

GOVERNMENT OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

REGULAR PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

THURSDAY

MARCH 27, 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
JOSEPH IMAMURA, Commissioner
GWEN WRIGHT, Commissioner
TAMMY STIDHAM, Commissioner

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

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

OFFICE OF ZONING LEGAL DIVISION STAFF PRESENT:

HILLARY LOVICK, ESQUIRE
DENNIS LIU, ESQUIRE
JACOB RITTING, ESQUIRE

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

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

MAXINE BROWN-ROBERTS
JENNIFER STEINGASSER
SHEPARD BEAMON

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the
Regular Public Meeting held on March 27, 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

Case No. 24-23
 Cedar Tree Academy Public Charter School 5

Case No. 18-03B
 Dancing Crab Properties, LLC and 10009 Field
 Road, Inc. 10

Case No. 15-18D
 Initio, LP 13

Case No. 24-14
 Emory United Methodist Church 17

Case No. 13-14E
 McMillan Parcel 2 Owner and McMillan Parcel 4
 Owner, LLC 26

Office of Planning Update/Forecast - Ms. Steingasser 40

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, Commissioner Stidham, Commission Imamura, and Commissioner Wright. I'm also joined by Office of Zoning staff, Ms. Sharon Schellin, as well as our Office of Zoning Legal Division, Ms. Hillary Lovick, Mr. Dennis Liu, and Mr. Jacob Ritting. Excuse me. We will ask all others to introduce themselves at the appropriate time, if required.

Copies of today's meeting agenda are available on the Office of Zoning's website. Please be advised that this proceeding is being record 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. 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 someone to speak. If you experience difficulty accessing Webex or with your phone call-in, then please call our

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

1 OZ Hotline number at 202-727-0789 for Webex log-in or call-in
2 instructions. At this time, the Commission will consider any
3 preliminary matters. Does the staff have any preliminary
4 matters?

5 MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir.

6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. We will proceed
7 with our agenda, as printed. First, we have final action, Zoning
8 Commission Case Number 24-23, Cedar Tree Academy Public
9 School -- Public Charter School, Design Review in the NHR zone
10 at Square 5861, Lot 89. Ms. Schellin.

11 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. So since the February 24th
12 public hearing, new exhibits, at Exhibits 25 and 25A, are the
13 applicant's post-hearing submission providing some comments
14 regarding the outdoor play space and their landscaping plans. So
15 this is up for the Commission to consider final action this
16 evening, or this afternoon, rather, if you choose to do so. Thank
17 you.

18 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Schellin. Again,
19 colleagues, we heard testimony; we heard from the applicant,
20 DDOT, and OP. OP testified in support. DDOT testified in support
21 with one condition. We know that the applicant agreed to that
22 condition. We commented very favorably on this application, but,
23 as noted, we did express some reservations, but the landscaping
24 and outdoor play space I think are the main issue. Other than
25 that, we do have a letter of support from ANC 8A. It's a letter

1 of support that's in the record of this case. So with that, let
2 me open it up. Any questions or comments? Anyone want to comment
3 on the out -- landscaping plans or the outdoor play space? Let
4 me go to Commissioner Stidham.

5 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Thank you. I appreciate the
6 applicant's investigation in providing additional play space, and
7 I want to acknowledge our limited ability to influence any further
8 play space outside, but I can't help myself but to comment that
9 this is being treated as an afterthought for a school for small
10 children, and it really should be part of the integrated design
11 of the building. A gym does not meet all the needs or
12 requirements of children who need outdoor play space. So, you
13 know, I appreciate the additional space. I wish it could be
14 more, but prepared to move on.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Vice Chair Miller,
16 do you have any comments -- questions or comments -- I mean,
17 comments?

18 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yeah. I
19 share Commissioner Stidham's view on this. I appreciate the
20 revised -- revisions that have been made to the landscape plan
21 to provide additional open green space and outdoor play space,
22 and some of that is contingent upon getting public space
23 permitting I think, but it -- and I also do appreciate that there
24 will be interior play space that doesn't currently exist at this
25 facility, with the multipurpose cafeteria space and the

1 gymnasium, which doesn't exist, and all the improvements that are
2 being made for this -- for these -- for these students, the
3 library, the separate spaces for Art, Music, STEM. So, I mean,
4 there are a lot of positive aspects to the interior and exterior
5 design of this -- of this project -- of this project, but is
6 lamentable that the out -- the exterior outdoor play space has
7 been so substantially reduced.

8 And as I indicated at -- during the hearing, I would
9 prefer to have seen a waiver of some of the environmental features
10 on the rooftop, to just have a field where they could -- where
11 kids could play. They currently have one. They won't have one.
12 They'll have some play space, but not a -- not a field where you
13 could have a game I don't think. So, anyway, I'm prepared to
14 move forward though. I think it is an attractive design, and
15 it's an important educational facility for this -- for the
16 neighborhood and for the city, so I guess that's it on my
17 comments, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

18 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you both. Let me see
19 if others have any comments. Commissioner Wright, you have any
20 comments?

21 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: My only comment is I continue to
22 think this is a really good project. I appreciate that they're
23 working to have -- with Department of Transportation to have the
24 two driveways in, rather than a combined very wide driveway. I
25 appreciate that they took into account some of the suggestions

1 about the landscaping that's along the street to give it a really
2 nice edge for anyone who is walking by the school. And I know
3 that required moving the sort of rain garden type area, and that
4 also allowed them to shift things, in part, to provide more of
5 the outdoor play space. You know, I hear my colleagues', you
6 know, concern about the play space, and I think that -- I think
7 they've done probably as good a job as they can, given the
8 constraints of the -- of the property that they have. So I am
9 fully ready to vote on this project. I think it's a -- I think
10 it's a good project.

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Commissioner
12 Imamura, any comments?

13 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll
14 be brief. I align myself with the comments of Commissioner Wright
15 and also appreciate Vice Chair Miller and Commission Stidham's
16 comments to, you know, push for a little bit more, but I would
17 say, just on balance, this is a good project. And so I certainly
18 appreciate the improvements they made to the landscape design.
19 I still think there's room for a little bit more, but, again, on
20 balance, this is a pretty good project, so prepared to vote in
21 support.

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. Thank -- let me thank
23 all my colleagues. I will say that I appreciate all the comments,
24 and I especially want to emphasize the comments of Commissioner
25 Stidham and Vice Chair Miller. While we may not be able to deal

1 with anything, we always are pushing for additional space or
2 however you want to do that -- however you can rectify that or
3 find some kind of mitigation to continue to consider the young
4 folks. We're going to deal with what's in front of us, as my
5 other colleagues have mentioned, but, you know, even if -- as you
6 move forward, always keep that in mind, that we want to make sure
7 we have adequate space or whatever we need to do to try to arrange
8 that. But in front of us now, we're ready to move forward, but
9 please note what all of my colleagues have mentioned. So, with
10 that, would somebody like to a motion? Commissioner Stidham,
11 would you like to make a motion, or maybe -- yeah, Commissioner
12 Stidham, would you like to do it?

13 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yep. I'm scrolling to the top.
14 I'd like to move for final action on Zoning Case Number 24-23,
15 Cedar Tree Academy Public Charter School, Design Review in the
16 NHR Zone at Square 5861, Lot 89, as ask for a second.

17 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Second.

18 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Second.

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. It took a while, but we got
20 two seconds, so it's been moved and properly seconded. Any
21 further discussion?

22 (No response.)

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

25 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Commissioner Stidham.

1 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes.

2 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner -- I heard Imamura first.
3 Commissioner Imamura.

4 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.

5 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood.

6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.

7 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner -- I'm sorry. Commissioner
8 Wright.

9 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes.

10 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller.

11 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

12 MS. SCHELLIN: So the vote is five to zero to zero to
13 approve final action on Zoning Commission Case Number 24-23.
14 Thank you.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. Let's keep moving. Let's
16 go to time extensions; Zoning Commission Case Number 18-03B,
17 Dancing Crabs Partners (sic) -- I'm sorry -- Dancing Crab
18 Properties -- I must be thinking about crabs -- Dancing Crab
19 Properties, LLC and 10009 Field Road, Incorporated, Two-year PUD
20 Time Extension at Square 1769. Ms. Schellin.

21 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. In this case, the applicant
22 has requested a two-year time extension in which to begin
23 construction. This is a second request for a time extension, so
24 they are requesting a waiver from Subtitle Z, Section 705.5,
25 which allows the second time extension approval for no longer

1 | than one year. While the applicant was able to apply for the
2 | required building permits on time, they've been unable to secure
3 | all agency approvals necessary to start construction within the
4 | specified time frame.

5 | At Exhibit 3, there's an OP report recommending
6 | approval. Exhibit 3E, there's a report from -- I'm sorry --
7 | Exhibit 4, ANC 3E provided a report in support in reliance on a
8 | private MOU between them and the applicant, which they did provide
9 | a copy of that at Exhibit 4A. And, let me check, I believe we
10 | may have gotten another -- let's see if this was the case. I
11 | saw something else come in this afternoon. I just want to
12 | doublecheck. This might not have been -- but anyway -- so we
13 | have this case. It is ready for the Commission to consider the
14 | waiver request that they submitted and the request for the two-
15 | year time extension. Thank you.

16 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Schellin, for
17 | teeing that up. Again, colleagues, we have a waiver request and
18 | we have a two-year time extension. Typically, when there's an
19 | additional extension being asked for, we usually do one year,
20 | so -- under Subtitle Z-705.5, which allows no more than two time
21 | extension requests for approved PUD limits; the second time
22 | extension approval to no more than one year. They're asking for
23 | a waiver now. As noted, they're asking for two years for the
24 | time extension. They're also asking for -- they're asking for
25 | two years to the time extension, as opposed to one, which is our

1 normal process. The applicant is requesting a two-year time
2 extension of the deadline to begin construction, from March 1st,
3 2025 to March 1st, 2027. If you read that -- keep reading it
4 enough times like I did when I was reading and preparing, you
5 get confused. So I think everybody know what they're asking for,
6 so any objections, any comments on that?

7 (All Commissioners shake head negatively.)

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So I'm going to -- no comments
9 or questions of each other, so I'm going to ask Commissioner
10 Imamura if he can make a motion please.

11 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Absolutely. Thank you, Mr.
12 Chairman. I move that the Zoning Commission approve the time
13 extension and waiver in Zoning Case 18-03B, Dancing Crab
14 Properties, LLC and 10009 Field Road, Inc., Two-Year PUD Time
15 Extension at Square 1769, and ask for a second.

16 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Second.

17 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Second.

18 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. It's been moved and two
19 seconds. We're getting a lot of seconds. We're on a roll. It's
20 been moved and properly seconded. Any further discussion?

21 (No response.)

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Not hearing any, Ms. Schellin, would
23 you do a roll call vote please? You probably better give this
24 one to Commissioner Wright, because she didn't get the last one,
25 and Commissioner Stidham will take the next one. We'll do it

1 | like that.

2 | MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. So Commissioner Imamura.

3 | COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.

4 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Wright.

5 | COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes.

6 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood.

7 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.

8 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller.

9 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

10 | MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Stidham.

11 | COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes.

12 | MS. SCHELLIN: I almost forgot about her, and in here
13 | she battled for second. So the vote is five to zero to zero to
14 | approve final action on Zoning Commission Case Number 18-03B. and
15 | that's to approve it. And we would just ask that the applicant
16 | provide us a draft order within two weeks. And I did doublecheck;
17 | there were no other ANC reports. I was mistaken. It was another
18 | case.

19 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Schellin.
20 | Let's go right on, on our agenda; Zoning Commission Case Number
21 | 15-18D, Initio, LP, One-year PUD Time Extension at Square 1194.
22 | Ms. Schellin.

23 | MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. On this one, the applicant
24 | has requested for a one-year time extension in which to begin
25 | construction. This is the second request for a time extension,

1 and while they did request a waiver from the Subtitle Z-705.3,
2 which allows the Commission to grant extensions for no more than
3 two years, our excellent legal staff has advised us that the
4 request is not needed. It is their second time extension request,
5 and it's only for one year, and the regulations allow the second
6 request to be for one year. So we agree with our legal staff,
7 and the Commission, obviously, can question them, if they feel
8 the need to do so.

9 But moving on, the applicant has been able to file for
10 the required building permits on time, but they've been unable
11 to secure all agency approvals necessary to start construction
12 within the specified time frame, and the applicant has stated,
13 as justification for their request, that once they were able to
14 secure financing in September 2024, some of the requirements
15 for -- I believe there was maybe a prior gas station, and so
16 there were some requirements for removing some type of --
17 whatever the prior use was. Removing what was there before
18 prevented them to move forward in time for the construction
19 permit, so that is the need for this extension.

20 At Exhibit 6 is an OP report recommending approval;
21 Exhibit 2 is -- I'm sorry -- Exhibit 5 -- I'm reading these
22 backwards -- is a report from ANC 2E stating at their regularly-
23 scheduled meeting they voted in support. And so this is ready
24 to move forward, if the Commission chooses to do so. Thank you.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. Thank you, Ms. Schellin.

1 I'm going to try something a little different here. I think with
2 all the nuances and I think Ms. Schellin has really teed this
3 up, I don't know if I need to go around, but, if I do, my
4 colleagues will let me know. I believe -- we've heard the
5 recommendation coming from our legal counsel, as well as Ms.
6 Schellin telling us all of the nuances that went on. And we know
7 securing finances, when you get financing, you got to go through
8 all the permit processes, then you find out something else is
9 going on, which has to make you go back through the permit
10 process. When you read the story, I believe that this warrants
11 additional time, as requested. And any of my colleagues have any
12 other comments or questions on that; any other comments?

13 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I would agree with you, Mr.
14 Chairman, that good cause has been demonstrated in this case.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Maybe I should have said that
16 instead of all them other words I used, but, anyway -- so any
17 other comments on that?

18 (No response.)

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Would somebody -- Vice Chair,
20 would you like to make a motion then please?

21 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Sure. I would move that the Zoning
22 Commission approve Case Number 15-18D, Initio, LP, One-Year PUD
23 Time Extension at Square 1194, and ask for a second.

24 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Second. Is there another
25 second?

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: No, we just got one that time. Okay.
2 It's been moved and properly seconded. Any further discussion?

3 (No response.)

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

6 MS. SCHELLIN: Joe is wanting to test my hearing.
7 Commissioner Miller.

8 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

9 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Imamura.

10 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.

11 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood.

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.

13 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Wright.

14 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes.

15 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Stidham.

16 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes.

17 MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is five to zero to zero to
18 approve final action on Zoning Commission Case Number 15-18D.
19 And, once again, we'd ask the applicant to provide us a draft
20 order within two weeks. Thank you.

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. The next case, hearing
22 action -- I'm actually -- for the hearing action case
23 questioning, I'm going to start off with Commissioner Wright
24 first; then I'm going to go to Commissioner Imamura, and then
25 we'll go in that order, so I'm just -- so we'll get -- so let's

1 go to the hearing action on Zoning Commission Case Number 13-
2 14E, McMillan Parcel 2 Owner, LLC, et al., Modification with
3 Hearing to First and Second-Stage PUDs for Parcels 2 and 4 at
4 Square 3128. Ms. Brown-Roberts.

5 (No response.)

6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Ms. Brown-Roberts, are you speaking?

7 (No response.)

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I don't think we can -- am I the
9 only one who can't hear her? Can y'all hear me?

10 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: We can hear you, Mr. Chairman.
11 We can't hear Ms. Brown-Roberts.

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: It's all right. Take your time, Ms.
13 Brown-Roberts. We got an extra minute. No, I'm just -- you want
14 us to go to the next case and come back to you, or is the next
15 case yours too?

16 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: (Shakes head negatively.)

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. We're going to go to the next
18 case. Oh, are you ready? Let's -- Ms. Schellin, let's go to
19 the -- let's go to the next case and then we'll come back, while
20 she's getting her technical issues straight. All right. Let's
21 move to Zoning Commission Case -- give me one second. Okay. Ms.
22 Schellin, come back -- Zoning Commission Case Number 24-14, Emory
23 United Methodist Church, Map Amendment at Square 2672. Mr.
24 Beamon. Mr. Beamon, are you ready?

25 MR. BEAMON: Here we go.

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: There you go. All right. Good.

2 MR. BEAMON: All right. So good afternoon,
3 Commissioners, Chair Hood. I'm Shepard Beamon with the Office
4 of Planning, and this is Zoning Case 24-14. The Office of
5 Planning recommends the Zoning Commission set down this petition
6 for Emory United Methodist Church to amend the zoning map from
7 RA-2 to RA-4 for the property at 1459 Columbia Road Northwest.
8 The site is currently improved with a place of worship, and the
9 applicant requests a map amendment to adaptively reuse the
10 building and convert it into residential units. However, there
11 is no proposed development associated with this petition.

12 Next slide please. The requested map amendment would
13 not be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan Maps or other
14 adopted policies. The Future Land Use Map indicates that the
15 site is appropriate for medium-density residential, while the
16 General Policy Map shows the site as a Neighborhood Conservation
17 Area, both of which would support a variety of housing uses.
18 Medium-density residential states that the RA-3 is typically
19 consistent; however, other zones may apply. The proposed RA-4
20 zone is also consistent with the FAR or density ranks within the
21 medium-density residential.

22 Next slide please. And when evaluated through a racial
23 equity lens, the proposal would not be inconsistent with the
24 Comprehensive Plan and would uphold relevant policies, including
25 policies relevant -- related to land use, transportation,

1 housing, and the Mid-City Planning Area. The proposed map
2 amendment would continue to offer mixed income and affordable
3 housing opportunities at a higher density near Metrorail stations
4 and along Metro bus routes. The adaptive reuse of the existing
5 structure promotes rehabilitation before demolition and
6 conservation of the existing neighborhood character.

7 The Mid-City area has a higher number of renter-
8 occupied households; therefore, the proposed RA-4 zone would not
9 conflict with the residential trends in the area. Since the
10 proposed RA-4 zone permits higher density or FAR compared to the
11 existing RA-2 zone, IZ Plus is triggered, and, although the Mid-
12 City Planning Area already has met it's affordable housing target
13 goal, OP recommends the map amendment be subject to IZ Plus,
14 which the applicant has committed to exceed, as stated in their
15 application.

16 The amendment should not result in a significant change
17 in the physical environment, nor should it result in a direct or
18 indirect displacement of residents, as there are none currently
19 on the site, and the applicant proposes affordable housing
20 options. Allowing more housing options in the area also increases
21 access to employment opportunities and transit options. And in
22 the record we currently have a letter of support from ANC 1A.
23 And, with that, I will conclude OP's testimony, and I'm happy to
24 take any questions. Thank you.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Mr. Beamon. We

1 appreciate your report. Pretty straightforward. We may have a
2 few questions and comments, but let me go first to Commissioner
3 Wright.

4 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Thank you. This does sound
5 pretty straightforward. You mentioned the letter from the ANC.
6 Are you aware of any opposition to the proposed map amendment?

7 MR. BEAMON: At this time, I am not aware of any
8 opposition.

9 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Great. And you are recommending
10 IZ Plus, and the applicant has said that they anticipate meeting
11 IZ Plus or better, which is also great news. I don't think I
12 have any other questions. This seems like it's very
13 straightforward and ready for set down. Thank you.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Commissioner
15 Imamura.

16 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
17 agree with you and Commissioner Wright. This does seem pretty
18 straightforward. Mr. Beamon, I do have just a couple questions.
19 I'm curious to know if this amendment -- because we're in a
20 Neighborhood Conservation Area or Zone, I'd be interested, from
21 the applicant, if we decide to set this down, why the RA-4 would
22 be a better zone than maybe the RA-3. I do understand that with
23 the higher density we'll get more affordable units there
24 additionally with exceeding the IZ Plus, but just part of their
25 explanation, I'd like to know a little bit about that. For

1 tonight, I'm curious to know, from your expertise, by moving this
2 from the RA-2 to RA-4, if that will shape the neighborhood's
3 demographics any or any -- or significantly at all?

4 MR. BEAMON: So I would say that when we did the racial
5 equity analysis, again, pointing out that this is more a -- more
6 of a renter-occupied area, that this would not hurt or help that
7 in any kind of way. It's more so just continuing what's already
8 there, in addition to furthering what's -- you know, and further
9 increasing the number of affordable housing units for the Mid-
10 City area. In terms of the -- are you referring to racial
11 demographic data specifically?

12 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Just -- sure. You respond to
13 that or I was just thinking more broadly, but, you know, racially
14 being it too, the disaggregated data.

15 MR. BEAMON: Yeah. I mean, again, I don't think this
16 really has any correlation specifically to the racial demographic
17 data. I think, in general, the trends within this specific
18 planning area tend to --

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I think we lost him. He said, "tend
20 to", and I was just waiting for it to come and then it never
21 came. Let's give him a minute to come back.

22 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: I thought he was going for the
23 dramatic pause.

24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: There must be something going on at
25 the Office of Planning, because I see Ms. Brown has dropped off

1 again. Okay. There you go.

2 MS. SCHELLIN: She's under Joel now.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Okay.

4 MR. BEAMON: Sorry about that. I think we have a kind
5 of bad connection here. But overall, again, I don't think this
6 will have any negative direct or indirect impacts on any kind of
7 racial demographic data or any racial groups, so, moving forward,
8 I don't we'll have to be concerned about this particular rezoning
9 having an impact on any specific groups moving forward.

10 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: All right. Thank you, Mr.
11 Beamon. I really appreciate your response and your stick-to-
12 itiveness through the IT issues here, so -- and thank you for
13 your work on this report. Mr. Chairman, that's all that I have.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Commissioner
15 Stidham.

16 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: I don't really have any
17 questions, but I do appreciate Commissioner Imamura's questions
18 related to the zone, and would like to also hear why this zone
19 is better than some other zone. And thank you, Mr. Beamon, for
20 your report and for that response to his question.

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Vice Chair Miller.

22 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yeah, I
23 think that this map amendment is certainly not inconsistent with
24 the medium-density residential RA-4 zone -- the RA-4 is not
25 inconsistent with -- is consistent with the medium-density

1 residential designation on the Future Land Use Map, and that
2 amendment -- this map amendment will facilitate the production
3 of mixed-income and affordable housing opportunities in a
4 transit-oriented neighborhood, which is rich in amenities. So I
5 guess -- I know we don't have a project before us, but Mr. Beamon
6 indicated that the applicant intends to exceed IZ Plus, and
7 Commissioner Wright also noted this -- the applicant intends to
8 exceed the IZ Plus units in its redevelopment of the church site,
9 and that the -- and your report indicated that they're going to
10 adaptively reuse -- they're going to convert the existing
11 building into residential units. Are they also going -- just out
12 of curiosity, are they also going to build else -- additional
13 units, or I guess my -- here's the more appropriate question.
14 What -- how much -- how many housing units will this facilitate
15 total -- maximum; do you have any idea?

16 MR. BEAMON: Yeah, that I can't answer. Again, we
17 don't have a specific project in front of us, so the applicant
18 will have to answer that.

19 VICE CHAIR MILLER: And you did -- your report did
20 indicate they were going to adapt it -- adapt the building and
21 convert it to residential units, correct?

22 MR. BEAMON: Yeah, according to the applicant, yes
23 correct, yeah.

24 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Do you know if they also intend to
25 build additional units, or you don't know?

1 MR. BEAMON: Again, I don't know the details of the
2 actual development, but according to their application, yes, they
3 are intending to use the existing building, so, you know, there
4 wouldn't be any additional height, so, yeah, they are -- I guess
5 they're limited to what's either there currently, but that's
6 just, again, what I took from the application, but, again, there
7 may be more details that I'm not aware of at this time.

8 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Right. And church isn't a
9 designated historic building or anything like that --

10 MR. BEAMON: No, it is not.

11 VICE CHAIR MILLER: -- or is it?

12 MR. BEAMON: No, it is not, no.

13 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you. Well, I think -- I'm
14 supportive of setting this down for a public hearing strongly,
15 Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. I, too, am in
17 support of setting this down. And, Mr. Beamon, thank you for
18 your excellently done report. Thank you very much -- and
19 responding to the questions. Colleagues, I, too, agree. I'm
20 ready to set this down. Let me see, who would like to make the
21 motion to set it down? Commissioner Wright.

22 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Thank you. I'd like to move that
23 we set down Zoning Case Number 24-14, Emory United Methodist
24 Church, Map Amendment at Square 2672, and that we are ready to
25 set that down.

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Is there a second?
2 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Second.
3 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Second.
4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. We got -- did we get one
5 second or two seconds that time?
6 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: We got two in there.
7 Commissioner Stidham beat me out.
8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah, Commissioner Stidham has that
9 one I think. Ms. Schellin -- any further questions?
10 (No response.)
11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Ms. Schellin, could you do a roll
12 call vote please.
13 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Commissioner Wright.
14 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes.
15 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Stidham.
16 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes.
17 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood.
18 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.
19 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller.
20 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.
21 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Imamura.
22 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.
23 MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is five to zero to zero to set
24 down Zoning Commission Case Number 24-14 as a contested case.
25 Thank you.

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. I want Mr. Turnbull to
2 know that I'm using the space bar; I'm not using my mouse. That's
3 the Turnbull rule. I know he's watching. Psych. All right.
4 Ms. Schellin, is Ms. Brown-Roberts ready? I don't see her. Oh,
5 she's under Joel. Ms. Brown-Roberts, you ready? There you go.

6 MS. SCHELLIN: There she is.

7 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Good evening, Mr. Chairman and
8 members of the Zoning Commission. Maxine Brown-Roberts from the
9 Office of Planning on Zoning Commission Case 13-14E. And let me
10 apologize for earlier.

11 Next slide. The McMillan project, now known as the
12 Reservoir District DC, was approved several years ago and has
13 been subject to appeals and modification, which has caused some
14 delay in the overall project development. However, development
15 is underway as a recreation center on the southern portion of the
16 property. Parcel 6 is open, and the townhouses in the center
17 portion of the site, Parcel 5, are under development and will
18 soon be ready for occupancy.

19 To help continue the development of the overall
20 project, the applicant proposes to modify Parcel 2, first-stage
21 and second-stage PUD map amendment, and Parcel 4, consolidated
22 PUD amendment -- map amendment modified by Zoning Commission Case
23 13-15B. These modifications, and particularly the requested
24 flexibility, are to give the applicant leeway to be able to
25 respond in a timely manner to market changes, financing,

1 construction costs, and to bring the long-awaited development to
2 fruition.

3 Next slide. Parcel 4 is proposed to be a mixed-use
4 building with ground-floor retail and residential above. The
5 upper floors are in the shape of an E.

6 Next slide. The areas of modification and flexibility
7 relate mostly to the mix of -- mix and type of residential use,
8 the amount of retail, parking and loading provided and their
9 location, as well as minor deviations from the approved building
10 height, FAR, lot occupancy, building materials -- and the
11 approved materials for the building.

12 Next slide. The main feature of Parcel 4 was a full-
13 service supermarket to serve the Reservoir District and the
14 surrounding neighborhood, which is shown in red on the slide on
15 the left-hand side. The applicant was granted a modification in
16 the areas of flexibility in prior modification requests to make
17 the project viable, but they have lost out on grocers due to
18 delays, legal challenges, and changes in the market. The proposed
19 modification and flexibility would have a total retail area of
20 between 16 and 59,000 square feet, of which 10 to 25,000 square
21 feet would be dedicated to a grocer.

22 If the grocery and retail is reduced to the minimum,
23 the applicant requests flexibility to use the leftover space for
24 residential use, which is shown on the left side, and you see
25 that hatched in yellow. Secondly, the building was also to

1 provide 85 affordable senior units. With the modification, they
2 would be relocated to Parcel 2 and the space converted to 125
3 market-rate units. The applicant recommends -- or requests
4 flexibility to provide, plus or minus, ten percent of the units.
5 Further, the applicant requests the flexibility to convert up to
6 20 percent of the residential use to lodging use, if the market
7 will not support all the residential use.

8 Regarding parking and loading, the applicant proposes
9 modification and flexibility to vary the amount provided to be
10 responsive to the uses in the building, but not go below that
11 which is shown on the plans. The applicant has requested
12 modifications to the building height by five feet -- they're
13 going from approximately 79 to 84 feet -- modifications to the
14 FAR and lot occupancy, which are due to slight reduction in the
15 lot area; modification and flexibility to some of the approved
16 building materials are also requested, as this -- which is due
17 to the passage of time. Some materials are no longer available,
18 may have long delivery times, as well as an increase in cost of
19 materials.

20 Next slide. Parcel 2 -- the approved Parcel 2 building
21 has two structures and ground-floor retail, and the upper
22 residential floors are connected by an above-grade pedestrian
23 bridge. The modification would remove the pedestrian bridge, and
24 Parcel 2 would now have two independent structures, the East
25 Building and the West Building.

1 Next slide. Again, the modifications to Parcel 2
2 buildings would be the amount of retail and residential use,
3 parking and loading, building dimensions, and materials.

4 Next slide. On the left are the approved plans with a
5 mix of retail and residential uses. On the right are the modified
6 plans. The East Building would be modified to be an all-
7 affordable senior building with 142 units, plus or minus ten
8 percent, and retail use. The applicant requests flexibility to
9 convert the retail use to residential, if the market does not
10 support the retail use. And that is shown on the left side --
11 the right slide and the left building. You can see the hatched
12 area is where they're proposing, if the retail goes away, to have
13 senior affordable housing.

14 The West Building would have retail use and 125 units,
15 plus or minus ten percent -- these are the market-rate units --
16 with the flexibility to reduce the retail and replace it with
17 residential use, or convert the residential use to lodging use.
18 Further, the applicant requests modifications and flexibility to
19 adjust the parking and loading, to address the uses in each
20 building appropriately, but not less than is shown on the plans.
21 Similar to Building 4, the applicant requests modification to the
22 building height by five feet, modifications to the FAR, lot
23 occupancy adjustments due to the slight changes in the lot area,
24 and modification and flexibility to some of the approved building
25 materials.

1 Next slide. The applicant has also requested relief
2 from the MU-10 plaza requirement, side yards, and penthouse
3 setbacks and not having one enclosure. Regarding the penthouse
4 setbacks, those are related more to elevator overrides and
5 they're -- where they're located on the plans, they would not be
6 visible from the street or just minimally visible. And because
7 of the shape of the property, the penthouse does not have one
8 enclosure.

9 Next slide. The Future Land Use Map recommends a mix
10 of medium-density residential, moderate-density commercial, and
11 parks, recreation, and open space for the overall development.
12 The proposed modification to the buildings would not be
13 inconsistent with these designations. In its original approval,
14 the Commission determined that the proposal would not be
15 inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan. When viewed through a
16 racial equity lens, the proposal will continue to expand housing,
17 affordable housing, and would provide a supermarket to serve the
18 neighborhood.

19 Next slide. The applicant outlines that their
20 community outreach and coordination has included meetings with
21 ANC 5E, ANC 1E, the McMillan Advisory Group, the Bloomingdale
22 Civic Association. ANC 5E has provided a letter of support,
23 which is in the record. Mr. Chairman, we find that this is an
24 unusual amount of flexibility for a PUD, but this development has
25 been delayed by a number of appeals over the last ten years,

1 | which has resulted in changes and loss in finances and changes
2 | in the market. The requested modification and flexibility will
3 | allow the applicant to more quickly adjust to changes in the
4 | marketplace. As outlined in our report, OP is supportive of the
5 | proposed modifications, flexibility, and relief requested, and
6 | we will continue to work with the applicant to address any areas
7 | of concern and, therefore, recommends that the Zoning Commission
8 | set down the proposed application and allow the applicant to
9 | fully make their case to you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I'm
10 | available for questions.

11 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Brown-Roberts. We
12 | appreciate your very succinct report. I do have one question
13 | before I go to Commissioner Wright. Is -- do we know of any
14 | known -- I know we have, it seems like, generated some support.
15 | Do we know of any known opposition to this case -- to this
16 | modification?

17 | MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: No, I don't know of any at this
18 | time. As the applicant has told us, they have had a good
19 | reception from the organizations that they have been working
20 | with, and these are people -- or these are organizations that
21 | they have been working with from the outset of this -- of this
22 | proposal, but, as of this time, we are not aware -- I'm not aware
23 | of any.

24 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Great. Thank you.
25 | Commissioner Wright, any questions or comments?

1 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Thank you. I know this has been
2 a longstanding project. It has certainly predated my tenure on
3 the Zoning Commission. And it has been delayed for a whole
4 variety of reasons, but it's also a very, very important project
5 for this part of the city. And I think what's key, as we -- I'm
6 definitely in favor of setting this down and having a hearing on
7 it and having a good discussion, and I generally am comfortable
8 with much of what they're proposing. In fact, certain things
9 they're proposing, like removal of the pedestrian bridge, seem
10 like a really, really good idea. But, you know, I think that,
11 as the project progresses, we have to make sure it doesn't lose
12 the elements that made it such an important contribution to this
13 part of the city from the get-go. And I think the reduction in
14 the amount of retail does make me a bit uncomfortable.

15 I know that in Building 2, they're saying it could go
16 to 5,000 square feet, and I wasn't completely clear -- maybe your
17 PowerPoint explained it and I didn't quite get it -- is that
18 5,000 in total or 5,000 in the West Building and 5,000 in the
19 East Building, or is it split between the two buildings? So that
20 I was a little unclear on.

21 I'm also concerned that, you know, we make sure that
22 there is a grocery store that will serve the community in the
23 building on Lot 4. I understand there was a very large grocery
24 store originally proposed and, honestly, you know, I think the
25 trend is many urban grocery stores are smaller than 50,000 square

1 feet these days. 50,000 square feet is a very large grocery
2 store and sort of more of what you'd find in a large suburban
3 strip center, but, you know -- and I was not uncomfortable with
4 the idea that going down to the 22,000 square feet, but then
5 cutting it down to 10,000 square feet, that starts to more like
6 a small specialty grocery store, not a full-service grocery
7 store. So, you know, I think that they just need to make a strong
8 argument, when we do have the hearing on this case after we've
9 set it down, as to, you know, what their -- what their game plan
10 is for making sure that there is going to be a sufficient amount
11 of retail in this project to make it truly a mixed-use project
12 and to have the benefits to the community that were originally
13 anticipated in the PUD.

14 I, personally, am sort of excited about the flexibility
15 that allows the lodging component on the west side of Lot 2,
16 because I think having lodging in this location would be a real
17 asset to the community. I, personally, have had experience of
18 family members getting long-term treatment at Washington Hospital
19 Center and, you know, having to drive back and forth and back
20 and forth. I -- even though I live in the city, I would have
21 probably, for some occasions, if there had been good lodging in
22 the area, rented a hotel room so I could be close to the hospital.
23 And I have to imagine that's really true for people who come from
24 a farther distance. When my daughter was born, she had to be in
25 the NICU at Washington -- at Children's Hospital, and there was

1 another family who had come in from sort of Lancaster County,
2 Pennsylvania with their child, and I have no idea where they were
3 able to stay while they were being with their child in the
4 hospital. So I think lodging is a great idea in this location,
5 and I fully support that flexibility, but I am -- I am a little
6 concerned about making sure we don't minimize the retail so much
7 that this really, really doesn't provide the kinds of amenities
8 that the community needed, wanted, felt like they would get
9 through the PUD.

10 So those are my only comments, but I think it's -- I
11 think it's fine to have it set down, and I think we just really
12 would want to hear from the applicant during the public hearing
13 about, you know, what their sort of game plan is for the retail.
14 Thanks.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Who would like
16 to go next? Vice Chair Miller?

17 VICE CHAIR MILLER: You want me to go? Okay. Thank
18 you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Maxine Brown-Roberts, for your
19 very comprehensive report on a very -- there are a lot of
20 modifications being proposed here and, as you pointed out, an
21 unusual amount of flexibility that's being proposed here, and so
22 there's a lot to absorb, and I certainly support having a public
23 hearing to further explore all of those modifications and
24 flexibility. And I've strongly supported this project from its
25 outset and understand -- and I'm sympathetic to the flexibility

1 that's being asked for due to the almost unacceptable delays that
2 have occurred due to the litigation by the opposition in our
3 community, despite the fact that many in the community, including
4 the ANC, has consistently supported the project, and they do --
5 and they support the setdown in this case, ANC 5E, and so that's
6 important.

7 So I associate myself with Commissioner Wright's
8 comments about the reduction -- the flexibility that allows for
9 a reduction of the full grocery -- full-service grocery store to
10 as low as 10,000 square feet, though -- recognizing that in their
11 community outreach that the applicant has commendably done, they
12 originally were at one point apparently suggesting 6,000 square
13 feet, and, due to community feedback, increased that minimum to
14 10,000. They're hoping to get 22,000, and that's who they're in
15 negotiations with now apparently, a 22,000-square-foot grocery
16 store, but it was in the PUD -- approved PUD, a 50,000-square
17 foot-grocery store.

18 And a full-service, it doesn't have to be 50,000, of
19 course, although my neighborhood along the Wisconsin Avenue
20 corridor has too many of those, compared to other neighborhoods,
21 including the Wegmans I think is over 84,000. And I think even
22 our revamped Giant that -- you sat on that case, Mr. Chairman,
23 years ago, which there was opposition from my neighbors to, and
24 they're all there -- shopping there. I think even that is 50,000.
25 I think even that is 50,000, but -- so I'm concerned about it

1 going down to 10,000. That is not -- I don't think that's a
2 full-service grocery store. So I think we need to have a public
3 hearing on that, explore -- they can show us the -- what's being
4 offered there, and they can show us why the market has changed,
5 but I think Ward 5 can certainly support a full-service grocery
6 store and needs one, as all neighborhoods in the city do.

7 I'm also somewhat concerned -- I support also the
8 flexibility to convert to lodging, although I'm somewhat
9 concerned about if all of the flexibility to convert to lodging --
10 100 percent -- is it 100 percent of the West Building I guess
11 and then is it 20 percent of the Parcel 4? I'm not -- we really
12 are reducing a lot of residential units. They're increasing --
13 they're proposing to increase the senior affordable housing,
14 which is commendable, in this modification, but then they're
15 asking for flexibility to reduce it by -- I think it's from 142
16 to 88 or something like that, so the flexibility ends up going
17 below what they're -- I think what was being -- I don't know.

18 We need to explore all of these -- that flexibility,
19 because the residential market-rate, mixed-income, and senior
20 affordable was all a very important part of that PUD; the full-
21 service grocery store benefit was an important part of the PUD
22 package. And I certainly want this project to move forward and
23 so does the community -- most of the surrounding community, and
24 so I support setting it down. So I appreciate some of those --
25 exploration of some of those issues that Commissioner Wright and

1 I and perhaps other of my colleagues might identify and the
2 community might identify at the public hearing. So thank you,
3 Mr. Chairman.

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. Commissioner Imamura.

5 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and
6 thank you to Commissioner Wright and Vice Chair Miller for raising
7 some of those important points. Ms. Brown-Roberts, thank you for
8 your report. I think, clearly, these types of projects are
9 complicated, complex, a lot of moving parts. There are a number
10 of changes, but what I would say, instead of changes, I would
11 describe them as refinements. And so I'm interested to hear
12 more, should we choose to set this down, and I think it's
13 important to set this down to find out in more detail a little
14 bit about some of those refinements. I'm also interested and
15 hope that some of the issues that were raised in your report and
16 concerns -- I'll be very interested to hear how the applicant has
17 closed the gap and resolved those issues with OP, so I don't
18 think I have anything more to add, other than what Commissioner
19 Wright and Vice Chair Miller have already brought up.

20 This is an important project and it needs to move
21 forward, but details matter, and so I'm interested in hearing
22 more from the applicant with a compelling justification and
23 explanation. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. Commissioner Stidham,
25 any questions or comments?

1 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Thank you. I just want to echo
2 the concerns with the grocery store and the need for it to be
3 able to accommodate the community, and very much support setting
4 this down, but will expect to hear from the applicant strong
5 justifications for the flexibility that they're requesting and
6 how that will further the original objectives of the PUD. So,
7 really, they should come prepared to really dig into the meat of
8 what they're requesting.

9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. I would agree with
10 everything I've heard all of my colleagues mention. I do know
11 the changes and, as Commissioner Imamura said, the refinements,
12 and the issue about the reducing of the tenant space -- I mean,
13 the retail space, some of those issues, I know, it took us a long
14 time to get here, so I want to make sure what we're -- the way
15 we're moving forward in these modifications and changes and
16 refinements are better for the community, as opposed to taking
17 away from the community. So I'm hoping that the community had a
18 lot to do -- which I do see some support, but I'm hoping that
19 we're improving and not going back to -- because it's 15, 20, and
20 30 years that we've been trying to do something over here. So I
21 think we've got a great start. We are already moving on it. And
22 what I want to do is build -- what I would like to see us continue
23 to do is build upon that and make sure that it's beneficial for
24 the community and the neighborhood and the city as a whole. So
25 I'm looking forward to having that discussion, and I'm sure that

1 the community has been definitely engaged. They've been engaged
2 the whole time, so I'm looking forward to them -- I'm looking
3 forward to setting this down. All right. Would somebody like
4 to make a -- any other comments on this?

5 (No response.)

6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Would somebody like to make a
7 motion?

8 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I'd like to move, Mr. Chairman,
9 that the Zoning Commission set down for a public hearing Zoning
10 Commission Case Number 13-14E, McMillan Parcel 2 Owner, LLC, et
11 al., Modification with hearing to first and second-stage PUDs for
12 Parcels 2 and 4 at Square 3128, and ask for a second.

13 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Second.

14 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Second.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. It's been moved and
16 seconded again twice -- we only had one case today that was not
17 seconded twice -- moved and properly seconded. Any further
18 discussion?

19 (No response.)

20 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Not hearing any, Ms. Schellin, would
21 you do a roll-call vote please?

22 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Commissioner Miller.

23 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

24 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Imamura.

25 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.

1 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood.

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.

3 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Wright.

4 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes.

5 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Stidham.

6 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes.

7 MS. SCHELLIN: And this has -- Case Number 13-14E being
8 set down as a contested case by a vote of five to zero to zero.
9 Thank you.

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

12 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. The Office of Planning has a
13 report -- excuse me -- a report to give the Commission -- an
14 update.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Let's bring the Office of
16 Planning up for an update.

17 MS. SCHELLIN: And I believe Mr. Young has the
18 PowerPoint presentation.

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

20 MS. STEINGASSER: Can I start by making sure everyone
21 can hear me?

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes, we can hear you.

23 MS. STEINGASSER: Okay. So I just wanted to give the
24 Commissioners a quick update, a forecast of what we're going to
25 be bringing to the Commission this spring and summer. We have

1 | some major zoning cases, as well as a quick summary on the Comp
2 | Plan.

3 | Next slide please. So the first case that you'll be
4 | seeing initiated by OP is the amendments to the RA-1 zone. We
5 | hope to be bringing those to you -- filing at the end of April
6 | for setdown in May. That looks at both an expansion of some of
7 | the smaller matter-of-right options that are there, as well as
8 | looking at some of those flashpoints on the controversial cases
9 | over the last year, and proposing some design amendments and
10 | provisions in that regard.

11 | We'll also be bringing forth some amendments to alley
12 | lots, which would allow again for the expanded use of alley lots
13 | for residential. We've been working with some alley lot owners,
14 | and we'll be bringing those forward also towards the beginning
15 | of May.

16 | We're also going to be bringing forward some -- an
17 | amendment to the rear addition -- the 10-foot rear addition
18 | limitation that's often referred to as the 10-foot rule for
19 | rowhouses -- row structures, semi-detached, and we'll be bringing
20 | forward, again, some amendments to allow a matter-of-right
21 | provision with regard to that.

22 | We're also going to be bringing forward two more
23 | rulemaking map amendments that include the Wisconsin Avenue,
24 | based on the recently adopted development framework for Wisconsin
25 | Avenue, and that will run from Friendship Heights down to

1 Tenleytown, and then also one for the Connecticut Avenue/
2 Cleveland Park/Woodley Park area, and that's also based on the
3 recently adopted development framework plan, and those are
4 consistent with the Comp Plan. And there will be a similar
5 rulemaking and application to those particular areas.

6 And then we're going to also be bringing forward in May
7 and June what we're calling a housing and process omnibus case.
8 We have well over a dozen, maybe two dozen small amendments that
9 involve -- some are just clarifications; some of them are just
10 small tweaks to a number of regulations, so much so that each
11 one is not big enough to hold its own hearing. We started putting
12 them -- making a list, and we realized there was a real theme
13 towards housing and residential and facilitating removal of
14 barriers to housing and furthering the policies in the city, so
15 we decided we would bring them forward as an omnibus. We'll be
16 presenting those to you early in June, maybe late May. You'll
17 be able to set the whole omnibus down. If the Commission wants
18 to pull one or two off, that's fine too. We just didn't think,
19 as a group, there were -- they were all small enough that we felt
20 they could be heard en masse.

21 We also have a collection of map amendments and text
22 amendments, rather, for the downtown area, and we're also looking
23 at that as an omnibus. We've been working with a lot of the
24 stakeholder groups in the downtown to look at some of the issues
25 they've raised about conversion of the office buildings,

1 creating, you know, neighborhood conducive spaces that are also
2 now at issue down there. So those are what we plan to be bringing
3 forward to the Commission. It's obviously going to be very busy,
4 and then, of course, the hearings will probably be later towards
5 the end of the summer and the fall.

6 Next slide please. These are some of the issues on the
7 residential omnibus. We're looking at decks, allowing decks in
8 front yards by special exception and not by variance; accessory
9 apartments, clarifying how they are looked at in the RA and the
10 RF zones; surface parking screening requirements in alleys;
11 garage door heights. The zoning regs have an issue on garage
12 door heights that have been causing trouble. There's a 30-foot
13 lot frontage for new subdivisions in different zones that we're
14 also trying to analyze. We're clarifying some of the zoning
15 administration flexibility post-BZA hearings.

16 We're looking also at the GAR, the Green Area Ratio,
17 and how that works in terms of when it's triggered by interior
18 work. We're looking at standardizing penthouse heights in
19 certain zones. There's a zoning regulation about window
20 alignment and separation in the MU and the D, being the downtown
21 zones, so we're also taking a look at that, because that has --
22 also involves a hindrance when a building is trying to convert
23 from one use to another. And we're also looking at exempting
24 balconies from lot occupancy and how the inner balconies count
25 towards GFA. So those are some of the smaller things that are

1 really just -- they're a technical exercise, in terms of zoning,
2 but they need to be heard. They do have a collective impact.

3 Next slide please. So in the downtown, we're looking
4 at some of the issues involving a change in use when there's a
5 TDR covenant. As you may remember, you know, the D zones were
6 part of the downtown development overlay and started in 1990, and
7 there was a lot of regulations -- there were a lot of regulations
8 about bonus density, how it was cut, how much you got for certain
9 uses. Then a covenant was required. And now that there has been
10 a maturity of the downtown and a look at those uses is warranted
11 and how they can now be changed out.

12 So we're also looking at what constitutes preferred
13 uses in those zones, and we also want to clarify that in the
14 issue of changing office to residential, that some of these
15 smaller issues be made clear that a property owner doesn't have
16 to come back for variance relief. And we've done one of those
17 already I guess a year-and-a-half ago, and we'll be cleaning --
18 doing a fuller cleanup of those.

19 Again, court relief is one of the few area requirements
20 downtown that didn't get classified for special exception, so
21 they're still struggling with the variance standards, so we're
22 going to be looking at changing the relief type, and then also
23 looking for flexibility for the post-approval changes when
24 they're trying to get a building permit, because a lot of times
25 those building codes change, as we see. So those are the two

1 omnibus bills that we'll be bringing forward, and you see they
2 have a collection of issues that all work together.

3 Next slide. I also wanted to point out that the
4 Comprehensive Plan was kicked off this month. The Mayor had a
5 launch with the Office of Planning in March. There's a website
6 that people can go to. It's dc2050.dc.gov, and that'll have the
7 basic calendar of events that's coming up.

8 Can we go to the next slide please? So for the next
9 summer -- for the rest of the spring and summer, there's going
10 to be public engagements working to identify goals and priorities
11 of those communities throughout the city. We'll then, from
12 October -- for the next year, October to September of 2026,
13 additional engagement on land use scenarios and the racial equity
14 goals and accounting for trends and changes, so that'll be a lot
15 of -- a lot of community work, a lot of scenario planning there.
16 And then October 26th through June 27th, OP will be refining the
17 Plan and working on the final recommendations for Mayor Bowser
18 to transmit to the Council. And then we expect to transmit
19 that -- we hope to have that transmitted from the Mayor to the
20 Council in July of 2027, and, hopefully, that will give the
21 Commission (sic) -- the Council six months to consider it for
22 approval. And then we'll spend the next 25 years implementing
23 the plans and policies with our partners.

24 Next slide. And then I just wanted to end with, again,
25 the visual and the website for the dc2050.dc.gov. So that was

1 all. I just wanted to give you a quick update on what you'll be
2 seeing from OP.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Steingasser. I will
4 tell you that when I -- when I -- I wasn't expecting this report
5 this evening, but it really shows that -- I saw some things that
6 jogged my memory that we're supposed to be looking at or we're
7 going to look at. But I want to commend the Office of Planning
8 for your due diligence, and the word we've always used around
9 here, stick-to-itiveness, of bringing things back to make things
10 easier, to make things more understandable, and to tweak things
11 that we needed to do, so I really appreciate the PowerPoint, as
12 presented. I'm not sure what the outcomes are going to be, but
13 one thing that we can rest assured is that the Office of Planning,
14 our elected officials, the Commission, the residents, we stick
15 to -- continue to try to make things easier and make things
16 better. So that was a true example.

17 Now, I know we don't have a lot of people listening
18 tonight of all the things that we're still looking at, but I want
19 to rest assure the residents of this city that the Office of
20 Planning did not let stuff just go somewhere in a folder and
21 close it up and throw it away. No, it's still on the agenda. So
22 I want to thank the Office of Planning for doing that. I think
23 it's very important. Again, I don't know what the outcome's
24 going to be, but I want to thank the Office of Planning for your
25 due diligence and also bringing that forward. Now, in 2050, I

1 don't know if I'll be around to see how things go. Who knows
2 where I'll be in 2050, but I'm sure I won't be here, but I'm sure
3 it'll work. So, with that, let's see if my colleagues have any
4 questions or comments on that. Anybody? Vice Chair Miller, and
5 then we'll go to Commissioner Imamura.

6 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I just -- thank you, Ms.
7 Steingasser for your report, if you're -- you're still here,
8 yeah. I just didn't see you. That was an excellent report.
9 You, obviously, have a lot -- the Office of Planning has on their
10 plate, and I was very pleased, as the Chairman was, to see so
11 many items on that plate that have come up, whether it's in our
12 zoning cases or -- Zoning Commission case or BZA cases, that
13 need -- that need further work or amendments to them, so -- and
14 the Comprehensive Plan work you have on top of that. I think I
15 listened to the launch that the Mayor had a couple weeks ago,
16 and so I commend the administration for all the work that you've
17 been doing, and we look forward to seeing, you know, the proposals
18 that come forward. And I know that that isn't even a list that
19 will -- that is complete, because there are a lot of issues out
20 there that will require zoning actions to facilitate projects
21 going forward, you know, whether it's all the federal buildings
22 being vacated or other projects. So thank you for your work,
23 and I associate myself with the Chairman's remarks commending
24 you.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. Commissioner Imamura.

1 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just
2 wanted to build on your comments and appreciate Vice Chair
3 Miller's comments as well, that Ms. Steingasser, the Office of
4 Planning and your team are always busy making this city a little
5 bit better one zoning action at a time. And, you know, your
6 description of the technical exercise I thought was very apropos;
7 made me think of maybe zoning gymnastics here, but, all that
8 said, everything that you put forward really makes me think about
9 the quote, you know, "Make no little plans". And so just thank
10 you to you and your team and the work that you do on behalf of
11 the city, so I really appreciate it. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. Any other comments?

13 (No response.)

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I'm not seeing any. All
15 right. So, with that, thank you again, Ms. Steingasser. We
16 appreciate the work that you all do, and I'm sure on behalf of
17 the residents, I'm sure the residents do as well, so we
18 appreciate, so thank you again for bringing that up.

19 MS. STEINGASSER: Thank you.

20 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. Ms. Schellin, do we have
21 anything else?

22 MS. SCHELLIN: (Shakes head negatively.)

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Let me see if I can get this
24 right this time. So, okay, March the 31st, the Zoning Commission
25 will hear a case, which is the Office of Planning -- being brought

1 forward by the Office of Planning, Zoning Commission Case Number
2 24-20. We'll be on these same platforms at four p.m. So, with
3 that, I want to thank everyone for their participation in this
4 meeting, and have a great weekend. Good night.

5 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the
6 record at 5:15 p.m.)

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

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

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Public Meeting

Before: DC Zoning Commission

Date: 03-27-25

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