

From: [Ana Tejblum](#)
To: [DCOZ - ZC Submissions \(DCOZ\)](#)
Subject: Submission for OP supplemental Case 25-09
Date: Thursday, March 26, 2026 5:25:48 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the DC Government. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know that the content is safe. If you believe that this email is suspicious, please forward to phishing@dc.gov for additional analysis by OCTO Security Operations Center (SOC).

Some people who received this message don't often get email from taaeevans@msn.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Chairman Hood and members of the DC Zoning Commission,

I have lived in Cleveland Park for 33 years and have been an active member of my community in every aspect - as a parent of John Eaton students, with the Cleveland Park Club, the Cleveland Park Citizens Association, and the Cleveland Park Historical Society. But I am writing now as a private citizen who loves the entire city. I am grateful that the Zoning Commission's decided to reopen Case 25-09 given the many questions asked during the December 1 hearing. This letter is in response to the Office of Planning's (OP) Supplemental Report to the case, addressing just a few of the issues that concern me.

At the hearing that led to the Zoning Commission to reopen the case, the ZC asked why front setbacks are not included. It was suggested that the Office of Planning add language to indicate that additions and new construction are subject to review by the Historic Preservation Review Board (HPRB). In its Supplemental Report, OP declared this "inappropriate." How can any such request be inappropriate, when it is part of the normal process used to review and revise submissions, to make them compatible with existing structures.

The ZC should act to ensure development standards acknowledge the need for transitions from the low to moderate density by including this in writing.

I also believe there are other zones more appropriate for Cleveland Park's commercial corridor that are consistent with the Comprehensive. The ZC should consider the neighborhood's contributing structures, the history of the commercial strip, and how extreme height differentials would permanently change Cleveland Park's character. Please, employ smart preservation.

I see nothing in any document the Office of Planning has provided that ensures that affordable housing will truly come to Cleveland Park. This supports a cynic's view that the changes proposed will only benefit developers. The rationale for increased density should be accompanied by an increase in the affordable housing requirement. The many "vacancy" signs up and down Connecticut Ave argue for no need to increase density for its own sake.

Respectfully submitted,

Ana Tejblum Evans

ZONING COMMISSION
District of Columbia
CASE NO. 25-09
EXHIBIT NO. 267

