

GOVERNMENT OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

REGULAR PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

THURSDAY

MARCH 12, 2026

+ + + + +

The Public Meeting of the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened via teleconference, pursuant to notice at 4:14 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:

- JACOB RITTING, ESQUIRE
- BRIAN LAMPERT, ESQUIRE

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

- MICHAEL JURKOVIC, DC Office of Planning

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Regular Public Meeting held on March 12, 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. 87-23A
George Washington University 4

Case No. 21-18A
Dance Loft Ventures, LLC 8

Case No. 23-02
Office of Planning 11

Case No. 25-09
Office of Planning 19

Case No. 25-06 33
Office of Planning

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

(4:14 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. We are convening and broadcasting this public meeting by videoconferencing. My name is Anthony Hood, and I'm joined by Vice Chair Miller, Commissioners Wright and Stidham, and we'll be -- soon to be joined by Commissioner Imamura. We're also joined by the Office of Zoning Staff, Ms. Sharon Schellin, and Mr. Paul Young, who will be handling all of our virtual operations, as well as our Office of Zoning Legal Division, Mr. Jacob Ritting and Mr. Brian Lampert. We will ask all others to introduce themselves at the appropriate time, if required. I did call Commissioner Wright's name. Okay.

Also, I just want to inform the public that the Zoning Commission voted by roll call on March the 2nd to hold a closed meeting for the purpose of obtaining legal advice from our counsel and to deliberate, but we have not voted on the contested cases on today's agenda. And you will definitely see that we did not vote on it when we deliberated. So what I will do at this point, I just wanted to make sure we put that out there, as required.

Copies of today's meeting agenda are available on the Office of Zoning's website. Please be advised that this proceeding is being recorded by a court reporter and is also webcast live via Webex and You Tube Live. The video will be available on the Office of Zoning's website after the meeting.

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

1 Accordingly, all those on Webex or by phone will be muted during
2 the meeting.

3 For hearing action items, the only documents before us
4 this evening are the application, the ANC setdown report, and the
5 Office of Planning report. All other documents in the record
6 will be reviewed at the time of the hearing. We do not take any
7 public testimony at our meetings, unless the Commission requests
8 someone to speak. If you experience difficulty accessing Webex
9 or with your phone call-in, then please call our OZ Hotline number
10 at 202-727-0789 for Webex log-in or call-in instructions.

11 At this time, Ms. Schellin, you know, we're going to
12 move the agenda around, because we want to try to wait for
13 Commissioner Imamura. I think what we'll do is we will have --
14 Ms. Schellin, I'm going to ask you call the hearing case first,
15 so I'm hoping everybody's here for the hearing case. And I know,
16 after you call it, Commissioner Wright has a statement to make.

17 MS. SCHELLIN: Sure. Zoning Commission Case Number
18 87-23A, George Washington University, which is a PUD modification
19 with hearing at Square 78, and I believe the -- before we go to
20 the Office of Planning, I'll turn that over.

21 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioner Wright.

22 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes. Thank you. I just wanted
23 to say that I am recusing myself, because I have a family member
24 involved in this case, and so I will not be participating in any
25 aspect of it, and I will turn my camera off and --

1 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. So noted. All right.
2 Mr. Jurkovich, you may begin. Good afternoon.

3 (PowerPoint presentation shared on screen.)

4 MR. JURKOVIC: Good afternoon, and thank you, Chair
5 Hood, and good afternoon to the members of the Zoning Commission.
6 This is Mike Jurkovic, Development Review Specialist with the
7 Office of Planning.

8 OP recommends the Commission set down the requested
9 modification with hearing for Case Number 87-23A at 2001
10 Pennsylvania Avenue Northwest. The proposal would not increase
11 the approved density or height. Instead, the applicant, George
12 Washington University, requests this modification to only their
13 property for which they own within the PUD. Specifically, the
14 applicant requests approval of the identifying signage and a
15 modification of condition two of the existing order to allow a
16 University use within the upper stories and a portion of the
17 existing ground floor. In addition to said items, the applicant
18 also seeks flexibility to the required number of short-term
19 bicycle spaces.

20 We also examined this proposal as it relates to the
21 Comprehensive Plan policy, as viewed through a racial equity
22 lens. From this, we believe that the request is not inconsistent
23 with the Comprehensive Plan. However, OP requests that the
24 applicant provide additional information regarding the specifics
25 of the University uses to better access (sic) -- assess any

1 impacts and address any issues the Commissioner may determine at
2 setdown prior to the public hearing. Accordingly, in summary,
3 OP recommends that the Commission set down the proposed
4 modification with hearing. Thank you, and that concludes my
5 testimony.

6 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Mr. Jurkovic. If we can
7 take that down. I don't necessarily have any questions -- I will
8 stand on the recommendation by the Office of Planning -- but let
9 me see if others do. Commissioner Stidham.

10 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: No questions. I'm prepared to
11 set this down as well.

12 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Vice Chair Miller.

13 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank
14 you, Mr. Jurkovic, for your report. And, yes, I also have no
15 questions and support setting this down for a public hearing.

16 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Commissioner
17 Stidham, would you make a motion to setdown please? You have it
18 in front of you? You're on mute.

19 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: I had scrolled down, or up, I
20 guess. Hang on two seconds. So I make a motion to set down
21 Zoning Case Number 87-23A, George Washington University, PUD
22 modification with hearing at Square 78, and ask for a second.

23 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Second.

24 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. It's been moved and properly
25 seconded. Any further discussion. Again, we want to thank, Mr.

1 Jurkovic for his excellent report. Any further discussion?

2 (No response.)

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

5 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller.

6 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Did you call me?

7 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.

8 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

9 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Stidham.

10 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes.

11 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood.

12 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.

13 MS. SCHELLIN: And Commissioner Wright is not going to
14 participate, and Commissioner Imamura is not here, so the vote
15 is three to zero to two to set down Zoning Commission Case Number
16 87-23A as a contested case, the minus two being Commissioners
17 Imamura, not present, not voting, and, of course, Commissioner
18 Wright, having recused herself. Okay. Where do you want to go
19 next.

20 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yeah, I'd like to go to -- I thought I
21 saw a time extension.

22 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, there is.

23 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yeah, let's do the time extension
24 first.

25 MS. SCHELLIN: You want me to call that or you're going

1 to do that.

2 CHAIRMAN HOOD: No, let's call the time extension
3 please. I'll call it.

4 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. You got it, yeah.

5 CHAIRMAN HOOD: We'll go to time extensions, Zoning
6 Commission Case -- when I move the agenda around, I get mixed up.
7 Let's do the time extensions. Zoning Commission Case Number 21-
8 18A, Dance Loft Ventures, LLC, two-year time extension for
9 consolidated PUD and related map amendment at Square 2704. Ms.
10 Schellin.

11 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. As you stated, this is a time
12 extension request, and this was an amendment -- or I'm sorry --
13 a request, as you stated, for a PUD, and they're asking for a
14 two-year extension to start construction by February 10th, 2028.
15 They did file their building permit already on time back in
16 August -- on August 25th, 2023, which satisfied that time
17 condition of the order to file the building permit by February
18 10th of 2025. And then their justification is that, like most
19 others that we've heard from in the past couple of years, is
20 unable to obtain financing with the elevated interest rates, with
21 construction costs, constraints on the availability of permanent
22 financing on construction -- for construction projects, and the
23 significantly reduced public funding available out there for them
24 to try to take a look at -- or advantage of, rather. So at
25 Exhibit 5, there's an OP report recommending approval. And so,

1 other than that, there are no reports in from the ANC and -- or
2 the other party. I believe there was one other party, but the
3 requisite 30-day comment period has passed, so this can move
4 forward, if the Commission chooses to do so.

5 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Schellin. I believe
6 that you teed it all up. And I do know that -- and we've heard
7 it a lot in recent years, especially in the last two, about
8 financing issues, so I don't have any issues with supporting this
9 as moving forward. So, with that, let me see where my colleagues
10 are. Commissioner Wright, any questions or comments?

11 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: No. I support this time extension.

12 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioner Stidham, any questions or
13 comments?

14 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: No. I also support the time
15 extension.

16 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. And Vice Chair Miller, any
17 questions or comments?

18 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. No, I
19 agree with my colleagues and think that good cause has been
20 demonstrated for this time extension.

21 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I'm going to come back to
22 Commissioner Stidham again and ask if she would make a motion on
23 this case as well.

24 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Absolutely. This time I have
25 not scrolled away. So I so move Zoning Case -- the time extension

1 for Zoning Case Number 21-18A, Dance Loft Ventures, LLC, two-
2 year time extension for a consolidated PUD and related map
3 amendment at Square 2704, and request a second.

4 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Second.

5 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. It's been moved and properly
6 seconded. Any further discussion?

7 (No response.)

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

10 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Stidham.

11 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes.

12 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Wright.

13 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes.

14 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood.

15 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.

16 MS. SCHELLIN: And Commissioner Miller.

17 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

18 MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is four to zero to one to
19 approve final action in Zoning Commission Case Number 21-18A, the
20 minus one being Commissioner Imamura, not present, not voting.
21 And if we could have the applicant provide a draft order within
22 two weeks, that would be great.

23 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Ms. Schellin, I believe that we
24 only have two cases left, right, after this one?

25 MS. SCHELLIN: We have 25-09. We do have a -- 25-06

1 and 25-02. We have three.

2 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Well, let me go -- the third one
3 is alley lots? Is that the one? Hold on. Okay. Let me --

4 MS. SCHELLIN: I'm sorry, 23-02; not 25-02. 23-02 --

5 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Here's what I'd like to do. I'm trying
6 to --

7 MS. SCHELLIN: -- reconsiderations.

8 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yeah, yeah. I got all -- I know about
9 those cases, but I want to make sure we have a full complemented
10 Commission. Let's take about five minutes and come back.

11 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. Sure.

12 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

13 (Brief recess.)

14 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Colleagues, I guess we can start
15 talking through some of this, so if we can come on back up. I
16 don't want to hold the public up too much longer. All right.
17 Ms. Schellin, I'm going to -- we're going start to deliberate on
18 the first case, and I'm going to call it now. This is a motion
19 for a request to reconsider Zoning Commission Case Number 23-02,
20 Office of Planning map amendment at Square 175. Ms. Schellin.

21 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. So, at Exhibit 732, there's
22 a joint motion from -- for reconsideration, although it says
23 joint for reconsideration, they also are requesting a rehearing
24 also, but it's a joint motion from the Black Neighbors of U Street
25 Homeowners. And then at Exhibit 733, the same thing, a motion

1 for reconsideration and rehearing from the Dupont Circle Citizens
2 Association. And at Exhibit 734, there is a response from ANC
3 2B, who really, more or less, is bringing up -- they're the only
4 party that responded -- bringing up a -- the issue of whether
5 DCCA should be providing anything at this point. So I'll turn
6 that over to the Commission to consider these requests. Thank
7 you.

8 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Schellin. And, again,
9 this case is starting to snowball. As Ms. Schellin last mentioned
10 about whether a group that testified and had standing really did
11 have standing and was an organized group. We don't want to -- I
12 don't necessarily want to get into that, but that happens when
13 we have differences of opinions, but I think all of us want the
14 same thing with the best interest of the city. So let me -- I'm
15 going to read it like this, and this -- and I want to open it up
16 to my colleagues.

17 I have reviewed the arguments, and I believe that the
18 points raised were previously rejected by the Commission. Some
19 of them have been raised earlier and some of the ones that they're
20 asking us to do still does not affect the outcome, the way I see
21 it. And as we stated in the order, the Commission approved the
22 map amendment to MU-10, because the MU-10 zone is consistent with
23 many Comprehensive Plan policies, including the Future Land Use
24 Map. Because we reached that conclusion, we held extensive --
25 we've had extensive hearings, extensive cross-examinations of the

1 applicant's witnesses about the appropriateness of the MU-10
2 zoning for the site. And, as my colleagues will remember, the
3 application was that the size of -- was the size of the MU-10
4 rezoned area was reduced. And we reduced that after having
5 extensive conversation to some of the portions of the site
6 retaining the existing MU-4. And I think we did that from what
7 we heard from the community versus what we've heard and our
8 analysis, and some of the community who are some of the ones who
9 are asking us now to reconsider some of the things, I believe,
10 that a number of them pushed for.

11 So we did the MU-4 zoning for the portion removed from
12 the rezoning. This change is completely within the scope of the
13 amendment that was advertised and heard. As a result, interested
14 parties were given the opportunity to present all of their
15 evidence arguments, to cross-examination witnesses before the
16 Commission decided the case. The Commission is not required to
17 even hold a hearing, let alone require additional cross-
18 examination of witnesses to leave the existing zoning unchanged.

19 We understand that the parties filing the motions
20 disagreed with the results. They have -- they do have the right
21 to appeal. Now, we did -- we took all -- now, there are a group
22 that's out there that's very much in support of what we did -- a
23 lot of people who are in support, but we didn't look at -- it
24 was not a numbers game for us. It was about looking at the
25 regulations and interpreting the zoning regs and the

1 Comprehensive Plan, which the city has a lot of input on the
2 Comprehensive Plan as we get to where we are. We came up and we
3 reduced that MU -- all of it from being MU-10 to MU-4 is what we
4 heard from the community. So I think we came up with a win-win
5 compromise, which would be good for the city and good for the
6 residents, and I think some of the things, again, that are being
7 reargued here for this reconsideration and rehearing, I think we
8 have already been down that road, but let me hear from others.
9 Let's see, Commissioner -- let me just hear from -- Commissioner
10 Wright, you have anything you want to add?

11 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: No. I would just say that I
12 agree with you. I think this was a very carefully considered
13 case. There were a number of changes that were made in response
14 to concerns that had been raised by the community, including
15 reducing the area of land that would have the MU-10 zoning and
16 retaining certain areas in the MU-4. There was also a lot of
17 work and effort to work with the community on creating step-backs
18 that would help to address concerns about compatibility with the
19 lower-scale buildings in proximity to this site.

20 There was a lot of conversation, and the comments and
21 suggestions made by the community were carefully considered, and
22 they actually had an impact, and they changed what ultimately got
23 approved in a positive way, I think. So I do not support
24 reconsideration for all of the reasons that the Chair mentioned,
25 and I think that, again, the individuals who are in disagreement

1 have, you know, the right to other processes for expressing their
2 disagreement, but I do believe that reconsideration is not
3 appropriate at this time.

4 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Commissioner Stidham.

5 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: I have to agree with the remarks
6 of Commissioner Wright. We did hear a lot of testimony over a
7 lot of days that really did influence what ended up getting
8 approved, so I do not support reconsideration.

9 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Vice Chair Miller.

10 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I totally
11 agree with all of the comments of my colleagues. Just for the
12 public's edification, this is the 12th and U site that has the
13 police and the fire station that's going to be redeveloped with
14 a modernized police and fire station and a public plaza and mixed-
15 use development with housing and affordable housing, according
16 to our IZ regulations, and maybe even further -- that I can't
17 recall right now at the moment -- the higher standards of the
18 public disposition requirements for affordable housing. But I
19 totally agree.

20 We had 30 hours over five sessions of public hearings
21 on this case. We changed it at the beginning from a rulemaking
22 to a contested case, at the request of those who became parties
23 in opposition, who had extensive opportunity to cross-examine
24 during those early hours of hearings. I think it took up half
25 of the time of the public hearings, which you, Mr. Chairman, were

1 very indulgent about allowing a lot of redundant and, frankly,
2 irrelevant testimony, but we always want to hear from the
3 community. And at the end of the hearing -- at the -- well, they
4 got to -- the Office of Planning submitted I think, at least,
5 maybe two supplemental reports in response to concerns of the
6 community, and our -- the Zoning Commission, which were
7 responsive to the concerns -- some of the concerns that were
8 expressed, adding those -- reducing the size of the MU-10 zoning
9 so that there were 80-foot setbacks from the -- I think it was
10 the V Street low-density residential -- low-scale residential
11 townhomes and the 17th Street residential townhomes, which made
12 a difference.

13 So, at the end of the hearing, they asked us to reopen
14 the hearing and have another hearing. I think we heard everything
15 we need to hear, and there are other processes that -- for those
16 who continue to disagree with the outcome, which was supported,
17 as you say, Mr. Chairman, by others in the community, including
18 the ANC -- the affected ANC. So I do not support opening --
19 reopening this up for reconsideration or for yet another hearing,
20 whether limited scope or not.

21 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Great. Thank you. And I'll just add,
22 you brought up a point, Vice Chair, that I know the office --
23 and I want to thank the office for taking all of that ridicule
24 on me allowing testimony and people -- some people call and
25 complain, as the Vice Chair must mentioned, that I let a lot of

1 | stuff into the record, but people want to be heard, and that's
2 | what this Commission's about. We make sure they're heard, and I
3 | made sure that everyone was heard.

4 | And, at the end of the day, when I analyze this whole
5 | situation, because this case was big for the city -- and when I
6 | analyzed this -- good timing, but when I analyzed this situation,
7 | some of us were not even happy, because I -- you know, some of
8 | us, we know -- but we had to compromise, we had to co-exist, and
9 | we heard the information, we looked at the regulations, and we
10 | came up with the best outcome possible that we could possibly do.
11 | And, you're right, you have other avenues, but I think that's
12 | a -- I think what we have come up with, the Commission, is a win-
13 | win. And does everybody like it? No. But did everybody get
14 | everything they wanted? No, not even the Commissioners, but we
15 | worked with the community and the government agencies and
16 | ourselves, and this is what we came up with in our analyzation.
17 | This is not the only case we deal with, and I think this is a
18 | win-win for the city, and we'll just leave it at that. But I
19 | do -- Commissioner Imamura, I was kind of hoping that you would
20 | come in, because I wanted you to opine on this case, so do you
21 | have any -- and we were just making comments. I read a statement
22 | about how I felt about the -- not rehearing, because I think a
23 | lot of this is being brought up again, some of the things. We
24 | had heard the arguments. The Commission approved -- we approved
25 | the map amendment, how we went from the MU-10 to the MU-4. I

1 know you were very integral -- involved with that, you and others,
2 and I just don't know if -- I wanted to know if you have anything
3 you want to add to the record, and I'll leave it at that.

4 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman
5 for the opportunity to opine, but I'm in agreement with you, and
6 I don't think I have anything further to add to that. We
7 certainly deliberated this at length.

8 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Who did I call on
9 first, or did I go first?

10 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: (Raises hand.)

11 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Commissioner Wright. Would you
12 like to make a motion, Commissioner Wright?

13 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Sure, I would be glad to. Let
14 me get to my agenda. So in the case of the request for
15 reconsideration of Zoning Commission Case Number 23-02, Office
16 of Planning map amendment at Square 175, I move that we do not
17 reconsider this case, and ask for a second.

18 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I would approve the motion to deny
19 the motion for reconsideration.

20 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. It's been move and properly
21 seconded. Any further discussion?

22 (No response.)

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

25 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller.

1 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

2 MS. SCHELLIN: I'm sorry. Commissioner Wright first.

3 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes.

4 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller.

5 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

6 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood.

7 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.

8 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Imamura.

9 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.

10 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Stidham.

11 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes.

12 MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is five to zero to zero to deny

13 the two motions for reconsideration and rehearing in Zoning

14 Commission Case Number 23-02. Thank you. I would ask if OZLD

15 is looking for draft orders to be submitted or will they handle

16 that themselves?

17 MR. RITTING: No draft orders. We'll do it.

18 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let's go to -- one second. My

20 files closed up. Give me one second. Okay. The last case --

21 the last case that we're going to do -- no, not the last one,

22 the next-to-last one. All right. Anyway, let me call it.

23 Proposed action. Zoning Commission Case Number 25-09, Office of

24 Planning text and map amendments to create the Cleveland Park and

25 Woodley Park Neighborhood Mixed-Use zone at Square 2068, 2069,

1 2082, 2202, 2204, and 2218 through 2222. Ms. Schellin.

2 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. So, on this one, the Office
3 of Planning submitted their supplemental report. Commissioner --
4 if you'll remember, Commission Frumin had -- I'm sorry --
5 Councilmember Frumin -- I still think of him back in his ANC
6 days -- but Councilmember Frumin submitted a letter back in
7 January that the Commission considered, where he was asking that
8 the Commission open the record -- reopen the record once OP
9 submitted their report for the public. The ANC 3C submitted a
10 letter, since they were an automatic party, saying -- at Exhibit
11 249, stating that, at their regular meeting, they voted to submit
12 their comments, stating that they expressed strong and
13 unequivocal support for the immediate approval of the case. They
14 were not in support of Commissioner Frumin -- Councilmember
15 Frumin's request. So OP's supplemental report is at Exhibit
16 250 -- or second supplemental, which basically supplemented their
17 initial report, and then they filed, also, a first supplemental.
18 So this is before you now to consider.

19 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Schellin. And,
20 again, this case here is snowballing and it's going in a lot of
21 different directions and it's being exacerbated, so we're going
22 to try to keep control of it. At no time -- and I said this in
23 front of the Council, and I'll say this again before I turn it
24 over to Commissioner Wright -- at no time, as long as I'm sure
25 my colleagues -- I think I can say this for all of us -- do we

1 | ever discount public comment. There's a process, and we're trying
2 | to follow that process, and we're not trying to put the cart
3 | before the horse. So we're going to -- we're going to do
4 | things -- we have some more information now. We have the
5 | supplemental.

6 | And I think all those who were concerned about us --
7 | we got one group, I think, concerned about us prolonging what
8 | they've worked over the years, and we respect that. Then we have
9 | another group that says that we need to open it back up and start
10 | over again. But we're going to do our process, and I think we
11 | will -- which is inclusive of everybody -- Loddy Doddy and
12 | everybody. So, this misnomer, I would ask the public to stop
13 | saying that we are -- I'm not going to use who they say we were;
14 | I said it down at the Council -- but we always take -- will take
15 | public input. You all help us get to the conclusion, so that's
16 | where we are. We have to live there. So, anyway, that's my two-
17 | minute soapbox. Let me turn it over to Commissioner Wright.

18 | COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Thank you. This is a very
19 | important case, and it's a very important part of the
20 | implementation of the Comp Plan, and I know that it has been
21 | many, many years in the making. I asked a lot of questions of
22 | the Office of Planning when we had our initial meeting, and they
23 | provided a great deal of information. They were probably a little
24 | annoyed at me for asking all of the questions that I asked, but
25 | I felt it was really important. If we're going to do this, we

1 need to do it right. And they provided an excellent report with
2 a lot of information that I appreciate. It's a lot to absorb,
3 and I understand the community's desire to have an opportunity
4 to absorb this information and comment on it in writing before
5 we take any proposed action. So I actually -- I feel like a lot
6 of the questions that I had have been responded to, have been
7 answered in a good and detailed way by the Office of Planning,
8 but I also understand that I think it is appropriate to reopen
9 the record for a limited amount of time, in order for the
10 community to fully absorb the supplemental report from the Office
11 of Planning and to provide written comments and responses before
12 we actually take proposed action.

13 There's another opportunity, after we vote on proposed
14 action, for more input, but, you know, before we make a decision
15 about taking proposed action, I don't want anyone to perceive
16 that we have stopped listening. We are still listening very,
17 very much to all of the different voices in the community, both
18 the people who are in favor and who have concerns. So I would
19 suggest that we don't take proposed action tonight, but that we
20 reopen the record for a limited amount of time, and we can discuss
21 what that limited amount of time is, in order to give people in
22 the community an opportunity to respond in writing to the
23 supplemental OP report. So that would be my suggestion, and I'm
24 interested in hearing what my colleagues think.

25 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner Wright.

1 Vice Chair Miller.

2 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I totally
3 agree with each of the comments that you, Mr. Chairman, and
4 Commissioner Wright have made thus far. We did receive a
5 supplemental report from the Office of Planning, which I
6 appreciate. I thank the Office of Planning for providing a very
7 thoughtful and comprehensive response to concerns that we and the
8 community had raised at the public hearings. I'm not sure that
9 we're going to get -- and I think it was responsive -- not only
10 responded; it was responsive to those concerns, both community
11 concerns and Commission concerns.

12 And there's been a lot of public opportunity for
13 comment, as you've noted, Mr. Chairman, throughout the planning
14 analysis, and Commissioner Wright noted also, that led up to this
15 proposed zoning, whether it was the Housing Equity Report, the
16 Rock Creek West Roadmap, which I think had a second iteration,
17 and the Cleveland Park/Woodley Park Guidelines, Connecticut
18 Avenue Development Guidelines, the Comp Plan land use map --
19 mostly importantly, the Comprehensive Plan land use map changes,
20 which were made by the Council in 2021, I believe, that increased
21 the height -- increased the density for the -- for this -- these
22 Connecticut Avenue areas along Connecticut Avenue in Cleveland
23 Park and Woodley Park to -- with a goal of providing more housing
24 for the -- in this neighborhood -- these neighborhoods and more
25 affordable housing that would be provided under IZ Plus, the 20

1 percent set-aside. And that was one of the questions that the
2 community and we raised, "Is it explicitly required?", and the
3 answer was yes. There were other questions -- I don't know if
4 I -- you want me to go through them, but I could -- as to how --

5 CHAIRMAN HOOD: We probably -- once we end up -- Vice
6 Chair, not to cut you off -- we'll get the responses -- we
7 probably can go -- we're going to go through all of them, but
8 I -- we're going to probably hear, as we -- I think where we're
9 leaning to is hearing from the public now, as opposed to later,
10 and we're going to probably rehash it, but if you want to put it
11 out there now, just go ahead and put out there, and then maybe
12 they'll know what we're looking for.

13 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I'll just put the subject matters
14 out --

15 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

16 VICE CHAIR MILLER: -- and not the responses, but I
17 think they were totally responsive to the community and the
18 Commission concerns.

19 IZ Plus and the provision of affordable housing.
20 Potential Comprehensive Plan inconsistencies. I have to say
21 something in addition to that. The existing zoning is
22 inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map, so
23 this proposed zoning is much more consistent Building heights.
24 Matter-of-right development. Historic preservation review and
25 front setback. That's a very important one, because the design

1 review that will happen in this -- in both of these historic
2 districts will give the public an opportunity to comment and the
3 city to make an evaluation of whether there's compatibility with
4 the historic district, the adjacent neighborhoods, and with the
5 historic structures that might be there right now.

6 Infrastructure assessment. There was one done during
7 the whole Connecticut Avenue Development Guidelines, and OP
8 thinks it's still sufficient to accommodate -- I mean, the -- and
9 Planned Unit Developments, they're permitted, but additional
10 height or density over what's allowed in the proposed zone could
11 not be granted, because it's basically maxed out under the
12 proposed zone, unless they need additional relief from some other
13 zoning requirements, variance or special exception, which would
14 either go to the BZA or us. So those were the areas that they
15 addressed very comprehensively in their supplemental report. But
16 I agree with -- I don't think we're going to get any comments
17 that might affect the outcome at this state, but we are welcome
18 to accept and open and -- to hearing those additional comments.

19 And, as you said, there will be an additional -- even
20 if we reopen the record for additional comments for a limited
21 period, I would want to encourage it to be a very, very limited
22 period, because there is an additional comment period, if and
23 when we took proposed action later -- 30-day comment period,
24 which we would consider those comments, and we have in the past
25 changed things because of the public comments. That's what the

1 whole public participation process is all about, which is not
2 always recognized and appreciated by everybody. So I'm prepared
3 to reopen the record for a very limited time period to hear --
4 to get a response to the OP supplemental response, which I think
5 was responsive to our and the community's concerns; I'm sure not
6 to everybody's satisfaction. That's where I am, Mr. Chairman.

7 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Commissioner
8 Imamura, any comments or questions -- comments?

9 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
10 appreciate the summary and the positions of Commissioner Wright
11 and Vice Chair Miller. I'm in agreement with both of them and
12 agree that it should be a very narrow window for opening public
13 comment. I appreciate Commissioner Wright asking OP some very
14 detailed, thorough questions and OP's response to that. That's
15 helped us arrive at this point to make a more informed decision.
16 And, as Vice Chair Miller pointed out and Commissioner Wright
17 pointed out, the community will have an opportunity to provide
18 input again, and so just a great example, Mr. Chairman, of how
19 we encourage the public to participate in the public process here
20 for a better outcome, but I don't think I have anything more to
21 add.

22 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner Imamura.
23 Commissioner Stidham.

24 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Thank you, Chairman. I think
25 that all the Commissioners who spoke before me have already

1 | addressed all of the points. I think opening up for a limited
2 | time to provide that opportunity again for written comments is
3 | appropriate and support that.

4 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So that's the direction we're
5 | going, and we needed to get here so we can figure out how we're
6 | going to get further. So let me just say that my only concern --
7 | I don't know if my colleagues share this with me, but I'm going
8 | to mention it -- is if someone sends me something that could be
9 | earth shattering or changing for me, then I might have to -- have
10 | to -- I need to be able to talk to that person, and the only way
11 | I can do that is to have a hearing.

12 | And I know -- but let me just -- let me just do this.
13 | Let me just say this to the public. Those who are going to be
14 | submitting to the Office of Planning's supplemental report, if
15 | you're making a point, make your point and explain it, so that'll
16 | leave me with no questions, and then we don't have to -- I don't
17 | have to try to push for a limited scope hearing, which I don't
18 | know if I have the numbers, but, either way, that way I can --
19 | we can understand your point for all of us. And I'll just leave
20 | it at that.

21 | I mean, is anybody interested, if I -- if I request a
22 | limited scope hearing? I'm just curious. You don't have to tell
23 | me now. If it's no, don't tell me now.

24 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: I'm absolutely opposed to a limited
25 | scope hearing. I think if people have comments in response to

1 the supplemental Office of Planning report, they should submit
2 them, and we will carefully, seriously evaluate them. And I --
3 we've had many hours of public hearings, and I don't know how
4 many exhibits of public testimony. I would ask that the comments
5 that have been submitted that we're reopening the record for be
6 limited to just the OP supplemental report, not rehashing -- I
7 don't know -- other issues.

8 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So I -- you know, I can give
9 others -- let me just -- well, no, I kind of know where we may
10 be. Commissioner Wright.

11 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yeah. I would say, let's cross
12 that bridge when we come to it. If we get something, as you
13 described, sort of earth-shaking in the additional submissions
14 that we get during this limited amount of time, we can talk about
15 whether we actually need to have a hearing to discuss it further.
16 But, honestly, I'm not quite sure what earth-shattering kind of
17 comment we would get, but, you know, I never want to close the
18 door. That -- you know, that could happen. So, in terms of what
19 you said, Chair, I would say let's cross that bridge when we come
20 to it.

21 I think the main thing right now is that we've gotten
22 a very detailed supplemental report from the Office of Planning.
23 Let's hear what people in the community have to say in terms of
24 written response. And if there's anything that seems completely,
25 you know, unanswerable, we can have a hearing, but I don't -- I

1 don't anticipate that, but I never want to close the door to it,
2 because I don't know what people are going to submit in their
3 additional comments. So I would say, cross that bridge when we
4 come to it.

5 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I agree with that. Commissioner
6 Imamura.

7 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman for the
8 opportunity. I just want to comment that this is how the planning
9 process is supposed to work. It's incremental and, as you've
10 stated before, Mr. Chairman, we don't always -- not all of us
11 always agree. And I think this is a great example where the
12 Chair and the Vice Chair might have a difference of opinion here,
13 but it does lead to better outcomes, but this is exactly how the
14 process is supposed to work.

15 And for those who seem to think that the Commission is,
16 I guess, always unified, that's not always the case, but we all
17 share the same goal for a better outcome here. And so, again,
18 for the third time, I just want to say, this is how the planning
19 process is supposed to work for the public, so thank you, Mr.
20 Chairman. So I think this is a great example.

21 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Commissioner Stidham, any
22 comments?

23 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: I'm in the same agreement.
24 Let's see what we get and see where it takes us. I'm not opposed
25 to another hearing, if the situation so warrants it, if we choose

1 | that we need to take that direction, but hard to make that
2 | decision now, since we don't know what we might hear. It is hard
3 | for me to think of what we might hear that would be different,
4 | but you don't know and we should remain open to that possibility.

5 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. I want to thank all
6 | my colleagues for their comments. I think that shows the openness
7 | that we have. And I appreciate you all for reminding me about
8 | the process. Let's wait and see what we get first. That's what
9 | we did the first time, so I want to continue that process. I
10 | just wanted to make sure that if I had a question, I had a release
11 | valve where I could that out, but I figured that out too. If I
12 | have a questions and we're just taking submissions, I'll just ask
13 | Vice Chair Miller. That was a joke. But, anyway, so we will --
14 | we will continue in that fashion. Does anybody have any other
15 | additional statements or comments on this?

16 | (No response.)

17 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Ms. Schellin, do we have
18 | a -- I think I heard two weeks. Is it two weeks?

19 | MS. SCHELLIN: Two weeks, yes.

20 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Two weeks.

21 | MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. You only need 14 days to have
22 | another continued hearing, so I can't imagine why you would need
23 | more than 14 days, if that's what you want, so, yeah, that would
24 | be the 26th of March, and then we could -- if the Commission
25 | would like, we could then put it on the first meeting in April,

1 | which would the 9th, for consideration on that meeting agenda,
2 | if that works for the rest of the Commission. Everybody good
3 | with that?

4 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Everybody's good with the 9th?

5 | (All Commissioners nod in agreement.)

6 | MS. SCHELLIN: Yeah, I'll do that.

7 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right. We will --

8 | MS. SCHELLIN: So you're going to announce -- so we're
9 | announcing that the record will be reopened until -- we're not
10 | going to cut off the time, just say 11:59 p.m. --

11 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Whatever the normal time --

12 | MS. SCHELLIN: -- on March 26th.

13 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: March 26th. Now, let me just state
14 | this for the record, because I know how people misconstrue, and
15 | I want to -- the reason the record was reopened, it wasn't because
16 | you went down to the Council and told on us. We watched our
17 | process -- we're doing our process. I want to make sure that's
18 | clear. We did our process. The reason the record was still
19 | open -- so please don't go down and tell Chairman Mendelson that
20 | we opened the record because you came down and complained about
21 | us. We opened the record because we followed the process, we
22 | saw a need, and we, at no time, were going to close out anything
23 | for -- from the public, so -- as Commissioner Imamura has so
24 | eloquently said and others. So, again, we follow the process,
25 | we see that we needed additional comments -- we wanted additional

1 | comments. Those were two weeks, on the 26th, and we will take
2 | it up on April the 9th. I look to the right; that's where my
3 | calendar is. We will take it up on April the 9th. Anybody have
4 | anything else on that?

5 | (No response.)

6 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: And, again, I want to thank those in
7 | support, opposition, or whatever the case is. We appreciate it.
8 | I believe we're going to have a very good outcome up in this area
9 | for what we're doing now, so looking forward to it. All right.
10 | Ms. Schellin, anything else on this case?

11 | MS. SCHELLIN: No.

12 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: We all good?

13 | MS. SCHELLIN: (Nods head affirmatively.)

14 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Do we have anything else
15 | on our agenda?

16 | MS. SCHELLIN: (Nods head affirmatively.)

17 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: We do? Oh, there's one case. Okay.

18 | Hold on.

19 | MS. SCHELLIN: You're not done yet.

20 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yeah, I thought we --

21 | MS. SCHELLIN: There's another proposed action case,
22 | 25-06.

23 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let's go to -- let me turn to
24 | it. One second. Give me -- give me one moment please. I don't
25 | know whether it's better to meet in person and have papers in

1 front of me or files, because the files open -- at least on my
2 computer, open slow, probably because I have so many files open.
3 All right. Here we go. Okay. Okay. Yeah. Okay. Zoning
4 Commission Case Number 25-06, Office of Planning text to
5 regulations governing alley lots. Ms. Schellin.

6 MS. SCHELLIN: So this case was heard in early January,
7 and, at the conclusion of the hearing, the Commission asked OP
8 to provide a supplemental report in this case, which they did,
9 and that is at Exhibit 234, and it modifies their original report
10 and their first supplemental, which I may have mixed in that
11 other case, so Exhibits 187 and 189 have been modified by their
12 most recent report at Exhibit 234. And I just wanted to state
13 that because Matt Jesick, who I believe was the planner on this,
14 wanted to clarify that, because someone contacted him, thinking
15 that all of the other sections were renewed, because he didn't
16 restate them. So I just want to make sure that they -- that you
17 guys understand that they were just modifying their previous
18 reports, and that's it.

19 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let me just go over something,
20 and we can talk about all these. As stated, the Office of
21 Planning had made the following changes to the proposed text
22 amendments. The changes were eliminating vehicle parking
23 requirements for many uses on alley lots; increase matter-of-
24 right heights for alley buildings to 25 feet in zones which 20
25 feet is the current maximum; revise the minimum pervious surface

1 requirements; revise the minimum yard requirements in the R1 and
2 R2 where those alley lots abut the R -- the rear yard of a street-
3 facing lot; updated BZA standards for review of special
4 exceptions on alley lots; update approval criteria for
5 residential use where a special exception is required; revise
6 text to clarify that penthouses are permitted in -- on alley
7 buildings; technical corrections to Subtitle J to align wording
8 with other subtitles -- I think that's pretty
9 straightforward -- another one, technical amendments to
10 Subtitle U to insure internally consistent structures of
11 subparagraphs and conforming amendments to Subtitle X to align a
12 section reference that is altered by the above changes. I think
13 those last four -- last three I think were pretty
14 straightforward, but let me open it up. Who'd like to take the
15 lead on this? Any questions or comments? We do have a letter
16 from Fire and EMS not supporting, no, but let me open it up for
17 others to see what we have to say on this. Anybody?

18 (No response.)

19 CHAIRMAN HOOD: So are we good with what we have in
20 front of us?

21 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: (Raises hand.)

22 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioner Wright.

23 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yeah, I'm basically fine with it.
24 I think that, you know, what we're struggling with is that the
25 language says that a new alley record lot shall have frontage

1 | along a public alley with a minimum alley width of 24 feet.

2 | The reality is that there are almost no alleys in the
3 | District of Columbia that have a width of 24 feet. Twenty-four
4 | feet is two 12-foot travel lanes. That's wider than many streets,
5 | much less alleys. And, you know, so I think the concern is that,
6 | basically, it is going to put all of these new alley record lots
7 | into the position of automatically having to get a variance,
8 | because they will be on lots -- on alleys that probably don't
9 | have a width of 24 feet.

10 | And so, you know, I'm not, honestly, opposed to that,
11 | because I think what we've heard from Fire and Rescue is that
12 | they want to look at everything on a case-by-case basis. They
13 | want to be able to see if it's going to be possible to bring in
14 | their equipment, in the case of a fire, or park at the end of
15 | the alley and bring a hose to the property. You know, they are --
16 | they are asking, basically, that for all of these alley lots
17 | there by a process for them to look at the details of how they
18 | get emergency vehicles there, and that process would be the
19 | variance process.

20 | So I think what we have to sort of balance is, you
21 | know, is that going to discourage or quash the desire to do alley
22 | lots. And we've all really said and I think there's been really
23 | general support for the idea that alley lots can be a good idea.
24 | And this whole effort is to allow more alley lots and to allow
25 | that to move forward. I'm not particularly troubled by the idea

1 of, you know -- because of the concerns raised by Fire and Rescue,
2 of the need to do variances, but I'm interested in what my
3 colleagues think.

4 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner Wright.
5 Commissioner -- or Vice Chair Miller. Hold on one second.

6 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yeah. Okay.

7 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Lampert -- hold on one second. Mr.
8 Lampert, you have something you want to add or take away?

9 MR. LAMPERT: Yeah, Commissioners. Just in case the
10 level of relief is something that's weighing on your mind, as
11 part of OP's text amendment, if the new record alley lot is less
12 than 24 feet, the relief is going to be by special exception
13 instead of variance. So I just wanted to let you know that that's
14 in record.

15 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Thank you.

16 MR. LAMPERT: That'll be -- yeah.

17 VICE CHAIR MILLER: And while you're here -- thank you,
18 Mr. Lampert, for that. And let me ask you, is that the current
19 situation with the 24-foot requirement? Is it through a special
20 exception or is it -- if you know, or a variance? I've sat on
21 several BZA cases where this has come up and Fire and Emergency
22 Medical Services has supported the 15-foot alley, which is, as
23 Commissioner Wright pointed out, is what most are, or even less
24 actually, in the city. Very few 24-foot alleys. But they've
25 supported it if -- and, as I recall, they supported it if they

1 | could get a hose from the street access from the alley if, it's
2 | within a certain feet. I think it was 200 feet, because I think
3 | that's what their apparatus allows. And so I recall them -- FEMS
4 | supporting those relief requests. Do you know whether they -- I
5 | can't -- I can't remember whether they were special exception or
6 | variance under the current, but I certainly would not want it to
7 | be a variance, if we agreed -- if we keep the -- I don't support
8 | keeping the 24-foot rule.

9 | MR. LAMPERT: Under the current existing rules,
10 | Commissioner Miller, it's a variance for relief, but OP's
11 | proposing amending Subtitle C, creating Section 306.5, which will
12 | switch that to special exception.

13 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: Well, that's certainly an
14 | improvement, but it does delay the development of these alley
15 | lots by at least six months, an expense for those who are
16 | developing them, and the whole point of this is to encourage more
17 | housing and affordable housing, because -- so -- but that's
18 | important information, so thank you for that.

19 | COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes, thank you for that
20 | clarification. I had misspoke, and it is definitely, as you
21 | described, Mr. Lampert, a special exception that would be
22 | required.

23 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right. Anything else on
24 | this list that anybody has any concerns or problems with? Okay.
25 | Vice Chair Miller.

1 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Well, I mean, I would support --
2 we're taking proposed action. This is a text amendment that
3 allows a public comment period in between the proposed and final,
4 including by FEMS. I don't know if, at this stage, we could
5 amend OP's recommendation to say that it would be matter -- that
6 the 15-foot would be matter-of-right, if the hose could get --
7 if the hose is accessible from within -- if the property is
8 accessible, not the hose -- the property is accessible within 200
9 feet through the alley, because, if it is, then -- that's what I
10 recall them saying previously in all those BZA cases that they
11 are okay with, but we -- they could comment if that's not okay,
12 that I got the feet wrong or I got the recommendation wrong, but
13 that's what I recall.

14 So I don't know if we should amend that or what. I'm
15 willing to go with the OP recommendation and get the proposed
16 comment further from OP, but public safety is obviously paramount
17 in all of our considerations, and when FEMS says that they're
18 opposed to something, that's kind of important. So I guess I'm
19 asking Mr. Lampert, are we permitted at this stage, if -- I don't
20 know if there's even a majority for this -- to amend the OP
21 recommendation to say that it would be matter-of-right only if
22 that alley -- that 15-foot alley was within 200 feet of a street
23 access, which the Fire Department would be able to get their hose
24 through.

25 CHAIRMAN HOOD: I think, before Mr. Lampert speaks --

1 I know you asked Mr. Lampert -- I don't think we need to ask Mr.
2 Lampert that, I mean -- and you can, but I'm going to tell you
3 why. If the safety people tell me they -- they're the experts,
4 not me, and I don't think anybody here -- the only thing I've
5 done with a firetruck is have one as a kid and played with it.
6 So they are -- they are the super-experts. And I think, for me,
7 I do not support that, Vice Chair, but you may have others, but,
8 anyway, go ahead, Mr. Lampert.

9 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I'm just saying that they've said
10 that before --

11 CHAIRMAN HOOD: I know what they said before.

12 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I'm sure you sat on those BZA cases
13 too.

14 CHAIRMAN HOOD: I sat on one. Did I disagree with
15 that?

16 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Because that's --

17 CHAIRMAN HOOD: I even talked to the former Deputy Fire
18 Chief about that.

19 VICE CHAIR MILLER: That's what democracy is all about.

20 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yeah, what he had to do -- what he told
21 me they had to do -- now, he's been gone since '95, but what he
22 told me they had to do, I'm sure things have changed since then,
23 and that is not the way to save somebody's life or whatever the
24 case is or property. So that's my opinion. I don't know if
25 others would like to go along with that amendment, but I don't

1 favor it, and I will vote against us doing anything in the
2 alternative, other than what the experts have given us, but, Mr.
3 Lampert, go ahead and answer the Vice Chair's question.

4 MR. LAMPERT: I'm going to play my relative
5 inexperience on the Zoning Commission card here and defer that
6 to Mr. Ritting. My understanding is, generally, we -- the Zoning
7 Commission takes the proposal written by the applicant and
8 approves or disapproves, rather than rewrite it, but my
9 experience is more limited here, so I'll defer to Mr. Ritting.

10 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I think we can make it more
11 restrictive, but I'll let Mr. Ritting say.

12 MR. RITTING: Yeah. Jacob Ritting. You could -- you
13 could -- if you've heard the case, you could vote to take a more
14 restrictive approach now. At the risk of making this more
15 complicated, I could suggest another alternative, which is you
16 could advertise two alternatives in the proposed rulemaking
17 notice, and then decide at final action which one you wanted to
18 take, hearing the public comment on both, but you need to have a
19 majority of the Commissioners to vote to either advertise one
20 alternative, advertise the other alternative, or advertise both.

21 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you for your response. I
22 would be in favor of doing that, but I don't know if I have
23 support from any of my colleagues for that.

24 CHAIRMAN HOOD: You may. Let's see. Is there any
25 support to move with what Vice Chair Miller is proposing and

1 | doing something in the alternative? Any support?

2 | (No response.)

3 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Going once, going twice, gone. Okay.
4 | Vice Chair Miller, anything else?

5 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: No. I think we're going to though
6 | prevent the whole purpose of -- discourage the whole purpose of
7 | what this regulation is -- proposed action was all about, to
8 | encourage housing when they can't meet -- although they'll
9 | just -- they'll have to go through a special exception process,
10 | which one of us will be on the BZA to hear that case, so --

11 | COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yeah, I would -- I just want to
12 | say that I really appreciate what Vice Chair Miller is saying,
13 | and I think the goal is to make it easier to provide more housing
14 | and to do these alley lots. I, though, am not -- I'm not opposed
15 | to a special exception process at the BZA. I know it is another
16 | step. I know it adds a level of bureaucracy and a level of
17 | complication to doing these kinds of projects. But I also, you
18 | know, appreciate that, you know, what we're hearing from Fire and
19 | Rescue is they want to sort of look at this as a case-by-case
20 | basis, and that that -- that that's important to them. And I
21 | think the special exception process is a good way to look at it,
22 | as a case-by-case basis.

23 | Again, it doesn't make it as streamlined and as easy
24 | as if we simply said it's okay if you're on a 15-foot alley, but
25 | you're within 200 feet of a -- of a major or a bigger road where

1 the hose can come -- can be rolled down. I just -- I think
2 that -- you know, I go to those BZA meetings too, and they're a
3 little bit of a -- of a long haul, but I also think they offer a
4 great opportunity to look at projects in a more detailed way, and
5 I'm not opposed to that, so --

6 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Anybody else? Anyone?

7 (No response.)

8 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So we will -- is there any other
9 topic that we have in front of us, any other issue? I think
10 that -- for me, that was the biggest one, and then I don't know
11 if there's anything else, because I'm sure we've discussed most
12 of it. Anybody have anything else? Vice Chair Miller.

13 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I just want to say I appreciate the
14 Office of Planning's supplemental report that I think was
15 responsive, again, to community and Commission concerns that were
16 raised at the public hearing.

17 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right. Can I get somebody
18 to make a motion? I just -- I won't call on anybody. I just
19 ask somebody else to do it.

20 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: I can do it.

21 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

22 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: I move -- sorry, totally lost
23 train of thought. I make a motion to approve Zoning Commission
24 Case Number 25-06, Office of Planning text to regulations
25 governing alley lots, and ask for a second.

1 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Second to take proposed action.

2 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. It's been moved and properly
3 seconded. That was good. Thank you. Moved and properly seconded
4 for proposed action. Any further discussion?

5 (No response.)

6 CHAIRMAN HOOD: All in -- oh, thought we was in the
7 hearing room. Ms. Schellin, would you do a roll call vote please?

8 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Stidham.

9 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes.

10 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Imamura.

11 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.

12 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood.

13 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.

14 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller.

15 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

16 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Wright.

17 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes.

18 MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is five to zero to zero to take
19 proposed action on Zoning Commission Case Number 25-06.

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

22 MS. SCHELLIN: Nothing else.

23 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I want to thank everyone for
24 their participation. The Zoning Commission will meet again on --
25 I think I have March 23rd; right, Ms. Schellin?

1 MS. SCHELLIN: (Nods head affirmatively.)

2 CHAIRMAN HOOD: And I'm going to ask my colleagues to
3 help me remember that we need to close the meeting for your
4 meeting that you're going to have on the 26th. Thank everyone
5 for their participation, and, with that, this meeting is
6 adjourned. Have a nice weekend.

7 (Whereupon, the above-entitled public meeting was
8 adjourned at 5:28 p.m.)

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript


In the matter of: Public Meeting

Before: DC Zoning Commission

Date: 03-12-26

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