

GOVERNMENT OF  
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

REGULAR PUBLIC HEARING  
CASE NUMBER 25-18

+ + + + +

THURSDAY

MAY 21, 2026

+ + + + +

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

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

PAUL YOUNG, Zoning Data Specialist  
ELLA ACKERMAN, Acting Secretary

OFFICE OF ZONING LEGAL DIVISION STAFF PRESENT:

BRIAN LAMPERT, ESQUIRE

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

## ALSO PRESENT:

JEFF UTZ, ESQUIRE, Goulston and Storrs  
SHANE DETTMAN, Goulston and Storrs  
DANIEL SOLOMON, Gorove Slade  
CHARLES WARREN, Teass/Warren Architects  
ERKIN OZBERK, District Department of Transportation  
MAXINE BROWN-ROBERTS, DC Office of Planning  
JOSHUA MITCHUM, DC Office of Planning  
SHELBY DAWIRS

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the  
Regular Public Hearing held on May 21, 2026.

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

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

Case No. 25-18 - Champlain Street Partners, LLC

Introduction - Chairman Hood ..... 4

Preliminary Matters ..... 6

Applicant's Presentation

    Mr. Utz ..... 9

    Mr. Mutreja ..... 13

    Mr. Warren ..... 15

    Mr. Solomon ..... 20

    Mr. Dettman ..... 23

Questions/Comments from Commissioners

    Commissioner Imamura ..... 33

    Commissioner Wright ..... 41

    Vice Chair Miller ..... 42

    Chairman Hood ..... 47

Department of Transportation Report - Mr. Ozberk ..... 50

Office of Planning Report - Mr. Mitchum ..... 52

Questions/Comments from Commissioners

    Vice Chair Miller ..... 54

ANC 1C Report - Vice Chair Miller ..... 55

Testimony from Ms. Dawirs ..... 57

Applicant's Closing Statement - Mr. Utz ..... 62

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

(4:00 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. We are convening and broadcasting this public hearing by video conferencing. My name is Anthony Hood, and I'm joined by Vice Chair Miller, Commissioner Wright, and Commissioner Imamura. We're also joined by the Office Zoning Staff, Ms. Ella Ackerman, as well as Mr. Paul Young, who will be handling all of our virtual operations; and our legal counsel, we're joined by Mr. Brian Lampert from our Office of Zoning Legal Division. I will ask all others to introduce themselves at the appropriate time.

The virtual public hearing -- the virtual public hearing notice is available on the Office of Zoning's website. This proceeding is being recorded by a court reporter and is also webcast live via WebEx and YouTube Live. The video will be available on the Office of Zoning's website after the hearing. Accordingly, all those listening on WebEx or by phone will be muted during the hearing and only those who have signed up to testify will be unmuted at the appropriate time. When called, please state your name before providing your testimony. When you are finished speaking, please mute your audio.

If you experience difficulty accessing WebEx or with your telephone call-in, then please call our OZ Hotline Number at 202-727-0789 to receive WebEx log-in or call-in instructions or if you have not signed up to testify. All persons planning

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

1 to testify must sign up in advance and will be called by name at  
2 the appropriate time. At the time of sign-up, all participants  
3 will complete the oath or affirmation required by Subtitle Z-  
4 408.7. If you wish to file written testimony or additional  
5 supporting documents during the hearing, then please be prepared  
6 to describe and discuss it at the time of your request when  
7 testifying.

8 The subject of this evening's hearing is Zoning  
9 Commission Case Number 25-18, the Champlain Street Partners, LLC  
10 consolidated PUD and related map amendment from the RA-2 to the  
11 RA-3 at Square 2560, Lot 827. Again, the address is 2384  
12 Champlain Street Northwest. And, again, today's date is May the  
13 21st.

14 The hearing will be conducted in accordance with the  
15 provisions of 11-Z DCMR, Chapter 4, as follows: We have  
16 preliminary matters; the applicant's case -- the applicant has  
17 up to 60 minutes, but I believe they can do it in 30, but they  
18 have up to 60; let's see how it goes -- report of other government  
19 agencies; Department of Transportation; report of the Office of  
20 Planning; report of the ANC -- I believe this one is 1C --  
21 testimony of organizations and individuals -- each have five and  
22 three minutes, respectively -- and we'll hear in order from those  
23 in support, opposition, and undeclared -- organizations, five  
24 minutes; individuals, three minutes -- then we'll have rebuttal  
25 and closing by the applicant. At this time -- by the applicant --

1 at this time, the Commission will consider any preliminary  
2 matters. Does the staff have any preliminary matters?

3 MS. ACKERMAN: Yes, I do for this case, but I also  
4 wanted to see if you guys wanted to vote on a closed meeting for  
5 next Thursday's public meeting.

6 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, I have that information. I was  
7 going to bring that up, so let's do that, and then we'll come  
8 back to the case. Thank you.

9 MS. ACKERMAN: You're welcome.

10 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let me get my information out. Give  
11 me one second. Okay. Okay. This is a vote for the Commission  
12 to hold an executive session on May the 28th at 3:15 p.m. to seek  
13 legal advice from our counsel regarding the contested noted --  
14 the contested cases noted on the agenda for May the 28th -- and  
15 those cases are Zoning Commission Case 25-08, 25-12, 25-13, and  
16 25-16 -- to have our closed meeting to preserve the attorney-  
17 client privilege between the Commission and its attorney,  
18 pursuant to DC Official Code 2-575(b)(4) and (A), and to  
19 deliberate, but not vote on limited deliberations and not -- but  
20 not to vote on the contested cases, pursuant to DC Official Code  
21 2-575(b) and 13. Okay. Is there -- I would move that we hold a  
22 closed meeting. Can I get a second?

23 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Second.

24 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. It has been moved  
25 and seconded that the Commission hold a closed meeting. Ms.

1 Ackerman, could you do a roll call vote please?

2 MS. ACKERMAN: Yes. Commissioner Hood.

3 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.

4 MS. ACKERMAN: Commissioner Imamura.

5 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.

6 MS. ACKERMAN: Commissioner Miller.

7 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

8 MS. ACKERMAN: Commissioner Wright.

9 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes.

10 MS. ACKERMAN: Okay. This closed meeting for next  
11 Thursday, May 28th's public meeting -- or closed meeting has been  
12 approved four to zero to one, with Commissioner Stidham not  
13 present, not voting.

14 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Again, the Commission  
15 will hold a closed meeting at 3:15 on May the 28th, as captioned,  
16 and we will announce it again when we come back for our regular  
17 meeting session to make sure that we give adequate notice. Okay.  
18 Ms. Ackerman, do we have any preliminary matters for tonight's  
19 case?

20 MS. ACKERMAN: Yes, we do.

21 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let's go through them.

22 MR. UTZ: All right. So this case was set down on  
23 January 15th, 2026 at the public meeting, and I have a few  
24 exhibits I want to mention. Exhibit 13 is the report from ANC  
25 1C, in support; Exhibit 23 is the OP hearing report recommending

1 approval; and Exhibit 22 is the DDOT report stating they have no  
2 objections to the application, but they want one condition to be  
3 included in the order.

4           Next are proffered expert witnesses. These are all  
5 from Exhibit 3J. Daniel Solomon in transportation planning;  
6 Shane Dettman in land use planning and zoning; and, lastly,  
7 Charles Warren in architecture. Charles does need to be approved  
8 for this case. And then, lastly, the applicant is represented  
9 by Jeff Utz of Goldston and Storrs, and they are planning on a  
10 30-minute presentation, unless the Commission prefers otherwise.  
11 Thank you.

12           CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Ackerman. I'm looking  
13 to my colleagues. I think we can continue the status of Mr.  
14 Dettman, as well as Mr. Solomon. And I'm looking to my colleagues  
15 about architecture. What was the gentleman's name again? I'm  
16 sorry.

17           COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Charles Warren.

18           MS. ACKERMAN: Charles Warren.

19           CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So Mr. Warren. Thank you. Any  
20 objections to Mr. Warren, anybody?

21           COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: No objections.

22           CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. No objections. Anybody else,  
23 any objections?

24           (Vice Chair Miller and Commissioner Wright shake head  
25 negatively.)

1 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So we'll give Mr. Warren expert  
2 status. Thank you, Commissioner Imamura for taking the lead on  
3 that. All right. Ms. Ackerman, do we have anything else?

4 MS. ACKERMAN: No, that's all.

5 CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Let's bring everybody up.  
6 And, colleagues, we said it for 30 minutes, but if it's more that  
7 needs to go on, then, you know, we can manage that, so just let  
8 me know. All right. Mr. Utz, whenever you're ready, you may  
9 begin.

10 MR. UTZ: Hey, can you all hear? Can you all hear?

11 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, we can hear you. We can hear you  
12 now, yes.

13 MR. UTZ: Great. Thank you. Fantastic. Well, good  
14 afternoon, Commissioners. My name is Jeff Utz, and I, along with  
15 my colleague, Shane Dettman, are with the law firm of Goulston  
16 and Storrs. We are here on behalf of the applicant in Case Number  
17 25-18, Champlain Street Partners, LLC. We greatly appreciate the  
18 opportunity to appear before you today to present this project.  
19 It's been quite a long time coming, so we're excited to be here  
20 today.

21 Before you is an application for the review and  
22 approval of a consolidated PUD and related zoning map amendment  
23 from the RA-2 to the RA-3 zone district. This application results  
24 from a partnership between Housing Help Plus, MED Developers,  
25 Mutreja Development, all of which are DC-based real estate

1 development companies that specialize in the construction and  
2 operation of affordable housing. Can we pull up the --

3 (Applicant's PowerPoint presentation shared on  
4 screen.)

5 MR. UTZ: Thank you. There it is. Next page please.  
6 Thank you. Just some background on the property. It is currently  
7 zoned RA-2, as I mentioned. It has a lot area of 7,348 square  
8 feet. The building on it was built in 1941, and it has 32  
9 microunits. So it has an interesting history of zoning at the  
10 site. At one point, it was designated as commercial, and then  
11 it actually was rezoned to industrial, and then it was rezoned  
12 again to residential in 1987. So it's had quite a quite an  
13 interesting journey over its years of existence and, hopefully,  
14 will have some more twists and turns here, as the result of this  
15 application.

16 The property was acquired in 2019, as part of the TOPA  
17 process, with the tenants in ownership, completing critical  
18 improvements to address pre-existing fire and life safety code  
19 violations and generally improve the on-site conditions. Despite  
20 these improvements, the building is still in need of major  
21 modernization and improvement, given its age and its inadequate  
22 unit configuration and system.

23 So the project that is on part of this application and  
24 we are going to present will deliver approximately 28,700 feet  
25 of Gross Floor Area of residential use, approximately 44 units

1 of affordable housing for households earning between 30 and 80  
2 percent MFI, has 32 replacement units and 12 new units, four at-  
3 grade vehicle parking spaces, and approximately 1,000 square feet  
4 of rooftop solar panel array area.

5           So the application proposes to build -- rebuild,  
6 really, a 50-foot building. The current building is about that  
7 height, and that is current RA-2 height max. It'll have an FAR  
8 of approximately 3.91, so it is in line with the existing height  
9 allowances, and about 1.75 FAR greater than the current RA-2 zone  
10 allowance. This result will be a well-designed and sustainable  
11 structure that is within the height and density appropriate for  
12 this location and will be additive and appropriate for this  
13 street. The project is designed according to Enterprise Green  
14 Community Certification standards and is designed for near net  
15 zero energy consumption, with the goal of achieving full net  
16 zero. The project will also be certified through Energy Star  
17 multifamily new construction.

18           Just a couple other notes. As noted in the OP report  
19 and in our application materials, we are requesting flexibility  
20 from lot occupancy, closed court, minimum parking, and parking  
21 screening requirements. Pursuant to Subtitle X, Section 301.1,  
22 the minimum land area for a PUD in the RA-3 zone is 15,000 square  
23 feet. This property, as I mentioned, contains a bit over 7,300  
24 feet of land area. Therefore, we need to seek a waiver from the  
25 minimum land area requirement. The Commission can waive the

1 minimum land area requirement in this case, if it finds that the  
2 proposed PUD is of exceptional merit and is in the best interest  
3 of the District or the country; and, if the development is to be  
4 located outside of the central employment area, which is this  
5 property, at least 80 percent of the GFA of the development can  
6 be used exclusively for dwelling units and accessory uses. As  
7 mentioned, the application does meet these criteria.

8           We believe that the application and the project is of  
9 exceptional merit and it's in the best interest of the District,  
10 since it will preserve affordable housing on the site, but also  
11 create and make permanent new affordable housing, all of which  
12 fully aligns with the Mayor's housing goals and the housing  
13 element policies and other policies of the Comprehensive Plan.  
14 The package of public benefits set forth in the application more  
15 than suffices to justify the PUD flexibility, including the  
16 technical zoning flexibility I just listed and the zoning map  
17 amendment itself.

18           Next slide please. Thank you. The applicant responded  
19 to the Zoning Commission and the Office of Planning questions and  
20 comments from the January 15th setdown in the prehearing  
21 statement and package that was submitted in Exhibit 14 of the  
22 record. This included information, as listed on the left side  
23 of the slide, relating to the project's financing,  
24 affordable -- affordability levels and terms, tenant  
25 relocation and the return plan, and coordinating with the

1 existing tenants. We also summarized the community outreach,  
2 which is shown, generally, in the middle column of this slide.

3 We are here today with the support of OP and the ANC  
4 and a letter of no objections from DDOT. Summarized at the right  
5 side of the slide is an overview of that agency input on the  
6 project and on the application itself.

7 With me today are Neil Mutreja, Mutreja Development,  
8 on behalf of the applicant; Charles Warren, Teass/Warren  
9 Architects, the project architect; Daniel Solomon, Gorove Slade,  
10 the project transportation consultant; and, as mentioned, Shane  
11 Dettman, the project landman. We also have others logged in and  
12 with us and available for questions of help. With that, I'd like  
13 to turn it over to Neil to give a little more information on the  
14 applicant, tenants, the project, and the community outreach to  
15 date.

16 MR. MUTREJA: Thank you, Jeff. Good afternoon, Zoning  
17 Commissioners. My name is Neil Mutreja, and I'm the  
18 representative of the applicant, Champlain Street Partners, LLC,  
19 for 2384 Champlain Street Apartments. Champlain Street Partners,  
20 LLC and the development team are proposing to construct and  
21 operate a new 44-unit multifamily affordable housing development  
22 with a mix of unit types targeting households earning up to 60  
23 percent AMI. Located within the heart of the Adams Morgan  
24 neighborhood in Ward One, the project seeks to create housing in  
25 an area rich with amenities, but lacking in affordability, with

1 a mix of permanent supportive housing units and more standard  
2 affordable studios, one-bedrooms and two-bedroom units.

3           The Resident Services Plan contemplated for this  
4 application looks to take a multifaceted community, an individual  
5 wealth-building approach to serve the populations most in need  
6 of support in this area. As Jeff had mentioned, the property  
7 currently operates as affordable housing for 32 households. The  
8 property was acquired in November 2019 through the TOPA process  
9 via joint vendor -- venture and assignment from the 2384  
10 Champlain Northwest Tenants Association. The acquisition was  
11 financed by a loan from the Capital Impact Partners' Housing  
12 Preservation Fund. As part of the acquisition, ownership  
13 immediately addressed all life safety and code issues at the  
14 existing building.

15           The ten-year affordable covenant on the property burns  
16 off in 2029, so, in efforts to keep affordable housing at the  
17 property, an agreement between the developer and owner and the  
18 TA anticipated a DHCD LIHTC execution and have collaborated  
19 together on this process. The existing property has 30 microunits  
20 and does not meet the current green energy and accessibility  
21 standards. An as-built was performed and determined that to  
22 bring the property up to new renovation and building standards,  
23 it would lose half of its units. Thus, ownership and the  
24 development team pursued a PUD map amendment from RA-2 to RA-3  
25 that allows the existing unit count and creation of an additional

1 40 -- additional 12 new units -- affordable units, all meeting  
2 current energy, accessibility, and building standards.

3           The development team met with ANC 1C on October 9th in  
4 2024, and then again on February 4th, 2026, and received unanimous  
5 support for the PUD map amendment and development both times.  
6 The development team also met with the Office of Planning multiple  
7 times prior to submitting the PUD application to determine the  
8 preferred entitlement pathway for this project. Since filing the  
9 PUD application, ownership has remained in coordination with OP  
10 and, to date, received positive feedback.

11           Additionally, ownership held several meetings with the  
12 Tenants Association and engaged in significant community outreach  
13 with neighbors from 24 -- 2024 to 2026, including with the Adams  
14 Morgan Partnership BID, and received full support from the  
15 community on the redevelopment efforts. The managing member of  
16 the development team, Housing Help Plus, which is the nonprofit  
17 sponsor, is an innovator and leader in serving highly vulnerable  
18 populations in the District, and has extensive and proven  
19 expertise in both property management and supportive services.  
20 Housing Help Plus works closely with both community connections  
21 and members of the development team on a number of supportive  
22 housing initiatives in the District. And, with that, I will turn  
23 it over to Charles.

24           MR. WARREN: Thank you. Thank you, Neil. Good  
25 afternoon, Chairman Hood and other Commissioners. Charles Warren

1 with Teass/Warren Architects and representing the applicant here.

2           Next slide please. We can go to the next slide. Thank  
3 you. -- just a quick background. I'm sure all of you are  
4 familiar with the property. This property is located along  
5 Champlain Street, between Columbia Road and Kalorama Road. As  
6 mentioned earlier by Mr. Utz, it is zoned -- currently zoned to  
7 RA-2 from the Reed-Cooke Overlay. It's located in the Adams  
8 Morgan neighborhood, one block over from the 18th Street main  
9 corridor for Adams Morgan, and it's just south of the Line Hotel,  
10 which is the large building you see labeled as number two on this  
11 site plan.

12           Next slide please. As mentioned earlier, the existing  
13 building is a three-story brick building built in the 1940s.  
14 It's comprised of 30 very small microunits, limited  
15 accessibility, and in need of significant upgrades, as mentioned  
16 before, including energy upgrades. The site has a pretty  
17 considerable slope from north to south. It's about three feet  
18 of fall over that 50 feet of width, which is -- has some  
19 complications with the accessibility piece. The street is quite  
20 narrow, and we have no ability to do public space projections  
21 here. And the existing mix of the context mix of the neighborhood  
22 is a mix of newer buildings and some older construction, mostly  
23 apartment buildings at that four to five-foot story, with the  
24 notable exception of the Line Hotel.

25           Next slide please. The site plan, just to get you

1 oriented. As noted, Champlain Street is pretty narrow. It's a  
2 50-foot right-of-way. There's a 16-foot alley in the rear. We  
3 are locating the entrance to the building on the south side of  
4 the property to take advantage of some of that natural slope.  
5 This is lot-line infill construction, so there's limited  
6 flexibility for landscaping and open space. We are proposing a  
7 closed court on the north side to allow for light and air to the  
8 internal units of the building. We are providing a significant  
9 amount of green roof. This is to help meet our -- excuse me --  
10 our Green Area Ratio requirement and storm water management  
11 requirement. We also have permeable pavers on the rear parking  
12 area.

13           Next slide please. Here you can see the proposed  
14 building in the context of the streetscape and just a sense of  
15 that slope across the street. We are electing to keep the  
16 building at five stories or 50 feet, which is in line with the  
17 pattern of development to the south of the site. We are slightly  
18 taller than the -- than the project to the south, but that is  
19 essentially a function of the grade change. And you can see,  
20 just to the right, how significantly the height shows the Line  
21 Hotel, as you move towards Columbia Road.

22           Next slide please. This is a context view of the  
23 building, just to give you a sense of that five-story, 50-foot  
24 height, and really trying to stay consistent with that pattern  
25 of development to the south. As I noted, we're locating the

1 entry of the building on the south side there. It gives us a  
2 little more height at the ground floor, but also allows for more  
3 ease of access and accessibility for the building. We are  
4 proposing a brick building, primarily, as the material, partially  
5 as an homage to the existing building, recasting it in a more  
6 modern expression, but we also feel it speaks to the historic  
7 context of the neighborhood and some of the newer construction  
8 buildings that are also primarily main street.

9           It's a pretty narrow street here, and we can't do  
10 traditional bay production, so we're proposing what we're calling  
11 shadowbox elements, and that's the grid you're kind of seeing  
12 over the windows. The idea there is to create a more dynamic  
13 element to the facade, which is relatively simple in its massing  
14 and configuration and still evokes the idea of the window -- the  
15 Washington traditional bay window. We are locating the public  
16 program of the building on the front facade at the ground floor  
17 to create more of an open welcoming experience, and it also helps  
18 with privacy concerns where we are locating the apartment units  
19 above.

20           Next slide please. A little detailed view of that  
21 entry condition. Because we do have limited ability to provide  
22 landscaping or green areas, we're carving into this front facade  
23 at the ground floor to create, like, a porch-like experience or  
24 a little bit of a protected entry. The sidewalk is quite narrow  
25 here, and that little bit of relief helps to soften that entry

1 and create a more gracious transition between the street and the  
2 building, and it also allows sort of an opportunity to incorporate  
3 some plants or just a little bit of greenery there.

4           Next slide please. As was mentioned, we have a PUD  
5 sustainability program we're shooting for, Enterprise Green  
6 Community certification, and we will be targeting net zero, and  
7 that includes high-performance mechanical and ventilation system,  
8 tempo (phonetic) hot water heaters, and it will be an all-electric  
9 building. And, part of that, we're including a large solar array  
10 for on-site energy generation, an intensive green roof system,  
11 which helps satisfy our stormwater and GAR requirements, and, in  
12 this particular project, we're using a solar-racking system  
13 that's actually balanced with a hybrid green roof, so we can have  
14 both solar and green roof at the same time.

15           Next slide please. Overall, we're looking at a simple  
16 material palette to keep it, you know, pretty modern and clean.  
17 It's primarily a brick building. We are looking at a dark  
18 ironspot brick with a smooth finish, have kind of a nice  
19 reflective quality to it, and then Norman-size proportion on that  
20 brick, which helps to highlight the horizontality of the  
21 project -- of the building. We are introducing a subtle soldier  
22 course accent bands that speak to some of the detailing of the  
23 original structure, but also helps to break up that massing. The  
24 metal accent, the shadow boxes, and the window frames are copper-  
25 colored. This choice was inspired by some of the copper

1 (indiscernible) you see on historic structures in nearby  
2 neighborhoods, but re-envisioned as a more modern expression. We  
3 think that color contrasts really nicely with the brick tone.  
4 We're also incorporating perforated metal screening as part of  
5 that shadow box. That allows for some shading, privacy, and more  
6 dynamic side elements. And we're proposing European-style high-  
7 performance uPVC windows to help with our sustainability.

8           Next slide please. And I'll hand that over to Mr.  
9 Solomon to discuss the transportation element, and I'm happy to  
10 answer any questions the Commission may have. Thank you.

11           MR. SOLOMON: Thanks, Charles. Good afternoon, Zoning  
12 Commissioners. For the record, I'm Daniel Solomon, a principal  
13 of Grove Slate. We've been working with the applicant, the  
14 project team, and DDOT, related to the transportation aspects of  
15 the 2384 Champlain Street Northwest PUD. I'm going to touch on  
16 the highlights of our review, in coordination with DDOT.

17           Next slide please. In terms of access, vehicle access  
18 to the surface parking and loading areas will continue to be  
19 provided by the public alley to the west of the building, as  
20 shown in red and purple on the screen. Pedestrian access will  
21 be primarily provided by Champlain Street, which will function  
22 as the main point of entry to the building. Sixteen long-term  
23 bicycle parking spaces will be provided in a secure bicycle room  
24 in the cellar of the building and can be accessed by elevators  
25 from the building's primary entrance on Champlain Street, as well

1 as from the rear of the property. Two short-term bicycle parking  
2 spaces will be provided along the site's frontage on Champlain  
3 Street in a single U-Rack. Bicycle and pedestrian access is  
4 shown in green and yellow.

5           Next slide please. Currently, the project is subject  
6 to zoning requirements to provide 13 vehicle parking spaces.  
7 However, that requirement is expected to change, following the  
8 Zoning Commission's approval of Zoning Commission Cases Number  
9 23-17 and 25-12. Collectively, these amendments to the zoning  
10 regulation would eliminate the minimum parking requirement for  
11 the project, because the site is located within one-quarter mile  
12 of priority transit, and the proposed development is an all-  
13 affordable residential project containing fewer than 50  
14 dwellings. While the current zoning regulations remain in  
15 effect, the applicant is proposing three on-site parking spaces  
16 and is requesting relief from the ten remaining required parking  
17 spaces, as part of the PUD application.

18           Given the project's proximity to transit, walkable  
19 neighborhood, and access to multimodal transportation options,  
20 DDOT finds the proposed parking supply to be appropriate for the  
21 development. Furthermore, the development will be supported by  
22 a robust Transportation Demand Management Plan to further  
23 encourage the use of non-auto modes. As the proposed development  
24 has less than 50 dwelling units, a loading berth and service  
25 delivery space are not required. However, to accommodate the

1 majority of the site's anticipated loading demand, a compact 8-  
2 by-18 service delivery space will be provided along the west of  
3 the building abutting the alley. Trash collection will occur  
4 within the public alley, and it is expected residential move-  
5 in/move-outs will be conducted on street with the use of emergency  
6 no parking permits via DDOT's transportation online permitting  
7 system, also known as TOPS.

8           Next slide please. Here, we have looked at the  
9 highlights of the Transportation Demand Management Plan that  
10 we've coordinated and agreed to with DDOT. This plan includes  
11 many of the typical components expected of such a package. We  
12 believe this TDM plan is appropriate for this type of project to  
13 help encourage non-single occupancy vehicle trips and non-auto  
14 trips in general, and DDOT is supportive of the proposed TDM  
15 Plan.

16           Next slide please. For this project, we performed a  
17 Comprehensive Transportation Review, which was scoped and  
18 reviewed by DDOT. Our study concluded that the redevelopment of  
19 the site will not have a detrimental impact on the surrounding  
20 transportation network and minimizes impacts by meeting or  
21 exceeding the amount of bicycle parking that is required by  
22 providing compact service delivery space on site and proposing a  
23 robust TDM plan. We have coordinated extensively with DDOT during  
24 the review. We're pleased to have their support in the form of  
25 a no-objection staff report. DDOT's report did include the

1 condition that the TDM plan be implemented, as outlined in the  
2 CTR, which the applicant has agreed to. At this time, we believe  
3 we addressed all DDOT concerns. That concludes my testimony, and  
4 I'll be available to answer any questions. Thank you, and I'll  
5 pass it to Mr. Dettman.

6 MR. DETTMAN: Next slide please. Thank you, Daniel,  
7 and good evening, Commissioners. My testimony this evening will  
8 just walk the Commission through how the proposed PUD and related  
9 map amendment satisfies the PUD standard of review, which is just  
10 listed here on the slide. It's in the regulations. I won't  
11 take the time to read through it.

12 Next slide please. You can see in this diagram on the  
13 left and the site there in the red hatch, the subject property  
14 is identified in an area on the Generalized Policy Map as a  
15 Neighborhood Conservation Area. And, as you know, Neighborhood  
16 Conservation Areas are described in the Framework Element of the  
17 Comp Plan as generally being residential in character and that,  
18 from a policy perspective, the maintenance of existing land uses  
19 and the community character is generally anticipated over the  
20 horizon of the Comprehensive Plan. Any sort of changes in density  
21 or scale are typically expected to be modest, but in -- but, most  
22 importantly, the guiding philosophy in a Neighborhood  
23 Conservation Area is to conserve and enhance established  
24 neighborhoods, but not to preclude development, especially when  
25 that development will go towards helping to address citywide

1 housing needs. We think, based upon the framework, the  
2 description of a Neighborhood Conservation Area, and then looking  
3 at the surrounding development pattern and the mix of uses and  
4 building types in this area, the proposed project is not  
5 inconsistent with the policy.

6 Next slide please. I think the bulk of my comments  
7 this evening are going to focus on the Future Land Use Map, and  
8 mainly because the site is currently designated -- or in an area  
9 on the Future Land Use Map designated for moderate-density  
10 residential, and what I'd like to do this evening is kind of walk  
11 the Commission through our approach to just establishing how the  
12 proposal, including the related map amendments to RA-3, is not  
13 inconsistent with the Future Land Use Map, even though the  
14 requested RA-3 zone is not expressly listed as a zone that is  
15 considered to be compatible with the moderate-density residential  
16 land use category.

17 Just generally speaking though, in the Framework  
18 Element, the moderate-density residential land use category is  
19 described -- or is used to describe neighborhoods that are  
20 generally, but not exclusively, rowhouses, as well as low garden  
21 apartment complexes. These areas also, you know, may include  
22 existing multi-story apartments, many of them maybe built decades  
23 ago when the areas were zoned for perhaps more dense development  
24 or perhaps not even zoned at all.

25 From a density perspective, the Framework Element

1 provides guidance that typical matter-of-right densities in this  
2 area, you know, hover around 1.8 FAR for each building, although,  
3 as the Framework Element specifically says, greater density is  
4 possible when you're complying with IZ or when you're pursuing a  
5 planning and development like we are today. And, as I mentioned,  
6 just the Framework Element provides the R-3, RF, and RA-2 zones  
7 as being generally consistent with the moderate-density  
8 residential category on the FLUM, but it does specifically state  
9 that other zones may apply.

10           Next slide. And so this is just kind of comparing the  
11 existing zone, the proposed zone, and then what we're proposing.  
12 The reason why we had to explore the RA-3 zone in order to advance  
13 this project is that the RA-2 zone just doesn't give us the  
14 density that we need in order to achieve the intended program of  
15 preserving the existing affordable units, as well as providing  
16 an additional 12 new affordable units. You can see there on the  
17 left, the -- as a matter of right, the existing RA-2 zone allows  
18 50 feet, and that's the height that we're proposing, but it only  
19 provides 2.6 -- 2.16 FAR as a matter of right, and only 2.59  
20 through a PUD, so we can't really quite get to the density that  
21 we need.

22           The proposed RA-3 zone gets us that density through the  
23 PUD. It allows up to 4.32 FAR. We are only proposing 3.91, so  
24 we're really only just stepping a little bit beyond the matter-  
25 of-right FAR that's allowed in the proposed RA-3 zone. And,

1 again, our height is at the matter-of-right height of our existing  
2 zone. We thought that maintaining the height and given the  
3 surrounding context and the -- and in the intent of the Reed-  
4 Cooke Overlay, which really looks at maintaining heights and  
5 scale in this particular area, we thought keeping the height at  
6 the same height that the existing zone allowed and then,  
7 essentially, fattening up the building a little bit through  
8 increased lot occupancy, which we're looking for flexibility for,  
9 approaching it that way, in order to achieve the intended program,  
10 was the best way to go for this particular neighborhood.

11 Next slide. And so the way that we can make an argument  
12 that the proposed RA-3 zone is not inconsistent with the  
13 Comprehensive Plan and that the proposed -- with the Future Land  
14 Use Map and that the proposal, in and of itself, is not in  
15 inconsistent with the Comprehensive -- with the Future Land Use  
16 Map, we sort of pieced together the guidance that the Framework  
17 Element gives us, in terms of how to approach Comp -- Future Land  
18 Use Map consistency in a PUD. The Comp Plan does expressly  
19 acknowledge, of course, that a PUD allows for greater height and  
20 density, and the Framework Element does not prescribe any limits  
21 on height and density when it comes to a PUD. That's not to say  
22 that, you know, all bets are off when you're on a PUD when it  
23 comes to Comp Plan consistency; it's just that the Comprehensive  
24 Plan acknowledges that the Zoning Commission, in looking at the  
25 details and the specifics of a project, can look at the proposed

1 height, can look at the proposed density of a project relative  
2 to its potential impact, and decide, in and of itself, outside  
3 of the guidance, that a particular height and density is  
4 appropriate, given the specific circumstances around that.

5           Next slide. The Framework Element also states that  
6 other zones might apply, as you know, outside of those that are  
7 expressly listed under the Future Land Use Map description that  
8 said even if a zone is not identified in a category -- moderate-  
9 density residential here -- it can be permitted, as described in  
10 Section 227.2 of the Framework Element. And what that section  
11 says is that each land use category identifies representative  
12 zone districts and states that other zone districts may apply,  
13 and in making a determination as to whether or not a -- as to  
14 whether or not to approve a requested zone, the Commission  
15 considers and balances competing and sometimes conflicting  
16 aspects of the Comp Plan, as well as they look at the intent of  
17 the Future Land Use Map land use designation. And, as I  
18 mentioned, for moderate-density residential, it's typical  
19 rowhouse and low-rise and garden-style apartments, but it also  
20 does reflect or acknowledge the fact that moderate-density  
21 residential areas can have that sort of fluctuating building ,  
22 based upon the historic development pattern of an area.

23           Next slide. We also know that the FLUM is interpreted  
24 together with the Comp Plan policies, and I've just listed here  
25 three specific Mid-City Area Element policies that go directly

1 | to what we're trying to achieve with this project, in terms of  
2 | being compatible in the scale and character of the adjacent uses  
3 | and to encourage more housing; and then the next two about  
4 | preserving affordable housing and finding ways to incorporate and  
5 | maintain heights and densities at appropriate levels, but also  
6 | in a way that allows for greater housing production.

7 |           Next slide. The FLUM also reflects -- and this is  
8 | really an important one, which is really one to focus on -- the  
9 | Framework Element specifically says that the densities on the  
10 | FLUM that are identified in the Framework Element, they reflect  
11 | all contiguous properties on a block where individual buildings  
12 | might be a little bit larger, a little bit smaller than the  
13 | typical ranges that are stated, and so, really, the FLUM is not  
14 | intended to be applied on a specific property-by-property basis,  
15 | but it looks at area, and that's how it describes all of the land  
16 | use areas, right?

17 |           So what we did in this situation -- next slide  
18 | please -- is we looked at the block, and what we did here is we  
19 | calculated the approximate density of every single property up  
20 | and down the block from north to south on both sides of the block.  
21 | What we also did is we looked at what are the -- what's the range  
22 | of stories along the block. And, as Mr. Warren said, this block  
23 | really -- the surrounding area really is kind of a four-to-five-  
24 | story neighborhood -- residential neighborhood, and that's where  
25 | we are; we're at five stories. And then, because we're looking

1 | for flexibility for lot occupancy, we calculated the approximate  
2 | lot occupancy up and down the block too. Most importantly, when  
3 | it came to density, we find that the average density along the  
4 | block is approximately 2.24, and that's probably within the range  
5 | of an RA-2 moderate-density residential description on the Future  
6 | Land Use Map. You can see there that with IZ the RA-2 zone, our  
7 | existing zoning, is 2.592 through a PUD, and we're at 2.24. So  
8 | even with our building, which we're proposing at 3.91 FAR, even  
9 | with our building added into the range of densities on the block,  
10 | we still remain within the moderate-density residential density  
11 | guidance that's provided by the Comprehensive Plan. And that's  
12 | really the biggest reason why we believe that the proposed RA-3  
13 | zone through a PUD is not inconsistent with the Comprehensive  
14 | Plan.

15 |           Next slide. And then, finally, we think about, sort  
16 | of like, does this set precedent. It doesn't. There are a number  
17 | of Zoning Commission orders and that are supported -- some of  
18 | which are supported by favorable court rulings, that say that a  
19 | PUD-related map amendment is a temporary change to the zoning;  
20 | it only applies to that PUD. If the PUD is never built, the  
21 | zoning never goes -- the PUD-related zoning never goes into  
22 | effect. If the PUD expires, the site reverts back to the  
23 | underlying zone. It really is tied to the approval. But, most  
24 | importantly, that last bullet there, is that the zoning  
25 | regulations, in and of themselves, specifically say that a PUD-

1 related zoning map amendment is valid only in combination and  
2 contingent upon a project being built. It sets no precedent for  
3 any future PUD or any future map amendment application.

4 Next slide. But the applicant's not off the hook,  
5 right? Even if they're proposing a zone that steps outside of  
6 the guidance that's provided in the Framework Element, we still  
7 have to -- we still have to demonstrate that the proposed PUD is  
8 not going to have unacceptable project impacts on the surrounding  
9 area.

10 Next slide. We -- and so we know that the Commission  
11 likes to see how we've considered various zones; we know  
12 that -- we already mentioned that the RA-2 zone does not get  
13 us the density that we need. The RA-2 with the Reed-Cooke Overlay  
14 doesn't get us the density. It also doesn't get us the height.  
15 We actually get a reduction in height with the Reed-Cooke Overlay.  
16 So we were looking at what sort of moderate-density zones are out  
17 there, and it's the MU-5. We can't pursue the MU-5, because  
18 that's a mixed-use zone, and on the Future Land Use map we're a  
19 residential designation zone, so that's kind of where we landed  
20 with the RA group. We thought that was the best-fitted zone for  
21 this project.

22 Next slide. Just stepping through my last few slides  
23 here, these are the policies that are identified in our  
24 Comprehensive Plan evaluation being advanced by the project.  
25 There's a whole host of them, but we are really strong in

1 | advancing housing element policies, particularly those related  
2 | to the production of affordable housing and the preservation of  
3 | affordable housing.

4 |           Next slide. We're also not inconsistent with the Adams  
5 | Morgan Vision Framework, a Small Area Plan that is applicable to  
6 | this site and, in particular, the recommendations related to  
7 | promoting community diversity, and we're doing that through the  
8 | preservation of the existing affordable housing and allowing  
9 | residents an opportunity to come back to the subject property,  
10 | protecting neighborhood character by capping the height at 50  
11 | feet, and, of course, the Enterprise Green communities and near-  
12 | net-zero goals that we have in advancing sustainability.

13 |           Next slide. We've provided a full evaluation of a few  
14 | potential Comp Plan inconsistencies that we might have, and that  
15 | we believe that they are far outweighed by just some of those  
16 | policies that are listed there. There are many others that we  
17 | believe are enough to outweigh the small inconsistencies that we  
18 | might have. Next slide. And then when we look at the -- next  
19 | slide please. Just looking at the balancing of whether or not  
20 | the degree of development incentives and the flexibility we're  
21 | requesting balance out -- are balanced by the benefits and  
22 | amenities -- next slide -- and we believe that we are -- we are  
23 | balanced. This is just a list of the public benefits that will  
24 | be provided by the project; again, preservation of existing  
25 | affordable housing with the -- with the 12 additional affordable

1 units. There's our sustainability goals there, as well as our  
2 superior architecture and improvements to the streetscape.

3 Next slide. And if we look at that and sort of balance  
4 that with the development incentives that we're requesting --  
5 we're requesting a PUD-related map amendment, which, by  
6 regulations, is considered flexibility that has to be  
7 balanced -- we get the additional density. We're asking for  
8 flexibility of lot occupancy. And what's not listed there, we're  
9 also asking for flexibility from the closed court requirements.  
10 And then, as Mr. Solomon mentioned, minimum parking and parking  
11 screening.

12 Next slide. So this just shows the two -- the benefits  
13 and amenities and the incentives that we're requesting. We  
14 believe that we do -- when you judge balance and reconcile the  
15 two of those things together, we think that we are well balanced,  
16 in terms of what we're requesting.

17 Next slide. And so, with that, I won't read this, but,  
18 in conclusion, I believe that the proposed PUD-related map  
19 amendment is not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan, when  
20 read as a whole and, also, when looked at through a racial equity  
21 lens. We believe that the project meets the PUD balancing  
22 standard. And then, overall, the degree -- the degree of  
23 development incentives requested through the PUD and the  
24 potential impacts of the proposal are well balanced by those  
25 proper benefits and amenities. And, with that, I'll hand it back

1 to Mr. Utz.

2 MR. UTZ: Great. Thank you, Shane. That brings our  
3 presentation to a close. We are happy to answer any questions  
4 or drill into any details that the Commission might want to talk  
5 about. Thank you so much for your time.

6 CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Thank you all for your  
7 presentation. Let's see if we have any questions or comments.  
8 I'm going to ask Commissioner Imamura to go first, and then  
9 Commissioner Wright, and then Vice Chair Miller.

10 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank  
11 you, Mr. Utz and team, for your presentation tonight. I think  
12 this is pretty straightforward, but I do have a number of  
13 comments. The first comment is, this is a nice example of how  
14 to make a box look good, and we'll get to the architecture part  
15 of it in a little bit here.

16 I would like to -- I have a couple questions for Mr.  
17 Mutreja. The first is just if you have a response to the  
18 pedestrian safety concern that was uploaded into the record, and  
19 if you have any comments about that or a strategy to move forward  
20 with that.

21 MR. MUTREJA: Yes. Thank you, Commissioner. I did  
22 reach out to Miss Shelby. I tried reaching out to her several  
23 times. I did see that comment. You know, I think one of the  
24 tricky parts of it is that, you know, this is referencing  
25 projects that are -- other projects that are under construction,

1 | which, you know, I wanted to walk through with Ms. Shelby, the  
2 | timeline of, you know, when we are planning to actually break  
3 | ground, which is still quite a bits away. You know, we're talking  
4 | 2028 when we would actually break ground, so there will be changes  
5 | in that -- in the way the traffic is being handled on that street  
6 | when we do start construction, but that we are working to have a  
7 | TCP. And, as you all know, as part of our permitting process,  
8 | we will be having TCPs along each phase of construction, which  
9 | I'm happy to share with Miss Shelby. Unfortunately, I left her  
10 | two voicemails, but wasn't able to get a hold of her, did not  
11 | receive a return call, but will continue that effort.

12 |           COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Terrific. Well, I appreciate  
13 | that response, and I have every confidence that you will continue  
14 | to reach out and keep her informed, as well as the neighbors.  
15 | Clearly, looking into the record, going all the way back to 2019,  
16 | where you worked with the Tenant Association and entered into an  
17 | agreement back then; you notified ANC 1C back in October of 2024,  
18 | again in June 2025, working with the Tenant Association there;  
19 | and then again in January of this year. I was struck by the fact  
20 | that you had reached out and sent out individual letters to the  
21 | owners; individual letters to the tenants residing in the  
22 | apartment building located immediately north of the property;  
23 | also met with the owner of the apartment building located, yeah,  
24 | to the north; and then you contacted Reed-Cooke Neighborhood  
25 | Association and Kalorama Citizens Association, as well as the

1 Adams Morgan BID, so, certainly, a lot of outreach here. So I  
2 have every confidence that you'll continue to chase that down  
3 with Ms. Shelby.

4 I'd like to give you an opportunity, too -- it's in the  
5 record already, but for those that are listening in the public --  
6 to talk a little bit about the Tenant Relocation Plan. I know  
7 that there's a draft that's in the record, but if you could just  
8 highlight that a little bit.

9 MR. MUTREJA: Yeah, absolutely. Just high level. You  
10 know, we've been working with the Tenant Association, and, you  
11 know, we do have a Tenant Relocation Plan that we're working  
12 with. we engaged Housing On Merit. You may recall from a  
13 previous zoning that I had done with you all, Belmont Crossing,  
14 we had engaged Housing On Merit there, so we had gone through  
15 this process before. Obviously, that project was 500  
16 tenants -- 500 units, rather. It was a much, much larger  
17 endeavor, but we had a very successful plan with them, and so we  
18 wanted to implement that here on Champlain Street as well.

19 And part of Housing Help Plus is that, you know, they  
20 have a portfolio existing in DC, so, you know, we have been  
21 working with the Tenant Association and their attorney agent, you  
22 know, trying to identify properties that the tenants -- the  
23 current existing tenants can potentially move into, as well as,  
24 you know, working, again, with Housing on Merit to, you know,  
25 generate that plan. Obviously, you know, again, we're still in

1 the infant stages. You know, as we get closer to identify that,  
2 we will. And it's also part of our budget as well, you know,  
3 with our submission for the LIHTC execution that we're proposing.

4 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Terrific. I'm happy to hear  
5 that, and I think that your efforts here are certainly helping  
6 this PUD, I guess, trend in the right direction, and I think  
7 it'll be successful with that continued effort there, so thank  
8 you very much, Mr. Mutreja. I don't think I have any further  
9 questions for you. And I don't have any comments for Mr. Solomon  
10 either, although I know that he knows my affinity for  
11 transportation, and so I'll move on to a comment about Mr.  
12 Dettman's part of the presentation.

13 I think this speaks to something I've heard the  
14 Chairman say before, "Show me your math", and so I appreciate Mr.  
15 Dettman's rationale and explanation for the map amendment. And  
16 I think the best way to describe that is that it's -- Mr. Dettman  
17 and the team is not just looking at the text, but in between the  
18 text of the regulations, so it goes to the intent of the FLUM  
19 and the GPM. And, as I think Mr. Dettman might have said, it is  
20 a contextual decision, as -- and judgment call for the Commission  
21 and that other zones may apply, as he said several times tonight.  
22 And I think what this demonstrates, in terms of, I think, one of  
23 the slides -- the density map was very helpful, so thank you for  
24 that. It also aligned really well with the building use, the  
25 color coding for the building use map, as well as the building

1 height map that was also in the record. But to the point that --  
2 there was a slide, I think, that showed the RA-2 at 50-foot;  
3 matter-of-right, 60 feet for the RA-3; and 75 for a PUD. And I  
4 think where -- this project is proposed at 50 feet, and so I  
5 wrote down "design restraint", and so I think this is a great  
6 example of design restraint and, I think, a modest increase in  
7 density here. And so I appreciate the architect's effort to stay  
8 within those parameters. So that's where, I think, some of my  
9 questions or comments will move to next, is to Mr. Warren there.

10           And before I jump into that, I just want to comment on  
11 the waiver from the PUD minimum land use area requirement of  
12 15,000 square feet for RA-3, pursuant to X-301.3, because the  
13 property's only 3,300-plus square feet. That seems pretty  
14 reasonable to me, as well as the relief for lot occupancy, closed  
15 court, the minimum parking requirement from 13 down to four, just  
16 given the site constraints of itself, and then the parking  
17 screening requirements. Just to note, I know that you all  
18 submitted that out of an abundance of caution, knowing that  
19 there's already Zoning Case 25-12 that we've taken proposed  
20 action on with the omnibus regarding parking screening  
21 requirements. So all of that seems pretty reasonable to me. I  
22 think the design flexibility about the penthouse and roof  
23 structures is reasonable here. Same with the exterior details  
24 for projections and encroachments.

25           So this is where I pick up with my first question with

1 Mr. Warren is the exterior materials. Thank you for walking us  
2 through some of your design decisions about the material  
3 selections and some of the design moves that you made. So here's  
4 a couple -- just a couple notes that I wrote down. Just about  
5 the copper coloring and perforated metal screening, I thought was  
6 a really nice touch; your selection of brick and brick colors  
7 and the soldier coursing; as well as the shadowbox, as you  
8 described it in the storefront, about carving in a little bit, I  
9 think were all great moves. My question here is, in the exterior  
10 materials, asking for flexibility about the substitute of  
11 cementitious panel cladding in place of the brick, and so I just  
12 wanted to ask if you could talk a little bit more to that and  
13 what the reasoning or justification behind that is.

14 MR. WARREN: Okay. Sorry. Can you hear me all now?  
15 I just want to make sure we were (indiscernible). Thank you for  
16 your question, Commissioner Imamura, and your comments. The  
17 areas of flexibility we're seeking would be -- to have  
18 flexibility on material would be in the courtyard areas and on  
19 some areas along the party wall, where they're not really visible  
20 from the public right-of-way. And the reasoning behind that is  
21 a couple of things. Primarily, just really related to cost during  
22 construction and then some of the weight that may be added to  
23 the building, which is also related to cost. The courtyard  
24 elevations are pretty tall there. It's about a six-story  
25 building, so there's a -- there's sort of a cascading effect of

1 | having that much brick along that facade, so we have to introduce  
2 | some steel there. Right now, that's what we're planning for, but  
3 | we would like some flexibility there to make that change.

4 |           COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: That seems reasonable to me, Mr.  
5 | Warren. Thank you for the explanation. Before I address some  
6 | of the PUD benefits and amenities, I think the only other question  
7 | that I have for you, Mr. Warren, is I thought I saw the original  
8 | building had about 32 microunits or 30-plus microunits in there.  
9 | It seems as if, from the layout, that you're certainly matching  
10 | that and then adding 12 more units. So I was just curious, was  
11 | it just a reconfiguration of space planning or how did you get  
12 | the additional 12?

13 |           MR. WARREN: The 80 percent lot occupancy helped with  
14 | that. We needed just more square footage to work with. And then  
15 | they are configured a little bit more efficiently, as part of how  
16 | we did that, so -- and then we're just -- more density. That's  
17 | how we got from 30-plus units to 30ish units.

18 |           COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Okay. Terrific. I guess I do  
19 | have one more question for you, or just a comment, because I'd  
20 | like to highlight this. So it seems as if you've set an ambitious  
21 | goal here to achieve full on-site net zero possibly, and so using  
22 | some of the energy obviously generated from the solar panels,  
23 | all-electric here, I think that's highly ambitious, really  
24 | terrific. And, if achieved, I understand this project would be  
25 | among a very limited group of true net-zero-energy buildings in

1 the District, and so that is setting a new bar and a high standard  
2 for others to follow. So I'd like to give you an opportunity to  
3 talk a little bit about that. That's quite an achievement, both  
4 for the firm, as well as the applicant here, so if you'd like to  
5 talk a little bit more about that, I'll give you the floor.

6 MR. WARREN: Sure. Yeah. I think that it was -- one  
7 of our goals from the very beginning was to try to maximize that  
8 on-site generation. That was, you know, a goal from the very  
9 beginning, and we're not 100 percent sure we're going to get  
10 there, but we're certainly trying. And I think that the -- you  
11 can see on the roof plan that we have covered most of the roofs  
12 with solar, and part of what we were looking at there, which I  
13 mentioned in my presentation, was using a solar-racking system  
14 that allows for both green roofs and solar, which, you know, we  
15 obviously have a lot of competition on the roof space for  
16 mechanical units and a green roof (indiscernible) site like this,  
17 the green roofs is primarily satisfying our GAR, so we sort of  
18 have all these competing elements there, so that's part of the  
19 reason why we're looking at that racking system, and we're also  
20 looking at trying to put a trellis over the mechanical units to  
21 just maximize that solar production. And I think it's the right  
22 thing to do, and I think it makes a lot of sense for this building  
23 for the long term, and we're kind of striving for that as much  
24 as we can.

25 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Terrific. I think it's a great

1 design strategy. As I said before, unfortunately, I didn't get  
2 a chance to see your facial expression when I said, "This is a  
3 nice example of how to make a box look good." I appreciate the  
4 simple and subtle --

5 MR. WARREN: (Indiscernible response.)

6 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Very good. This is -- yeah,  
7 it's -- this is, I think, in a way, a good example of design  
8 excellence for a project like this and a program like this. This  
9 really hits all the marks. And so I'm pleased to lend my support  
10 for this PUD and map amendment. And, with that, Mr. Chairman, I  
11 yield back.

12 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you very much, Commissioner  
13 Imamura. Commissioner Wright, questions or comments?

14 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Really, everything that I would  
15 have asked questions about, Commissioner Imamura already did, and  
16 the answers were great. This is not a big project, but it's a  
17 really good project. It's very well documented. I wish many of  
18 our applications had the same level of documentation and the same  
19 level of information about community outreach that has been done  
20 and, you know, the relocation plans and so forth. Everything is  
21 really -- it's a very complete application and very well  
22 detailed, so I really don't have anything else to say, other than  
23 I think this is an excellent project and great PUD, and I'm  
24 prepared to support it.

25 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Vice Chair Miller, any questions

1 or comments?

2 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank  
3 you to the entire applicant team for your presentation and your  
4 prehearing submissions, which were very helpful. And, like  
5 Commissioner Wright, I agree that Commissioner Imamura has  
6 thoroughly examined almost all the components that I would have  
7 touched on, as well -- probably more of the components that I  
8 would have touched on as well. And so, I mean, I think -- I  
9 think it's a great project with the 44 -- not just the replacement  
10 units, 32, but the additional 12 all-affordable. And just for  
11 the public's benefit -- and correct me if I got these figures  
12 wrong; I'm reading this from the Office of Planning report -- of  
13 the 44 units, 19 are studio, nine of which are at no more than  
14 30 percent median family income, which is very commendable, and  
15 10 of which are no more than 60 percent median family income --  
16 that's the 19 studios -- then there's 24 one-bedrooms at no more  
17 than 60 percent median family income, and then there's one two-  
18 bedroom at no more than 30 percent median family income. I think  
19 you had a couple of two bedrooms in the existing building. Is  
20 that correct, and is that tenant -- are those fully occupied,  
21 those two-bedrooms?

22 MR. MUTREJA: Yeah, I believe it's one two-bedroom  
23 that's existing at the current -- at the current property. And,  
24 again, as Mr. Warren had noted, you know, these are microunits,  
25 so, you know, it's not -- although it is a two-bedroom, it's not

1 really a two-bedroom. So, you know, part of what we wanted to  
2 do was for -- to address for that family to be able to come back,  
3 and so there's not overcrowding, so we have a good, you know,  
4 two -- good-sized unit bedroom for that tenant.

5 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yeah. And I saw the average size,  
6 and, yeah, I understand that. And I agree with all of the  
7 comments of my colleagues, and Commissioner Imamura commending  
8 you on the community engagement and outreach, particularly with  
9 the Tenant Association on the relocation plan and the guaranteed  
10 right to return. And we don't have anything, I don't think, in  
11 the record directly from the Tenant Association. I think there  
12 was some reference in one of your materials that you can't submit  
13 to us the development agreement that you have with them, because  
14 there's some privacy or confidential issues there. I wonder if  
15 we could get, before we get to final action, the -- at least the  
16 signature page of the -- of the development agreement that shows  
17 that the Tenant Association, beyond your own representation, or  
18 something from them directly that says they are supporting this  
19 application. Is -- would that be possible Mr. --

20 MR. MUTREJA: This is Mr. Mutreja speaking.

21 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Mr. Mutreja. Okay.

22 MR. MUTREJA: No, no problem at all. I can definitely  
23 get you the signature page of the development agreement, and, you  
24 know, we're happy to reach out to the Tenant Association, as  
25 well, to see if they can put something in writing to get over to

1 | you.

2 |           VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yeah. Well, yeah, either one would  
3 | be great.

4 |           MR. MUTREJA: Okay.

5 |           VICE CHAIR MILLER: It just would make an even more  
6 | complete application. The environmental sustainability features  
7 | are excellent. The design features are excellent. The -- I  
8 | think you've enclosed -- in your community engagement with Adams  
9 | Morgan BID, it mentioned some trash issues, and your plans --  
10 | your revised plans include an enclosed trash storage room; is  
11 | that correct?

12 |           MR. MUTREJA: I believe so. Mr. Warren can speak to  
13 | it with a little bit more clarity.

14 |           MR. WARREN: Yes, there is an enclosed -- excuse  
15 | me -- there is an enclosed trash room at the rear of the  
16 | property that would be serviced off the alley.

17 |           VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Warren. Yeah,  
18 | I -- so I appreciate that response on this, as well, and  
19 | that -- all of that community outreach and engagement. One issue,  
20 | which I can talk to the Office of Planning about as well, but --  
21 | is the -- you know, you're certainly exceeding -- far exceeding  
22 | what Inclusionary Zoning would require and Inclusionary Plus  
23 | Zoning -- Zoning Plus would require, in terms of the amount  
24 | of -- amount of square footage of affordable housing and the  
25 | affordability levels, so -- but usually in these cases, the

1 Office of Planning recommends -- and, in this case, the Office  
2 of Planning report references the Department of Housing and  
3 Community Development recommendation that you set aside some  
4 portion of those affordable units as the IZ units that would be  
5 otherwise required. I mean, they meet -- they seem to all --  
6 they seem to meet the affordability levels -- there are enough  
7 units that you can easily meet IZ Plus or IZ designation on the --  
8 on the -- on the site. So is that something that can be done?  
9 Is there a reason why it wasn't addressed directly or --

10 MR. MUTREJA: No, I think that is something that can  
11 be done. you know, as it pertains to this specific project,  
12 we're committed to keeping it a hundred percent affordable. And  
13 for the application that we've submitted to DHCD, you know, it's  
14 affordable in perpetuity, so for 99 years. We're still required,  
15 as part of our permitting process, to fill out the IZ forms and  
16 identify IZ units; you know, even after the 99 years, that, you  
17 know, there's still an IZ component associated with it, even when  
18 the affordability covenant burns off. That being said, you know,  
19 we would follow that standard, as we do with, you know, the  
20 majority of our affordable projects.

21 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you. I appreciate that.

22 MR. UTZ: I was just going to say, sorry, just adding  
23 to that, I think the goal with our submission would really be  
24 just to keep the condition around affordability as simple as  
25 possible, so to not, you know, explicitly reference that this

1 default might exist of IZ. And just, as Neil said, the higher  
2 level in perpetuity would be the condition, and then the  
3 documentation, actually, would follow through; also, as Neil  
4 said, that there would be an IZ covenant that would show that,  
5 yes, indeed, this project significantly exceeds the IZ  
6 requirement, but I think we would really prefer a condition that  
7 was in perpetuity at the higher level, for the sake of kind of  
8 simplicity and maybe not confusing, as part of this development  
9 and so forth.

10 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Well, I appreciate that response,  
11 and it makes sense. I thought I had one more comment, but I  
12 can't remember, so again -- oh, it was for Mr. Dettman. Just to  
13 echo what Commissioner Imamura said, the land use Future Land Use  
14 Map analysis was thorough and comprehensive and answered  
15 questions I initially had about how this was at the higher  
16 density level of the -- of what's designated moderate density on  
17 the Future Land Use Map, but I think you -- with all the analysis  
18 that you did, the comparative analysis of the -- both the Future  
19 Land Use Map designations and those Comparative Zoning Analysis  
20 and all the balancing of the Comprehensive Plan housing and Mid-  
21 City Plan and Adams Morgan Framework Plan policies, I think you've  
22 made the case for the zone that you're asking, associated with  
23 the PUD map amendment, especially since it's an all-affordable  
24 housing project. So I thank you all for all of your work on this  
25 project. Is there -- do you know, Mr. Mutreja, what's the status

1 | of the LIHTC and financing?

2 |           MR. MUTREJA: Yes. So we've submitted an application  
3 | to this latest NOFA. That was back in April. They also now have  
4 | the rolling Housing Production Trust Funds application open, so  
5 | we submitted to that as well. And we are just waiting for a  
6 | response, and been continuing to push the project forward, having  
7 | those discussions with DHCD and our lenders at CIP, as well as,  
8 | you know, pushing forward with permitting, as well, to advance  
9 | the project.

10 |           VICE CHAIR MILLER: Good. Well, I wish you luck in  
11 | getting a positive response --

12 |           MR. MUTREJA: Thank you.

13 |           VICE CHAIR MILLER: -- to all that financing, so thank  
14 | you all again. That's it.

15 |           MR. MUTREJA: Thank you, Commissioners.

16 |           CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Thank you, everybody, for  
17 | your questions. I do want to talk about the relocation, and,  
18 | Mr. Utz, maybe you can help me. When I was reading the  
19 | (indiscernible) -- and I'm going off the top of my head, which  
20 | sometimes can be dangerous -- I heard mention that it was going  
21 | up to 60 percent, but, in the relocation, I think I saw 80  
22 | percent. Was that a typo, a mistake, or am I misunderstanding  
23 | something? I mean, I like -- keep it at 60. Now, I'm not asking  
24 | for a change. I'm just -- I'm trying to make sure that everything  
25 | is cross-referencing correctly. But, anyway, if we don't have

1 | it -- I'm looking for it again. I don't think I dreamed it, but,  
2 | anyway, regardless, let's make sure that it cites exactly what  
3 | was what -- was trending, and I'm going to be looking for that,  
4 | because I did see up to 80 percent, and I heard mention today  
5 | that it was up to 60 percent.

6 |           Now, let me ask a question. And I was looking for that  
7 | too. Now, the solar on the -- I really like the way the roof is  
8 | set up, but the solar -- who gets the benefits from those solar?  
9 | Is it the tenants; are you all passing that on; or how is that  
10 | working? Maybe Mr. Mutreja can tell me, how is that working?

11 |           MR. MUTREJA: So it ultimately passes to the tenants.  
12 | The way it works -- so we we've engaged Safe Solar, and there's  
13 | various programs within the District, whether there's cost -- or  
14 | energy savings to the city, and then -- and then we get a payment  
15 | for that to reduce utility costs. Specifically, on the permanent  
16 | supportive housing units that we're projecting, it's ownership's  
17 | intention to cover all utility costs for those 30 percent AMI  
18 | units.

19 |           CHAIRMAN HOOD: So, in other words, let me -- let me  
20 | see if I understand how it's going to work. So you all will get  
21 | the RECs -- whatever you get back, you get the -- the renewable  
22 | energy credits will come back to the applicant, and then you all  
23 | will pass that savings or whatever on to the resident. Is that  
24 | how it will work?

25 |           MR. MUTREJA: That's correct.

1 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. That's a plus.

2 MR. MUTREJA: And we do have a full program from Safe  
3 Solar, which I'm happy to share with the Commissioners, if you'd  
4 like.

5 CHAIRMAN HOOD: No, no. I think, unless my other  
6 colleagues -- I'm fine with it. I'm -- we have enough  
7 information, so I think I'm pretty -- we're pretty versed on Safe  
8 Solar. I don't think I have any other questions. I just want  
9 to associate myself -- it's a tight spot. There's, you know, not  
10 a whole lot of room up there. And then I don't see any opposition.  
11 I know there were some concerns, and as mentioned by, I think,  
12 Commissioner Imamura, those concerns will continue to be worked  
13 out, and as well as working with the community. I think that  
14 you all have done a spectacular job. Now, I haven't heard from  
15 everybody, but at least that's the way it looks here. I don't  
16 have any other questions. Again, thank you all for all the hard  
17 work on this, and, as Commissioner Imamura said, you all have  
18 done a great job on -- I'm not going to call it a box, even though  
19 it's probably more -- a better term, but it looks great, so I  
20 really like the design, so great job.

21 MR. MUTREJA: Thank you Commissioner.

22 CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Let's see -- let's see if  
23 we have any follow-up questions or comments from my colleagues.

24 (No response.)

25 CHAIRMAN HOOD: And I want to thank my colleagues,

1 | since you all have really went into this, Commissioner Imamura  
2 | taking the lead. It didn't leave -- that's why it's good to go  
3 | last, because you don't have to come up -- even though I heard  
4 | both of my colleagues say that Commissioner Imamura took a lot  
5 | from them, you didn't take anything from me, because I wouldn't  
6 | have asked none of those questions, so anyway -- all right. Well,  
7 | thank you. Ms. Ackerman, do we have anyone from ANC 1C?

8 |           MS. ACKERMAN: No, ANC 1C did not sign up for the  
9 | hearing today.

10 |           CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Do we have -- I think we have  
11 | something from them. I'm going to ask the Vice Chair to prepare.  
12 | I think they are -- but I'm not going to -- the Vice Chair can --  
13 | when we get to that point, if he can give their report. All  
14 | right. Let me pull back up my agenda. So I don't believe we're  
15 | going to have anyone from OAG no time soon, so let's -- do we  
16 | have anyone from DDOT?

17 |           MS. ACKERMAN: Yes, we do.

18 |           CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Who do we have?

19 |           MS. ACKERMAN: Erkin.

20 |           CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh Mr. Ozberk, Mr. Osberk. You may  
21 | begin, Mr. Ozberk, whenever you're ready.

22 |           MR. OZBERK: Good evening, Chairman Hood, members of  
23 | the Commission. For the record, my name is Erkin Osberk with  
24 | the District Department of Transportation. DDOT is in support  
25 | of the applicant's PUD application. In our May 8th, 2026 report,

1 | which is in the record as Exhibit 22, we recommended approval  
2 | with one condition, and that is to implement the Transportation  
3 | Demand Management Plan, as proposed in the January 6th, 2026  
4 | Transportation Statement, which is Exhibit 14A in the record. As  
5 | you heard in the applicant's presentation, they have agreed to  
6 | this condition. With the TDM plan included in the zoning order,  
7 | DDOT has no objection to the approval of this PUD application.  
8 | We look forward to continuing to work with the applicant on any  
9 | public space permitting. I thank you and am happy to answer any  
10 | questions.

11 |           CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Mr. Osberk. Let's see if  
12 | we have any questions. Commissioner Imamura.

13 |           COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: No questions. Thank you, Mr.  
14 | Osberk.

15 |           CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Commissioner Wright.

16 |           COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: No questions. Thank you.

17 |           CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. And Vice Chair Miller.

18 |           VICE CHAIR MILLER: Sorry about that. Yes, no  
19 | questions. Thank you, Mr. Ozberk.

20 |           CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. And, Mr. Utz, you have any  
21 | questions -- cross?

22 |           MR. UTZ: No questions. Thank you.

23 |           CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right. Thank you, Mr.  
24 | Osberk. We appreciate you -- your report. Great job, as always.  
25 | Let's go to the Office of Planning.

1 MS. ACKERMAN: We have Joshua Mitchum today and Maxine  
2 Brown-Roberts.

3 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I think Ms. Brown-Roberts is the  
4 Associate Director, so I'll call on Mr. Mitchum. Mr. Mitchum.

5 MR. MITCHUM: Hi. I had just, like, two slides. I  
6 don't know if the Commission would like to see it. Otherwise, I  
7 can just give my normal presentation.

8 CHAIRMAN HOOD: If you want to show them, you put a lot  
9 of time into it, we want to see them.

10 (Office of Planning PowerPoint presentation shared on  
11 the screen.)

12 MR. MITCHUM: Thank you so much. I'll just make this  
13 brief, as the applicant gave a very comprehensive account of the  
14 application. Good evening, Mr. Chairman and members of the  
15 Commission. My name is Joshua Mitchum with the Office of Planning  
16 for Zoning Commission Case ZC 25-18. The Office of Planning  
17 recommends that the Zoning Commission approve this application  
18 by Champlain Street Partners, LLC for a consolidated PUD with a  
19 related map amendment.

20 Since the time of setdown, OP has continued discussions  
21 with the applicant and have found that our comments and questions,  
22 as well as those of the Commission, have been adequately  
23 addressed. Furthermore, since setdown, as we discussed, notable  
24 changes to the application include the addition of a compact  
25 loading space along the public alley, in response to DDOT's

1 | comments, as well as the changing of the proposed distribution  
2 | of unit types from a range of 30 to 80 MFI to 30 to 60 MFI.

3 |           Next slide please. So, as discussed at setdown, the  
4 | application would not be inconsistent with the Comprehensive  
5 | Plan, including when viewed through racial equity lens. The  
6 | proposed rezoning to the RA-3 zone would allow for more density  
7 | and, subsequently, more potential for the production of  
8 | affordable housing units, while conserving an overall residential  
9 | neighborhood character.

10 |           Next slide please. So the applicant has proffered  
11 | superior urban design, affordable housing, and environmental and  
12 | sustainability features that have exceeded -- that exceeded the  
13 | standards set by the zoning regulations, such as meeting  
14 | Enterprise Green Communities certification standards, which DOEE,  
15 | Department of Energy and Environment, notes is equivalent to a  
16 | LEED certification. Overall, OP finds that the benefits of the  
17 | application are commensurate with the degree of flexibility  
18 | sought through the PUD.

19 |           In summary, OP finds that the PUD satisfies the  
20 | criteria for approval and recommends, again, that the Commission  
21 | approve the application. That concludes OP's presentation, and  
22 | I'm happy to answer any questions. Thank you.

23 |           CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Mitchum. Let's  
24 | see if we have any questions of the Office of Planning.  
25 | Commissioner Imamura, any questions?

1           COMMISSIONER IMAMURA:  No questions.  Thank you, Mr.  
2 Mitchum, for your work on this.

3           CHAIRMAN HOOD:  Commissioner Wright, any questions?

4           COMMISSIONER WRIGHT:  No questions.  Thank you.

5           CHAIRMAN HOOD:  And, Vice Chair Miller, I know you have  
6 at least one question, so go right ahead.

7           VICE CHAIR MILLER:  Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank  
8 you, Mr. Mitchum and Maxine Brown-Roberts from the Office of  
9 Planning.  Very comprehensive report.  The question was the same  
10 one to the applicant about the Inclusionary Zoning.  DHCD had  
11 recommended -- I understand what the applicant was saying, in  
12 terms of keeping the application simple, and it's clear, by its  
13 simplicity, that it far exceeds any IZ or IZ Plus designation  
14 that would be on this site otherwise, because of the all-  
15 affordable and in-perpetuity duration and the levels of  
16 affordability.  But are you -- so DHCD was recommending -- and  
17 they have to go through that IZ covenant process at permitting,  
18 in any event, but are is OP recommending, as it usually does,  
19 even in all affordable or exceeding affordable cases, that there  
20 be an IZ map -- IZ designation on the -- or with a PUD that's --  
21 what are you -- are you -- what are you recommending with regard  
22 to the IZ?  Are you recommending an IZ designation for this site?

23           MR. MITCHUM:  Typically, for PUD applications, it  
24 wouldn't have an IZ requirement or IZ plus requirement, so we are  
25 in agreement with DHCD that should something happen with the

1 funding, that the applicant is more than capable of having set-  
2 asides for the affordable requirements for the application, so  
3 we would recommend, just in the event, setting aside the  
4 appropriate amount as they're able to do, so --

5 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Thank you very much. I  
6 appreciate it.

7 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you again, Mr. Mitchum. I don't  
8 have any questions for you. Mr. Utz, do you have any questions  
9 for the Office of Planning; anything?

10 MR. UTZ: We do not. Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Mitchum. Good  
12 report, as always. Okay. Ms. Ackerman, let's go to anyone who's  
13 here in support, opposition, or undeclared.

14 MS. ACKERMAN: So we only have one today.

15 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, wait a minute. Hold on. Let me --  
16 hold on.

17 MS. ACKERMAN: Okay.

18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Vice Chair Miller, can you give us the  
19 ANC report please?

20 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Sure.

21 CHAIRMAN HOOD: But do we have the ANC person? We  
22 don't have the ANC person here. They didn't sign up, so Vice  
23 Chair Miller, can you give us the ANC please?

24 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes. At Exhibit 13, we have a  
25 letter from Advisory Neighborhood Commission 1C, dated February

1 5th, 2026, saying that at their February 4th meeting, with a  
2 quorum present, the ANC voted six to zero in support of this  
3 proposed Planned Unit Development and map amendment requested in  
4 association with 28 -- 2384 Champlain Street. I think that was  
5 a reiteration. I appreciate the applicant going back to the ANC.  
6 There was a previous unanimous support letter that I think is in  
7 our record at maybe Exhibit 4, from October 2024 as well. So I  
8 thank the applicant for going back and getting an up-to-date  
9 unanimous support from ANC 1C. That's it, Mr. Chairman.

10 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Vice Chair Miller.  
11 We appreciate you giving us the ANC 1C's report in this case.  
12 Ms. Ackerman, do we have anyone here in support, opposition, or  
13 undeclared?

14 MS. ACKERMAN: Yes. Her name is Shelby -- I don't know  
15 how to pronounce her last name -- Shelby D, I'm going to call  
16 her.

17 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. She will pronounce it. I'm not  
18 going to mess it up either, so let's bring Ms. Shelby up, and  
19 she can -- but, anyway, let them tell -- anybody else, Ms.  
20 Ackerman?

21 MS. ACKERMAN: No, that's all.

22 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Shelby Dawirs, you may begin  
23 whenever you're ready.

24 MS. DAWIRS: Hi there. I'm Shelby Dawirs.

25 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Dawirs. Okay.

1 MS. DAWIRS: I'm the neighbor directly across the  
2 street from the proposed redevelopment, and I did want to address  
3 the safety concerns I have about the sidewalks. We are -- we've  
4 had the poor distinction of having a very bad development just  
5 to the north of our building, at 2377. It's been an open pit  
6 for a year-and-a-half. They have flooded my unit twice. We have  
7 sued them and settled, and we still do not have use of the  
8 sidewalk down that whole side, all the way to the alley, and I  
9 have no expectation that that is going to be resolved in the next  
10 year. And so, as a mother of a student at Marie Reid, which is  
11 one block away, and there are eight other first graders in my  
12 son's class on this street, I am curious what the solution is,  
13 knowing that 2377 is effectively abandoned and has left us with  
14 an open pit.

15 We also have an open pit where the Brass Knob storage  
16 building was. That is 2329 Champlain Street, just a few  
17 properties south. So I'm curious, like, truly, how could a  
18 neighborhood that is dense with families, like, navigate this  
19 long street and busy narrow street with narrow sidewalks, as  
20 mentioned.

21 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Dawirs.

22 MS. DAWIRS: Dawirs, yeah.

23 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Dawirs. Okay. Thank you, Ms. Dawirs.  
24 I will tell you, I'm going to put it back on this applicant --  
25 not the whole thing, because they're not responsible for the

1 whole gamut.

2 MS. DAWIRS: Right.

3 CHAIRMAN HOOD: But what -- from their part, what they  
4 can deal with, let's see what they can do, because, certainly,  
5 we don't want to put -- we don't want to have residents of this  
6 city jaywalking because of development and putting themselves in  
7 harms' way, but I believe that --

8 MS. DAWIRS: And that is actively happening now. Plus  
9 we have The Line, we have a vibrant night life; like, you know,  
10 I worry about the danger to the children twice a day, and then  
11 also to, like, the young adults in the evening when they are  
12 drunk.

13 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Have you -- have you talked to  
14 this applicant about their specific area? Have you spoken to  
15 them already?

16 MS. DAWIRS: I have received two calls from Neil -- two  
17 voicemails, and I replied and left him a voicemail, but that's  
18 what -- it's just been phone tag.

19 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So, Mr. Utz, can you all at  
20 least have a conversation and, maybe before we move forward with  
21 final, see how we can -- what you all can do; you know, at least  
22 have that -- let's have that discussion.

23 MR. UTZ: Sure. Yeah, we're happy to. And it is --  
24 it's in our team's interest as well to make sure that this works  
25 for Champlain. We know it's a lot of people living in a small

1 space --

2 MS. DAWIRS: Yes.

3 MR. UTZ: -- and that there are some conditions that  
4 everyone's inheriting kind of unfortunately, and we're definitely  
5 not looking to add to that, so we're happy to connect and figure  
6 out with DDOT as well how the TCP (indiscernible) work for  
7 everyone.

8 MS. DAWIRS: Yeah. I -- my building, we're all owners  
9 and we've talked about this, and we're excited about the  
10 development across the street, but we are just, like, kind of  
11 staggered by having three projects in various states of  
12 development and, like, what do we do with our strollers; like,  
13 how do we absolutely navigate this. And if there's any way anyone  
14 on this call could help us advocate with the Department of  
15 Buildings or Department of Transportation, we've -- you know, we  
16 submit 311 calls constantly and nothing has changed at 2377, and  
17 it -- I don't know what else we could do to advocate for the  
18 safety of the street.

19 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right. So, at least for  
20 this particular case, Mr. Utz and them will work with you to see  
21 what they can do for their part.

22 MS. DAWIRS: Great.

23 CHAIRMAN HOOD: And I -- sometimes -- well, I'm not  
24 going to say, "Call the director." That's what I always do when  
25 you don't get results. Sometimes you have to start at the top

1 and work down, but --

2 MS. DAWIRS: Yeah. We --

3 CHAIRMAN HOOD: -- I'm sure DDOT or somebody will --

4 MS. DAWIRS: Yeah. We have -- truly, yeah, we have a  
5 whole lawsuit about it, but --

6 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, okay. Then I won't speak on it --

7 MS. DAWIRS: -- yeah, if you guys could help, we'd  
8 appreciate it.

9 CHAIRMAN HOOD: -- because I'll be -- because I'll be  
10 in the -- we'll be in the lawsuit, so I better be quiet. All  
11 right. So I hope -- I hope things work out for you all, and  
12 we'll go from there. All right. So any questions of Ms. Dawirs?  
13 Any questions?

14 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I just wanted to thank her for  
15 bringing that issue forward, and I think the applicant has  
16 committed to work with you on, at least, their -- what they can  
17 do on their property. And if Mr. Ozberk is still here from  
18 Department of Transportation, if he could look into -- if  
19 there's -- if it's -- I don't even know if it's under DDOT's  
20 jurisdiction or Department of Building's jurisdiction, but it's  
21 certainly public space, and I don't know if who regulates those  
22 construction pathways when there's construction going on and  
23 whether it's buildings or DDOT, but if Mr. Ozberk is still on,  
24 and if he can look into that, that would be helpful, I think,  
25 for the neighbors as well.

1 MS. DAWIRS: Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right. Thank you. Let's  
3 see, Mr. Utz, you have any question for Ms. Dawirs?

4 MR. UTZ: (Indiscernible response.)

5 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I think you said nothing. I  
6 didn't hear you, but --

7 MR. UTZ: Yeah, no questions from us. Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right. Well, thank you, Ms.  
9 Dawirs. Hopefully, things work out, and I'm sure they will,  
10 especially from this applicant. Thank you. All right. Ms.  
11 Ackerman, do we have anyone else? Nobody else?

12 MS. ACKERMAN: No, we do not. Ms. Dawirs, I'll send  
13 you Mr. Ozberk's contact information, if she can hear me.

14 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Ackerman. Okay. All  
15 right. Mr. Utz, do you have any rebuttal or closing? We already  
16 had some closing. You have any rebuttal?

17 MR. UTZ: No rebuttal, other than to say we'll  
18 work -- continue to work with Ms. Dawirs, and we are intending  
19 to make sure that Champlain works during construction and  
20 definitely thereafter.

21 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

22 MR. UTZ: But I'm happy to say a few words in closing,  
23 if appropriate.

24 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right. I think -- you  
25 finished, Mr. Utz?

1 MR. UTZ: Just a quick closing to kind of summarize  
2 everything that we went through.

3 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Sure. Go right ahead.

4 MR. UTZ: I won't belabor this. This has been a  
5 thorough review, and we really appreciate it, but we also  
6 appreciate getting on your calendar tonight and the opportunity  
7 to present this to you. As I mentioned before, this was a long  
8 time coming. It started a couple years ago, as that initial  
9 letter from the ANC indicates, in 2024, and finally we are here.  
10 You know, the first PUD was filed in 2025 -- late in 2025.

11 As you have seen, the application meets the PUD and map  
12 amendment standards. The building is consistent with and  
13 appropriate to be constructed in the surrounding context and the  
14 community that exists along Champlain, it's been designed to do  
15 that. It will not adversely affect any neighboring property and  
16 it will, in fact, be additive to this environment. It is designed  
17 to be additive. It is a unique opportunity to work with the  
18 building tenants to maintain existing housing, while adding new  
19 housing all at affordable levels; truly, a mechanism that is rare  
20 in any city.

21 The project does enjoy agency support and greatly  
22 appreciates the agency feedback and time that's been spent so  
23 far. As mentioned, the DDOT report of no objection does contain  
24 a condition that we will happily agree to regarding the TDM plan,  
25 which is included in the record in Exhibit 14A. And, as

1 mentioned, the project does have long-standing community support  
2 with the two letters from AMC 1C, and then just a very high level  
3 of outreach to neighbors and the tenants of the building.

4           So, all in all, we're happy to circle back on the  
5 elements that we talked about today. I counted three open items  
6 to follow up with, as part of a hearing submission. We greatly  
7 appreciate your time and, again, thank you for letting us present.

8           CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I want to thank you, Mr. Utz,  
9 and to the team. I think you all presented very well tonight,  
10 in fine fashion, so I want to thank you all, I'm sure on behalf  
11 of my colleagues, and appreciate all the information, all the  
12 work that's been put into it, and how we've gotten to this point.  
13 But I'm looking at my colleagues.

14           Mr. Utz had mentioned there were three things that we  
15 have outstanding, and I know this is a two-vote case, and I want  
16 to know what you all would like to do. I think the three  
17 issues -- we can always stop it, but I don't see it. They can  
18 submit those three things before final, unless I hear some  
19 objections. I'm looking.

20           (No response.)

21           CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

22           VICE CHAIR MILLER: I think they can take care of that  
23 before final.

24           COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: I agree. We're ready to move  
25 forward.

1 CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. All right. So, with that,  
2 I'm going to ask Commissioner Imamura if he doesn't mind making  
3 a motion to get us -- this moving.

4 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Sure. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
5 And before I make the motion, I just want to make two comments.  
6 One for Ms. Dawirs, that I think everybody is in agreement. She  
7 affectionately called the neighborhood "Sesame Street", so  
8 everybody wants to make sure that Sesame Street is safe for the  
9 children. Second -- the second comment I'd like to make is that,  
10 Mr. Utz, I'd like my tie back. I have the same tie.

11 So, with that, Mr. Chairman, I'll make the motion. I  
12 move that the Zoning Commission take proposed action for Case  
13 Number 25-18, Champlain Street Partners, LLC, consolidated PUD  
14 and related map amendment from the RA-2 to RA-3 zone at Square  
15 2560, Lot 827, at 2384 Champlain Street Northwest, and ask for a  
16 second.

17 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Second.

18 VICE CHAIR MILLER: And your motion and the seconder  
19 includes the waiver of the PUD minimum land area I assume.

20 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes. Thank you, Vice Chair  
21 Miller. I accept the friendly amendment, and it also includes  
22 my tie back.

23 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right. So we have the  
24 motion, we have the second, and we also have the amendment, plus  
25 the tie. Maybe, since you're getting ties back, you can give me

1 one. I don't have one. All right. So --

2 VICE CHAIR MILLER: You don't want one ever again.

3 CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. So we have all that in the  
4 motion, with the exception of the tie. So, with that, any further  
5 discussion?

6 (No response.)

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

9 MS. ACKERMAN: Commissioner Imamura.

10 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.

11 MS. ACKERMAN: Commissioner Wright.

12 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes.

13 MS. ACKERMAN: Commissioner Hood.

14 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.

15 MS. ACKERMAN: And Commissioner Miller.

16 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

17 MS. ACKERMAN: Zoning Case 25-18 has been approved for  
18 proposed action four to zero to one, motioned by Imamura and  
19 seconded by Commissioner Wright; Stidham not present, not voting.

20 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Ms. Ackerman, do we have anything  
21 else before us tonight?

22 MS. ACKERMAN: No, we do not.

23 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let me thank everyone for their  
24 participation in this case tonight. We appreciate, as I mentioned  
25 previously, all the work that's been done. The Zoning Commission

1 | will meet again on May the 28th, as already been announced, for  
2 | our regular monthly -- well, one of our regular monthly meetings  
3 | for the month of May. And, with that, I hope everyone has a safe  
4 | and enjoyable Memorial Day. Thank you.

5 |           (Whereupon, the above-entitled public hearing was  
6 | adjourned at 5:35 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 Hearing - Case No. 25-18

Before: DC Zoning Commission

Date: 05-21-26

Place: Webex Videoconference

was duly recorded and accurately transcribed under my direction; further, that said transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.



---

Deborah B. Gauthier