-03, So
18 Others Might Eat, known as SOME. This is a Voluntary Design
19 Review at Square 1110, Lot 86. Again, today's date is February
20 23rd, 2026. And when we get into it, I would like to start with
21 Commissioner Imamura, if that is not an issue.

22 Okay. The hearing will be conducted in accordance with
23 the provisions of 11-Z DCMR, Chapter 4, as follows. We have
24 preliminary matters; the applicant's case -- the applicant has
25 up to 60 minutes; I'm not sure if they -- I didn't see any

1 opposition, but I may have overlooked it, but -- so let's keep
2 that in respect of the record -- report of other government
3 agencies, the report of the Department of Transportation, report
4 of the Office of Planning, report of the ANC; testimony of
5 organizations and individuals -- organizations, five minutes;
6 individuals, three minutes -- and we'll hear in the order from
7 those who are in support, opposition, or undeclared; then we'll
8 have rebuttal and closing by the Applicant. And, again, this is
9 ANC 6D I believe -- I mean -- I'm sorry -- 7D I believe. So,
10 with that, Ms. Schellin, do we have any preliminary matters?

11 MS. SCHELLIN: Yeah, just very briefly, to give you an
12 update on Commissioner Stidham. She is in a meeting, and she
13 will join us as soon as she can, but she is tied up and she just
14 said she will be here as soon as she can.

15 So, moving on with preliminary matters, at Exhibit 20,
16 the applicant submitted a request for a waiver to accept some
17 additional materials that they filed, which is an updated
18 statement in support, so it's some updated architectural plans.
19 So that is before you first to accept.

20 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any objections to accepting the updated
21 plans?

22 (Commissioners present shake head negatively.)

23 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. No objections.

24 MS. SCHELLIN: And that's because they were filed less
25 than 30 days.

1 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. No objections. I don't see any
2 objections.

3 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. One proffered expert that we did
4 not find on our prior list of approvals, Marc Feinstein, project
5 architect with Miner Feinstein Architects at Exhibit 18, pages 9
6 through 11, for your consideration as an expert.

7 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Give me one second. Okay. Let
8 me --

9 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Mr. Chairman --

10 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioner Imamura.

11 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes. I reviewed Mr. Feinstein's
12 CV, and I don't have a problem and am supportive of him as an
13 expert witness. I did note that he's from Texas A&M, while I am
14 from Texas Tech, so we -- but I won't hold that against him, so
15 I'm interested to get to hear what he says tonight.

16 CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Since he's from Texas A&M
17 and we have one from Texas Tech or wherever -- I might have it
18 reversed, but, anyway -- okay. Well, thank you for examining me.
19 Colleagues, any other objections from anybody?

20 (No response.)

21 CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. We will accept the
22 recommendation on Mr. Feinstein.

23 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay.

24 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Anything else Ms. Schellin?

25 MS. SCHELLIN: Just very briefly. ANC 7D provided a

1 | report at Exhibit -- oops, I lost their exhibit, but they provided
2 | a report in support based on the materials they saw as of July
3 | 2025. Chairman Brian Alcorn or Commissioner Zach Abramowitz --
4 | I'm sure I messed that one up -- have been authorized to
5 | represent. I don't think I see either of them yet. OP's report
6 | at Exhibit 21 recommends approval with conditions. DDOT has a
7 | report a Exhibit 23. So far, they have not signed up to testify.
8 | They had a condition of approval. And then OAG, they are here
9 | to testify and have signed up at Exhibit 22, recommend approval
10 | also, so you'll hear from them later on.

11 | The applicant will probably take 15 to 20 minutes,
12 | maybe less, for their presentation. They are aware that there
13 | is no opposition and that, typically, the Commission likes for
14 | the applicant to hit the highlights and any issues, concerns that
15 | may have been brought up in the agency reports, so they are aware
16 | of that, and they will go from there. I'll leave it up to the
17 | Commission. Thank you.

18 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Schellin. Let's
19 | bring -- Mr. Kadlecek and everybody can come up. We do know the
20 | mission that SOME -- what SOME does. I think the mission is very
21 | focused -- laser-focused exactly on helping, and what they're
22 | doing is definitely a well-needed operation. So let's see where
23 | we are from here. So Mr. Kadlecek, once you get up, you can
24 | introduce everybody, and we can get started.

25 | MR. KADLECEK: Good afternoon, members of the

1 Commission. Cary Kadlecek from the law firm of Goulston and
2 Storrs on behalf of the applicant, SOME. With me, behind me, is
3 my colleague, Cindy Vong. I'll let the other members of the --
4 of the team introduce themselves as they speak, so I'll just go
5 ahead and start, give you a brief introduction, and, as Ms.
6 Schellin noted, we'll try to keep this brief and just hit the
7 highlights of the application.

8 Amoni Woodby from SOME will provide more details on the
9 application and a bit of the history, but just briefly, for some
10 context, as the Commission probably already knows, SOME provides
11 housing and continuing-care services for individuals who
12 previously experienced homelessness.

13 The subject property in this case, known as Jeremiah
14 House, is improved with a three-story building that was
15 originally constructed as an apartment house in 1925. However,
16 it has been a rooming house with 59 rooming units since 1993,
17 though it is currently vacant, and SOME has operated it as the
18 rooming house since 1993.

19 Due to SOME's programmatic needs changing to better
20 serve its clients in the current environment, SOME now proposes
21 to convert the building into an all-affordable apartment house
22 with approximately 61 efficiency apartments, which is only an
23 increase of two units from what's currently there. Converting
24 the room units into efficiency apartments, however, each with
25 their own kitchen and bathroom, will require that the units be

1 larger than their current footprint, which is what necessitates
2 an expansion of the building to accommodate approximately the
3 same number of residents.

4 However, due to the property being in the RF-1 zone and
5 the resulting complexities and types of relief necessary for
6 converting into and expanding an apartment building, the pathways
7 to entitling this project are very limited. Accordingly, we are
8 requesting this approval of Voluntary Design Review, or VDR,
9 because it allows us to efficiently bundle multiple forms of
10 relief into the same application, thereby enabling the Commission
11 to consider the proposed project in its entirety, instead of
12 piecemeal.

13 This VDR application includes the development standard
14 flexibility for height and rear yard. In addition, this
15 application includes two special exceptions and three variance,
16 all of which are described and justified in detail in our written
17 filings. Notably, most of the special exceptions and variances
18 are technicalities resulting from the change from rooming house
19 to apartment house, not resulting from the building expansion and
20 nominal increase of approximately two units and residents.

21 We are pleased to have the Office of Planning's report
22 recommending approval at Exhibit 21; DDOT's report confirming no
23 objection to approval at Exhibit 23; ANC 7D's letter in support
24 at Exhibit 27; as well as support from OAG at Exhibit 22.
25 Briefly, just regarding OP's proposed conditions, we agree that

1 the number of apartments will be no less than the current number
2 of rooming units, so the project will have a proposed range of
3 59 to 64 efficiency apartments. Regarding DDOT's proposed
4 condition that 20 long-term bicycle parking spaces be provided,
5 we note that the project will provide the zoning requirement of
6 five long-term spaces, but, unfortunately, accommodating 20
7 spaces is not feasible, due to the adverse impact on the potential
8 number of apartments that can be accommodated in the building,
9 and Mr. Feinstein can elaborate a bit more on that. But, with
10 that, I will hand it over to Amoni Woodby from SOME.

11 MS. WOODBY: Thank you. Good afternoon, Chairman and
12 members of the Zoning Commissioner. My name is Amoni Woodby and
13 I am the Senior Housing Development Project Manager with SOME,
14 So Others Might Eat. I just want to thank you for the opportunity
15 to speak with you today regarding the proposed conversion of
16 Jeremiah House.

17 Before discussing the project, I'd just like to briefly
18 provide some context on SOME, our organization, the organization
19 that owns and operates Jeremiah House. So SOME, So Others Might
20 Eat, is a Washington, DC-based nonprofit organization that has
21 served the District for more than 50 years. Our mission is to
22 meet the immediate needs of our individual experiencing
23 homelessness and poverty, while supporting long-term stability
24 and independence. We provide a continuum of services, including
25 affordable housing, supportive housing, healthcare, behavioral

1 health services, employment training, workforce development, case
2 management, and supportive services. We also are an experienced
3 developer -- affordable housing developer and a long-term owner
4 and operator. We own and manage over a thousand units of
5 affordable and supportive housing across the District. We serve
6 a range of income levels, including individuals with the greatest
7 housing and service needs. Our approach is long-term stewardship.
8 We do not develop housing to sell or to exit. We reinvest in
9 our properties to insure that they remain safe, affordable, and,
10 of course, well managed.

11 Jeremiah House is one of those. It's part of the long-
12 term commitment that we have. And this proposed conversion allows
13 us to responsibly modernize an aging building while continuing
14 to serve our District residents with dignity and, of course,
15 stability. In terms of Jeremiah House, it's currently operated
16 as a single-room-occupancy building, and that's been happening
17 since 1993, and it's been serving individuals earning between
18 zero and 30 percent AMI.

19 So SOME has owned and operated Jeremiah House for
20 decades, using it as part of our broader mission to provide
21 stability, housing, paired with supportive services for single
22 adults who are exiting homelessness or have some housing
23 instability. The current building, as it is, the physical
24 configuration, doesn't -- it's outdated. It has an outdated
25 model, one that no longer aligns with our practices for health,

1 safety, and, of course, long-term housing stability. So the
2 proposed project will be converting the Jeremiah House from the
3 SRO building into approximately 61 units, give or take, studio
4 apartments. Every unit will be a hundred percent affordable. It
5 will be serving residents earning at or below the 50 percent AMI
6 tier, and every unit will be equipped with that private kitchen
7 and the private bathroom. This conversion represents a
8 significant upgrade for the quality of life for our residents for
9 dignity, and, of course, making sure we continue to look at the
10 health and outcomes of the future residents.

11 As to why this conversion is necessary, so two
12 things -- two primary reasons: one, the building, itself, the
13 large majority of renovations for Jeremiah House -- again, we've
14 had this building for 30 years. The building's a bit outdated
15 with the outdated mechanical systems, electrical systems,
16 accessibility improvements, some life safety issues. As simple
17 as it puts, just a simple repair or a partial renovation, it's
18 just not adequate. Secondly, one of the critical things is,
19 during COVID, we have a public health lessons learned, and that --
20 during the pandemic, we realized that SRO buildings with the
21 shared kitchens and the shared bathrooms just posed serious
22 health risks for us, particularly for our vulnerable population.
23 Of course, infection control, isolation, basic hygiene were far
24 more difficult to manage, so this project directly responds to
25 those lessons learned, so it eliminates those shared kitchens and

1 | bathrooms, provides private living spaces that support the health
2 | and safety of our residents, and then, of course, it aligns with,
3 | like, a more modern housing standard.

4 | As relates to community, while each resident, they'll
5 | still maintain community and we'll foster that community, because
6 | we'll have the shared common areas, the laundry facilities, we'll
7 | have some on-site services and programs for them. We will
8 | continue to provide, case by case, case management services,
9 | behavioral health support; any type of connections that they need
10 | to healthcare and appointment resources, we'll continue to
11 | provide that.

12 | I also want to note that Jeremiah House is currently
13 | vacant. We've moved all our residents into our other housing,
14 | so no one has been displaced from this project redesign. And
15 | then I also want to highlight that we have ANC support, so we've
16 | been going -- having these conversations with the ANC, so we do
17 | have that support from them.

18 | And then, in terms of alignment with the District
19 | goals, I just want to mention that what we're doing is perfectly
20 | aligned with the District. It's preserving and expanding
21 | affordable housing; it's converting outdated housing models; it's
22 | responding to our public health realities; and, of course, it's
23 | just advancing the District goals in general. So, in closing,
24 | this conversion is not simply a renovation. We believe it's a
25 | necessary evolution of Jeremiah House. It reflects what we have

1 | learned, what residents deserve, and how we, at SOME, can be
2 | responsible for our residents and our most vulnerable population.
3 | So I want to say thank you for your time and your consideration,
4 | and I'm happy to answer any questions. So I'll turn this over
5 | to Marc Feinstein.

6 | MR. FEINSTEIN: Hi. Good afternoon, everybody. My
7 | name is Mark Feinstein. I'm with Miner Feinstein Architects, and
8 | also with Texas A&M, I guess. First, to tell you a little bit
9 | about Miner Feinstein, we've been around since 19 -- sorry --
10 | 2009, and we've, over those years, designed and renovated
11 | thousands of affordable housing units in and around Washington,
12 | DC, so doing this type of work is kind of what we do, and we're
13 | grateful for -- to work with SOME and, hopefully, move forward
14 | with this project.

15 | So if you can move forward the slides deck to the
16 | vicinity context map, and I'll try to be brief with the -- talking
17 | about the project. So just to locate everybody, we're talking
18 | about Jeremiah House, which is on 18th Street and East Capitol
19 | on the corner of those two, the southeast corner. So you can
20 | see RFK or the remnants of RFK to the east, Eastern Senior High
21 | School directly to the north, and then just the neighborhood
22 | around it.

23 | Next slide please. So you see Jeremiah here, and then
24 | across it is the large high school, and directly to the west,
25 | across the street, you can see the apartment complex that is kind

1 of our precedent for what we're trying to do with the additional
2 story that we're planning to do with this property.

3 Next slide please. Talk a little bit about the zoning.
4 As Cary was saying, we're looking to provide approximately 61
5 units. Existing there are 59, so it's a similar unit total as
6 what is currently there. If we were not to provide this
7 additional story of housing, it would wind up being approximately
8 47 units of housing that could be provided on the -- in this
9 building to -- if we wanted to keep the model of doing every unit
10 to have its own studio, kitchen, and bathroom, so we'd be losing
11 a lot of housing units, should we not be able to do this
12 additional story.

13 Additionally, about the parking -- the bicycle parking
14 on site, 20 bicycle parking spaces equates to -- when you factor
15 in the accessibility, equates to about 250 square feet, which is
16 approximately the average square foot of one of our units, so we
17 truly would be sacrificing a unit for the bicycle parking, so
18 that's why we're looking to only provide the zoning-mandated five
19 permanent spaces.

20 Next slide please. Some more context to give you an
21 idea of what the scale of the property is in relation to its
22 immediate neighbors. You can see how the high school, not just
23 in terms of scale of the building, but also in terms of the
24 location on top of a hill, kind of dwarfs the surrounding --
25 immediate surrounding area.

1 Next slide please. Just showing how the proximity to
2 existing public transportation and the street context around
3 there, so it's a great location for what we're trying to achieve,
4 and it's been that way for a long time for SOME, so we're just --
5 this modernization, hopefully, will enhance the ability to
6 continue the programs and continue the focus that SOME has
7 provided for so many years.

8 Next slide please. We've already kind of talked about
9 the zoning in the immediate slide, so next slide please. Some
10 context photos, just to give you an idea of what's around it.
11 Next please. This is the existing property as it is right now,
12 so it's four stories. There's -- the existing entrance is not
13 accessible, so that's one of the things we're talking about today,
14 is providing a small ramp at the entrance to allow for
15 accessibility into the property.

16 Next please. This is the -- along East Capitol. You'll
17 see the benches -- where the park benches are and that fence.
18 That's actually public space that's not part of our property, but
19 it's been used as such and it's part of our landscaping plan. As
20 you can see, we'll -- we're trying to beautify -- utilize and
21 beautify that space as well. And the entrance along 18th Street,
22 you'll see in the left photo there, that does not have an
23 accessible entry.

24 Next slide please. So the -- adding that additional
25 story, it plays off of the apartment building that's just a half

1 a block down on the west. Next please. And this is kind of what
2 the rendering will look like, so we're -- we have a pretty
3 handsome building. The existing structure is a masonry structure
4 that's one of those classic 20th century masonry handsome
5 buildings. So we're looking to accentuate, just so the new story
6 will not fight with the existing building, but will kind of play
7 off of it using different materials, so it's not trying to copy
8 what's there, but trying to just keep the scale similar, keep the
9 window locations similar, while appearing to be of today's time.

10 Next please. And, as I was talking about before, that
11 property that's -- the public property that's directly adjacent
12 to East Capitol, we're going to utilize that for some of our
13 outdoor space. The area in the court that's -- we'll -- that is
14 where the secondary means of egress currently is, will just kind
15 of be maintained as such, and it will be where trash is picked
16 up. There's no parking associated with it; that's more just a
17 utility space. And then -- and directly on the -- at the west
18 entrance, we're introducing that small ramp to allow for
19 accessible entrance to the -- to the building.

20 Next please. So the red is the property line itself,
21 so we are intruding on public space along both 18th Street and
22 East Capitol with what we're planning to do.

23 Next please. This is the elevation along 18th Street.
24 So you can see the high school that's on the left there, across
25 East Capitol. And then as you go into -- further onto 18th

1 Street -- I guess it'll be south, you get more of a residential
2 rowhouse community there, but our building is more focused a
3 little bit along East Capitol, so -- the next slide please -- you
4 can see here, scalewise, we are very much kind of with the same --
5 playing with the same scale as the apartment building that's a
6 half a block directly to the west, so it's the same number of
7 stories. And as you'll see on the -- on the images ahead, it's
8 basically a similar-looking design, as we're trying to kind of
9 make the community feel as -- you know, as one, to some degree.

10 So next slide please. So, on the right, you can see
11 our building with the -- rendered with the additional story, and
12 then you can see directly to the right of that, what that
13 apartment complex currently looks like. So while it's -- while
14 it's not a copy, there's a -- there's a precedent we're looking
15 to play off of a little bit, and it's something that we think is
16 an attractive building. It's something we think that plays with
17 the existing masonry very well, while not competing with it, and
18 we think it'll -- will work very well within that neighborhood
19 context.

20 Next please. And some just quick elevations as we're
21 walking around the building, so we'll go through this quick.
22 This is the 18th Street elevation. Next please. This is the
23 East Capitol elevation. Next please. This is the alleyway
24 elevation facing west, and next, please, is the alleyway
25 elevation facing north.

1 Next slide please. I will pass it back to Cary. Thank
2 you very much for your time. If you have any questions, please
3 don't hesitate to ask.

4 MR. KADLECEK: Thanks, Marc. And this is just a quick
5 summary of the relief that's being requested as part of this
6 application. I won't go through everything, but just here for
7 your reference. As mentioned, we're seeking Voluntary Design
8 Review approval under 604 and the related flexibility and special
9 exception relief. As described in the application materials in
10 the record and then through the testimony presented here today,
11 this application, when viewed through a racial equity lens, is
12 not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan and otherwise
13 satisfies the standards for approval of Voluntary Design Review,
14 as well as the general special exception and variance standards.
15 Of course, if anyone has questions about the particular relief
16 we're seeking, happy to answer those, but, with that, we will
17 conclude our presentation and are happy and available to answer
18 any questions. Thank you for your time this afternoon.

19 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Mr. Kadlecek and to the team
20 for being very straight to the point. Again, let's see if we
21 have any questions or comments. Commissioner Imamura, if you
22 could start us off please?

23 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My
24 first comment -- and I do have just a couple questions. My first
25 comment is for Ms. Woodby. Ms. Woodby, you did a fantastic job,

1 and you have a very important job, and this is a very important
2 project, and so I'm delighted that -- appreciate the time and
3 effort that you all put into coming before the Commission tonight,
4 so I just wanted to remark on your preparation, so job well done
5 tonight.

6 MS. WOODBY: Thank you.

7 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: And I wanted to also comment
8 on -- I understood, Mr. Kadlecek, that you're in agreement with
9 OP and DDOT, so thank you for highlighting that. I did want to
10 ask, before we get into the architecture part of this -- I guess
11 this might be for Ms. Woodby or anybody else on the team -- sort
12 of the relocation plan. I understand that none of the tenants
13 are there now and have been relocated elsewhere. And I just
14 wanted to ask if you could elaborate on the right of return a
15 little bit more and what that plan looks like.

16 MS. WOODBY: Yeah. So we are going to give our tenants,
17 obviously, the option to come back into the Jeremiah House space.
18 We will also provide them with a \$500 relocation stipend, so that
19 we can help them come back into the unit. So that's pretty
20 much -- we're just offering them those opportunities.

21 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Okay. Great. Thank you. In
22 general, I think I'm in agreement with the flexibility on height
23 and rear yard and your special exceptions and your variance in
24 the VDR here, so I don't see anything -- I think it's pretty
25 straightforward, and, given the program of this project, I think

1 | it all makes sense. I do have a couple questions for Mr.
2 | Feinstein. So I noticed that there were some new plans that were
3 | uploaded into the record and just wanted to ask if you could
4 | elaborate on what those revisions were from the last set of
5 | drawings that were uploaded, if there was anything significant
6 | or substantial that were -- that was changed.

7 | MR. FEINSTEIN: I don't believe so. I mean, we've been
8 | just cleaning up some of the inconsistencies, I believe, as part
9 | of the new uploads. It wasn't any fundamental changes to what
10 | we're trying to achieve here.

11 | COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Okay.

12 | MR. KADLECEK: Yeah, I can just interject quickly. A
13 | lot of it was just adding some labels and more descriptions to
14 | the plans, at the request of the Office of Planning, but, in
15 | terms of the design, it didn't change.

16 | COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Okay. Thank you. I didn't see
17 | anything significant, so we just want to put that out there.
18 | Appreciate the highlight on the accessibility issue and bringing
19 | that to light. I guess to circle back to Ms. Woodby's comment,
20 | I took a little note there about the COVID lessons learned, and
21 | I think that's probably important.

22 | And, Mr. Feinstein, you had mentioned, if we don't do
23 | the fourth-story addition, that brings the unit number -- unit
24 | count down to 47, which is a pretty significant loss, I think,
25 | so -- and I think the goal here is at least 61, right?

1 MR. FEINSTEIN: (Nods head affirmatively.)

2 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: So -- and your current count is
3 59. I do appreciate the fact that you provided some neighborhood
4 context, in terms of the fourth story, and I would say it's
5 complimentary to the apartment building that's nearby, so I
6 certainly appreciate that. I guess what I'd like to hear from
7 you, both as part of the architecture and then just north of the
8 site, itself, or south of East Capitol there, is just a little
9 bit about the landscape, but tell me a little more about the
10 materiality of that fourth story. I do also want to acknowledge
11 and appreciate the effort, architecturally, to match the window
12 fenestration -- the windows and the fenestrations with the
13 existing building, itself, so I think that's pretty successful,
14 but tell me a little bit more about the materiality.

15 MR. FEINSTEIN: Yeah, we were planning to utilize a
16 cementitious siding, like a Hardie panel, that type of material,
17 so it would be a contemporary material against the existing
18 masonry.

19 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Okay. I did notice some of the
20 design flexibility that's been requested is sustainable features.
21 Can you go into detail a bit more about that?

22 MR. FEINSTEIN: Well, some of the sustainability we're
23 looking to achieve is, typically, with the -- with the funding
24 that's required, they require -- whether it be Enterprise Green
25 Communities approval or another GPS approval. So, with that,

1 sometimes there's changes to introducing some new louvers and
2 things like that, as -- into the existing masonry. So you're
3 looking at -- for instance, for -- we're adding new cooking, so
4 that there will be an exhaust from this cooking that will
5 introduce new louvers, bathroom exhaust, that sort of thing that
6 we're -- we would -- we're not there yet, in terms of the design
7 and how that's going to impact it, but it will be mild changes
8 to the existing elevation as a result of that, as an example.

9 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: All right. Thank you very much,
10 Mr. Feinstein. The last question I have is the -- is about the
11 set of picnic benches and trees. And so I don't know if we can
12 pull that slide back up, but it might be easier to talk through.
13 I understand this isn't really part of your property, but do
14 appreciate the effort there to provide some kind of outdoor space.
15 It just seems a little flat to me, and I wanted to ask if you
16 could just kind of walk through what the design thinking was
17 behind the trees. And I understand, I guess, as we're looking
18 north plan -- I guess north is on plan north here, right?

19 MR. FEINSTEIN: Correct.

20 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: So the location of the trees,
21 I'm not sure -- and I know we called them shade trees -- aren't
22 really providing much shade for the intended picnic benches
23 there, but I guess that's why I wanted to find out a little bit
24 more about what your design intent is back there.

25 MR. FEINSTEIN: Again, I think it's --

1 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: And maybe (indiscernible) right
2 of that. I don't know what slide that's on.

3 MR. FEINSTEIN: I think it's the previous slide to
4 what's on there currently. There it is.

5 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yeah.

6 MR. FEINSTEIN: I think you're right in pointing that
7 out. It is kind of a little bit flat. I think it's the least
8 developed of what we're trying to achieve as of now. The idea
9 is to just provide a usable space for the residents that provides
10 some privacy from the -- from the street, so the trees were meant
11 to provide somewhat of a -- a little bit of a private gathering
12 area, be it picnic benches or some other seating area that could
13 be there, but you are correct. This is a concept, because that
14 will -- obviously, with it being a public space, it's going to
15 go through some reviews with the public space approval and
16 everything like that, but, yeah, the idea is to provide separate
17 areas of gathering for the residents, so that's what this slide
18 is trying to show.

19 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: So I appreciate your
20 acknowledgement of that and I thought maybe that was the intent
21 behind where you located your trees, to provide some privacy
22 perhaps from East Capitol, but we know that the understory there,
23 that the trees and -- you know, it's not really going to provide
24 the privacy, I think, that's intended there, so, you know, maybe
25 some type of shrubbery or, you know, the outdoor -- I don't need

1 | to say this, Mr. Feinstein, because you already know this, but,
2 | you know, the outdoor space is just as important as the indoor
3 | space, and so I don't see that this has been fully developed to
4 | the same level that the architectural features and interior space
5 | planning has been developed. And so I would encourage you all
6 | to spend a little more time on that. And I understand it's going
7 | to go through public space review, but I think we can do better
8 | and we can do more, right, and especially if -- maybe specify the
9 | species of the tree. I know it's generic to call it a shade
10 | tree, but then that just highlights the fact that they're not
11 | providing any shade when they're on the north side there. So I
12 | would just encourage you to spend a little more time on the
13 | landscape component of that.

14 | MR. FEINSTEIN: Certainly. Understood.

15 | COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Outside of that, I think, in
16 | terms of the materiality, color, and every other -- all the other
17 | design flexibility requests that are made, I don't seem to have
18 | an issue with. Oh, I do have one more question about the 20
19 | long-term parking -- bicycle parking and asking for five to meet
20 | the requirements there. So, Mr. Feinstein, how many -- I
21 | understand that the 20 is approximately the same size as one
22 | unit, and, certainly, nobody wants to give up one unit for
23 | bicycles. That makes sense. How many can we -- can we actually
24 | fit into the program?

25 | MR. FEINSTEIN: We -- I mean, we were trying to see how

1 many more we could get, other than the five, without sacrificing
2 whether it be a unit, obviously, which we talked about, or some
3 other common area functional space, and with mailboxes and things
4 like that, that we're adding that take up more space than what
5 currently is used for mailboxes and other elements that keep
6 growing the program of the interior space, so we could probably,
7 if we -- if we really tried to maneuver things around a little
8 bit, maybe pick up one or two additional ones, but five was the --
9 where we were comfortably.

10 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: All right. Well, I'd like to
11 see you pick up maybe another one or two. I know that creates a
12 Rubik's Cube of sorts, in terms of space planning. I understand
13 that. I'm just asking maybe that you take another look at that,
14 along with the landscape there, because there are intended, what,
15 61 units, so it would be great to have a few more, I think, at
16 least. So, all right, with that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back and
17 want to thank the applicant.

18 MS. WOODYBY: Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Commissioner Imamura.
20 Commissioner Wright, any questions or comments?

21 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Well, Commissioner Imamura
22 covered pretty much everything that I would have raised. I think
23 this is a good project and a good design solution, and I
24 appreciate the effort to create studio units rather than the
25 single-room occupancy. And I -- you know, all in all, I think

1 | it's great. My only -- I just want to sort of pick up where
2 | Commissioner Imamura left off on the bicycle parking. I think
3 | that, again, this is very close to the RFK Metro Station, and I
4 | do understand, as stated in your application, that many of your
5 | residents probably do not own cars, and so there is a lot of good
6 | reasoning for giving the special exception to not require any
7 | vehicular parking.

8 | I am a little concerned about the difference between
9 | 20 spaces and five spaces, and I do understand the five spaces
10 | are what's technically required, because you only have to provide
11 | bicycle spaces for the additional square footage that you're --
12 | that you're adding to the building, but I sort of would imagine
13 | that a number of your residents very well may have bicycles and
14 | that that's -- that that's important.

15 | I was looking at the first-floor plan and I see where
16 | you have your bicycle parking spaces right now, but, I have to
17 | admit, there appears to be other potential spaces where
18 | additional bicycle parking could be created on the first floor
19 | or possibly even on the cellar floor. I understand they'd have
20 | to bring their bikes down to the cellar on the elevator, but I
21 | also wondered, you know, again, that the spaces that you have
22 | shown appear to be all horizontal spaces rather than -- which,
23 | again, I know that is something that DDOT prefers -- rather than
24 | vertical spaces of sort of bikes hung, you know, to the -- on
25 | the walls and that sort of thing. I guess I would just say

1 that -- I mean, what I read DDOT's letter to say was that they
2 recommend approval of this plan, but it was conditional on
3 providing more bicycle parking, so I do think that there needs
4 to be another effort to look at providing, again, maybe not the
5 full 20 spaces, but I would hope you could get at least to 10,
6 again, whether that's with additional space or with a different
7 kind of bicycle mounting device, so that you can, you know,
8 perhaps even in the space you have, try to double up the number
9 of bicycles that end up being in the space. So I just want to
10 basically sort of reinforce that I think that that's very
11 important.

12 You aren't doing a -- you aren't required to do a
13 Traffic Demand Management Plan for this project, which, again,
14 many 61 apartment projects with no parking would be required to
15 do a TDM, and I think DDOT was just saying, you know, we aren't
16 going to require this, if you can give us some more parking --
17 some more bicycle parking spaces. So I just think that that's
18 important, and I think it is the kind of facility that probably
19 would be helpful to your clients, so that's my only comment
20 really. I just -- I think the bicycle parking is important.

21 MR. FEINSTEIN: I do have one question about that, if
22 that's okay.

23 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yeah. Let me just finish by
24 saying, I think what you've done with the exterior architecture
25 is very nice, and I think, you know, doing the Hardie -- the

1 vertical Hardie plank, which definitely is very different than
2 the brick on the rest of the building, you know, clearly
3 differentiates the new addition from the older building and
4 mimics some of the colors of the newer apartment building down
5 the block, and so I did want to sort of say kudos on that. I
6 think it's -- I think it's a good solution.

7 MR. FEINSTEIN: Thank you. I did have a question about
8 the bicycle parking. And there is potential for exterior --
9 additional exterior parking in the -- in the courtyard, and we
10 could -- it could be -- there are exterior bike storage
11 facilities that could be utilized as an opportunity, rather than
12 take space from the -- from the inside. We could probably
13 definitely get more space -- more bicycle parking that way, if
14 that would be acceptable.

15 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: I mean, I think that's also a
16 good idea. I mean, I would try, honestly, to do a little of
17 both. If you can get a couple more spaces on the inside and then
18 some bike lockers on the outside, and you might even -- maybe the
19 bike lockers don't end up being in the green space, because
20 that's, like, pretty obvious. It looks like it's the back of
21 the building, where you have an exterior small ramp staircase in
22 the L of the building --

23 MR. FEINSTEIN: Yeah. Right. Right.

24 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: -- that you might be able to put
25 some bike lockers -- you probably have trash cans and other

1 | things back there too, but, you know, maybe some bike lockers
2 | back there would also be -- would be a good idea.

3 | MR. FEINSTEIN: Okay. Thank you.

4 | COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: That's all I have. Thanks.

5 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. I'm going to come
6 | back to you, Commissioner Stidham. I know you just -- you've
7 | joined us, but Vice Chair Miller.

8 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank
9 | you to the So Others Might Eat team, Amoni Woodby and Marc
10 | Feinstein and Cary Kadlecek and all the -- all those who've helped
11 | put this together and all of your efforts, SOME, over five decades
12 | of service -- public service to the District of Columbia
13 | community fighting -- addressing the homeless community, poverty,
14 | food scarcity, the whole continuum of care that you -- that you
15 | outlined in your testimony. It's very commendable, and the
16 | District of Columbia certainly appreciates all of your service
17 | over these years.

18 | This is a very attractive design. I think the Voluntary
19 | Design Review was an appropriate mechanism for you to pursue all
20 | of these reliefs from various requirements where you need special
21 | exception or variance relief from certain requirements. It's
22 | an -- it's an unusual property in an RF zone, but I think the
23 | current property is compatible with the zone, and I think the
24 | addition that you've added of the additional floor is compatible
25 | with the character of the neighborhood, so -- and I think you've

1 met the standards of review for the relief that's being requested
2 under those various variance and special exception requests.

3 So I just had a couple of questions on the tenant
4 relocation and right of return that you -- everybody you said has
5 been relocated, I guess, who wanted to be relocated. I don't
6 know if all of them wanted to be relocated, but -- and you said
7 they're in other of your facilities. Just out of curiosity,
8 where -- which of the -- where are the other -- or what are sort
9 of some of the other facilities? I wasn't even familiar -- I'm
10 sorry to say, I wasn't familiar even with Jeremiah House, even
11 though it's been there for so long.

12 MS. WOODYBY: Yeah. So we have our latest building,
13 which is 1515 North Capitol. We have 139 units there, and which
14 is a brand new building. It was built a few years ago, like
15 three years ago. And so the majority of our residents moved to,
16 like, our 1515 building, but, as I mentioned earlier, we have
17 over a thousand units in our portfolio, so we -- they've -- we've
18 relocated to Shalom House. We have another building that is 59
19 units; they relocated to that particular building. So it's just
20 scattered throughout our portfolio, yeah, and they have the
21 opportunity to come back, once the building is up and running.

22 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Right. And is most of your
23 housing -- is it transitional short-term housing or is it -- some
24 of it long-term or longer-term housing, just because of the
25 various natures of the population?

1 MS. WOODEBY: Yeah, most of it -- we have a hybrid. Of
2 course, a lot of our residents love our buildings, so they
3 typically stay a little bit longer than expected. We also have
4 two other buildings that we have, which is 4111 Kansas; that's a
5 new building. And we have 2607 Connecticut; folks have moved
6 into that big building as well. Those are brand new buildings
7 that people could move into, and we have folks that moved in
8 there. So it's a hybrid we've seen.

9 VICE CHAIR MILLER: And I see that, you know, the
10 current -- or the pre-existing population was zero to 30 percent
11 Median Family Income, and what you're -- this isn't really part
12 of Voluntary Design Review, but these are just my questions. And
13 I see that you're proposing less than 50 percent Median Family
14 Income, each of which far exceed our inclusionary zoning
15 requirements, both on the set-aside and on the affordability
16 levels, but I just wonder what the change -- what the difference
17 is. You have a -- you probably have multiple populations that
18 you're trying to serve.

19 MS. WOODEBY: Yes. A lot of folks, unfortunately, when
20 they pick up -- like, for example, if you pick up an extra few
21 hours, that will put you over the threshold, and we all know,
22 even if you pick up a few extra hours, that doesn't stabilize
23 you, and so that was kicking folks out of the income band. So
24 what we did was increase that band slightly for the folks that
25 were just kind of taking like an extra hour here and there, and

1 that allows them to stay in the housing, so that was part of the
2 thinking and making sure we're being very mindful of -- like, we
3 want to make sure you have a job, we want to make sure you're,
4 you know, pushing yourself towards sustainability, but we also
5 understand that there's some hurdles in that area. So that was
6 really like to identify that, or that was really to rectify that
7 hurdle there, so that people can stay in our housing.

8 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Well, thank you for all of those
9 responses. And just on that point, while we're on the income
10 levels, Mr. Kadlecek, I think in your applicant's statement you
11 say that -- I think there's some statement about being exempt
12 from IZ zoning, because you do exceed the -- all the requirements
13 by far, but is that really necessary? I'm not sure how we zone
14 this in a Voluntary Design Review, but is it necessary to exempt
15 it from IZ, so, in perpetuity, this building doesn't get converted
16 at some point to --

17 MR. KADLECEK: Yeah.

18 VICE CHAIR MILLER: -- the little 12 percent set-aside
19 that we require in (indiscernible) or 20 percent under IZ Plus?
20 What was -- what was the meaning of that exemption?

21 MR. KADLECEK: Well, yeah, it's exempt, because it's
22 publicly financed, and so Ms. Woodley can speak a little bit more
23 to that, but I believe that that financing has a different scheme
24 for administration, and so if it is subject to IZ, that sometimes
25 creates a conflict with these otherwise affordable projects --

1 all-affordable projects, because of the financing scheme. I
2 believe there's an affordability covenant that's recorded on the
3 property for that -- for that level of affordability and type of
4 affordability, but if I'm speaking out of turn, Amoni, please let
5 me know.

6 MS. WOODYBY: You're correct.

7 MR. KADLECEK: So there is an affordability -- I
8 believe it's affordable in perpetuity; it's just not the IZ
9 scheme.

10 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Thank you. So it's District
11 financing and federal financing?

12 MS. WOODYBY: We'll be using LIHTC. Yeah, LIHTC has
13 been working with DHCD to get financing there.

14 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. All of this has nothing to
15 do with Voluntary Design Review, but it does factor into my own
16 consideration and I think my colleagues' consideration. And I
17 appreciate my colleagues' questions. They've really covered all
18 of the relevant questions. I would just say on the bike issue,
19 the five is what Office of Planning and DDOT recognizes the
20 minimum required for the long-term biking -- bike spaces, and I
21 guess there's two short-term as well required under that -- under
22 the requirements, and you're providing those or -- is that
23 correct? Yes, I see Ms. --

24 MR. KADLECEK: Yeah, we're providing the zoning -- the
25 zoning requirement currently.

1 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Right. And I assume that there are
2 no bike spaces currently provided, but maybe I'm wrong. Are
3 there any bike spaces previously provided when there were tenants
4 there?

5 MR. FEINSTEIN: No, there were not.

6 MS. WOODBY: No.

7 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yeah. Well, just from my own
8 perspective, I would not want one inch of housing to be
9 compromised or one unit to be compromised by having to provide
10 additional beyond the minimum. I think my colleagues have pointed
11 out areas where there is -- and you've acknowledged areas that
12 they can be perhaps added to, but I would not want one inch of
13 this affordable housing to be -- to be given up for that also
14 very important goal, but not as important.

15 And the open space -- and putting it -- that open space
16 is so attractive in the front. Bike lockers are not usually very
17 attractive. I would not want -- I wouldn't want -- I think that's
18 a very important factor, the streetscape for the neighborhood,
19 the compatibility, so I really would not necessarily want it
20 located in that open space courtyard, but this is just my own
21 personal opinion. It just -- it's -- that's part of what makes
22 your building, currently and as proposed, compatible with the
23 neighborhood. So I don't have any further questions. If you
24 have any further comments in response to my comments, you're
25 welcome to make them, but I thank you for all of your time and

1 effort on this project.

2 MS. WOODYBY: Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Vice Chair Miller.
4 Commissioner Stidham, you ready or you want me to go first?

5 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: No, I'm ready.

6 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Go right ahead.

7 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: First of all, apologies for my
8 tardiness. I just couldn't help it, so I'm very sorry that I
9 missed your presentation, but I have been through the entire
10 record, and it seems like I joined at a great time, because some
11 of my questions have already been asked and answered related to
12 the bike parking. And the relocation was really one of my big
13 questions, and I think you've done a great job of answering those.

14 I do think it's a very handsome addition to this very
15 beautiful building and very complimentary of the neighborhood,
16 so thank you for your efforts there. And, just lastly, I have
17 to agree with Vice Chair Miller. I would not want this to be in
18 the front of the -- any bike lockers to be in the front of the
19 building, nor would I want any inch of available housing to be
20 used up for bike parking. I appreciate the need, I appreciate
21 the goal, but, really, the most important thing is the housing
22 and the level of housing that you offer that really serves so
23 many needy communities. So just, overall, thank you for all of
24 your work.

25 MS. WOODYBY: Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN HOOD: I, too, want to echo what I've heard
2 from my colleagues. I appreciate all of the questions that have
3 been asked and the dialogue that I've heard. But when -- as I
4 was hearing some of the conversations, I'd like the major -- I
5 don't like the major on the minor, and I don't like the minor on
6 the major. What I'm hearing -- what I've heard from Ms. Woodby --
7 and I want to thank you, Ms. Woodby, for -- I want to stay focused
8 on the mission, and I think that's why you all have done a
9 Voluntary Design Review, so we can ask for more reliefs, and as
10 Mr. Kadlecek opened up about not bifurcating. And I would agree
11 with the Vice Chair; I don't want to lose not one inch of all
12 the good things that need to be done, so I want to stay focused
13 on what we're trying to achieve here. What I understand about
14 the bicycles -- and this is where I'm going to come to you, Ms.
15 Woodby -- I'm just curious, do a lot of the participants or those
16 who need these services, do they have a lot of bicycles?

17 MS. WOODBY: They do not.

18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yeah. So that's what I'm saying, I
19 want to major on the major and not minor on the major -- and not
20 minor on it. And I would hope that we would build for the future
21 and I would hope to aspire, but I think -- when I know what the
22 mission of SOME has been over the years, just to do what you're
23 doing here -- and I've read the letter in the record about keeping
24 the character and the facade of the area, and I think you all
25 have done this. It's a well done design. But I would agree --

1 I would -- for me -- and I know I'm only one vote, but I would
2 encourage us, because we want to stay focused on the mission.
3 And, you know, people -- and, Ms. Woodby, correct me if I'm
4 wrong -- people who are in a situation like that, we strive
5 to -- one thing about Washington, DC, we're always striving to
6 help, and organizations like SOME have been doing it for years.
7 But when you're in that situation, do you think -- and I'm going
8 to ask you this, Ms. Woodby -- are they worried about a bicycle?

9 MS. WOODBY: They are not worried about bicycles. And
10 I could just give you one example. We have a 139-unit building
11 and no one uses the bike -- bicycle space, and that's just --
12 it's just a waste of space, and we just want to utilize that
13 space for the -- for the actual need.

14 CHAIRMAN HOOD: And at some point in time, when we --
15 they get stable and able to go out and do what they need to do,
16 I think the focus will change, and I just -- I've heard the
17 conversation, and I saw the DDOT report, but that's where I'm at,
18 and I know I'm only one vote, but it sounds like I at least four
19 or three. Anyway, we're going to move forward. Any follow-up
20 questions or comments from anybody? Thank you -- thank you, Ms.
21 Woodby. And Mr. Feinstein, great design. I think you've handled
22 the gentleman -- I can't think of his name -- the gentleman who
23 talked about the character or something he mentioned in his
24 letter, and I appreciate the letter, because I think you've done
25 exactly what's he's -- what he's requested, so thank you, not to

1 mention Texas A&M and Texas -- I'm not going to go to that. But,
2 anyway, Commissioner Imamura, you have an additional question,
3 Commissioner Imamura, or comment?

4 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Nothing further to add. Thank
5 you, Mr. Chairman.

6 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right. I thought I saw you
7 waving your hand. Maybe I'm seeing things. But, anyway, all
8 right. Okay. Ms. Schellin, do we have anyone from the ANC? Let
9 me ask you this, Vice Chair. Could you get ready for the ANC
10 report, just in case?

11 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Let me find it.

12 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Schellin --

13 MS. SCHELLIN: I -- yeah, I do not see either of the
14 Commissioners that were named to represent the ANC.

15 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Okay. Well, good. Let's go
16 to -- let's go to Office of Attorney General then. Ms. Wurst,
17 you may begin, whenever you're ready.

18 MS. WURST: One moment. All right. There we go. All
19 right. Thank you, Paul. So good evening, members of the
20 Commission. My name is Noelle Wurst, and I am here representing
21 the Office of the Attorney General to testify in support of this
22 project. These slides can be found on Exhibit 25, and we have a
23 written testimony, which I'll explain a little later. It goes
24 into a little bit more depth on the various VDR elements, and
25 that can be found at Exhibit 22. Next please. So, here, OAG

1 | does recommend that the Zoning Commission approve the proposed
2 | VDR, since the provision of, you know, about 61 modernized units
3 | for low-income households essentially converting from, as we
4 | know, the single-room occupancy model to one that's much more
5 | comfortable, fosters more privacy, both furthers the public
6 | interest in affordable housing in the District and satisfies the
7 | requirements for design review, special exception relief, and
8 | variance relief.

9 | Next please. So it's true that a VDR doesn't typically
10 | involve the balancing test of, you know, the process like the
11 | Planned Unit Development, you know, where public benefits are
12 | used to outweigh potential inconsistencies with the Comp Plan,
13 | but I would like to note that the Zoning Commission would still
14 | find that the proposed project is not inconsistent with the Comp
15 | Plan. So here we wanted to highlight two, you know, groups of
16 | policies here that are especially pertinent to this project, so
17 | the first of which being the Comp Plan's call in addressing the
18 | District's affordable housing crisis, and, as we know, you know,
19 | the rising housing costs driven by rising housing demand has
20 | created a very pressing and critical issue for the District.

21 | Now, in order to address this, the Comp Plan does
22 | incentivize and promote the use of various zoning processes and
23 | incentives, such as through the VDR process, to raise by-right
24 | height and density limits. And, of course, in turn, increased
25 | density supports greater affordable housing set-asides, which,

1 | in this case, since it's an all-affordable project, you know,
2 | instead, we're looking to rather expand the capacity of rooms in
3 | absolute terms. Then the second category of which is relevant
4 | here is addressing the need for more housing around Metro stations
5 | and other transit nodes and corridors. So the Comp Plan states
6 | that new affordable and market-rate housing should be located
7 | near Metrorail stations, and this will help reduce transportation
8 | costs and ultimately increase the affordability of an area for
9 | its residents.

10 | And, furthermore, this supports and enhances various
11 | community amenities, like neighborhood-servicing retail, with
12 | increased pedestrian traffic. And I'd also like to note that
13 | this is being done in the background of the, you know, upcoming
14 | and, you know, looming, if you will, RFK stadium development,
15 | which shows that it's even more critical to, you know, insure
16 | that there's sufficient affordable housing in the area, as that
17 | development, you know, begins and unfolds over time.

18 | So next please. So the Comprehensive Plan maps would
19 | also support development of this type on this property. So the
20 | property is an area designated for moderate-density residential
21 | development, and there is no -- there is no maximum FAR in the
22 | zone in which the property is located, but the one constraint
23 | here is that, you know, buildings in the RF-1 zone are permitted
24 | a maximum height of 50 feet, and this proposed building will be
25 | only 46 feet, so this is below both that maximum height limit

1 and is, otherwise, you know, consistent with the type of
2 flexibility that could otherwise be given by a -- given to a PUD
3 in this same zone. And, of course, as the renderings point out,
4 this, you know, height and ultimate massing of the project is,
5 you know, fairly consistent with the building's surrounding
6 context, which, of course, fits into the GPM designation as well.

7 So while the property is located in a Neighborhood
8 Conservation Area, the Comp Plan does allow, you know, change
9 that is modest in scale and does anticipate some new development
10 and reuse opportunities. It doesn't preclude development,
11 particularly, to address citywide housing needs, which this
12 project certainly would do. And, once again, according to the
13 renderings, this is a project that does fit in very well with
14 the neighborhood context, given its, you know, height in feet,
15 given its story count, given the surrounding context.

16 So, from there, I'll go ahead and move on to some more
17 specifics of the relief requested, so next slide please. Yeah.
18 So, as I mentioned before, our written filing does go into a
19 little more depth as to what precisely the VDR requirements would
20 be. And, since our office's expertise tends to lie in, you know,
21 advancement of the public interest, we wanted to pay special
22 attention to one of the requirements here, which is that the
23 applicant must demonstrate the relief can be granted without
24 substantial detriment to the public good and without impairing
25 the intent, purpose, and integrity of the zone plan, and we see

1 | this is being ultimately expressed through the Comprehensive Plan
2 | and maps as well. So, you know, we ultimately do conclude that
3 | the proposed flexibility and variance relief are not inconsistent
4 | with and, in fact, do advance the Comp Plan's goals.

5 | So next please. In the next few slides, we'll just go
6 | into a little bit of detail about how the requested flexibility
7 | and relief does support the public good, as, you know, advanced
8 | through the Comp Plan policies and maps I touched on earlier.
9 | So, in terms of building height, as I mentioned, this is
10 | consistent with the VDR's limits on height flexibility vis a vis
11 | the PUD limits as well, and it does not exceed the general scale
12 | of the surrounding neighborhood.

13 | As for the rear-yard flexibility, while the building
14 | can't easily be modified without reducing the number of
15 | affordable units, and since the VDR's goal is to just, you know,
16 | essentially add a floor on top and not, you know, otherwise modify
17 | the building plate, this is a very fair type of flexibility to
18 | give. So, taken together, granting flexibility with these would
19 | support the public good by allowing the proposed floor plans to
20 | maximize the amount of affordable housing onsite.

21 | Next please. So, in terms of special exception relief,
22 | here we have the conversion of an existing residential building
23 | from single-room-occupancy rooming house to an apartment
24 | building, you know. And, here, as the applicant has stated, this
25 | is a very, like, creative and positive creation and expansion and

1 modernization of affordable housing, not only providing more
2 units overall, but providing some additional amenities that
3 weren't present and help facilitate quality of life for the
4 residents.

5 And as for the minimum parking relief, I understand we
6 had a lengthy conversation on the provision of bike spaces, but
7 I wanted to focus for just a moment on the car parking spaces.
8 So we do highlight that the site is physically constrained. You
9 know, it would be very difficult to carve out additional parking
10 spaces. It is well served by transit, including Metrorail,
11 several bus lines, and other modes. Additionally, as SOME's
12 representatives pointed out, that there's not as much demand for
13 parking among the residents currently. So, in all, you know,
14 that does facilitate additional space, not giving, you know, a
15 single inch of this development away to, you know, expanding any
16 sort of parking onsite and reserving it for the expansion of
17 these units.

18 Next please. And just a little more in depth is the
19 ways in which the variance relief does support the public good
20 as well. So, as for the minimum area requirement, this is a bit
21 similar to the previous slide, in which, you know, the strict
22 application of zoning regulations and to the minimum land area
23 per dwelling unit as well, would pose practical difficulty
24 because the building predated the 1958 zoning regulations. So
25 allowing both of those to, you know, receive relief would, you

1 know -- wouldn't, you know, produce any sort of a detriment or
2 impairment to the public good and, as with the other requested
3 flexibility, would, in fact, allow for more space to be dedicated
4 to the units.

5 Similarly to the parking requirements, waiving the
6 requirement for a TDM would also be efficient, in the sense that
7 there's minimal change in parking demand and it has a possibility
8 of posing a practical difficulty, as it ultimately detracts
9 resources away from other aspects of the development as well.

10 So next please. Yeah, so taking a look at all those
11 forms of relief and flexibility required, once again, OAG
12 recommends that the Zoning Commission approves the VDR. You
13 know, as I've mentioned several times, it does align with numerous
14 Comp Plan policies, additional ones listed in our written filing,
15 advancing the public good through creative expansion and
16 modernization of housing. And, not only that, it also satisfies
17 the more technical requirements for design flexibility, variance
18 relief, and special exception relief. So that concludes my
19 presentation, and I welcome any questions that you all might
20 have. Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Wurst. If we
22 could take that down, I want to looking at my colleagues to see
23 if anybody has any questions or comments.

24 (No response.)

25 CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. No questions, no comments.

1 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I would -- I would just thank
2 Noelle Wurst again for a very concise presentation that not only
3 covered the standards of review being satisfied for the Voluntary
4 Design Review and the special exception and variance, but
5 mentioning the Comprehensive Plan affordable housing policies,
6 which I neglected to mention, so I appreciate your mentioning
7 that.

8 MS. WURST: Yes. Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN HOOD: And thank you, Vice Chair Miller. As
10 I -- as I said in front of the City Council the other day, you
11 always thank people in support or opposition. So what was the
12 statement, I still -- I thought about the statement. The
13 statement was made that we don't thank the people in opposition.
14 We do all the time. And, as I said there and I'll say here, you
15 do that all the time, so thank you, and continue to do that. The
16 tapes -- like I said, just watch the tapes. So, anyway, thank
17 you, Vice Chair Miller. Ms. Wurst, thank you for your --

18 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you. I hope the videotape
19 confirms that.

20 CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'm sure it does. It sit here and I
21 witness -- we witness it, so I know what goes on. All right.
22 Thank you, Ms. Wurst.

23 MS. WURST: No, we appreciate your work, Commissioner
24 Miller, so thank you.

25 CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Let's go to DDOT. Ms.

1 Schellin, I don't think we have DDOT here. We know the main
2 issue with DDOT was about the bikes, and we can discuss that
3 during deliberations.

4 MS. SCHELLIN: I do not see any -- oh, wait a second.
5 Erkin Ozberk is on now.

6 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, Mr. Ozberk. Okay. Come right up,
7 Mr. Ozberk.

8 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. He had not signed up earlier.
9 There you go.

10 CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. You can begin, Mr. Ozberk.

11 MR. OZBERK: Good evening. Yeah, I can't turn my camera
12 on, but that's okay. Oh, there I am. Good evening, Chairman
13 Hood and members of the Commission. For the record, my name's
14 Erkin Ozberk with the District Department of Transportation. So
15 DDOT is supportive of the applicant's design review application.
16 In our February 13th, 2026 report, which is in the record as
17 Exhibit 23, we recommended approval with one condition, providing
18 the 20 long-term bicycle parking spaces within the building. And
19 while I missed part of the earlier applicant's presentation --
20 my apologies -- I did hear the Commissioner's deliberations on
21 the requested condition a few minutes ago, and just wanted to
22 state that we appreciate all the uses in this development that
23 are trying to balance within its envelope, so we really have
24 nothing more to add there, beyond just clarifying that this
25 request was made in the spirit of insuring that all residents

1 have facilities in their homes that provide them with
2 transportation options for accessing the range of opportunities
3 across our city. So thank you and happy to answer any questions,
4 but I understand this item's been discussed, and we agree with
5 that.

6 CHAIRMAN HOOD: It has. Mr. Ozberk, thank you, and you
7 have been -- I haven't had to go back at you, but I'm not going
8 to go back at you either now, because I appreciate the work that
9 you do, but let me just ask you this. The way it was written
10 and it was alluded -- the way -- I read it differently. Was that
11 a showstopper for you all -- for DDOT? That's not a showstopper.
12 It doesn't -- it doesn't mean you take away all your support.

13 MR. OZBERK: Correct. I would -- I would -- that's
14 correct.

15 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. That's all I need to know.

16 MR. OZBERK: Yeah, and I -- when we're reviewing these
17 applications sometimes, we recognize that design can be influx
18 sometimes, and, where there is space for these facilities, we
19 want to make sure that they can be provided, but we also recognize
20 that in a project like this, where space is at a premium and as
21 was discussed, there are a lot of competing uses, tradeoffs have
22 to be made. So we understand that's sort of part of your
23 deliberation process, but we still have a responsibility to put
24 forward what we think would be helpful from a transportation
25 perspective for the public.

1 CHAIRMAN HOOD: I appreciate it, and you all always do,
2 so thank you, Mr. Ozberk. Let's see if we have any other
3 questions or comments from anybody -- my colleagues? No
4 questions? Looking, looking.

5 (No response.)

6 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Vice Chair Miller, you want to thank
7 him?

8 VICE CHAIR MILLER: You did it for me, so I didn't have
9 to do it, but --

10 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank yous don't matter -- don't count.

11 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I would just say that I saw the
12 renderings of the -- the illustrations of the current and
13 proposed efficiencies that are going to be in this building, and
14 I don't know if there's an elevator in this building, but there's
15 room for a bike, if a resident wants to bring a bike up to their
16 room and have long-term biking there -- long-term space there.
17 Even though they're small, there was room. There was TVs in the
18 room. There's a kitchen in the room. So, anyway, I just would
19 add that. Probably gratuitous. Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well, you know, I heard that mentioned
21 earlier, but, you know, we had one case where -- I forget -- it
22 may be some years ago and I know things have changed -- where
23 the applicant -- or one of the things were -- one of the
24 requirements were you could not take the -- put the bike on the
25 elevator. That's why they had it downstairs. This was a whole

1 other development. So, I guess, again, it depends, as Mr. Ozberk
2 mentioned, but I remember, specifically, they could not put the
3 bike on the elevator. Maybe they could do it on the freight
4 elevator, but not on the elevator. Anyway, I'm getting -- I'm
5 bringing --

6 MR. OZBERK: And maybe not necessarily related to this
7 case, but, in general, we've seen, you know, with electric
8 bicycles, they're getting a little bit heavier, a little bit
9 bulkier, and so those might not always be the easiest thing to
10 keep in your home or to transport on the elevator up to your
11 unit, but they are increasingly very helpful for people to access
12 employment across the city and, also, as a source of employment,
13 whether that's food delivery or other things. And so, as we're
14 seeing more of these in our city, we want to make sure that there
15 is the right kind of space for them in our buildings that
16 encourages and really enables them to be used. They're also kind
17 of expensive, and so people have concerns about theft, again, not
18 necessarily related to this case, in particular, but as I think
19 you all know, this a recurring request of ours, and we always
20 want to make sure we're rationalizing for you all why these
21 requests are made.

22 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right. Any other questions,
23 colleagues?

24 (No response.)

25 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not seeing any. Again, Mr. Ozberk, we

1 | thank you for your report. All right. Let's go to the Office
2 | of Planning. Mr. Beamon, whenever you're ready.

3 | MR. BEAMON: So good afternoon, Commissioners. For the
4 | record, Shepard Beamon with the Office of Planning. OP recommends
5 | that the Commission approve the Voluntary Design Review
6 | application and the associated zoning relief and design
7 | flexibility. OP finds that the application generally meets the
8 | design review criteria for Subtitle X, Chapter 6, and can largely
9 | rest on the record of our written report.

10 | The proposed design review for the conversion of 59-
11 | unit rooming house to a 61-unit apartment house includes
12 | requested flexibility and relief from the building height, rear
13 | yard, unit count, exterior and interior details, site design, and
14 | parking requirements. OP finds that the applicant has met the
15 | criteria for the requested special exception and variance relief.
16 | As stated in our report, we do not believe that the penthouse
17 | relief is needed, and the applicant has removed that. However,
18 | if it is determined at some point that it is still required, then
19 | OP is in support of that as well.

20 | OP is in support of the requested unit count
21 | flexibility on the condition that there is no decrease from the
22 | current total unit count of 59 units. We also encourage the
23 | applicant to provide the minimum number of shade trees, as shown
24 | on the site plan. However, OP -- we understand that this may
25 | need to change, due to review by the Public Space Committee.

1 And, actually, I'm sorry, I had a presentation in the record, if
2 we can pull that up, Exhibit 28.

3 (PowerPoint presentation shared on screen.)

4 MR. BEAMON: Thank you. And next slide please. The
5 proposal would not be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan
6 maps and other adopted policies. The Future Land Use Map
7 indicates that this site is appropriate for moderate-density
8 residential, which could include existing multistory apartments
9 built decades ago, when those areas were zoned for more dense
10 uses, While the Generalized Policy Map shows the site as a
11 Neighborhood Conservative (sic) -- Neighborhood Conservation
12 Area, which aims to conserve and enhance established
13 neighborhood, but not preclude development that could address
14 citywide housing issues.

15 Next slide please. When evaluated through a racial
16 equity lens, the proposal would not be inconsistent with the
17 Comprehensive Plan and would uphold relevant policies, including
18 policies related to land use, housing, transportation, and the
19 Capitol Hill Area Elements.

20 The proposed renovations and modernization would
21 continue to offer affordable rental housing in a high-cost area
22 near Metrorail stations and along Metro bus routes. The proposal
23 should not result in a loss of housing units or displacement of
24 tenants, and the proposed single-occupant apartment units could
25 offer lower housing and utility costs, more privacy and

1 independent living, less maintenance, and serve as the beginning
2 of transitional housing choices for individuals. The proposed
3 conversion should not result in a significant change in the
4 physical environment and should not result in indirect
5 displacement of residents. The proposed expansion could result
6 in temporary displacement of tenants during the construction. As
7 the applicant has noted, the property is currently vacant, and
8 residents who previously lived there were relocated to other
9 buildings owned and operated by SOME. The applicant has also
10 indicated that those residents will be given the chance -- the
11 choice to return to the building once construction is complete.
12 The applicant has met with ANC 7D, who have submitted their letter
13 of support to the record. And, with that, I will conclude and
14 take any questions.

15 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Mr. Beamon. Mr. Young --
16 yeah, thank you. I appreciate your report, and we always
17 appreciate the work that you put into it, so thank you. Let me
18 ask -- I'm looking -- I'm looking at my colleagues. Anybody have
19 any questions of the Office of Planning?

20 (All Commissioners shake head negatively.)

21 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So far I see all nos. Okay.
22 All right. Thank you, again, Mr. Beamon. We appreciate it.
23 Okay. Ms. Schellin, is anyone here representing the ANC? If
24 not, I'll go to the ANC rep on the Commission.

25 MS. SCHELLIN: Again, looking, I do not see anyone from

1 the -- either of the named individuals here.

2 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Well, Vice Chair Miller, could
3 you help us with the ANC report please?

4 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Well, as Ms. Schellin mentioned at
5 the outset, we do have a letter at Exhibit 27, a letter addressed
6 to the Zoning Commission from Brian Alcorn, the Chairman of ANC
7 7D, dated February 3rd, 2026, which says at their regularly-
8 scheduled properly noticed meeting on July 8th, 2025, their
9 Commission voted seven to zero to zero to support this case.
10 Specifically, the Commission voted to support the design review
11 concept application proposing to renovate and expand an existing
12 building and to conform it from a nonconforming rooming house
13 with 57 units to a residential apartment building with 61 units.
14 And, as Ms. Schellin, stated, although they -- their letter
15 states they have not -- they're aware -- their letter states that
16 they're aware that there have been updates since that -- their
17 review and that they have made no comment on those updates. So
18 they are in -- ANC 7D is in support of this application.

19 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Vice Chair Miller. We want
20 to thank ANC 7D, Brian Alcorn and the whole ANC, for all the work
21 they put into it as well. All right. So thanks, Vice Chair
22 Miller. Let's -- Ms. Schellin, do we have anyone who's here in
23 support, opposition, or undeclared?

24 MS. SCHELLIN: Let me check the list one more time.
25 There is no one in any category.

1 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Schellin. All
2 right. So what we'll do, we'll go back now -- Mr. Kadlecek, do
3 you have any rebuttal or any closing?

4 MR. KADLECEK: Nothing significant. I appreciate the
5 Commission's time this afternoon on this case and listening to
6 all of our arguments and testimony. As stated, we believe that
7 the application meets the standards for approval of the Voluntary
8 Design Review and the various special exception and variance
9 relief, and we conclude with what we've already said. So we
10 thank you again for your time and look forward to the Commission's
11 deliberation and vote on this matter.

12 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Kadlecek, you know, I should stay
13 focused on my mission, but I just want to ask you, you introduced
14 the young person behind you -- young lady behind you. If I had
15 a question for her, how is that going to work? Is she going to
16 get up and come around here or is she going to up there? How is
17 that going to work?

18 MR. KADLECEK: That's a great question, and it's
19 something we have struggled with for years, since these hearings
20 have been virtual, on how to make it so that we're all together.
21 This is my colleague Cindy. Apologies if I didn't introduce here
22 at the beginning. I thought I had, so I'm sorry for that. Cindy
23 Vong is my colleague here.

24 CHAIRMAN HOOD: No, you introduced her. I just wanted
25 to know if I had a question for her, how that was gong to work,

1 | but, anyway, that's totally off in left field. That shouldn't
2 | even have been brought up, but I did, so thank you. Thank you,
3 | Mr. Kadlecek, and also to the team, for your presentation tonight.
4 | Let's see what my -- well, this afternoon, or almost evening.
5 | Let's see, colleagues. Any follow-up questions from my colleagues
6 | for anybody?

7 | (No response.)

8 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right. So I think we --
9 | what we can do -- we've closed the record on this case. I think
10 | we can deliberate, unless I hear any objections.

11 | (No response.)

12 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I know the BZA usually takes
13 | everybody down, but we can leave everybody up, just in case we
14 | have any questions as we move forward. I've heard some of the
15 | concerns about maybe the bicycle parking, and you heard my concern
16 | on it. I think this is pretty well flavored, as far as I'm
17 | concerned, to move forward, because I look at the mission that
18 | we're trying to accomplish here; I look listen to the OAG, and I
19 | look at -- to me, the mission, the focus, and the benefits of
20 | what helps the city to help those who are less fortunate or
21 | whatever the case is, I think, outweigh some of the things that
22 | we have in front of us. It might not all be tied into zoning,
23 | but sometimes zoning is a way of life, the way I've always --
24 | and Mr. -- the former mayor for life told me that when I first
25 | got on the Commission. Zoning is -- it impacts your lives, and

1 I think this is a strong case that verifies exactly what he said
2 to me. And I think they also -- for the Voluntary Review, I
3 think they have basically satisfied the different reliefs that
4 were requested, and I will be voting in favor of this. I don't
5 see anything in this record that gives me any pause or any
6 opposition, but I know others may have something -- may have some
7 issues. And we can deliberate about the bike piece, if you would
8 like. So let me to go Vice -- I mean, Commissioner Imamura.

9 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm
10 comfortable moving forward in support of this important project.
11 In light of the testimony provided by Ms. Woodby about the bicycle
12 storage use, I think that -- you know, I think that maybe the
13 architect, Mr. Feinstein, can probably find one or two more spots
14 perhaps, but my focus is really on the exterior, and I think
15 there's certainly room for improvement there, but nothing of my
16 requests or asks should actually put a hold or a stop to the
17 project moving forward, so I'm ready to approve this case.

18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Thank you. Commissioner
19 Wright.

20 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yeah, I'm ready to vote in favor
21 of it as well. I just don't think we should sort of roll over
22 on saying, you know, okay, we'll just take five bike spaces. I
23 think that it's worth our while to encourage and push. You know,
24 obviously, the very -- the architect is very creative and very
25 good, and just see if you can get a few more spaces, whether they

1 | be, you know, in the building or bike lockers in the back of the
2 | building, not in the green space. I just -- you know, I think
3 | if you don't ask you don't get, so -- and I don't think there's
4 | any intention with that to reduce the number of units, to make
5 | the project impossible to build. I mean, we're talking about a
6 | very minor issue here, so I'm definitely ready to vote in favor.
7 | I still would encourage the architect and the applicant to see
8 | if they can find a few more bike storage units.

9 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Commissioner Wright. And I
10 | don't -- I don't disagree, but, anyway -- all right. Let's go
11 | with Commissioner Stidham.

12 | COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Thank you. I am, frankly,
13 | willing to forego the bike requirement in this instance. It's
14 | just not applicable here, and it's great to push goals and
15 | standards, but it also is most appropriate to be sure that it's
16 | consistent with what is being proposed as well. So I'm prepared
17 | to support and am willing to let the bike parking go.

18 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Commissioner Stidham. I
19 | don't disagree with you either. Vice Chair Miller.

20 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman, and
21 | thank you to all my colleagues and to the team -- applicant's
22 | team and to all of -- the ANC and others who gave us input on
23 | this project. I strongly support this case going forward, and
24 | I'm prepared to make a motion to approve it, if you want me to,
25 | Mr. Chairman.

1 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Go right ahead.

2 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I would move that the Zoning
3 Commission approve Zoning Commission Case Number 25-03, So Others
4 Might Eat, SOME, Voluntary Design Review at Square 1110, Lot
5 86 -- I think that's at Number Two 18th Street Southeast,
6 Square -- I think I said the Square already and the Lot, so I
7 ask for a second.

8 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Second.

9 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. It's been moved and properly
10 seconded. I thank everyone for the motion and second. It's been
11 moved and properly seconded. Any further discussion?

12 (No response.)

13 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing any, Ms. Schellin, would
14 you do a roll call vote please?

15 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.

16 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Hold on. Vice Chair, did I leave
17 something out?

18 VICE CHAIR MILLER: No. I was just getting ready to
19 hit my unmute button.

20 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, okay. All right. Ms. Schellin,
21 would you do a roll call vote please?

22 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Commissioner Miller.

23 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

24 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Stidham.

25 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes.

1 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood.

2 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.

3 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Wright.

4 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes.

5 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Imamura.

6 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.

7 MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is five to zero to zero to
8 approve final action in Zoning Commission Case Number 25-03. And
9 I would ask if a summary order is appropriate, if OZLD agrees.
10 You guys are good? Okay. Thank you. Two weeks.

11 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Ms. Schellin, do we have anything
12 else before us this evening?

13 MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir.

14 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So before I close out, the Zoning
15 Commission will meet again -- I keep looking at my calendar --
16 the 26th. We've already announced the closed meeting at 3:15,
17 which is this coming Thursday, on various agenda items that were
18 named in the -- in the announcement about the closed meeting.
19 So, with that, I want to thank everyone for their participation
20 this evening. Job well done. Looking forward to continuing to
21 serve the city, as you all have been doing in the past. So thank
22 you all, and, with that, this hearing is adjourned. Good night,
23 everyone.

24 (Whereupon, the above-entitled public hearing was
25 adjourned at 5:37 p.m.)

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

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Public Hearing - Case No. 25-03

Before: DC Zoning Commission

Date: 02-23-26

Place: Webex Videoconference

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



Deborah B. Gauthier