

GOVERNMENT OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

REGULAR PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

THURSDAY

APRIL 30, 2026

+ + + + +

The Public Meeting of the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened via teleconference, pursuant to notice at 4:09 p.m. EDT, Anthony J. Hood, Chairman, presiding.

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

- ANTHONY J. HOOD, Chairman
- ROBERT E. MILLER, Vice Chair
- 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:

- HILLARY LOVICK, ESQUIRE
- JACOB RITTING, ESQUIRE
- BRIAN LAMPERT, ESQUIRE

ALSO PRESENT:

- MAXINE BROWN-ROBERTS, DC Office of Planning
- KAREN THOMAS, DC Office of Planning
- MERIDITH MOLDENHAUER, ESQUIRE, Cozen O'Connor

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Regular Public Meeting held on April 30, 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

Consent Calendar:

Case No. 20-08G
Howard University 4

Case No. 62-19D
Friedman Capital Advisors, LLC 7

Case No. 94-01B
Manager 8-10-34 Trust Partners, LLC 12

Time Extensions:

Case No. 23-10B
Georgetown University 14

Case No. 05-28AJ
Parkside Residential, LLC 17

Case No. 20-12B
Westminster Presbyterian Church and
Westminster Community Partners, LLC 19

Proposed Action:

Case No. 25-13
Office of Planning 23

Hearing Action:

Case No. 26-04
Office of Zoning 46

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

(4:09 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, Commissioner Wright, and Commissioner Stidham. We're also joined by the Office of Zoning staff, Ms. Sharon Schellin, as well as Mr. Paul Young, who will be handling all of our virtual operations. We're also joined by the Office of Zoning Legal Division, Mr. Brian Lampert, Mr. Jacob Ritting, and Ms. Hillary Lovick. We will ask all others to introduce themselves at the appropriate time, if required.

Just to note, today at 3:15, the Commission had entered into a closed meeting. This closed meeting was voted upon previously in a public setting to be held for the purpose of obtaining legal advice from our counsel and deliberate, but not vote, on contested cases on today's agenda. While discussions were held, there were no decisions made. Upon conclusion of the closed meeting, the Commission immediately entered until this open meeting.

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

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 listening on Webex or by phone will be
2 muted during 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. Does
11 the staff have any preliminary matters?

12 MS. SCHELLIN: No preliminary matters.

13 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Did you -- did you lose me for a minute,
14 Ms. Schellin?

15 MS. SCHELLIN: I think so.

16 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Yeah, because everybody's
17 going -- it's says -- everybody's keep flickering. Okay. So let
18 me say this -- let me do this. All right. Well, let's just see
19 what happens. All right. You can hear me now okay, right?

20 MS. SCHELLIN: (Nods head affirmatively.)

21 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So moving right along with our
22 agenda -- and somebody let me know if something goes in and out,
23 because everybody just went blank for a minute. All right. Under
24 consent calendar, we have modification -- modifications without
25 hearing, Zoning Commission Case Number 20-08G, Howard University,

1 modification without hearing to Campus Plan at Square 3055 and
2 3063. Ms. Schellin.

3 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. As you stated, they are
4 requesting a modification without hearing for their Campus Plan
5 at Squares 3055 and 3063, and what they are requesting is to
6 allow personal care services that would further the University's
7 objective to provide students with the convenience of being on
8 campus, living in campus housing that's designed to meet their
9 needs while doing so. These services would be specialized
10 in -- popular among African Americans -- among the African-
11 American community. It would also provide an opportunity --
12 economic opportunity for local small businesses and community
13 members to gain cosmetology experience. So this is before you
14 with an OP report at Exhibit 7, recommending approval. They did
15 not feel that the -- actually, the application -- they have --
16 I'm sorry. It's a three percent limit of the dormitory use of
17 the Gross Floor Area and it is what they're recommending. ANC
18 1E, at Exhibit 8, they recommend support of the application.
19 They voted four to zero to zero. And then I believe that was
20 it, and it makes this ready to turn over to the Commission to
21 decide if this is, in fact, a modification without hearing and
22 if you want to proceed. Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Schellin. And,
24 colleagues, anyone have any objections to us proceeding as this
25 being a modification without a hearing?

1 (No response.)

2 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So, with that, as Ms. Schellin
3 has already really pretty much teed up, again, this is a request
4 for personal service use facilities to be exclusively to serve
5 Howard University students. And then the caveat is the Office
6 of Planning is saying that this -- the faculty and staff in the
7 University's dormitory is subject to a three percent limit of the
8 subject dormitory Gross Floor Area. I think this is pretty
9 straightforward. We've already decided this does not need to be
10 a hearing in this case. I think this is very straightforward,
11 especially for the personal uses for the students on the campus
12 and for those on the campus exclusively.

13 So, with that, unless I hear anything else -- any other
14 comments, I would move that we approve this modification without
15 a hearing, Zoning Commission Case Number 20-08G, and I ask for a
16 second.

17 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Second.

18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: It's been moved and properly seconded.
19 Any further discussion?

20 (No response.)

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

23 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood.

24 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.

25 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Stidham.

1 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes.

2 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Wright.

3 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes.

4 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller.

5 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

6 MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is four to zero to one, the
7 minus one being Commissioner Imamura, who is not present, not
8 voting. And I would just ask the applicant to provide a draft
9 order within two weeks. I'm assuming that could be a summary
10 order, if they check with OZLD and they're okay with that.

11 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I am going to -- give me one
12 moment please. Okay. There we go. All right. Let's move right
13 on with our agenda. Zoning Commission Case Number 62-19D,
14 Friedman Capital Advisors, LLC, modification without hearing for
15 an approved PUD at Square 0008. Ms. Schellin.

16 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. For this one, it's an oldie
17 from the past. They are requesting to modify the Watergate PUD,
18 and they want to convert the top six floors that were previously
19 approved as office space into residential space, and that will
20 equate to approximately 89,940 square feet, for a total of 87
21 units of residential use, with 76 apartment units on floors six
22 to nine, and eleven for-sale condo units on floors ten and eleven.
23 The applicant's justification for this basically says that
24 it -- the residential use will not require any zoning relief
25 or changes in the building's height or density; the proposal

1 remains consistent with the evaluation -- the PUD evaluation
2 criteria, because it would not be inconsistent with the Comp Plan
3 and -- nor would it have any negative impacts on the surrounding
4 area; the PUD benefits have long ago been satisfied and serve the
5 residents, employees, visitors, surrounding community; and the
6 proposal would not modify any conditions of the PUD, as previously
7 modified, which -- and involves residential use, which is also
8 permitted by the original PUD and the underlying zone.

9 The applicant provided a supplemental statement at
10 Exhibit 5, which responds to some things that OP provided in
11 their report at Exhibit 4, which recommended approval.
12 Exhibit -- I'm sorry. ANC 2A provided a report today, along with
13 a private MOU that's been entered into with the applicant, and
14 that's at Exhibit 6A, and they are supportive also of this
15 application. The other party, Five Watergate PUD Owners, were
16 properly served; however, they did not provide a response, but
17 the 30-day requisite notice period has passed. Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Schellin, for teeing
19 that up for us. Commissioner Stidham, would you take the lead
20 on this one please?

21 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Sure. I think Ms. Schellin
22 covered everything actually. I think the only thing that is
23 left -- I mean, this seems fairly straightforward. I think the
24 only thing that is really left is to acknowledge that the
25 applicant reached an agreement with ANC 2A, and we are -- they

1 are both to be commended for working things out -- that is always
2 greatly appreciated -- and that we will not incorporate it into
3 the order, but we will acknowledge that a private agreement has
4 been reached, but it is not a condition of the order.

5 And, with that, I can make a motion to approve Zoning
6 Case Number 62-19D, Friedman Capital Advisors, LLC, modification
7 without a hearing for an approved PUD at Square 0008, and ask
8 for a second.

9 CHAIRMAN HOOD: I will second that, with the caveat
10 that we believe, moving forward, that this could be done as a
11 modification without a hearing. So it's been moved and properly
12 seconded. Thank you, Commissioner Stidham. Any further
13 discussion?

14 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes. And I appreciate Commissioner
15 Stidham's comments, all of which I agree with, but I had a
16 question about -- and I totally support this application and
17 appreciate the application for conversion of office to
18 residential, which is something that the city -- the DC -- the
19 District is encouraging and incentivizing and, actually,
20 providing subsidies for, I think, downtown to happen, due to the
21 economic circumstances that we face in our city. But I had --
22 yeah, so these are going -- they're -- these previously -- I
23 think current vacant, but previously office units are going to
24 be converted to residential -- 87 residential units, I think 76
25 of which will be at -- well, my question is, and maybe the -- I

1 know the applicant is here in the attendance, Ms. Moldenhauer
2 representing the applicant.

3 The Zoning Commission has taken the position that IZ,
4 inclusionary zoning, applies when there is a modification of a
5 previously approved -- in this case, PUD from 1962, a long time
6 ago, pre-Home Rule -- 12 years before Home Rule, there was a
7 Zoning Commission -- so I just want to make sure that IZ --
8 inclusionary zoning does apply to these 87 units that the -- I
9 think it does, and I think the applicant's statement might say
10 it does, but I just want to get a confirmation that inclusionary
11 zoning will apply to these newly-created residential units in a
12 rich -- amenity-rich neighborhood, the Watergate, of all
13 places -- that it will apply, which has affordability levels and
14 certain set-asides. Can we get a confirmation of that, either
15 from our counsel or the applicant in this proceeding? And I'm
16 ready to move forward, just if we do get that confirmation.

17 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Schellin, can we bring up Ms.
18 Moldenhauer or somebody from her team, if they're -- if they're
19 available.

20 MS. SCHELLIN: Sure. Let me see if she is available.
21 Yep, there she is.

22 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Ms. Moldenhauer, you heard the
23 question, and you get ready; you can give us the right answer.

24 MS. MOLDENHAUER: Yes, Commissioner Miller. Meridith
25 Moldenhauer, Cozen O'Connor. Yes, the applicant is aware that

1 affordable housing is required, IZ, and there is to be two
2 different IZ concepts. One would be IZ for the apartments, and
3 then one would be IZ that would be for-sale units. And,
4 obviously, under the IZ requirements, you would have to apportion
5 those, based on the two different types of -- one for the for-
6 sale, one for the apartment, but the intent is -- and we have
7 explained to the ANC and in our application -- that there will
8 be IZ and affordable units in this conversion.

9 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you for that confirmation.

10 MS. MOLDENHAUER: No problem. Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Moldenhauer. All
12 right. It's been moved and properly seconded. Any further
13 discussion?

14 (No response.)

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

17 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Commissioner Stidham.

18 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes.

19 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood.

20 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.

21 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Wright.

22 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes.

23 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller.

24 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

25 MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is four to zero to one to

1 approve final action in Zoning Commission Case Number 62-19D, the
2 minus one being Commissioner Imamura, not present, not voting.
3 Again, if we could ask the applicant for a draft order in two
4 weeks, and if they could communicate with OZLD and find out
5 whether that can be a summary order or not. Is that okay?

6 CHAIRMAN HOOD: (Nods head affirmatively.)

7 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let's go to Zoning Commission
9 Case Number 94-01B, Manager 8-10-34 Trust Partners, LLC,
10 modification without hearing for an approved PUD at 247. Ms.
11 Schellin.

12 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. On this one, they are making
13 a request to modify the previously-approved PUD to renovate the
14 existing mixed-use office and retail buildings. They want to
15 redesign some architectural elements from the final design
16 approved by the Commission, and that doesn't -- they feel this
17 doesn't require a public hearing, and that's why they are
18 requesting the modification without hearing. They want to
19 improve the rooftop amenity space for office tenants, and they
20 anticipate contributing approximately \$84,270 to the Housing
21 Production Trust Fund.

22 There is an OP report at Exhibit 5, recommending
23 approval. And, at Exhibit 6, ANC 2C provided support for the
24 application, with a quorum present, voting three to zero. And I
25 will turn it over to you to decide if it is, in fact, a mod

1 without hearing and if you want to proceed. Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Does anyone believe
3 that this -- that we cannot proceed as this -- with this being a
4 modification without a hearing?

5 (No response.)

6 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing any objections, I would ask
7 Commissioner Wright if she could take the lead on this one.

8 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Sure. I think that these are
9 relatively minor changes to the PUD and are appropriate for doing
10 a modification without a hearing. The changes that are being
11 proposed include revising the front entrance with more modern
12 transparent glass doors and updating the canopy above the doors.
13 It also includes certain changes to the penthouse roof structure
14 and roof deck. The envelope of the penthouse or roof structure
15 will not be expanded as a result of this application, but it will
16 have new habitable space, and the exterior roof deck will be
17 improved. So I think that these are all, again, quite modest
18 changes and are appropriate for a modification without a hearing.

19 And, to that end, I'm glad to make a motion to approve
20 Zoning Commission Case Number 94-01B, modification without
21 hearing to Zoning Commission Orders Number 684D for 1331 L Street
22 Northwest, Square 247, Lot 96, and I ask for a second.

23 CHAIRMAN HOOD: I will second the motion. It's been
24 moved and properly seconded. Any further discussion?

25 (No response.)

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

3 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Wright.

4 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes.

5 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood.

6 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.

7 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller.

8 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

9 MS. SCHELLIN: And Commissioner Stidham.

10 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes.

11 MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is four to zero to one to
12 approve final action in Zoning Commission Case Number 94-01, the
13 minus one, of course, being Commissioner Imamura, not present,
14 not voting. And, again, if the applicant could provide a draft
15 order in two weeks, checking in with the OZLD.

16 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

17 MS. SCHELLIN: Uh-huh.

18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Let's move to time
19 extensions. Zoning Commission Case Number 23-10B, Georgetown
20 University, two-year time extension of design review at Square
21 569. Ms. Schellin.

22 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. So it is a two-year extension
23 request to extend having to file for a building permit by April
24 5, 2028. The applicant has stated that it completed construction
25 drawings in 2024, but, once the project design went out for bid,

1 high construction, labor, material costs, that we've heard for
2 several years now, made the project economically infeasible, and,
3 because of that, the applicant -- with the economic realities,
4 the applicant needs some additional time to redesign the project
5 to make it a smaller footprint within their budget targets, and
6 then come back to the Commission with a modification to the
7 approved plans. In order to do that, they need to have this
8 extension. And OP has provided a report at Exhibit 5,
9 recommending approval of the two-year time extension. And ANC
10 6E, as of this evening, has not provided a response, but the 30-
11 day time to respond has passed. Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Schellin. Again, this
13 is a time extension request. I'm going to ask Vice Chair Miller
14 to take the lead on this one please.

15 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
16 And thank you, Ms. Schellin, for that lead up to this case.
17 This -- yes, this is an application for a time extension of the
18 design review, which we previously approved for Georgetown
19 University at its downtown campus at 120 F Street Northwest,
20 which is currently, I think, improved with a residence hall and
21 a student center, which the University, one, plans to demolish
22 and instead have -- what do they instead plan to have -- it's a
23 lot of different uses; academic, office -- anyway, they're asking
24 for a two-year time to redesign the -- additional time to design
25 it -- redesign this project, because of the economic realities

1 that a lot of projects around the District, whether they're before
2 the Zoning Commissioner or just their need to re-evaluate because
3 of the challenges with financing.

4 So I support the two-year time extension of the design
5 review in this case, and I would make a motion to approve the
6 Zoning Commission -- approve the two-year time extension of
7 design review at Square 569 by Georgetown University at 23 --
8 Zoning Commission Case 23-10B, and ask for a second.

9 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Second.

10 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. It's been moved and
11 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: Commissioner Miller?

16 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

17 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Stidham.

18 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes.

19 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood.

20 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.

21 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Wright.

22 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes.

23 MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is four to zero to one to
24 approve final action in Zoning Commission Case Number 23-10B, the
25 minus one, of course, being Commissioner Imamura, not present,

1 not voting. And, again, a summary order, if -- in two weeks, if
2 the applicant works with OZLD and they are okay with that. Thank
3 you.

4 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Next, Zoning Commission Case
5 Number 05-28AJ, Parkside Residential, LLC, one-year time
6 extension for second-stage PUD at Square 5056. Ms. Schellin.

7 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. In this case, the applicant
8 is requesting a one-year time extension and a waiver request.
9 The extension would extend the deadline to begin construction for
10 Parcel 9B from March 23rd, 2026 to March 23rd, 2027. The waiver
11 request is from the requirements that allow no more than two time
12 extensions and the second one being for only one year. This
13 is -- this waiver would allow for this extension, which is their
14 fourth.

15 The applicant's justification is that, basically, not
16 granting this extension would jeopardize the Parcel 9B PUD and
17 it would adversely or could adversely affect any future
18 development of the remaining blocks, and granting the waiver,
19 however, would allow the applicant to proceed with construction
20 of 9B and the broader Parkside development as market conditions
21 improve. The applicant's been unable to secure financing, like
22 some of the others to -- in order to commence the actual
23 construction.

24 OP has filed an approval recommendation at Exhibit 5,
25 and -- for both the extension and the waiver request. ANC 7D,

1 ANC 7F, nor Parkside Homes -- Townhomes Condo Association, Inc.,
2 all three being parties, none have provided reports as of this
3 writing, so I'm ready to turn it over to you guys.

4 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Schellin. I think this
5 is pretty straightforward, the questions being asked, especially
6 in this day and time. We're hearing a lot of this, and I'm sure
7 we'll hear more of it, with the way the economy and everything
8 is going. I think the waiver request is in order, as well as
9 the time extension, as requested and captioned and mentioned --
10 as Ms. Schellin has already mentioned. I don't need to be
11 redundant. And this is the -- while we know this is the fourth
12 request, they've asked for additional -- to no more than one
13 year, which is the waiver request, even though this may be the
14 fourth one, but they're still trying to get this moving forward,
15 as Ms. -- the drawback is, some of the things that'll -- that
16 will be lost to not just the community, but also to the city.

17 So I am in favor of the waiver request, as well as the
18 time extension, as captured and noted and requested. And, with
19 that, I would move that we would approve Zoning Commission Case
20 Number 05-28AJ, as requested, with the time limits specified, and
21 also the waiver request, and ask for a second.

22 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Second.

23 CHAIRMAN HOOD: It's been moved and properly seconded.

24 Any further discussion?

25 (No response.)

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

3 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood.

4 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.

5 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Wright.

6 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes.

7 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller.

8 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

9 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Stidham.

10 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes.

11 MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is four to zero to one to
12 approve final action in Zoning Commission Case Number 05-28AJ,
13 the minus one, again, being Commissioner Imamura, not present,
14 not voting. And, again, if the applicant would work with OZLD
15 to find out if a summary order is appropriate. Thank you. And
16 two weeks for that.

17 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes. Thank you. All right. Let's go
18 to our next time extension, Zoning Commission Case Number 20-
19 12B, Westminster Presbyterian Church and Westminster Community
20 Partners, LLC, two-year time extension for PUD at Square 499.
21 Ms. Schellin.

22 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. As you stated, it is a two-year
23 time extension to allow for a building permit application to be
24 done by -- or filed by June 10th, 2028, and then they would start
25 construction June 10, 2029. They, too, are asking for a waiver

1 request, which limits the second time extension to no more than
2 one year, and they are requesting two years. The justification
3 from the applicant for the waiver -- for the -- for the waiver
4 is that the applicant explains that more than one year is needed
5 to actually solicit and engage with a general contractor, prepare
6 the application required to get the building permit, and so that's
7 why they need more than one year in order to move forward, and,
8 thus, the need for the waiver request.

9 The justification for the extension, again, since
10 COVID-19, it caused great impacts on the market for multifamily
11 residential development, the construction costs, inflation,
12 interest rates, the lending market is pretty limited, and just
13 the economic and market conditions, in general, so all of those
14 being outside the applicant's reasonable control. And so,
15 despite that, the applicant notes its commitment to move forward
16 with the project, and they have had a substantial investment to
17 date in legal, architectural, engineering, and permitting, and
18 other consulting fees totaling approximately one million dollars,
19 so they do have the intent and want to move forward with this
20 project.

21 So I will also let you know that OP provided a --
22 recommended approval at Exhibit 5 for both the extension and the
23 waiver; ANC 6D voted unanimously for this at Exhibit 6; and I
24 will turn this over to the Commission. Thank you.

25 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Schellin. Again, this

1 case, I think, has a ground swell of support and also has -- a
2 lot has been -- went into this, so I will not have any objections
3 to us doing the time extension, and also, giving the waiver
4 request, as requested and captioned by the applicant. I think
5 they've been earnestly trying to move forward, and I think they
6 have done their due diligence, as noted in the tee-up by Ms.
7 Schellin, and also in the record, so I don't have anything --
8 anymore to add.

9 I would move that we approve with the time extension
10 and -- I would move that we approve the waiver request, as well
11 as the time extension, as requested and captioned, in Zoning
12 Commission Case Number 20-12B, and ask for a second.

13 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Second.

14 CHAIRMAN HOOD: It's been moved and properly seconded.
15 Okay, moved and seconded. Okay. It's been -- any further
16 discussion?

17 (No response.)

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

20 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood.

21 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.

22 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Stidham.

23 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes.

24 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller.

25 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

1 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Wright.

2 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes.

3 MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is four to zero to one to
4 approve final action in Zoning Commission Case Number 20-12B,
5 again, the minus one being Commissioner Imamura, not present, not
6 voting. And the applicant can provide -- or should provide a
7 draft order within two weeks; again, work with OZLD as to whether
8 it can be a summary order or not. Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN HOOD: (Speaking on mute.)

10 MS. SCHELLIN: You're on mute. There we go.

11 CHAIRMAN HOOD: You know what? I must -- I must have
12 had a long day. I'm saying, "Am I coming across okay; can anybody
13 hear me?", and I'm on mute. I guess I wouldn't be coming across
14 okay.

15 MS. SCHELLIN: We did not hear you, so you were not
16 coming across.

17 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yeah. So does anybody need to take a
18 break or we good?

19 (No response.)

20 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

21 VICE CHAIR MILLER: A few minute break would be good.

22 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let's take -- five minutes or
23 ten?

24 VICE CHAIR MILLER: That's good. Thank you.

25 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Which one; five or ten?

1 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Three or five, whatever you want.

2 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Five minutes, and we'll come
3 back at 4:50. Let's come back -- no, that's ten minutes.

4 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Come back in -- come back at 4:48.

6 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay.

7 (Brief recess.)

8 CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Let's go ahead and get
9 started, Ms. Schellin. Proposed action, Zoning Commission Case
10 Number 25-13, Office of Planning, text and map amendments to
11 create new Wisconsin Avenue mixed-use zones. Ms. Schellin.

12 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. So, this one, there were a
13 couple of new exhibits since the hearing. There was a letter
14 from Councilmember Frumin -- he submitted the same letter in
15 another case, as you'll recall -- at Exhibit 230 requesting that
16 the Commission allow the public comments, in response to OP's
17 supplemental report, prior to the Commission considering proposed
18 action. This was the same letter in 25-09. Then, at Exhibits
19 231 and 232, this was the ANC's letters in opposition to
20 Councilmember Frumin's request allowing for public comments.
21 They feel it's ready to move forward; enough discussion's been
22 held. At Exhibit 233, DHCD's report stating that they support
23 OP's proposal to apply IZ-Plus and not some other affordability
24 scheme that would impose different affordability requirements,
25 and they made some other statements in their report that I'm sure

1 | the Commission has read. Exhibit 234 is OP's supplemental report
2 | that responds and to charts that they've provided in there. And
3 | then, at Exhibit 235, there's a request to reopen the record from
4 | the Committee of 100 that was submitted by Judy Chesser, and they
5 | are asking that the Commission reopen the record to allow the
6 | public to respond to the OP supplemental report prior to taking
7 | proposed action. So I'll turn it over to the Commission for your
8 | discussion, for considering the request to reopen the record and
9 | however you want to proceed.

10 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. And I'm going to put
11 | the request to reopen the record in abeyance. I want us to have
12 | our discussion first, but we have already had a trail previously
13 | because it's almost like deja vu all over again, but one thing
14 | that will happen -- and I said this previously, but, obviously,
15 | it's not being heard -- that people will have -- we will never
16 | silence the community. So, with that, I'm going to ask
17 | Commissioner Wright to start us off on this.

18 | COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Thank you. And, as I understand
19 | it, Chair Hood, you want to dive into the substance of the
20 | proposal and not talk about process at this time. Is that
21 | correct?

22 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well, I kind of -- I kind of wanted to
23 | talk about -- I guess we can talk about -- I wanted us to see
24 | what's out there; then we would know what the process is. You
25 | know, we don't -- we don't want to say -- we do something, and

1 then we have to do something three more times later. We want to
2 try to -- let's just try to organize and orchestrate our comments,
3 and then we will talk about the process -- if we have any
4 questions now, but then we will talk about the process after we
5 see what some of the responses possibly may be.

6 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Great. So I felt like the Office
7 of Planning provided good information in their supplemental
8 report, and they definitely addressed a number of the issues that
9 the Commission had raised. I do need some clarification on a
10 number of those issues, so I don't know if we want to invite the
11 Office of Planning staff to join us, but the first --

12 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes. Let's bring them up. Let's bring
13 them up first. If we can -- Ms. Schellin, if we can get the
14 Office of Planning team up, so we can kind of have this dialogue
15 and see how far we go.

16 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Great.

17 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let's make sure we got them first,
18 Commissioner Wright. I don't see them yet, unless it's just --

19 (Brief pause.)

20 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Schellin, Mr. Young, somebody,
21 anybody.

22 MS. SCHELLIN: I'm sorry. I thought he brought her up.
23 I'm sorry. I was --

24 MR. YOUNG: Sorry. I didn't hear the name. I apologize.
25 Who was it?

1 MS. SCHELLIN: It's going to be Maxine.

2 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Probably Maxine Brown-Roberts.

3 MS. SCHELLIN: Right, yes, because we no longer have
4 Joel.

5 CHAIRMAN HOOD: And, also, the Director -- the Director
6 is there too. I saw the Director -- the Deputy Director. Oh,
7 wait a minute. Maxine, you're the Deputy Director, right? I
8 was confused.

9 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, that's her. She's the replacement.

10 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Hello. Good afternoon, Mr.
11 Chairman and members of the Commission. For the record, Maxine
12 Brown-Roberts from the Office of Planning.

13 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Thank you for joining us.

14 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Yes.

15 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: So the first -- I'm going to
16 start with what I think is pretty straightforward, which is the
17 IZ-Plus issue, because we talked about this same issue when we
18 talked about the Cleveland and Woodley Park zones, and I just
19 want to reiterate some of the things we said at that time, which
20 I think are consistent with what the Office of Planning has
21 provided in their report. And, also, I appreciated the memo from
22 DHCD, again, explaining that the IZ-Plus program was developed,
23 I think, in 2020, with some very specific studies that were done
24 about what amount of IZ is economically feasible without
25 additional subsidies. And the DHCD letter talked about what some

1 of those additional subsidies are that either provide for a
2 greater percentage of affordable units or lower area median
3 incomes for affordable units. And I think, again, we all
4 recognize the very desperate need for more affordable units,
5 especially in this part of the city. That's why we have the IZ
6 program. It's why we have the IZ-Plus program. And I don't
7 think I support, at least -- I can't speak for my other
8 colleagues -- creating some special one-off different IZ program
9 for this part of the city.

10 I do recognize that the Office of Planning did get a
11 grant from the Council of Governments and is going to be studying
12 the IZ program and there may be some citywide improvements, but
13 I just want to say, because I think this is -- this is the easiest
14 topic, is that I really don't think we -- I, at least, don't
15 think we should do any kind of one-off different IZ or IZ-Plus
16 program, and I look forward to hearing more about the study that
17 the Office of Planning is going to be doing about the whole
18 citywide program.

19 The second thing that I wanted to just ask a question
20 about was -- the idea of design review was something that we had
21 discussed and that you have included as a new part of the text
22 amendment creating these zones. Could you describe for all of
23 us a little bit about how you see that design review process
24 actually being implemented? I mean, we do design review. In
25 fact, one of the cases we just approved an extension for was a

1 design review, and so the Zoning Commission does design review
2 in many other different parts of the city. Could you just sort
3 of take us through the step-by-step process of how a design review
4 would work in this particular text amendment?

5 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: The process would not be any
6 different from the process that all the other design reviews that
7 are in the Zoning Commission -- are in the zoning regulations and
8 are required. It will be the same process. If the zoning goes
9 through, whenever a developer has a new project, whether it's a
10 new building or it's a substantial addition to an existing
11 building, then they would file to the Zoning Commission to have
12 the design review.

13 The parameters of the design review are sort of
14 explained in the zoning, from what we provided before, and also
15 in the -- what we have proposed in the last iteration, all the
16 parameters that would go into, you know, having the design review
17 and what they would be required to provide and that sort of thing.
18 So, similarly, they would just file for a design review process
19 to the Zoning Commission. It would be a one-hearing process,
20 also, and it would go through just the regular hearing, and we'd
21 have to do all the notifications and all of that, just similar
22 to what we're doing now for any other, you know, Zoning Commission
23 application.

24 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: And it would be a public hearing?

25 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Yes, it's a public -- it's a public

1 process, yes.

2 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: And so testimony from the public
3 would be taken as part of a hearing.

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

5 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: I know we had a lot of discussion
6 about form-based zoning, and I read the responses that OP had
7 submitted. You know, in some ways -- and what -- I'd like you
8 to articulate it -- it feels like it's six of one, half dozen of
9 another, in that form-based zoning isn't a magical different
10 process with a lot of the parameters that have been taken from
11 the Wisconsin Avenue Development document that have been put in
12 the code, plus requiring a design review hearing before the Zoning
13 Commission. Again, in your mind, is there a substantial
14 difference between that process that we've just been talking
15 about and this idea of a form-based code? Because having worked
16 with form-based codes a lot, I feel we're -- again, it's a little
17 bit of six of one, half dozen of another, that they're very
18 similar processes we're talking about.

19 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: One of the things that I don't know
20 is that, for design review, again, this is a public process.
21 Under the form-based codes, it could either be a public process
22 or neither, you know, or it is just written.

23 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Uh-huh.

24 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: The problem with having -- going
25 through and writing all the -- all the parameters for the -- for

1 the -- for the form-based code is that it's going to take a much
2 longer time for us to do. a lot of the review is being --
3 coming -- is being assigned to the DoB or some particular body
4 that would have to be set up to review that. A lot of the review
5 that would be done at date of birth, some of it, in some
6 instances, maybe have to be assigned to OP. That's not one of
7 the things that we do currently. When it -- when an application
8 goes to DoB, they review that. I think a lot of the things are
9 going to be sort of more judgmental, where, in DoB, they look at
10 specific things; you know, if it's eight feet, it's eight feet.
11 With us, sometimes in our review, we can negotiate whether it's
12 eight or ten feet, you know.

13 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Right. Right.

14 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: So the -- those sort of parameters
15 would be this whole new system that we'd have to create, I think,
16 to have that implemented. I think we can achieve the same thing
17 under a design review, but it's built in with a public process.

18 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yeah, and I agree with you. I
19 think we are familiar with having the Zoning Commission do design
20 review, because we've done that in a number of other parts of
21 the city. We have a good document, the Wisconsin Avenue Design
22 Guidelines design document, that the Zoning Commission and the
23 Office of Planning can refer to during a design review process.
24 And, you know, I think that -- I think it is a -- again, I keep
25 saying this, six of one, half-dozen of another -- that the form-

1 based codes would require those setting up this new process in
2 the Department of Building. It's probably better to do a process
3 that we're already doing in other parts of the city, which is
4 the design review through the Zoning Commission.

5 So, again, I think that that's all moving in a good and
6 positive direction. One thing -- and I have to admit, I did look
7 at the specific language in the text amendment, but I would like
8 to just be reassured, I guess, that the overarching goal is stated
9 that, in any design review process we have to be consistent with
10 the Wisconsin Avenue Design Guidelines.

11 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: It is stated -- it is stated there,
12 yeah.

13 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Because I think that's a very
14 important statement. You know, we can have the specific language
15 about the one-to-one setbacks and the information that's in
16 there, but it doesn't capture sort of everything that's in the
17 Wisconsin Avenue Design Guidelines. So I think that having, you
18 know, the directive to this Commission and all the members of
19 this Commission in the future that you have to be consistent with
20 the Wisconsin Avenue Design Guidelines is important. It's not
21 literally just the setbacks that were specifically called out in
22 the text of the zone; it's that we have to look at the whole --
23 the whole Wisconsin Avenue Design Guidelines document, which,
24 again, went through an extensive public process, had a lot of
25 input, and so on, so --

1 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: I think --

2 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: I'm sorry.

3 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: So I just want to respond to that
4 again, because in the draft -- in the -- in the recommendation
5 that we had, I think what we did is to say that, you know, the
6 intent is to be consistent with that. Maybe later, you know, we
7 can make the language a little stronger, but I'll just offer
8 that, you know, just to --

9 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yeah. I just want to make sure
10 that in the actual text, that it's very, very clear that in the
11 design review process we need to use the Wisconsin Avenue Design
12 Guidelines.

13 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Okay.

14 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: The other question that I had,
15 had to do with the lot occupancy, and this is really just a
16 clarification. I know we talked about the 80 percent cap on lot
17 occupancy and how that could end up with what I keep calling
18 postage-stamp public open spaces and how, you know, it certainly
19 is fine, in terms of providing wider sidewalks or a nice small
20 plaza at the entry of a building, but it doesn't really give you
21 open space. And the response, which I understand, is that there
22 really isn't a mechanism to get property owners to work together
23 and combine their postage-stamp open spaces into a bigger open
24 space that has a greater potential for placemaking and, you know,
25 really good public use. So what I -- but what I didn't

1 understand, and I'm looking at this, is there is, you know, a
2 discussion that it could lead to unintended reduction in
3 buildable residential footprints at the upper levels, and it
4 could mean that owners will come in and seek zoning relief. So
5 sort of with the Office of Planning sort of acknowledging that
6 there are some potential pitfalls with the 80 percent, you're
7 still recommending the 80 percent for residential uses only. And
8 I -- you know, I get the impression that by saying it's for
9 residential only seems to be something that you all see -- feel
10 is very important, but I didn't quite understand why, you know,
11 after noting some of the pitfalls that could happen from this 80
12 percent requirement, why you didn't just say "Okay. We'll get
13 rid of the 80 percent requirement and allow it to be a hundred
14 percent." So could you explain a little bit about why saying
15 it's for residential only seems to be a gamechanger or important
16 in OP's recommendation?

17 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Because the 80 percent, we see that
18 as something that will give more opportunity for light and air
19 and, you know, for the residential units, which is going to be
20 above the ground floor, and so that was the main -- the main
21 tenet of that, is to give the residences -- you know, to be able
22 to carve the building out to really allow for more light and air,
23 yeah. And 80 percent -- the 80 percent lot occupancy is sort of
24 a standard for buildings in the higher density also.

25 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: I see. Okay. I know on the

1 WMATA site it specifically says a hundred percent coverage is
2 allowed.

3 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Yes, and those are for the WMATA --
4 you know, for the bus garage and that sort of thing. That's --
5 that was the difference.

6 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Uh-huh. But you're saying you
7 feel the 80 percent is appropriate for residential, because that
8 allows some carving to allow for additional light and air.

9 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Right. Uh-huh.

10 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Okay.

11 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: And it also allows for the
12 buildings to be -- you know, to be set back from the -- you know,
13 any adjacent buildings, that sort of thing.

14 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Okay. And then, in terms of the
15 pedestrian connections, you know, I appreciate that you've looked
16 at the midblock connections and that you've revised some of your
17 recommendations, given the fact that some of these midblock
18 connections -- pedestrian connections would be very, very
19 difficult to implement, given topography or land ownership or
20 other kinds of issues. I just wasn't completely clear. Did you
21 look at every pedestrian connection that was in the Wisconsin
22 Avenue Development Guidelines --

23 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Yes.

24 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: -- or just the ones that were
25 raised at the hearing?

1 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: No, we looked at all the ones that
2 were -- that were indicated in the in the Guidelines.

3 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: And you've made what you feel to
4 be appropriate changes, either eliminating -- in one case,
5 completely eliminating the requirement for a pedestrian
6 connection, and in another, revising it a bit. Again, help me
7 so I make sure I understand. Are these connections mandatory?
8 I would think if we went through a design review process and they
9 were noted in the Wisconsin Avenue Design Guidelines, but not
10 proposed in the actual application, we would say, "No, no, that's
11 not consistent with the Wisconsin Avenue Design Guidelines." So
12 I'll let you sort of respond. They are mandatory or recommended?

13 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Well, in in the zoning, they are --
14 they're going to be mandatory; you know, in the -- in the Design
15 Guidelines, they were recommendations. And so, as you said,
16 after we took a -- you know, a deeper look at some of them, we
17 made adjustments to make sure that, you know, they would be
18 possible. On one, we didn't, because -- just because of the
19 topography and all the issues that goes with that. It was really
20 not feasible to do it there. It looks good on paper, but when
21 you go, practically, it doesn't work.

22 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Right.

23 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: So that's why we took a closer look
24 at them and adjusted -- made the adjustments. Great. Those were
25 most of the clarifications that I was looking for, and I think

1 | you've, you know, explained them pretty well.

2 | MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Uh-huh.

3 | COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: And so I'll turn it over to my
4 | colleagues and see if they have additional questions or
5 | clarifications.

6 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Vice Chair Miller,
7 | any questions or comments?

8 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank
9 | you, Commissioner Wright, for all of your questions and
10 | clarifications about what's being proposed here. I very much
11 | appreciate the Office of Planning's responsiveness to the
12 | comments that the public and we made at the public hearing a
13 | couple months ago, so thank you Radhika Mohan, Maxine Brown-
14 | Roberts, and Karen Thomas for a very thorough response in your
15 | supplemental -- second supplemental report, April 20th dated
16 | that's in our public record. It really did provide a lot of
17 | information that answered questions that were raised by us and
18 | the public at that hearing.

19 | Most importantly, you propose a design review process
20 | for every case on Wisconsin Avenue that will come forward, which
21 | is what the major complaint from opponents who testified or
22 | submitted comments, that they wouldn't have an opportunity if
23 | this was matter-of-right, unlike Cleveland Park/Woodley Park,
24 | where there is a historic district, where there will be a review
25 | process where the public can participate. But you proposed a

1 design review process, which we've done in other rezoning cases,
2 like, I think, the Yards Park, other major -- other major
3 rezonings, and I appreciate that responsiveness, so thank you.
4 That was -- that's a big thing, and people should recognize that
5 that's a big thing. And it will delay projects, because that
6 will require another layer of review, which has been a problem
7 in all of our zoning decisions over the last three decades, but
8 it's limited to the scope of what's in -- supposed to be in that
9 review.

10 And so I would like to -- and I appreciate that the
11 Office of Planning has provided the information about that. So
12 I really don't have many questions. I think you've provided an
13 opportunity for public input, which is what the Ward 3
14 Councilmember asked for, which is what a lot of folks asked for.
15 You know, there was a form-based codes alternative, but the design
16 review process of the Zoning Commission does -- alternative does
17 provide -- and you said you don't have time to -- or the staff
18 or resources to develop those specific design guidelines,
19 although you did provide, I think, in the original proposed zoning
20 and now in the revised zoning, setbacks and other design
21 guidelines that are incorporated to be -- that will be there as
22 a baseline, beyond whatever design review, which the Zoning
23 Commission and the public will review. So I really do appreciate
24 the time and effort that you all at OP have put into this case,
25 so I'm ready to move forward. I don't think we need a -- we're

1 not talking about process at the moment, but I'll just say it,
2 since I have a mic. We -- I don't think we need a limited --
3 any further public hearing, limited scope or otherwise. I think,
4 as we did in the Cleveland Park/Woodley Park case, the public
5 should have an opportunity to respond to how OP has very fully,
6 in my opinion, and responsibly and responsively responded to all
7 of the comments by us and the public in the -- in the last public
8 hearing, so I think they should have an opportunity -- the public
9 should have an opportunity to comment. So I would support keeping
10 the record open, as other -- has been recommended by the Ward 3
11 Councilmember and the Committee of 100, for a limited -- very
12 limited period.

13 I think they have addressed the major issues in this
14 case. You know, in Cleveland Park, the HPRB is going to review --
15 and we haven't even taken proposed action in that case, but HPRB
16 is going to review every -- probably every case -- every action
17 in there, but here, now, we're going to -- we're now going to
18 review every case with public input, which is what the public
19 wanted. So I think this is ready to move forward with -- maybe
20 an opportunity to move forward with the significant responsive
21 changes that have been made by the Office of Planning, which I
22 very much thank you for being so responsible and finding creative
23 ways to address the issues that have been raised in the public
24 record, so thank you.

25 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Commissioner

1 Stidham, any follow-up questions or comments?

2 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Just a little bit. First of
3 all, I just wanted to reiterate the thanks to OP for all of your
4 work and for coming back with everything that you've come back
5 with. I think it was very thoughtful and appreciated, so thank
6 you for that. And, you know, I think the other Commissioners
7 have covered everything, so I would just add that I agree on the
8 need for the public comment, which has been requested. Figuring
9 out what that looks like, I think, is our next step, but
10 definitely necessary.

11 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Okay.

12 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. I only have one
13 question for our Deputy Director, Ms. Brown-Roberts. One of the
14 things that I saw in the record in the -- another case. I don't
15 recall which one it was -- well, it was Chevy Chase -- and in
16 this case, there were some concerns across the city that their
17 neighborhood is going to be like this, but through these processes
18 the way I'm looking at it -- looking at this -- and I don't
19 necessarily have anything germane to the substance -- but the
20 Office of Planning worked with the community for some time. It
21 just wasn't taken to the community and say, "Hey, here, this is
22 what we're going to do." You all work with the community, and
23 the community actually helped create some -- what we had before.
24 Is that -- is that -- let me ask it this way. Is that a correct
25 statement that I'm making?

1 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: That is a correct statement, Mr.
2 Hood, yes.

3 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. And the reason I'm saying that,
4 because I saw another Ward where they were very concerned about
5 this is going to infiltrate or this is going to be pushed over
6 to their neighborhood. No, the Office of Planning will work with
7 neighbors and, you know, they will work with the community to
8 develop something, if that's what the plan is. And I may be
9 behind (indiscernible) when maybe the plan is already there. I'm
10 not sure. And, again, I don't necessarily have anything. And,
11 again, I want to commend the Office of Planning, Ms. Brown-
12 Roberts and the team, on all -- being responsive to all the many,
13 many concerns.

14 I do know that we have a request to -- for additional
15 information, but then we also have another request to double down
16 on saying we have done this extensively. So I don't have anything
17 else for you, Ms. Brown-Roberts, so thank you and the Office of
18 Planning for all the work that you all have done on this.

19 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: And --

20 CHAIRMAN HOOD: You have something you want to add, Ms.
21 Brown-Roberts?

22 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Yeah. I just wanted to say, it's
23 Associate Director, not Deputy Director.

24 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, excuse me. Associate Director.
25 Okay.

1 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Yes.

2 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: You can just say "the new Joel".
3 All right. All right. Everything's moving around, so forgive me.

4 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Congratulations.

6 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

7 CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. I don't know what's going
8 on with my computer. I don't know whether my -- the bandwidth --
9 I don't know what's going, because people popping in and out so
10 let's talk about process. Let me -- let me start with
11 Commissioner Wright and Vice Chair Miller and Commissioner
12 Stidham. Let's talk about process.

13 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yeah. I don't -- I don't really
14 think that any of the topics that I brought up require, like, a
15 third supplemental report. I think that Ms. Brown-Roberts
16 answered, you know, the questions that I had, and I understand.
17 I think, you know, I might again suggest that you look again at
18 the actual text of the zone to make sure that the Wisconsin Avenue
19 Design Guidelines are very, very clearly identified as the
20 overarching document that we look at during the design review
21 process -- that the Zoning Commission looks at during the design
22 review process, just to make sure that that's very, very clear.

23 But, you know, I think that you were able to really
24 answer most of my questions, and I don't have, you know, things
25 to send you back and do more research on -- unusual for me, I

1 know. I'm always asking for more. But I do think that, you
2 know, we should treat this case pretty much exactly the way we
3 treated the Cleveland Park Woodley Park case, where we kept the
4 record -- (Commissioner Wright temporarily lost her
5 connection) -- I'm not sure if I -- I'm not sure if I cut out
6 there. There was something weird that happened.

7 CHAIRMAN HOOD: I've been cutting in and out the whole
8 time. I don't know what's going on.

9 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yeah. So, you know, I do think
10 that we should keep the record open and ask the public to submit
11 written comments and testimony on -- focused only on this second
12 supplemental report and the ideas in the second supplemental
13 report, and then meet again after we get that public testimony,
14 and then take a vote on proposed action. So, again, I think
15 we've been through this. We should just do the same thing we
16 did with the Cleveland Park/Woodley Park case. That's my
17 suggestion.

18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner Wright.
19 Commissioner -- Vice Chair Miller, you have anything to add to
20 that or take away from that?

21 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Not really. I agree with everything
22 Commissioner Wright said. And I meant to mention that one of
23 the things that the Zoning Commission commented on and public
24 testimony commented on at the public hearing was the
25 encouragement for family-sized housing units, and that has now

1 | been included as a specific purpose of this zone, and that's
2 | important, you know, two or three or more bedrooms for family-
3 | sized units. It's not a requirement, because there's always the
4 | feasibility issues that we can't control, but that's a goal of
5 | the city that we all support. So I appreciate that that's been
6 | added as a purpose and it will be part of the design review
7 | process, because not always the design review process will deal
8 | with unit size, but here, in this -- the way this is constructed,
9 | as I understand it, the design review process would allow that
10 | unit size to be considered in our consideration by us and the
11 | public. So I -- again, I appreciate the Office of Planning's
12 | responsiveness to that concern of us and the public.

13 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Commissioner
14 | Stidham, anything else on process?

15 | COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: No, just to agree that the
16 | process we used before would be, you know, best suited here again.
17 | They are very similar in nature and, for consistency's sake, it
18 | makes a lot of sense, and it's the right thing to do. Thank you.

19 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Okay. I would agree
20 | with my colleagues with the process; same thing that we did
21 | previously, so I don't need to belabor the point. We're going
22 | to tackle what the Committee of 100, Ms. Judy Chesser, who's the
23 | Chair of the Committee of 100, and I'm sure others, may have
24 | said. And I know there's some others who don't think we need to
25 | do this, but we're going to go ahead and kind of be consistent,

1 as my colleagues have already mentioned. Ms. -- unless I hear
2 anything else. Ms. Schellin, do we have anything outlined? And
3 it doesn't look like we need another supplemental. I think we're
4 good with what we have, but we want to make sure that they're
5 able to respond.

6 MS. SCHELLIN: So if you want to do the same thing that
7 you did in 25-09, you left the record open for two weeks to allow
8 the public to respond to that supplemental OP report. And you're
9 only leaving the record open, I believe, for just responses to
10 that supplemental report, correct?

11 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Right. Correct.

12 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. So, if you want to do that, then
13 two weeks from today would make that May 14th, which is your next
14 meeting.

15 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Wait a minute. Let me -- let me ask --
16 let me ask legal this. Ms. Lovick, do -- should we narrow it to
17 just the second supplemental or do -- or can people just respond
18 to everything? How does that work? I don't want to limit -- I
19 don't want to go back down the same --

20 MR. RITTING: Well, it's up to the Commission to decide
21 that. It depends on whether you want broader comments or if you
22 are only interested in comments that address the OP second
23 supplemental report.

24 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Ritting. Sorry.
25 I forgot this was your case. All right. Let's stick with what --

1 let's stick with --

2 MS. LOVICK: But I would -- but I would note that in
3 in the 25-09 case, like, since you're trying to do something
4 similar, you only open the record up to provide comments on the
5 supplemental report. So if you want to be consistent with that,
6 that just might be something to consider.

7 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. I just didn't want
8 to have to redo anything. Okay. So let's keep going. Sorry.
9 Thank you all.

10 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. So that would be until three
11 o'clock p.m. on May 14th, and, like I said, that is your next --
12 that would be the meeting day, so that would mean this case --
13 the Commission could consider proposed action at the May 28th
14 meeting. Does that work?

15 MS. LOVICK: Jake, does that give you enough time to
16 prepare? Please respond because, I mean, I just want to make
17 sure that you have enough time.

18 MR. RITTING: So the record would be open for the
19 comments until May 14th, and then proposed action would occur two
20 weeks later on May 28th?

21 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.

22 MR. RITTING: That's fine. Yes.

23 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. Other than that, the record is
24 closed.

25 CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Anything else on this?

1 MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir, unless you want OP to respond
2 to those -- did you want them to respond?

3 CHAIRMAN HOOD: I don't -- I don't necessarily need
4 to -- need anything, unless my colleagues need something from OP.
5 I think OP has done their due diligence with this responding.

6 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. Then no other dates then. Gotcha.

7 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Give me a second. My agenda closed up
8 on me. Okay. Hold on a second. We just had one thing, and
9 that's a hearing action, Zoning Commission Case Number 26-04,
10 Office of Zoning, text amendment to Subtitles Y and Z, Chapter
11 2,7, and 16. Ms. Schellin, are you doing this one or is Ms.
12 Thomas doing it?

13 MS. SCHELLIN: Ms. Thomas.

14 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Thomas. Ms. Thomas.

15 MS. THOMAS: Yes. Good afternoon --

16 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Good afternoon.

17 MS. THOMAS: -- Mr. Chair, members of the Board --
18 Commission. Sorry. Karen Thomas with the Office of Planning.
19 And we are recommending the approval of the requests submitted
20 by the Office of Zoning as being consistent with the Comprehensive
21 Plan and, also, updating required regulations to contemporary
22 needs of the District. Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Thomas. Any
24 questions, colleagues?

25 (No response.)

1 CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'm looking. I'm looking. I'm not
2 seeing anyone. All right. Thank you, Ms. Thomas. We appreciate
3 your report. Pretty straightforward. Ms. Schellin -- no, let
4 me do this. I make a -- I make a motion that we will set down,
5 as captioned, Zoning Commission Case Number 26-04, Office of
6 Zoning text amendments to Subtitle Y and Z, Chapter 2,7, and 16,
7 and ask for a second.

8 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Second.

9 CHAIRMAN HOOD: It's been moved and properly seconded.
10 Any further discussion?

11 (No response.)

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

14 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood.

15 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.

16 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Wright.

17 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes.

18 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller.

19 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

20 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Stidham.

21 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes.

22 MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is four to zero to one to set
23 down Zoning Commission Case Number 26-04 as a rulemaking case,
24 the minus one being Commissioner Imamura, not present, not
25 voting. And I believe Ms. Lovick came --

1 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Lovick has -- Ms. Lovick's up. Ms.
2 Lovick.

3 MS. LOVICK: Hi. I just want to ask, will you please
4 just -- can you please confirm that you're also authorizing
5 publication of a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking --

6 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.

7 MS. LOVICK: -- as a part of that motion? Just confirm
8 it please.

9 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Yes, we will include that
10 in the motion as well. Unless I hear any objections, yes, we
11 will. Thank you. Anything else, Ms. Schellin?

12 MS. SCHELLIN: Nothing.

13 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Okay. The Zoning Commission
14 will meet again on May the 14th, and that'll be another public
15 meeting. Okay. So, with that, I want to thank everyone for
16 their participation, and, with that, this meeting is adjourned.
17 Have a great evening.

18 (Whereupon, the above-entitled public meeting was
19 adjourned at 5:40 p.m.)

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: 04-30-26

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