GOVERNMENT OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

In the Matter of:	)	
	)	
401 14TH ST SW 2025, LLC –	)	Z.C. Case No. 26-06
ZONING MAP AMENDMENT AT	)	
401 14TH STREET, S.W.	)	
(SQUARE 231, LOT 803;	)	
PARCEL 316/16)	)	
	)	
REGULAR PUBLIC HEARING	)	

Pages: 1 through 54

Place: Washington, D.C.

Date: November 2, 2026

HERITAGE REPORTING CORPORATION
Official Reporters
1150 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 305
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 628-4888
contracts@hrcreporters.com

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ZONING COMMISSION

In the Matter of:	)	
	)	
401 14TH ST SW 2025, LLC –	)	Z.C. Case No. 26-06
ZONING MAP AMENDMENT AT	)	
401 14TH STREET, S.W.	)	
(SQUARE 231, LOT 803;	)	
PARCEL 316/16)	)	
	)	
REGULAR PUBLIC HEARING	)	

Monday,
November 2, 2026

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

APPEARANCES:

Zoning Commission:

ANTHONY J. HOOD, Chairman
ROBERT MILLER, Vice Chair
CHRISTINE BRUINS, Commissioner
JOSEPH IMAMURA, Commissioner
GWEN MARCUS WRIGHT, Commissioner

Office Of Zoning Staff:

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

Office Of Zoning Legal Division Staff:

HILLARY LOVICK, Esquire

APPEARANCES: (Cont'd)

On Behalf of the Applicant:

MARTIN SULLIVAN, Esquire
Sullivan & Barros, LLP

For the Office of the Attorney General:

NOELLE WURST, Esquire
Office of the Attorney General, Housing and Environmental Justice Section

For the Office of Planning:

PHILIP BRADFORD, Development Review Specialist

C O N T E N T S

ITEM:	PAGE
Introduction	4
Preliminary Matters	6
Applicant's Presentation	8
Questions/Comments from Commissioners	15
Presentation by Office of Attorney General	23
Questions/Comments from Commissioners	30
Presentation by Office of Planning	36
Questions/Comments from Commissioners	38
Summary of ANC Reports	43
Motion and Vote on Proposed Action	50

P R O C E E D I N G S

(4:00 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. It's 4:00. Mr. Young, can you start the recording please? Okay. 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 Imamura, and Commissioner Bruins, as well as Commissioner Wright, who should be joining us shortly. We're also joined by the Office of Zoning staff, Ms. Sharon Schellin, and the Office of Zoning Legal Division, Ms. Hillary Lovick. Mr. Paul Young will be handling all of our virtual operations.

And while I'm on that, I want to thank Mr. Brian Lampert. Even though he's not going far -- he was serving the Zoning Commission, and now he's moving back over to the BZA -- we'll see him soon, but we want to thank him for all his great work that he's done. And I think he worked on this case along with, as usual, Ms. Lovick, who works on all of them, I'm sure. But want to thank him for all what he's done for the Zoning Commission, and we wish him much success still as we transition from time to time over to the BZA.

The virtual public hearing notice is available on the Office of Zoning's website. This proceeding is being recorded by a court reporter, and it's 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 login or call-in instructions, or if you have not signed up to testify.

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

The subject of this evening's hearing is Zoning Commission Case No. 26-06. This is the 401 14th Street SW 2025 LLC map amendment from unzoned to D-8 in Square 0231, Lot 0803, Parcel 316/16. Again, today's date is November 2nd, 2026.

The hearing will be conducted in accordance with the provisions of 11-Z DCMR Chapter 4 as follows: preliminary matters, applicant's case -- the applicant has up to 60 minutes. I don't believe they need 60 minutes, but we'll see

how much time they need, maybe 15. Report of other government agencies -- we will then have the Department of Transportation, then the report of the Office of Planning, report of the ANC. I believe we have two ANCs, and we have some preliminary matters that -- Ms. Schellin will tee us up when we get to that. Testimony of organizations and individuals, each -- organizations, five minutes, and individuals, three minutes, respectively, and we'll hear in the order from those in support, opposition, and undeclared. Then we'll have rebuttal and closing by the applicant.

At this time, the Commission will consider any preliminary matters. Does the staff have any preliminary matters?

MS. SCHELLIN: Very briefly, there are three motions, waivers that need to be addressed. The first one, from the applicant, their Notice of Intent, they did not serve on one of the ANCs, that being ANC 6D. However, they have been in touch with ANC 6D, and -- so that is the first waiver request, that they did not serve them 45 days prior to the filing. But once that was served by the Office of Zoning, once we referred it, the applicant stated that they were in communication before and after setdown. So that's the first one, if the Commission would -- you can rule on all of these by consensus if you prefer. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: If you just call all three of them,

I'm going to do them en banc.

MS. SCHELLIN: At one time? Sure.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yeah.

MS. SCHELLIN: And the second and third are both -- I could just do them both -- OP and the Office of -- or the Office of Planning, rather, and the DDOT submitted their reports less than 10 days prior to the hearing, so they are both asking for a waiver for the late submission. Those are the three waivers.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Schellin. Colleagues, you've heard the three waivers as captioned by Ms. Schellin, and I think that all of them are warranted, are fine. I don't think anyone's being prejudiced through our granting these waivers. Can we do that by general consensus? Any objections? Any objections? No objections. Not seeing any nos, so Ms. Schellin, all three of those waivers are approved.

MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. Initially, the applicant had submitted their application with a request for exemption from IZ -- however, at Exhibit 16, they did submit a withdrawal for that request. So they are moving forward with IZ+ being applied. At Exhibit A -- I'm sorry, at Exhibit 20, ANC 2A submitted their report in support, provided that the applicant continue with IZ+ and that the application is consistent with the presentation that their ANC received.

As of Friday, and I just looked very quickly, I did

not see a report from ANC 6D yet. The applicant may be able to shed some light on that. The OP hearing report and their waiver was at Exhibits 24 and 24A; they recommend approval with IZ+ to rezone from unzoned to D-8. The DDOT report at Exhibit 21 shows no objection of the map amendment and expects the applicant will, of course, continue coordination when it eventually goes through the permitting process. And the Office of the Attorney General, at Exhibits 18 and 22, their PowerPoint presentation, they submitted a letter of support. And so I will turn this over to the Commission. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Schellin. Let's bring up the applicant -- or the counsel. I think Ms. Wilson or Mr. Sullivan.

MS. SCHELLIN: It's going to be Mr. Sullivan, and they asked for 15 minutes or less, so I'll let him let you know for sure how much time he'll need.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right.

MS. SCHELLIN: And he'll be the only one, I believe, for the applicant this evening.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, thank you. Mr. Sullivan, you may begin, and you have 15 -- or whatever much time you need. Go right ahead.

MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you, Chairman Hood. I think we'll need probably about 10 minutes or so -- if we could load the PowerPoint. My name is Martin Sullivan, here on behalf of

the applicant in this case, map amendment case number 26-06 for 401 14th Street Southwest.

Currently, the property is unzoned. It was former federal land. Proposed zone is D-8, subject to IZ+. The current use -- it's vacant now. It was a former federal office building, and the agency that was in the space moved to the Mint building next door, I believe. Next slide, please.

There you see the property, where it says subject site on the lower left -- that's 14th Street to the right of it; it's the L-shaped building. Next slide, please -- on 14th Street Southwest between the Tidal Basin and L'Enfant Plaza, just south of the National Mall, beside the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and the Holocaust Memorial Museum.

It's unzoned because of its historic federal ownership. The GSA disposed of this building, known as the Liberty Loan Building, to private ownership. The abutting land to the east is zoned D-5 and D-8, and The Wharf area is MU-12, which lies to the south and the right there. The abutting land to the east -- I'm sorry. Walking distance of the Smithsonian and L'Enfant Plaza Metro stations, plus Metrobus, VRE, and Amtrak. It also happens to be within the 100- and 500-year floodplains and the jurisdiction of the Commission of Fine Arts. Next slide, please.

The request is to zone the property to D-8. No building permit or C of O can issue for privately owned land

until it is zoned, and D-8 is designed to transition federal land south of the National Mall into a mixed-use area with public and private ownership. The applicant consulted with the Office of Planning before selecting D-8 for its application. No specific development is proposed. This will be presumably an adaptive reuse of the Liberty Loan Building, anticipated -- hopefully with residential is what the applicant is looking at with development partners, but nothing has really been advanced so far. The property will be subject to IZ+.

The Office of Planning setdown report found the amendment not inconsistent with the Comp Plan and recommended IZ+. ANC 2A has voted in support. This property is in ANC 2A. It's across the street from ANC 6D. The applicant has met with 6D on two occasions, and a resolution in support -- so at their meeting on October 19th, they voted on a proposed resolution in support, and the vote failed to pass by a three-to-three vote, and so 6D effectively has no resolution to submit, as far as we know, from that meeting. DDOT has no objection to the approval of the map amendment, and Office of Attorney General also is recommending approval. Next slide, please.

Unzoned, so the current numbers are easy. It's not applicable. And there's the D-8 provisions. Of course, the property's subject to historic preservation, Commission of Fine Arts, and other variables that will likely limit any or much additional height. If there's any further development, the

expectation is it will be -- mostly be a conversion of the existing building. Next slide, please. Property is subject -- will be subject to IZ+. The initial request asked to apply standard IZ rather than IZ+, citing historic, floodplain, and site constraints, and just concerns about economic feasibility. And then the Office of Planning recommended IZ+, and also both ANCs were very much in favor of IZ+ as well, too, so the applicant withdrew that initial request. Next slide, please.

On the FLU Map -- the FLU Map designates the property currently Parks, Recreation, and Open Space, reflecting its historic federal ownership. Federal parklands are generally unzoned, and the FLUM is interpreted broadly and read with the Comp Plan text. The FLU Map is soft-edged. Adjacent, privately owned land is designated high-density commercial and mixed high-density residential/commercial. Office of Planning also noted the site's inclusion in Central Washington Policy Focus Area 2.7 implies development is anticipated and not PROS uses only. And the Commission has also handled, in two other cases, where portions of land that were -- or land was rezoned wherein a portion of that land was PROS-designated also. Next slide, please. Federal lands acknowledges the -- this is other general policy map consistency elements. Federal lands acknowledges the District's limited jurisdiction. It does not exempt land from the Comp Plan or require its use to stay static. And a Resilience Focus Area, future development must

address the 100-year and 500-year floodplains through siting and design. It is a Neighborhood Conservation Area, not identified by OP as an inconsistency; a disposed federal parcel differs from the residential neighborhoods that the designation protects. And the Office of Planning has also noted that zoning the site aligns with the intent of the Generalized Policy Map and allows adaptive reuse that adds vitality to the area. Next slide, please.

Here's more detailed information on the Central Washington Area Element and how it supports the approval of the map amendment. Next slide, please. And other citywide elements are also implicated as well, including land use, transportation, housing, environmental protection, and historic preservation. Regarding potential inconsistencies, which are noted by the Office of Planning and in our prehearing statement as well, those being three policies. Well, specifically the FLU Map designation, which is PROS, and then three policies: one, sustaining the federal workforce; federal workforce growth; and retaining federal employment. And we address these in page 24 and 25 of the prehearing statement. I'll try to summarize that quickly.

Notwithstanding the numerous policies across the Comp Plan that are advanced by this zoning map amendment, an evaluation of potential inconsistencies is required to demonstrate that the proposed D-8 Zone is not inconsistent with

the Comprehensive Plan. And citing Court of Appeals cases, our conclusion is that even where a proposal may be inconsistent with one or more individual policies, the Commission may approve the application if it finds that those inconsistencies are outweighed by other policies and considerations when the Comprehensive Plan is read as a whole. And for that reason, we believe the application overcomes -- on balance, overcomes the potential inconsistencies noted by the Office of Planning, and the Office of Planning agreed with that assessment in their report as well. Next slide, please.

Now, the Racial Equity Tool is in four parts handled on the following slides. Next slide, please. Shows the area -- bolded areas show the areas that address the racial equity review, including the Central Washington housing diversity element, neighborhood revitalization, production targets, mixed-income housing, and advancing diversity and equity. Next slide, please.

Community outreach and engagement -- the Notice of Intent was mailed to 2A and owners within 200 feet; an initial outreach to 2A and ANC 6D across the street in June shortly after filing the application. The applicant has attended two meetings of ANC 6D and attended ANC 2A's monthly meeting in October. The applicant withdrew its IZ+ exemption request after discussions with the Office of Planning and the ANC. And we have support from ANC 2A. And again, ANC 6D took no

position after a three-three vote. Map amendment impacts: there's no displacement. It's a vacant federal building. There's no current residents or tenants. This will allow new housing, including IZ+ affordable units, and it supports transit-oriented growth. Next slide, please.

Criteria by which the Commission shall evaluate through a racial equity lens. We noted displacement, there's no impact on that or indirect displacement; this will be new housing. Under the housing element, it permits housing where none is possible today, with IZ+. Transportation -- it's close to several Metro stations and a Metrobus line. And the physical/built environment: the streetscape improvements on 14th Street Southwest, subject to Commission of Fine Arts and historic preservation review. Jobs/economic opportunity: the ground floor

-- potential ground-floor retail, plus construction and building operations jobs in a transit-rich location. Community: outreach to 2A and 6D, and ANC 2A support. Next slide, please. And I think that might be it. Yes, that's it for the presentation, if you have any questions. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Sullivan. Let's see if we have any questions or comments. I'm going to start with -- if he doesn't mind -- Commissioner Imamura, then Commissioner Bruins. I almost said Vice Chair Wright. Commissioner Wright, then Vice Chair Miller. Commissioner

Imamura?

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Sullivan, for your succinct report or presentation tonight. I do have a question about ANC 6D -- and if you could just elaborate a bit more in terms of your conversation with them and how that went and where it went, and if there's any explanation for the vote.

MR. SULLIVAN: Sure. I will -- without claiming to speak for the ANC, of course, I'll describe our interactions with them. The applicant went to -- there were two in-person meetings, and the applicant attended both. At the first meeting, the understanding was that, if the applicant would drop the IZ+ exemption request, that the ANC would likely be supportive. And after that meeting, we received an email from one of the commissioners with several demands about any potential development, and -- which we couldn't really address because there's no development proposed. And so we went back. And after that, once we dropped the IZ exemption request, we were told by the chair that the ANC would be supportive and there was nothing else needed to be done. And then the applicant went back to the full meeting, and for some reason it was a three-three vote and -- without comment from the opponents when they voted no. So that's all I know about it.

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: All right. Well, thank you for the explanation and shedding a little more light on that.

I think this is a rather exciting opportunity here and has a lot of potential. We know there will be a design review associated with whatever takes shape here, but this is sort of the impetus for bigger moves, I think, for the Federal Center Southwest area here in the city.

So I think it's a rather exciting opportunity here, and -- not for this conversation today, but we know because of its location and adjacent in viewshed of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial and other significant commemorative works, I think that'll be important to at least be in dialogue design-wise with those significant pieces of commemorative works, and hope that -- you know, there's a significant story behind this particular building, not the site necessarily, but certainly hope that that comes out, too, in whatever project manifests from here, so as -- at least to tell part of the American story.

In terms of -- I don't think I have any other questions, Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Chair, but appreciate the opportunity, and again, thank you for your presentation. I yield back.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner Imamura. Commissioner Bruins, any questions, comments?

COMMISSIONER BRUINS: My only question was to get more information on the 6D meeting, so I think that's been covered to the extent it can. And I'll just sort of say this

is an exciting project. I walk by it every day, and I look forward to what comes next. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Commissioner Wright?

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Thank you. I share the sentiment that Commissioner Bruins just articulated. We know that there's going to -- that there are going to be a number of federal buildings that are going to be repurposed, that are not going to be used as federal office buildings. And, you know, this may be the first in a series of these types of cases.

So I think it is appropriate to move forward with this rezoning. I think it is consistent with the general plan and the Future Land Use Map. I think it is, as has been stated by both of the previous folks who spoke, Commissioner Imamura and Commissioner Bruins, it is important to, you know, go through the appropriate design review processes to really have it be a project of the highest quality. And I'm looking forward to seeing what ends up happening on this site, so I am in support of the proposed map amendment. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Commissioner Wright. Vice Chair Miller?

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Mr. Sullivan, for the presentation of this map amendment for the former Liberty Loan Building to zone it from unzoned to D-8, which is, I think, essentially a downtown zone:

mixed use, high-density residential and high-density commercial permitted. Can you just -- I align myself with, to use an expression that the BZA colleagues use often, align myself with my colleagues' statements and questions. One question I had was, Mr. Sullivan, the applicant is 401 14th Street SW 2025 LLC. Can you enlighten us on who are the principals of this LLC applicant?

MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, the principal is a man named Vinny Raj, R-A-J. And I thought he was going to be attending, but I don't see him here, so maybe he didn't get in here. But he's been the -- I believe, I don't know if it's sole member or not, but he's definitely the lead principal in that, and he's been involved with GSA and OP and the city throughout this whole process. And he may be --

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yeah, I didn't --

MR. SULLIVAN: He has talked to certain development partners just informally, but nothing's -- nothing really is put together yet. But that's -- his expectation is that he would work with a District developer, housing developer of some kind, in partnership with them.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yeah, I didn't have any questions for the principals. I just was curious -- not curious -- I wanted to have on the public record who one of the principals was. And was it Mr. Raj or the LLC that purchased the property from GSA that put it out for disposal?

MR. SULLIVAN: Yes. Yeah, it was -- I believe that process started in 2024 when GSA initially announced that it would be disposing of the building in April 2024. And he closed on this sometime last spring or summer. It was late spring, early summer, I believe, was the closing.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: And this doesn't -- my questions really don't have anything to do with the map amendment, but I'm just curious, and I think the public might be. What was the purchase price from -- if there was a purchase price from GSA?

MR. SULLIVAN: Geez, I don't know offhand.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay.

MR. SULLIVAN: Yeah.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: And the footprint of the Liberty Loan Building, that may be in the public record, do you happen to know that -- what that footprint --

MR. SULLIVAN: I could find it for you.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay.

MR. SULLIVAN: But I don't have it right in front of me.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Oh, and I --

MR. SULLIVAN: It's -- let me see. So we've got -- the additional parcel was 1.17 acres, and the existing building -- hmm. Stalling for time waiting for the text to come through from my office. Sorry, I don't have that. I can find it. I

can get it for you in minutes.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: No, it's okay. The Office of Planning may have that in their report or off the top of their head. Okay. I appreciate the applicant's community engagement. Was it the principal that was there, or you were there on behalf of the applicant at the ANC meetings?

MR. SULLIVAN: We attended the 2A meeting, and the principal was in there in person for the 6D meetings, Mr. Raj.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Well, I agree with my colleagues that this is an exciting opportunity for the -- that whole conversion of the federal southwest corridor into a livable, walkable community of commercial and residential. Hopefully some federal office leases will still be around to rent some of the commercial office, but maybe not in this climate.

There was a recent master plan I think I saw that -- I don't know if -- that NCPC developed for the whole federal -- there may be one in the latest iteration of the master plan for that conversion of the corridor. And I know that -- I think, just from public reports, I think I saw -- I don't know if it's been approved by NCPC or anyone yet, but it was presented, I think, by NCPC staff. And this appears to be -- this map amendment and the development that it would facilitate, the mixed-use development that it would facilitate, seems to be consistent with what's envisioned for -- I guess this is the

end of what's called the Tidal Basin Quarter in that master plan.

So that's just commentary on my part. Thank you, Mr. Sullivan, and I look forward to seeing the development project move forward. That's it, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SULLIVAN: And thank you, Commissioner Miller. If I may just say, 120,422 square feet is the land area -- I don't know the building footprint -- and that's made up of 69,000 square feet for the existing property, and then about a 1 acre -- 1.1 acre abutting the property was added, was part of the deal as well.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Right. And it is a very prominent location, as you and my colleagues have pointed out, incredibly prominent. And Commission of Fine Arts, as you've noted and I think as OP's report notes, is -- will have jurisdiction over design review, so --

MR. SULLIVAN: Oh, the Zoning Commission actually will have a special exception under the design review standards for any conversion of change of use and any changes to the structure. So it's definitely coming before the Commission again when it's proposed for use.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Right. Well, that's certainly appropriate, and I look forward to -- we look forward to seeing that. Thank you, Mr. Sullivan. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. I want to thank all of my

colleagues for your questions and comments. This is going to be reviewed out. It's going to be a lot of review around here. I do have one -- not necessarily a question, but a comment. I'm not too concerned about 6D because I believe -- Mr. Sullivan, you can correct me -- Gottlieb Simon is the chair of 6D. Am I correct?

MR. SULLIVAN: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: And Gottlieb Simon basically opened up the ANC office, so if there's anybody that knows ANCs, it's Gottlieb Simon. So I don't know what's all going on there, but I'll leave it where it is, and we'll just go ahead and continue with what we have here in the record, so thank you. Any follow-up questions, comments? Anybody? Okay. Ms. Schellin, do we have anyone here from either one of the ANCs, either 2A or 6D?

MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. Let's see what we've got here. Mr. Young, would you check and see if we have either Gottlieb Simon or if we have -- for ANC 2A? I'm not sure how to pronounce --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I don't see either. I don't see either one.

MS. SCHELLIN: -- Ms. Patel or Mr. Patel, Trupti Patel?

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I just went ahead and did -- we don't have either one. I don't see them.

MS. SCHELLIN: Neither one? Okay.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: But Mr. Young, check behind me because I did a quick cursor --

MS. SCHELLIN: Trupti, is that how you say it?

MR. YOUNG: I don't see either of them.

MS. SCHELLIN: Either of them? Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. All right. Let's keep moving. Thank you. Let's go to report of other agencies. Do we have, I think, the Office of Attorney General? I know they submitted a PowerPoint. Are they here, Ms. Schellin?

MS. SCHELLIN: Ms. Noelle --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, I see Ms. Wurst. Yeah, Ms. Wurst. Okay. Ms. Wurst, you go right ahead, ma'am.

MS. SCHELLIN: Oh, Wurst. I'm sorry, Wurst.

MS. WURST: Yes, thank you. One moment. All right. Perfect. Just making -- my equipment is working properly. All right, thanks, Mr. Young.

All right. Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Noelle Wurst, and I am testifying on behalf of the Office of the Attorney General in support of this proposed map amendment. These slides can be found at Exhibit No. 22, and the written version of our testimony can be found at Exhibit No. 18. Next, please.

All right. In summary, OAG is recommending tonight that the Zoning Commission approve the proposed map amendment

to the D-8 zone, a high-density, you know, downtown zone with IZ+. This rezoning is consistent with the Comp Plan's land use maps' guidance and does have quite a bit of promise in advancing numerous policies supporting increased density for housing, especially in the Central Washington area, affordable housing near transit, both Metrorail and Metrobus, and the adaptive use of quite the iconic, historic, and disposed-of federal property, which is the Liberty Loan Building here. Next, please.

All right. There are three major categories of Comp Plan policies that inform our analysis here. You know, the first one is the Comp Plan's focus on addressing the District's affordable housing crisis, which is, of course, one of the kind of foundations of OAG's advocacy here. The Comp Plan calls to address rising housing costs, of course, driven by rising demand, being one of the most pressing and critical issues facing the District today, which has resulted ultimately in a crisis of housing affordability for many residents. It also calls to use zoning processes and incentives to raise by-right height and density limits, thus supporting greater affordable housing set-asides. And for the Central Washington planning area specifically, it calls to promote high-density, mixed-use, and mixed-income development in order to create a vibrant collection of central neighborhoods. Furthermore, the Comp Plan also calls out the utilization of any sort of government

property disposition for more affordable units especially.

Second is addressing the need for more housing near transit. So the Comp Plan encourages the location of new affordable and market-rate housing near Metrorail and Metrobus stations, which ultimately reduces transportation costs, decreasing the reliance on cars, for instance, and thus increasing affordability for residents. This in turn serves to support and enhance neighborhood-serving retail and other businesses with increased pedestrian traffic.

The Comp Plan also features several policies addressing the use of former federal sites and the adaptive reuse of historic properties, as well as disposed federal properties. The Comp Plan calls to integrate these former federal sites into the surrounding fabric of neighborhoods in the Central Employment Area of the District, or CEA. Development, furthermore, should be mixed-use and mixed income, you know, calling back to the Comp Plan's overall housing goals, but in this case, in this area, especially to support downtown economic prosperity and vibrancy. The Comp Plan encourages the reuse of existing historic buildings to provide more housing generally, and affordable housing alongside non-residential uses. Furthermore, it also calls to preserve the scale and character of the CEA's historic resources -- and the wrinkle here, of course, being that the Liberty Loan Building is subject to certain regulations pertaining to historic

buildings but doesn't have other official designations as a historic landmark. But either way, it is a long-standing building for sure and has definitely become an iconic one along the corridor. Next, please.

And to briefly review the Comprehensive Plan's maps applicable to the case, the site is located in the FLUM designation calling for Parks, Recreation, and Open Space, which does include the federal and District park systems. Though federal parklands are generally unzoned, district parklands tend to be zoned the same as surrounding land uses. So the analysis in our written testimony uses that as its core analogy -- You know, taking a look at the changing use from a former institutional or federal site to one that is, well, residential or mixed use. And in this case, the Comp Plan prescribes that the new designations should be comparable in density or intensity to those in the vicinity, unless, of course, otherwise stated. Here, I'd note that immediately surrounding the site are properties zoned D-6 and D-8, which, again, are designated for high-density, mixed-use development with a balance of office, retail, and other uses. Therefore, application of the D-8 zone would be appropriate and consistent with the FLUM.

And briefly revisiting the Generalized Policy Map, or GPM, the GPM designates the property as federal lands, which is more of a bit of a relic designation in this particular case

due to the sale of the property, and also as a Neighborhood Conservation Area with this Resilience Focus overlay. And since the Resilience Focus overlay focuses more on the kind of environmental standards applicable to particular projects, our analysis focuses a little less on that, though noting that any future project will have to be subject to that. The NCA designation does accommodate change that is modest in scale and anticipates some new development and reuse opportunities as guided by Comp Plan policies in the FLUM.

As I have just discussed with the FLUM, ultimately this change to a D-8 zoning would be consistent with the character of the surrounding properties and the surrounding up-and-coming neighborhood, so to speak. Therefore, you see how the FLUM and GPM designations ultimately encourage this change to a higher density downtown zone. Next, please.

All right, and once more, just a couple of points on the neighborhood context of the Liberty Loan Building. Of course, the property is one of several unzoned federal properties south of the National Mall marked for disposal and now has been sold. That being said, rezoning will ultimately advance the Comp Plan's housing and affordable housing policies by accommodating this creative creation, if you will, of residential density in Central Washington and the CEA. Furthermore, this will be located near key transit corridors such as the L'Enfant Metro station, Smithsonian -- I believe to

some extent that Federal Triangle, for the walkers out there, is proximate; the other Metrobus lines are proximate to it as well -- and ultimately the adaptive reuse of a vacant building. Furthermore, this rezoning will streamline any sort of future development on site, allowing a whole new suite of matter-of-right changes and, in some cases, bypassing the need for special exception review, though as the applicant and the commissioners just noted, there is already kind of a package of review that needs to be brought forth. But this rezoning does help bypass certain portions of this. Next, please.

And also, OAG wanted to highlight its application of IZ+ standards to the site, once again highlighting that the purpose of IZ+ is to ultimately encourage affordable housing where it's needed, with exceptions possible if the planning area has already achieved its affordable housing goal. And this is especially important given the fact that the Housing Equity Report's interim deadline had already passed in 2025, so now we're taking a look at planning areas that are looking to catch up.

Also, fully evaluating any sort of financial, logistical, or other impacts of the development constraints on site -- though OAG acknowledges the potential difficulties of these on development, we ultimately have to argue that this is at most speculative without any sort of a project or at least hypothetical development scenarios present. And of course, the

purpose of a map amendment hearing, or rather -- a map amendment hearing does not necessarily concern itself with a future project, but we do have to acknowledge that it's difficult to evaluate those constraints fully.

And once more, I'd like to highlight the fact that the Housing Equity Report set the Central Washington Planning Area's goal, an interim goal of just over 1,000 units by 2025, and the most recent data showed that it is only at about 88 percent of its target. So it's very close, but definitely too soon to foreclose any additional opportunities for affordable housing in the planning area. Next, please.

So to conclude, OAG does recommend approving the proposed map amendment with IZ+. Doing so will meaningfully advance the Comp Plan's vision for a more equitable and inclusive city by streamlining future development of housing on site through this intended adaptive reuse of a former and longtime vacant federal building. Additionally, this will help Central Washington achieve its affordable housing goal, and I think this is shaping up to be an interesting model for future development of federally disposed properties as well, so OAG certainly looks forward to monitoring those cases as they come up in the future.

And that is all from me. Thank you, and I will be happy to take any questions that the Commissioners or the applicant might have.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Wurst. I'm going to start off before I go to Commissioner Imamura. I'm trying to figure out when you give us -- at least this report and in many reports, are you giving us this -- and this is something I probably will ask the attorney general too -- when you're giving us reports, are you giving us from a planning perspective?

Let me just tell you what I look for. I look, when I hear from OAG, and I know we have our set of -- I look for more of a legal analysis. Are you, when you -- and I'm trying to figure out you all's intentions. Your intentions are to give us a legal analysis through planning, or give us a planning report, because there's some of the same things I -- or are you checking the planning of it? I'm trying to figure out -- what is the shift. I mean, what is the outcome that OAG is trying to give to the Commission?

MS. WURST: Sure. So of course, our reports are rooted in the legal analysis of any case, with the legal analysis, of course, being rooted in analysis of the Comprehensive Plan and its policies. I do admit that quite a bit of that analysis of the Comp Plan being the legal standard here involves taking a look at the contextual aspects of a case too. You know, one can't say -- you know, fully evaluate consistency with the Comp Plan's call for additional, say, affordable housing without taking a look at other planning

documents at case here.

I do note that as a general practice, in looking to adapt our written reports for presentation before the Zoning Commission here, and of course the public, we do leave more of our citations and nitty-gritty legal analysis in the written part. For instance, we go into some depth about the, say, compatibility analogy of the Parks, Recreation, and Open Space FLUM designation and potential legal wrinkles that the -- well, not legal wrinkles, so to speak, but potential legal questions when it comes to changing to a residential use on that site from a former federal or institutional. Here, we want to make sure that we cover the bases, make it clear and concise for members of the public. For those who want to dive deeply, that's what the written report is for.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So what I'm -- I mean, I'm not knocking it. I'm just trying to -- and I probably have asked this question before.

MS. WURST: Of course.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: But over time I forget. So -- because I'm sure I've asked some of your predecessors and even our own legal counsel. Now, you said something that I have been grappling with, and I've been hearing from the public as well, and I look to you as long -- as well, and I've had this conversation with our legal counsel -- this one, the one before that, and the one before that. We talk about doing these

amendments, map amendments. We always say we're not talking about a project, so we can't give a full analysis. So that has been a sticking point, so, you know, when I look to the legal folks to help me figure that out -- or is that just the way it is? So when I heard you say that, I'm looking -- do you all have a resolution for that or you're just saying we can't go that far in our analysis because of that situation? That's kind of what I'm trying to get at.

MS. WURST: Oh, yeah, of course. That's the latter. And our written report does have a little more detail on some of the factors that the applicant brought up in its initial ask for this waiver from IZ+. But here we wanted to reiterate the agency's stance that this is a policy that we see as something that is very productive for the city. There are other venues to talk about specific mechanisms within the IZ+ program that may need some reworking in the future, but that's a place where we wanted to highlight our position and ultimately affirm our agreement with OP on the application of IZ+ in this particular case.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right. I appreciate the conversation. I'm going to continue to have it because I'm actually looking --

MS. WURST: Of course.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: -- I'm trying to lean more on OAG for some things, even though I have our own legal counsel to help

me make sure stuff is legally sufficient as well. Even though we have a great legal counsel of our own -- so I'll leave it at that. All right. So thank you again, Ms. Wurst. Let's see if others have any questions. Commissioner Imamura?

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. No questions. Thank you, Ms. Wurst, for your presentation, and I think I align myself -- as Vice Chair Miller had said, align myself with the question that Chair Hood had asked, which I thought was very thoughtful, and look forward to more engagements from you.

MS. WURST: Yes, thank you. I just wanted to add that it's always tricky threading the needle when it comes to analyzing map amendment cases because it is tempting to look too forward, so to speak, to any sort of intended project on site. So here, we prefer to highlight what this project could -- or sorry, what this rezoning could facilitate, which is provision of additional housing, or provision, in some cases, of retail or other things that that community needs, rather than pointing to, "oh, the applicant is looking to add 30 additional units." That's not the subject of a map amendment hearing. But we do understand that it is very tempting to refer to any sort of projected project, so to speak.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: It is very tempting. That's why I'm asking that line of questioning, so thank you.

MS. WURST: Yes, of course.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioner Bruins, do you have any questions?

COMMISSIONER BRUINS: I do not. Thank you for your presentation.

MS. WURST: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Commissioner Wright?

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: No questions. Just want to say I really, really appreciate the reports from the OAG, and I think they're always very thoughtful and very well done. So I appreciate them.

MS. WURST: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, and Vice Chair Miller.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I align myself with Commissioner Wright's comments about OAG reports, and thank you for being here today, Ms. Wurst.

MS. WURST: Appreciate it. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: So that must be the new word. The other day I was on the BZA, and they were aligning. Everybody's aligning now, so I'm glad to hear that, so.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: I was there recently too, so it's in my -- on my brain, yeah.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yeah, okay.

MS. WURST: It's a useful word.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Aligning? Okay. There was another word we used previously, but I don't know, I can't think of

what it was. So Ms. Wurst, thank you. Let's see if we have any questions from Mr. Sullivan. Any questions of OAG?

MR. SULLIVAN: No, I do not. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. And I don't think we have anyone, right, Ms. Schellin, from either one of the ANCs, I think. I don't think. I don't want to step by them if we do. At least I want to confirm that for the record.

MS. SCHELLIN: Yeah. Yeah, let's look just to make sure that they didn't come on late. I did not see them, and I don't see them now.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Okay. Well, thank you.

MS. SCHELLIN: So, yep.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Thank you again, Ms. Wurst, for all the work that you all do, and looking forward to have those conversations as we move forward. Thank you. All right.

MS. WURST: Yes, thank you as well.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. And I know we don't have anyone here from DDOT. We usually don't for map amendments, I don't think.

MS. SCHELLIN: Right. No one signed up.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let's go to -- who is it, Ms. Brown-Roberts? No, it's not Ms. Brown-Roberts.

MS. SCHELLIN: It'll be Philip Bradford.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Bradford, yeah. Let's go to Mr.

Bradford, Office of Planning.

MR. BRADFORD: Good -- can you all hear me?

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, we can.

MR. BRADFORD: Thank you. Good evening, Chairman Hood, Commissioners. For the record, my name is Philip Bradford, Development Review Specialist with the D.C. Office of Planning. OP recommends that the Zoning Commission approve Case No. 26-06 to rezone Square 231, Lot 804, and Parcel 316/16, located at 401 14th Street Southwest, which is currently unzoned, to D-8. On balance, the proposed D-8 zone is not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan policies, the FLUM, and the Generalized Policy Map. OP also continues to recommend IZ+ for the property. The Future Land Use Map indicates that most of the site is appropriate for Parks, Recreation, and Open Space. Guidelines for interpreting the FLUM state that it shall be interpreted broadly and is intended to be soft-edged.

The property is developed with a large building and is surrounded by other high-density development, either unzoned and under federal ownership or zoned D-5 or D-8 and under private ownership. The property is included on many other Comprehensive Plan maps, such as the Central Employment Area and the L'Enfant Plaza/Near Southwest/Maryland Avenue Policy Focus Area of the Central Washington Area Element, which recommends high-density mixed-use development and a mixed-use

transformation of the Southwest Federal properties into a mixed-use neighborhood.

The site's inclusion on these other maps implies that development is envisioned to occur on the site, which contrasts with the Parks, Recreation, and Open Space designation. The Generalized Policy Map identifies the property as federal lands, which is appropriate as the site was federal land prior to its sale to a private owner. It is also within the Neighborhood Conservation Area and Resilience Focus Area.

With many vacant or underutilized buildings in the area, the rezoning and potential redevelopment of the site would allow the property to add new vitality and enhance the character of the neighborhood. The D-8 zone continues to be the most applicable zone for the subject property, as it is intended and recommended for sites transitioning out of federal ownership south of the National Mall.

When evaluated through a racial equity lens, the proposal will not be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The map amendment would allow the adaptive reuse of this prominent historic building with a wide variety of permitted uses in the zone, which could allow it to become new offices, add new employment opportunities, or supply much-needed new residential units in a transit-rich area.

OP continues to recommend IZ+ as part of the requested map amendment. The Central Washington Planning Area

is currently at 88 percent of achieving its target affordable housing goal. OP is also pleased to see the applicant withdraw its request to be exempt from IZ+. Should residential units be constructed on the property, IZ+ should help the Central Washington Planning Area get closer to its housing production goals set by the mayor.

Again, OP recommends approval of the proposed rezoning to the D-8 zone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I'm happy to answer any questions. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Mr. Bradford. Always a great report. Let's see what others may have. Commissioner Imamura, any questions, comments?

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: No. No questions or comments. Mr. Bradford, thank you for your report.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioner Bruins, any questions, comments?

COMMISSIONER BRUINS: Just a question. So the applicant had stated that working with you, you had determined D-8 was the most appropriate zone and still feel that, even with D-5 and D-8 surrounding -- and I'm just wondering if you can elaborate a little bit on the difference between D-8 and D-5 and why you determined D-8 was most appropriate for this site.

MR. BRADFORD: Yes. Commissioner Bruins, I don't believe you were on the Zoning Commission at the time this

application was set down. I did cover that in the setdown presentation.

The D-8/5 zone is an area specifically in -- the purpose statement for that zone says that is a transfer of develop -- it's for properties that receive transfer of development rights from other areas in that vicinity, and this project, given it was unzoned, wouldn't be subject to a transfer of development rights situation. And the D-8 zone specifically says south of the Mall, which this is -- I know it's kind of in an odd location, but it's still south and fits the description of the purpose of the D-8 zone most closely out of the adjacent D zones in the area, which is why we believe that the applicant has correctly requested D-8 for the property.

COMMISSIONER BRUINS: All right. Fabulous. Thank you for that detailed explanation, and sorry I missed it at the original meeting. Thank you very much. No further questions.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Commissioner Wright?

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: No questions. Thank you for the report from Office of Planning.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. And Vice Chair Miller.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Mr. Bradford, for the Office of Planning's analysis and conclusions about the site's consistency with the comprehensive plan and other issues. I agree with your -- with

OP's analysis. Do you have a sense of -- in the current envelope of this building, several people -- maybe even your report -- alludes to adaptive reuse and compatibility, and of course, the D-8 zone permits certain maximums, but this will be subject to design review by federal and District authorities. But in the current existing envelope of the building, do you have a sense of how much square feet -- well, how much square feet of office was in the Liberty Loan Building, and how much residential could be, if it was all residential, would be in that building?

And I realize it possibly could be expanded if compatible and all those design review bodies approve it. But in the existing envelope, do you have a sense of what the number -- well, square footage of residential and then, of course, the IZ+, I think is -- correct me if I'm wrong, would be 20 percent of the any total residential square footage would be the -- have to meet the affordable standards in IZ+?

MR. BRADFORD: Off the top of my head, I'm not 100 percent sure of the exact square feet of the building. That may be in the report. I also believe the applicant might have said that the -- no, he said the footprint, but not the internal square footage. So I'm not 100 percent sure on that.

But then to also clarify, I believe, and I could be wrong because I'm not in the IZ+ section of the Zoning Regulations all the time, but I believe the IZ+ only applies to

new square footage within that building. The existing square footage, I believe, is exempt from IZ+. So if they were to build a penthouse, or not a -- an additional story, the IZ+ would apply to that GFA and not the existing GFA of the building; would just be regular IZ for that. And then obviously the penthouse regulations have their own IZ requirements that are separate from IZ and IZ+.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: I appreciate that clarification and that, I guess, reminder to me and others that -- I guess, conversions, is what you're saying, are -- of existing space are not subject to IZ currently under our regulations.

MR. BRADFORD: Subject to, but only additional square footage --

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Right.

MR. BRADFORD: -- or GFA would be --

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Right.

MR. BRADFORD: Subject to the IZ+ of the site.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Right. And do you know what the -- so D-8 would permit 130 feet in height. Do you know what the height is of this building, which seems consistent with the height generally of the other buildings nearby, but is it 130, or is it 110, or do you know?

MR. BRADFORD: I am not sure the height off the top of my head, but it is much lower than 110, I believe -- or 130. I think it's only five or six floors, so I would venture to

say, like, at max, I think it's probably 75 to 80, if I had to guess. But as part of the map amendment, the applicant obviously did not submit building plans, given that's not a requirement, so.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Right. I was just trying to -- I was just trying to get a sense of the potential for redevelopment of the existing envelope and what potential there is for expansion, given -- but realizing that there are constraints, design constraints and others involved. Okay. Well, thank you very much. I appreciate your answers to those questions and for your report today. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Great, thank you. And thank you as well, Mr. Bradford. Always, as I said earlier, a great report. We appreciate all the work that goes into the reporting. Mr. Sullivan, do you have any cross of Office of Planning?

MR. SULLIVAN: No, I do not. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. And again, we -- I don't believe we have anyone from ANC. We've checked three times, and so far, they have not announced that they are here, so we've done that for the record. Thank you as always, Mr. Bradford. We appreciate it.

All right, Ms. Schellin. I'm going to go -- can you call those who are here to testify? Oh, okay. I'm going to call those who are to testify here in support or opposition. And Vice Chair, if you could look at the ANC report and just --

oh, you got it already? Okay. Well, look, before we do that, we'll go to the Vice Chair to just give us a summation of the ANC reports.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Well, Ms. Schellin covered it, but at Exhibit 20, we have a report, a letter to you, Mr. Chairman, dated October 23rd from ANC 2A -- from Trupti Patel, the ANC 2A chairperson, reporting that the ANC supported at -- with six commissioners present, the commission voted five to one to zero to support this map amendment, provided that the applicant continues to agree to be subject to IZ+ and that the application is consistent with the presentation that ANC 2A received from the applicant. So that is the ANC 2A report in support at Exhibit 20.

And as Mr. Sullivan stated and Ms. Schellin alluded to, we do not have a report from ANC 6D. Mr. Sullivan stated that he -- the applicant met with them twice, but they put up a resolution in support which got a three-to-three vote, so that it did not pass. And so there is -- there was no resolution approved by ANC 6D and none submitted to us to date.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Thank you, Vice Chair, for putting that on the record. Let's -- did I -- yeah. Mr. Sullivan, I asked you did you have any questions of Office of Planning, right?

MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, you did. But I do have a piece of information to add if you'd like. The building is 174,000

square feet in gross floor area.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Well, thank you, Mr. Sullivan. And I would report that in response to my question about the purchase price, according to my research online here, it was approximately $17,000,000 from several different news sources, according to Google and AI.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

MR. SULLIVAN: That sounds right. I mean, so I would've guessed at something around that, just -- I wasn't involved in the transaction, so I don't like to presume that I know exactly what that number is unless I know for sure.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: And it has nothing to do with the map amendment, so -- but thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well, Vice Chair, if you purchase it, let me know. I may want to rent some space from you. Okay. Ms. Schellin, let's go to anyone who's here in support, opposition, or undeclared. I think we can get everybody in there.

MS. SCHELLIN: We sure can, because there's only two.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let's bring them up.

MS. SCHELLIN: Sure. We have Devon Coleman, undeclared, and Judy Klevins, opponent, and that's it.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. We'll start off with Devon Coleman, if we can bring Devon Coleman up. Devon Coleman? I don't see Devon Coleman.

MR. YOUNG: I don't see him on. He was on earlier, but I don't see him anymore.

MS. SCHELLIN: I -- yeah, I was going to say he was just on there a little bit ago.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yeah. And it's her. Devon is her.

MS. SCHELLIN: It's her, yeah. She was on just a few minutes ago. She -- oh, she's on there.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: She is?

MS. SCHELLIN: Let's see. Yeah. Make a panelist. Let's try again.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, okay.

MS. SCHELLIN: Oh, maybe not. I just -- maybe I need to refresh.

MR. YOUNG: Yeah, you need to refresh the attendees list.

MS. SCHELLIN: Yeah. See, they stopped that. Now they're back to having you refresh. Okay. Yep, she's gone.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

MS. SCHELLIN: Do I get another take?

CHAIRMAN HOOD: So what was the other name you called -- Klevins?

MS. SCHELLIN: Judy Klevins.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Klevins?

MS. SCHELLIN: Klevins. I'm sorry, Klevins.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Ms. Klevins. Ms. Klevins?

MS. SCHELLIN: Opponent. She's on as Klevins, yeah.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Klevins, can you unmute? Ms. Klevins, you can go now if you can unmute -- at the bottom of your computer where it says mute and unmute. Ms. Klevins, if you have your phone, you can call 202-727-0789.

MS. SCHELLIN: Actually, if she could just change that to my cell number? Just call me at --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Don't give your cell number out.

MS. SCHELLIN: No?

CHAIRMAN HOOD: You're going to get all kinds of calls.

MS. SCHELLIN: That's true too. Ms. Klevins, in the bottom left corner, you'll see mute and unmute at the very bottom if you just scroll your mouse at the bottom of your screen. Just scroll it down at the bottom. On the left-hand side, do you see anything at the bottom? The first thing should be mute and unmute. And then video.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let's do this. If she could just go ahead and use her phone and call, that might be easier if you can hear us.

MS. SCHELLIN: Yeah, we've sent a request to unmute to her. I have twice, and she's not unmuting. Let me see if I can find her phone number. She's calling in right now.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

MS. SCHELLIN: She's familiar with the Webex, but she

could not even switch her audio, so that's why she's calling in. So hopefully she'll be on very shortly.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Somebody make sure she's not in the waiting room.

MS. SCHELLIN: I'm in there watching.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, okay. Let's give her another minute or so, and then we'll figure something out.

All right. What I'm going to do, Ms. Schellin, we're going to go ahead and let Mr. Sullivan give us any closing, and if she brings something up, he can finish up with that so we can kind of save time. Because actually, I've -- I mean, calculating, we've been waiting for about five minutes, and I don't want to --

MS. SCHELLIN: Yeah, okay.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yeah. Okay. Mr. Sullivan, do you have any closing?

MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do not. Just a thank you to the Commission for your consideration of this request. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Sullivan, this is the time I needed some closing, but anyway.

MR. SULLIVAN: Sorry.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Let's give Ms. Klevins -- let's see where Ms. Klevins is. Ms. Klevins, if you can hear me, you have the number now, so if you could call in, we would

greatly appreciate it so we can get your testimony.

MS. SCHELLIN: I'm not sure where she is. I just tried to call her again because her phone number is not showing up. We have no callers right now. No callers showing as calling in. And I just tried to call her. I'll try again.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Is this a two-vote case? Ms. Lovick, if it's one vote --

MS. LOVICK: Yes, sir. It's a two-vote case.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, is it two votes? Okay. Thank you. Well, we may have to make some addendums and just let her give us something between now and final, because we're not able to get in touch with her.

MS. SCHELLIN: Yeah, I just tried again and it went straight to voicemail, and I refreshed my screen and still do not show anyone calling in.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Maybe something's wrong with the phones as well. So either way, I'll --

MS. SCHELLIN: Well, I'm not sure. But we could leave the record open for her written submission.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yeah, let's do that.

MS. SCHELLIN: And one other thing I wanted to say --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Hold on, hold on one second, Ms. Schellin. Hold on one second. Let's keep it very straightforward and simple. We're going to go ahead and deal with it how we're going to deal with it today, but could the

staff just reassure Ms. Klevins that she can send that to us, and we will look at it between now and final? I think that's the best thing we can do.

MS. SCHELLIN: Okay, sure.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. You want to say something else?

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. The other person who was on and then went off. Oh, wait. Oh, okay, she's off. She did not -- I thought maybe she'd pop back up. Ms. Coleman, she had submitted to the record some written testimony; however, she submitted it today, not 24 hours prior. And so may I make a request on her behalf to submit it to the record or not? I mean, they're supposed --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Sure, I mean we --

MS. SCHELLIN: -- to testify, make the request, but she was on here to testify earlier and had signed up.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, we'll submit that, and we'll --

MS. SCHELLIN: And I had sent her an email and told her she'd have to make that request this evening.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, yeah.

MS. SCHELLIN: So may I make that request?

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yeah, you can do that, and we will look at that. That'll be something else we'll look at between now and final.

MS. SCHELLIN: Yeah, okay. All right.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

MS. SCHELLIN: All right.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right, so Mr. Sullivan has given us his closing, and colleagues, I don't see anything holding us up. And again, we will take any -- we can do a proposed. We can always take into consideration what comes in, and Mr. Sullivan will have a chance to opine on what comes in in between proposed and final. But let me ask my colleagues, what is your pleasure? If you're ready to move forward or what is the --

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Ready to move forward, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Everybody's ready to move forward? Commissioner Imamura, could you make a motion for proposed action?

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes, sir, it'd be my pleasure. Thank you.

I move that the Zoning Commission take proposed action for Case No. 26-06, 401 14th Street Southwest 2025 LLC, a map amendment from unzoned to D-8 at 401 14th Street Southwest, Square 231, Lot 803, Parcel 316/16, and ask for a second.

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Second.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. It's been moved and properly seconded. Any further discussion on proposed?

Not hearing any -- Ms. Schellin, would you do a roll call vote, please?

MS. SCHELLIN: Sure. Commissioner Imamura?

COMMISSIONER BRUINS: Just quickly -- quickly, is IZ+ being included?

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: I accept the friendly amendment from Commissioner Bruins. Yes, the IZ+ will apply.

MS. SCHELLIN: That's what they requested, yes.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

MS. SCHELLIN: All right.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: You can probably start.

MS. SCHELLIN: So we're ready?

CHAIRMAN HOOD: You can roll call, yes.

MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. Commissioner Imamura?

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.

MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Wright?

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes.

MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood?

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.

MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller?

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

MS. SCHELLIN: And Commissioner Bruins?

COMMISSIONER BRUINS: Yes.

MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is five to zero to zero to approve proposed action in Zoning Commission Case No. 26-06.

And the record is open until, I would say, the end of the week, since they both have their testimony, to submit their testimony and allow -- and then seven days for the applicant to respond to what they submit since they have that opportunity. And if the applicant would submit a draft order within two weeks and we'll go from there; we'll refer it to NCPC and then get it on the next agenda. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Schellin. And again, if we could follow up, somebody from staff can follow up with Ms. Klevins and let her know that we're looking for her testimony so we can read that between now and final, that would be great.

MS. SCHELLIN: Yeah, she could hear us and see us, but she could not get the audio for you to hear her.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, okay.

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: And the telephone must be -- it must be some connectivity issues. Okay. But anyway, we're looking forward to the -- we didn't disregard her, that's what I'm trying to basically say. All right, anything else tonight, Ms. Schellin?

All right. So I want to thank all my colleagues and everyone who's expounded on this case. The Zoning Commission will meet again on the 5th of November -- NRP Properties LLC, design review modification with hearing, 4401 through 4435

Benning Road. And again, that's Zoning Commission Case No. 22-08B, and we'll be on these same platforms at 4:00 p.m. on this coming Thursday.

So with that, I want to thank everyone for their participation tonight, and this hearing is adjourned. Good night.

(Whereupon, at 5:24 p.m., the hearing in the above-entitled matter was concluded.)

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

DOCKET NO.: Z.C. Case No. 26-06

CASE TITLE: Map Amendment from Unzoned to D-8, 401 14th St. SW

HEARING DATE: November 2, 2026

LOCATION: Washington, D.C.

I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately on the tapes and notes reported by me at the hearing in the above case before the Government of the District of Columbia, Zoning Commission.

Date: November 5, 2026



Michelle Michelbacher
Official Reporter
Heritage Reporting Corporation
Suite 305
1150 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036