

GOVERNMENT OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

REGULAR PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

THURSDAY

JUNE 25, 2026

+ + + + +

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

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

PAUL YOUNG, Zoning Data Specialist
ELLA ACKERMAN, Acting Secretary

OFFICE OF ZONING LEGAL DIVISION STAFF PRESENT:

JACOB RITTING, ESQUIRE
BRIAN LAMPERT, ESQUIRE

ALSO PRESENT:

MAXINE BROWN-ROBERTS, DC Office of Planning

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Regular Public Meeting held on June 25, 2026.

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

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

Case No. 25-18	
Champlain Street Partners, LLC	5
Case No. 25-09	
Office of Planning	8

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

(4:00 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, who is in attendance and will turn his camera on shortly, Commissioner Wright, Commissioner Imamura, and Commissioner Stidham; the Office of Zoning staff, Ms. Ella Ackerman, and Mr. Paul Young, who will be handling all of our virtual operations; and our Office of Zoning Legal Division, we have joining us this evening Mr. Brian Lampert and Mr. Jacob Ritting. I will ask all others to introduce themselves at the appropriate time.

At 3:15 p.m. today, the Commission entered into a closed session, approved by a vote of five to zero to zero on June the 11th, 2026, to be held for the purpose of obtaining legal advice from our counsel and deliberate, but not to vote, on the contested cases of today's agenda. While discussions were held, there were no decisions made. Upon conclusion of the closed session, the Commission immediately entered into 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. Okay. The video will

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

1 be available on the Office of Zoning's website after the meeting.
2 Accordingly, all those listening on Webex or by phone will be
3 muted during the hearing and -- during the meeting. For hearing
4 action items -- and, actually, this evening, the hearing action
5 item has been taken off at the request of some further discussions
6 from the ANC and the community working with the applicant, so we
7 don't have anything this evening, but I'm going to read this
8 anyway.

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

17 At this time, I will go to Miss Ackerman. Ms. Ackerman,
18 do we have any preliminary matters? And if you can just announce
19 that the hearing action has been rescheduled, that would help us
20 move expeditiously. Thank you.

21 MS. ACKERMAN: Hi. Yes. One moment. So the only
22 preliminary matter we have this morning -- or this afternoon --
23 sorry -- is that hearing action item -- sorry -- 26-03 was
24 scheduled for today for setdown, but has been moved to the July
25 16th public meeting agenda. This will provide the ANC more time

1 to submit their setdown report. And that is the only matter we
2 have.

3 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. All right. Let's
4 move right into our agenda. Final action, Zoning Commission Case
5 Number 25-18, Champlain Street Partners, LLC, consolidated PUD
6 and related map amendment at Square 2560. Ms. Ackerman.

7 MS. ACKERMAN: At the conclusion of the May 21st public
8 meeting, the Commission took proposed action to approve this
9 case, and it was referred to the NCPC for its 30-day comment
10 period. At Exhibit, 30 we have the NCPC staff report stating
11 that the proposal falls under an exception listed in Chapter 8,
12 Exceptions and Project Changes of the NCPC's guidelines, and is
13 exempt from Commission review. This case is ready for the
14 Commission to consider final action. Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Ackerman. Colleagues,
16 we asked for a few things, and I think we we've gotten all of
17 it. We asked for a signature page, and we saw the signatures.
18 The agreement -- MOU has been signed. We also saw -- we also --
19 there were some questions about DHCD's comments regarding the
20 project's IZ set-aside, if financing for the project, as
21 proposed, doesn't come through. And then we asked to provide an
22 update or coordination efforts to address the concerns raised by
23 one of the persons who had concerns, who testified concerning
24 pedestrian circulation and safety along Champlain Street. I
25 think there was only three things that were outstanding, and they

1 | were -- to my satisfaction, they were submitted -- responded to
2 | with -- I don't have any further discussions, but those who may
3 | have asked those questions, I'm going to open it up, and I will
4 | ask, does anyone have any additional concerns or comments -- just
5 | anybody have any additional concerns or comments on this?

6 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: I don't have any. I agree with
7 | you, Mr. Chairman. I think the applicant was responsive in their
8 | post-hearing submission to our request for the signature page
9 | that would show the Tenant Association support for this proposal.
10 | And I appreciate the applicant working with our own legal counsel
11 | on a condition that assures that even though this is an all-
12 | affordable project that will be much more than affordable
13 | housing -- at a deeper affordable level than our IZ requires.
14 | If -- as you said, if the financing or something doesn't go
15 | through, there is -- and, in any case, there is always in
16 | perpetuity, at least, 15 percent I think is what came in the
17 | condition, 15 percent inclusionary zoning, because their
18 | financing is 30 years, so our IZ is in perpetuity. So I
19 | appreciate the applicant working with our legal counsel on that
20 | condition and the applicant's work -- the dialogue with that
21 | neighbor who is concerned about the pedestrian safety in the
22 | neighborhood, which is a real concern, so they're working with
23 | them, and they will continue to work with them. So thank you.

24 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. And I would also
25 | agree there are sustainable benefits in this case, as well as

1 affordable housing, which has already been alluded to, the deeper
2 affordability. When you start getting down to 30 percent of the
3 MFI that's -- we're striving then. I'd like to get to 20, 10,
4 and maybe 5, but we did 30, so, you know, we're going to take
5 what we can get. I think this is a very sufficient project, so,
6 unless I hear further discussion, I will move that we approve
7 for final action Zoning Commission Case Number 25-18, as
8 captioned, and ask for a second.

9 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Second.

10 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Second.

11 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. It's been moved and seconded
12 twice. It took a minute. I was wondering. It's been moved
13 properly seconded. Any further discussion?

14 (No response.)

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

17 MS. ACKERMAN: Yes. Commissioner Hood.

18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.

19 MS. ACKERMAN: Commissioner Stidham.

20 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes.

21 MS. ACKERMAN: Commissioner Miller.

22 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

23 MS. ACKERMAN: Commissioner Imamura.

24 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.

25 MS. ACKERMAN: And Commissioner Wright.

1 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes.

2 MS. ACKERMAN: Staff records the vote five to zero to
3 zero to approve Case Number 25-18 for final action.

4 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I think -- wait a minute. Okay.
5 Our next case is Zoning -- proposed action -- I'm sorry -- Zoning
6 Commission Case Number 25-09, Office of Planning text and map
7 amendments to create the Cleveland Park neighborhood mixed-use
8 zones. Ms. Ackerman.

9 MS. ACKERMAN: At the conclusion of the April 9th public
10 meeting, the Commission provided additional time for the comments
11 by the Office of Planning. At Exhibit 274, OP requested an
12 extension for their time; and at Exhibit 275 is OP's supplemental
13 report. This case is ready for the Commission to consider
14 proposed action tonight. Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Give me one second please. There
16 were a number of things that were discussed at our last meeting.
17 We had a supplemental report. Give me one moment. My files
18 closed up on me. All right. So what I'll do is, I'm going to
19 ask -- I know that the designation of the zones -- let's talk
20 about that first, but, anyway, let me just do it this way. Let
21 me ask Commissioner Wright if she will start us off in a
22 discussion on those four to five items, and, also, Vice Chair
23 Miller and the rest of us will pull up the rear, so to speak.
24 Commissioner Wright.

25 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Sure. And please, you know, any

1 of the other Zoning Commission members who have thoughts, please
2 jump in. You know, I'm not trying to be the only one talking.

3 So this has been a -- an effort that has been underway
4 for quite a long time and has had a lot of public input and has
5 had, you know, several different opportunities to provide
6 testimony at the Zoning Commission about this proposal. And, you
7 know, I do want to say, as I've said at other Zoning Commission
8 meetings, the basic idea of focusing density along our
9 transportation corridors is a sound and appropriate goal, and it
10 is a major part of our Comprehensive Plan, and we should be
11 focusing density along our transportation corridors, particularly
12 where there are Metro stations.

13 So what we've said in previous meetings, and I think
14 is still true, is that our goal is just make sure we do it right.
15 It's not to say that we are concerned about the concept, but to
16 make sure that we are exploring all of the permutations of the
17 zone that is being proposed to make sure that it is appropriately
18 fulfilling the goal of adding density along transportation
19 corridors, but also protecting the unique character of our
20 communities, both the properties along the corridors and the
21 properties adjacent to the corridors.

22 So we've had a lot of different discussions about, you
23 know, the IZ issue, for example. And I do want to just reiterate
24 what we have said previously, which is that, you know, at least
25 I, as one Commissioner -- and I don't know how the others feel,

1 but I sort of think they feel the same way -- we should not create
2 a brand new IZ program or set of requirements for this zone. We
3 have an IZ program with IZ Plus as an option, and we know the
4 Office of Planning is going to be studying the city's IZ program
5 to see if it does require any changes, but we do not see creating
6 a brand new IZ set of rules for this zone. So I -- that was a
7 big discussion that was had. I think we absolutely support IZ
8 Plus, as it's currently described in regulation, but we don't
9 propose a brand new take on IZ.

10 We also have been wrestling with the whole issue of,
11 you know, what is the correct zone; if we're going to add density
12 along our corridors, what is the correct zone. And so we asked
13 the Office of Planning to do a detailed analysis of the current
14 zone and other potential zones, which they did, and they did a
15 chart comparing the existing zoning versus MU-5B, NMU-7B, and the
16 proposed zone, which is a tailored zone based on MU-8, but has
17 specific provisions for this corridor, and that's for the
18 Cleveland Park area.

19 For the Woodley Park area, they did a similar
20 comparison and looked at a proposed zone, again, based on MU-9
21 in Woodley Park, but with specific language in the zone tailored
22 to this corridor. I think they did a really, really good job on
23 providing that analysis. This was one of -- this was a -- one
24 of the better written staff reports, I thought, with really good
25 analysis of the different potential zones, and I think they made

1 a persuasive case for the zones that they are recommending,
2 particularly in terms of creating zones that have the highest
3 likelihood of producing the most affordable units. And I honestly
4 have to say -- I'll just put it out there -- the one part of
5 their argument that I was not persuaded by was the discussion
6 that the MU-7 in Cleveland Park -- that the MU-7 zone, 7B, doesn't
7 have the rear-yard setbacks and the current zone proposed does.
8 Well, yes, it does, because it was written in specifically for
9 this geographic area. And if we wanted this to do -- wanted this
10 to be the NMU-7B, we could write a specific zone for Cleveland
11 Park that has those setbacks in. So I sort of saw that, really,
12 as a wash and not the strongest argument to say that their
13 proposed zone was the appropriate zone. I do think that their
14 strongest argument is that it really is going to maximize the
15 amount of affordable housing that would occur in this area.

16 So we had a lot of discussion about the appropriate
17 zones. We had a discussion because of some input that we got
18 about infrastructure assessment. And the Department of --
19 District Department of Transportation has reiterated that their
20 assessment remains true. OP reports that they got no response
21 from DC Water, but we have, also, certainly not heard any of the
22 utilities express a concern that additional development along
23 these corridors is going to break the grid, is going to somehow
24 put too much stress on our utility grid. So I have to believe
25 that if the utility companies had a strong concern, they would

1 | be speaking up and saying "We can't do this; we can't handle
2 | this."

3 | On the issue of historic preservation, all of the areas
4 | in Cleveland Park and Woodley Park are designated historic
5 | districts and do come under the review of the Historic
6 | Preservation Review Board. I do want to note that we have asked
7 | on more than one occasion for staff in the Office of Planning --
8 | from the Historic Preservation Office in the Office of Planning
9 | to attend a Zoning Commission meeting to talk about the
10 | intersection of their review and whatever happens from a zoning
11 | standpoint. We have had -- we haven't gotten a no, saying we
12 | won't attend. We've gotten no response at all. And I have to
13 | tell you, I find that unacceptable.

14 | If the Zoning Commission requests a member of the
15 | Office of Planning to come to a Zoning Commission meeting, I
16 | think it is essential for that staff person from the Office of
17 | Planning to come to the Zoning Commission meeting. And for this
18 | to just have been ignored and not addressed is really, really
19 | unacceptable, and I'm prepared to, number one, reiterate that
20 | request, but also take it up the chain of command in the Office
21 | of Planning to find out why our Zoning Commission request has
22 | been ignored. So I do have to say that. But in terms of the
23 | issue of --

24 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioner Wright, let me -- let me
25 | just interrupt right there.

1 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes.

2 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let me just interrupt. Ms. Ackerman,
3 can we bring Ms. Brown-Roberts up please?

4 MS. ACKERMAN: Sure. One moment.

5 CHAIRMAN HOOD: We're going to dispel this right now.
6 We got enough on our plate. We don't want to add anything else.
7 Or Ms. Mohan or whoever we can bring up, and I have a few questions
8 before we get there, because I want to make sure that that was
9 relayed. I'm not sure. I can't remember if we did a formal
10 request or we just said it virtually and was there something that
11 our staff was supposed to follow up on. I want to make sure that
12 we didn't drop the ball, Commissioner Wright, and then I will
13 turn my attention to the Office of Planning.

14 MS. ACKERMAN: We're bringing her up right now.

15 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

16 MS. ACKERMAN: Uh-huh. Paul, are you able to bring
17 Maxine up. For some reason, it's not letting me.

18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Young, can you help us?

19 (Brief pause.)

20 CHAIRMAN HOOD: I tell you what, while you all are
21 working on it -- keep working on that to bring her up, and,
22 Commissioner Wright, if you can continue please.

23 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Sure. So the topic with the
24 Historic Review Board and the Historic Preservation Office within
25 the Office of Planning is related to the issue of front setbacks.

1 And there are, in the zones, required rear-yard setbacks, which
2 is great, and I don't think any of us have a disagreement with
3 the required rear-yard setbacks, but that we've gotten lots of
4 feedback about the front-yard setbacks.

5 In the Connecticut Avenue Development Guidelines, it
6 does talk about the need for front setbacks, but it doesn't
7 specify, you know, a 10-foot, a 15-foot, a 20-foot; it really
8 says it should be decided on a case-by-case basis, and given the
9 context of the project, and give the Historic Preservation Review
10 Board the ability to study context and so forth and make a
11 decision on setback on a case-by-case basis, and I agree with all
12 of that. I do think -- and we'll get to this in a few minutes --
13 that the new sort of overarching purpose language that has been
14 proposed by the Office of Planning is really good, but I think
15 it may need to be tweaked a little bit to address that issue.
16 And I actually think we may have some -- a short suggested
17 language on that, but, I'm sorry, Ms. Brown-Roberts, you're
18 now -- you're now with us, so --

19 CHAIRMAN HOOD: So let me -- let me just interject.
20 Thank you, Commissioner Wright. Ms. Brown-Roberts, we -- I want
21 to make sure that we've done our due diligence. I know that
22 there has been a number of requests to have someone from HPRB
23 attend. Did you all get that from us? Do you -- did you all
24 get that request from us?

25 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: You -- good afternoon, Mr. Chairman.

1 Maxine Brown Roberts for the -- for the record. The request was
2 made verbally to us during the testimony, and I did convey that
3 on more than one occasion to our Director, and was directed that
4 it was not something that she wanted to do.

5 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So the Director already has said
6 that she didn't want to --

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

8 CHAIRMAN HOOD: -- to send anyone to the Zoning
9 Commission.

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

11 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right. Commissioner Wright,
12 Commissioners, we have our answer. I will follow up with our
13 Director and follow up with a letter myself to Ms. Cozart, so
14 I'll just leave it at that. Thank you, Ms. Brown-Roberts. I'm
15 sorry to have to call you up, but, you know, when you move up
16 the ladder, sometimes you got to show up.

17 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Yes. No problem at all. I mean,
18 we need to get this squared up, so there's no problem with that.

19 CHAIRMAN HOOD: And I will be sending a letter or
20 talking to the Director myself about these issues.

21 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Yes.

22 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right.

23 VICE CHAIR MILLER: While Ms. Roberts is -- Brown-
24 Roberts is here, I just wanted to compliment her on the report --
25 the second supplemental -- I guess it's the second supplemental

1 report, at least, that you provided to us and was very responsive
2 to all of the Commission's concerns. And I just -- I was going
3 to say that when I had my turn, but you're here; I wanted to say
4 it to you personally. I mean, nothing's perfect.

5 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Thank you.

6 VICE CHAIR MILLER: But it really -- particularly, the
7 analysis -- the comparative analysis of the -- of the zones was
8 very helpful, so I appreciate that.

9 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Okay. Great. Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Miss Brown Roberts. I want
11 to thank you, too, But I'm going to also mention, when it comes
12 to round of my turn, while I know we're doing this in Cleveland
13 Park and Wisconsin Avenue, I'm still going to be echoing and
14 pushing for Ivy City. I know you were out there. I was with
15 them the other day, and they mentioned it to me again. And I
16 appreciate all the work that's been done all over, but I want to
17 make sure that people who are asking for this also get the same
18 attention, so I'm going to say it again, but I wanted to make
19 sure, as the Vice Chair did, to seize the moment while you were
20 here.

21 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Okay.

22 CHAIRMAN HOOD: So that's what happens when you go up
23 the ladder, so keep on going up the ladder so I can call you back
24 up, so thank you.

25 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Okay.

1 CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Commissioner Wright, if you
2 want to continue.

3 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yeah. And I think, really, the
4 last part of this conversation today was, we had asked the Office
5 of Planning to provide more language to the purpose and intent
6 section of the proposed new zones. We had noted that other zones,
7 like the Dupont Circle zone, had very strong purpose and intent
8 language, and we asked them to add that. So they are proposing
9 additional language that -- and I'm just going to read it out.

10 It says, "Recognize the Cleveland Park corridor as a
11 unique resource that must be preserved and enhanced; recognize
12 the Woodley Park corridor as a unique resource that must be
13 preserved and enhanced; provide strong protections to adjacent
14 residential areas, independent retail businesses, human-scale
15 streetscapes, and historic character; encourage new or additions
16 to existing buildings to not have a substantially adverse effect
17 on the use or enjoyment of any adjacent dwellings and that the
18 light, air, and privacy not be unduly affected; require a scale
19 of development consistent with the nature and character of
20 historic Cleveland Park and insure a general compatibility in the
21 scale of new buildings with older lower-scale buildings."

22 And it's that last one where I think we would propose --
23 or I would propose -- and, also, I know our Vice Chair may have
24 some thoughts on this -- adding, first of all, not just Cleveland
25 Park, but Woodley Park, where it says "Require a scale of

1 development consistent with the nature and character of historic
2 Cleveland Park and historic Woodley Park," because they're both
3 historic districts, "and insure a general compatibility in the
4 scale of new buildings with older low-scale buildings, including
5 setbacks, as recommended in the Connecticut Avenue Development
6 Guidelines and as appropriate."

7 So that language would specifically give everyone a
8 heads up that front setbacks, which are addressed in the
9 Connecticut Avenue Development Guidelines, are an important part
10 of this zone, and that, in the purpose and intent clause of the
11 zone, we're specifically referencing it in the portion that talks
12 about requiring an appropriate scale of development. So, you
13 know, with that additional language -- the addition to the
14 additional language, you know, I'm feeling comfortable.

15 And, again, it's been a long process, but, as I think
16 all of us have said on numerous occasions, the goal is to put
17 density along corridors, but to do it in the right way and to
18 get it right. And I do think that this process that we have been
19 going through has led to a better final result, so I'm feeling
20 like we're getting to be in a good place. That's all. I've said
21 probably too much.

22 CHAIRMAN HOOD: And I appreciate you recapping and
23 giving your points. I think that sets groundwork for the rest
24 of us, if we have anything to add or take away or give our own
25 comments. So I'm going ask the Vice Chair, and then I'm going

1 | come to Commissioner Imamura, and then Commissioner Stidham, and
2 | then myself.

3 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank
4 | you, Commissioner Wright, for your very thorough analysis and
5 | discussion. You really covered all the points that we had raised
6 | at the last hearing and responded to Office of Planning's response
7 | to our request for additional information. So I agree with all
8 | of the comments that you have made, especially -- well, I agree
9 | with all of the comments that you have made, and I think that
10 | the additional language that you've suggested in the purpose and
11 | intent section will -- to -- in that last point, require --
12 | they've added purpose and intent, at your -- at kind of your
13 | request, because it's in, like, the Dupont Circle's special zone,
14 | and they've added a lot of important purposes and intent that are
15 | in the Connecticut Avenue Development Guidelines, so it's nothing
16 | that hasn't been already vetted with the community, but you gave
17 | the specificity on the last one that addresses some concern about
18 | the lack of any requirement in this -- in these zones, Cleveland
19 | Park and Woodley Park, for front setbacks. So you requiring the
20 | paragraph that was added, "Require a scale of development
21 | consistent with the nature and character of historic Cleveland
22 | Park", and you appropriately added "historic Woodley Park" and
23 | "Insure general compatibility in the scale of new buildings with
24 | older low-scale buildings, including consistency with front
25 | setbacks, as referenced in the Connecticut Avenue Development

1 Guidelines, where appropriate." I mean, we we're not --
2 wordsmithing the entire thing right now. We can leave that to
3 our counsel to develop the exact language, but I think that's an
4 appropriate addition and a responsive addition to testimony that
5 we've had and with the Connecticut Avenue Development Guidelines.

6 The overarching goal, as you've said, Commissioner
7 Wright, is -- which is what the Comprehensive Plan's most recent
8 amendments, five years ago now, directed. It intensified the
9 density levels on the Future Land Use Map for both of these
10 transit-rich, amenity rich corridors that are in historic
11 districts, not the adjacent single-family neighborhoods. It's
12 just the commercial districts that are being dealt with in this
13 special zone.

14 And so the Future Land Use Map was intensified by the
15 Council and Mayor -- the density levels in the last cycle of
16 Comprehensive Plan amendments. So this zoning, I believe, is
17 certainly more consistent with that Comp Plan density designation
18 than the existing MU-4A moderate -- I guess that's moderate-
19 density zoning. I mean, what's called for in the Future Land
20 Use Map is medium-density residential here in Cleveland Park and
21 moderate-commercial, and what's called for in Woodley Park is
22 high-density residential and, I believe, low-density commercial.
23 So the MU-4A is way out of line with that, and I think the
24 proposed MU-8 and MU-9 specialized zones for Cleveland Park and
25 Woodley Park are certainly more consistent and will -- are

1 designed with -- as you said, they have specific rear-yard
2 setbacks and rear stepdowns in them tailored to those zones. The
3 front setbacks would be encouraged by the additional language
4 that we've -- that you've suggested, and I agree with, in the
5 purpose and intent section, and we know that the Historic
6 Preservation Review Board will be reviewing the context of each
7 and every project that comes forward.

8 So I'm supportive of -- I think we've reached a point
9 that this is -- this is ready to go forward, at least, with
10 proposed action. There may be additional items that we need
11 before any final action, but I'm satisfied with the responses
12 that we've gotten from the Office of Planning to our set of ten --
13 I think ten questions or requests for additional information at
14 our April -- I think it was our April hearing, and I appreciate
15 that comprehensive response, as I just conveyed to Maxine Brown-
16 Roberts. I mean, it wasn't perfect. I had asked for the
17 comparative base zone analysis between the different zones, which
18 Commissioner Imamura and I have been asking for in almost every
19 case for at least a couple years, is actually one of the best
20 comparative analyses I've seen, although it didn't include
21 what -- something I was hoping for which would show -- it does
22 maximize affordable housing -- it does show how it's going to
23 maximize affordable housing, but it didn't give any
24 quantification of that, which, actually, we've seen in other
25 comparative analyses, what the potential could be under various

1 zones and what the loss would be of affordable housing if we went
2 from what's currently proposed to a lower-density zone, which is
3 called out for, actually, on the -- in the Framework Element or
4 on the -- on the on the Comp Plan Future Land Use Map as
5 appropriate zones for this site -- additional appropriate zones
6 for this site.

7 So I think I personally am satisfied with where we've
8 gotten. It's -- the proposal has changed, in response to a lot
9 of testimony we've gotten and a lot of comments that we have
10 made, and I appreciate all of the public input into this process,
11 and I appreciate the Office of Planning's responsiveness and my
12 colleagues' questions and input on this matter. So I --
13 personally, Mr. Chairman, I'm ready to move forward with proposed
14 action. I'm not sure if there's a majority to do that tonight,
15 but I wanted to put that out there.

16 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Commissioner
17 Imamura, any comments or anything left? No, I'm just --

18 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm
19 not sure there is anything left. Commissioner Wright and Vice
20 Chair Miller did an excellent job. I don't think I have anything
21 more to add, other than to say that I agree with Vice Chair Miller
22 that the comparative analysis and report was well done, and really
23 appreciate the time, effort -- time and effort that went into
24 that. And so I share the opinion of Commissioner Wright and Vice
25 Chair Miller, and will leave anything that's left to Commissioner

1 Stidham after that.

2 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Commissioner Stidham, any
3 additional comments or questions?

4 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: I think -- I think, with the
5 addition of the remarks on the quality of the reporting, I --
6 there is absolutely nothing left. I do agree with all of the
7 comments that have currently already been made and support moving
8 forward tonight.

9 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. I, too, agree that
10 we could move forward. I know we've been through quite a bit to
11 get here, and I want the community to know, those who've worked
12 on this for some time, we do not take it lightly that you all
13 have worked and come up with what you've come up with. While
14 everyone does not agree, we had to do our due diligence in this,
15 and some of it, as we move forward, I didn't necessarily agree,
16 but, you know, we, again, as a Commission, had to do our due
17 diligence, and I think we've landed in a place -- and I've always
18 said this -- we've landed in a place, I think, that we can
19 proceed, as Commissioner Wright has mentioned about the base
20 zones, the historic preservation, the setbacks, the real setbacks
21 in (indiscernible) zones. I know that there was some language
22 that we -- I'm not sure if Commissioner Wright or Vice Chair
23 Miller mentioned that language. I don't want to necessarily just
24 leave it up to HPRB, because that's not what we do. HPRB handles
25 theirs; we handle ours. I don't know if we -- we had some

1 language. I forgot exactly what we said. It was mentioned in
2 our closed session, some language that was proposed. I don't
3 know -- Commissioner Wright -- I can't remember now; it's been a
4 while -- did you mention that in your briefing?

5 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: (Nods head affirmatively.)

6 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, you did. Okay. Okay. So you
7 mentioned that. Okay.

8 VICE CHAIR MILLER: We each did.

9 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Both of you did. Okay. Maybe
10 I've heard it so much that it's just -- it's become synonymous.
11 All right. So, as long as we have that, because that's the way
12 we've done our due diligence, I don't have any problems. I like
13 that language. Unless I any objections from any one of my other
14 colleagues, I think we're good to go. I don't have anything to
15 add. Again, I want those who have worked on this for such a long
16 time to understand, we had to go through this process. Everybody
17 didn't get what they want, I'm sure, but we have tackled this,
18 and I just -- I know that -- I think the ANC -- one of the ANC's,
19 I think -- was it 3C -- had doubled down on their support for
20 this, and I wanted to make sure that I acknowledged them, because
21 they are the ones -- and everyone, but they are the ones who are
22 the elected officials -- the frontline elected officials.

23 So, with that, I don't have anything additional to add.
24 I'm going to ask Commissioner Wright, since she's done such an
25 eloquent job on getting us to where we are, if she -- oh, let me

1 back up. I appreciate all the work that's being done up there,
2 but I can -- I'm going to say this again to OP. There are
3 neighborhoods who are crying out to do this and to do something
4 in their neighborhood, so I'm looking for the Office of
5 Planning -- and I know in January there'll be some shifts, but
6 I'm looking for the Office of Planning to work particularly with
7 Ivy City. Every time I go to an event, Ivy City mentions to me
8 that they want to do some zones. I'm not sure what they want to
9 do, but I'm hoping that those conversations are being had with
10 them like it's being had over here in this particular area. We
11 have to be -- we have to make sure we're inclusive and include
12 all eight wards. So, anyway, with that, Commissioner Wright, if
13 you could make a motion on this, we would appreciate it.

14 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Sure. So I would like to move
15 that we take proposed action on Zoning Commission Case Number 25-
16 09, Office of Planning text and map amendment to create the
17 Cleveland Park neighborhood mixed-use zone and the Woodley Park
18 mixed-use zone, with all of the amendments that have been
19 presented in OP's supplemental reports and with the amended
20 language that we discussed today in the purpose and intent section
21 of the zones --

22 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I would second --

23 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: -- and ask for a second.

24 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I would second that.

25 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. It's been moved and properly

1 seconded. Any further discussion?

2 (No response.)

3 CHAIRMAN HOOD: And unless I see our Office of Zoning
4 Legal Division light up, we're good to go. I didn't see him
5 light up. Maybe I'll give him a minute. No light up, so let's --
6 Ms. Ackerman, could you do a roll call vote please?

7 MS. ACKERMAN: Yes. Commissioner Wright.

8 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes.

9 MS. ACKERMAN: Commissioner Miller.

10 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

11 MS. ACKERMAN: Commissioner Hood.

12 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.

13 MS. ACKERMAN: Commissioner Imamura.

14 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.

15 MS. ACKERMAN: And Commissioner Stidham.

16 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes.

17 MS. ACKERMAN: Staff records the vote five to zero to
18 zero to approve Case Number 25-09 for proposed action, including
19 all amendments and added language.

20 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Any other comments,
21 colleagues? We're good?

22 (No response.)

23 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Ackerman, do we have anything else
24 before us?

25 MS. ACKERMAN: No, we do not.

1 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. The Zoning Commission will meet
2 again on June the 29th. You can call our office or look at --
3 my file closed up -- you can call our office or you can look on
4 the web and see what we have that night on. I do know we have a
5 hearing on -- I mean, a hearing on June 29th. With that, I want
6 to thank everyone for their participation, and have a great
7 weekend. Good night, and thanks, colleagues.

8 (Whereupon, the above-entitled public meeting was
9 adjourned at 4:46 p.m.)

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: 06-25-26

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