

GOVERNMENT OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

REGULAR PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

THURSDAY

JULY 30, 2026

+ + + + +

The Public Meeting of the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened via teleconference, pursuant to notice at 4:13 p.m. EDT, Anthony J. Hood, Chairman, presiding.

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

PAUL YOUNG, Zoning Data Specialist
SHARON S. SCHELLIN, Secretary
ELLA ACKERMAN, Acting Secretary

OFFICE OF ZONING LEGAL DIVISION STAFF PRESENT:

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

ALSO PRESENT:

PHILIP BRADFORD, DC Office of Planning

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Regular Public Meeting held on July 30, 2026.

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

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

MODIFICATION WITHOUT HEARING:

Case No. 15-18E
PENN LP 4

FINAL ACTION:

Case No. 25-20
DC Department of General Services 8

PROPOSED ACTION:

Case No. 25-13
Office of Planning 11

HEARING ACTION:

Case No. 26-06
Office of Planning 36

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

(4:13 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. We are convening and broadcasting this public meeting by videoconferencing. My name is Anthony Hood, and I'm joined by Vice Chair Miller, as well as Commissioner Wright and Commissioner Stidham. We're also joined by the Office of Zoning staff, Ms. Sharon Schellin, and her assistant, Ms. Ella Ackerman, as well as Mr. Paul Young, who will be handling all of our virtual operations. We're also joined by our Zoning Legal Division, Ms. Lovick, Mr. Ritting, and Mr. Lampert. I will ask all others to introduce themselves at the appropriate time.

This is to announce at 3:15 today, the Commission entered into a closed meeting. We came into that session we held for the purpose of obtaining legal advice from our counsel and deliberate, but no vote or contested cases -- on the contested cases on today's agenda were had. While discussions were held, there was no decision made.

Copies of today's meeting agenda are available on the Office of Zoning's website. Please be advised that this proceeding is being recorded by the court reporter and is also webcast live via Webex and YouTube live. The video will be available on the Office of Zoning's website after the meeting. Accordingly, all those listening on Webex or by phone will be muted during the meeting.

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

1 For hearing action items, the only documents before us
2 this evening are the application, the ANC setdown report, and the
3 Office of Planning report. All other documents in the record
4 will be reviewed at the time of the hearing. We do not take any
5 public testimony at our meetings, unless the Commission requests
6 someone to speak. If you experience difficulty accessing Webex
7 with your phone call-in, then please call our OZ Hotline number
8 at 202-727-0789 for Webex log-in or call-in instructions.

9 Before I turn it over to the staff, I just want to make
10 an announcement for the public. During our month off, I'm going
11 to -- staff and I will -- and the Commission will be working to
12 have our -- what I want to call our racial equity checkup, and
13 we will come out with some parameters of what that discussion is
14 going to look like, and we just want to do a -- get a pulse check
15 on how things have been going since we have implemented our racial
16 equity. And any questions or anything, you can contact Ms. Sharon
17 Schellin at the Office of Zoning.

18 So, at this time, does the staff have any preliminary
19 matters?

20 MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir.

21 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Moving right with our agenda,
22 let's go to modifications. We have a request for a modification
23 without hearing, Zoning Commission Case Number 15-18E, 2715 PENN
24 LP, modification without hearing for an approved PUD at Square
25 1194. Ms. Schellin.

1 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. As you stated, it is a request
2 for a modification without hearing. They are requesting to allow
3 the seven approved residential units to be designated as
4 residential and/or lodging use. And, with that, they would
5 request that no more than three of those seven units would be
6 operated as lodging at one -- any given time. Their justification
7 for this is that the modification is limited in scope to internal
8 uses within the building, and they've not yet delivered the
9 project. It is currently under construction.

10 And, at Exhibit 7, you have an OP report that recommends
11 approval with one condition, which the applicant has agreed to
12 in a submission at Exhibit 8. At this time, ANC 2E, the only
13 party to the case, has not submitted anything to the record for
14 consideration, but the requisite time period has passed. At
15 Exhibit 5, you have a DDOT report with no objection to the
16 request. So we'll turn this over to the Commission for
17 consideration. Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Schellin. And, again,
19 colleagues, as stated, this is a request, as Ms. Schellin has
20 already mentioned, but I'm going to mention it for our
21 discussions, to modify approved -- the approved PUD to allow the
22 seven approved residential units to be designated as residential
23 and/or lodging use, with no more than three of the seven units
24 being operated as a lodging use at a given time. But before I
25 do that, let me back up. Does anyone believe that this should

1 | come off as a modification without a hearing?

2 | (No response.)

3 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. No objections. We will continue
4 | in that status. And the other thing is, I know that the Office
5 | of Planning had a condition, which we know that -- which is our
6 | Exhibit 8, which the applicant submitted a letter stating that
7 | it agrees to OP's suggested condition of the approval, if we
8 | choose to move that way. And I think that's all, but let me open
9 | it up. Any further deliberations or any further discussion? I
10 | think this is pretty straightforward. At one time, I thought
11 | maybe we might need to have a hearing, but after looking, I don't
12 | believe so, but let me hear from others. Anybody have anything
13 | additional to add?

14 | (No response.)

15 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So if that -- in that case, I
16 | would move that we approve, as captioned and discussed -- or
17 | requested, Zoning Commission Case Number 15-18E, as this
18 | modification without a hearing, as discussed and captioned as a
19 | request, and ask for a second.

20 | COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Second.

21 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. It's been moved and properly
22 | seconded. Any further discussion?

23 | COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Just clarifying, that does
24 | include the OP condition that was proposed?

25 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, the OP condition is included.

1 Thank you. Okay. Moved and properly seconded. Any further
2 discussion?

3 (No response.)

4 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Ms. Schellin, would you do a
5 roll call vote please?

6 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood.

7 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.

8 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Stidham.

9 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes.

10 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Wright.

11 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes.

12 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller.

13 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

14 MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is four to zero to one to
15 approve final action in Zoning Commission Case Number 15-18E, the
16 minus one being Commissioner Imamura, not present, not voting.
17 And if we could have the applicant provide a draft order within
18 two weeks, and I would assume that could be a summary order, but
19 I'll leave that up to the Commission, or the applicant, if the
20 Commission prefers, could work with OZLD on that.

21 CHAIRMAN HOOD: We'll leave that in the hands of our
22 very capable OZLD.

23 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Thank you. All right.
25 Ms. Wright, did you raise your hand?

1 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: (Shakes head negatively.)

2 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, I'm sorry. Okay. All right. Let's
3 move on to final action, Zoning Commission Case Number 25-20, DC
4 Department of General Services, consolidated PUD and related map
5 amendment at Square 5728. Ms. Schellin.

6 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. On this one, after the -- at
7 the conclusion of the hearing on June 29th, the Commission
8 requested some post-hearing submissions to address its questions
9 and -- before taking proposed -- I'm sorry -- before taking
10 proposed action, so it actually took proposed action at the
11 conclusion of the hearing, but they -- but you guys still wanted
12 some post-hearing submissions, which they have provided at
13 Exhibits 30 through 33A. So I will turn this over to the
14 Commission to consider final action this evening. Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Schellin. Again, the
16 Commission -- during the post-hearing submissions, we asked for
17 post-hearing to address our questions, which were regarding
18 Capital Improvement Plan and the MPD employee housing. And we
19 took proposed action, as it's already been stated, at the
20 conclusion of that hearing. So we did propose and we asked for
21 those two things, and they have submitted, and I want to thank
22 them for submitting it, but let me go to the Commissioners who
23 asked for those two things and hear what they have to say. Let
24 me start with Vice Chair Miller.

25 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yeah, I did ask for that, just out

1 of curiosity, not that it had any effect on what is being asked
2 for here. I'm disappointed, but not surprised, to see that only
3 five percent of MPD 7th District staff live within the 7th
4 District and only about 25 percent of MPD 7th District staff live
5 within the District overall. And I was asking that question
6 because I was wondering why the District, in its RFP for this
7 project, didn't include housing above the police -- the new
8 police headquarters. There new there are new police headquarters
9 needed in all the Districts across the city, and many have already
10 been -- several have already been done. So, obviously -- I just
11 would comment that there's obviously -- we all need to do more
12 of in the District government, both that whatever we can do and
13 what the City Council and Mayor can do to incentivize or acquire
14 affordable housing for our police -- not only for our police, but
15 for our fire and teachers who want to be able to afford to live
16 in the city. And we got to -- I know there are some programs
17 already in existence, but we need to do -- obviously, do
18 more -- do more, because that -- these statistics of the
19 numbers are kind of pathetic.

20 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Commissioner Wright, you have
21 anything?

22 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yeah. I think I had just raised
23 the issue about how difficult it is sometimes to get plantings
24 and vines to grow up the side -- up the side of a parking garage.
25 And, you know, it really wasn't because I was suggesting they do

1 something different. I was just noting that there's going to
2 have to be a sort of concerted effort to make sure that the
3 plantings, which they have noted in their supplementary material,
4 are vines, which I sort of expected that they were vines -- that
5 there's going to just have to be a concerted effort to make sure
6 they don't die and that the vines actually do grow and fulfill
7 the function that they are intended to fulfill, which is softening
8 that wall of the parking garage. So I didn't really have anything
9 that I was proposing that they change. I just sort of wanted to
10 emphasize that I hope they put in a real concerted effort to try
11 to have those plants succeed.

12 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Commissioner Stidham, you
13 have anything to add?

14 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: No. We appreciate the
15 information that was provided. And then I think we had already
16 commented on the design and how we felt about that.

17 CHAIRMAN HOOD: I don't necessarily have anything extra
18 to say, other than I'll just reiterate, I'm glad to see that the
19 Districts are being improved, and I'm glad that we're, at least,
20 getting started. I know all of them, I think, are planned, for
21 the most part, and we're looking forward to that in the years to
22 come. So let me ask Vice Chair Miller if he would make a motion.

23 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. So I would move that the
24 Commission take -- Zoning Commission take final action on Zoning
25 Commission Case 25-20, DC Department of General Services,

1 consolidated PUD and related map amendment at Square 5728, which
2 relates to the 7th District MPD headquarters, and ask for a
3 second.

4 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Second.

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

7 (No response.)

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

10 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller.

11 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

12 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Wright.

13 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes.

14 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Stidham.

15 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes.

16 MS. SCHELLIN: And Commissioner Hood.

17 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.

18 MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is four to zero to one to
19 approve final action in Zoning Commission Case Number 25-20, the
20 minus one being Commissioner Imamura, not present, not voting.

21 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Next, proposed
22 action, Zoning Commission Case Number 25-13. This is the Office
23 of Planning text and map amendments to create the new Wisconsin
24 Avenue mixed-use zones. Ms. Schellin.

25 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. So, on this case, the Commission

1 considered this case at their July 16th meeting, because there
2 was a letter from Councilmember Frumin asking that the Commission
3 consider reopening the record to allow the public to respond to
4 OP's third supplemental report, and the Commission allowed that
5 through Thursday, July 23rd.

6 And so there are submissions in the record at Exhibits
7 260 through 275, which are the responses to OP's supplemental
8 report. And then, at Exhibit 276, you have a fourth supplemental
9 report from OP. And this case is ready for the Commission to
10 consider proposed action. Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Schellin. This case has
12 a lot of history, and I want to just first start off by thanking
13 our legal counsel for the job that they do, not just in this
14 case, but all cases, but this is one, in particular. We show up
15 once or twice a week, and they put all this together for us.
16 Even though we know the information, we've heard testimony, they
17 put it all in for us, so we can be able to examine it and make a
18 good decision for the city. So I'm going to do my best to do a
19 case summary, and I want to thank our legal counsel again for
20 teeing all this up and getting this, so I can remember -- we can
21 be refreshed.

22 So the Office of Planning brought this case and
23 responded to the Comprehensive Plan policy guidance recommending
24 the creation of additional dedicated affordable housing for the
25 portions of Wisconsin Avenue and carry out the Wisconsin Avenue

1 Development Framework recommendation to rezone the corridor to
2 allow additional flexibility and development to allow greater
3 height and density to accommodate additional housing and
4 affordable housing.

5 At the December 11th, 2025 public hearing, the
6 Commission heard testimony in support of the amendments from the
7 Office of Planning and testimony, both in support and opposition,
8 by members of the public. One issue discussed by the -- by the
9 Commissioners was the design guidelines that were incorporated
10 as mandatory design requirements in the text. Two commissioners
11 expressed interest in exploring alternatives to the mandatory
12 design regulations, such as the design review process, given that
13 a design review process was explicitly mentioned in the Wisconsin
14 Avenue Development Framework. There was also discussion of form-
15 based codes of -- or other approaches.

16 A second issue was whether the design guidelines
17 required the mid-block pedestrian connection. A third issue was
18 the amount of the affordable housing that would be required in
19 future developments under the proposed new regulations and
20 whether it was sufficient. There was testimony and support that
21 raised two specific concerns. One affected property owner, 4800
22 Wisconsin Avenue, commented that the required pedestrian
23 connection for his property may not make sense, because of the
24 grade change of the affected location. Another affected property
25 owner, 4551 Wisconsin Avenue, commented that it would be required

1 to provide a pedestrian connection under the proposal, but could
2 not comply because it did not have frontage on Wisconsin Avenue.

3 There was -- there was opposition testimony that raised
4 several issues; whether the IZ -- whether the IZ map amendment
5 would provide the amount of depth of affordability that was needed
6 to address community needs. A related concern was whether the
7 proposal should be included some incentive for family size three-
8 bedroom units; whether the upcoming would negatively affect
9 neighborhood character and cause overcrowding; whether the
10 proposal should include a design review process to allow
11 community input; whether this would result in an increase in
12 taxes, strain infrastructure; whether there was a sufficient
13 notice of 200 footers; and other concerns.

14 At the conclusion of the hearing, the Commission
15 requested the Office of Planning respond to several issues,
16 including IZ Plus analysis and clarification, design review
17 and/or form-based standards; pedestrian connection issues,
18 response to property-specific feasibility concerns, mapping
19 clarifications, and infrastructure analysis.

20 Now, the Office of Planning with its second
21 supplemental, dated April 20th, 2026. The Commission considered
22 the case at its April 30th meeting and discussed the Office of
23 Planning's second report, which provided revised text and made
24 the following changes: required design review for all properties
25 in the quarter; modified the 80 percent lot occupancy cap proposed

1 for the two MU-10 -- MU-10/FHM and MU-10/TTM zones included in
2 the next text, so it would apply only to residential properties
3 in those zones; modified the text that applied to the mandatory
4 pedestrian connection at Square 1770; modified the text to
5 eliminate the requirement for mandatory pedestrian connection at
6 4800 Wisconsin Avenue; modified the text proposed section to add
7 language encouraging three-bedroom units; responded to other
8 questions posed by the Commission at the hearing; granted motions
9 to reopen the record to allow public comment on the Office of
10 Planning's supplemental report before the Commission considered
11 proposed action.

12 Now, moving on, the Commission considered the case
13 again at its May 28th meeting and revisited the Office of
14 Planning's second supplemental, in light of the public comments
15 concerning the new design review requirement. The Commissioners
16 discussed that they did not want to reinvent the wheel by
17 abandoning the existing IZ program or start from scratch and
18 develop specific form-based codes and were generally satisfied
19 with the changes recommended in the report, aside from the new
20 design review requirement.

21 The Commission noted that the comments raised some
22 serious concerns about whether requiring design review for all
23 properties in the corridor was overbroad or too onerous, because
24 it could, one, stifle development of affordable housing; be too
25 onerous for property owners with smaller properties and projects;

1 create unnecessary development and improvement expense, delay,
2 and uncertainty; add another subject process to the top of the
3 existing Historic Preservation Review process that already
4 applied to several properties; again requested a further report
5 from OP that addressed the potential overreach of the design
6 review requirement introduced in the second supplemental report
7 somehow, either by creating a threshold for property subject to
8 design review and/or exemptions from affordable housing and
9 historic preservation.

10 The Office of Planning responded with its third
11 supplemental report, which is Exhibit 256. The Commission --
12 256. The Commission considered the case again at its July the
13 16th meeting. So it seems like there's a continuum of every
14 month. OP requested to postpone the requested action, which we
15 did, for July the 26 to July the 30, which comes into today,
16 needing to allow time for the Office of Planning and OZLD to make
17 clarifications to the proposed text, and it was granted. The
18 Commission granted a request, also, from Councilmember Frumin to
19 reopen the record and allow the public to comment on the Office
20 of Planning's third supplemental report until Thursday, July the
21 23rd.

22 Now we have new exhibits, and today let me just talk
23 briefly about them. Office of Planning's third supplemental
24 report. The Office of Planning recommends that development over
25 15,000 square feet be subject to design review, and there's some

1 things that we'll be discussing; rationale of selecting the
2 15,000 square-foot threshold; negligible impact below 15,000
3 square feet; alignment with the PUD standard and efficient case
4 management; and, number two, exemption from design review for
5 affordable developments of at least 33 percent affordable to very
6 low and extremely low income households and exemption from design
7 review for historic properties, and that's about it.

8 But let me -- let me just say that we did receive a lot
9 of additional comments. I'll run through them, but I want us
10 to -- we received some additional comments from the Committee of
11 100. Individuals expressed support. Committee of 100 expressed
12 there was some opposition to certain things. But what we're
13 going to do, we're going to discuss those at a later date, but
14 today I think we're going to deal with the design review portion
15 of it and how we -- see how we're going to do. I think they --
16 you know, we had some things proposed to us by the Office of
17 Planning. We're going to discuss that, but I will say that there
18 will be a time -- so I know Councilmember Frumin, we like to
19 write letters and get him to get us to open the record, but I
20 can assure the Councilmember and everyone else, you will have
21 time to respond. There will be a time to respond. So I've said
22 that and said that and said that, so we've -- we're here now,
23 and there will be a time to respond to some of the things that
24 that we decide today, as well as anything else before we get
25 ready, if we go to final. So I just want you all to know, we do

1 take note of what you all presented, what was sent. I just called
2 the Committee of 100. That was the first thing I saw on here,
3 but there are other people who provided things, and we will be
4 discussing those at a later date, but right now we're going to
5 just basically deal with the design review process and parameters
6 around that, because that was one of the biggest outstanding
7 issues that we had.

8 So, with that, I will ask Commissioner Wright to get
9 us started on that, and then Vice Chair Miller. Thank you.

10 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Thank you. So I am glad that we
11 are meeting today. I'm glad that we kept the record open through
12 July 23rd. I have read all of the submissions that came in up
13 to July 23rd. I would just reiterate, I think, what the Chair
14 was saying, which is we want to hear from people. We are not
15 ever interested in closing the door to not hear from the
16 community.

17 And, you know, the comments that I made last time
18 around, you know, I think that if any people in the community
19 feel that they need to be heard, they can send a letter directly
20 to the Zoning Commission. That is not ex parte communication.
21 That is very appropriate to communicate by letter directly with
22 the Zoning Commission about their need for time to provide
23 additional input. And so I do want to be very clear about that,
24 and that we, as Commissioners, welcome all the input that we get,
25 and I think it actually, in this particular case, has been an

1 incremental process that has been improving what will, I believe,
2 be the final outcome. So I just sort of want to say that from
3 the get-go.

4 So we have talked about a couple of issues or options,
5 let's say, regarding the idea of design review. And I do want
6 to mention that the Wisconsin Avenue Development Framework, which
7 is a document at which there was a lot of public input -- I think
8 folks said it took 18 months to actually create -- it's a very
9 important document, and I think what we are all, in a way,
10 discussing is how can that important document be given strength
11 and the ability to, you know, really review it and make sure that
12 projects that happen are consistent with the Wisconsin Avenue
13 Development Framework.

14 We've heard suggestions that the best way to do that
15 would be to create a form-based code; to take all of the
16 discussion in the lengthy Wisconsin Avenue Development Framework
17 and write a detailed form-based code that includes everything
18 from that document. And, in many ways, I think that would be,
19 you know, an optimal approach. However, it isn't something that
20 can be done overnight. It can't be done quickly.

21 And we've really heard from the Office of Planning
22 that, even though they are interested, generally, in the idea of
23 form-based codes, they don't really have the capacity at this
24 point to do the very, very detailed work to create a form-based
25 code. And so what we are looking at, or, at least, what I am

1 | looking at is, you know, is there language in the zoning text
2 | amendment and the map amendment that essentially goes back to
3 | that Wisconsin Avenue Development Framework that puts in place,
4 | in detailed language, some of the bigger ideas about the one-to-
5 | one setback and, you know, bringing buildings up to the property
6 | line and, you know, some of the general, very big picture ideas
7 | that are in that, but is there also a way to really memorialize
8 | that document and make it a part of any future significant
9 | projects that go forward in this area along Wisconsin Avenue.

10 | I think it was, again, an important document. There
11 | was a lot of community input. It can't just be put on a shelf
12 | and say "Oh, well, you know, we'll have the one-to-one setback
13 | at the rear, and, you know, that was one of the ideas in it and
14 | we've captured that." I think it's very important that the
15 | document actually is used and has meaning, as we're looking at
16 | future projects.

17 | So one of the ways that we have talked about doing that
18 | is to create a design review process. And I want to be very,
19 | very clear; this is not a brand new idea. We have design review
20 | requirements in many zones throughout the city. We have design
21 | review required in many different Wards throughout the city. We
22 | do design review -- in fact, our case on this past Monday was a
23 | design review case that this Zoning Commission heard. So we have
24 | done in many parts of the city design review. It's not a brand
25 | new idea.

1 The question that has been debated is, should we do
2 design review in this particular zone and this particular zoning
3 text amendment, and, if we do, should it be for every property
4 covered by the -- by the zoning text amendment, or should there
5 be an exemption for certain projects. And Office of Planning has
6 put a lot of good thinking into that and has come up with a
7 proposal that I, personally, think has a lot of merit. I do --
8 you know, again, I heard all of the testimony; I read every piece
9 of written testimony that's come in. I found that testimony very
10 helpful in understanding both some of the challenges of design
11 review and in understanding some of the ways that design review
12 could be, you know, honed a little bit to make it as effective
13 as possible.

14 I really do not agree that design review, in and of
15 itself, lengthens a project, makes a project more difficult. I
16 think that it is another step, but it's a step that allows for
17 significant benefit and ways to make projects better. And I
18 think, again, the design review that we did on Monday is an
19 example of that.

20 So, you know, one of the things that I also, you know,
21 read and I've heard about is this idea that, well, if you allow
22 design review, you're going to create a situation that can be
23 appealed. You know, the reality that we all have to come to
24 terms with is, everything can be appealed. We cannot decide
25 significant public policy on the fear of appeal.

1 I'm involved in a case before the BZA right now, which
2 is an appeal of a decision by the Department of Building, who
3 issued a building permit by right, and the community group who's
4 appealing feels that they didn't interpret some of the zoning
5 text correctly. So, you know, even if we did everything along
6 Wisconsin Avenue completely by right, there is still the ability
7 of an aggrieved party to appeal the Department of Building and
8 say they haven't -- they didn't interpret our code correctly,
9 they didn't interpret or call to mind the Wisconsin Avenue
10 Development Framework appropriately. I mean, there is nothing
11 that isn't appealable. So that's part of my, you know, sort of
12 counterargument to folks who are saying, well, if you have a
13 design review process, you're creating an opportunity for appeal.
14 Everything can be appealed.

15 And, in this particular case, you know, we are upzoning
16 a large area along Wisconsin Avenue quite a bit. We are using
17 the zoning powers that we have, as a government, to provide a
18 significant benefit of additional density and zoning to property
19 owners along Wisconsin Avenue. And I think, in exchange for
20 that, it is appropriate that there is a design review process to
21 assure that those new projects are consistent with not only the
22 details of the zoning text, but consistent with the Wisconsin
23 Avenue Development Framework. And that framework, specifically,
24 had referenced having a design review process, so it was
25 contemplated.

1 So, anyway, I just lay that all out. I would say --
2 so, to my mind, I could not support the idea of no design review
3 at all. I also believe that it's probably not a good idea to
4 have design review for every single property, because I was
5 definitely convinced, with some of the smaller projects -- the
6 design review is not only for new construction -- if you're
7 putting on an addition to a building, so if there's a small
8 commercial building that wants to build an addition, I don't
9 think they should have to go through a design review process.

10 I do believe that Office of Planning did a pretty good
11 job of finding the sweet spot of doing design review for certain
12 development. And what they proposed was development on properties
13 that are on lots of 15,000 square feet or greater. And for those
14 of you who, you know, are thinking, "What is 15,000 square feet?",
15 well, that is something that is used in the PUD regulations, but
16 it's also not a big property. I mean, 15,000 square feet is
17 significantly less than half an acre. Acres are about 42,000
18 square feet. So it's a property -- it is property that's a little
19 over a third of an acre. So these are not only the big, big
20 properties. It's -- I thought that it was a well-reasoned and
21 well-justified suggestion as one of the parameters that the
22 Office of Planning came up with.

23 Secondly, properties that meet an affordable housing
24 threshold of 33 percent, and that would be -- again, there's been
25 additional work done to define the area median income levels of

1 | that 33 percent and the specific language defining what that 33
2 | percent would be. I think that's realistic, because, honestly,
3 | there aren't very many projects that are going to be more than
4 | 33 percent affordable. Those are unusual projects, and they're
5 | very, very tough to do, and they're very -- they have lots of
6 | hoops that they have to jump through. I have -- again, in the
7 | work that we've done here on the Zoning Commission, I don't even
8 | think I've seen a handful of projects, in the time I've been on
9 | the Zoning Commission, anywhere in the city that have that kind
10 | of level of affordability. I mean, it's really not very common,
11 | and they are complex projects, and so I do -- I do see that as a
12 | parameter that I think is acceptable.

13 | The third are projects that are subject to HPRB review,
14 | and I think that's acceptable, because it is identical to, really,
15 | some of the discussions we had about Connecticut Avenue in Woodley
16 | Park and Cleveland Park, where we said, you know, we're going to
17 | create a zone that's going to allow for additional density, but
18 | we are going to put a lot of faith in the Historic District review
19 | process to assure that the buildings are compatible with their
20 | historic area and with their community. And so I think it would
21 | be consistent to have the same kind of parameter in this
22 | particular instance on Wisconsin Avenue.

23 | So, you know, I think there are some details that need
24 | to be discussed. I was interested in the Committee of 100's
25 | comments about how, if you do more three-bedroom units, you

1 actually, through a different part of the IZ law, can reduce the
2 amount of affordable housing that you're required to put in a
3 project. and that concerns me a little bit. I mean, we've
4 definitely emphasized the importance of three-bedroom units, but
5 I didn't really want that to take away from the actual amount of
6 affordable housing that would be produced along this corridor.
7 So I think we need to work through that and noodle that a little
8 bit more, but, in in my mind, I think we are moving in an
9 appropriate direction.

10 Ideally, for me, we would do a form-based code, but I
11 don't think we have the -- OP is telling us -- it's not what I
12 think -- OP is telling us they don't have the time and resources
13 to do that without a significant delay in this whole effort. And
14 I don't want to do a significant delay in the whole effort. So
15 that would be ideal, but I don't think, at this moment, that it's
16 realistic.

17 I think what we're looking at with this design review
18 process is the next best thing. And I think that the exemptions
19 or the parameters -- I don't like even calling them exemptions;
20 I like calling them parameters -- that have been suggested by OP,
21 I think make a lot of sense. I think that they've done a very
22 good analysis, and that would be the direction that I think we
23 should go. And, again, as the Chair mentioned, there would need
24 to be more detailed discussion about some of the smaller -- and
25 they aren't small issues -- some of the other issues, like the

1 one I mentioned regarding the IZ in the three-bedroom units, but
2 we can -- we can get to that, if we get to a sort of core decision
3 of how we're going to move forward on this design review issue.
4 So that is my comment for now.

5 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very much, Commissioner
6 Wright. Very well done and articulated. So, Vice Chair, let's
7 hear from you.

8 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Well, that was -- I very much
9 appreciate Commissioner Wright's comprehensive analysis of all
10 of the issues and your -- and the -- and the OZ staff's tee-up
11 of more than 300 exhibits that are already -- or almost 300
12 exhibits that are in our record. And we reopened the record at
13 least twice, and there's still another bite of the apple, if we
14 do proposed rulemaking. So I appreciate everybody's -- all the
15 public's, Office of Planning's, and our own staff's comments on
16 this, and it's evolved.

17 You know, people say we just are like a rubber stamp
18 sometimes. It's just -- it's, obviously, evolved into a
19 different proposal than was originally offered. And I think that
20 the proposal before us for proposed action tonight is pretty much
21 consistent with the Wisconsin Avenue Development Framework and
22 the upzoning that was done by the Mayor and Council five years
23 ago -- five years ago. It takes a long time for things to get
24 implemented, but we are the implementing zoning agency, so, you
25 know -- so I am -- the design -- I think the design review process

1 that was added to this original proposal is consistent with the
2 Wisconsin Avenue Development Framework, and I think the
3 exemptions or parameters, as Commissioner Wright referred to them
4 as, on affordable housing, on the lot size, on historic
5 preservation are appropriate, so not everything is subject to
6 that. So I'm -- I appreciate everybody's input. They will have
7 more opportunity for more input, and there may be opportunity for
8 more change, but I think the Wisconsin Avenue Development is
9 ready to move forward.

10 I remember when -- I'm old enough to remember when
11 former OP Director Ellen McCarthy proposed something 25 years
12 ago, and it got withdrawn because of all the pushback from my
13 neighbors -- my neighbors or some of my neighbors. But, you
14 know, we have support, generally, in this case from three ANC's,
15 3E, Tenleytown/Friendship Heights; 3A, which is a new ANC --
16 newly-created ANC along Wisconsin Avenue, west of me; and 3C, my
17 own ANC, which was upset that we reopened the record even. So
18 there is -- there's opposition, but there's a lot of support for
19 moving forward here. It might not be the economic climate where
20 things might happen right now, but I -- it's time for this avenue
21 to be rejuvenated. It's kind of sad that it's been in the
22 condition it's been for so many years. I've lived along it for
23 35 years, and there are great things going on, but there's a lot
24 of opportunity here. So I don't -- you know, Commissioner Wright
25 was so thorough in her analysis, I don't think I really have

1 anything to add there, except to emphasize again that I think
2 this current proposal, which has evolved, is consistent with the
3 Wisconsin Avenue Development Framework, which was developed with
4 the community, which was developed after the Mayor and Council
5 upzoned Wisconsin Avenue, and so it's consistent with that, too.
6 So there may be future changes, too, but I'm ready, finally, to
7 move forward with this case, Mr. Chairman.

8 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Commissioner Stidham,
9 do you have anything to add?

10 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Just to add that I think OP did
11 a great job of finding a way to implement the design review in a
12 way that it is consistent with the framework, but appropriate for
13 the area, so -- and, again, I am in support of the comments that
14 have already been made, but just to reiterate the congrats -- the
15 thanks to OP for their work and finding us a good solution that
16 we can move forward with.

17 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Again, I want to thank all of
18 my colleagues for their comments and their discovery on this.
19 I'm going to start off this way. I appreciate what's being done
20 up there on Wisconsin Avenue, but when I hear from other residents
21 who want this exact opportunity, I think that it's important that
22 everybody has it. I've been talking about Ivy City; I know now
23 Councilmember Parker here in Ward 5. I would be a pretty poor
24 Ward 5 member if I wasn't pushing for what I'm hearing over here
25 in my community as well, so I would -- I just want to say that

1 again on the record, and I'm hoping that the Office of Planning --
2 I know we have some different people over at the Office of
3 Planning or some -- there's been a change, but I know some of
4 the folks who I've worked with and I know some of the ones who've
5 come in have great reputations, but there's a community out there
6 that's crying out to do exactly -- well, I don't know if exactly,
7 but to do something like what we're doing here now. So let's
8 make sure that we, at least, consider those in Ivy City,
9 Commissioner Rhodes and some of those, Empower DC and others.
10 I've heard -- I'm hearing from them quite a bit, and I want to
11 make sure that they are getting the same attention that we're
12 giving over here.

13 And I know this has been, what, 18 months or so, and I
14 appreciate all the work everyone has done, but let me go back to
15 what Commissioner Wright has so eloquently spoke about, and
16 appreciate the Office of Planning sending us some things that we
17 had requested. When I looked at the no design review, at first,
18 my thoughts were -- and after hearing from my colleagues, my
19 thoughts for no design review were, okay, well, the enforcer of
20 it is the Zoning Administrator, and I know sometimes we don't
21 like some of those decisions and, as Commissioner Wright
22 mentioned, everything's appealable, so -- and then the design
23 review for every development. No, that's what we're trying not
24 to do, but, also what -- also what we're trying not to do is take
25 away public input.

1 So, you know, we had a lot of moving parts here that
2 we were working with. So I think we've come up with the design
3 review exemption, but I'm going to go along with Commissioner
4 Wright; I don't like to say "exemptions". I forgot; what was
5 the word you used? You didn't say exemptions, but you said --

6 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Parameters.

7 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Parameters. There we go, design roof
8 parameters for some of the development, which will consist of
9 properties with a lot area of under 15,000 square feet, and
10 Commissioner Wright had spoke about that; properties to meet an
11 affordable housing threshold of 32 percent, 33 percent, and
12 properties that are subject to HPR review, and to go on and
13 refine -- that we had in the reports.

14 So what I will say before, I think -- I think, if I'm
15 not mistaken, we're talking about design review with parameters
16 for some development, with the recommendation that the Office of
17 Planning has given us. So that's the way, I think, we're going
18 to go. I think what we can do now is vote on this and -- but
19 before I vote on them -- take it a little bit out of sequence --
20 I want the -- there were issues about one affected property owner
21 claims that -- you know, that there was an issue with the
22 pedestrian connection, as mentioned. The Committee of 100 talked
23 about the conflicts. The Committee of 100 observed that there
24 are inconsistency descriptions of the number of affected lots in
25 various areas. We're going to -- we're going to -- we note it.

1 We know it's out there. We will consider these comments further
2 at a further meeting, as we continue to move forward with any
3 other public comments we received in response to the Notice of
4 Proposed Rulemaking. And we will leave the record open after the
5 public comment period closes for OP to submit a further report
6 that responds to the comments.

7 So that that's how we laid it out. I mean, you know,
8 we're not cutting public input. Again, let me just repeat it,
9 so if it's not understood. We will consider the comments -- the
10 comments that I just mentioned and others at a further meeting.
11 We will also leave the record open after the public comment period
12 closes for the Office of Planning to submit further reports that
13 responds to the comments that we've heard and the comments that
14 have been given to us, that we've left the record open two or
15 three -- I can't remember now -- two times I believe, we will
16 discuss that at a future meeting after the Notice of Proposed
17 Rulemaking. Any objections to us moving in that fashion?

18 VICE CHAIR MILLER: No, that makes -- that makes sense.
19 And, you know, we've had four OP supplemental reports, in addition
20 to their original setdown report, so they are, actually, I think,
21 at least five, and there may be more. And we've reopened the
22 record for people to comment on the additional reports, and
23 there's still additional opportunity for public to comment.

24 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right. And we're getting
25 close. If we -- unless we have additional changes and corrections

1 | that we want to see, let's do that. So, again, let me see --

2 | COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Well, I would say, Chair Hood has
3 | mentioned three specific issues that were in the, you know,
4 | testimony that we've received, that we're going to want the Office
5 | of Planning to do a little more work on, and those were the two
6 | comments by the Committee of 100 about the conflict in the IZ
7 | law about if you do three-bedroom units, you can actually not
8 | have to do as much IZ, and I'd like them to do an analysis of
9 | that; the issue that you also mentioned, Chair Hood, about the
10 | difference in the numbers of the numbers of properties. I think
11 | we need to be very precise and ask the Office of Planning to go
12 | back and double-check that, so that we're very precise on the
13 | number of properties.

14 | And then the third issue, I think, had to do with the
15 | pedestrian access and the problems that the property owner raised
16 | regarding the pedestrian access. And, again, I think we'd want
17 | a little more detail from the Office of Planning on that, although
18 | I don't want to limit it to those three items. I mean, I'm hoping
19 | the Office of Planning will go through all the testimony and --
20 | on their own and see what issues were raised perhaps above and
21 | beyond those three that we've just mentioned and prepare some
22 | additional information when we have our future meetings on this.

23 | So I think, again, the Chair did a good job of listing
24 | out the three sort of big things that have been mentioned, but
25 | there may be some other pieces of testimony that require

1 additional analysis.

2 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. And we will, again --
3 Jake, hold one second, Jake. I got -- I got the message. Let
4 me make sure I got that message, because one thing I have to say,
5 our OZLD is on it. They be on it, so I'm going to give them
6 that. Let me -- let me just say this; I've been instructed the
7 best thing for me to clarify, we are taking proposed action on
8 the language in attachment two of the Office of Planning's fourth
9 supplemental report. Again, I'm going to say it again. We are
10 taking proposed action on the language in attachment two of the
11 OP fourth supplemental report. Again, I say our OZLD is on it
12 now. Now, Mr. Ritting, I just -- if you just give me an
13 opportunity -- I see you closed your light, so I guess I've --

14 MR. RITTING: No, you got it. I was going to suggest
15 the language of the motion, but you were -- you were already
16 ahead of me, so you got it. I don't have anything to add.

17 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well, actually, I wasn't, but, anyway,
18 it came to me by a very -- another one of your colleagues, so
19 you all keep on doing -- keep on sending it to me. All right.
20 And, again, this is a lot, as my colleagues have mentioned. We
21 you know we still have a lot, but I want the public to seriously
22 know that after -- we're going to consider everything else
23 after -- along with the other public comments that we received
24 after the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, so just know that we
25 have not stopped. I mean, I can't tell you what to do, but you

1 don't have to go to Councilmember Frumin and -- but, if you do,
2 that's fine, but we're going to hear from you anyway, so that'll
3 save him a step, give him some time to work with some other
4 issues, but we got you, we got you. All right.

5 VICE CHAIR MILLER: And he wasn't -- he wasn't
6 commenting on the merits, for the record, when he responded to
7 the Committee of 100's request that we reopen the record twice.
8 I would note that he -- I think I noted it before, that he was
9 the former Chair of ANC 3E, Friendship Heights/Tenleytown, so
10 he's very familiar with this area.

11 CHAIRMAN HOOD: But he's working hard to deal with what
12 his some of his constituents want. And, again, you're right,
13 Vice Chair. You know, he he's a great Councilmember. He does
14 he does not on the merits, but he's listened to his constituents,
15 pro or con, and he's trying to work with all of them, so I have
16 to give him that. I give all of them that, because it's not easy
17 working with all -- with us, because we all have different views,
18 so, anyway -- including me. So let's -- Commissioner Wright,
19 unless I hear anything else, could we make a motion on the design
20 review -- of what we discussed on design review and proposed
21 action -- again, we will hear in the Notice of Proposed
22 Rulemaking -- everything else, plus what we've -- what's already
23 been in there. We'll discuss the rest in a future meeting.

24 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Great. Are you looking for a
25 motion?

1 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, yes, If you don't mind.

2 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes. Okay. So I move that the
3 Zoning Commission take proposed action on Zoning Commission Case
4 Number 25-13, Office of Planning text and map amendment to create
5 new Wisconsin Avenue mixed-use zones, and, as we discussed, it
6 is the second set of proposed language in OP's fourth supplemental
7 report. That is what we're taking action on. And, again, we
8 will have more discussions about many of the other details, but
9 we're taking -- I'm moving that we take proposed action on the
10 second set of language in OP's fourth supplemental report.

11 VICE CHAIR MILLER: And I second that.

12 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Mr. Ritting has not turned his
13 light on, so I guess we're good. It's been moved and properly
14 seconded. Any further discussion?

15 (No response.)

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

18 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Commissioner Wright.

19 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes.

20 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller.

21 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

22 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood.

23 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.

24 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Stidham.

25 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes.

1 MS. SCHELLIN: So the vote is four to zero to one to
2 approve proposed action in Zoning Commission Case Number 25-13,
3 per OP's fourth supplemental report and as discussed this
4 afternoon or this evening, and the minus one -- excuse me --
5 being Commissioner Imamura, not present, not voting. Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. And let's go to
7 hearing action, and then I have a comment to make, and then we
8 can close out. Give me one second. Okay. Hearing action. I
9 thought I had it. Okay. Hearing action, Zoning Commission Case
10 Number 26 -- excuse me -- 26-06, 401 14th Street Southwest 2025,
11 LLC, map amendment at Square 231 and Parcel 316/16. Who do we
12 have? Mr. Bradford. Mr. Bradford. Is it Mr. Bradford? Yeah,
13 there you are. Go right ahead.

14 (Office of Planning's PowerPoint presentation shared
15 on the screen.)

16 MR. BRADFORD: All right. Mr. Young -- oh, thank you.
17 You got it. Good evening, Chairman Hood, Commissioners. For the
18 record, Philip Bradford, Development Review Specialist with the
19 DC Office of Planning.

20 The Office of Planning is recommending that the Zoning
21 Commission set down for public hearing Case Number 26-06, on
22 behalf of the applicant, 401 14th Street Southwest, LLC, to rezone
23 Square 231, Lot 804 in Parcel 316-16, located at 401 14th Street
24 Southwest, which is currently unzoned, to D-8. On balance, when
25 reviewed through a racial equity lens, the proposal would not be

1 inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The subject property
2 is improved with the Liberty Loan Building, which is currently
3 vacant. The building was intended to be a temporary structure
4 to house the Liberty Bond -- Liberty Loans' Bond Program during
5 World War I. The historic structure will be required to be
6 preserved, and further review by other agencies will be required
7 prior to any alterations to the building.

8 The size of the subject parcel is 69,922 square feet
9 and is bound by 14th Street Southwest to the east, Main Avenue
10 Southwest to the south, and 15th Street to the west, with the
11 Bureau of Engraving and Printing Building to the north. There
12 is an existing on-ramp to 14th Street and I-395 that runs through
13 the building, and that will remain.

14 While the D-8 zone has many permitted uses and the site
15 may develop with a non-residential use, OP is recommending IZ
16 Plus as part of the requested map amendment. The Central
17 Washington Planning Area is currently at 88 percent of achieving
18 its target affordable housing production goal. Should residential
19 units be constructed on the property, IZ Plus should help the
20 Central Washington Planning Area get closer to the housing
21 production goals set by the Mayor. And it is also note -- worth
22 noting that the D-8 zone is one of the downtown zones that
23 includes the standard IZ requirements.

24 With so many different types of downtown zones in the
25 zoning regulations, it's important to discuss why the applicant

1 is requesting D-8 and why D-8 is the most appropriate for this
2 map amendment. The subject property is surrounded by D-5 and
3 D-8 zoning. The purpose and intent of both zones are as follows.
4 The purpose of the D-8 zone are to permit high-density development
5 to foster the transition of a federally-owned area south of the
6 National Mall to a mixed-use area of commercial, residential,
7 cultural and arts, retail service uses with both public and
8 private ownership. This is in contrast to the D-5 zone, which
9 has the purpose to promote high-density development as well, but
10 specifically in areas that have been receiving areas for
11 transferable development rights under Chapter 17 of the 1958
12 zoning regulations.

13 The subject property is not a receiving area for
14 transferable development rights. Therefore, D-5 would not be
15 appropriate for the subject property. By being south of the
16 National Mall and east of the Tidal Basin, which functions as an
17 extension of what is broadly considered the Mall, the site most
18 clearly fits the intent of D-8 zoning.

19 Next slide please. The Future Land Use Map indicates
20 that most of the site is appropriate for Parks, Recreation, and
21 Open Space. Guidelines for interpreting the FLUM state that it
22 shall be interpreted broadly and is intended to be soft-edged.
23 The property is developed with a large building and is surrounded
24 by other high-density development, either unzoned, under federal
25 ownership, or zoned D-5 and D-8 under private ownership.

1 The property is included on many other Comprehensive
2 Plan maps, such as the Central Employment Area and L'Enfant
3 Plaza/Near Southwest Maryland Avenue Policy Focus Area of the
4 Central Washington Area Element. The site's inclusion on these
5 other maps implies that development is likely to occur on this
6 site, which contrasts with the Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
7 designation.

8 Next slide please. The Generalized Policy Map
9 identifies the property as federal Lands, Neighborhood
10 Conservation Area, and Resilience Focus Area. With many vacant
11 and underutilized buildings in the area, the rezoning and
12 potential redevelopment of the site would allow the site to add
13 new vitality and enhance the character of the neighborhood. When
14 evaluated through a racial equity lens, the proposal would not
15 be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The map amendment
16 would allow the redevelopment and adaptive reuse of a prominent
17 historic building and allow a wide variety of permitted uses in
18 the zone that could become offices and add new employment
19 opportunities or supply new residential units in a transit-rich
20 area.

21 The Central Washington Planning Area has produced 793
22 dedicated affordable housing units since 2019, or 88.7 percent
23 of the production goals set by the District's Housing Equity
24 Report. The proposed map amendment would allow for a mix of new
25 market-rate and affordable units, which would help housing

1 opportunities in the area with no direct displacement and little
2 risk of indirect displacement.

3 With that, that concludes my presentation, and I'm
4 happy to answer any questions the Commission may have.

5 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Mr. Bradford. Let me ask
6 first, do you know of any opposition in this case?

7 MR. BRADFORD: No opposition so far in the record.

8 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I would also ask the applicant,
9 who I know may be listening, that they address the Neighborhood
10 Conservation Area designation in the -- in the GPM and the
11 potential Comp Plan inconsistency identified by the Office of
12 Planning, and if they could provide an update on their community
13 outreach; again, the designation of the Generalized Policy Map
14 and the potential Comp Plan inconsistencies identified by OP, as
15 well as their community outreach and engagement efforts, if they
16 can provide those things to us. But let me open it up.
17 Commissioner Wright, any additional questions or comments?

18 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: No, not at all. I think what
19 you've mentioned, Chair Hood, are exactly the same things that I
20 would have highlighted. And I am -- I'm -- I think this
21 definitely should be set down, and I'm very interested in
22 discussing the project or the rezoning -- not project, but the
23 rezoning.

24 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Vice Chair Miller.

25 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I

1 | agree with the comments of my colleagues, and I appreciate Mr.
2 | Bradford's report and presentation on behalf of the Office of
3 | Planning. And this is a map amendment, which we evaluate mostly
4 | through the zoning consistency with the Comprehensive Plan
5 | standard through the racial equity lens that the Chairman cited
6 | earlier in this meeting. But I would be -- I think there's been
7 | some reference to what the project is that might be facilitated.
8 | It's a very prominent location. Can you just -- even though
9 | that's not really part of our evaluation, can you just give us a
10 | brief -- if you have -- if you know it, what the project is that's
11 | envisioned here?

12 | MR. BRADFORD: Commissioner Miller, based on the
13 | applicant's filing, there, actually, is not a set project. The
14 | map amendment just speaks to what the projects could be, and they
15 | speak to the different D-8 uses that the building would likely
16 | convert to as part of an adaptive reuse. If there is a project,
17 | that's something the Commission may choose to ask the applicant
18 | in the hearing. However, based on the submittal, OP is not aware
19 | of a specific program for the site upon the map amendment being
20 | adopted.

21 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Thank you. I thought there
22 | might have been, but okay. Thanks.

23 | CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. And, Commissioner Stidham, any
24 | questions or comments?

25 | COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes. So thank you for your

1 report. I appreciate it. Chairman, some questions
2 (indiscernible) -- I have to disclose (indiscernible due to
3 connectivity issue.)

4 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioner Stidham -- Commissioner
5 Stidham, are you breaking -- is she breaking up or is it just
6 me? Oh, yeah. Okay. You're breaking up.

7 VICE CHAIR MILLER: No, she's breaking up.

8 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

9 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Is that better?

10 CHAIRMAN HOOD: No, it's crackling like.

11 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: (Indiscernible response.)

12 CHAIRMAN HOOD: It's still doing it. You want -- I
13 hate to have you cut off and come back on at this late in the
14 day.

15 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Is that better?

16 CHAIRMAN HOOD: No, it's crackling.

17 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Okay. I'm going to sign off and
18 come back.

19 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. You're going to leave him come
20 back. Okay. We'll wait on you. We'll wait.

21 (Commissioner exited the videoconference.)

22 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well, since we got some time, I
23 saw -- I saw Archie, my good friend, earlier.

24 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yeah. He fixed all my modem issues
25 earlier, so I can be back at this location.

1 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, okay. He's six years old, but he
2 I learn a lot from him every day.

3 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yeah. Yeah. He might -- he can get a
4 job and come around to our houses and help us, because we be
5 needing help.

6 MS. SCHELLIN: I thought for a moment, since you said,
7 "Since we have time", you were going to break out in song.

8 CHAIRMAN HOOD: No. The don't let me sing in the choir
9 at my church, so I know I can't sing here. All right. Let's
10 see where Commissioner Stidham is now.

11 (Commissioner Stidham rejoined videoconference.)

12 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Okay. How is that?

13 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yeah, that's good, that's good.

14 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Great. Good. Okay. What --
15 all I was really trying to say is that, in my official capacity
16 in the National Park Service, this is a property that I have --
17 I had been working on with GSA before they sold the property, so
18 there -- I know a lot about the property and about the potential
19 project, but I want to say that none of that would prejudice my
20 involvement in the case moving forward; that I could decide --
21 or set down the case and review the case and a hearing based on
22 the record alone. So I just wanted to establish that here, so
23 that it's -- everyone is well informed of my connection to the
24 case.

25 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner Stidham.

1 Any objections to her participating? I'm sure she will be not
2 biased.

3 (No response.)

4 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right. You have any other
5 questions, Commissioner Stidham?

6 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: No, just thank you for the
7 presentation, if that was garbled in the original, when I started.

8 CHAIRMAN HOOD: I, too, want to thank you, Mr. Bradford.
9 We're looking forward to having this case. And those things that
10 we mentioned previously, if we can get that, if the applicant can
11 submit those, we will look forward to setting this down. So
12 would somebody like to make a motion; Commissioner Wright or Vice
13 Chair or somebody?

14 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: I'm glad to make a motion,
15 although I'm also glad to defer, but, you know, either way. Let
16 me get to my language. So I am happy to move that the Zoning
17 Commission set down Case -- I'm just scrolling through to get to
18 it. Finding things on my phone is difficult. Okay. I move that
19 we set down Zoning Commission Case Number 26-06, 401 14th Street
20 Southwest 2025, LLC, which is a map amendment at Square 231 and
21 Parcel 316/16, and ask for a second.

22 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Second.

23 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. It's been moved and properly
24 seconded. Any further discussion?

25 (No response.)

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

3 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. Commissioner Wright.

4 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes.

5 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Stidham.

6 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes.

7 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood.

8 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.

9 MS. SCHELLIN: And Commissioner Miller.

10 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

11 MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is four to zero to one to set
12 down Zoning Commission Case Number 26-06 as a contested case, the
13 minus one being Commissioner Imamura, not present, not voting.

14 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. And, again, I want
15 to thank you, Mr. Bradford, for your report. Ms. Schellin, do
16 we have anything else before us?

17 MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir.

18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So, colleagues, we have a well-
19 deserved month off. I'm sure Ms. Schellin and the team will be
20 working hard. But, first, I want to thank the staff, and I'm
21 not going to call out any particular staff or names; all the
22 staff, you know what you do, you know how you support us. And I
23 said this yesterday; we show up once or twice a week, and the
24 staff is always -- they have us very well prepared for what we
25 do. It's not always easy, but I want the staff to know -- and

1 even the ones who are behind the scenes and don't interact with
2 us all the time, we know that you all are a part of what we do
3 as well, so we want to thank everyone who works in the office,
4 everyone who works in Office of Zoning. We appreciate all of
5 you all do, from the Director on down, and especially those who
6 make sure -- they make us look good. So, you know, we show up,
7 like I said, twice a week. They make us look good.

8 But I, too, want to thank my colleagues. You know,
9 it's all right for us -- I always say it's all right for us to
10 disagree. Sometimes I like to disagree, because then, that way,
11 we can go a little harder. And I -- and, you know, I'm going to
12 be frankly honest, I really like disagreeing with Commissioner
13 Wright, but I learn from her, and I think we come up with
14 outcomes. And one thing I want to say, Commissioner Stidham's a
15 great person to work for, Commissioner Imamura, Commissioner
16 Wright, and Commissioner Miller and I have been friends, but we
17 disagree, but we -- but I'm going to tell you, with all those
18 disagreements, we come up with better outcomes. It's not always
19 appreciated, but we come up with better outcomes. So I want to
20 thank my colleagues for all the work that you all put into this.
21 Also, I want to thank all the stakeholders.

22 Now, for some reason, I feel like this month is going
23 to go by fast, because every August that we're off, I know Ms.
24 Schellin and I -- I'm always calling Ms. Schellin with issues,
25 and I want the public to know that the Office of Zoning never

1 stops. Even though the Commission takes a month, Ms. Schellin
2 and Ms. Bardin and others, I have a lot of comments I direct to
3 them, and they work all through the month of August, as they
4 continue to do. So I want to -- I appreciate everybody, and I
5 just wanted to say that. And I hope, my colleagues, you all
6 enjoy the 30 days off. Now, it'll go quick, but enjoy the 30
7 days, because it's well deserved. Anybody else have anything
8 else? If not --

9 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Well, I thank you for doing the
10 Academy Awards' thank yous, so I don't have to do any of them.
11 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

12 CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. And I'm going to say this,
13 and I'm going to end. Vice Chair, I'm going to get you another
14 shirt. It's not going to have that on it, but I'm going to get
15 you another shirt.

16 VICE CHAIR MILLER: It's going to have the New York
17 Giants on it, I know.

18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. So, with that, this meeting
19 is adjourned. Y'all enjoy the month off. Thanks.

20 (Whereupon, the above-entitled public meeting was
21 adjourned at 5:34 p.m.)

22

23

24

25

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

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Public Meeting

Before: DC Zoning Commission

Date: 07-30-26

Place: Webex Videoconference

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



Deborah B. Gauthier