

Dear BZA staff,

I am writing to support BZA case 21167, and to offer a suggestion on how to interpret ANC 1B's letter of support.

I am writing in my capacity as an individual member of Advisory Neighborhood Commission (ANC) 1B, representing Single Member District (SMD) 1B09. My opinion does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the ANC as a whole.

At its meeting on September 5, 2024, ANC 1B voted (5 in favor, 1 against, 3 abstaining) "to vote in support case 21167 located at 527 Florida Avenue." This can be found in ANC 1B's minutes from that meeting ([see October meeting agenda package, page 18](#)). I have also submitted a certification of that vote signed by ANC 1B's Chair and Secretary. That certification *does* reflect the opinion of the ANC as a whole.

ANC 1B's vote at the September meeting was based on the BZA case as it was presented to us at that time.

Since then, the applicant for BZA case 21167 made the following adjustments to the application, as described by the applicant in an email to me dated December 1, 2025:

1. "An error of dimension of the subject of relief before the Board, the rear open deck, has been detected. Whereas the proposed deck dimension as presented was eight feet by eighteen feet (8ft. X 18 ft.), the actual bird's eye view dimension is ten feet by eighteen feet (10ft. X 18ft.) This error of omission was inadvertent/unintentional due to the fact the two feet differential is the deck floor overhang beyond the deck posts/columns. The architect had simply erroneously represented the depth to the deck posts/columns on the builder's Plat. Hence the deck as graphically represented has not changed, but its depth accurately represented and reconciled with an updated DC Builder's Plat to reflect the revised dimensions.
2. "The Office of Planning has suggested that the appropriate relief from the provisions set forth under Subtitle G, Chapter 7, Sec. 210.1 for relief from the prescribed percentage of lot occupancy is a special exception pursuant to Subtitle G, Chapter 52, Sec. 5200.1, rather than the area variance requested for, and upon reflection, the Applicant concurs."

ANC 1B will not be able to re-consider this item with the updated information before the December 4 BZA hearing, due to our own meeting schedule. However, it is my personal view that ANC 1B does not need to re-consider this item.

At no point during ANC 1B's or the ZPD committee's discussion about this item was the precise size (10 ft x 18 ft vs. 8 ft x 18 ft) or the precise type of relief needed an issue.

**Therefore I personally recommend that BZA consider ANC 1B's vote in September to**

**support BZA case 21167 as still valid.** In my view, the substance of the application has not changed enough to render ANC 1B's previous support invalid.

Thanks,  
Tucker Jones

Commissioner Tucker Jones, 1B09  
[1B09@anc.dc.gov](mailto:1B09@anc.dc.gov)