

GOVERNMENT OF  
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

REGULAR PUBLIC HEARING  
CASE NO. 24-20

+ + + + +

MONDAY

MARCH 31, 2025

+ + + + +

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

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

ANTHONY J. HOOD, Chairperson  
ROBERT E. MILLER, Vice Chair  
JOSEPH IMAMURA, Commissioner  
GWEN WRIGHT, Commissioner  
TAMMY STIDHAM, Commissioner

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

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

OFFICE OF ZONING LEGAL DIVISION STAFF PRESENT:

HILLARY LOVICK, ESQUIRE

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

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

PHILIP BRADFORD  
JENNIFER STEINGASSER  
JOEL LAWSON

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the  
Regular Public Hearing held on March 31, 2025.

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

T-A-B-L-E    O-F    C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

Case No. 24-20  
Office of Planning

Introduction - Chairman Hood ..... 4

Presentation by Office of Planning - Mr. Bradford ..... 6

Questions/Comments by Commissioners

    Commissioner Wright ..... 11

    Commissioner Imamura ..... 12

    Commissioner Miller ..... 13

    Commissioner Stidham ..... 16

    Commissioner Hood ..... 16

Motion and Vote ..... 18

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

2 (4:00 p.m.)

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Good afternoon, ladies and  
4 gentlemen. We are convening and broadcasting this public hearing  
5 by videoconferencing. My name is Anthony Hood. Joining me this  
6 evening are Vice Chair Miller, Commissioner Wright, Commissioner  
7 Stidham, and Commissioner Imamura. We're also joined by the  
8 Office of Zoning staff, Ms. Sharon Schellin, and Mr. Paul Young,  
9 who will be handling all of our virtual operations; also, our  
10 Office of Zoning Legal Division, Ms. Hillary Lovick.

11 Copies of today's virtual public hearing notice are  
12 available on the Office of Zoning's website. Please be advised  
13 that this proceeding is being recorded by a court reporter and  
14 is also webcast live via Webex and YouTube live. The video will  
15 be available on the Office of Zoning's website after the hearing.  
16 Accordingly, all those listening on Webex or by phone will be  
17 muted during the hearing, and only those who have signed up to  
18 participate or testify will be unmuted at the appropriate time.  
19 Please state your name before providing oral testimony on your  
20 presentation. Oral presentations should be limited to a summary  
21 of your most important points. When you are finished speaking,  
22 please mute your audio, so that your microphone is no longer  
23 picking up sound or background noise.

24 If you experience difficulty accessing Webex or with  
25 your telephone call-in, then please call our OZ Hotline number

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

1 at 202-727-0789 to receive Webex log-in or call-in instructions  
2 or if you need assistance to sign up to testify. Also, persons  
3 planning to testify either in favor, opposition or undeclared  
4 must sign up in advance and will be called by name. If you wish  
5 to file written testimony or additional supporting documents  
6 during the hearing, then please request that the submission be  
7 entered into the record and be prepared to describe it at the  
8 time of your testimony. Oh, it must be nice, modern technology.  
9 I see you, Rob. I get distracted easily.

10           Anyway, the subject of this evening's hearing is the  
11 Office of Zoning Commission Case Number 24-20, Office of Planning  
12 text amendment to Subtitles B, D through F, and I; clarifications  
13 to rear-yard measurements in the R, RF, and RA zones. Again,  
14 today's date is March the 31st, 2025.

15           The hearing will be conducted in accordance with the  
16 provisions of 11-Z DCMR, Chapter 5, as follows: preliminary  
17 matters; presentation by the petitioner -- in this case, the  
18 Office of Planning -- they have up to 60 minutes. I don't believe  
19 it will take that much time. And I would also ask that they  
20 respond to the letter or any concerns that we have in the record.  
21 I think that would help us move more efficiently -- report of  
22 other government agencies; report of the ANC; testimony of  
23 organizations and individuals, each having five and three  
24 minutes -- organizations, five minutes; individuals, three  
25 minutes, respectively. And we'll hear in the order from those

1 | in support, opposition, or undeclared. While the Commission  
2 | reserves the right to change the time limits for presentations,  
3 | if necessary, it intends to adhere to the time limits as strictly  
4 | as possibly, and notes that no time shall be ceded. At this  
5 | time, the Commission will consider any preliminary matters. Does  
6 | the staff have any preliminary matters?

7 | MS. SCHELLIN: I don't think staff really needs to tee  
8 | this one much -- up much. As you stated, it's a rulemaking case  
9 | with the Office of Planning as the petitioner. Mr. Bradford, Ms.  
10 | Steingasser, and Mr. Lawson will be the three presenters. This  
11 | is a text amendment to Subtitle B, D, E, F, and I, with regard  
12 | to clarifying the rear-yard measurements. So I will turn this  
13 | over, and, at this point, we only have one person signed up to  
14 | testify. We'll see how it is, once we get to that point of the  
15 | hearing. Thank you.

16 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Schellin.  
17 | Let's bring Mr. Bradford and Ms. Steingasser and Mr. Lawson up.  
18 | And whoever's going to proceed for the Office of Planning, you  
19 | may begin.

20 | MR. BRADFORD: Mr. Young, could you pull up my  
21 | PowerPoint presentation please?

22 | (PowerPoint presentation shared on screen.)

23 | MR. BRADFORD: Thank you. Good evening, Chairman Hood,  
24 | members of the Commission. For the record, this is Philip  
25 | Bradford, Development Review Specialist with the Office of

1 Planning here to present Zoning Commission Case 24-20. OP has  
2 been working closely with DOB and the Office of the Zoning  
3 Administrator on this text amendment, as staff from both agencies  
4 have noted difficulties in administering the rear-yard standards  
5 for residential zones, with many projects now requiring special  
6 exception relief. These changes seek to bring consistency  
7 between the Zoning Code and the current Zoning Administration  
8 interpretations regarding rear yards and accessory buildings and  
9 will likely result in a reduced administrative burden on building  
10 accessory structures within the District.

11 Since the setdown meeting on December 19th, 2025, the  
12 proposed text amendment is now before you in the public hearing  
13 without any additional changes. The Office of Planning is  
14 recommending the Commission approve the proposed text amendment  
15 to Subtitles B, D, F, and I, which would add clarifications to  
16 the rules of measurement and change the rear-yard development  
17 standards for accessory buildings in residential zones.

18 Next slide please. In approving the proposed text  
19 amendment, it's important to visualize some of the proposed  
20 changes to the rules of measurement in accessory buildings. The  
21 lot shown on the left illustrates several of the clarifications  
22 within the proposed text amendment. First, new language is --  
23 new language clearly states the measurement for the rear yard  
24 begins at the rearmost point of the principal building and extends  
25 from the rear lot line, and this is in B318.1.

1           Next, the proposed text clarifies that within the rear  
2 yard, the required depth is measured between the rear line of a  
3 building and a rear lot line, and this is in Section B318.2.  
4 This change codifies the difference between rear yards and  
5 required rear yards, because often lots have additional distance  
6 between the rear lot line and the rear building beyond what is  
7 required in the zoning regulations.

8           The lot -- excuse me -- the lot on the left also  
9 clarifies -- or illustrates B318.4, which measures rear yard from  
10 the rear of the building towards the rear lot line. This new  
11 language is consistent with staff interpretations and the Office  
12 of the Zoning Administrator. On the right side of the slide are  
13 two irregular lots where the measurement begins at the  
14 furthestmost point of the lot line from the street for B318.5.  
15 No change is proposed to these sections -- to this section, and  
16 it remains as is. These lots are just included to illustrate  
17 the difference. The definitions in rules of measurement contain  
18 numerous other sections on how to measure rear yards on irregular  
19 lots, and, as part of this text amendment, they all remain  
20 unchanged.

21           Next slide please. With the rules of measurement  
22 clarified, the next slide illustrates how the return to the ZR-  
23 58 standard of allowing accessory buildings to occupy the 30 --  
24 to occupy 30 percent of the required rear yard and removing the  
25 ZR-16 prohibition will work in practice. These two lots show



1 typical lots in the R-1B and RF zone. With this text amendment,  
2 the accessory structure has additional flexibility on placement  
3 within the required rear yard. Anything occupying beyond 30  
4 percent of the required rear-yard area will require special  
5 exception relief following the existing special exception  
6 criteria.

7           Next slide please. This map shows all the R, RF, and  
8 RA zones within the District and illustrates how many properties  
9 were likely made nonconforming when the accessory structures were  
10 prohibited in the rear yard in ZR-16. Given how widespread these  
11 zones are also shows how many properties can be impacted by the  
12 current regulations when building a garage or accessory dwelling  
13 unit, which would potentially require special exception relief,  
14 adding time, cost, and additional administrative processes on  
15 development. The proposed text amendment has a citywide impact;  
16 therefore, it does not impact a specific planning area more than  
17 any other, and, thus, has a neutral impact on racial equity. The  
18 text amendment furthers several Comprehensive Plan policy goals  
19 within the land use, housing, and implementation elements, as the  
20 Comprehensive Plan generally encourages monitoring, updating, and  
21 improving regulations and permitting processes.

22           Next slide please. The project record includes public  
23 comments from Committee of 100 and the Washington, D.C. Chapter  
24 of the American Institute of Architects. The D.C. AIA Chapter  
25 is supportive of the proposed text amendments. The Committee of

1 100's comment letter includes several questions that OP would  
2 like to address to highlight that a text amendment such as this  
3 can be confusing and quite technical. There are three questions  
4 contained in their comment letter, so to address these questions,  
5 the first of which is, "Will the proposed text amendment shrink  
6 or expand minimum rear-yard depth?" No, the required rear yard  
7 does not change in any of the residential zones as part of this  
8 text amendment.

9           The next question, "Will the changes impact maximum  
10 allowable lot occupancy?" No, the maximum lot occupancy by right  
11 and by special exception does not change, as part of this text  
12 amendment.

13           And the last question, "Will the proposed changes  
14 facilitate or hinder approval of ADUs?" The impact is neutral.  
15 This text amendment includes clarifications that codify standard  
16 practice to rules of measurement and provide flexibility on the  
17 placement of accessory structures in the rear yard. This text  
18 amendment does not facilitate or hinder ADU approval. The  
19 proposed text amendment will likely reduce the need for special  
20 exception relief for ADUs that are located in accessory  
21 buildings, rather than ones that are located internal to the  
22 primary structure. And, with that, that concludes my  
23 presentation, and I'm available for any questions. Thank you.

24           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Mr. Bradford, and thank  
25 you for addressing the Committee of 100's letter from Mr. Repp,

1 | because that was one of my questions, and I appreciate you all  
2 | providing that information for the record. Let me go to  
3 | Commissioner Wright, and then Commissioner Imamura; and then,  
4 | Vice Chair Miller, I'm going to go to you third, and then  
5 | Commissioner Stidham, and myself last. I don't think I have any  
6 | questions though. Commissioner Wright.

7 |           COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Thank you. And thank you for the  
8 | PowerPoint about the text amendment. I have a couple of  
9 | questions. In the current situation, with the example that you  
10 | gave of the accessory building on the lot that was about 5,000  
11 | square feet in size, are you saying that one of the things that's  
12 | unclear today is whether that accessory building can extend into  
13 | the required rear-yard area?

14 |           MR. BRADFORD: Currently that is relatively clear in  
15 | the Code, in that it's not prohibited -- it's not permitted at  
16 | all in the required rear-yard area. So the return to the ZR-58  
17 | allowance of letting it occupy up to 30 percent just gives that  
18 | structure some slight wiggle room in the rear -- required rear-  
19 | yard area to give some more flexibility to where it can be placed.

20 |           COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: I see. So, today, the problem  
21 | that is being solved, in essence, is that there is -- in that  
22 | illustration that you showed us, that accessory building could  
23 | not have been placed at all within the hatched area --

24 |           MR. BRADFORD: Correct, yes.

25 |           COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: -- because that is the required

1 rear yard. This gives additional flexibility, in that at least  
2 30 percent of that hatched area can include a portion of the  
3 accessory building. It isn't required that it all be in the  
4 hatched area, but it gives flexibility that some portion of it,  
5 as long as it doesn't exceed 30 percent, can extend into the  
6 hatched area.

7 MR. BRADFORD: That is exactly right, Commissioner  
8 Wright.

9 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Okay. Well, that helps clarify  
10 that for me. I mean, I would say, to that end, I think this  
11 actually is not just neutral, but actually helpful in providing  
12 additional flexibility for accessory dwelling units. I do  
13 understand that some accessory dwelling units are internal to the  
14 main structure, but some are separate, detached accessory  
15 buildings, and, you know, this definitely I think gives some  
16 additional flexibility on placement, which I think is a good  
17 thing. And it sounds like the letter from the American Institute  
18 of Architects also sort of saw this as a positive in providing  
19 additional flexibility for accessory dwelling units. So I think  
20 that -- that was just sort of my clarification. I wanted to make  
21 sure I understood sort of the full purpose of this text amendment,  
22 and I think that is it, in terms of my questions.

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. Commissioner Imamura.

24 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
25 Appreciate Commissioner Wright's questions seeking further

1 clarification. And, Mr. Bradford, thank you for the  
2 illustrations. That certainly does help, because this is kind  
3 of a technical exercise here. I don't really have any questions.  
4 I think -- I appreciate the succinctness of your presentation,  
5 and I do agree that this adds, you know, more clarity and  
6 consistency with the R, the RF, and the RA zones for rules of  
7 measurement here, so happy to see the additional flexibility  
8 here, and hopefully this does reduce some of the special exception  
9 relief cases that the BZA is inundated. So, all right, thank  
10 you, Mr. Bradford. Appreciate it.

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let me go to Vice Chair Acela -- I  
12 mean -- I'm sorry -- Vice Chair Miller.

13 VICE CHAIR MILLER: We're on the Northeast Corridor,  
14 not the Acela, but -- and we're stuck in Aberdeen because of the  
15 power outage, apparently, in Baltimore. Hopefully, I'll be home  
16 tonight. So, actually, it makes it easier to have this  
17 technology, because it would be very shaky I think otherwise,  
18 because the infrastructure law probably will never get  
19 implemented that was going to fix this -- these tracks, at least  
20 in the next four years. So that's my commentary.

21 On this case, thank you, Mr. Chairman, Thank you, my  
22 fellow Commissioners. I agree with the comments of -- I share  
23 the comments of Commissioners Wright and Imamura. Thank you, Mr.  
24 Bradford, for your presentation and the Office of Planning for  
25 bringing these clarifications forward. I had one question, which

1 I think is not related to what you're trying to do here, which --  
2 because it was -- but it's in my mind, because it was a recent  
3 BZA case that I sat on that I can't remember if you were on, Mr.  
4 Bradford, but I see Mr. Lawson is here, and he -- I know he  
5 monitors all of them -- all the BZA Cases.

6 This isn't dealing with any issue regarding the side  
7 yard of an accessory dwelling unit. There was an issue, at least  
8 from the neighboring owner, about whether the side yard --  
9 whether there needed to be a side yard -- it wasn't in -- it  
10 wasn't in the rear -- they met the rear-yard requirements of the  
11 current -- probably in the old regulations, but because it was  
12 in the back against the alley, it met the -- whatever the setback  
13 was, what it needed to be from the alley, but it was right up  
14 against the property line I think of the side of the property  
15 owner. Was that your case, Commissioner Wright, or was it mine?  
16 I don't know why -- I think you -- maybe I -- we're all -- we're  
17 all on those cases -- we're all there together --

18 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes, that is a BZA appeal case,  
19 but -- again, it may not be the same case that you're describing,  
20 but it was a similar issue about a concern about an accessory  
21 building which was an ADU being right on the property line. And,  
22 in fact, you know, again, at some point in the future, I think  
23 there may be another little zoning text amendment that's needed  
24 for clarification, that although an accessory dwelling unit is a  
25 detached building, it doesn't have to meet all of the requirements

1 about side-yard setbacks of detached buildings. Right now, the  
2 Code is sort of silent on that, and the interpretation has been  
3 that the accessory dwelling units can essentially go to a zero  
4 lot line, except with alleys, for setbacks -- side-yard setbacks  
5 and so forth, but I think there's a little clarification that is  
6 needed, because they are detached structures, and there are other  
7 rules for detached structures, which are interpreted to not apply  
8 to accessory dwelling units. I just -- I just think that is  
9 another little point -- not part of this text amendment, but  
10 another little point that might need clarification in the future.

11 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Well, I'm glad I called on you,  
12 Commissioner Wright, because that completed what I was trying to  
13 get at, that I don't think that it's part of this text case, but  
14 I would be interested, if the Office of Planning is looking at  
15 that issue, because I don't know if it's come up in more than  
16 one BZA case, but I would encourage you to look at it and see if  
17 there needs to be a little tweaking to have a side-yard setback,  
18 even if the ADU is meeting -- we want the flexibility to have  
19 these ADUs as much permitted, to get the housing that we need in  
20 the city, without going through a process before the zoning, so  
21 we want it to be as matter of right as possible, but we want the  
22 protections to be there. And I think the Office of Planning  
23 maybe should look at the side-yard situation and those situations  
24 that Commissioner Wright was describing. Thank you, Mr.  
25 Chairman. I am finished. I don't know if Mr. Bradford or Mr.

1 | Lawson or anybody had a comment on the other issue, if they're  
2 | looking at it, but I would encourage them to look at it.

3 |           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I'll take silence -- oh, Mr.  
4 | Lawson.

5 |           MR. LAWSON: Hi, Mr. Chair and Commissioner Miller. It  
6 | looked like you were looking for a response. I guess I would  
7 | say that right now it was not part of our work plan, but we're  
8 | happy to add that to the issues that we're looking at. Thank  
9 | you.

10 |           VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yeah. I don't want to -- I mean,  
11 | I know your work plan is very overloaded, and I -- we heard a  
12 | great presentation at the Zoning Commission's last meeting about  
13 | that, but at least a look at it -- not an actual report to us  
14 | about it, but at least a look at it and see if there needs to be  
15 | something done, I would appreciate that, so thank you.

16 |           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you both. Commissioner  
17 | Stidham, any comments or questions?

18 |           COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Just to thank you for the  
19 | PowerPoint presentation. That was helpful in understanding the  
20 | measurements of these. And, no, no questions.

21 |           CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I, too, have no questions, but  
22 | anytime we try to clarify and make things easier, I'm all for  
23 | that, so, Mr. Bradford and the Office of Planning, thank you very  
24 | much for all your work and, again, all the work that you -- and,  
25 | also, thank you for responding to the Committee of 100's issues,



1 | so thank you. All right. Ms. Schellin -- hold on one second.  
2 | Let me -- I don't do these often, so I don't have this off the  
3 | top of my head. Okay. Do we have -- I didn't see, Ms. Schellin,  
4 | any other ANC's, but I need to call for it. Any other -- any  
5 | other government reports first? We do have a letter from the  
6 | Architect -- I guess the AIA. Let me open that back up. Do we  
7 | have any other ANC comments?

8 | MS. SCHELLIN: Oops. I'm sorry. I didn't unmute. I  
9 | did not see any either.

10 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. And we did -- as already  
11 | mentioned, we have a letter from Mr. Forehand -- Brian Forehand  
12 | from AIA, and we did have the Committee of 100's letter, which  
13 | was responded to. So, Ms. Schellin, do we have anyone here who's  
14 | testifying in support, opposition, or undeclared?

15 | MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. Let me go to that list. Let me  
16 | refresh it. Right now I only have one person, and that's Paula  
17 | Edwards from ANC -- she's an SMD, undeclared, 4A01, so she has  
18 | three minutes as an individual.

19 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Let's bring up Commissioner  
20 | Edwards. And when you're ready, Commissioner Edwards, you may  
21 | begin.

22 | MR. YOUNG: I don't see her on.

23 | MS. SCHELLIN: Oh, you don't?

24 | MR. YOUNG: No.

25 | MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. She's the only name I have.

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So we -- I didn't see anything  
2 in the record for Commissioner Edwards. Did she send -- submit  
3 something?

4 MS. SCHELLIN: No. She was just registered to testify  
5 as an SMD.

6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. So hopefully that got --  
7 maybe her issues have gotten resolved, so that's the way I'll  
8 take it. Silence -- well, I better not say that, because I don't  
9 know. All right. So, colleagues, you have anything else you  
10 want to add to this?

11 (No response.)

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. I think this is right  
13 for us to move forward. And would somebody like to make a motion?  
14 Commissioner Wright?

15 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: I'll make a motion.

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Commissioner Imamura.

17 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Sure. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
18 I move that the Zoning Commission approve Case Number 24-20,  
19 Office of Planning text amendment to Subtitles B, D through F,  
20 and I, clarifications to rear-yard measurements in the R, the RF,  
21 and RA zones, and ask for a second.

22 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Second.

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: It's been moved and properly  
24 seconded. Any further discussion?

25 (No response.)

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Not hearing any, Ms. Schellin, would  
2 you do roll call vote please?

3 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. Commissioner Imamura.

4 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.

5 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Wright.

6 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes.

7 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood.

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.

9 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller.

10 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

11 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Stidham.

12 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes.

13 MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is five to zero to zero to  
14 approve proposed action in Zoning Commission Case Number 24-20.  
15 And we will get the proposed rulemaking published, and once that's  
16 done, it'll have a 30-day comment period and also referred to  
17 NCPC, and then we'll bring it back to the Commission's next  
18 meeting for final action consideration. Thank you.

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Schellin. Do  
20 we have anything else before us today?

21 MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir.

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. The Zoning Commission will  
23 meet again April the 10th I believe, and I think it's Zoning  
24 Commission Case Number 23-20 -- 23-20

25 MS. SCHELLIN: April 10 is our public meeting, right?

1 April 10 is the public meeting.

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. The Zoning Commission will  
3 have a public meeting on April the 10th, our regular -- oh, you  
4 know what, I'm sorry. But, anyway, we will have a number of  
5 items on the docket that night. And, with that, I want to thank  
6 everyone for their participation, and we'll see you on April 10th  
7 on these same -- at four p.m. on these same mutual lines. With  
8 that, Vice Chair, have a safe trip home, and everybody have a  
9 great evening. Thank you.

10 (Whereupon, the above-entitled public hearing was  
11 adjourned at 4:30 p.m.)

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Public Hearing - Case No. 24-20

Before: D.C. Zoning Commission

Date: 03-31-25

Place: Webex Videoconference

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



---

Deborah B. Gauthier