

GOVERNMENT  
OF  
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY

OCTOBER 30, 2019

+ + + + +

The Regular Public Meeting convened in the Jerrily R. Kress Memorial Hearing Room, Room 220 South, 441 4th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20001, pursuant to notice at 9:30 a.m., Frederick Hill, Chairperson, presiding.

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT MEMBERS PRESENT:

FREDERICK L. HILL, Chairperson  
CARLTON HART, Vice-Chairperson (NCPC)

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBER PRESENT:

PETER SHAPIRO, Commissioner

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

CLIFFORD MOY, Secretary

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PRESENT:

ALEXANDRA CAIN, ESQ.

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Public Meeting held on October 30, 2019.

C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

APPLICATION NO. 20061  
MDP 1353 WISCONSIN, LLC: . . . . . 7

APPLICATION NO. 19507A  
1005 FIRST, LLC: . . . . . 18

ADJOURN:  
 Frederick Hill, Chairperson . . . . . 22

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

(9:40 a.m.)

CHAIRPERSON HILL: The hearing will please come to order. We are located in the Jerrily R. Kress building. This is the October 30th Public Hearing of the Board of Zoning Adjustment for 2019.

My name is Fred Hill, Chairperson. Joining me today is Carlton Hart, Vice Chair, and Peter Shapiro for the Zoning Commission.

Copies of today's hearing agenda are available to you and located in the wall bin near the door. Please be advised that this proceeding is being recorded by a court reporter and is also webcast live. Accordingly, we must ask you to refrain from any disruptive noises or actions in the hearing room.

When presenting information to the Board, please, turn on and speak into the microphone first stating your name and home address. When you are finished speaking, please, turn your microphone off, so that your microphone is no longer picking up sound or background noise.

All persons planning to testify either in favor or in opposition must have raised their hand and been sworn in by the Secretary.

Also each witness must fill out two witness cards. These cards are located on the table near the door and on the

1 witness table. Upon coming forward to speak to the Board,  
2 please, give both cards to the reporter at the table sitting  
3 to my right.

4           If you wish to file written testimony or  
5 additional supporting documents today, please, submit one  
6 original and 12 copies to the Secretary for distribution.  
7 If you do not have the requisite number of copies, you can  
8 reproduce copies on our office printer in the Office of  
9 Zoning located across the hall. Please remember to collate  
10 your set of copies.

11           There are procedures for special exceptions and  
12 variances and appeals. They are also listed as you come  
13 walking in through the door.

14           The record shall be closed at the conclusion of  
15 each case, except for any material specifically requested by  
16 the Board. The Board and the staff will specify at the end  
17 of the hearing exactly what is expected and the date when the  
18 persons must submit the evidence to the Office of Zoning.  
19 After the record is closed, no other information shall be  
20 accepted by the Board.

21           The Board's Agenda includes cases set for  
22 decision. After the Board adjourns, the Office of Zoning in  
23 consultation with myself determine whether a full or summary  
24 order may be issued.

25           A full order is required when the decision it

1 contains is adverse to a party, including an affected ANC.  
2 A full order may also be needed if the Board's decision  
3 differs from the Office of Planning's recommendation.  
4 Although the Board favors the use of summary orders whenever  
5 possible, an applicant may not request the Board to issue  
6 such an order.

7           The District of Columbia Administrative Procedures  
8 Act requires that a Public Hearing on each case be held in  
9 the open and before the public pursuant to § 405(b) and 406  
10 of that Act.

11           The Board may, consistent with its rules and  
12 procedures and the Act enter into a closed meeting on a case  
13 for purposes of seeking legal counsel on a case pursuant to  
14 the D.C. Official Code § 2-575(b)(4) and/or deliberating on  
15 a case pursuant to D.C. Official Code § 2-575(b)(13), but  
16 only after providing the necessary public notice in the case  
17 of an emergency closed meeting after taking a roll call vote.

18           The decision of the Board in cases must be based  
19 exclusively on the public record. To avoid any appearance  
20 to the contrary, the Board requests that persons present not  
21 engage the Members of the Board in conversation.

22           Please turn off all beepers and cell phones, at  
23 this time, so as not to disrupt these proceedings.

24           Preliminary matters are those which relate to  
25 whether a case will or should be heard today, such as request

1 for a postponement, continuance or withdrawal or whether  
2 proper and adequate notice of the hearing has been given.  
3 If you are not prepared to go forward with a case today or  
4 if you believe that the Board should not proceed, now is the  
5 time to raise such a matter.

6 Mr. Secretary, do we have any preliminary matters?

7 MR. MOY: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, Members of  
8 the Board. My announcement for the transcript as to the  
9 cases on today's docket is going to be brief. The only  
10 statement I can say is that one of the decision making cases  
11 in the Public Meeting Session has been withdrawn; that is  
12 20109 of Bernard Berry. And as the Board may or may not be  
13 aware, that withdrawal letter from the applicant is under  
14 Exhibit 64.

15 Other than that, Mr. Chairman, there are other  
16 preliminary matters, but staff would suggest that the Board  
17 address those when I call the case.

18 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Thank you. If  
19 anyone would like to testify, if you wouldn't mind, please,  
20 standing and taking the oath administered by the Secretary  
21 to my left.

22 MR. MOY: Good morning. Do you solemnly swear or  
23 affirm that the testimony you are about to present in this  
24 proceeding is the truth, whole truth and nothing but the  
25 truth?

1 Ladies and gentleman, you may consider yourselves  
2 under oath.

3 CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right. Good morning,  
4 everybody. Mr. Moy, you don't sound very well today. I hope  
5 you feel better as the day progresses.

6 MR. MOY: Me, too. Thank you. I'll work my way  
7 through today. Thank you, sir.

8 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right. And then  
9 also after that, the Nats won last night and so it's Game 7  
10 tonight, as I'm sure we are all excited about, except for the  
11 people that live in Houston. And yeah, that's it for that.

12 Okay. So, Mr. Moy, you can call our first meeting  
13 case when you get a chance.

14 MR. MOY: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
15 That would be case Application No. 20061 of MDP, 1353  
16 Wisconsin, LLC. Let's see, captioned and advertised for area  
17 variance from the floor area ratio requirements Subtitle G,  
18 § 402.2, this would renovate existing commercial retail space  
19 and convert the existing residential units into office space  
20 in the MU-4 Zone. This is at 1353-1355 Wisconsin Avenue,  
21 N.W., Square 1243, Lot 812.

22 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Thanks. So  
23 originally I had recused myself because I thought some things  
24 were going to happen, but those things did not happen so,  
25 therefore, I was able to participate.

1 I have gone ahead and read into the case. Is the  
2 Board ready to continue deliberation?

3 So the last time you guys were here, you all were  
4 split in that, yeah, you guys came up with a split vote. And  
5 so I went back and actually I was watching the case from the  
6 anteroom when it actually was going on.

7 And so there was a variety of issues that you all  
8 brought up in your last deliberation and I suppose that, you  
9 know, it being the variance test in terms of the different  
10 prongs that we have to go through in order to decide one way  
11 or the other with this case.

12 I thought that -- I mean to go over it again, you  
13 know, the ANC had come forward and they were in favor of this  
14 application and then a variety of also other community  
15 organizations had put forward a Letter of Support and also  
16 actually I thought in several cases had made a pretty good  
17 argument in terms of why it should be granted. And I would  
18 even cite the Citizens Association of Georgetown and their  
19 argument that came from Cheryl Gray, which is their  
20 president, I thought even spoke specifically to the issues  
21 for the variance.

22 I did think that it was something that I can  
23 understand why the Board was split in terms of the  
24 discussion. And the argument that the applicant had made in  
25 terms of the confluence of factors that had brought the

1 building to an exceptional situation in terms of how it met  
2 the first prong of the test, I think that you could possibly  
3 argue it, obviously, as you guys did either way.

4 I'm going to land up on the side that I think that  
5 the applicant did meet the standard for us to grant the  
6 application, and the reasons why I guess I would agree with  
7 the confluence of factors in terms of the -- I guess one of  
8 the things is that the historical fabric of the building  
9 itself, in terms of they had, you know, the walls on the  
10 floors there that were unable to remove.

11 I would cite also the -- again as that was the  
12 configuration of the existing historic structure, I thought  
13 that the fact that the property had been vacant for a very  
14 long time made it unique. I thought that again the building  
15 efficiency that they were speaking of in terms of the -- you  
16 know, you guys had asked about the skylights and how the  
17 skylights could be configured or how the mechanical systems  
18 could be configured differently. I thought that that is  
19 another reason that led to the uniqueness of this particular  
20 property.

21 I thought that -- again, I keep kind of circling  
22 back to not that historic is a reason why it makes a property  
23 unique and I'm specifying this for future cases that might  
24 come down the line, but the confluence of factors and one of  
25 those that kind of made more of an issue with me was the

1 historic nature of it in terms of also the skylight study and  
2 how they needed to avoid the historic sight lines for those  
3 skylights.

4           Let's see, I suppose that's again how I get  
5 through the first prong of the test in terms of what I  
6 thought made the property unique. I mean, again, I would  
7 agree with the confluence of factors and cite a little bit  
8 more towards the inability to move some of the walls in order  
9 to make it a more efficient property.

10           I think that then moving on to the second and  
11 third prong, I thought that there was not an issue with the  
12 public good nor the Zone Plan itself. I thought that what  
13 I had also -- what I continue to somewhat struggle with and  
14 I think there is going to be a couple of different sides of  
15 this today, even within this particular ANC, is that the  
16 great weight that we give the ANC, you know, and what we are  
17 supposed to do by giving the great weight to the ANC and what  
18 I have learned now over the past, you know, five years or so  
19 is that, you know, it's giving great weight to their concerns  
20 and some of those concerns might be zoning. Some of those  
21 concerns might not be zoning.

22           And so, however, I think the ones that aren't  
23 zoning tend to lean towards the public good. And so that's  
24 kind of -- well, I guess it's then zoning. It's the third  
25 prong, right?

1           And so you know, the fact that in this case again  
2 the ANC came forward and the commissioner came forward and  
3 I thought spoke very well about why they thought that this  
4 property had been vacant for a long time, had been -- you  
5 know, it's an area of the community that is trying to  
6 revitalize itself, I suppose, on that one section of  
7 Georgetown. I mean, I happen to be familiar with that area  
8 living in that ANC myself.

9           However, I do think that it did sway me in terms  
10 of the testimony that the commissioner had given and so I  
11 think that that is, in general, why I think -- I don't think  
12 again it was an easy thing and I think that that is how I'm  
13 getting to how the property is unique and how it is meeting  
14 the first prong and how it is meeting the second and third  
15 prong of the variance test.

16           So I'm happy to continue the discussion, but that  
17 is where I'll be voting. Who would like to go next? Well,  
18 I know, Peter. Why don't we go with you, Peter, because we  
19 know where you are, I think, unless --

20           COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: I appreciate, Mr. Chair,  
21 and I think you have articulated it well and I concur with  
22 what you are saying. I mean, it's a version of what we have  
23 been talking about the past few times that we have heard  
24 this, so I appreciate the way you framed it and I'll leave  
25 it at that.

1                   VICE CHAIR HART:       So I know during the  
2 conversation that we had previously on this, I really was  
3 having a difficulty with it because I was trying to  
4 understand how I would come down -- how I would take the  
5 information and then be able to either agree or disagree.  
6 I actually had a hard time trying to get to one or the other  
7 of them.

8                   So but I do appreciate the time that I have had  
9 to really look over the information over the last, what is  
10 that, well, whatever the -- when we heard this last, which  
11 was a couple weeks ago?

12                   CHAIRPERSON HILL:   Three weeks.

13                   VICE CHAIR HART:   So after further consideration,  
14 I think I would have to agree with the applicant. I  
15 understand that there are many factors that are raised here  
16 affecting the applicant and several of them seem to  
17 differentiate it and make it an exceptional condition. And,  
18 Mr. Chairman, you spoke about the historic fabric of the  
19 rowhouses.

20                   And you know, this is a hard one only because  
21 there is so many -- there are so many other historic  
22 buildings that are here. The one thing that really kind of  
23 started to sway me was it wasn't just that it was the  
24 historic fabric. It was the historic fabric that really  
25 couldn't be expanded upon.

1 I mean, they are not taking up 100 percent of the  
2 lot right now. So they are constrained within that. There  
3 is a portion of the building, there is a one-story portion  
4 of the building that is behind the rest of it and so that  
5 takes up the back portion of the lot.

6 The front portion of the lot is this -- actually  
7 there are kind of two rowhouses. They are narrow rowhouses.  
8 I noticed this only by looking at some of the other buildings  
9 along the street frontage and I understood that most of them  
10 actually had, if not all of them, three bays, so they had  
11 three windows in front. This one has two and two. So it is  
12 -- so those are two things that you are having to deal with.

13 There is a historic wall that separates them, that  
14 historic wall you can only remove a certain percentage of  
15 that, so now that reduces the amount of porosity in that  
16 wall, so that now instead of having a 32 foot width that you  
17 have for the inside, you have much less than that because you  
18 are now having to do two 16s.

19 And I think that that coupled with the fact that  
20 you are having to deal with the stairs that are existing and  
21 having to add an additional stair or additional core for the  
22 site now further reduces the amount of space on an already  
23 limited area.

24 And I thought hard about that issue, whether or  
25 not the historic part of this is important and I think that

1 which means that you can't expand it, coupled with the fact  
2 that it is already a smaller footprint begins to make me  
3 understand that this -- that there are -- that there is a  
4 difficulty with creating, you know, the top floor as a  
5 residential floor.

6 I also note that while you do have skylights that  
7 you can put in the building, most buildings, most rowhouses  
8 that we have in D.C. when you have a constrained site, a  
9 smaller site, you have doglegs. So you are able to use a  
10 dogleg as a court to be able to allow light to come into the  
11 building, into the interior of the building. And you don't  
12 have that -- there are no doglegs or interior courts or any  
13 of that in this instance. You just have the footprint.

14 And again, I know that there is a skylight for the  
15 stairs, but those stairs are not moving. So those -- that  
16 skylight is only going to be used for those stairs.

17 And so the more I started thinking about it, the  
18 more I realized that there are particular issues about this  
19 particular building that make it difficult to be able to  
20 reuse this building and the fact that it has actually been  
21 vacant for so long, I think we heard upwards to about 10  
22 years, if not longer than that. I mean, it was years.

23 So it began to -- so I began to understand the --  
24 that issue, the problems that you were running into with  
25 trying to kind of reconfigure this building and to be able

1 to use it for the -- for residential in the future.

2           And you know, I understand the Office of Planning  
3 said that they had not anticipated using non-residential  
4 passed the second floor, which I understand kind of fully  
5 what they were looking at. I will also say this is a fairly  
6 commercial building -- a commercial street. This isn't some,  
7 you know, residential street that we are talking about. This  
8 is Wisconsin Avenue.

9           So you know, I think that location also helps me  
10 to kind of get to that understanding that I could agree with  
11 the applicant and I just think that the pieces of information  
12 that we have here that have led us to this point are  
13 compelling enough. And I say that in that I don't think that  
14 it is -- I understand it as there are -- I can understand how  
15 someone could get on both sides of this issue. And I think  
16 that we had that during our conversation several weeks ago  
17 when we first discussed this.

18           But again, I think that having the additional  
19 period of time to be able to look at this makes me understand  
20 this a little bit better in understanding how the applicant  
21 is -- what their issues are and how that relates to this  
22 particular property. So that's kind of where I am.

23           COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And  
24 just to join with Vice Chair Hart and specifically, you know,  
25 if we move forward with this, we also need to give great

1 weight to OP's position and their denial. And I think  
2 what you have just described is that -- is very clear and  
3 specific in response to how we are giving great weight to OP,  
4 recognizing it while we disagree with it.

5 VICE CHAIR HART: Right.

6 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

7 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yeah, and just to continue  
8 discussing this so that there is more information available  
9 for the order, because I don't -- I think that -- I do think  
10 that this is a unique situation. I mean, I don't -- as we  
11 have kind of talked about, there are other properties like  
12 this in Georgetown and so -- or all around the city.

13 And so why is this so unique? And so I stated  
14 this because again I don't want others to think that this is  
15 something that we do lightly or that it will be difficult for  
16 someone else to jump through these hoops, right?

17 And so the thing that you just mentioned, Mr.  
18 Hart, that I appreciate is that, you know, this is on  
19 Wisconsin Avenue. Like that is something that I had not  
20 actually really thought too much about, that like, you know,  
21 this is a very commercial area, right?

22 And so you know, someone coming and having this  
23 kind of an argument and in a different area would not  
24 probably -- you know, who knows, would sway the Board, I was  
25 going to say. But and then again, you know, as you had

1 mentioned the -- you know, the pair of houses, right and that  
2 there -- the applicant had also mentioned kind of the  
3 multiple cores that were involved that also made it, I think,  
4 very unique.

5           So I restate those issues in terms of how the  
6 first prong is being met so that it is clear to future cases  
7 coming down the line as to how this particular property met  
8 those standards for us to vote in the way that we are -- seem  
9 to be voting.

10           So I'm going to go ahead and make a motion to  
11 approve Application No. 20061, as captioned and read by the  
12 Secretary, and ask for a second.

13           VICE CHAIR HART: Second.

14           CHAIRPERSON HILL: Motion made and seconded. All  
15 those in favor say aye.

16           (Chorus of ayes.)

17           CHAIRPERSON HILL: All those opposed or absentee?

18           (No response.)

19           CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Moy?

20           MR. MOY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Before I give a  
21 final vote count, we do have -- I am in possession of two  
22 absentee ballots. One is from Ms. Lorna John, the other is  
23 from Lesylleé White, who has reviewed the record and she has  
24 conveyed to me. Let me -- all right. Ms. Lorna John's  
25 absentee vote is to deny the application. And Ms. White's

1 absentee vote is to approve the application.

2 This would give a final vote count of 4-1-0. This  
3 is on the motion of Chairman Hill to approve the application  
4 for the relief requested, seconding the motion Vice Chair  
5 Hart. Also in favor of the motion is Zoning Commissioner  
6 Peter Shapiro. Ms. John is opposed to the motion.

7 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Thank you, Mr.  
8 Moy. Mr. Moy, you said that 20109 was withdrawn, correct?

9 MR. MOY: Yes, sir. All right. The last case for  
10 decision making is case Application No. 19507A of 1005 First,  
11 LLC. This is a request for modification of consequence to  
12 the plans approved in BZA Order No. 19507 to permit an  
13 increase in the number of units from 460 to 500 residential  
14 units in a mixed-use project consisting of hotel, residential  
15 and retail uses, D-5 Zone at 1005 First Street, N.E., Square  
16 713, Lot 53.

17 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Is the Board ready to  
18 deliberate? Okay. I can kind of start. I guess I do think  
19 that the record has enough information in it for me to make  
20 a decision. I do think that, and this is just kind of that  
21 we have an opportunity to kind of talk amongst ourselves, you  
22 know, some of these things I just don't know.

23 I don't like the fact that we can't ask anybody  
24 any questions, you know. I mean, like you know, I even see  
25 the attorneys in the audience that are here for the thing and

1 you can't ask anybody anything, because it's a decision case.

2           And so it's a modification consequence. And then  
3 we have to determine whether or not we think it is a  
4 modification consequence.

5           I know that, you know, they are trying to -- they  
6 are changing the number of units from 460 to 500, which isn't  
7 a lot of units I suppose percentage wise, but it is, you  
8 know, 40 units. And so I was a little bit -- I would have  
9 liked to have asked a little bit more questions. However,  
10 after reading through the Office of Planning's report and  
11 kind of understanding that, you know, the outside of the  
12 building isn't changing really and then just exactly what the  
13 configuration of the units were and the changes, I felt as  
14 though I could understand whether or not I could get behind  
15 again just the standards that we needed to determine as to  
16 whether or not this was a modification consequence and if I  
17 could get behind the modification.

18           And so that and that we did get an email from the  
19 ANC and that's where it is kind of -- you know, I would have  
20 preferred a formal report in order to -- I guess my whole  
21 thing and I'm going to be voting in favor of this and I'm  
22 citing primarily the applicant's application as well as the  
23 analysis that the Office of Planning has provided.

24           But the struggle that I have often with this, I'm  
25 having a hard time pulling up this email from the ANC right

1 now, is that I would like all the boxes checked. You know,  
2 it's like, you know, we would have a full record in terms of  
3 the Office of Planning's report. We have, you know, the ANC  
4 weighing in one way or the other, as well as, you know, if  
5 DDOT needed to do that just so it's easier to review  
6 everything.

7 But regardless of all of that, I would be  
8 comfortable voting in favor of this application. Does the  
9 Board have anything they would like to add?

10 VICE CHAIR HART: Only that I think that there are  
11 some conditions that DDOT had. I mean, I think that I would  
12 be in support of the application. I didn't really have any  
13 questions on it, but DDOT included how many conditions in  
14 this? Wow, there are quite a number of conditions.

15 Well, actually, it looks like there were other  
16 conditions and they are, I think, adding to that. I mean,  
17 that was my only concern was around the DDOT conditions, but  
18 it looks like that it was a fairly easy condition to change.

19 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So  
20 yeah, DDOT submitted a report recommending approval subject  
21 to the adoption of a revised TDM. Also OAG has two changes  
22 to the TDM as well. I can read those into the record, Mr.  
23 Chair, which is:

24 To remove the Office of Zoning as one of the  
25 recipients of the letter from the transportation coordinator.

1           And the second item is to note that the conditions  
2 were provided to DDOT by the applicant and not into the IZIS  
3 case record. So it's just clarifying where we are in this  
4 process.

5           VICE CHAIR HART: And those are the last two  
6 conditions in the TDM.

7           CHAIRPERSON HILL: Right. So just so I can repeat  
8 what you guys all said, so the specific changes with the  
9 transportation coordinator will submit a letter to the Zoning  
10 Administrator, so strike the Office of Zoning.

11           So they will supply the letter to the Zoning  
12 Administrator, DDOT and goDCgo in compliance with the  
13 transportation and TDM conditions in the order and the issued  
14 Certificate of Occupancy and supporting documentation  
15 demonstrating compliance of the TDM conditions of the order  
16 will be provided to DDOT by the applicant. So strike it.  
17 It doesn't have to go to the IZIS case record.

18           And then the other was that the TDM Plan will now  
19 be reflective of the increased number of units. So those are  
20 the conditions that you all are speaking of, correct?

21           VICE CHAIR HART: Yes. Yes, sir.

22           CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right. Okay. So  
23 that being the changes in the conditions that I mentioned,  
24 I will not repeat that and I will then make a motion to  
25 approve Application No. 19507A as captioned and read by the

1 Secretary and ask for a second.

2 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Second.

3 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Motion has been made and  
4 seconded.

5 All those in favor say aye.

6 (Chorus of ayes.)

7 CHAIRPERSON HILL: All those opposed?

8 (No response.)

9 CHAIRPERSON HILL: The motion passes. Mr. Moy?

10 MR. MOY: Staff would record the vote as 3-0-2.

11 This is on the motion of Chairman Hill to approve the request  
12 for modification of consequence. In addition to the  
13 revisions in the last two conditions, that's outlined in the  
14 DDOT report, as stated by the Chair in his motion. Seconding  
15 the motion is Zoning Commissioner Peter Shapiro. Also in  
16 support is Vice Chair Hart. We have two other Members not  
17 present with us today.

18 CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right. Great. Thank you,  
19 Mr. Moy.

20 MR. MOY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

21 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the  
22 record at 10:11 a.m.)

23

24

25

C E R T I F I C A T E

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Public Meeting

Before: DC BZA

Date: 10-30-19

Place: Washington, DC

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



-----  
Court Reporter

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701