GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

+ + + + +

REGULAR PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY

FEBRUARY 12, 2025

+ + + + +

The Public Hearing of the District of Columbia Board of Zoning Adjustment convened via teleconference, pursuant to notice at 10:00 a.m. EDT, Frederick L. Hill, Chairperson, presiding.

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT MEMBERS PRESENT:

FREDERICK L. HILL, Chairperson
LORNA JOHN, Vice Chair
CHRISHAUN SMITH, Commissioner
CARL H. BLAKE, Commissioner
ROBERT E. MILLER, Zoning Commission Vice Chair
TAMMY STIDHAM, Zoning Commissioner

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT STAFF PRESENT:

KEARA MEHLERT, Secretary
PAUL YOUNG, A/V Specialist

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Regular Public Hearing held on February 12, 2025.

TABLEOFCONTENTS

Case No. 19887-A Application of Marjorie Hutchinson
Case No. 20825-A Application of SNH Medical Office Properties Trust12
Case No. 21248 Application of Michael Tran15
Case No. 21226 Application of Alexander-Benons, LLC18
Case No. 21176 Application of Natalia Banulescu-Bogdan28
Case No. 21217 Application of David Ortiz and Nicole Johnston33
Case No. 21238 Application of HGIT 1015 Half Street, LLC

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

(10:00 a.m.)

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. The Board of Zoning Adjustment 2/12/2025 public hearing will please come to order. My name is Fred Hill, Chairman of the Board of Zoning Adjustment. Joining me today are Board members Lorna John, Carl Blake, Chrishaun Smith and Zoning Commissioners Tammy Stidham and Rob Miller. Today's meeting and hearing agenda are available on the Office of Zoning's website. Please be advised this proceeding is being recorded by a court reporter and is also webcast live via Webex and YouTube Live. The video of the webcast will be available on the Office of Zoning's website after today's hearing. Accordingly, everyone who is listening by Webex or by telephone will be muted during the hearing. Also please be advised that we do not take any public testimony at our decision meeting session.

If you're experiencing difficulty accessing Webex or with your telephone call-in, then please call our OZ hotline number at 202-727-5471 to receive Webex login or call-in instructions. Once again, 202-727-5471. At the conclusion of a decision meeting session I shall, in consultation with the Office of Zoning, determine whether a full or summary order may be issued. A full order is required when the decision it contains is adverse to a party including an affected ANC. A full order may also be needed if the Board's decision differs from the Office

of Planning's recommendation. Although the Board favors the use of summary orders whenever possible an Applicant may not request the Board to issue such an order.

In today's hearing session everyone who is listening on Webex or by telephone will be muted during the hearing and only persons who have signed up to participate or testify will be unmuted at the appropriate time. Please state your name and home address before providing oral testimony or your presentation. Oral presentations should be limited to a summary of your most important points. When you're finished speaking please mute your audio so that your microphone is no longer picking up sound or background noise.

All persons planning to testify either in favor or in opposition should have signed up in advance. They'll be called by name to testify. If this is an appeal, only parties are allowed to testify. By signing up to testify all participants completed the oath or affirmation as required by Subtitle Y, Section 408.7. Requests to enter evidence at the time of an online virtual hearing such as written testimony or additional supporting documents other than live video which may not be presented at the time of testimony may be allowed pursuant to Y-103.13 provided that the person making the request to enter an exhibit explain, a) how the proposed exhibit is relevant, b) the good cause is justified allowing the exhibit into the record including explanation of why the requestor did not file the

exhibit prior to the hearing pursuant to Y-206 and, c) how the proposed would not unreasonably prejudice any parties. The order of procedures for special exception and variances are pursuant to Y-409.

At the conclusion of each case an individual who is unable to testify because of technical issues may file a request for leave to file a written version of the planned testimony to the record within 24 hours following the conclusion of public testimony in the hearing. If additional written testimony is accepted then prior to the amount of reasonable amount of time to respond as determined by the Board. The Board will then make its decision at its next meeting but no earlier than 48 hours after the hearing. Moreover, the Board may request additional specific information to complete the record. The Board and the staff will specify at the end of the hearing exactly what is expected and the date when persons must submit the evidence to the Office of Zoning. No other information shall be accepted by the Board.

Finally, the District of Columbia Administrative Procedures Act requires that the public hearing on each case be held in the open before the public. However, pursuant to 405(b) and 406 of that Act, the Board may, consistent with its rules and procedures and the Act, enter into a closed meeting on a case for purposes of seeking legal counsel on a case pursuant to D.C. Official Code Section 2-575(b)(4) and/or deliberate on a case

pursuant to D.C. Official Code Section 2-575(b)(13) but only after filing the necessary public notice in the case of an emergency closed meeting after taking a roll call vote.

Madam Secretary, to we have any preliminary matters?

MS. MEHLERT: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members of the Board.

Regarding the schedule today, the advanced party status request in Application No. 21220 of 327 Upshur, LLC was withdrawn. The hearing is still scheduled for February 26th and Application No. 21228 of D.C. Department of General Services has been withdrawn.

Also the Chairman has reviewed and granted waivers to allow late filings into the applicable case records pursuant to Subtitle Y, Section 206.7 and Section 103.13. Any other late filings during the course of today's live hearing should be presented before the Board by the Applicant party to the witnesses after the case is called. Any other preliminary matters will be noted when the case is called.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Thank you.

You may go ahead and, well, good morning everybody. You may go ahead and call, I think, is Commissioner Miller with us?

ZC VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I am here. I think there is a request for postponement of the one case that I'm on.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes. That's it, Commissioner

1	Miller. So we'll go ahead and do that one first.
2	I guess, Ms. Mehlert, if you want to call it.
3	MS. MEHLERT: Yes. This is in the Board's hearing
4	session. It's Application No. 19887-A of Marjorie Hutchinson.
5	This is a request pursuant to Subtitle Y, Section 704 for a
6	modification with hearing to remove a condition of approval
7	adopted in the order approving Application No. 19887. This will
8	eliminate condition No. 10 to allow trash storage in the shed
9	outside of the building. It is located in the RF-1 zone at 1724
10	North Capitol Street, Northwest, Square 3105, Lot 72.
11	This hearing began on September 11th after the Board
12	re-scheduled as a modification of hearing. The hearing was
13	continued and submissions were requested, and participating are
14	Chairman Hill, Board members Smith, Blake and Commissioner Miller
15	and in the record as a preliminary matter there is a request to
16	postpone from the Applicant, and this would be the fourth
17	postponement.
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Great. Okay.
19	Can the Applicant hear me and if so, can they introduce
20	themselves for the record?
21	(Pause.)
22	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Ms. Hutchinson, can you hear me?
23	MS. HUTCHINSON: Hello, can you hear me?
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes. Yes, can you hear me?
25	MS. HUTCHINSON: Yes, I can hear you.

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Great. Could you introduce yourself
2	for the record, please?
3	MS. HUTCHINSON: My name is Marjorie Hutchinson.
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
5	MS. HUTCHINSON: 1724 North Capitol Street, Northwest.
6	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Great. Thank you, Ms. Hutchinson.
7	So, I know you have a request here for a postponement
8	and I think you still have to meet with Public Space. Can you
9	tell me where you are in this process?
10	MS. HUTCHINSON: I myself is not the one that has been
11	the case. My daughter is Janet Stedman and she's online also.
12	She has all the information so would you direct that question to
13	her, please?
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure, of course.
15	Ms. Stedman, can you hear me?
16	(Pause.)
17	MS. STEDMAN: Can you hear me?
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes. Is that Ms. Stedman?
19	MS. STEDMAN: Yes.
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Hi.
21	Ms. Stedman, can you go ahead and introduce yourself
22	for the record?
23	MS. STEDMAN: Sure. Janet Stedman from 1724 North
23 24	MS. STEDMAN: Sure. Janet Stedman from 1724 North Capitol Street, Northwest, Washington, D.C.

1	So, Ms. Stedman, you're requesting a postponement and
2	I think you still have to go to Public Space I think or can you
3	tell me where you are and how much of a postponement you think
4	you may need?
5	MS. STEDMAN: Well, we're scheduled for the Public
6	Space hearing on the 27th of this month. So after that then we
7	can move forward with the BZA case. I believe that those were
8	the indications at the first meeting.
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
10	Would you go back to the ANC after you go to Public
11	Space or no? Let me look here at the ANC.
12	MS. STEDMAN: No. I don't need to go back to the ANC.
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Got it. They're fine with the, you
14	met with them
15	MS. STEDMAN: Right.
16	CHAIRPERSON HILL: and you discussed the different
17	things that they might want to see. Okay. All right. Well,
18	why don't we do this?
19	COMMISSIONER BLAKE: A quick question, Mr. Chair.
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure. Go ahead, Mr. Blake.
21	COMMISSIONER BLAKE: I'd just be curious to know about
22	the comments from HPRB.
23	MS. STEDMAN: Yeah. I spoke with Mr. Brendan and he
24	also indicated that he's going to wait until after Public Space
25	makes a decision. But in speaking with him, he indicated that

he would also agree, he and I just need to come up with a design to make the place aesthetically pleasing and match the historicness of the neighborhood.

COMMISSIONER BLAKE: Okay.

So is that, I'm not sure that the staff levels make that decision or not but it would probably make sense to do it, we could do it before or after HPRB but it would be (indiscernible) to consider that.

MS. STEDMAN: Well, he indicated that he didn't want to make a decision without knowing if it was going to be approved. Naturally if it's not approved then HPRB wouldn't need to make a decision. But if it is approved then he said we can move forward with how we'll go about making whatever we put there match the neighborhood. I don't know if he's speaking out of his purview or not, but that was the conversation we had.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Ms. Stedman, when are you supposed to meet, I got a little confused, sorry. You're going to go to Public Space on the 27th and then you go to HPRB after that?

MS. STEDMAN: Yeah. He held his comments because once I submit the plan, he was supposed to comment on the plan and he held his comment. His comment was he's going to reserve his comments until a decision has been made if I can put the shed there.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.

Let's go ahead, let's have you meet with us after you've

1	had a chance to talk to Public Space and HPRB. So I'm going to
2	go ahead, Ms. Mehlert, the secretary, can you tell me when might
3	be a good time in the next couple of months to do this so there's
4	enough time to go to Public Space and then HPRB?
5	MS. MEHLERT: So, I mean I'm not sure how long the HPRE
6	discussion would take. You know, I was going to suggest March
7	19th as a potential re-schedule date. I don't know if that's
8	enough time with having HPRB comments, otherwise we'd have to go
9	to one of the first couple of weeks in April.
LO	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Ms. Stedman, you don't know when you
L1	might meet with NPRB, correct?
L2	MS. STEDMAN: Per our conversation it would be after,
L3	shortly after the decision from Public Space.
L 4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
L5	MS. STEDMAN: But it's, I would prefer something in
L6	April just to be sure because I really would like to get this
L7	over with.
L8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yeah, yeah. I agree. I agree.
L9	Okay.
20	So go ahead, what's April looking like, Ms. Mehlert?
21	MS. MEHLERT: You have six cases on April 2nd and five
22	cases on April 9th.
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
24	Let's go with April 9th unless, Commissioner Miller,

are you around April 9th or you don't know?

1	ZC VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I should be around. Thank
2	you.
3	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
4	Ms. Stedman, we're going to postpone this until April
5	9th, okay?
6	MS. STEDMAN: Thank you very much.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you.
8	Okay. I'm going to close this portion of the hearing.
9	Commissioner Miller, we'll see you next time.
10	ZC VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Have a great day.
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. You too.
12	Okay. Welcome Commissioner Stidham. You can call our
13	next order of business, Ms. Mehlert.
14	MS. MEHLERT: I believe we're going into the Board's
15	meeting session Next case is Application No. 20825-A of SNH
16	Medical Office Properties Trust. This is a request pursuant to
17	Subtitle Y, Section 705.2 for a two year extension of the validity
18	of the order in Application No. 20825. This project is a
19	penthouse addition to an existing nine-story building in
20	conversion from medical office to residential use. It's located
21	in the D-5 zone at 2141 K Street, Northwest, Square 73, Lot 79.
22	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Thank you.
23	Okay. So I went ahead and reviewed the record and
24	understand why, I'm sorry, the argument for a time extension. I
25	would agree with the reasoning that the Applicant has put forward

1	with the time extension. I would also note that the Office of
2	Planning has also reviewed their reasoning and criteria and
3	believes that they are, I mean it's justified to grant the time
4	extension.
5	So if we were to do this, it would then go to December
6	21st, 2026, one year? No, a little bit more than a year.
7	(Reading.) So I didn't really have any issues with this time
8	extension.
9	Mr. Smith, do you have any issues with the time
10	extension?
11	COMMISSIONER SMITH: No issues. I agree with the
12	assessment of the Office of Planning.
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you.
14	Mr. Blake?
15	COMMISSIONER BLAKE: I agree, Mr. Chair, with your
16	comments and Mr. Smith. The Applicant has demonstrated good
17	cause and I'm hopeful that they'll begin to get something done
18	within the next two years.
19	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you.
20	Vice Chair John? You're on mute, Vice Chair John.
21	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: I also agree with Board member
22	Blake's suggestion.
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you.
24	Commissioner Stidham?
25	ZC COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: I also agree with OP and what

1	has already been said by fellow Board members.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
3	I'm going to go ahead and make a motion to approve
4	Application No. 20825-A which is the time extension, which would
5	take the application to December 21st, 2026, and ask for a second.
6	Ms. John?
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Second.
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Motion is made and seconded. Madam
9	Secretary, could you take a roll call, please.
10	MS. MEHLERT: Please respond to the Chair's motion to
11	approve the application.
12	Chairman Hill?
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.
14	MS. MEHLERT: Mr. Smith?
15	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Yes.
16	MS. MEHLERT: Mr. Blake?
17	COMMISSIONER BLAKE: Yes.
18	MS. MEHLERT: Vice Chair John?
19	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Yes.
20	MS. MEHLERT: And Commissioner Stidham?
21	ZC VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Yes.
22	MS. MEHLERT: Staff would record the vote as five to
23	zero to zero to approve Application No. 20825-A on the motion
24	made by Chairman Hill and seconded by Vice Chair John.
25	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you.

Madam Secretary, you may call our next one.

MS. MEHLERT: Next in the Board's meeting agenda is an expedited review application No. 21248 of Michael Tran. This is an application pursuant to Subtitle X, Section 901.2 for a special exception under Subtitle D, Section 5201 from the accessory building location requirements of Subtitle D, Section 5004.1(a) to allow an accessory building in a required rear yard.

This is for a one-story accessory structure in the rear yard of a detached principal dwelling. It's located in the R1-B zone at 3017 16th Street, Northeast, Square 4136, Lot 18, and the Applicant also submitted a request as a preliminary matter to allow a late filing regarding ANC outreach. It is already in the record.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Great. Thank you.

Unless the Board has any issues, I would like to go ahead and allow that into the record.

(Pause.)

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. I'm just (indiscernible).

Okay. I do appreciate that the Applicant put this into the record because there was a question about that for me.

After taking a look at this I do think that that this is something that meets the criteria for an expedited review. I think that it's a small accessory building that is being proposed. I would agree with the findings, or I'm sorry, the report that the Office of Planning has put together in terms of how this

1	would meet the criteria for us to grant this accessory building.
2	I don't think, again, there's any issues with light and air,
3	privacy, and I don't think we need any, you know, screening or
4	such.
5	I don't particularly have any questions or issues with
6	this. I'm glad that the Applicant, again, has put forward its
7	information concerning the ANC and their outreach and we don't
8	have an official ANC report to give credit to, but I do appreciate
9	and believe what's been put forward in the record concerning the
10	Applicant's outreach to the ANC. So I'm going to be voting in
11	favor of this application.
12	Mr. Smith, do you have anything you'd like to add?
13	COMMISSIONER SMITH: No. I agree with your assessment
14	of this particular case as well as the Office of Planning, and
15	I'll support as well.
16	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you.
17	Mr. Blake?
18	COMMISSIONER BLAKE: Mr. Chair, I'm in support. I have
19	nothing to add.
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you.
21	Vice Chair John?
22	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I'm also in
23	support and I have no additional comments.
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you.
25	Commissioner Stidham?

1	ZC COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: I am also in support and have
2	nothing to add either.
3	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Thank you all.
4	I'm going to go ahead and make a motion to approve
5	Application No. 21248 as captioned and read by the secretary, and
6	ask for a second. Ms. John?
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Second.
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Motion's been made and seconded.
9	Madam Secretary, could you take a roll call, please.
10	MS. MEHLERT: Please respond to the Chair's motion to
11	approve the application.
12	Chairman Hill?
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.
14	MS. MEHLERT: Vice Chair John?
15	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Yes.
16	MS. MEHLERT: Mr. Smith?
17	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Yes.
18	MS. MEHLERT: Mr. Blake?
19	COMMISSIONER BLAKE: Yes.
20	MS. MEHLERT: Commissioner Stidham?
21	ZC COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes.
22	MS. MEHLERT: Staff would record the vote as five to
23	zero to zero to approve Application 21248 on the motion made by
24	Chairman Hill and seconded by Vice Chair John.
25	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Give me one moment, Madam Secretary.

(Pause.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, Madam Secretary. You may call our next one when you get a chance.

Next is back to the Board's hearing MS. MEHLERT: Application No. 21226 of Alexander-Benons, LLC. is an application pursuant to Subtitle X, Section 901.2 for special exception under Subtitle C, Section 1501.1(c) from the penthouse height requirements of Subtitle C, Section 1501.1(b) to allow a penthouse on a principal dwelling that is not entirely within the height permitted as a matter-of-right for Also under Subtitle C, Section 1506.1 from the building. penthouse setback requirement of Subtitle C, Section 1504.1(b), under Subtitle E, Section 204.4 from the rooftop architectural element requirements of Subtitle E, Section 204.1 to allow removal or significant alteration of a rooftop architectural element original to the principal building, under Subtitle E, Section 207.5 to allow the rear wall of a row dwelling to extend farther than ten feet beyond the farthest rear wall of any adjoining principal residential building on any adjacent property, under Subtitle E, Section 5201 from the rear yard requirements of Subtitle E, Section 207.1 and from the lot occupancy requirements of Subtitle E, Section 210.1.

This is for a new third story with roof deck and three-story rear addition to an existing attached principal dwelling for use as a flat. It's located in the RF-1 zone at 1206 Staples

1	Street, Northeast, Square 4667, Lot 58, and there is a request
2	for party status in opposition from Angela Michelle Nicholas
3	located 1208 Staples Street.
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great.
5	If the Applicant can hear me, if they could introduce
6	themselves for the record.
7	MS. ALEXANDER-BENONS: Yes, I can hear you. Good
8	morning everyone. My name is Jan Alexander-Benons. My address
9	is 1206 Staples Street, Northeast.
10	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Great. Thank you.
11	Is the party status person here?
12	MS. ALEXANDER-BENONS: Is that a request to me or are
13	we just going to wait?
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: No, no, Ms. Alexander-Benons. I was
15	asking
16	MS. ALEXANDER-BENONS: Okay. Yeah.
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Young whether he saw.
18	MR. YOUNG: Yeah. Staff just spoke with them and they
19	should be logging on.
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Thank you.
21	(Pause.)
22	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
23	Well, I'll tell you what. First, Ms. Alexander-Benons,
24	I guess, like, you know, I don't have an Office of Planning
25	report, correct?

1	MS. ALEXANDER-BENONS: I know we spoke to Philip in the
2	Office of Planning yesterday and he said that he would be writing
3	and submitting a report. I'm not sure if he's on the line as
4	well.
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Oh, okay.
6	Could I hear from the Office of Planning for a minute?
7	MR. BRADFORD: Good morning, Chair Hill, and
8	Commissioners. Philip Bradford with the Office of Planning.
9	I've been working with the Applicant quite often this
10	past week. I've gotten much of the information that I need to
11	write the report. It's not finished yet.
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. No problem. Okay.
13	And is the ANC Commissioner here? Hi, Commissioner.
14	How are you? Could you introduce yourself for the record.
15	ANC COMMISSIONER ROBLIN: Yes. I'm Anna Roblin, I'm
16	the Commissioner of ANC 5D03.
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Oh, hi, Commissioner. How are you?
18	ANC COMMISSIONER ROBLIN: How are you doing?
19	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Good. Okay. Great.
20	Let's see. So, Ms. Alexander-Benons, we can go ahead
21	and have you do your presentation. I'm a little confused between
22	what the difference is between the relief you're requesting and
23	what the Zoning Administrator says that you need, and then I
24	don't have a report from the Office of Planning.
25	MS. ALEXANDER-BENONS: Okay.

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: So even to be able to review a report
2	from the Office of Planning I would still need some time to be
3	able to do that, so it's unlikely that anything's necessarily
4	going to happen today.
5	MS. ALEXANDER-BENONS: Okay.
6	CHAIRPERSON HILL: We don't have the report from the
7	Office of Planning. So I don't really want to, I understand that
8	you've been in contact with your neighbor. Is this your project?
9	Is this your home?
10	MS. ALEXANDER-BENONS: Yes.
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So, and it seems as though
12	your neighbor has pulled their, or you've at least come to an
13	agreement that they would pull their party status?
14	MS. ALEXANDER-BENONS: Correct, correct.
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: And so let me just get, one second
16	here, please.
17	MS. ALEXANDER-BENONS: And I can give some color to
18	that. That's mostly due to some shading that we would be causing
19	to Angela's solar system.
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: That's fine.
21	MS. ALEXANDER-BENONS: Yeah.
22	CHAIRPERSON HILL: That's fine.
23	So I'm just trying to get this kind of straightened up
24	a little bit. So, Mr. Young, you haven't seen Ms. Nicholas yet,
25	correct?

1	ANC COMMISSIONER ROBLIN: Jan, I thought you weren't
2	living there. I thought you lived somewhere else.
3	MS. ALEXANDER-BENONS: We do. But it's our home that
4	we'll be, it needs renovation. Do you need my, like, current
5	address because I can provide that? I thought you
6	(indiscernible).
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: That's okay. That's okay.
8	I was just asking a question as to whether or not really
9	you were the architect or, you know, that's what I'm trying to,
10	I was asking about. But before you all answer, I'm just trying
11	to find Ms. Nicholas, if she's there.
12	ANC COMMISSIONER ROBLIN: I know she said she was going
13	to be on and she was waiting for someone to call her and then
14	she was coming on. I don't know why she isn't
15	MR. YOUNG: She's calling by phone right now. She just
16	needs to unmute herself.
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Ms. Nicholas? How do you unmute
18	yourself, Mr. Young?
19	MR. YOUNG: Star six.
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Star six I think, Ms. Nicholas, is
21	to unmute yourself.
22	MS. NICHOLAS: Okay. I'm unmuted.
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great.
24	Can you hear us, and could you introduce yourself for
25	the record please, Ms. Nicholas?

1 MS. NICHOLAS: My name is Angela Nicholas. I'm the 2 neighbor at 1208 Staples Street, Northeast. 3 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. 4 So I just wanted to, I see in the record here that you 5 have come to an agreement with Ms. Alexander-Benons and I just 6 wanted to get on the record you're withdrawing your party status; 7 is that correct? 8 MS. NICHOLAS: Yes. If that's what that entails that 9 we came to an agreement yesterday, yes. 10 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right. Great. Okay. 11 Then, Ms. Nicholas, I'm going to let you go and you're 12 welcome to watch. I don't know what's going to happen today. 13 We're probably going to come back here again but thank you for 14 your time and we'll let you know, I guess actually if staff could 15 just let Ms. Nicholas know when this gets re-scheduled so if she 16 wanted to watch she could. 17 Okay, Ms. Mehlert? 18 MS. MEHLERT: Yes. Would you like her to submit 19 anything to the record withdrawing her party status? 20 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure. 21 Ms. Nicholas, yeah. If you could put something in the 22 record that you're withdrawing your party status, that would be 23 helpful. 24 MS. NICHOLAS: All right. And I send it to you guys? 25 Okay.

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Do you know where to send it to, Ms.
2	Nicholas?
3	MS. NICHOLAS: I'm assuming the same email I sent you
4	guys prior
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.
6	MS. NICHOLAS: or if someone could send me a link.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes. No, that's right. Whatever
8	you sent prior to put this into the record you did it correctly.
9	MS. NICHOLAS: Okay. Thank you.
10	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay? Thank you.
11	MS. NICHOLAS: Welcome. Bye bye.
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right. Okay. Bye bye.
13	All right. Commissioner, I don't think we're going to
14	have a full hearing here today because I still want to hear from
15	the Office of Planning and I want to have an opportunity to read
16	through what the Office of Planning's analysis is.
17	Would you like to come back, Commissioner, or do you
18	just want to go ahead and give us your testimony now?
19	(Pause.)
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: You're on mute, Commissioner Roblin.
21	Sorry.
22	ANC COMMISSIONER ROBLIN: Sorry. I think it would be
23	better when we come back.
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right. Sure, whatever
25	you'd like to do. All right. So, let's see. All right.

Well, I will, so, Ms. Mehlert, can I hear from the Office of Planning again, Mr. Bradford? Can you hear me? I'm not, I'm just trying to figure out, Mr. Bradford, when you think you might be able to give a report so the Board can take a look at it, and I appreciate, Mr. Bradford, the work you've done with the Applicant and so, you know, and I know that, again, Ms. Alexander-Benons, again the confusion has been a little bit between what the Zoning Administrator has asked for and what you're asking for, right, and I'm hoping that the Office of Planning will be able to help clarify that for the Board as well and then we'll have everything in the record that we can take a look at.

Mr. Bradford, when do you think -- and I'm not trying to push you because I don't know when I'm going to be able to come back here again -- when do you think you might be able to give us a report to look at?

MR. BRADFORD: I would be able to finalize the report by the end of next week. We've got some scheduled vacation within the department so I'm not quite sure when it would be able to be reviewed to be submitted for the record, but I wouldn't say more than two weeks it would take to get a report.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.

Ms. Mehlert, where are we in terms of, like, figuring out how to get back here if, like, the end of next week is the 21st, then it's like the 28th, the 7th of March?

1	MS. MEHLERT: Could come back on March 19th. I mean,
2	I don't know, the 5th is too, March 5th, is too close. March
3	12th is a busy day with an appeal.
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Commissioner Roblin, if you could
5	just mute yourself for a second. I'm sorry. Go ahead, Ms.
6	Mehlert, I'm sorry. What did you say?
7	MS. MEHLERT: I mean, March 19th is just looking like
8	the best day unless you think, unless the Office of Planning
9	thinks they can get everything in before a March 5th hearing with
10	enough time for the Board to review.
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yeah. I mean, he's saying the 21st,
12	the 28th. I mean, I'm fine with the 19th. The 5th is going to
13	be a weird day actually anyway, and so I would rather put anything
14	kind of complicated later on.
15	So, Ms. Alexander-Benons, we're going to come back here
16	on the 19th, okay, and that'll give the Board enough time to get
17	a report from the Office of Planning and then if the ANC wants
18	to add anything else, I mean, I see the letter from the ANC but
19	I don't know if there's an actual report.
20	Ms. Roblin, Commissioner, do you know if you guys are
21	going to
22	ANC COMMISSIONER ROBLIN: The report should be in. We
23	mailed it, Commissioner Arbuckle mailed it, submitted it. I'm
24	surprised it's not there. But maybe he didn't (indiscernible).
25	MS. MEHLERT: It's Exhibit 27.

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Oh, I'm sorry. I missed it. Oh,
2	great. I see it. Okay. All right.
3	Commissioner Roblin, so then if you'd like to you're
4	welcome to come back on March 19th.
5	ANC COMMISSIONER ROBLIN: Okay. That sounds great.
6	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right.
7	And you know what we'll try to do, Commissioner? We'll
8	do this first, okay? We'll do it first in the day so you know
9	when you're on, okay? If you want to come back, Commissioner.
10	ANC COMMISSIONER ROBLIN: That's nice of you. You
11	don't have to for me, but thank you. That's nice.
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: We'll do it for now and if it goes
13	sideways I'll let you know. Okay?
14	ANC COMMISSIONER ROBLIN: Okay. Thanks.
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right.
16	Ms. Alexander-Benons, do you have any questions?
17	MS. ALEXANDER-BENONS: No questions. I mean, I've
18	petitioned for an earlier date but I think the justifications
19	that you provided make sense.
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. All right.
21	Then we'll see you here on March 19th.
22	MS. ALEXANDER-BENONS: Okay. Cool. See you guys then.
23	Thank you.
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. Bye bye.
25	MS. ALEXANDER-BENONS: Bye.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right. 1 2 You may call our next one. 3 MS. MEHLERT: Next is Application No. 21176 of Natalia Banulescu-Bogdan. This is a self-certified application pursuant 4 5 to Subtitle X, Section 901.2 for special exceptions under 6 Subtitle D, Section 5201, from the rear yard requirements of 7 Subtitle D, Section 207.1 and the lot occupancy requirements of Subtitle D, Section 210.1. 8 9 This is for a new two-story rear addition and rear deck 10 addition to an existing two-story detached principal dwelling. 11 It is located in the R1-B zone at 6629 Piney Branch Road, Northwest, Square 2972, Lot 17. This was removed from the 12 13 September 11th expedited review calendar and scheduled for a 14 hearing on December 18th which was then postponed at the 15 Applicant's request. As a preliminary matter there is a request 16 to postpone from the Applicant and this would be the third 17 postponement. 18 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Thank you. 19 Can the Applicant hear me and if so, if they could 20 introduce themselves for the record. 21 MS. SCHINDER: Yes. This is Ileana Schinder. I'm the 22 architect for the Applicant. 23 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. 24 Ms. Schinder, you guys need a postponement. Can you explain to us why you need a postponement. 25

1	MS. SCHINDER: Yes. We're working with DDOT. The
2	Public Space Committee made an error in their agenda so we were
3	bumped from the December hearing to the hearing on February 27th.
4	So that's why, we were expected to have it by early January but
5	we do not, so that's why we keep requesting a postponement from
6	the Board of Zoning.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: When do you think you might be ready?
8	MS. SCHINDER: Well, based on their preliminary review,
9	we were going to get a result from them and a response in, on
10	February 27th of the hearing by Public Space Committee. We are
11	an item on their agenda right now.
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
13	All right. Ms. Mehlert, back to you I guess, when we
14	might be able to come back. Are we now back on the 19th again?
15	COMMISSIONER BLAKE: Mr. Chair, the Office of Planning
16	has not filed a report. Would they, how much time would they
17	need to do that?
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right. Give me one second here.
19	Can the Office of Planning hear me and if so, if they
20	could introduce themselves for the record.
21	(Pause.)
22	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. That's all right.
23	Ms. Mehlert, give me, I mean we're going to have to
24	get if we figure out time for the Office of Planning, like, I
25	mean you're going to Public Space, Ms. Schinder, on the 27th of

February, correct? 1 2 MS. SCHINDER: Correct. 3 CHAIRPERSON HILL: I'm sorry, you're going to Public 4 Then you have to go to DDOT after that? 5 MS. SCHINDER: It's the same one. DDOT, the only issue 6 with DDOT is with the Public Space Committee. We're not expecting 7 any other committee to review our project within DDOT. 8 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. 9 And then I'm waiting for Office of Planning to chime 10 in, but I think they probably can get us back something so we 11 can get back here on the 19th; is that not correct, Ms. Mehlert? 12 MS. MEHLERT: I'm not sure what OP's time line would 13 be. I mean, I don't, I mean --14 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. 15 MS. MEHLERT: -- yeah (indiscernible). 16 CHAIRPERSON HILL: I'll wait for OP. I'll wait for OP 17 to chime in here. Let's just keep OP out of it for one second. 18 When would be, I forget what, we just put something on the 19th, 19 right, so I don't know how. 20 MS. MEHLERT: Yeah. The case right before, we just put 21 on the 19th so you now have six cases and an expedited review on 22 the 19th. So you could add another case or you could push it to 23 the following week which also has six cases. 2.4 CHAIRPERSON HILL: No, let's put it on the 19th. And 25 then if the Office of Planning needs more time, Mr. Jurkovic, I

don't know if you can hear me or not? 2 MR. JURKOVIC: Yeah. Sorry, I just got back to my 3 desk. Which case is this for? CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure. No problem. 4 It's 21176 and they're waiting for Public Space hearing 5 6 on the 27th of February and we're trying to come back here on, I 7 don't know how far along you guys with this report or not or at least whether you've had a chance to look at this case really. 8 9 but if we could, that would mean we'd need to get a report from 10 you, like, you know, by March 14th in order to come back here on 11 the 19th. 12 MR. JURKOVIC: I'm not the one assigned to this case 13 so maybe you can bring in Joel and he would be a better one to 14 speak on this. 15 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. 16 Is Mr. Lawson available? I've never called in Mr. 17 Lawson before. Mr. Young, is Mr. Lawson available? 18 (Pause.) 19 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Oh, my gosh, Mr. Lawson. This is a 20 terrible precedent for you. I didn't know that we could just 21 call you up. This is fantastic. 22 MR. LAWSON: That's part of the job description so 23 that's perfectly fine. 2.4 CHAIRPERSON HILL: I didn't know that you could do it.

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

This is great. So, Mr. Lawson --

25

MR. LAWSON: Oh, now I'm worried. Now I'm worried. 1 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yeah. Well, you shouldn't really 2 3 be but now we kind of do know in the back of our brain that we can find you. I had no idea, that makes complete sense. It only 4 took four or five years of Covid to realize that you're probably 5 6 around. 7 MR. LAWSON: (Indiscernible) when you have a question for OP. 8 9 Ron Barron is the project manager for this and he's in 10 another meeting so I'm covering for him. Whatever date you set 11 we should be able to meet. We're certainly more than comfortable 12 with filing a report for May the 19th, or sorry, March the 19th. CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Right. 13 14 So March the 19th, so then you think we can get something by March the 14th which is that Friday? Oh, no, wait 15 16 a minute, any chance we can get it by March the 12th which is 17 the one week before the hearing? 18 MR. LAWSON: Feel free to set the date and we'll make 19 sure we meet that date. CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right. 20 Just because then legal (phonetic) will be able to put 21 22 that in their report before we get it on Friday. So let's go 23 ahead and put that on, Office of Planning's report on March the 2.4 12th. 25 Ms. Schinder, make sure you work with the Office of

1	Planning to get whatever it is with Public Space to them and then
2	we'll come back here on March 19th for the hearing, okay?
3	MS. SCHINDER: We'll be here. Thank you so much.
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Thank you.
5	MS. SCHINDER: Thank you.
6	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
7	I'm closing this portion of the hearing and the record
8	and we're postponing until 3/19. That makes complete sense.
9	Like, Mr. Lawson is actually listening. He's been listening for
10	years, like, he's been listening for years and so, like, we
11	literally could have just called Mr. Lawson at any time. Whenever
12	there's like an emergency closed meeting, we can have an emergency
13	Mr. Lawson meeting. It's great. Anyway okay, whatever. All
14	right. I'm sorry. I'm having a little bit of fun because we're
15	almost done.
16	All right. Do you all need a break? I'm happy. Break?
17	(Pause.)
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: No break? We can take a break.
19	Okay. Let's take a quick break. Okay? Fifteen minutes, we'll
20	come back. Thank you.
21	(Whereupon, there was a brief recess.)
22	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right, Ms. Mehlert. You are
23	welcome to call us back and our next case.
24	MS. MEHLERT: The Board is back from a quick recess and
25	is returning to its hearing session.

The next case is Application No. 21217 of David Ortiz and Nicole Johnston. This is an application pursuant to Subtitle X, Section 901.2 for a special exception under Subtitle E, Section 5201 from the rear yard requirements of Subtitle E, Section 207.1. This is for a first floor rear deck addition to an attached two-story principal dwelling. Located in the RF-1 zone at 149 Thomas Street, Northwest, Square 3114, Lot 65.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Great.

If the Applicant can hear me, if they could please introduce themselves for the record.

MR. ORTIZ: Yeah. Good morning, Chairman, Commissioners and Secretary. My name is David Ortiz. I live at 149 Thomas Street, Northwest, in Washington, D.C.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you, Mr. Ortiz.

Mr. Ortiz, if you want to go ahead and explain your project to the Board and, as best you can, how you believe it's meeting the criteria for us to grant the relief requested. I would imagine you're not a zoning lawyer but also we're working through this process with the Office of Planning and also any questions the Board has. So please go ahead and begin whenever you like.

MR. ORTIZ: Okay. I'll provide a summary and then look forward to your questions.

We seek exemption from the rear yard requirements. I think that's Subtitle E, Section 207.1. This is for an existing

structure that was constructed prior to our occupancy. The relief 2 sought is retroactive and seeks to bring the structure into 3 compliance. As stated in the burden of proof, the structure meets 4 the standard of review including air and light, privacy and the 5 general aesthetic of the alley and use of the area but does not 6 7 have any frontage on the front of the street and so wouldn't have 8 any implication for that aspect of any of the Board's purview. 9 All of this is summarized both in the burden of proof as well as 10 in Mr. Lawson's report from the Department of Planning. 11 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Great. Thank you. 12 Before I turn to my Board, may I hear from the Office 13 of Planning. 14 MR. MITCHUM: Yes. This is Joshua Mitchum with the 15 Office of Planning. 16 OP is in agreement with the Applicant's statement and we believe that it does meet the burden of proof required for 17 18 rear yard requirements, and we stand by the report submitted to 19 the record. 20 Thank you. 21 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you, Mr. Mitchum. 22 Let's see. Does the Board have any questions for the 23 Applicant or the Office of Planning? 2.4 (No response.) 25 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.

1	Mr. Ortiz, just for me, you talked to your neighbors
2	and the ANC. Can you just speak a little bit to the public
3	outreach.
4	MR. ORTIZ: Yeah. We talked to our neighbors. As
5	required, there's obviously hosting (phonetic) requirements but
6	we also know our neighbors on both sides adjacent, discussed with
7	them and they indicated that they had no problem, as well as our
8	ANC Commissioner, Hume Imtiaz, who also is in support of the
9	structure. And then in the record there are two letters of
10	support from neighbors who were notified through the notification
11	process.
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Thank you.
13	Mr. Young, is there anyone here wishing to speak?
14	MR. YOUNG: We do not.
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
16	Once again, does the Board have any questions of
17	anyone?
18	(No response.)
19	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
20	Mr. Ortiz, I'm going to let you go and I appreciate all
21	of the time that you went through and how tidy you made this
22	case.
23	MR. ORTIZ: Okay. Very good. You're quite welcome.
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you.
25	Going to close the hearing and the record.

1 (Pause.) 2 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. 3 I believe that I don't think I have any problems. think that the burden of proof that the Applicant has put forward 4 I would agree with their argument. I would also agree with the 5 analysis that the Office of Planning has given us, also that of 6 7 the ANC and as I mentioned during the hearing, it's nice that the Applicant has actually taken the time to reach out to their 8 9 adjacent neighbors and also garner support for this, and I think 10 it's relatively straightforward and I will be voting in favor of 11 this application. 12 Mr. Smith, do you have anything you'd like to add? 13 COMMISSIONER SMITH: No, Chairman Hill. 14 I agree that this is a relatively straightforward case. 15 So kudos to the Applicant for putting together a very, you know, 16 straightforward case and I recognize that the ANC is in support 17 of the application and the adjacent neighbors are also in support 18 of the application, and I will be as well. 19 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. 20 Mr. Blake? 21 COMMISSIONER BLAKE: Mr. Chair, I'm in support of the 22 application. 23 I agree with the statements that you and Board member 2.4 Smith made. I don't have any additional comments to add.

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

25

Thank you.

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you.
2	Vice Chair John?
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: I am in support of the
4	application and I have no additional comments.
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you.
6	Commissioner Stidham?
7	ZC COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: I am in support of the
8	application and have nothing to add.
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you.
10	All right. I'm going to make a motion to approve
11	Application No. 21217 as captioned and read by the secretary, and
12	ask for a second. Ms. John?
13	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Second.
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Motion has been made and seconded.
15	Madam Secretary, if you would you take a roll call, please.
16	MS. MEHLERT: Please respond to the Chair's motion to
17	approve the application.
18	Chairman Hill?
19	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.
20	MS. MEHLERT: Vice Chair John?
21	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Yes.
22	MS. MEHLERT: Mr. Smith?
23	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Yes.
24	MS. MEHLERT: Mr. Blake?
25	COMMISSIONER BLAKE: Yes.

MS. MEHLERT: Commissioner Stidham 1 2 ZC COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: 3 MS. MEHLERT: Staff would record the vote as five to 4 zero to zero to approve Application 21217 on the motion made by 5 Chairman Hill and seconded by Vice Chair John. CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. 6 Thank you. 7 You may call our next one when you get an opportunity, 8 Madam Secretary. 9 Next is Application No. 21238 of HGIT MS. MEHLERT: 10 1015 Half Street, LLC. This is a self-certified application pursuant to Subtitle X, Section 901.2 for special exceptions 11 12 under Subtitle C, Section 1304.2 and 1312 from the rear roof-13 mounted antenna setback requirements of Subtitle C, Section 14 1304.1(a) and from the roof-mounted antenna height limitations 15 of Subtitle C, Section 1304.1(b). This is for 31 roof-mounted 16 antennas on the penthouse roof of a ten-story building located 17 in the D-5 zone at 1015 Half Street, Southeast, Square 697, Lot 18 45, and as a preliminary matter the Applicant has proffered an 19 expert witness, Kerron Miller, in architecture who is not in the 20 witness book. 21 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Great. Thank you. 22 If the Applicant can hear me, if they could please 23 introduce themselves for the record. 2.4 Good morning, Mr. Chairman, MR. MILLER: Yes.

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

Commissioners and Secretary. My name is Kerron Miller. I'm a

25

senior associate with Hickok Cole. I'm a registered architect 2 in the District of Columbia and have been practicing for over 23 3 years. 4 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. 5 Mr. Miller, are you going to be presenting to us or is 6 Mr. Utz? I'm sorry, Mr. Utz, you're on mute. 7 (Pause.) CHAIRPERSON HILL: No, you're still on mute. Oh, now 8 9 Yeah. Do you want to go ahead and introduce yourself, 10 Mr. Utz? 11 MR. UTZ: Sure. Sorry about that. 12 I'm Jeff Utz with Goulston & Storrs. I am land use 13 counsel on behalf of the Applicant and I will be presenting along 14 with Mr. Miller and Mr. Goodman who are both on the line right 15 now. 16 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. 17 Mr. Goodman, would you like to introduce yourself for 18 the record? 19 MR. GOODMAN: This is Tony Goodman with DC's Homeland 20 Security and Emergency Management Agency. 21 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Great. 22 Mr. Utz, do you know where Mr. Miller's resume is in 23 the record? MR. UTZ: I do. It's Exhibit 19 in the case record. 24 25 So it's page 3 of the PDF.

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I got it.
2	MR. UTZ: Yes.
3	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thanks.
4	MR. UTZ: Sure.
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I don't have any issues of Mr. Miller
6	being admitted as an expert in architecture, being that he is an
7	architect. Do my fellow Board members have any issues with it?
8	(No response.)
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right. Thank you, Vice
10	Chair John.
11	All right, Mr. Utz. You can go ahead and walk us
12	through your client's application and however you would like to
13	do it. You know, there's a lot of antennas and so just tell us
14	about how you're meeting the criteria for us to grant this
15	particular relief. I'll put 15 minutes on the clock so I know
16	where we are, and you can begin whenever you like.
17	MR. UTZ: Great. Thank you so much.
18	Could we please pull up the presentation that's in the
19	record?
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Which one do you have? There's,
21	like, nine parts.
22	MR. UTZ: Yes. So I think it got chopped up in the,
23	due to its size.
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All of it. So just go ahead and
25	start with the first part.

MR. UTZ: Sure. Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Young.

MR. UTZ: Thank you. Great. Thank you.

So, hello again. For the record I'm Jeff Utz of Goulston & Storrs. I'm land use counsel for today's case which is, the Applicant is HGIT 1015 Half Street, LLC and that is the owner of the building working with its tenant, DC Homeland Security and Emergency Management Agency, DC HSEMA, which is Mr. Goodman's agency.

I just wanted to start by thanking the Board for this opportunity to present the case and, as discussed in our filings, walk through the antennas that are necessary and talk about the need. Basically this application allows for these 31 antenna that are a necessary enhancement to the safety in the region. We are also happy to share that we received unanimous support from ANC 8F as well as supported reports from OP and DDOT.

So as mentioned, with us today is Tony Goodman of HSEMA and the proffered expert witness is with us as well, Kerron Miller, of Hickok Cole, and I appreciate him being admitted as an expert. Can we go to the next page, please? Thank you.

So the application does seek relief for the setback and height requirements for roof-mounted antennas. The property is currently improved with an office building which is surrounded by similarly sized office and residential buildings. As mentioned it's in the D-5 zone. The Applicant is working with

its tenant, DC HSEMA to install the proposed antenna array to augment, modernize and supplement the existing communications equipment and capabilities of the District to address homeland security and emergency preparedness issues.

This slide sets out the relevant zoning regulation section for the building mounted antennas which is Subtitle C, Section 1305.1 and the slide shows the project's compliance with all the building mounted antenna requirements except for the two for which we are seeking relief which are Subsections (a) and (b), shown here with the red notation as special exceptions. (Indiscernible) height and special exception relief items Subtitle C, Section 312 permits the Board to grant special exception relief so long as the Applicant complies with several criteria.

The proposed antenna array complies with all these criteria. Notably, the Applicant has minimized the requested relief to the extent practicable to ensure effective and reliable emergency communications and logistics coordination services for the District and the region. The detailed justification is in the record at Exhibits 8 and 15A1 and I will close today's presentation with an overview of how this application addresses the standards of relief if the Board would like that overview.

Now I would like to turn it over to Mr. Goodman for an overview of the site and the need for the project along with some mention of the community outreach and then we'll hear from the

project architect. Next slide, please, and I'll turn it over to Mr. Goodman.

MR. GOODMAN: Thank you.

As I had mentioned, HSEMA, DC's Homeland Security Emergency Management Agency, we plan and coordinate everything related to preparing, preventing, responding, mitigating, recovering to all threats and hazards. In order to do that we work with dozens of District Federal and regional partners.

We're a small agency ourselves, you know, but we will typically have during a large emergency activation, we will have sometimes up to 60, 70, 80 agencies and will all be in our space with us as liaisons back to their own agencies. That's a lot of Federal agencies, lot of regional partners, each of which have their own frequencies, their own ways of communicating and so our space is designed to accommodate all those partners so that during events like large storms, the inauguration, the NATO Summit, things like that that we have all the right people in the room to make sure that we're prepared for any complications or any incidents that may occur.

So as part of that we will disseminate public safety information. Some of that is alerts that, you know, go to over social media and stuff, but we also will send out and coordinate alerts such as the variable message boards working with DDOT or getting push notifications on people's phones for emergencies.

As mentioned we operate the District's emergency

operations center. That includes a 24/7 fusion center for the things that are a step below that 80 agency response, but the typical responses that we often have that have a handful of agencies that still need to coordinate in the field and coordinate with each other.

We collect and disseminate all sorts of hazards, not only for the District but also for the region, specifically chartered by that with, by the Department of Homeland Security. We work a lot on post-emergency canvassing. That means assisting out other partners to make sure that people displaced by a fire or a storm or some sort of utility outage have what they need. A major thing we do is coordinating the recovery operations in terms of the resources, so making sure that the right resource in the right place and we get reimbursed appropriately and, again, just making sure that we coordinate with all of our neighbors a lot.

As part of this project, we have spent a lot of time talking to our partners on what their communication needs are. So that's been a very important part of our outreach making sure that we have the right antennas but also that we're not, you know, building anything that our partners won't use and we also of course have talked to the ANC. We have toured many other people and other agencies through our space often to make sure that we are serving our mission of being that coordinating agency in a space that can properly accommodate all of our partners.

MR. MILLER: Next slide, please.

So in the overall context 1015 Half Street is located south of the Capitol building between 395 and M and South Capitol and New Jersey, basically invisible from the major thoroughfares. Next slide, please.

Built in 2011 the building houses broadcast facilities for D.C., Federal (phonetic) utilities and disaster support organizations for several years. This image is before the surrounding context was filled in. Currently in and around the area of the building is almost completely transformed. Next slide, please.

In this existing site plan, just note marked just to the right, the building is bounded by K Street to the north and L Street to the south, Half Street to the west and a public alley to the east. There are several existing antennas already on the roof serving the tenant's mission critical purposes. Next slide, please.

The new site plan shows the new antennas being proposed by DC HSEMA and their setbacks from the penthouse roof to (audio interference). Next slide, please.

The setback relief, this diagram shows the eight antennas that will not meet the setback requirements along the public alley and will require setback relief. However, you can see that they are seen from the setback from K and L Streets. It's only at the public alley side that need a setback

requirement. Next slide, please.

1.3

There are 25 antennas that exceed the height limit of 12 feet above the roof. Again, all are significantly setback from the major streets and meet the setback limits from those streets and as we'll see in the formal elevations with antennas (indiscernible). Next slide, please.

This is the east elevation along facing Half Street. Setbacks are indicated by diagonal lines and the height limit datums (phonetic) are indicated by the horizontal lines. The lower datum line, horizontal datum line, is the penthouse roof line. The second is a total for max height per zoning and the third upper line is the height to the highest antenna. Next slide, please.

On the south elevation which faces L Street you see that there's no issues with the setbacks, just the height limits. Next slide, please.

On the north elevation, K Street facing, the antennas facing the alley is the only area that we need to have a setback. (Indiscernible) this is still (phonetic) setback significantly from the major street, however once again we don't need the height limit. We don't have height limit issues here. Next slide, please.

On the west elevation we only have a height limits issues. Setbacks are the same as Half Street. Next slide, please.

On this enlarged context line, there are many antennas located around the surrounding buildings. Some appear to exceed the height requirements of the total max setback zoning. Here we're showing eight surrounding buildings with antennas and we'll dive in a little bit closer at these locations. Next slide, please.

These photos were taken from the 1015 Half Street penthouse. There are similar types of antennas that are located on surrounding buildings. They are hard to see in the photos and in reality. Next slide, please.

So what we did on the left side is that we went ahead and revised (phonetic) where these antennas are located. Next slide, please.

We took a step further out and photos E through A shows the antennas' location a little bit further out. Again, this is not uncommon on the skyline. You see a lot on the D.C. skyline. Next slide, please.

Again, here we highlighted the antennas for ease of sight. Next slide, please.

We walked around the entire neighborhood and we also took views of the building and there you have an idea of the bulk, and so we really in one view that we begin to see the penthouse from the street level. Next slide, please.

It's not until that we're further down on South Capitol that you begin to see the penthouse outline. The existing view

to the left and approach with the new antennas to the right. It is very difficult to see the new antennas. Of note, there's an existing vacant lot adjacent to the church that we understand future development will fill out, thereby further obstructing the views to the building from the location on South Capitol. Next slide, please.

Hand it over back to Jeff.

MR. UTZ: Great. Thank you, Kerron.

I would just like to give an overview of the criteria for special exception relief and how this application satisfies those elements and I know there's a lot on this slide. It is a detailed set of standards for special exception relief for special exceptions, but the intent with this slide is to provide a snapshot showing that all those detailed elements are actually satisfied by elements of the application.

So I can just run through. This particular slide shows the elements that are particular to antenna special exceptions. These are the elements set forth under Subtitle C, Section 312 and then we have a second slide that speaks through the elements of the general special exception relief under Subtitle X, 901.

So taking it from the top on this slide, application requirements are set forth in C-1312.1 including No. 1, a map of area to be served by the new antennas, that is provided in the record as page A4 of Exhibit 10 and we've shown that as part of this presentation as well.

The second item is a map and explanation of area being inadequately served that necessitates the antenna, and this is as we've mentioned, as Mr. Goodman mentioned, that array here supports emergency response services for the whole District. This is the key, a key node and kind of command center for those efforts.

The third item is a map indicating the location of any other antenna and other monopoles and those sorts of elements within the vicinity. Pages A4, A5 and A6 of Exhibit 10 show a map and pictures of the ten identifiable sites that are in the vicinity of the site.

Item No. 4 is a site and roof plan showing all structures and antennas on the site and that was shown as part of this presentation but that can be found as pages A7, A9 and A10 of Exhibit 10 as well.

Item 5 is an elevation drawing or drawings of this structure and the proposed antennas from all four directions, and Mr. Miller did show those as part of this presentation but those are also in the record as pages All through Al4 at Exhibit 10.

The sixth item is a picture of the proposed antennas and specifications and pictures are shown on pages A21 through A28 of Exhibit 10. The implementation of these antennas is shown on the site plans, elevations and renderings included as pages A9 through A14 and A18 of Exhibit 10.

No. 7 is the total mounted height of the antennas

relative to the top of surrounding trees as they exist within a quarter of a mile and this site is located in a highly urban context so the building's taller than the surrounding trees and there's no interference or adverse relationship there. Pages A8, A15 and A16 of Exhibit 10 show the buildings that are in the vicinity of the site.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Item 8 is other information that may be necessary for the impact assessment of the antenna and the response here is two-fold. You know, the OP report indicated that there are no additional elements necessary for the impact assessment but we are happy to provide additional information if the Board may deem necessary to review the impact here. Next slide, please.

Thank you. So this slide, as I was mentioning, gives an overview of the more general special exception review standards that are set forth under Subtitle X, Section 901. would say broadly that this application meets those standards. The first element of the relief standard is that the requested special exception will be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the zoning regulations. Here, the antenna create conditions favorable for health, safety, transportation, prosperity, protection of civil property, civic activity, recreation, education and cultural opportunities among other purposes, and those are the elements that are set forth in the D.C. Code itself regarding the zoning regulations and then reflected in the zoning regulations as well, and then also these

antenna will provide the District's emergency response and security systems with a safer and more robust municipal infrastructure system that will enhance protection for the public.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The second element of the relief standards is that the requested relief will not tend to affect adversely the use of Here the antennas will indeed not neighboring property. adversely affect neighboring properties and will not create any appreciable change to the favorable conditions of the area. Also There are, we importantly the visual impact is minimal here. have 31 antenna overall but their location atop a 110 foot building which is surrounded by other buildings and very limited viewpoints exist around the street will mitigate visibility of these antenna. So, and they are also barely visible from neighboring properties. They are designed for minimal visual intrusion and they are made of materials that blend with the surroundings and as a testament to the minimal adverse impacts produced by these antenna, there are antenna on this property now and other properties in the vicinity that are not having adverse impacts. So all in all, we do not feel that there is a visual impact that would be adverse in any way.

With that, that brings our presentation to a close. I think we might have run over 15 minutes and for that I apologize, but we're happy to answer any questions you might have, and thank you so much for the opportunity to present.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you, Mr. Utz. 1 Before I turn to my Board can I hear from the Office 2 3 of Planning. MS. THOMAS: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members of the 4 Board. Karen Thomas with the Office of Planning. 5 And the Office of Planning is in support of this 6 7 application, particularly as it supports the District's emergency management operations and having satisfied the criteria under 8 9 Subtitle C, Section 1312.1, it has met those criteria as explained 10 by Mr. Utz just now, and also it has satisfied the special 11 exception criteria to meet the intent of the regulations which, 12 in part, is to minimize visibility from public space and with the 13 surrounding height of the buildings and the location of this 14 building and the location on the penthouse roof, the antennas 15 would be barely visible from public space. 16 And with that, I'll rest on the record of our report. 17 Thank you. 18 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you, Ms. Thomas. 19 Does the Board have any questions of the Applicant or 20 the Office of Planning? Go ahead, Mr. Smith. 21 22 COMMISSIONER SMITH: My question is regarding, so I'll 23 just state from a Federal interest point, this is along South

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

Capitol Street that overlooks The Capitol. So there is a Federal

interest in the viewsheds along South Capitol Street.

24

25

My question is the pictures that were provided, the proposed pictures that were provided that look out to this building along from the tunnel on South Capitol Street, that is fairly far away. Was there any additional views that were provided either to the Office of Planning or that you have that show it from the northbound side of South Capitol Street, because these are 20 foot tall antennas.

MR. UTZ: Thank you for that question.

There was quite an effort that we put in to find those points of view that would even show the roof here. That view that's included in the record from South Cap., is actually the only one that our team could find that would even show the antenna at all. So if we came from that northern approach it would actually be shielded from the surrounding buildings that already exist and actually that southern view will hopefully soon be blocked by a building that will rise on the left. It's actually right between where that point of view exists and where the building is shown in the image. There's a site there that is ready for development that will hopefully happen soon.

So it will be, that was something that we were very mindful of, how the viewsheds from South Capitol would be impacted and if there would be any impact on the monumental view down South Capitol or up South Capitol, and we don't think that there is. There actually is a limited impact on Half Street itself, even the immediate streets themselves. It's just, it is really

1	hard to get a shot of this roof array when it comes down to it.
2	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Honestly, I think it would have
3	been helpful to show that, to show that if you had some type of
4	contextual picture, that showed that along the auxiliary lanes
5	for the exits to turn right as South Capitol is (audio
6	interference) to show that you can't see those antennas from
7	northbound South Capitol or those auxiliary lanes.
8	So I think that would have been helpful for me but, you
9	know, c'est la vie, you know, we're here now. But that was my
10	only question, Chairman Hill.
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Smith.
12	Anyone else from the Board?
13	(No response.)
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Young, is there anyone here
15	wishing to speak?
16	MR. YOUNG: We do not.
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
18	Mr. Utz, you guys went to the ANC. Can you tell us
19	how that went?
20	MR. UTZ: We did. They voted in support of this
21	application but have not been able to put that letter in the
22	record. We've been in touch with them quite a bit since then
23	but they did vote on a full ANC agenda, the duly noticed meeting,
24	to support the application.
25	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Thank you. All right.

Anything else from the Board?
(No response.)

3 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.

Mr. Utz, I'm going to let you guys go. You guys have a nice day.

MR. UTZ: Thank you so much. You too.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Bye bye. Okay.

For me it really came down to, like, you know, just about the special exception and the standards and X-901(b) about adversely affecting the use of properties and the antennas I guess, you know, they're on a 110 foot story building and they're smaller antennas than I thought to be quite honest. They're pretty slim, tiny, you know, they're narrow and so I don't think that any of the views are being affected by this and I think that they've done a good job of showing how it's not really affected in terms of the relief. I mean, I think obviously it's DC emergency services and so they need as many communications systems that they can to help the community.

But, and I also appreciate that they did reach out to the ANC and although we don't have an official, I think I heard that correctly, we don't have an official statement from the ANC, meaning the vote on the record, the Applicant did state that they did present before the ANC and they voted in favor. Then on top of that I'll credit the analysis of the Office of Planning has provided and I would also agree with that, and I will be voting

in favor of this application.

Mr. Smith, do you have anything you'd like to add?

COMMISSIONER SMITH: I think I by and large agree with your assessment of this particular case and how it meets the special exception criteria per D.C. zoning regulations. But, you know, from a Federal interest standpoint, I'm uncomfortable with supporting the application without additional site line to show its visual impact along South Capitol Street. So for now I'm a no from a Federal interest standpoint.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Let's see where we land.

11 Mr. Blake?

COMMISSIONER BLAKE: Sure. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I do believe that the Applicant has met the burden of proof to be granted the requested relief and I do agree with the Office of Planning's analysis of how the Applicant has met the criteria. As I see it, these antennas favorably affect the welfare and safety of the population and don't detract from the landscape, streetscape, the skyline, the scenic beauty or aesthetic interests of the District and I would give great weight to the Office of Planning's analysis and recommendation for approval, and I do acknowledge that you said there's nothing from the ANC but note the testimony from the ANC.

I do understand Mr. Smith's concern about the view, however, at that height and given those sizes and the way that it, it's hard to see those at that height. You know, our head

doesn't look up in such a way that does that from the street so you do have to get fairly far away to even see them and they're such small antennas that they're barely noticeable. That's what I saw on that, in the pictures that I think really did reflect how difficult it was to even notice they were up there.

And so I am, as I said, long story short I'm in support of the application and I do think it met the criteria for approval.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you.

Vice Chair John?

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am also in support of the application and I'm going to give great weight to the Office of Planning's analysis, and I also appreciate Mr. Utz's explanation of why there is minimal visual impact in the surrounding area in terms of the South Capitol view and why it was difficult to even see the antenna from closer in.

So based on that consideration, I'm in support of the application even though I understand Mr. Smith's hesitancy. But from a zoning standpoint I believe the application meets the criteria for relief.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you.

Commissioner Stidham?

ZC COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: I really don't have anything to add to what Board member John and Board member Blake. I think

1	they both covered it well, and I agree to support it.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Thank you. All right.
3	I'm going to make a motion then to approve Application
4	No. 21238 as captioned and read by the secretary, and ask for a
5	second. Ms. John?
6	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Second.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Motion made and seconded. Madam
8	Secretary, if you could take a roll call, please.
9	MS. MEHLERT: Please respond to the Chair's motion to
10	approve the application.
11	Chairman Hill?
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.
13	MS. MEHLERT: Vice Chair John?
14	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Yes.
15	MS. MEHLERT: Mr. Smith? Can you say that again?
16	COMMISSIONER SMITH: No.
17	MS. MEHLERT: No. Mr. Blake?
18	COMMISSIONER BLAKE: Yes.
19	MS. MEHLERT: Commissioner Stidham?
20	ZC COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes.
21	MS. MEHLERT: Staff would record the vote as four to
22	one to zero to Application 21238 on the motion made by Chairman
23	Hill and seconded by Vice Chair John, with Board member Smith
24	opposed to the motion.
25	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right. Thank you.

I believe there's one more order of business for us, if I'm not mistaken and so if you all would bear with me for one second. I think, so Vice Chair John's term with us is officially ending on March 26th and she has been just a wonderful Vice Chair and has, you know, been very helpful to me, the Board and particularly when I have to, you know, not be here and she's been great and she's just a smart person to have help with the regulations and bringing her expertise in her past career to this job.

And so I first, Ms. John, want to thank you so much for having the opportunity to do that. I'm sure whoever's here on the 26th, and I hope I'm here for a little bit, will have a little thing to say as well. But what we're supposed to do now is have elections and since Ms. John will no longer be with us on the 26th, I wanted to take the opportunity to, I don't know if there is seconding or not, but I would ask Ms. John to second I guess, have an opportunity to nominate Mr. Carl Blake as our Vice Chair and would look for someone to second this nomination and I guess I could ask Ms. John if you would be so kind.

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: I will be happy to second that nomination, Mr. Chairman.

I believe Board member Blake will be an excellent Vice Chair and he has done a great job since he joined the Board and I'm excited to see what he does and how he brings his special experience to the Board, and I think the Board is lucky to have

1	him.
2	So I wholeheartedly support Board member Blake's
3	nomination.
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you.
5	Madam Secretary, are we supposed to take a vote?
6	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Yes.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Oh, okay. Great.
8	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: That's my recollection of what
9	happened in my case.
10	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Do we have to ask Mr. Blake if he's
11	accepting?
12	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Yes, I think so.
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Blake, do you accept?
14	COMMISSIONER BLAKE: Yes, I do. No further comment.
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I guess you have to take a vote,
16	Madam Secretary.
17	MS. MEHLERT: All right Please respond to the Chair's
18	motion to nominate Board member Blake as Vice Chair.
19	Chairman Hill?
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.
21	MS. MEHLERT: Vice Chair John?
22	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Yes.
23	MS. MEHLERT: Mr. Smith?
24	COMMISSIONER SMITH: Yes.
25	MS. MEHLERT: Mr. Blake?

1	COMMISSIONER BLAKE: Yes.
2	MS. MEHLERT: Commissioner Stidham?
3	ZC COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes, very much so.
4	MS. MEHLERT: Staff would record the vote as five to
5	zero to zero to nominate Mr. Blake as the new Vice Chair on the
6	motion made by Chairman Hill and seconded by Vice Chair John.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Great.
8	Well, since we're going to go with this, oh, yeah.
9	Yeh, all right. Okay.
10	Well, since we're going to go with this back and forth
11	thing here a little bit, not to assume anybody's going to nominate
12	anybody, but Ms. John, we need a nomination for a Chair.
13	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Oh. I vote, I nominate Chairman
14	Hill to continue in his position as Chair of the Board, and I'm
15	looking for a second. Vice Chair Blake?
16	COMMISSIONER BLAKE: Second.
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I accept.
18	MS. MEHLERT: Please respond to Ms. John's motion to
19	nominate Mr. Hill to continue as the Chair.
20	Chairman Hill?
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.
22	MS. MEHLERT: Ms. John?
23	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Yes.
24	MS. MEHLERT: Mr. Smith?
25	(Pause.)

1	COMMISSIONER SMITH: I had to think about it. Yes.
2	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: I love the suspense.
3	MS. MEHLERT: Vice Chair Blake?
4	COMMISSIONER BLAKE: Yes.
5	MS. MEHLERT: And Commissioner Stidham?
6	ZC COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes.
7	MS. MEHLERT: Staff would record the vote as five to
8	zero to zero to nominate Mr. Hill as the Chair again on the motion
9	made by Ms. John and seconded by Vice Chair Blake.
10	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yeh. Okay.
11	There's only two people. Like, there's not like, a
12	whole lot of suspense there, right? Although maybe one day there
13	will be suspense, just not while I'm around.
14	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Maybe, maybe not.
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Maybe, maybe not. I don't know.
16	So, anyway, okay. Well, congratulations Mr. Blake.
17	Thank you for your service, Ms. John. Thank you for nominating
18	and continuing to think that I'm doing an okay job to keep going.
19	All right. I guess that's it, right? Madam Secretary?
20	MS. MEHLERT: Yes.
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right.
22	We stand adjourned. You all have a good day.
23	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you. Bye.
24	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the
25	record at 11:51 a.m.)

CERTIFICATION

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Public Hearing

Before: DC BZA

Date: 02-12-25

Place: Webex videoconferencing.

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

Michelle Morales-Bonilla

Michelle Mnale