

GOVERNMENT OF  
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

REGULAR PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 2025

+ + + + +

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

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

ANTHONY J. HOOD, Chairperson  
ROBERT E. MILLER, Vice Chair  
GWEN WRIGHT, Commissioner  
JOSEPH IMAMURA, 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  
DENNIS LIU, ESQUIRE  
JACOB RITTING, ESQUIRE

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

MATTHEW JESICK, Office of Planning

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Regular Public Meeting held on February 13, 2025.

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

Introduction - Chairman Hood ..... 4

Vote for Officers ..... 5

Case No. 23-26  
Office of Planning ..... 8

Case No. 24-15  
901 Monroe Street, LLC ..... 12

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

(4:00 p.m.)

CHAIRPERSON 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 and Commissioners Wright and Imamura. 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. Also our Office of Zoning Legal Division, Ms. Hillary Lovick, Mr. Dennis Liu, and Mr. Jacob Ritting. We will ask others to introduce themselves at the appropriate time, if needed.

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, Webex -- via Webex and YouTube Live. The video will be available on the Office of Zoning's website after the meeting. Accordingly, all those listening on Webex or by phone will be muted during the meeting. For hearing action items, the only documents before us this evening are the application, the ANC setdown report, and the Office of Planning report. All other documents in the record will be reviewed at the time of the hearing. We do not take any public testimony at our meetings, unless the Commission requests otherwise.

If you experience difficulty accessing Webex or with your phone call-in, then please call our OZ Hotline number at

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

1 202-727-0789 for Webex log-in or call-in instructions. At this  
2 time, I will turn it over to our staff. Does the staff have any  
3 preliminary matters?

4 MS. SCHELLIN: No preliminary matters, other than what  
5 is on the agenda, which is the first meeting we need to vote for  
6 officers, or you guys need to vote.

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Schellin.  
8 Okay. Colleagues, we have the vote for officers, which is  
9 basically the Chair and Vice Chair. Let me ask, what is your  
10 pleasure?

11 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: So, Mr. Chairman, last year I  
12 had the privilege to nominate you as the returning Chair and Vice  
13 Chair Miller as returning Vice Chair. I'd like to do that again  
14 this year, nominate Chairman Hood as the Chair and Vice Chair  
15 Miller as the Vice Chair. Chairman has demonstrated a long  
16 history of steady leadership, having served over 25 years on the  
17 Zoning Commission, almost -- of that 25 years, almost two decades  
18 as Chair. And Vice Chair Miller has served almost 15 years on  
19 the Zoning Commission, since 2012, and always -- has always had  
20 a steady presence on the Commission with insightful questions and  
21 offering thoughtful deliberation. I think both individuals have  
22 a very good pulse on the city and its needs and always place its  
23 interests above anything else. I think both individuals  
24 demonstrate fairness and impartiality. Chairman Hood always  
25 encourages the good neighbor policy. So, with that, I move that

1 the Zoning Commission nominate Chairman Anthony Hood to continue  
2 in his role and Vice Chair Miller to continue in his role as the  
3 Vice Chair, and ask for a second.

4 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: I would be very happy to second  
5 that. I agree with all of the remarks made by Commissioner  
6 Imamura. Although I'm the newest member of the Zoning Commission,  
7 I have been very impressed with the leadership of Chair Hood and  
8 Vice Chair Miller, and delighted to second the motion to have  
9 them continue in those roles.

10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. It's been moved  
11 and properly seconded. And I'm going to say something after the  
12 motion. It's been moved and properly seconded. Any further  
13 discussion?

14 (No response.)

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Ms. Schellin, would you do a roll  
16 call vote please?

17 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Imamura.

18 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.

19 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Wright.

20 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes.

21 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood.

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.

23 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Commissioner Miller.

24 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

25 MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is four -- and Commissioner

1 Stidham is not present. She's out ill. So the vote is four to  
2 zero to one to retain Commissioner Hood as Chairman and  
3 Commissioner Miller as Vice Chairman for the year '25, and, again,  
4 minus one being Commissioner Stidham. Thank you.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. And let me, first of  
6 all, thank Commissioner Imamura for his kind words. We always  
7 try -- you know, we always get a better outcome. We may not  
8 always be on the same side, but we get a better outcome. I really  
9 appreciate what he brings to the Commission, as well as  
10 Commissioner Wright, what she brings to the Commission. And we  
11 appreciate you having the faith in us to continue on. But as  
12 you were saying that, Commissioner Imamura, I was thinking our  
13 oversight hearing is coming up on the 25th, and all those bad  
14 things that's going to be said about me, I wanted to invite you  
15 to come down and speak too. But, anyway, I appreciate your  
16 comments. It goes -- it's straight from you, and I appreciate  
17 that, and, Commissioner Wright, we appreciate you as well. So  
18 thank you both, and let's continue to work together to do the  
19 best we can for the city. Vice Chair Miller, you want -- you  
20 had something to say?

21 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yeah. I just wanted to echo our  
22 comments, Mr. Chairman, and thank my fellow Commissioners for  
23 their confidence in our continued positions. We are fortunate  
24 to have Anthony Hood as Chairman. His experience and his  
25 community-oriented outlook has really benefitted the city for

1 many years, as Commissioner Imamura and Commissioner Wright have  
2 said. I don't it's quite 16 years yet, Commissioner Imamura; I  
3 think it's 12-and-a-half. It might be --

4 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Almost 15.

5 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. I guess I'm not good at  
6 math. I thought it was 12-and-a-half, but, anyway, thank you for  
7 your confidence, and it's a very well run body, and we're very  
8 fortunate -- the city's very fortunate to have Anthony Hood's  
9 leadership. And I appreciate all of the strength and wisdom that  
10 my colleagues bring to this effort to try to do the best land  
11 use outcomes for the city as we possibly can for what's before  
12 us in the zoning world of DC, so thank you.

13 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And, Vice Chair, I want to say right  
14 back at you. I appreciate all you bring to the Commission. As  
15 you've known over the years, you and I have worked together even  
16 before you came on the Commission, and we worked together in a  
17 number of your other capacities and my other capacities, so I  
18 appreciate what you bring to the city as well, you've been  
19 bringing to the city for a long time, and pulling into the  
20 District of Columbia. But, Vice Chair, I want to make sure  
21 you're -- I know you will be there for the oversight hearing,  
22 so -- all right, but I thank you all. All right. So without  
23 further ado, let's move into our agenda. Final action, Zoning  
24 Commission Case Number 23-26, Office of Planning Text Amendment  
25 to create a building height transition setback and a side yard

1 on Square 175. Ms. Schellin.

2 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. This case was referred to  
3 NCPC on December 6th, and on the 16th of January, at Exhibit 27,  
4 they filed a letter attaching delegated authority, stating that  
5 the proposed amendments are not inconsistent with the Comp Plan,  
6 nor the National Capital, and would not adversely impact any  
7 other identified federal interests. The Notice of Proposed  
8 Rulemaking was published in the DC Register on December 20th,  
9 2024. No comments were received thereto, and so this case is  
10 ready for final action, if the Commission desires to proceed  
11 accordingly. That's all I have. Thank you.

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Schellin. As you all  
13 know, we have discussed this in length. And, with that, I'll  
14 just ask Commissioner Imamura if he can get us started off.

15 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I  
16 would be glad to. For this case, there's also a companion case,  
17 23-02, that's worth mentioning. And, as you already stated, the  
18 record is complete, and we had a through and even robust  
19 discussion someone said at our December 5th hearing. The Chair  
20 responded to letters from those in opposition, stating that the  
21 case should be converted to a contested case, but we decided, by  
22 consensus as a Commission, with the authority that we're granted,  
23 to proceed as a rulemaking case. There at the December 5th  
24 hearing, OP presented a shadow study. They also clarified that  
25 as a result of the amendment to the map amendment in 23 -- in

1 that companion case, 23-02, some of the original text wasn't  
2 necessary, and so that was dropped from OP's hearing report. We  
3 commented, as a Commission, that the text is an appropriate  
4 response to concerns about transitions for lower density  
5 using -- lower density uses neighboring the site. And we also  
6 stated that our voting to approve would advance the interests  
7 expressed in the companion map amendment to establish those  
8 setbacks.

9           And, as Ms. Schellin stated, the proposed -- the Notice  
10 of Proposed Rulemaking was posted to the Register on December  
11 20th. And, again, I just want to reiterate that NCPC filed a  
12 letter on January 16th stating that the proposed amendment is not  
13 inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital  
14 and would not adversely impact any other identified federal  
15 interests. And so, with that, Mr. Chairman, again, the record's  
16 pretty full; we've had a robust discussion; I'm prepared to vote  
17 in support.

18           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you for an excellent recap.  
19 Let's see if anybody else has any additional comments.  
20 Commissioner Wright.

21           COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: I also support this case. I  
22 think the issue of creating transitional setbacks between new  
23 buildings and existing residential structures is a very, very  
24 important concept. And I think in this case it has been studied  
25 quite thoroughly, and there have been a number of sketch-up models

1 and shadow studies to understand what these setbacks would do and  
2 what advantage they would have, in terms of compatibility with  
3 the adjacent buildings. And I fully support this text amendment.

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. Vice Chair Miller.

5 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, I  
6 continue to support moving forward with this case. I think  
7 Commissioner Imamura summarized it very well, as did Commissioner  
8 Wright, in terms of the transitional setbacks that the text  
9 amendment would provide for this site. There were changes in  
10 the -- made in the companion case as well, in response to  
11 community concerns, the height adjacent to V Street -- the zoning  
12 adjacent to V Street, in fact, it was retained, the zoning, rather  
13 than changing it. So I appreciate all the work -- all the  
14 comments of my colleagues, and I appreciate all the work of the  
15 Office of Planning and the community stakeholders on this case.  
16 There was a lot of -- and the companion case. There was a lot  
17 of discussion and comments submitted in both cases, and we  
18 appreciate that, and I'm ready to move forward. Thank you.

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I want to thank all my  
20 colleagues. You all have done an excellent job recapping this  
21 case. I have nothing to add. And, with that, it looks like  
22 we're moving forward. I will ask Commissioner Imamura if he  
23 would make the motion.

24 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: I would be glad to, Mr.  
25 Chairman. I move that the Zoning Commission take final action

1 on Case Number 23-26, Office of Planning, text amendment to create  
2 a building height transition setback and a side yard -- and a  
3 side yard on Square 175, and ask for a second

4 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: I'm happy to second that.

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

7 (No response.)

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

10 MS. SCHELLIN: Sure. Commissioner Imamura.

11 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.

12 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Wright.

13 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes.

14 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood.

15 COMMISSIONER HOOD: Yes.

16 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller.

17 COMMISSIONER MILLER: Yes.

18 MS. SCHELLIN: Staff records the vote four to zero to  
19 one to approve final action on Zoning Commission Case Number 23-  
20 26, the minus one being Commissioner Stidham, not present, not  
21 voting.

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Our final case for today is  
23 a hearing action case, Zoning Commissioner Case Number 24-15, 901  
24 Monroe Street, LLC, Consolidated PUD and related map amendment  
25 at Square 3829. Mr. Jesick.

1 MR. JESICK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the  
2 Commission. The Office of Planning recommends that the  
3 Commission set down Case 24-15, a consolidated PUD and related  
4 map amendment. The vacant subject site, which you can see on  
5 your screen, is located in the Brookland neighborhood across  
6 Monroe Street from the Brookland CUA Metro Station. The applicant  
7 proposes a map amendment to MU-5B in order to construct a  
8 residential building with about 230 total units and 33 IZ units.  
9 Although this is a PUD, the building would be built to only the  
10 matter-of-right height and FAR for the MU-5B zone, that is 75  
11 feet and 4.2 FAR. Proffered benefits include 15 percent IZ, the  
12 urban design of the building, efficient land use, and  
13 sustainability. And a complete listing of the proposed benefits  
14 can be found in Exhibit 3, the applicant's written statement.  
15 The proffers today are sufficient for setdown, but OP recommends  
16 that the applicant study a higher IZ percentage and confirm that  
17 the project will include rooftop solar panels. The applicant has  
18 also stated that they will continue to work with the neighborhood  
19 to identify other potential benefits.

20 Next slide please, Mr. Young. Regarding the  
21 Comprehensive Plan, the subject site is identified on the  
22 Generalized Policy Map as falling within a neighborhood  
23 conservation area and, as shown on the Future Land Use Map, is  
24 appropriate for medium-density residential and moderate-density  
25 commercial mixed use. The project would not be inconsistent with

1 | those designations. The MU-5 zone is specifically identified in  
2 | the framework element of the plan as a zone compatible with  
3 | moderate-density commercial.

4 |           Next slide please. We also reviewed through a racial  
5 | equity lens the policies of the Comprehensive Plan, and we feel  
6 | there are some key areas where the project would advance the  
7 | plan's goals regarding equity. These include the provision of  
8 | both market rate and affordable housing, especially family-sized  
9 | units. The project would provide more IZ floor area than  
10 | required, but as I mentioned earlier, OP recommends that the  
11 | applicant examine a larger IZ contribution.

12 |           The project would also, in conformance with the plan  
13 | policies, reinforce the neighborhood fabric by creating  
14 | compatible infill housing, and developing the vacant lot could  
15 | help to improve the safety and appearance of the area. It would  
16 | also further other urban design policies related to equity,  
17 | including providing active and engaging streetscapes. Of course,  
18 | equity and transportation access are closely linked. When  
19 | residents are near transportation options, they can get to  
20 | employment easier. Here you have excellent access to Metro and  
21 | bus, and it's in a walkable and bikeable neighborhood. And with  
22 | all those transportation modes, they would provide options for  
23 | residents reaching employment destinations either locally,  
24 | citywide, or even outside of the city.

25 |           Regarding environmental equity, as I mentioned earlier,

1 we ask that the applicant confirm the use of solar panels on the  
2 roof, but with that, with the green roof, with the LEED Gold  
3 certification, the project could help to create a more equitable  
4 environment and an overall healthier city.

5 Now we have provided a full analysis against the  
6 criteria of the Zoning Commission's racial equity tool, and that  
7 can be found in our written report, and that includes economic  
8 and demographic data and data trends for the planning area. But,  
9 in summary, when evaluated through a racial equity lens, the  
10 project would not be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan.  
11 The applicant has also provided their own racial equity analysis,  
12 again, at Exhibit 3.

13 And, finally, on the architecture of the building, OP  
14 generally supports the design of the project, including the  
15 overall massing; the use of brick in the differentiation and  
16 pattern and colors of brick; the residential units opening  
17 directly onto the street, which should help the building engage  
18 and activate the public space, and the use of the alley for all  
19 vehicular access. That concludes my verbal testimony, but,  
20 again, OP recommends setdown of the application, and I'd be happy  
21 to take any questions.

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Mr. Jesick. I'm going  
23 to go to the Vice Chair first, and I'm going to ask Commissioner  
24 Imamura to go second, and then Commissioner Wright to go third,  
25 and I'll end up. All right. Vice Chair Miller.

1           VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank  
2 you, Mr. Jesick, for your very thorough work on this case and  
3 the report that you've provided us, both in writing and today  
4 verbally.

5           I agree with -- I share all the comments you made -- I  
6 agree with all the comments you made, including the  
7 recommendations that you've made regarding requesting the  
8 applicant to provide more information on the solar generation on  
9 the roof -- on the rooftop, confirm and commit to that, including  
10 considering your recommendation to have a higher -- an even  
11 higher percentage of inclusionary zoning units, even though the  
12 application that is before us is higher than the minimum 10  
13 percent required, it's at the 15 percent level, as you pointed  
14 out, so I think that's 30 -- I think that computes to, according  
15 to your report, 33 out of the -- units out of the 230 would be  
16 IZ units, and many of those would be three-bedroom units I think.  
17 I think there are 12 three-bedroom units in the current applicant,  
18 the family-sized units; and higher than the minimum than the IZ  
19 requires is certainly beneficial, but we always encourage more,  
20 and so we asked the applicant to do that, as you have as well.

21           And I also share your comment that the applicant should  
22 provide us more information on the further outreach -- community  
23 outreach that they're doing with the community to firm up specific  
24 benefits and proffers as we go forward with that. And I think  
25 there's also -- we want a confirmation of a list of the design

1 flexibility that's being -- and I think it's standard design  
2 flexibility under our zoning regulations, but if we could just  
3 get a confirmation or clarification of what that list of --  
4 standard list is of design flexibility, that would be part of the  
5 case. On the design -- well, on the Comprehensive Plan, I agree  
6 with your assessment, based on what I've read so far, that the  
7 proposed -- proposal is not inconsistent with the Comprehensive  
8 Plan and would note, as your report notes -- I'm not sure you  
9 noted it verbally today -- that there was a land use map amendment  
10 by the Council a few years ago for this area, changing it from  
11 moderate-density residential, I believe, to medium-density  
12 residential and still having the mixed-use moderate commercial  
13 designation on it as well. Is that correct, that it went from a  
14 moderate commercial -- moderate residential to medium residential  
15 on the -- on the land use map in the most recent --

16 MR. JESICK: Let me double check that.

17 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Well, actually, you don't need to  
18 do that right now. I guess if we get them to bring -- get that  
19 at the hearing by you and by the applicant, I think that would  
20 be helpful for us and for the public to understand --

21 MR. JESICK: Right.

22 VICE CHAIR MILLER: -- in terms of Comprehensive Plan  
23 consistency. And you pointed out the compatibility of the zone  
24 that's being requested with the Comprehensive Plan land use  
25 moderate-density commercial designation and the MU-5B

1 compatibility with that -- with that -- MU-5B zoning being  
2 compatible with the Comprehensive Plan designation. The  
3 Neighborhood Conservation Area designation for the site does also  
4 use the word "compatibility" with the -- the new development  
5 should be compatible with the scale of surrounding development.  
6 There always has been a historic concern with the compatibility  
7 of different other proposed developments for this site in the  
8 past with the compatibility, with the lower height houses --  
9 townhouses on 10th Street I believe. I saw the renderings that  
10 showed the setbacks on the upper floors and the -- and the  
11 stepdowns and the variation of the bays and -- to try to -- and  
12 the courtyard that's being provided, all those design features  
13 that are trying to mitigate any adverse impact upon those lower-  
14 scale townhouses that are nearby. But I guess I want a little  
15 more emphasis at that -- on that or discussion of that by the  
16 applicant and by OP at the hearing, whether additional setbacks  
17 or stepdowns would be appropriate, given the compatibility  
18 language, both in the Neighborhood Conservation Area designation  
19 and in the -- I think it's in the upper northeast area element,  
20 in general, that describes -- uses that word.

21 But, of course, all of this is a balancing and a lot  
22 of housing -- market rate and affordable housing that's being  
23 provided here in a site that's -- a vacant, underutilized site  
24 adjacent to Metro -- nearby Metro, so that's -- so that, you  
25 know, if there are going to be increased setbacks, there would

1 obviously be some loss of units. So I just want a further  
2 discussion of that by the applicant of what the ramifications of  
3 what's being proposed and why it's being proposed and how it's  
4 meeting the important affordable housing and market rate housing  
5 goals of the Comprehensive Plan, which is -- defines that housing  
6 as a specific priority. So I don't think I have any questions  
7 of you, Mr. Jesick, but that's just my comments, Mr. Chairman,  
8 at this time.

9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Commissioner  
10 Imamura, any questions or comments?

11 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do  
12 have a couple questions and a couple comments that build on Vice  
13 Chair Miller and, by and large, I agree with all of the comments  
14 that he made. And I think to his point, Mr. Jesick, I'm also  
15 interested -- I'll try -- I'll work backwards, I guess, from some  
16 of the sticky notes that I have here.

17 I'm interested in the applicant describing, just as  
18 Vice Chair Miller had said, you know, what part of the surrounding  
19 neighborhood really informed their design decisions, particularly  
20 about materiality, form, the design vocabulary, really get back  
21 to the design fundamentals here to describe the design decisions  
22 that didn't work and those that did that got us to this point.  
23 So I'm interested in hearing a little bit more about how we got  
24 here, in terms of just the design aspect of it.

25 Additionally, to Vice Chair Miller's comment about

1 neighborhood conservation, I'm always -- when I see that, I pay  
2 even closer attention, and I'm also concerned, in general, about  
3 the urban fabric you had talked about, Mr. Jesick, the  
4 neighborhood fabric. I'm always concerned about the urban fabric  
5 and the height, and so -- and scale, using Vice Chair Miller's  
6 words there -- description, I'd like a thorough explanation of  
7 sort of the setbacks and how it relates to the surrounding or  
8 existing context.

9           Pleased to see that OP is asking the applicant to  
10 examine a larger IZ contribution. I'd like to hear that as well,  
11 in addition to the PUDs (indiscernible) of the solar panels and  
12 the rooftop. And essentially on a higher level, Mr. Jesick, from  
13 the applicant, I'm really interested to see -- and I've asked  
14 this before, and it's something I'll continue to ask for by other  
15 applicants too -- is I'm really interested in understanding what  
16 it is that they want to see from this project -- from this PUD,  
17 not to say that we're bringing 230 units, 33 IZ; I really want  
18 to understand what their investment is in the neighborhood, what  
19 is it that they want to do, how is this going to improve the  
20 surrounding neighborhood and DC more broadly, so what is it that  
21 they want to achieve for the community. That's the answer (sic).  
22 That's the question there that I wanted an answer on.

23           And I guess for you, Mr. Jesick -- as always, I  
24 appreciate your thoroughness in your reports -- something I'm  
25 interested in, and this my only question, is, in your professional

1 opinion and view in studying this case, how will this be PUD --  
2 or will this be the PUD transform the demographics of this  
3 neighborhood; in what way?

4 MR. JESICK: Would you like me to address that today  
5 or --

6 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes, if you could, just  
7 topically would be fine.

8 MR. JESICK: I mean, I think that's very difficult to  
9 say how it would impact the demographics. Certainly, the  
10 Comprehensive Plan talks about adding or finding a greater degree  
11 of equity through housing. The -- I can look at our data again,  
12 but I believe that, you know, in this planning area there are  
13 some discrepancies by race of income and unemployment rates, and  
14 housing plays into that. So the provision of affordable housing  
15 and even market rate housing should, in theory, help to tamp down  
16 price increases for housing generally, so that would tend to help  
17 the, you know, minority populations in the -- in the planning  
18 area. You know, whether that would change the overall  
19 demographics or not, 230 units is a good chunk of units, but  
20 compared to the planning areas as a whole, I don't know if that  
21 would have a numerical impact, but we could talk to our housing  
22 planners or our neighborhood planners to see if they have more  
23 insights into that.

24 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Terrific. Thank you, Mr.  
25 Jesick. I'd be interested in hearing just a little bit about

1 that. And, outside of that, it's good to see you. Thank you  
2 again for your report -- your setdown report. And, Mr. Chairman,  
3 I yield back.

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Commissioner Imamura.  
5 But, also, the question that Commissioner Imamura mentioned just  
6 now, the impacts -- I know the applicant is listening -- I want  
7 them also to expound on that. That was a good question, so I  
8 want to hear that at the hearing as well, so I think that's very  
9 appropriate. I may steal that question. All right. Let's go  
10 to Commissioner Wright.

11 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Thank you. I have a few comments  
12 and suggestions for additional information that we'd like to have  
13 at the hearing and that we'd like to discuss. The first is  
14 something already mentioned by Commissioners Miller and Imamura,  
15 which is the setbacks. We just finished a case where we talked  
16 at length about setbacks adjacent to smaller scale two-story  
17 rowhouses. And so I'd like to see if some of the tools that were  
18 used in that last case of literally having, you know, a 45-degree  
19 plane and a setback in the areas facing the backs of the adjacent  
20 smaller townhouses is something that could be accomplished.

21 I also am interested in how the ground floor is going  
22 to be activated. I do understand that there is no retail being  
23 proposed for this building, and, you know, I understand some of  
24 the reasons why that is the case, but there are other ways to  
25 activate a ground floor, whether it be where the building lobby

1 is placed, where the fitness room is placed, different kinds of  
2 things that can be on the ground floor that will help, you know,  
3 activate it, because this is an important block, as you're walking  
4 from the mixed-use development that is closer to Catholic  
5 University and walking over to the sort of downtown Main Street  
6 of Brookland, so you don't want it to be a dead lot; you want it  
7 to have something that enlivens the ground floor.

8 I do know there's some units that have individual  
9 entries facing the street and, you know, I'd like to know exactly  
10 where those are and how many and, you know, if they're going to  
11 try to be used to help activate. Another option, which, you  
12 know, I've seen in a lot of other projects is some kind of either  
13 lighting or public art that, you know, can be installed on the  
14 building that will help activate that ground floor, instead of  
15 having a retail use.

16 The other thing that I know was discussed by a number  
17 of people in the community is the access point for parking. I  
18 think the amount of parking is appropriate. It's right across  
19 from the Metro. I think having a very low parking ratio makes a  
20 lot of sense, but I'd like to better understand the parking  
21 access, because I know that was a concern of many people in the  
22 community, in terms of how the alley would have to be changed in  
23 order to have -- to be accessed off the alley. And I think it's  
24 worth weighing whether, you know, you might recapture some square  
25 footage by not widening the alley, which allows you to do the

1 45-degree incline plane and put the access on one of the side  
2 streets. Certainly, you know, I understand not doing it on  
3 Monroe. That's a very, very busy street, but, you know, maybe  
4 on one of the other facades.

5           So I think those are some things that definitely need  
6 to be explored. You know, I did read through a lot of the  
7 comments from the community and, you know, I was happy to see  
8 that the majority of folks do not oppose redevelopment of this  
9 site. In fact, I think they want to see it redeveloped, but they  
10 do want it to be compatible and to have minimal impacts on the  
11 existing residential units that surround it. So, I mean, all in  
12 all, I'm really excited that this project is coming forward; I'm  
13 excited that it is a PUD, and that we have an opportunity to talk  
14 about some of these public benefits that are being considered.  
15 I just do think that there will need to be a pretty robust  
16 discussion about some of them when we get to the hearing and the  
17 consideration of the project. And that's it.

18           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner  
19 Wright. I will say that -- I can't, for some reason, get my file  
20 opened back up. I know there were letters in there, which the  
21 letters actually -- we don't work with the letters until we get  
22 to the hearing. So I'm going to ask the question this way, Mr.  
23 Jesick, because I can't get my file opened up. I don't know if  
24 anybody else is having that problem. Maybe it's the operator's  
25 problem. But, Mr. Jesick, do you know of any known opposition?

1 I know there were letters in the file, but I know we don't take  
2 those under consideration when we're doing setdown, but do you  
3 know of any known opposition?

4 MR. JESICK: Yes. The letters in the record so far are  
5 a mix of letters in support and letters in opposition, so, yeah,  
6 there are a variety of views on the project.

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I want to make it clear for the  
8 public, when the Zoning -- when we are setting cases down, we  
9 don't look at -- we don't really talk about those letters until  
10 the hearing case, which (indiscernible) so I want to make sure I  
11 clear that up for the record, if anybody misunderstood, so we  
12 really don't -- that's why I asked you that question that way,  
13 Mr. Jesick, as opposed to me asking you about letters in  
14 opposition. But, like I said, I can't get nothing to come up  
15 now anyway, so I don't know what happened to my case file.  
16 Anyway, I don't have any questions. I think my colleagues have  
17 covered it, and we will govern ourselves accordingly when the  
18 hearing comes up, 'cause this looks like we'll be able to set  
19 this down. I'm looking forward to, as Commissioner Wright has  
20 already said, a robust conversation with the applicant, and,  
21 again, I thank my colleagues. They've asked some great questions,  
22 and we're looking forward to having a good dialogue. I'm hoping  
23 that we're a lot closer than where we were in previous cases,  
24 and I'll just leave it at that. Any further follow-up questions  
25 or comments?

1                   COMMISSIONER IMAMURA:    Yes, Mr. Chairman.    If you  
2 don't -- if you'll indulge me.    Just one more comment, Mr. Jesick.  
3 As Vice Chair Miller and I have urged applicants to illustrate  
4 what other zones they've considered and either why or why they  
5 haven't worked, here I think there's a common theme, and I  
6 certainly hope other applicants follow, or at least are either  
7 listening in or will follow the same guidance here, but I think  
8 Vice Chair Miller, Commissioner Wright, and I are asking, you  
9 know, what is it -- what did you look at and why did it or did  
10 it not work, and so we need a better explanation, rather than  
11 coming to the Commission with what appears to the public a  
12 complete design.

13                   And I think it's also to the benefit of the public to  
14 understand the decision-making that took place and how it arrived  
15 at the Zoning Commission.    So that's what I'm looking for.    I  
16 think that's what the three of us or all four of us are looking  
17 for.    So thank you, Mr. Chairman, and, again, thank you, Mr.  
18 Jesick.

19                   CHAIRPERSON HOOD:    Okay.    Thank you.    Vice Chair Miller,  
20 would you like to make a motion to set down, unless we want to  
21 go a different way?

22                   CHAIRPERSON HOOD:    Yes, I would.    Thank you, Mr.  
23 Chairman.    I would move that the Zoning Commission set down for  
24 a public hearing Zoning Commission Case Number 24-15, 901 Monroe  
25 Street, LLC, Consolidated PUD and related map amendment at Square

1 3829, and ask for a second.

2 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Second.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: It's been moved and properly  
4 seconded. Any further discussion?

5 (No response.)

6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Not seeing any, Ms. Schelling, would  
7 you do a roll call vote please?

8 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller.

9 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

10 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Imamura.

11 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.

12 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood.

13 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.

14 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Wright.

15 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes.

16 MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is four to zero to one to set  
17 down Zoning Commission Case Number 24-15 as a contested case, the  
18 minus one being Commissioner Stidham, not present, not voting.  
19 Thank you.

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

22 MS. SCHELLIN: Nothing else. Thank you.

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I hope everyone has a great  
24 Valentine's Day tomorrow, however you celebrate it or if you  
25 celebrate it. But the Zoning Commission will meet again

1 February -- I almost said February the 14th -- February the 20th,  
2 and it's an Office of Planning case, and it's Zoning Commission  
3 Case 24-10, and we'll be meeting on these same platforms.

4 MS. SCHELLIN: The 17th. We're going to meet on the  
5 17th. 24-21, the DGS Department of Corrections case.

6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: The 17th?

7 MS. SCHELLIN: Is that up there yet?

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I would have shown up on the 20th.

9 MS. LOVICK: No, I don't think so. I think it's --0  
10 no, it's 24-10 on Thursday, February 20th. February 17th is a  
11 holiday.

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Oh, Ms. Schellin will be here.

13 MS. SCHELLIN: I'm looking at March. I'm looking at  
14 March. You're right.

15 MS. LOVICK: Don't give me -- don't give me a heart  
16 attack.

17 MS. SCHELLIN: I jumped ahead.

18 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So we're --

19 MS. SCHELLIN: I just got to make sure Anthony's paying  
20 attention, you know. It's a test for him.

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: The rest of us will be here February  
22 the 20th. Ms. Schellin will be here on the 17th, if anyone wishes  
23 to join her.

24 MS. SCHELLIN: I probably will be.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So, with that, I want to thank you

1 | for their participation tonight with all my colleagues and all  
2 | the work that everybody does. And, with that, this meeting is  
3 | adjourned. Good night.

4 |           COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank  
5 | you, Vice Chair Miller. Congratulations.

6 |           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you all. Thank you all.  
7 | Appreciate you.

8 |           VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you.

9 |           (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the  
10 | record at 4:42 p.m.)

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: 02-13-25

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