GOVERNMENT OF

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

+ + + + +

PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 2017

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

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT MEMBERS PRESENT:

FREDERICK L. HILL, Chair CARLTON HART, Vice Chair LESYLLEÉ M. WHITE, Board Member

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

ANTHONY HOOD, Chair

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

CLIFFORD MOY, Secretary

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PRESENT:

CHRISTOPHER COHEN, ESQ.

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

MAXINE BROWN-ROBERTS
BRYAN GOLDEN
STEPHEN MORDFIN
ELISA VITALE
CRYSTAL MYERS

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Public Hearing held on November 15, 2017.

CONTENTS

Case No. 19573, Appeal of Nefretiti Makenta	3
Case No. 19581, Application of Latin American Montessori Bilingual Charter School	8
Case No. 19605, Application of 1331 Taylor Street, LLC	229
Case No. 19572, Application of SIM Development, LLC	270
Case No. 19589, Application of Thad Hunkins	344
Case No. 19606, Application of St. Albans School	351
Adjourn	366

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

2	10:36 a.m.
3	MR. MOY: All right. That moves the Board into
4	the hearing session, and I believe the first case before the
5	Board for public hearing is Appeal Number 19573 of Nefretiti
6	Makenta, as captioned and advertised, as a decision an
7	appeal from the decision made on May 26th, 2017 by the Zoning
8	Administrator, Department of Consumer Regulatory Affairs, to
9	issue Building Permit Number B1707364, amending Building
10	Permit B160388 let me restate Building Permit B1603868
11	to alter the approved third floor addition in the RF-1 Zone
12	at premises 3616 11th Street, N.W., Square 2829, Lot 169.
13	There are preliminary matters before the Board,
14	a motion to strike under Exhibit 33, as well as a motion to
15	dismiss from both DCRA and the property owner under Exhibits
16	33 and 36.
17	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, great. Is the appellant
18	here?
19	MR. MOY: Mr. Chair, we, this morning, received
20	a phone call from Ms. Makenta saying that she's caught in
21	traffic from a traffic accident, and she would be late, but
22	I'm assuming she will be here as soon as she can. That was
23	about an hour ago, I think, at this point or 45 minutes ago.
24	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, all right. We don't have
25	an applicant. What are we going to do?

1	MR. MOY: We can move on to the next case and come
2	back to this when she arrives, unless you have some other
3	ideas, Mr. Chair.
4	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. Oh, do you have some ideas?
5	Just give me a second. Let's introduce ourselves first,
6	okay? So from right to left. One second. Okay. I'm going
7	to introduce everybody. Can you introduce yourselves,
8	please?
9	MR. TONDRO: Maximilian Tondro on behalf of DCRA.
10	MR. LEGRANT: Matthew LeGrant, Zoning
11	Administrator, DCRA.
12	MS. MOLDENHAUER: Good morning. Meredith
13	Moldenhauer from the law firm of Cozen O'Connor on behalf of
14	the property owners, the interveners.
15	MS. DIAO: Alexis Diao, property owner.
16	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. So I'm going to turn to OAG
17	here. Oh, I'm sorry.
18	MR. SMITH: That's okay. Good morning. I'm
19	Graham Smith, and we're married and we own the house
20	together.
21	CHAIRMAN HILL: You're the husband, right? So
22	you're used to being ignored, so it's okay, right? Okay,
23	good. Let's see. So I'm just turning to OAG here, and I'm
24	a little confused. Again, we can't dismiss, you can dismiss
25	this now or if the applicant is not here? I mean
Į.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

1 MR. UQDAH: Well, there are two motions to dismiss 2 on the table. For the Board's consideration, however, OAG 3 would tend to agree with the Secretary in that perhaps we 4 should wait for the appellant. CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, all right. So we're going 5 6 to wait and see what happens. I know you want to speak 7 because you're about to speak, but I'll let you speak. Just 8 give me one second again. So we're probably going to wait 9 We'll see how long we wait or what we're going to do. 10 But, Ms. Moldenhauer, you have something to say? 11 MS. MOLDENHAUER: We became aware this morning 12 that there was also a filing. When Ms. Makenta does show up, 13 there was a filing that was filed this morning at 8:59 a.m. 14 We were not served with that. There was no certificate of 15 So when this case does, I quess, get called today, service. 16 we would obviously like to add that to our preliminary 17 motions for a motion to strike. 18 CHAIRMAN HILL: Okav. Which one is that? 19 Exhibit 39. MR. TONDRO: 2.0 CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, thanks. Okay, all right. 21 Mr. Tondro. 22 I just simply wanted to add to that MR. TONDRO: 2.3 just to note that the filing, not only does it violate also 24 the three-day rule that's required that the appellant has to 25 file at least three days prior to the hearing, but I also

want to point out, in terms of this issue of the appellant 1 2 being stuck in traffic, the fact was that this was uploaded to ISIS at 8:59 for a hearing that was due to start at 9:30. 3 4 CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. Okay. Let's see. AllWe're going to move on. I don't think that, I mean, 5 right. 6 given how lengthy this has all been and given, you know, the 7 applicant knows everything that's been going on for this, you 8 know, I don't think that this is going to help matters by not 9 So we're going to go ahead and push back and hearing this. 10 hear the next case. So stick around. 11 Actually, I haven't done this before, but I'm 12 interested in having an emergency meeting so that we can talk to OAG because I'm curious as to how now this delay works. 13 14 And so, you know, if the person just continues to not show 15 or be stuck in traffic, I mean, I want to talk about that a 16 little bit further. the Board find that Does 17 appropriate? 18 So, Mr. Moy, how do I do this? 19 Well, we could recess from this public 2.0 hearing to go into an emergency Board closed meeting. 21 do that now and --22 And you have to have, I'm just CHAIRMAN HILL: 23 saying you take a roll call vote, right? 24 MR. MOY: Yes, I --25 CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. So I'm going to make a

1	motion to have an emergency closed meeting, and I ask for a
2	second and then have a roll call vote. Can I get a second?
3	VICE CHAIR HART: Second.
4	CHAIRMAN HILL: Motion has been made and seconded.
5	Will the Secretary please take a roll call vote?
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Chair, I have a clarification
7	question. The closed meeting, what are we going into the
8	closed meeting for?
9	CHAIRMAN HILL: I wanted to find out a little bit
10	more from the OAG just how, if the person, you know, what are
11	our options in terms of, like, the delay and if the person
12	doesn't show. I mean, how does this move forward?
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: And this is in reference to Case
14	Number 19573, correct?
15	CHAIRMAN HILL: Yes, we'd only be speaking about
16	Case 19573.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
18	CHAIRMAN HILL: Thank you for the clarification.
19	So, again, the motion has been made and seconded. Will the
20	Secretary take a roll call vote?
21	MR. MOY: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. When I
22	call your name, if the Board member can reply with a yes or
23	a no. Mr. Hood?
24	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.
25	MR. MOY: Ms. White?

1	MEMBER WHITE: Yes.
2	MR. MOY: Chairman Hill?
3	CHAIRMAN HILL: Yes.
4	MR. MOY: Vice Chair Hart?
5	VICE CHAIR HART: Yes.
6	MR. MOY: We're a Board seat vacant, but the
7	motion carries four to zero to one, Mr. Chair.
8	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. Let's talk.
9	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the
10	record at 10:44 a.m. and resumed at 11:02 a.m.)
11	MR. MOY: Okay. Mr. Chairman, we're back in
12	session. So I believe, if we can have parties to the table
13	oh, wait a minute. Was there something you want to say
14	on the record before I call the case?
15	CHAIRMAN HILL: No.
16	MR. MOY: Okay, all right. So the Board will move
17	forward with Application Number 19581 of Latin American
18	Montessori Bilingual Charter School, captioned and
19	advertised, for a special exception under Subtitle U, Section
20	205.1(a), to establish a public charter school in the R-16
21	Zone at premises 5000 14th Street, N.W., Square 2711, Lot
22	802. And, Mr. Chair, as you know, on the record there's a
23	party status request on record under Exhibit 39.
24	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. Good morning. If you could
25	please introduce yourselves from my right to left. You need

1	to push the button first.
2	MR. UQDAH: Good morning, Mr. Chair. My name is
3	Taalib-Din Uqdah. I am here on pardon me. I am here on
4	behalf of the committee of neighbors directly impacted by
5	LAMB. We are the committee which has filed for a party
6	status in this matter.
7	CHAIRMAN HILL: All right, Mr. Uqdah.
8	MR. KADLECEK: Cary Kadlecek from Goulston &
9	Storrs. I'm land use counsel on behalf of the applicant.
10	MR. ZAYETS: Morning. Jerry Zayets, Building
11	Hope, the applicant.
12	MS. COTTMAN: Good morning. Diane Cottman,
13	executive director and co-founder of LAMB.
14	MR. VAN PELT: Good morning. Dan Van Pelt,
15	principal and vice president of Gorove/Slade Associates.
16	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. So Mr. Uqdah, if you would
17	just kind of we got your submission in terms of party
18	status in terms of the request. But if you could please just
19	kind of clarify again for the Board why you think you should
20	be granted party status.
21	MR. UQDAH: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For the record,
22	my name is spelled T-A-A-L-I-B, dash, D-I-N. The last name
23	is spelled U-Q-D, as in David, A-H, as in Henry. I'm not a
24	John Smith or a Michael Brown, so I

No,

HILL:

CHAIRMAN

25

no, the transcriber

2 Mr. Chair, this was a matter that the MR. UODAH: community discussed and through my counsel, we felt as though 3 this, by presenting ourselves as a committee, it would save 4 5 this board a lot of time because there would be one entity 6 in which the majority of the people in close proximity to the 7 subject property would be affected. 8 Okay, okay, all right. CHAIRMAN HILL: And, Mr. 9 Kadlecek, I didn't see anything in terms of opposition for 10 the party status request. 11 MR. KADLECEK: We have no opposition. 12 CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. So starting with the board, 13 I'm going to go ahead and grant the -- again, Mr. Ugdah, 14 what's the acronym, I forget, for the --15 It's CNDI-LA. CNDI-LA. MR. UODAH: 16 CHAIRMAN HILL: CNDI-LA. Okay, great. All right, 17 Then we're going to go ahead and grant great. your 18 organization party status, and so you'll have an opportunity 19 to present to us and also an opportunity to cross with the 2.0 applicant, as well as the Office of Planning. So just bear 21 with us here. 22 Kadlecek, through Mr. have gone SO we 23 application, and we're going to go ahead and do a full 24 presentation here with you because there's a variety of 25 issues that we're going to try to work through.

So continue, please.

1

appreciated that.

1	So you can go ahead and start whenever you like.
2	I'm going to
3	MR. KADLECEK: Just one preliminary matter. I
4	wanted to make sure that Mr. Van Pelt was qualified as an
5	expert. I know he's been qualified before at the Board, but
6	I just want to make sure that the Board
7	CHAIRMAN HILL: Sure. And I appreciate that. I
8	think, Mr. Van Pelt, you're in the book, aren't you? Okay,
9	all right. So we'll accept Mr. Van Pelt as an expert. So
10	I'll go ahead and put 20 minutes on the clock, Mr. Moy. And,
11	Mr. Kadlecek, you can begin whenever you like.
12	MR. KADLECEK: Is it possible for us to have 30?
13	I think that we probably
14	CHAIRMAN HILL: Sure. Put 30 minutes.
15	MR. KADLECEK: need 30 just to make sure we
16	cover all the issues.
17	CHAIRMAN HILL: Great. No, I don't have anything
18	to do here, yes. Go ahead.
19	MR. KADLECEK: We'll try and be as brief
20	CHAIRMAN HILL: Now Mr. Uqdah will get 30 minutes,
21	as well.
22	MR. KADLECEK: No, I understand that.
23	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay.
24	MR. KADLECEK: But we felt it was important to
25	make sure we cover all the issues.

CHAIRMAN HILL: No, I appreciate that.

MR. KADLECEK: Good morning, members of the Board. The application before you is for the special exception approval of a public charter school and for the co-location of a public charter school with another school. In all other residential zones, public charter schools are permitted as a matter of right, but in this case of the R-16 Zone, a special exception is required.

With this application, the Latin American Montessori Bilingual Public Charter School, or LAMB, one of the most successful and highly-regarded public charter schools in the city, proposes to consolidate its operations and occupy the existing building located at 5000 14th Street, N.W. It will share the facility with Kingsbury Center, a private school, until Kingsbury relocates, at which time LAMB will occupy the entire building.

LAMB has existed in the District for 15 years and currently occupies three different sites, so LAMB is not an unknown entity and this fact allows all the stakeholders to have a much greater assurance with respect to LAMB's commitments and impacts at the proposed site.

During the course of this public process, LAMB has proven to be eminently receptive, responsive, and reasonable with respect to addressing community concerns. For more than five months, LAMB has extensively engaged the community to

2.0

listen to and respond to concerns.

2.0

To that end, LAMB has agreed to a remarkable 24 of 25 total conditions proposed by a combination of the Office of Planning, DDOT, the community, and the ANC. And with respect to the 25th condition, LAMB has proposed an alternative with the same goals with which the Office of Planning agrees.

With all of these conditions, LAMB has responded to community concerns and heavily invested itself in mitigating its impacts on the community. We are pleased to have the support of the Office of Planning, DDOT, the ANC, many community members and residents of SMD 402, LAMB parents, the ANC Single Member District representative, Maria Barry, and Ward 4 Councilmember Brandon Todd.

With that, I'll turn it to Ms. Cottman.

MS. COTTMAN: Good morning, Board. Just a brief history of LAMB. We submitted our charter application 17 years ago and were unanimously approved at that time to create a charter school here in the District to provide early childhood and elementary education to D.C. children. We opened in 2003 with 57 children. Today, 15 years later, we have been ranked as the highest early childhood elementary public school in the District of Columbia in terms of its academic achievement and number three of all public charter schools city-wide.

LAMB has 462 students at three different facilities: the Historic Military Road School in Ward 4, South Dakota Avenue in Ward 5, and we recently opened at Delano Hall on the Walter Reed property. In two of those three locations, we co-locate with other schools, Perry Street Prep and with D.C. International. So we are very accustomed to having to share space.

a means to achieve our vision of all of our students, pre-K three to five, consolidated under one roof where siblings are not split between buildings and parents no longer have to make two drop-offs and pick-ups daily. LAMB's enrollment ceiling is approved by the D.C. Public Charter School Board at 600. We will not reach that goal until the year 2024.

Kingsbury, an approximately 173,000 square feet property, has sufficient classroom space, outdoor green space, and off-street parking. Moreover, 49 percent of our current families live in Ward 4. Commuting to Kingsbury will just be night and day from what they have to do currently and allows many to then walk, bike, and carpool, which is much more difficult to achieve today. That 49 percent represents 232 children. In addition, we have 25 staff members, that's a quarter of our staff, who live in Ward 4, and they, too, may choose to walk and bike to school.

Kingsbury really allows us to efficiently and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

effectively invest our resources into one building. With the move to Kingsbury, we would close our other three sites and operate from one site. That's our goal. We have a proven track record of being a good neighbor, and it's our hope that we will be given that opportunity at Kingsbury.

MR. ZAYETS: Thank you very much, Diane, for that introduction about the school. My name is Jerry Zayets, and I'm with Building Hope. Building Hope is, essentially, a financier for public charter schools. We provide the conduit for charter schools to allow ultimate facility ownership, so we're sort of the middle man in that transaction. We've worked with about 85 percent of all charter schools in the District of Columbia, and it is our goal and our intent here to help LAMB essentially move to the Kingsbury campus.

So just a little bit of background on the site for the Kingsbury campus. It's roughly 173,000 square feet. It's about four acres. It's located at the intersection of Gallatin, Piney Branch, and 14th Street, so it fronts three streets. 173,000 is about four acres.

This case is not really about density or height or bulk, so I do want to materialize and sort of put some perspective on what that means as far as capacity. So what we did was we put together some slides on similar comparable schools in the District of Columbia and essentially put a mass assumption under them.

2.0

So this school in particular, at full enrollment, will basically be about 288 square foot per student. In comparison to the others schools, so Powell Elementary is a good example of a renovated school that's in Petworth. It tailors, it fronts Upshur Street. The school is enrolled at capacity of 534 students and roughly on a 100,000 feet of site, so that's roughly 60,000 square feet less, so that's almost an acre less. So as far as the density perspective, it's about 190 square feet per student.

A major distinction between this site and our prospective site at Kingsbury is the fact that loading and drop-off will take place for the Powell Elementary on public space adding traffic and congestion, whereas in the Kingsbury site it's all inside the property and self-contained.

The next example is the Truesdell Academic campus. Again, roughly, enrollment numbers of 679 students with a land mass of 132,000 square feet, so that's also about 30,000 square feet less with a density of about 194 square feet per student. And, again, this one loads and drops off all in public space so very, very different circumstances.

Just a brief summary as far as the counts. This puts some density metrics in perspective, and you can see that the amount of land or area we're allocating to our prospective student count is roughly 30 percent more than the comparable schools in Ward 4.

2.0

1	Next, I'm going to pass over the mic to Daniel
2	with transportation. He'll go into the logistics, loading,
3	and drop off, and various traffic mitigation measures. Thank
4	you.
5	MR. VAN PELT: Good morning again. I'm Dan Van
6	Pelt with Gorove/Slade. I'm working with LAMB and Building
7	Hope on this application.
8	CHAIRMAN HILL: Mr. Van Pelt, could you just lean
9	a little bit forward into the
10	MR. VAN PELT: Oh, I'm sorry.
11	CHAIRMAN HILL: That's all right. It's just hard
12	to hear you.
13	MR. VAN PELT: Is that better now?
14	CHAIRMAN HILL: Yes, thank you.
15	MR. VAN PELT: Okay, all right. So, yes, Dan Van
16	Pelt with Gorove/Slade, and I'm working with LAMB and
17	Building Hope on this application and going to go through and
18	talk about the transportation review that we performed, the
19	mitigation measures that were identified, and the associated
20	transportation-related commitments, go through those and talk
21	about those in some detail.
22	The site is located in 16th Street Heights, and
23	it's adjacent to 14th Street, which is an arterial street.
24	It's further bound by Gallatin Street on the north, Piney
25	Branch on the west, and a public alley to the south. D.C.
	I

Public Schools West Education Campus is located immediately across the street across 14th Street.

There are several bus routes and stops on 14th Street and several more one block to the west on 16th Street. There are bike lanes on 14th Street, and 14th Street is a significant north-south facility in the District's bicycle network. The nearest Capital Bikeshare station is located a little over three blocks to the south on 14th Street just off the figure that's shown on this slide. The Rock Creek Park Trail is in the vicinity. And while the site is a little more than a mile from the nearest Metro station, it is well served by other transportation modes.

I think one thing that is important to point out that DDOT has been actively studying this neighborhood. The 16th Street Heights Neighborhood Traffic Safety Study was completed by DDOT in July of 2016, and it concluded with a recommendation to make blocks of Emerson Street one way to discourage cut-through traffic. This conversion took place during the course of our study for this application, and DDOT is now kicking off a second phase of this study in the neighborhood that actually will start next week on November 20th. The next phase will pick up where the first phase left off, and it's going to review the streets for Farragut Street up to Military and should help address community concerns that exist today in the neighborhood.

2.0

Many of the issues that we heard are independent of this site and project and relate to cut-through traffic, speed, safety concerns, pick-up/drop-off traffic related to West Education Campus, and the Beach Drive construction traffic diversions. These would be neighborhood concerns even if LAMB wasn't to do anything at this site.

So LAMB consolidating and moving to this new campus will not happen immediately and will be phased in. For a period of time, the Kingsbury School will continue to operate at the site, along with LAMB. For our transportation analysis, we looked at the interim condition where there would be the greatest occupancy of the schools two simultaneously at the site. We also looked at the ultimate condition when LAMB was projected to be at full enrollment of 600 students in year 2025.

The bell times at each school will be staggered to distribute arrivals and departure on the site. Additionally, bell times will be coordinated with the West Education Campus to disperse all school-related trips in the vicinity over a longer amount of time.

We should also note that LAMB provides before- and after-school care. Children will begin to arrive as early as 7 a.m. and may be on campus until as late as 6 p.m. This all acts to reduce the concentration of school trips in the morning and afternoon peak periods.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

As Kingsbury currently operates at the site, existing vehicle counts at the site driveways were used to determine the interim trip generation of the Kingsbury site component. Based on existing and proposed student and staff populations at Kingsbury, the site driveway vehicle volumes were factored up and determined the net change associated with that part of the site.

Interim and ultimate trip generation for the LAMB component of the site was based on data collected from LAMB at their existing facilities and incorporated with other observations of existing schools that we've studied in the District. The student and staff populations were dispersed across different modes of transportation, including car, transit, bike, and walking, and across different times of the day. Most of it was based on travel information provided by LAMB, differing for younger students, older students, and staff members, and cross-referenced with where students' families and faculty live to determine the appropriateness of those mode splits.

Ultimately, it was determined that 81 percent of the PK3 through 2nd grade students would be driven, 71 percent of the 3rd through 5th grade students would be driven, and 70 percent of staff members would drive. It was also assumed that many students would be carpooling, given the prevalence of LAMB families with multiple students. The

2.0

peak hour trip generation was further developed based on when student and staff members are expected to arrive and depart, as not all student and staff members are expected to do so during the same hour, the same peak hour.

The methodology described above shows the highest net increase of trips during the A.M. peak hour. During the interim condition, there would be a net increase of 166 new vehicles projected in the A.M. peak hour and during the ultimate condition, that increases to 247 vehicles projected during the A.M. peak period. However, it should be noted that many of these trips are likely already on the network in this neighborhood given that one of LAMB's campuses currently operates to the north. The study conservatively assumes that all trips will be new trips and, in reality, we don't expect that that would be the case, and we don't take credit for those existing trips.

Today, the site has four existing curb cuts over driveways. Two of those are on 14th Street, and two are on Piney Branch Road. Kingsbury uses all of them, and the curb cuts are planned to remain as is. Although LAMB intends to utilize all curb cuts, too, the circulation plan will orient pick-up and drop-off traffic to and from 14th Street. We'll talk more about that in a moment.

There are 107 vehicular parking spaces which will adequately accommodate projected demand. Demand was

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

determined based on the number of faculty and staff expected to drive and carpool. Also factored in was the demand for student pick-up and drop-off of the PK through 2nd grade students whose parents must park and walk them into the school.

In the ultimate conditions, this results in a demand of about 40 parent cars parked at one time during pick-up and drop-off, combined with a demand of 64 spaces for staff. The total demand is 104 spaces, which is within the supply.

Outside of the pick-up/drop-off times, the 40 spaces will be available for visitors during the evenings and the majority of faculty and staff parking is also available during the evenings.

All service vehicle activity will be accommodated on the site with any backing movements necessary occurring on private property out of public right-of-way. There will be a limited number of trucks coming to the site, mainly mail, FedEx, UPS, on a daily basis, along with the food service delivery. Trash will be collected a few times a week.

So under the interim condition while LAMB and Kingsbury both occupy the site, Kingsbury's primary student access will be along the north end of the building, while LAMB's primary access will be along the east side of the

2.0

building. Vehicle queuing will take place adjacent to the primary access point for each of the schools.

The proposed circulation plan is shown here in yellow and orients the majority of the traffic towards 14th Street. LAMB's policy manual dictates that all arriving traffic by car, foot, or bike must enter the campus from 14th Street. Vehicular traffic will enter at the northeastern driveway identified here with the green dot on 14th Street. After circulating through the site, the majority of traffic will exit back onto 14th Street heading south. And this is identified with a larger red dot.

The plan does include some amount of pick-up/drop-off traffic exiting out to Piney Branch for those needing to return to the north. The exit onto 14th Street only allows a southbound right turn. And as stated in the staff report, DDOT concurred with the circulation plan and the usage of the site driveways, which includes assigning some exiting trips to Piney Branch Road.

Kingsbury is projected to have a queuing demand of about 50 feet or two to three vehicles with available space for over 150 feet of queuing or about seven vehicles. The projected demand is shown here in orange. Those are the orange vehicles, while the white cars that trail the orange ones are just showing you how much additional queuing space there is or what the queuing capacity is without impacting

2.0

circulation on site.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

As discussed previously, LAMB's pick-up and dropoff activity is split between drop-offs at the door for 3rd through 5th graders and parking and walking for the PK 2nd graders, walking in for the PK through 2nd through Based on the expected student population in the interim condition, which assumes a higher proportion of younger students, LAMB is projected to have a queuing demand of 50 feet or about two to three vehicles with available space for up to 170 feet of queuing or about eight cars. projected demand is shown on green on the slide, and, again, trailing white cars just show you what additional capacity there is for queuing. And there's ample room for queuing on site.

Additionally, pick-up and drop-off activity for younger students results in a demand of 29 parking spaces, and those are the pink vehicles that you'll see on the plan. This demand is based on the assumption of parking and walking and will take about ten minutes per vehicle, a number that was provided to us based -- from LAMB based on their daily experience.

So going to the ultimate condition, after Kingsbury has left and LAMB is the remaining school on site, their primary access will remain on the east side of the building. Traffic circulation entering and exiting on the

site will occur pretty much in the same manner that was described in the interim condition. Vehicle queuing will take place next to the primary access point, but the start of the queue will be shifted further to the south to allow for even more queuing space. Again, here the proposed circulation plan is shown in yellow and orients the majority of the traffic towards 14th Street.

Based on the expected student population of 600 in the ultimate condition, LAMB is projected to have a queuing demand of 320 feet or about 14 vehicles, with available space for 880 feet of queuing or about 36 vehicles. So, again, the green is what we projected, the white trailing vehicles are not our projections but what is the actual capacity on site for queuing, so quite a bit more capacity for queuing than there is demand.

Additionally, pick-up and drop-off for younger students results in demand for 40 parking spaces, and those are shown here in pink again. We talked about the queuing space. The one thing that this is really kind of a unique situation I think, as was pointed out earlier, a lot of schools, a lot of public schools in the District rely on using public right-of-way and using curbside for pick-up and drop-off and parking, which is the case across the street at the West Campus.

So the comprehensive transportation review was

2.0

scoped with DDOT and it was performed for the project to review the vehicular multi-modal impacts and accommodations. studied the scoping process, there were 12 intersections that were initially scoped, with DDOT later requesting the inclusion of four additional intersections, primarily along 16th Street. This study was reviewed by multiple groups within DDOT, including the traffic operations group that manages the 16th Street Heights Neighborhood Traffic Safety Study and is very familiar with the neighborhood traffic conditions.

DDOT ultimately determined that the 16 studied area intersections -- that that study area was sufficient for evaluating potential impacts of the project. It should be noted that intersections outside of the ones selected for the study could observe some site-related traffic. However, it is these 16 intersections that DDOT determined are most likely to see potential impacts of this project based on the knowledge of the area.

As mentioned previously, DDOT is currently undertaking the 16th Street Heights study to address existing transportation-related issues in the surrounding area. And phase one was completed in July of 2016, and it resulted in the Emerson one-way conversions this past summer. And then phase two is going to get started here next week. This study is expected to address some of the existing issues that we

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

outlined in our CTR.

2.0

The CTR was submitted to DDOT September 5th, and then there was an addendum that followed that with some additional information that DDOT requested. DDOT produced their staff report on November 1st, and overall DDOT concurred with the findings and methodology of the CTR and expressed approval with conditions. These conditions will be outlined a little bit later in the presentation.

Some of the highlights of the analysis, the analysis and methodology included in the CTR was consistent with what --- typical DDOT industry standards. However, there was one unique assumption here that we had to make that was a result of the Emerson one-way conversion. Traffic counts of the initial 12 study intersections were performed prior to the one-way conversion of Emerson Street in order to collect traffic volumes during a typical non-summer month.

Then over the summer DDOT converted Emerson Street to one-way operations and as such, existing traffic we counted along Emerson needed to be re-routed through the network to reflect the new traffic pattern. In order to maintain a conservative analysis, the traffic was distributed to the adjacent two-way through streets in the study area and a lot of the reassigned traffic was put on to Gallatin Street.

Supplemental traffic counts were performed for the

four additional studied intersections that DDOT requested, and these were counted after the one-way conversion. These counts, along with the site reconnaissance, led us to believe that we probably conservatively re-routed too much traffic to Gallatin in our analysis. In reality, the traffic patterns were changed in a more global way that is difficult to replicate in the micro-level sort of analysis that we do here in the impact study. As such, areas of poor capacity are likely overstated in our traffic study.

Our analysis shows no issues with the operation of the site driveways, particularly on 14th Street, which would be the primary means for entering and exiting the site. Overall the traffic study determined that the project will not. have detrimental impact on the surrounding intersections, assuming the signal time adjustments are made at the intersection of 14th and Gallatin Street. recommended transportation of the management plan and that DDOT continue to study the after-effects of Emerson Street one-way conversion to the larger patterns in the neighborhood.

The TDM plan with this application was tailored specifically to LAMB, and we used it as a tool to coordinate with West Education Campus with a desire to have the greatest impact to reducing vehicular demands and facilitating walking and biking to schools for both schools. Many of the plan

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

components are listed here. I won't read them all, but they should be familiar tools in the TDM toolkit. Particular attention was given in this plan to be developed and implemented working with the input from the community and again, coordinating with West. The siting of the two schools can actually be beneficial in developing a robust Safe Routes to School program as it provides more gravity for DDOT to provide crossing guards.

So DDOT agreed with our TDM plan and made it their first condition of their support. They have also requested off-site pedestrian improvements that the applicant will be making. We'll discuss more about that in just a moment. The third DDOT condition was the implementation of a performance monitoring plan. DDOT's plan, as described in the staff report, will begin once LAMB enrollment reaches 90 percent of the cap. However, LAMB will begin this monitoring the very first year at the site and will continue it annually until the DDOT requirements are met.

The monitoring will include multi-modal counts, mode split data, vehicle occupancy counts, queue length observations, and a review of the TDM measures that have been implemented, along with any tweaks to the plan for the next year. If the vehicle trip target is exceeded or queues back into public space, then LAMB would be required to adjust and improve the TDM plan until two consecutive years of

2.0

compliance are demonstrated. The applicant has agreed to all DDOT conditions, and the applicant will continue to coordinate with DDOT as the project moves to public space permitting.

So to summarize the transportation elements of the projects being committed to by the applicant, the site has ample space on campus to accommodate queuing and parking needs without spilling over onto the adjacent streets, and all of this activity will occur on the site. Again, this is rather unique for a public school in the District.

The proposed mitigation plan includes a robust TDM plan, and the applicant is committing to work with DDOT to address signal timings and address pedestrian deficiencies in the vicinity. The figure that's shown here on this slide identifies a new sidewalk that will be installed on the south side of Gallatin Street. You can see it up there in blue at the top of the figure. That sidewalk is currently missing. There will also be crosswalk and curb ramp upgrades at locations that are identified here on the slide on Gallatin and 14th Street and Emerson Street.

And then the performing monitoring plan is the mechanism that will ensure that the TDM plan and overall transportation plan is effective and encourages multi-modal options in managing traffic loads over time. And lastly, there are even more transportation-related commitments that

2.0

have been made to the community that others will touch on.

I believe Jerry will touch on them later in the presentation.

With that, I'll pass it back to Jerry.

MR. ZAYETS: Thank you very much, Daniel. I got five minutes. I'll be brief. So as far as some of these conditions and some of the community engagements we've had, so we've had multiple engagements, more than 14 of them, with various community members: the ANC, local residents, and so on, Office of Planning, and DDOT. And as far as these conditions, we've summarized them into these four pages. I'm not going to go into all of them, but I'll highlight the most important ones.

There's a current lack of infrastructure. Daniel summarized what the sidewalks and some of the curbs that need to be improved, so we're going to go ahead and do that. And then as far as coordination with the West Education Campus, we are going to coordinate events and make sure large events, parties, and any type of larger event are not overlapping. This is super important when it comes to fundraising or cofundraising events, maybe like Christmas tree sales where the schools respect each other's fundraisers and just cohabitate in a respectful manner.

As far as routing and traffic, Daniel has already highlighted that and explained some of the TDM procedures. Some specifics on operating the nuts and bolts where the

2.0

school is going to route students and safe passage, they're all summarized in this slide.

School operating hours. We've coordinated with West as far as starting earlier and closing a little bit later. Because of the nature of the program, there's some flexibility for LAMB to do that, so we're going to go ahead and do that.

And then most importantly I'll focus on slide number five, which is this check to make sure that impacts of the schools are being monitored. Because we're here as a special exception, we wanted to assure the community and the Board that the implementation is happening. So what we put together is this condition where LAMB will demonstrate to DDOT and through the administration of using the zoning administrator and DCRA that if LAMB is not participating in the PMP program, LAMB will not be permitted to expand and grow their student count. So again, this is the check to make sure that the school is being monitored and is growing accordingly and being a good neighbor with the rest of the community.

These slides will be super brief. There was some questions brought up --

CHAIRMAN HILL: May I just interrupt you for one second? If you go back to that, is that the 25th condition that you were speaking to?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

MR. KADLECEK: Yes. So I just want to clarify
that a little bit. So all the other there were 25
conditions effectively proposed through agencies, ANC,
etcetera. LAMB agreed to 24 of them. The 25th one was a
condition that LAMB has to come back to the Board when it
wants to expand to the full 600 students after Kingsbury has
left the site. Jerry can go into the explanation about why
that's problematic for LAMB. But as an alternative, because
LAMB is sensitive to the concerns of the community that there
is some sort of check put in place, we've devised this
alternative condition that basically says if LAMB is not in
compliance with the transportation performance monitoring
plan proposed by DDOT, at the time that it goes to apply for
a CFO to expand into the entire building which they need
to do to accommodate 600 students, they cannot accommodate
the 600 students until they are able to expand into the
entire building they would have to demonstrate that they
are in compliance with that transportation performance
monitoring plan. If they cannot, then they have to come back
to the Board. And that's an alternative to just having to
come back to the Board in any course.

We've reviewed this condition with the Office of Planning, and they are in agreement with this.

MR. ZAYETS: As well as the zoning administrator.

MR. KADLECEK: Yes, and they've also reviewed it

with the zoning administrator.

2.0

MR. ZAYETS: As far as the mechanism, we'll have to check. Again, this would happen at the --

CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, I understand. And what was the reasoning as to why it's problematic to come back to the BZA?

MR. ZAYETS: So I'll summarize it. Because charter schools are given an allocation per pupil on an annual basis, there's no real mechanism for a charter school to get money from a public way to finance the facility. So we essentially, we, Building Hope, step up and we basically get market rate financing, but we have to finance the building at its whole. We finance the project up-front, and it's based on a series of enrollment numbers. So we finance it at full capacity, and then the idea is that the school grows into it.

In the meantime, there's usually a gap in funding because the school is not fully occupied. We cover that gap. But essentially, we need to then repay that loan to whoever we get the loan from as a whole at the later date. So we're a stop gap for the interim period, but in the end, the school ultimately has to reach that enrollment number in order to cover the costs of the facility and everything else. And we do that at no cost.

So it's that mechanism. Because there's no other

mechanism, because we're using the private financial sector, that's the reason is that, from a lending standpoint, it just presents too much risk from a lender.

CHAIRMAN HILL: I got it. Okay. Please continue.

MR. KADLECEK: Thank you. So there are two other slides left in the presentation. One of them was, we added in here because we heard concerns from some of the neighbors about sewer backup and just the general demand, potential demand increase on the local infrastructure. We verified that this location is in the combined sewer, so sometimes, because it's a combined sewer, there's excess supply during rainstorms and that does cause potential over-supply of water in the sewer system. So that is being resolved by D.C. Water and the existing infrastructure.

Lastly, this slide is just a summary of all the community engagements we've had. There's a total of ten of them we've had. We actually started in June. Again, we've had conventional ANC meetings. We've had meetings at various civic associations, and we've just been super engaged with the community just to hear all their comments and questions. And it's really that process that has arrived at these series of conditions and these things that the school is willing to accept as part of this comprehensive review.

That concludes our presentation. We're happy to answer questions.

2.0

1	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, great. Thanks. Does the
2	Board have some questions for the applicant?
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes. If we can put back up the
4	yes, Mr. Chairman. If we can put back up the slide showing
5	the ingress and egress of traffic pattern, the circulation
6	slide. Mr. Van Pelt, where it's right out only, I'm trying
7	to remember, what's to keep me from entering that way?
8	MR. VAN PELT: There is a median and
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I keep looking for years. I've
10	been looking on the wall. I've always look at
11	MR. VAN PELT: I keep wanting to point to
12	something over there.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'm with you on that.
14	CHAIRMAN HILL: It's called change.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, Chairman Hill.
16	MR. VAN PELT: There is a median there. But one
17	of, I think, the other concerns, too, is just the geometry
18	of that intersection and the proximity to the next
19	intersection, it needs to operate as a right out only for
20	that reason. But there is a median that is in
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So there's a median. So I
22	couldn't make a left?
23	MR. VAN PELT: No, no, I think it comes, I'd have
24	to check, but I believe, I don't think it comes far enough
25	that you could actually even try to hook around it.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So you'd have to go through a lot
2	to make a left?
3	MR. VAN PELT: Yes. And it's also, you know
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Can you check on that? I just
5	don't remember that right out only, and I was thinking maybe
6	we might use some signage. But I think the traffic pattern
7	is, because a lot of stuff, like the load and unloading,
8	would be on-site, correct?
9	MR. VAN PELT: Correct.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So this is a more self-
11	contained campus at Kingsbury, so it's not a whole lot that
12	would be interactive with the it's just a matter of
13	getting there.
	getting there.
14	MR. VAN PELT: It is very much a campus, yes.
14	MR. VAN PELT: It is very much a campus, yes.
14 15	MR. VAN PELT: It is very much a campus, yes. CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Thank you. Thank you,
14 15 16	MR. VAN PELT: It is very much a campus, yes. CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
14 15 16 17	MR. VAN PELT: It is very much a campus, yes. CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. CHAIRMAN HILL: Sure. Please, go ahead.
14 15 16 17 18	MR. VAN PELT: It is very much a campus, yes. CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. CHAIRMAN HILL: Sure. Please, go ahead. MEMBER WHITE: Yes, I don't know if that, I think
14 15 16 17 18	MR. VAN PELT: It is very much a campus, yes. CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. CHAIRMAN HILL: Sure. Please, go ahead. MEMBER WHITE: Yes, I don't know if that, I think I'm somewhat familiar with that street area. The right out
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. VAN PELT: It is very much a campus, yes. CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. CHAIRMAN HILL: Sure. Please, go ahead. MEMBER WHITE: Yes, I don't know if that, I think I'm somewhat familiar with that street area. The right out only, I think they could make a u-turn, but it would be very
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. VAN PELT: It is very much a campus, yes. CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. CHAIRMAN HILL: Sure. Please, go ahead. MEMBER WHITE: Yes, I don't know if that, I think I'm somewhat familiar with that street area. The right out only, I think they could make a u-turn, but it would be very awkward because you have traffic flowing down 14th Street,
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. VAN PELT: It is very much a campus, yes. CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. CHAIRMAN HILL: Sure. Please, go ahead. MEMBER WHITE: Yes, I don't know if that, I think I'm somewhat familiar with that street area. The right out only, I think they could make a u-turn, but it would be very awkward because you have traffic flowing down 14th Street, especially pretty rapidly during rush hour. And that leads
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. VAN PELT: It is very much a campus, yes. CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. CHAIRMAN HILL: Sure. Please, go ahead. MEMBER WHITE: Yes, I don't know if that, I think I'm somewhat familiar with that street area. The right out only, I think they could make a u-turn, but it would be very awkward because you have traffic flowing down 14th Street, especially pretty rapidly during rush hour. And that leads into Emerson; is that correct?

done after Emerson changed to one way in terms of how that's going to impact the traffic flow?

MR. VAN PELT: I think that's one of the things, I think DDOT asked for some additional information when we did our study, and I think part of it is they wanted to get some additional information to understand what changes may have happened associated with it. And I think this next phase of the neighborhood study that they're going to do is going to look at that because, when you do make changes, you have big changes to streets and make them one way from two way, you're going to change patterns.

And, again, our study, what we did, because our counts were before the one way happened, we just put those trips on the adjacent nearby streets. But, realistically, what happens is usually those get more dispersed. People change their patterns because one of their routes is no longer there. And so it becomes a more global thing.

I think that's one of the things that DDOT is going to look at, what has really been that impact, when they look at this next phase of the larger transportation study.

MEMBER WHITE: How do you prevent the cars -- I see you have some arrows saying LAMB access and then you have some that say Kingsbury access. What's to prevent a Kingsbury car from going through the LAMB entrance?

MR. VAN PELT: Well, all the traffic, pick-

2.0

1	up/drop-off traffic will enter at that northeastern driveway.
2	And what happens is that you'll circulate around through.
3	So if you are coming to the LAMB access, if you're coming to
4	LAMB pick-up and drop-off, you'll come into that lane where
5	we have the green cars. If you are needing to park and
6	you're a LAMB parent and you have to walk your child in
7	because they're in the pre-K through 3rd, then you'll park
8	where the pink are. If you're Kingsbury, then you just
9	circulate through that parking area, go around to the north
10	side of the site, so, basically, run around the little length
11	of the site to get to that Kingsbury access.
12	MEMBER WHITE: So that entire site is gated, and
13	there's parking inside of the self-contained gated area?
14	MR. VAN PELT: Correct. There's a fence around
15	the entirety of the property.
16	MEMBER WHITE: And the final question is is there
17	a traffic cop or someone kind of directing people or are
18	people kind of just used to flowing a certain way to kind of
19	keep the traffic moving?
20	MR. VAN PELT: On-site, I don't know.
21	MR. ZAYETS: So at this point, we don't own the
22	facility, so we can't speak to the existing conditions. But
23	as part of this PMP measure, we will have people in place and
24	that's part of the conditions that somebody will be there

morning and during rush hour guiding and basically directing

traffic, where you cannot go. So it will be self-policing with a very strong check at the end.

VICE CHAIR HART: Just one quick question. About, actually, this alternative condition that you've proposed, did you say the ANC was, is anyone, are the other parties or other groups in support of this proposed condition, or are you just giving it now? Are you, you know, saying what if we did this?

We've reviewed it with the MR. KADLECEK: Yes. Office of Planning. The original condition for returning to the BZA came from the Office of Planning. For the reasons that Mr. Zayets explained, that condition didn't work for the So in the interim, between when the Office of applicant. Planning prepared their report and today, we had been working on something that we would have hoped would satisfy everyone and we reviewed it with the Office of Planning first since they were the first ones who came up with the alternative, and that's where we are now. So we're presenting it today as an alternative that has the same goals of making sure there's a check on the performance of the school as it grows into the campus.

VICE CHAIR HART: So the Office of Planning are the only, and I'm assuming DDOT?

MR. KADLECEK: Yes, and DDOT.

VICE CHAIR HART: Would be the ones that are

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

1	onboard with this condition?
2	MR. KADLECEK: Correct.
3	VICE CHAIR HART: But the ANC has not weighed in
4	on it, and I'm assuming the community, the rest of the
5	community has not weighed in on it, as well?
6	MR. KADLECEK: They have not. We reviewed it with
7	the single member district commissioner for the ANC, or the
8	concept I should say, but, no, the rest of the community has
9	not seen this exact language, no.
10	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you.
11	CHAIRMAN HILL: And what did the SMD think of
12	that?
13	MR. KADLECEK: Well, she was in agreement that it
14	wasn't necessary to have to return to the Board, so she was
15	in agreement with the concept. I believe we've not shared
16	this exact language with her, but there is a letter from her
17	in the record saying that she agrees that returning to the
18	BZA as a requirement, she believed, speaking for herself,
19	that that wasn't necessary.
20	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, all right. I got some
21	questions, but I guess I'll wait until the end. Mr. Uqdah,
22	do you have any specific cross exam questions that you'd like
23	to apply to the applicant at this time from their
24	presentation?
25	MR. UQDAH: Yes, sir, we do. First, as a matter

1	of business, I would like to introduce one of our neighbors
2	and colleagues and have him speak on the record.
3	MR. STRAND: Good afternoon. My name is John
4	Strand, and I am a resident at 1501 Emerson Street, directly
5	adjacent to the southwest corner of the subject property.
6	CHAIRMAN HILL: Mr. Kadlecek, can you pull up that
7	map again that has the diagram going in? I'm just trying to
8	understand where you are.
9	MR. STRAND: So you see where the new, it says new
10	crosswalks and curb outings at the bottom there?
11	CHAIRMAN HILL: Yes.
12	MR. STRAND: I am the house right above the new.
13	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay.
14	MR. STRAND: It's not a new house, but it's a, you
15	know, that's where it's located.
16	CHAIRMAN HILL: Got it.
17	MR. STRAND: So we have standing here, and I'm
18	presenting as a
19	CHAIRMAN HILL: I understand. Did you get sworn
20	in earlier?
21	MR. STRAND: I did, yes.
22	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay.
23	MR. STRAND: So I just have two quick questions.
24	They relate to the presentation earlier. First of all, there
25	was a question about community engagement going for five
	I .

months, and I believe there was a slide that had the number of activities. I just bring your attention to the fourth bullet there at number 13. This was the first occasion that we had an opportunity to meet with any of you about this, as a neighbor with immediate, on the list of people with standing. Was there any attempt on your parts to engage us prior to that? You had lots of conversation prior to September 13th, but I don't recall, as an immediate neighbor, anything, so did I miss something? Was there some kind of overt effort to engage the immediate --

MR. ZAYETS: Sure. So the typical protocol we always follow is reaching out to the ANC and the SMDs, and, essentially, the SMDs, we believe, are your local representative and we hope through them that they will reach out to the local residents and pass the word. That's the methodology.

MR. STRAND: So just as a point of clarification, as immediate neighbors, we didn't have any notice of this activity whatsoever until we received the notice that there was going to be a hearing here --

CHAIRMAN HILL: Right. That ANC meeting.

MR. STRAND: Yes, that's right. So that's one. The second question is directed to Mr. Van Pelt about the traffic study, and it sort of relates to the comment that was made about the benefits of having such a 49 percent of the

2.0

1	school students living in Ward 4 and what a benefit that will
2	be for walking and biking to mitigate the volume of traffic.
3	In your study, I'm just looking at your traffic study where
4	you were making the modal shifts, can you recall what your
5	projections for the walking and biking were for the interim
6	condition for the LAMB students? I believe it's on page 18
7	of your study.
8	CHAIRMAN HILL: Mr. Kadlecek, do you know which
9	exhibit that is, by any chance?
10	MR. KADLECEK: Sorry. The CTR?
11	MR. ZAYETS: Oh, real quick, is the clock supposed
12	to be running?
13	CHAIRMAN HILL: No, unfortunately it's not. This
14	is for cross exam. It could go on forever.
15	MR. KADLECEK: The initial CTR was Exhibit 31A,
16	and then the supplemental pre-hearing, the CTR rather was
17	36A.
18	MR. STRAND: So, Mr. Van Pelt, just for clarity
19	and for simplicity, maybe we could just focus on the A.M.
20	peak hour, which is analogous to morning rush hour, what your
21	own projected modal splits for walking and biking.
22	MR. VAN PELT: So as I said earlier in the
23	presentation, so we have, we really broke it out for the
24	students by different age group. So we looked at the PK3
25	through 2nd grade. Because of the age of the students, it's

expected that more of them would be driven, and so what we said in the presentation, 81 percent. We have walking and biking, walk is 4 percent, biking is 3 percent, 8 percent transit. Some of those would actually be, well, I guess the way we look at some of those, they would have a passenger in a car because one of them has a child or a faculty member has a child that, you know, is at the school.

MR. STRAND: So just for clarification, I think there may have been a misimpression given that there would be a lot of walking and biking when, in fact, the combined numbers of their own projections for walking and biking were in the neighborhood of 4 to 5 percent just during that morning hour. So I just think that's an important contextual clarification on this by your own numbers.

MR. VAN PELT: Well, if I could just pick up on that, that is really based on existing patterns that happen today, and we really didn't try to take credit for potential additional walking or biking that could occur at this location. So we actually hope that there will be less vehicle trips and there will be more walking and biking, but we always do our transportation studies and we have a tendency to get criticized if we move too far away from vehicular trips because those are the ones that seem to be the most impactful.

CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, okay, I understand, I

2.0

understand. Mr. Strand, is that it?

MR. STRAND: That's it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. Mr. Uqdah, any more?

MR. UQDAH: Just real briefly. In the traffic study, was there any consideration given to how the queuing would be affected on 14th Street with West Education Campus? Currently, West parents use the west side of 14th Street to park, particularly when the traffic gets backed up on Farragut.

MR. VAN PELT: I mean, we are accommodating all of our queuing needs on site. So anything that West does on 14th Street really doesn't impact the queues of this project. Any existing trips, any existing traffic patterns that's associated with West would be captured in our counts and is included in our analysis.

Pelt, MR. UODAH: Van I'm not Mr. much than I am with patterns, concerned with counts habits, patterns or habits when people are driving. Even though the queuing may start on Gallatin Street, it's going to wind around to 14th. And right now, Kingsbury, with its 107 - 108 students, there are buses that park on 14th Street and there are other cars of parents who are taking their children to West that, because of the crowding on Farragut Street during pick-up and drop-off, they use 14th. And now your proposal that's shown on here, this project is going to add to that

||madness.

2.0

MR. VAN PELT: It will add traffic to 14th Street. It certainly will. I think that, again, this project doesn't need to use 14th Street for any queuing or parking for pick-up and drop-off. That's one of the things that's been committed to. Certainly, it's coordination with West, so, hopefully, some of the West-related activities that are happening on 14th Street, LAMB and West can coordinate ways to best mitigate those two overlapping and work with DDOT in terms of what sort of --

CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. I'm just going to interrupt for one second. So, Mr. Uqdah, I do want to get to your presentation, and so I guess what he seemed to answer was that they are self enclosed and it's not going to be, West does not affect your --

MR. VAN PELT: Well, I think the point is that LAMB will produce additional trips on 14th Street, but we don't need to use 14th Street. It's more of, I think, how could West probably manage their activities a little bit better, and so can the two not also overlap.

CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. And that's part of the conditions?

MR. VAN PELT: I think that's part of the performance monitoring, and that's part of the agreement to work with West to figure out how the two schools both co-

1	exist.
2	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. So somebody just came and
3	stacked me up here again. So do you have a specific question
4	to the testimony that was given?
5	MR. GILES: Yes, I do.
6	CHAIRMAN HILL: Could you introduce yourself,
7	please, also?
8	MR. GILES: Yes, my name is John Giles.
9	CHAIRMAN HILL: Mr. Giles, did you get sworn in
10	also?
11	MR. GILES: Yes, I did. I live at 1501 Gallatin
12	Street at the corner of Gallatin and Piney Branch. I just
13	want to ask a quick question to our Building Hope colleague
14	here about this 25th item which they're requesting to change.
15	I think most of us are impressed by LAMB and not absolutely
16	against LAMB moving into the neighborhood, but we worry about
17	the credibility of the transportation demand management
18	program and, if it is credible, I don't understand why the
19	private capital market would worry about having to come back
20	and see the BZA again.
21	CHAIRMAN HILL: I'm sorry. I'm just trying to
22	understand your question.
23	MR. GILES: Yes.
24	CHAIRMAN HILL: So what is your question?
25	MR. GILES: My question is you have a credible

1 transportation demand management program, correct? That we 2 can count on, that we don't need to worry about --3 CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. I got that part. So what's 4 your question? 5 So if that's credible, what's the MR. GILES: 6 problem with coming back to see the BZA in five years or 7 moving to Kingsbury moves out to approve 600 8 students? 9 CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. 10 You know --MR. GILES: 11 CHAIRMAN HILL: No, no, no, just let him answer 12 that question. 13 Thank you for that question, MR. ZAYETS: 14 that's completely valid and I completely understand it. The 15 difference between zoning hearing biggest and а an 16 administrative hearing is the fact that zoning is subject to 17 objectivity and appeal and everything else, whereas, if it's 18 administrative process, that's something that's an 19 administered by DCRA as a matter of process and law. 2.0 that's the biggest distinction between the unknown and the 21 known. One is a performance metrics. If you meet the

performance standards, you're quaranteed that reward at the

end, whereas the other one has some maybes and some un-

And from a lending standpoint, that presents an

assurances.

element of risk.

22

23

24

1 So it's a difference between administrative versus 2 hearing like we're here today. So that is key 3 distinction. 4 CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, okay. He answered your 5 So I'm just going to give you an opportunity to question. 6 present your testimony. I mean, you'll have half an hour, 7 and so, you know, there's plenty of time to present. 8 Mr. Uqdah, we're going to go ahead and give you 9 Their presentation had Michelle Obama on it and 30 minutes. 10 smiling children all playing together, a multi-ethnic group. 11 They need to throw in some puppies in there and then, you So I'd like to see your presentation 12 know, that might work. 13 also. Yes? 14 CHAIRMAN HOOD: I just want to go back. I want 15 to expand on some more of what the last question was. 16 CHAIRMAN HILL: Okav, sure. 17 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Because when schools come back 18 after a while, we're looking at special exception, correct? 19 So when they come after a while, we look at adverse impacts 2.0 and that's what we monitor. And so that's why you come back 21 to the Board. 22 I can just let you know up-front I'm not there 23 with you about not coming back to the Board. We've done it 24 I know change, you said change comes up, but it's for years. 25 for a reason, because that gives communities way

1	assurances so they can re-look at what's going on.
2	I'm still interested in this idea, but I'm not
3	with you yet. So that's a heavy lift for me to get there.
4	MR. KADLECEK: I think the difference, Mr. Hood,
5	I think the difference is, and Jerry can explain this maybe
6	a little better, I think the difference is, one, it's a
7	public school as opposed to a private school, so I think the
8	burdens that are placed on a public school are very different
9	in terms heaving to go back through the process. You know,
10	a public school is subject to a budget, they're
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Kadlecek, I've heard that
12	argument before. I've been around enough to hear that
13	argument.
14	MR. KADLECEK: I think it's still true.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: It's true, but it actually does
16	not happen. There are private schools that come back, as
17	
	well. I'm not saying this one has to come back, but I'm just
18	well. I'm not saying this one has to come back, but I'm just saying that, some of that argument, I don't agree.
	saying that, some of that argument, I don't agree.
19 20	saying that, some of that argument, I don't agree. MR. KADLECEK: Yes, but I was trying to draw the
19 20 21	saying that, some of that argument, I don't agree. MR. KADLECEK: Yes, but I was trying to draw the distinction between a private and a public school.
19 20 21 22	saying that, some of that argument, I don't agree. MR. KADLECEK: Yes, but I was trying to draw the distinction between a private and a public school. CHAIRMAN HOOD: I went to public school, so I
18 19 20 21 22 23 24	saying that, some of that argument, I don't agree. MR. KADLECEK: Yes, but I was trying to draw the distinction between a private and a public school. CHAIRMAN HOOD: I went to public school, so I actually know that. We don't have

1	is, to your point, which is give the community some assurance
2	and allow a way to assess impacts. That's what this does.
3	The performance monitoring plan actually sets metrics that
4	the school has to meet, and if they don't meet those metrics
5	
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Kadlecek, we're going to have
7	a long discussion on that because I want to make sure the
8	checks and balances in place, and the problem is, while you
9	come down here and tell us, when it leaves out the door
10	there's no enforcement. So I'm not saying I'm closed to the
11	idea. I just want you to know it's a heavy lift, so help me
12	get there.
13	MR. KADLECEK: I understand. That's why we
14	actually, as I was trying to explain earlier, the enforcement
15	is the school cannot get a C of O if they don't meet those
16	performance metrics. They can't. They physically cannot
17	expand into the rest of the building because
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'm sorry, Mr. Kadlecek. Let's
19	move on. We're going to come back to that discussion.
20	MR. KADLECEK: Okay.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Because I've seen stuff that I
22	didn't think happens down here, but it does happen, so I
23	understand that. And people change, things change, stuff
24	gets lost in the pipeline. And I'm not discrediting this

I think this school is great. But I just want to

school.

1	make sure that we balance this to make sure that we look out
2	for the community. And I know that coming back to the BZA
3	was one safeguard that we had, and I'm not really ready yet
4	to push that out of the way because is think Kingsbury, the
5	whole thing up there, I think it's a good fit, but I also
б	want to hear from the residents.
7	So let's have that discussion after. Maybe I
8	shouldn't have brought that up.
9	MR. KADLECEK: Okay.
10	CHAIRMAN HILL: We're all apparently public school
11	graduates up here.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I didn't know. He was telling me
13	
14	CHAIRMAN HILL: So, Mr. Uqdah, we're back to you
15	for 30 minutes, okay?
16	MR. UQDAH: Yes, sir. Thank you very much. Good
17	morning, Commissioners. Good morning, Mr. Chair. The
18	committee of neighbors directly impacted by LAMB application
19	would welcome the LAMB school to our neighborhood and are
20	pleased to see their proposed conditions of approval as was
21	submitted in Exhibit 36B. However, we are against the
22	applicant's proposed 600-student population plus faculty and
23	staff and the gymnasium as an addition. As mirrored in our
24	request for party status and OP summary recommendation where

they stated, in part, the maximum number of students in the

interim stage will be 310 and a maximum number of faculty staff shall be 36. They went on to discuss the hours of seven to six and that LAMB shall maintain the current allotment of 107 parking spaces.

Just to add a little to that, this board heard, I will tell you, maybe about a month ago, an application for Kingsbury to extend its hours to 7 p.m. So where LAMB may conclude at 6, Kingsbury will still be going until 7.

OP further recommends that when Kingsbury departs the property and the student population for LAMB is to be increased to 600, the proposal will be submitted to the BZA for further review. In addition, LAMB shall submit details of the gymnasium to the BZA for review prior to construction either as part of that review or as a modification to the approved LAMB.

Granting the applicant's request that is 600 students plus faculty and staff and the addition of a 5,000-plus square foot gymnasium would adversely affect the noise, traffic, lighting, parking environment, and other quality of life issues on our 16th Street Heights community.

Kingsbury was granted a hearing before the BZA April of 2000, that's BZA Case Number 16569, seeking to establish a private school of 400 students ages 5 through 18 and a staff of 200. In its final order, and you'll find this in Exhibit 42A of the opponent's submissions, the BZA granted

2.0

the applicant's requests with 13 conditions, the first being that the student population would not exceed 300 students broken down to a maximum of 200 elementary to middle school students with 100 maximum limit for those of high school age. The staff was not to exceed 138.

Kingsbury never reached its 300 pupil BZA-approved limit, and, as such, for the past 17 years, this neighborhood has never experienced the potential for the adverse impacts with interim period offered associated even the applicant's Exhibit 14, page five, paragraph two, lines 9 through 12, where it states, during the interim period, the maximum number of students that will be at the property for both Kingsbury and LAMB will be 485. The maximum number of faculty and staff will be 116, and they repeat the hours of seven through six.

It is through this lens that we feel a combined Kingsbury - LAMB school increases the trepidation felt by the community and what would naturally follow when that consideration shifts to the requested 600 students, 110 staff maximum. We have nothing to compare it to. That, quite frankly, concerns us.

We, again, voice support for OP's recommendations, as they mirror our own. The maximum number of students interim stage, 310; 36 staff. When Kingsbury departs and the student population for LAMB is to be increased to 600, the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

proposal will be submitted to the BZA for further review and that LAMB shall submit details to the gym to the BZA for review prior to construction.

Finally, we would ask the BZA to stress the condition of its approval that LAMB holds quarterly meetings with designees from our committee and West Elementary Campus to review agreed-upon metrics and verify compliance with that order. This would allow all parties to assess the impact of LAMB's occupancy and management on the neighborhood impacts during this interim period before the maximum desired limit is reached.

This concludes my opening statement. I am now tasked with providing you a brief overview of the 1994 and 2009 zoning overlays established by the Zoning Commission for the 16th Street Heights community, which is what has brought us all here. I will then move directly into the matters before you today, which will be reflected in our key points related noise, traffic, parking, lighting, to and We will then proceed to substantiate evidence of those key points through testimony from witnesses in the affected area, charts or maps which identify our claims, or two cell phone videos that, Mr. Chair, are not very pleasant, but those have been submitted to the record demonstrating our And all of these have been uploaded. concerns.

With respect to the zoning overlay, zoning

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

overlays in 1994 and 2009 in this instance were established by the Office of Zoning to protect the residential integrity of the 16th Street Heights neighborhood from Military Road to the north, Decatur to the south, 16th Street west, 14th Street to the east. The subject property falls within those boundaries.

According to the Office of Zoning, some of the purposes of this overlay now referred to under the new zoning rules as R-16 were to promote the conservation, enhancement, stability of low-density single-dwelling and the neighborhood, control the expansion of non-residential users, allow neighborhoods to continue to provide а range facilities, as well as private institutions, that provide cultural and religious enrichment and economic vitality but within the framework of improved public review and control over the external effects of non-residential uses.

The R-16 zone is intended to respond to concerns that, over a period of years, approximately one in every ten houses in the R-16 zone north of Colorado Avenue has been converted to a non-residential use, a much higher ratio than identified has been for any other similarly-zoned neighborhood in the District. And south of Colorado Avenue, address concerns that more than 20 percent of the residentially-zoned land for non-residential is used And I would ask the Board to pay attention to the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

footnote that I have put there because that figure was actually revised to 35.5 percent, and we did submit that to you. You will find it in the Zoning Commission's notice of final rulemaking and order number 08-09, and that's on page eight.

To continue, the R-16 zone is also intended to recognize that the neighborhood accommodates a significant number and range of human service facilities and private institutions to an extent that new, and I stress this, "significantly expanded non-residential use facilities should be governed by improved public review to ameliorate adverse impacts on immediate and nearby neighbors," and, and this begins their last statement on the R-16 zone, respond to the D.C. comprehensive plan identification of the number of non-residential uses in the neighborhood as a problem.

With this backdrop, we submit this Commission is charged with upholding those parts of the law and its accompanying regulations that protect the integrity of this residential community, recognize and control the external effects of non-residential uses, ameliorate adverse impacts on immediate and nearby neighbors, and identify the number of non-residential uses in the neighborhood. And you will find that in Exhibit 95 as a problem.

With that, I would like to call our first witness, Mr. Rami Rihani.

2.0

CHAIRMAN HILL: All right, sir. If you could just introduce yourself. I assume you got sworn in earlier.

MR. RIHANI: I did, yes. Good morning. My name is Rami Rihani, R-A-M-I, and last name is R-I-H-A-N-I. I reside at 1505 Emerson Street, N.W. I'm the next door neighbor to Mr. John Strand. I'm that corner house right to the left of that new label that you saw earlier. I've been a resident in that neighborhood for the last eight years almost and 19 years in Washington.

I also wanted to echo Mr. Strand's comment about first hearing about this application when I received the BZA letter on August 21st and not beforehand. I also wanted to state about our ANC single member district commissioner's vote for the ANC resolution that you saw that she voted in favor of the ANC resolution which supported the OP recommendations, but her personal letter did not want that. So I thought that was a bit of a conflict.

But my main testimony today is I am particularly concerned about traffic, being on Emerson Street. In fact, when I look at the LAMB 2015 - 2016 annual report, they state that only 50 percent of their student population lives in Ward 4, and then they later show a breakdown of the students per grade and about 47 percent are in early childhood classes, PK3, 4, and KG, while the rest are in one through five. I heard the gentleman at the end of the table state

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

1 that they hope that they can see more walking and biking, 2 but, given that half of the population is in Ward 4 and half of it is under grade one, I just don't see how, you know, 3 4 when you see statements like many people are going to walk. I only say that because, being on Emerson Street 5 6 and traffic issues are very fresh on our minds based on what 7 we went through on the 1300 to 1600 blocks of Emerson Street. 8 We went through a year-long conversation with DDOT that 9 controlling that dramatic very resulted in and 10 dangerous increase in traffic that we witnessed. 11 Given LAMB's student population, location, and 12 grade distributions, I am afraid, as opposed to the hope of 13 more walking and biking, but I am afraid that we may return to those very unfavorable conditions on Emerson Street and 14 15 believe the best way to mitigate it is to have a gate, like coming back to the BZA specifically to see that, in fact, 16 17 they are being a good neighbor. Thank you. 18 CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, great. Thank you. 19 Next, Mr. Chair, we will hear from Mr. MR. UODAH: 2.0 John Giles. 21 Extra copies? MR. GILES: 22 Sure. You can pass them up to the CHAIRMAN HILL: 23 attorney there. Yes, I'm sorry. You have to speak in the 24 microphone. And, actually, you know, I'm going to just let

the rest of the audience know here what's going to happen.

So we're here. There are, we're going to -- thank you for pointing that out. I don't know how to stop it from -- can I stop it from here? I don't know how to stop it from there. But I'll, just like soccer, I'll add another, like, minute after the end there.

So we're doing this hearing. There still is the Office of Planning. There's still questions. This is going to go on for a little while longer. Then we're going to do an appeal. And then, since this day seems to be kind of lengthy, we're probably going to take a lunch break.

So the people that are here after the appeal, we won't hear you until probably after lunch. I don't have a time for you. I'm just saying that it won't be any earlier than, you know, one or something. So if you guys want to go grab some lunch or something, then, you know, there you go.

Has the applicant, for the appeal, the applicant, are they here? Can you raise your hand? All right. Well, we'll see how that goes. Okay, all right, okay, all right, okay, all right. So, once again, the appeal of 19573 is what we're going to hear after this, and then we're going to take a quick lunch break, and then we're going to come back. So I'm just kind of letting everybody else know just because, you know, this ain't the DMV, so I want to kind of like, you know, let you know what's going to happen. No offense to the DMV.

2.0

All right. How much time do you think you got there? I took three minutes? Okay, all right. Go ahead, please.

MR. GILES: All right. So I just want to point out I also went to public schools, and I believe in public schools. So I'm going to jump through this more quickly than simply reading it, but the transportation demand management plan looks, on paper, great. My neighbor, Liz, who lives across the street with me and had to leave, and I are both very much worried about alternative traffic routes that will come down Piney Branch Road to try to get in to the facility from the rear, and we don't really understand what mechanisms prevent individual behavior and individual drivers in a rush to get to school on time from making this decision.

If you look at the last page, there's the Google maps best route. This is at 8:13 a.m. on November 13, so imagine, parents typically don't space out their travel time uniformly over an hour. You're trying to get to school on time. What's the best way to do that? You drive down 14th to Colorado and then down Piney Branch. Piney Branch is a narrow, unimproved road with no sidewalks, and it can be unsafe when traffic is traveling quickly.

So, again, we support LAMB coming, but we would like to see some recourse and some return to BZA when the population expands to 600.

2.0

1	With respect to some of the sort of heartfelt
2	letters we've seen from our neighbors who are LAMB parents,
3	many of them living three to eight blocks from the location,
4	we just want to point out that they're not representative of
5	the total commuting body of the prospective LAMB school.
6	And, you know, again, we worry that LAMB cannot control the
7	transportation decisions and the driving decisions of its
8	parents before they show up at the gate.
9	Finally, again, the LAMB parents are parents of
10	today. They're not necessarily and the administration is
11	the administration of today. We worry that if this
12	transportation demand management program isn't fully
13	institutionalized with norms around its operation, well
14	developed, that there's no way they can free commit future
15	cohorts of parents and future administrators to abide by what
16	is essentially a recommendation.
17	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, thank you.
18	MR. UQDAH: Mr. Chair, I now would like to
19	introduce Ms. Amy Dine.
20	CHAIRMAN HILL: If you can just, again, like all
21	the others, just state your name, please. And you did get
22	sworn in earlier?
23	MS. DINE: I've not been sworn in.
24	CHAIRMAN HILL: Oh, okay. I'm going to get the
25	Secretary. Hang on one second.

That's fine, Mr. Chair, because we

2 have another witness that needs to be sworn in, so he can do both of them at the same time. 3 CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, thank you. The chairman of 4 the Zoning Commission is telling me that I can do it, but I'm 5 6 just a little too uncomfortable with that. All right. 7 if there's anybody else here who is going to testify that 8 missed the swearing in, if you could stand now and take the 9 oath administered by the Secretary. 10 MR. MOY: All right. Do you solemnly swear or 11 affirm that the testimony you're about to present in this 12 proceeding is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the 13 Thank you. You may be seated. truth? 14 (The witnesses were sworn in.) 15 CHAIRMAN HILL: I can memorize that. All right. 16 You don't need a Bible or nothing. All right. Okay, please, 17 go ahead. 18 MS. DINE: Sure. Hi. My name is Amy Dine. Т 19 live at 1500 Farragut Street, which is also an address called 2.0 4920 Piney Branch because I'm on the corner right behind the 21 property we're talking about. I'm here to speak on some of 22 my concerns, and I also would like to relay some of the 23 concerns that were written in a letter by my neighbor across 24 the street on Farragut who's at 1501. Similarly, we are 25 directly behind the property.

1

MR. UODAH:

And, first, I just want to say I'm a born and raised Washingtonian, and I have great regard for making better schools in this city and I have great regard for LAMB as an institution. Just as an aside, my grandmother was one of the first Montessori teachers ever certified in this country in the 60's, so I just really do appreciate your program.

CHAIRMAN HILL: I have to interrupt you just one second. I'm sorry. It was just brought to my attention. I don't think you can testify for somebody else who isn't here because there's no way we can cross exam that person. But, please, just go ahead and provide your testimony. Thank you.

MS. DINE: Okay. Thank you. I'm going to, I've just a number of points. I'll just say them quickly. First, I really want to take issue with the statements that said that LAMB and their proposal have been, quote, super engaged. I'd like to just reiterate, as neighbors, I heard nothing about this was going to happen until there was a piece of paper telling me about this September 13th meeting happening. So I just wanted to say that that does not bode well in my mind that LAMB can be a good neighbor. So I just need to relay that, that that does not, doesn't bode well for me.

Secondly, the R-16 zone, I just also want to reiterate, this is a very residential, trying to get back to

2.0

what it's intended to be, as a residential neighborhood. It is not high density in terms of people, nor was it designed. And, specifically, that Piney Branch Road, it's essentially an alley. I mean, it's an asphalted alley with unimproved — and I have very strong concerns that there's no reason that any parent is going to go out that proposed northwest exit and go north. They can also turn south and zip around or somebody can take that right out of 14th and zip around if they need to get to 14th to 16th. So I'm just concerned about that.

Secondly or thirdly, talking about the land per student, I think what is the issue for some of us is actually the proximity of the way the school will operate to its neighbors. The examples given are schools that are actually in much more densely-populated parts of this city. To actually talk about -- one of the examples that was not presented was West Elementary across 14th Street, which, as a school, has an enormous buffer in terms of its place or, you know, grounds from its neighboring streets. And this does not.

Fourthly, so I, for one, I really, I have grave concerns about a school of 600 children being in this neighborhood. I don't care if it's 2025 or 2018. I don't think the community can actually comfortably accommodate what that will take. And by definition, a charter school is not

2.0

a neighborhood school. It does not have its population within walking distance. By definition, it means that kids are coming all over the city, which I want them to come to LAMB, but this is not a property that is well served by public transportation. The Petworth - Georgia Avenue Metro, as was mentioned, is over a mile away. Little kids are not going to be coming on their own and walking from there.

Another point I just wanted to make is that we have also -- okay. I love living next to a school. I, you know, by choice, chose to buy the house that I'm in. again, I do really worry about a property that's not designed originally to be a school at all. I also worry quite greatly special exception somehow the that was given Kingsbury is somehow by right able to be passed along to another institution without them going through a much, just as rigorous process that Kingsbury was put through and living to certain expectations. And the problem is that Kingsbury was not able to actually live up to many of the promises that it already made to this community.

And so that's, you know, for someone who has put, literally, blood, sweat, and tears into making, bringing a house back to life and, literally, probably, I'd also add, a lot of arguments and a lot of shouting matches to actually bring it back to a nice building that can be part of the neighborhood because our house was actually rather derelict,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

1	I do worry about that and it's been shared with me by real
2	estate friends that, yes, living next to a very large school
3	does affect a property value. And I say that feeling really
4	embarrassed I'm saying that in talking about like, oh, I care
5	about, but I think we all do and that's just something we're
6	trying to preserve that the neighborhood is actually what it
7	intended to be in terms of a residential neighborhood that
8	actually has, you know, the right of quiet enjoyment for its
9	residents.
10	So those were sort of my, basically my points.
11	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, great. Thank you.
12	MR. UQDAH: Mr. Chair, I would now like to call
13	Ms. Gael Murphy.
14	CHAIRMAN HILL: Good afternoon. Just introduce
15	yourself first.
16	MS. MURPHY: My name is Gael Murphy. I live at
17	1405 Emerson Street, which borders 5000 14th Street on the
18	southern side, so I'm at the alley just behind where the
19	little butt of parking was added by Kingsbury.
20	So I'll try to be brief. I'd like to first put
21	out the question that it's interesting that the lenders
22	cannot take a risk but that that risk should be shifted to
23	the community in the event that there's a problem after two
24	years with LAMB's expansion. You said that Building Hope

could not organize that kind of lending. We would ask that

you try to be creative about it because I don't know why we should carry that burden if there's an issue.

And support the OP's recommendation that there be a serious BZA review at the end of two years. As others have stated, we have never lived with the reality of 300 students, let alone double that. And we would like the opportunity, as neighbors, to be able to see how that works out before, you know, and not a rubberstamp process at the end of a couple of years or several years.

Also, the overlay, as I understand it, was not why you had to come before the BZA but because it's a residential neighborhood and anyone wanting land bevond to use residential use must come before the BZA, as Kingsbury did. it shouldn't be grandfathered in to And, yes, I agree, another institution. I think every institution should have qualifications present its for movina into the neighborhood.

I also believe that traffic is not the only issue. You talk about everything being contained in the building. Well, we've lived, you know, for 15 years with all the Kingsbury contained inside the building in terms of traffic: idling, backing up buses, stacking buses. I mean, you know, the air quality in the morning and the afternoons is pretty rough. And because they lost their, Kingsbury lost its certification somehow and so reduced the number of students,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

and they were no longer able to get public school buses, and it alleviated the problem.

isn't just traffic outside but how the So it environment and how the cars are maintained inside. You know, my bedroom window is right underneath where the buses used to park and idle and back up and beep. I can read in the evening at night without using a light because lighting that Kingsbury installed was so bright. Now, that's not your issue, but, as others have said, promises are made made, recommendations particularly and are from the community, and then they're ignored or dismissed.

So we would like to have some say in what happens and appreciate that LAMB is more than willing to do that with us. But we really need that review after at least a couple of years or when that transition to doubling the activity use of that property.

And that's, I think, all that I have. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HILL: Thank you.

MR. UQDAH: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Finally, I'm going to -- let me do this in the interest of time. The applicant, in its presentation, and this would be, it's not labeled as such but it would be on page 29 where they talk about the civil sewers. My testimony to you today was to have been on that very issue, but I want to state for the record, and I've expressed this to them, as well, that my

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

concern about sewer backups which has occurred at my property at 14th and Crittenden Street, and you can see in the Exhibit 51, I've uploaded two videos that are like a minute and seven seconds for both of them, and you can clearly see where raw sewage and storm water is rising up in my basement office. And then a few minutes later, it goes back down.

I'm not blaming that on Kingsbury or LAMB. I do note that the applicant has, you know, spoken with WSSA. I've spoken with WSSA. There is a project now to separate these, but I don't believe any of us in this room will be alive by the time they complete that separation. And there's no real plan as to what areas they're going to start when. They have started, I guess, this Board knows, they started over in the Bloomingdale, you know, Rhode Island Avenue area.

But I want to now turn my attention to Mr. John Strand who will offer his testimony and then give the closing remarks.

CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. I went over by making my announcement and everything. I'm going to just let you know I'm putting five minutes up there for you guys to kind of wrap it up. Okay, thanks.

MR. STRAND: Members of the Commission and members of the Board, I live at the corner of Emerson and, almost at the corner of Emerson and Piney Branch at 1501. You've heard quite a bit of testimony here, pro and con. You've also

2.0

perhaps had the opportunity to review a number of letters both in opposition and in support, and you can see that it's a very emotional issue for all involved.

For the supporters, none of whom have standing in this case because they don't live adjacent to the property, this involves the health and future of their children's school to which they have a deep attachment and a great commitment. And for the opponents, those of us, many of whom do have standing, myself included, this involves preserving the residential quality and character of our neighborhood.

The LAMB parents who posted letters of support present an impassioned case for the quality of their school and its potential positive contribution to our neighborhood. We don't dispute any of those points. If we were LAMB parents, we would probably feel the same way.

My kids walked around the corner to West Elementary School when they were growing up, so we have a commitment to school quality, local school quality, as well. But this application is really about the opportunity for LAMB to move in and increase the number of its students in that property from its current number of 108 to 600 and also to build a gymnasium.

So with the special exception request for making that degree of significant expanded non-residential use, there are certain conditions that apply. There's no doubting

2.0

that this is significant expanded residential use. They want to increase the number of students by from 108 to 600. That's more than a 500-percent increase. And they want to increase the number of A.M., morning rush hour vehicle trips from the current Kingsbury level of 73 to 548. That's 475 more trips or a 750-percent increase.

as neighbors, feel strongly that So we, the applicant has not sufficiently demonstrated that the adverse effects that may come from this significantly expanded nonresidential use are have not going to have an adverse effect on our neighborhood, which is really the point of the R-16 And we're justifiably worried. I've been there for overlav. We were there when Kingsbury moved in and made their application, and we heard all the promises of, you we're really good people, we're going to be good neighbors, we're going to work this out. And, unfortunately, in Kingsbury's case, it didn't work out that way. They have failed to meet 4 out of the 13 conditions that the BZA placed on them as a condition of their approval.

So while we would love to welcome LAMB to the neighborhood, we would like to be able to do it in concert with the conditions that the Office of Planning originally put in place in its November 13th letter. We have never seen this, you know, new alternative that the applicant has put forward. It sounds very interesting, but, once again, it's

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

based on a	performanc	ce manage	ment pl	an that	we haven	't seen,
which prim	arily may	be put	in pl	ace to	address	traffic
conditions	when, as y	ou've hea	ard, the	ere are	a number	of other
conditions	that qual	ify as po	tential	adverse	e effects	that we
want to be	attendant	to.				
	~					

we would ask t.hat. t.he Board Zoning Adjustment attend to the original concerns of the Office of Planning, hold the applicant accountable for meeting those terms, come back when they are ready to expand the numbers back up to 600, and then ask that there be a community school monitoring group that meets to examine a set of agreed-upon metrics and monitor those metrics and report regularly and address issues that arise so that we have a little bit of enforcement capability on the community side so that it's not an approval and then we're stuck with the outcome, whatever happens over the next, you know, five to ten to however many So that's it. years.

CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. Mr. Uqdah, are you, I mean, are you good? Is that it? Do you want to --

MR. UQDAH: Yes, sir. I mean, I know how you all operate. I don't want to, you know, kind of --

CHAIRMAN HILL: It's okay. If you want to do a little closing, you're welcome to -- I think your witness did a really good closing right there.

MR. UQDAH: And I will, I don't want to step on

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

1	that.
2	CHAIRMAN HILL: Right, okay.
3	MR. UQDAH: So that will conclude our
4	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, great. So, Mr. Kadlecek,
5	now we're back over to you in terms of cross.
6	MR. KADLECEK: I have no cross.
7	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, all right. There you go.
8	Okay. Does the Board have any questions for the opposition?
9	No? Okay. I got a couple. So is there I mean, and we'll
10	get to all this because I'm a little confused, like, the
11	dialogue that has taken place between the two groups. I
12	mean, I understand there's notification questions and
13	different things that are brought up, but you all are here
14	now. So, Mr. Uqdah, like, is there a number that your group
15	is comfortable, I'm a little confused as to, like, you know,
16	there's 600, is there 500, 400? I mean, have you all come
17	up with what you think is acceptable?
18	MR. UQDAH: We placed in our submission and agree
19	with the initial OP report for 310 students, plus the
20	requisite number of staff.
21	CHAIRMAN HILL: Right. So it's the jump to the
22	600 that we're all here for?
23	MR. UQDAH: Right. Let's not, we're not going
24	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, okay, all right. Okay.

Anybody else got any questions?

l.	
1	MR. UQDAH: And there's one other thing I want to
2	point out. The 175 Kingsbury students that continues to be
3	mentioned, that 175 is a projected number. So Kingsbury
4	will, as part of this co-location, they're going to go out
5	and recruit, roughly, what? About 67 more students that they
6	don't presently
7	CHAIRMAN HILL: The thing about this, you know,
8	we're here for this application, so the issues with
9	Kingsbury, I mean, I think it will be interesting to discuss
10	and talk about, but, you know, Kingsbury is Kingsbury. But
11	still the issues that you all are bringing up are issues that
12	we are going to address and talk to the applicant about, so
13	does anybody yes, sure, of course.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I do want to ask Mr. Uqdah a
15	question. Let me talk about the neighborhood engagement.
16	I was looking at the list, and there was a charrette in,
17	like, July, I think. Was anybody in the neighborhood engaged
18	in that?
19	MR. UQDAH: Not those that had standing. There
20	was none of those people participated in that.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Help me understand when you
22	say have standing because I feel like I have standing.
23	MR. UQDAH: Okay. And I'm just speaking from the
24	process that takes place here at the BZA. There is a 200-

foot limit that the applicant has given to be able to notify

1	people within 200 feet of the
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: That's a notice. It doesn't
3	necessarily give you standing. What it does is give you
4	notice that there's activity that is getting ready to take
5	place in your neighborhood, everyone who is within 200 feet
6	of whatever is being proposed.
7	MR. UQDAH: Right. None of those people attended
8	this charrette that you're talking about, we were unaware of
9	it. I know I was unaware of it.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So let me ask you can you
11	emphatically state that nobody within 200 feet knew anything
12	about the charrette? No, I'm talking, I'm sure the BZA runs
13	like the Zoning Commission. We try to run it in order. So
14	can you emphatically state that?
15	MR. UQDAH: I can emphatically state it, sir.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So when did you first hear?
17	I mean, how did you hear let me ask this. I'm just trying
18	to figure all this out. How did you okay. Let me back
19	up. Do you all participate in your ANC meetings?
20	MR. UQDAH: Yes, I'm a former commissioner.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I thought so.
22	MR. UQDAH: For this
23	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So you attend regularly?
24	MR. UQDAH: I attend, I either attend or follow
25	from the agenda what the ANC is doing. And when those things

that, you know, pique my interest, I make comments.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: So let me ask this. If there's a process, and this may be jumping the gun because I'm also going to ask the applicant when we get there and I don't want to hold things up, but if there's a process, I know in some other campuses and things that we do across the city, we do a phased process and it's looked at. It's like, intimately, it's added on, and then we evaluate how that looks, and then it's added on again and we evaluate how that looks. That's kind of what I'm hearing. I'm hearing nobody is against the school.

MR. UQDAH: No, sir.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: It's just the 600. And to the applicant, I'm getting ready for applicant, is are we going to jump from where we are now to 600 all in two or three months? I'm just throwing that out there like that. But I think there's some gradual increases, and I think there's something that they can put in place. And I also think there's something that can be put in place where the neighborhood can also monitor and work along with the applicant over the school and see how we're progressing. It's done in other schools that way, and I think you also mentioned an advisory committee with some of the neighbors and stuff.

So those are some things that I'm thinking about,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

and I'm just talking out loud, thinking out loud. I like that song. I'm thinking out loud, but I have colleagues that we have to talk about it. I'm just throwing that out there because I'm hearing that through all this discussion.

MR. UQDAH: And the only thing we're looking for -- first of all, to address one thing, the immediate community including myself did not learn of this application until August the 21st or thereabouts.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. But it's not like there can't be a remedy to fix it.

MR. UQDAH: There is a remedy to fix it, but I will say this: where the applicant extensively met with the community, like in September, they also met with West parents. Our issues that we've raised here today, those issues have not been addressed. I mean, I've talked about, you know, the environmental issues. I have both emails and telephone conversations where I asked about the number of restroom facilities at Kingsbury, and I still --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'm going to stop asking my questions. I think the Chair is ready to move on.

CHAIRMAN HILL: That's okay, that's all right. I got a question. Are there people here wishing to speak in opposition, if you could raise your hand? Okay. Are there people here wishing to speak in support, if you could raise your hand? Okay. I'm just trying to get an idea as to how

2.0

long we're going to go.

2.0

All right. Does anyone have anymore questions?

No? Okay. I'm going to turn to the Office of Planning then.

MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the BZA. For the record, I'm Maxine Brown-Roberts from the Office of Planning. The LAMB school has requested special exception review under Subtitle U 205.1. And as you have read, we have outlined, you know, how they meet the requirements of that section. I'll sort of just go towards, in the interest of time, go towards our recommendation.

In our November 3rd recommendation, we had some conditions, and number one was that the maximum number of students in the interim range would be 310 with a maximum number of faculty and staff of 36 and then the hours of operation and the retention of the 107 parking spaces. We further recommended to the BZA that, at the time, at the interim stage, that before the number of students include 600 that they come back to the BZA for review. And we also outlined that we supported the conditions outlined by DDOT.

Subsequent to our November 3rd application, the applicant came to us and said that they had some concerns about our recommendation of coming back to the BZA, and we explained to them that our concern was that it was a big leap from the existing situation to 600 students, and we are concerned about that and how that would affect the community

and especially since there were a number of issues that DDOT had, transportation issues, and we wanted to make sure that those things were being addressed.

So that was our response to the applicant, and they explained to us the financing of the project. And so we took that into consideration. They submitted the language for us to consider, and we consulted with DDOT and with the Zoning Administrator to make sure as to what they had recommended was something that was enforceable. And so all three of us worked together and we came up with the language that has been submitted by the applicant here today.

We think that that gives some certainty because what DDOT has recommended is that there are these monitoring mechanisms there, and so, before they can expand to their 600, after Kingsbury moves out, then they have to demonstrate to DDOT that they have met these transportation conditions before that is going to be acceptable, and I suppose they write a letter to the Zoning Administrator saying, yes, we have met these conditions, and then the Zoning administrator would approve a certificate of occupancy for them to increase to the 600.

So that's where -- we are supportive of that, of that condition. And, you know, we still are open, if the Board thinks that it is something that is better for the BZA to review the application at the interim stage. I think we

2.0

2.3

1	are supportive of both.
2	Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I'm open for
3	questions.
4	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. Just real quick, I mean,
5	the language, it's the alternative condition that they had
6	in their presentation.
7	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Yes.
8	CHAIRMAN HILL: And the performance monitoring
9	plan, can you explain that a little bit more?
10	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: If you look at the DDOT
11	report, they have a section that outlines I'm not sure
12	exactly what page. If you look at page four of the DDOT
13	report, they have a bullet as part of their conditions that
14	talks about implementing the following performance monitoring
15	plan as agreed with the applicant. So what the applicant has
16	to do is to, every year, they have to submit how they're
17	meeting the requirements of this plan to DDOT, and DDOT will
18	monitor it over the years.
19	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. Does anybody have some
20	questions for OP?
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So, Ms. Brown-Roberts, I know
22	we're deviating from a normal process with this. Has this
23	been done before? I don't recall, but has this been done
24	before, this new tool of using to make sure that a school is

coming to compliance?

1	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: I don't know. I've never seen
2	it, but I don't know if it has happened before. I personally
3	haven't seen it before.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'm definitely open to it. I
5	just, for example, the student cap, how is that that won't
6	be monitored through this.
7	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Well, it's a condition, the
8	student cap would be a condition of approval.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Right. So the cap on the students
10	will be 600. 600 when?
11	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Are you talking about
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: When we get to the I mean, I'm
13	just, I'm having problems
14	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: If we were to go with
15	alternate language, the cap would be 600 right now, yes.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So it would be 600 without any
17	track record or anything of how we're working with 300, 400,
18	500? We go right to 600?
19	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Well, from speaking to the
20	applicant, they're not going to go to 600 in 2018 when they
21	start.
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Right. I kind of figured that.
23	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: So the 600 will come, well,
24	the 600 doesn't come into play until after Kingsbury moves
25	out.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
2	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: That's my understanding.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, we can probably talk about
4	this all day, but we're not. So I'll just go ahead and save
5	it for, see how this pans out. Thank you.
6	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. Does the applicant have any
7	questions for DDOT? I mean, for the Office of Planning?
8	MR. KADLECEK: No, thank you.
9	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. Does the opposition have
10	any questions for the Office of Planning?
11	MR. UQDAH: I do, Mr. Chair. Good afternoon. How
12	are you? When was this new language submitted to you?
13	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: I think maybe Monday.
14	MR. UQDAH: Oh, Monday of this week?
15	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Yes, yes. Either Monday or
16	Friday of last week, yes.
17	MR. UQDAH: And do you know whether or not that
18	new language was uploaded to ISIS?
19	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: I don't because, actually, we
20	just came to agreement yesterday on this new language -
21	MR. UQDAH: So it's safe to say that there was no
22	notice to the community or any other, like, there was no
23	notice to the ANC, there was no notice to any party that this
24	change had been introduced?
25	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: You are correct.

1	MR. UQDAH: Can you explain how the applicant will
2	be able to demonstrate that they have complied? Is it self-
3	certification, or how will they be able to demonstrate, what
4	metric will be used to say, yes, applicant, you're in
5	compliance?
б	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: This is all DDOT's
7	recommendation, and I don't want to, you know, be talking on
8	behalf of DDOT. But I think what's going to happen is that,
9	after Kingsbury moves out and they have to come back to get
10	a certificate of occupancy to occupy the whole building, then
11	they'll have to demonstrate to DDOT that, yes, we have been
12	meeting in the interim, you know, starting whenever the
13	school starts next year, we have been meeting these
14	requirements that are outlined in the DDOT report here today.
15	And then what would happen is that I suppose DDOT will write
16	a letter and say, okay, take this when you go for your
17	certificate of occupancy. They take that document to the
18	Zoning Administrator to say, hey, here we are meeting the
19	requirements outlined by DDOT.
20	MR. UQDAH: Now, as you just outlined, wouldn't
21	the applicant's lenders have the same concerns?
22	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: I don't know. I don't know.
23	MR. UQDAH: Okay. And last thing, you keep
24	mentioning and others have mentioned when Kingsbury moves
25	out. When is that?

1	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: I don't know. I haven't been
2	given a time line for that.
3	MR. UQDAH: Okay. Thank you.
4	CHAIRMAN HILL: You want to answer that question?
5	MR. ZAYETS: I'm sorry. I could have, I don't
6	want to speak out of turn.
7	CHAIRMAN HILL: That's okay. You can just answer
8	the question.
9	MR. ZAYETS: Sure. So there's a slide up on the
10	board that actually shows the interim, and it shows the
11	ultimate condition.
12	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, okay. All right. Mr.
13	Uqdah, anything else for OP?
14	MR. UQDAH: No, nothing else for OP.
15	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay.
16	MR. UQDAH: But it doesn't, but that slide that
17	we're looking at, it doesn't give a time frame. I mean, it's
18	2020. I mean, that's
19	CHAIRMAN HILL: Yes, when Kingsbury moves out.
20	That's what they're saying.
21	MR. UQDAH: So Kingsbury will be moved out in
22	2020?
23	CHAIRMAN HILL: 2020.
24	MR. UQDAH: Is that correct?
25	MR. ZAYETS: So the ultimate condition is, at the

1 latest, 2025. Because they're on a flexible lease, 2 anywhere between after 2020 and 2025. CHAIRMAN HILL: But after 2020, that's when it 3 4 could go up to 600? 5 So we would need to meet MR. ZAYETS: the 6 performance monitoring in order for that to happen so that 7 we can get the C of O to even apply for that building permit 8 application to increase the enrollment. So we would need to 9 show from day one proof of performance standards being met 10 and only after that would we be able to apply and ask for an 11 increase. 12 CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. Thanks. Mr. Chair, but only DDOT terms are to 13 MR. UODAH: None of the other conditions that we raised are on 14 15 the list of, you know, things that have to be met. It's just 16 And I haven't heard anything about 17 community review --18 CHAIRMAN HILL: We actually know where we are, and 19 there's a lot still here in terms of -- I think it's pretty 2.0 clear what the different little issues are, so we just keep 21 talking about them again and again. But we're going to get 22 to, at some point -- but I am going to ask -- okay. 23 Do you have anymore questions for DDOT? I mean the 24 Office of Planning. 25 MR. UQDAH: I do not.

CHAIRMAN HILL: I keep doing that. I wish there was someone from DDOT here.

MR. UQDAH: I do not.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN HILL: All right. Is there anyone here -- well, first, is there anyone here from the ANC? Okay. Is there anyone here wishing to speak in opposition? Is there anyone here wishing to speak in support? Okay. If you could please come forward. Mr. Uqdah, if you don't mind giving up that side of the table.

Yes, you can just sit right there. No, wait one second. First of all, I'm going to wait for everybody to show up there and sit with you at the same time. You have to push the button to speak, and then did you fill out your witness cards? Oh, you did not. That's all right. You can fill them out afterwards. Did you get sworn in? Okay. So everybody got sworn in. Okay. So everyone is going to get three minutes, okay? And I'm going to start, if that's okay, just right to left or my right to left. It's over here. And please state your name and address. There you go.

MS. ASPINWALL: Good afternoon. My name is Maria Aspinwall, and I live in Ward 4, lived in 16th Street Heights for seven years. I'm connected to LAMB for about 15 years. Initially, I was one of the founding parents who believed in school choice and, since then, I've come on as staff.

So as part of when, initially, when we started the

school as part of this school-parent compact, all families, all LAMB families are expected to volunteer for 40 hours to help the school become better engaged and better serve our students. During my volunteer service, that's when I got to know how special, how truly special the school was. I got to work with and meet the founding director and principal who are still there. So it was just a wonderful place to be.

While I was volunteering one day, I got the offer to work at the school and I was offered a position to implement a grant, a proposal that's called Safe Schools and Healthy Students Initiative. And so welcomed the I was very happy to do that. opportunity. That was one of our first cross-sector partnerships, and, since then, well, it's been 14 years and I've done a lot of different things, worked with little kids and big adults.

But, currently, one of my main goals is really to strengthen the parent body and to get them more engaged in their child's education and then also work with the community to increase other opportunities of engagement. So I've introduced and managed partnerships, like I said, working with the government, with, you know, green -- River Smart programs, with the community, whether it's at church or another public charter school, and then also working with some of the business sectors to support some of our families in need.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

Let's see. Basically, I just wanted to say I'm supportive of LAMB's move to Kingsbury and I'm continued, I continue to commit to working with both parents and the communities' stakeholders. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN HILL: Great. Thank you. Sir?

MR. CHAPLIN: Yes, my name is Duncan Chaplin, and I've just moved to the neighborhood in January or February of 2015. I have a two-year-old daughter, so she is not, we can't apply to LAMB yet, so I don't have any children -- my daughter probably won't go to LAMB, and I don't have any friends or relatives or connections to the LAMB school.

Τ do work for research company called а Mathematica Policy Research. We do a lot of research on charter schools. I've personally been doing research in education in D.C. for almost 25 years. So when I heard about LAMB, I got very excited about the idea that I could say I'm in the neighborhood that LAMB came to. And the way I view this is helping LAMB is going to help improve D.C. schools because LAMB is one of the best schools in the city, and making it easier for them to get more kids seems like a very positive thing.

Just a couple of very brief points on this sewage issue. It seems to me that, if LAMB is allowed to move in, that might help people apply to get work done on the sewage faster. It's going to be a tricky issue, I know, and I think

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

that might help.

2.0

In terms of traffic, I happen to bike right around the school every morning, and so I did a little traffic count myself. That's in my letter of support, and it basically just supports the review that was done by others that this should be easy to accommodate for the neighborhood.

And last, I do think the neighborhood has been very involved, certainly in the last couple of months. There's been lots of meetings, lots of people engaged, and I think it's been a great process.

I am definitely sympathetic to concerns that, you know, LAMB won't be able to follow everything they're asked to do, just as Kingsbury, I think, faced some challenges. So I certainly think it's good to have a monitoring process. I don't know if BZA wants to be involved in that or what's appropriate, and so I certainly, I think it's good, like I said, it's good to have a monitoring process, but the details I haven't thought through. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, great. Thank you.

MS. SALSTROM: Thank you, guys, very much. My name is Sandra Salstrom. I live at 315 Allison Street, N.W., so in the Petworth neighborhood of D.C. I've been a D.C. resident for 15 years. I've owned my home in Petworth for more than ten years. I currently have one child at LAMB and next year we will have two children at LAMB.

So, currently, we live 1.8 miles from the Missouri campus where our daughter goes to school, and our son is in a daycare at 14th and Colorado, the Estrellitas Montessori School. So presently we do make that drive every single day from Petworth, you know, coming from the east side heading west, so I understand very much the concerns of these parents. But, you know, I can speak for myself to say that we wouldn't be adding any additional traffic because this is actually a commute that we already do every single day. I use Gallatin Street because it has lights, so I come from, you know, Illinois Avenue, take that left onto Gallatin, go Gallatin over to 14th Street, take the right up 14th Street, take the left onto Ingraham to go to Estrellitas, drop our son at Estrellitas and then continue on up to LAMB.

So, you know, there have been days when LAMB has been closed, and so I've only had one child to take to school, and Estrellitas is currently about a mile -- I looked at the map. Kingsbury would be 1.1 miles from my home, so in days when I've just had my son, I'm a runner, I have a running stroller, and I love nothing more than to try to get a little exercise, so I've actually put him in that running stroller and run him that mile up to Estrellitas, which is, you know, as I say, just a block over from Kingsbury. So we'd be very much incentivized to do the same thing and very much love biking. My husband and I are both big bikers so

2.0

want to be able to bike both of our children.

2.0

Lastly, we are actually looking to purchase a home in the 16th Street Heights neighborhood with the express purpose of being able to walk to school. So, again, I can only speak for myself and our own commuting patterns, but, you know, right now, we already make that drive. We are looking to try to do less of that, more running and biking, and, ultimately, be able to walk our kids to LAMB. We are very much invested, you know, in the school, going to Kingsbury and the neighborhood. We have every incentive to be good neighbors, as I say, because we certainly want to be much closer neighbors to LAMB and to Kingsbury.

I know one other point, it's very hard, I believe, for charter schools to find adequate facilities. As you guys have heard, LAMB currently operates three campuses. It is very much in the school's plan and interest to have all of our students under one roof. It would help with cohesion. I think it would just benefit the students a lot.

So, again, just want to say very much in support of this and really appreciate you guys taking the time to listen to us.

CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, great. Thank you. Does the Board have any questions for the witnesses? So I just had a quick one. Are you within the 200 feet boundary? No, you can speak into the microphone again to answer my question.

1	But you can speak. You said you were in the neighborhood,
2	so I just wanted to understand what that meant.
3	MR. CHAPLIN: Yes, my apologies. I'm about three
4	blocks away.
5	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay.
6	MR. CHAPLIN: But I live on one side of the
7	school, my daycare is on the other, so I bike on Gallatin and
8	Piney Branch.
9	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. That's okay. I was just
10	curious where you were. Okay, great. Thank you. All right.
11	Thank you all very much. If the Zoning Administrator
12	wouldn't mind, if you wouldn't mind coming forward, I mean,
13	we're actually, we don't normally have you with us. And so,
14	Mr. Uqdah, you can also come forward because what I want to
15	do is I want to be very precise with this. I don't want to
16	take a lot of time. I have a couple of questions real quick,
17	and then you'll have an opportunity to also cross to the
18	testimony that the Zoning Administrator is about to give.
19	I do believe you've been sworn in, correct, sir?
20	MR. LEGRANT: I have.
21	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. If you could introduce
22	yourself, please.
23	MR. LEGRANT: Yes. Matthew LeGrant, Zoning
24	Administrator, DCRA.
25	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. So, Mr. LeGrant, for me,

since you are here, I'm just kind of, a lot of discussion has taken place about the PMP and there's a lot of conditions, and you've been here, so you've heard a lot of testimony from the community. And what I'm just trying to understand is what's the process for this PMP because, ultimately, it's coming to you then again, right, in terms of whether they're fulfilling their requirements. So can you walk me through that process a little bit?

MR. LEGRANT: Well, let me tell you my familiarity with this application, which, I'll be up-front with everyone here, is very small because Maxine Brown-Roberts from the Office of Planning asked me, I believe it was Monday, about the then draft condition language that you've seen, to have a discussion about the enforceability of that, and she wanted to discuss that with me. So the context of the other conditions I did not even look at, but this one specific condition we discussed that condition in terms of, for my view, as Zoning Administrator, the enforceability because there's the, I quess, the PDRN that is being reported to DDOT as to the, I believe, with the traffic count, the question was would I be in a position to enforce that prior to granting a C of O for an expanded occupancy for the LAMB And we discussed the wording as to my point, which I think was incorporated in the latest version, is that it would be, DDOT is actually making the determination as to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

1	whether that standard has been met, that criteria of that
2	program has been met. Then once that occurs, it has to be
3	reported to me, so I'm knowledgeable of that result in order
4	to then be able to consider a C of O for an expanded
5	occupancy.
6	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, great. Okay. So that's
7	great. Does the Board have any questions of the ZA for that
8	answer? Okay. So, Mr. Uqdah, just to that one piece of
9	testimony, do you have any question?
LO	MR. UQDAH: The only question I have is just for
11	clarity. So you don't have any enforceability other than
L2	looking at DDOT's approval in order to allow the occupancy?
L3	MR. LEGRANT: In terms of this condition, if the
L4	Board were to accept the language, then I would agree.
L5	Generally, I look to DDOT for does it meet the standard or
L6	not, and they report it to me.
L7	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, okay, great. Mr. Kadlecek?
L8	MR. KADLECEK: Can I ask a clarifying question of
L9	Mr. LeGrant?
20	CHAIRMAN HILL: Yes, sure.
21	MR. KADLECEK: Just in general, how are other
22	conditions enforced in orders? Not this one specifically,
23	but, generally, how do you enforce conditions?
24	MR. LEGRANT: Well, it certainly depends on the
25	condition. If there's a condition that requires I'll put

1	it in three categories. There are some conditions that
2	require reporting from other District government agencies,
3	such as the one we're discussing here. There are sometimes
4	requirements that the applicant make a representation or
5	report to me for my evaluation and consideration the
6	determination of whether the condition has been met or not.
7	And then if any citizen or member of the community lodges a
8	complaint about a particular condition, my office would
9	investigate that.
10	MR. KADLECEK: Thank you.
11	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, all right, great. Okay.
12	Thank you, Mr. LeGrant. All right. I guess let's see what
13	we're going to do next. So we did opposition, people,
14	everything. All right. Mr. Uqdah, do you want to provide
15	like a little bit of a closing for us? Are you good?
16	MR. KADLECEK: Sorry, Mr. Chairman. ANC?
17	CHAIRMAN HILL: We asked for the ANC. Nobody was
18	here. But thanks.
19	MR. UQDAH: I don't think I'm going to have a
20	closing, but I do have a concern relative to testimony from
21	Building Hope that I think deserves
22	CHAIRMAN HILL: Testimony from who?
23	MR. UQDAH: From Building Hope.
24	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay.
25	MR. UQDAH: There was this concern about dropping,
	I .

1	you know, 600 students, that they would not be able to obtain
2	financing. But I'm wondering whether or not a lender would
3	have the same concerns if that condition, that last condition
4	that they're seeking approval for is placed into the record.
5	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. I'm just trying to follow
6	my own, the process here. So you're providing testimony
7	again or you're asking a question about something.
8	MR. UQDAH: Right. I'm asking a question for
9	clarity because the, you know, Building Hope is saying there
LO	is no other alternative
11	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. I think we'll get to that
L2	on our own, meaning I think we are going to get to that
L3	issue. Is there anything you'd like to say in terms of,
L4	again, kind of a closing?
15	MR. UQDAH: No, no, sir. I think we've covered
L6	everything.
L7	CHAIRMAN HILL: All right. Thanks, Mr. Uqdah.
18	Mr. Kadlecek, do you want rebuttal and then a closing, as
L9	well?
20	MR. KADLECEK: Yes, is it okay if we just take two
21	minutes to organize our rebuttal? I think there's a couple
22	of issues outstanding that we just want to make sure
23	CHAIRMAN HILL: Sure. We'll take two minutes.
24	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the
25	record at 1:12 p.m. and resumed at 1:19 p.m.)

1	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, Mr. Kadlecek, we are back
2	here. Let's see, we've got somebody else who has joined us,
3	so, okay.
4	MR. KADLECEK: Yes, so one of our rebuttal
5	witnesses is Dominique Fortune and she works for Building
6	Hope and she actually was the most engaged in the community
7	process so we thought it would be most helpful to have her
8	testify with respect to the community engagement
9	(Simultaneous speaking)
10	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, then I'm going to have to
11	do cross again, you know, it's new testimony being taken.
12	MR. KADLECEK: No, I understand that. I
13	understand that.
14	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, all right. Before you even
15	do that, and I guess you can, but, you know, I think really
16	what is going to come down to a lot of this discussion is
17	like the financing and how, you know, what it is, as to why
18	you need it, you know.
19	So, okay. But you can go ahead and you
20	(Simultaneous speaking)
21	MR. KADLECEK: You tell us. If you don't think
22	it's valuable to hear the community engagement process, but
23	we know that the party in opposition did testify a lot to
24	that.
25	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. Does the Board need to hear

Τ	about anything about the community I don't need to hear
2	anything about the community engagement process, right?
3	MR. KADLECEK: Okay, then we won't
4	CHAIRMAN HILL: There is going to be a lot of
5	questions about the financing I think, and so go ahead and
б	do your conclusion then and then, or, I'm sorry, rebuttal and
7	then conclusion.
8	MR. KADLECEK: Yes. We're going to have just the
9	two, we're going to touch on a couple things for rebuttal and
10	then I'll do a closing that will be pretty brief.
11	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. Thank you.
12	MR. KADLECEK: Mr. Zayets will talk a little bit
13	and then Mr. Van Pelt.
13 14	chairman Hill: Okay, great. Thank you.
14	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, great. Thank you.
14 15	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, great. Thank you. MR. ZAYETS: Thank you. So there was a couple
14 15 16	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, great. Thank you. MR. ZAYETS: Thank you. So there was a couple things that came up and I wanted to reiterate. The first
14 15 16 17	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, great. Thank you. MR. ZAYETS: Thank you. So there was a couple things that came up and I wanted to reiterate. The first thing, the slide that's up there on the board is actually the
14 15 16 17	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, great. Thank you. MR. ZAYETS: Thank you. So there was a couple things that came up and I wanted to reiterate. The first thing, the slide that's up there on the board is actually the interim condition, just for clarity.
14 15 16 17 18	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, great. Thank you. MR. ZAYETS: Thank you. So there was a couple things that came up and I wanted to reiterate. The first thing, the slide that's up there on the board is actually the interim condition, just for clarity. So in the interim there will be approximately 175
14 15 16 17 18 19	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, great. Thank you. MR. ZAYETS: Thank you. So there was a couple things that came up and I wanted to reiterate. The first thing, the slide that's up there on the board is actually the interim condition, just for clarity. So in the interim there will be approximately 175 students from Kingsbury and approximately 310 students from
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, great. Thank you. MR. ZAYETS: Thank you. So there was a couple things that came up and I wanted to reiterate. The first thing, the slide that's up there on the board is actually the interim condition, just for clarity. So in the interim there will be approximately 175 students from Kingsbury and approximately 310 students from LAMB, so cumulatively that's about 485 students. So when we
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, great. Thank you. MR. ZAYETS: Thank you. So there was a couple things that came up and I wanted to reiterate. The first thing, the slide that's up there on the board is actually the interim condition, just for clarity. So in the interim there will be approximately 175 students from Kingsbury and approximately 310 students from LAMB, so cumulatively that's about 485 students. So when we speak of the condition of from there to the ultimate

As far as the general conditions that we have asked to modify in order to satisfy our lending requirements, that's going to address the transportation process and the traffic mitigation measures, but I do want to reiterate this is not so much for the Commission but more for the folks in the room is that any condition that we volunteer to is enforceable and it becomes a matter of law.

So that can be enforced at any time. So the lighting, the noise, the traffic mitigation measures, those are all enforceable conditions and at any point in time if there is a violation you can take enforcement action against us through DCRA and the Zoning Administrator's Office.

A couple other things I just wanted to reiterate, so as far as noise and matters of that, during one of the community meetings I actually heard explicitly from one of the folks is that there was some questions about noise mitigation, so what we did was we actually took some measurements from the proximity of homes to the nearest properties and where the mark is written "95 feet" there is some air conditioners that were installed by Kingsbury folks, we've actually agreed as part of our condition we're going to put acoustic blankets to muffle that and address the noise from those pieces of equipment.

As far as lighting, one of the other conditions we have agreed is that we're not going to be making any

2.0

2 any light pollution, and that's also in here as a condition. 3 As far as regular meetings, one of the questions 4 t.hat. was brought up was Condition Number 4, LAMB 5 representative will collaborative with representatives from 6 West to coordinate schedules, so that is also a condition. 7 That is part of the community involvement so that is already 8 in here. 9 Safe Passage, Condition Number 7, that's policy manual that Diane brought up that we want to put in 10 11 It's information to ensure students safe arrival and This policy manual can be made available to LAMB 12 departure. 13 residents as well. So that is also a condition. 14 As far as busses, charter schools don't actually 15 get an allocation for public school busses, so there probably 16 won't be any busses on the campus outside of like small field 17 trips or kids with special needs, but as far as the daily use 18 there is not busses that is part of charter schools. 19 Oh, one more thing, the community group. 2.0 is -- to which? 21 (Off microphone comment) 22 right. We'll focus MR. **ZAYETS:** Ah, 23 community network directly impacted, that's the community 24 that will establish key metrics for verification 25 methods and compliance with our own neighbors policies.

drastic improvements to the lighting plan that will add to

So basically LAMB is going to put together a committee that is going to meet regularly with the neighbors and just to make sure any concerns are met and vetted on a regular basis. That's everything.

MR. VAN PELT: Okay, just a few transportation things. The policy manual also designates the routes that parents are to use and how they are to enter and use the campus, if you will, and that's to, you know, enforce that 14th Street is the way that you arrive to campus and you must enter the campus off of 14th Street, and if you choose to exit off of Piney Branch, which we think is only the people that really want to go to the north, that that is, there is a route that you could do so but you are not to enter in off of Piney Branch, so I think that's something the policy manual will cover.

I wanted to pick up on the mode splits just a little bit. I want to make sure that, there may have been some misunderstanding on that, what was in the report and what we have in the report is really what is experienced by LAMB today.

We are hopeful and actually we expect that the non-auto mode splits will increase at this site, but we didn't take credit for that in this study. We didn't do that mainly because we didn't want to be accused of underestimating the number of vehicular trips, so that's why

2.0

we didn't change those mode splits.

2.0

And then as far as the number of trips itself, there was a number, I think it was quoted earlier 548 vehicular trips. Really when you look at it the net new is 475 vehicular trips, but the way we have to think about that is it's not quite exactly like that.

We are school so we have a trip that enters the site and pretty much not too long after that exit the site, so what we are looking at is really more on the order of 247, you know, new cars that will be coming onto the network in the morning, but that trip is essentially entering the site and within a short period of time it's leaving the site again.

CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. Okay, great.

MS. COTTMAN: I was just going to say one final thing regarding enrollment projections and this concern about an immediate increase in student population by LAMB students.

What we currently do is, I mean we have a steady growth plan and our enrollment projections generally have anywhere from 30 to 50 new students entering LAMB each year and that's because we only enroll children at three, four, and five years of age.

We do not backfill. So you cannot come into LAMB as a 5th grader or as a 4th grader or a 3rd grader. By having multiple campuses, until Kingsbury leaves, LAMB's

105 Kingsbury overall project, student enrollment at increases 20 to 25 students per year until after Kingsbury leaves and as part of Phase 2 development we have to renovate classrooms and the total number of 600 students at the earliest is at that '24/'25 school year, but we will not and cannot do that until we close another campus. CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, thank you. MR. KADLECEK: Just in closing, I just want it to be understood that Kingsbury is extraordinarily sensitive to all the concerns that you heard from the opponents today. That's why they have agreed to 24 of the 25 conditions that have been put out by --(Off microphone comment)

MR. KADLECEK: I'm sorry, LAMB's. I'm sorry, LAMB. LAMB has agreed to 24 of the 25 conditions that have been put out by the community, the ANC, the Office of Planning, DDOT, et cetera.

That is an utmost concern for them to be a good neighbor and they want to address those concerns. In fact, of all the concerns you heard there is a condition, as Mr. Zayets explained there is a condition to address all of those.

The reason that the proposed alternative condition was is it gives extra teeth to make sure that LAMB can't expand into the rest of the school unless they are meeting

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

these very specific metrics for traffic, because, as you have heard, traffic is the biggest concern, and so they want to make sure that traffic is being addressed in a way that is satisfactory to everybody that is being impacted by it.

The other conditions will be in the order as well and they addressed the other concerns that you have heard and those, too, are enforceable, but this additional condition, as Mr. Brown-Roberts explained, gives additional enforcement and allows the school to have the certainty that at some point in the future it can get to 600 students but it's on its own responsibility that it can get to 600 students.

So if LAMB can't expand to 600 students under this condition that's LAMB's fault because it can't comply with the transportation performance monitoring plan. That's the difference between having to return to the BZA and being responsible for itself.

LAMB could be doing everything perfectly and if they return to the BZA there is still a risk from the lender standpoint that they could not get that 600 students and that's really where the rub is, is that from a lender's standpoint the expansion to 600 isn't guaranteed if they have to go back to the BZA.

If they can expand to 600 by demonstrating that they are in compliance with the transportation monitoring plan they can expand to 600 as long as they are doing what

2.0

they are supposed to, and, as Mr. LeGrant explained, he would not grant a certificate of occupancy to expand into the rest of the building if there is no demonstration that LAMB is being responsive and in compliance with those conditions that are set forth in that transportation monitoring plan.

So I just hope that that helps explain it. I understand that there is maybe some further discussion to have about it, but with that I just wanted to close that LAMB is trying to do everything it can to be responsive to all the concerns that it has heard and that's why they have agreed to such extensive conditions, some of which are not insignificant, like improving the pedestrian areas nearby like by building sidewalks and so forth.

So they want to make sure that they are a good neighbor, that they will be a good neighbor for a long time, and that they minimize the number of impacts that they'll have on the neighborhood. So, thank you.

CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, great. Thank you. Okay, so I guess what I would like to do is ask some further information from you guys. I don't think we're going to make a decision today.

And so I think depending upon what else the Board would like to hear from, please chime in, as well as I think we're going to do a continued hearing. What I would like to do is if you could -- Well, first of all, if you can try to

2.0

talk to, you know, CNDI-LA, right, and see if they're -Well, okay, obviously the LAMB school, you know, everyone,
no one is, you know, no one is saying that they are not a
good neighbor, that they don't want them there, that they
don't think that, you know, what your mission is isn't a good
mission, and so it's kind of like, you know, you're trying
to get the community there to agree, you know, that you will
have, they will have, you will live up to your expectations,
right, okay.

And so the first thing I want to see is like there is so many conditions all over the place, like if you can provide them in one place, like you mentioned 25, then there was 24 in your submission I think.

I mean if you could submit again all of the conditions that you are agreeing to, right, and then if you could also submit a little bit more specificity as to this last, the condition with, you know, the PMP, like what is tied to that PMP.

You've heard that there has been some discussion about, you know, the PMP is just about the traffic, right, and so the other conditions aren't things that you would, that DDOT would be looking at again, right.

So I guess part of the issue with even -- because what you are trying to ask us to do now is to grant everything going forward, right, I mean you won't come back

2.0

to us again.

2.0

So I understand the opposition saying, okay, that's just the traffic issue that's not, and you can respond in a minute if you want to, but that's just the traffic issue it's not all the other conditions.

And I understand what you are saying is that, you know, if they are in violation of those conditions then you can go ahead and, you know, file something and get, you know, there is an action that would, they have a way to -- there is some teeth to it, right.

But at the same time who wants to do that, okay, right. So you obviously haven't -- and you haven't created enough of a comfort level, either be it that Kingsbury was there or whatever, that they are able to sign on to what you are saying, right.

And if you could provide this level of comfort I don't see why necessarily CNDI-LA, or at least I wouldn't see why CNDI-LA couldn't agree to that, right, like if they are, you know -- If everything is the way you say it's going to happen and, you know, there is some teeth to it and then, again, if you could, Mr. Kadlecek, again, the meetings, the community meetings that you talk about, if you could provide a little bit more clarity on that as well and when those meetings are supposed to take place and how there is some teeth to those meetings.

Again, I can understand the Applicant saying, you know, we don't know what the parents are going to be like in ten years, you don't know what the administration is going to be like in ten years, but the community is still going to be there in ten years.

And I know that at least one member of the Board here had some question about what has been the norm in terms of coming back, or in terms of coming back when there has been a change like that, so going from, you know, whatever the numbers are to the 600. So then those are two things.

The last thing then is I would like further clarification again how the financing component works and really what it is that, you know, why is this not going to work, why is this such a problem that, you know, the financing doesn't work in terms of, you know -- so then you don't get the loan until you need the loan, that's the part I don't really get at this point in terms of why the financing is so tied to that number because it doesn't sound like you are doing the work, you know, when do you need the money, or what is it, why is it that this has to work the way it has to work in terms of you needing this approval in order to get the financing.

So those are kind of the three little things that I am interested, again. And just to repeat it for myself again, you know, clarity on all of the conditions, okay, then

2.0

clarity, a second issue, clarity around how this PMP thing works and what it's tied to, so it sounds like it's not going to be tied to the conditions but it's going to be tied to the just the transportation issues, and then, third, how this community thing is going to take place and what teeth there is in the community process.

And then, lastly, again, was the financing thing. So there is four things that I am looking for. Does the Board have anything else they would be interested in?

VICE CHAIR HART: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I think, Mr. Van Pelt, you gave some information about mode splits and it sounded like what you were saying was that the mode splits that you gave in the report are basically very conservative because you wanted to make sure that you weren't overestimating underestimating something that the or community was interested in.

Could you provide something that's a little bit more what you anticipated it being, and if it was in there I apologize for missing it, but just a simple, you know, kind of this is what expect that to be, you know, the mode splits would be in whatever time frame you want to do, 2020 to 2025, I'm not exactly sure, but I think have -- If that's something that you could do that would be helpful for us to kind of see that.

I think to the Chairman's point about the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

financing piece of it, I think what would be helpful is to understand the difference between the public charter school financing and the regular school, public school financing, just so that, you know, the public schools tend to get the funding, the public schools for capital projects tend to get financing through the, you know, through the government.

know, \$50 million to do this particular building, how does the public charter school differ from that? And so that would be helpful to understand that difference because I think that that's part of what is going on with this is there is a bridge, what I understand there is some sort of, I'll call it a bridge loan, but there is some, a bridge that is allowing the lenders to be able to give money to the public charter school so the public charter school can then actually build, or actually they give it to an interim group who helps the public charter school to actually build the structure, or finance and build the structure.

So it would be helpful to just understand the difference between the public charter school funding for capital projects, in this case the capital project is a school, and a public school itself and how they do that.

And I think it's helpful to have, and this is a good slide to understand what the interim conditions are, but right now we are at 2017. Between 2017 and 2020 there will

2.0

be 300, well, if this is approved, there will be 310 LAMB students, or a maximum of 310 LAMB students at the school, and I am assuming that is a maximum of 310 LAMB students, and I say that because there is a total of 400 or maybe 500, but that's just assuming that there is 175 Kingsbury, so let's just talk about the LAMB school.

So between 2020 and 2025 there is an expectation that the Kingsbury school will leave and the LAMB students will increase in size, again if the application is approved, but it's not really clear as to kind of how do you get from one to the other and is there -- I understand there is a, you know, you don't exactly know what that is, but there has got to be some projection that you are, you know, looking at.

I think if we have some information, the community brought this up a number of times about, you know, we're not really sure what's going, you know, when this is actually going to happen, so it would be helpful to understand the delta between, not the delta, the interim steps between 2020 and 2025, because I think the community is really interested in that and I think we would be interested in that as well to understand how that phasing would occur.

So I think that's it that I would be looking for.

I mean, and I agree with the Chairman on the aspects that he raised as well.

MEMBER WHITE: Yes, I am always interested in the

2.0

financing aspect of this so I am glad you guys covered that portion of it, but one question that I had, I know that there is some information from ANC but I don't, I got the sense that they might have some additional information to submit into the record.

I am just looking at the last sentence of Exhibit 71, so if there are any updates from the ANC that you think would be helpful I would be interested in seeing that.

CHAIRMAN HILL: Yes, and I guess before Chairman Hood -- Just along those lines, you know, the ANC hasn't, I got a little, it was unclear to me as to how this alternative condition had been presented with them.

Like I know, you know, and just if you could put something in there from the ANC about the alternative condition in terms of, I know you spoke about it, but just add that to the record. Mr. Hood?

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I would agree with the list of what all of my colleagues mentioned, but I would also add, and I'm sitting here thinking, which is dangerous when I, I was sitting here thinking about why we at some point we didn't make this a campus plan, but that's for another question and answer at another time, I believe.

But I think that it's very important that you extrapolate and expound upon the good neighbor policy. I actually didn't, maybe, I don't know, but the good neighbor

2.0

1 policy, I'm not sure if you had conversations with the 2 neighbors about the good neighbor policy, but, you know, some time -- and if you did you did and if you didn't you didn't. 3 4 But I think when you start talking about good neighbor policy, I hear it a lot when I come down here. 5 It's 6 not the first time I heard of good neighbor policy, I've been 7 hearing it now for about 20 years, but I think it's important 8 though when we talk about the good neighbor policy that we 9 don't have those questions, because that question, we don't 10 have those questions if we didn't engage the neighbors when 11 you talk about a good neighbor policy. 12 Now I'm not saying that you did or you didn't, but 13 I've seen some good neighbor policies where those questions 14 don't even come into play. But I want to associate myself, 15 especially with the Chairman's remarks. I think he asked for 16 quite a bit and I think that will get me where I need to go 17 as far as moving forward. 18 CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, thank you. And then I would 19 to ask one supplemental from the OP. 2.0 alternative condition, I quess there wasn't, you hadn't 21 written about it, correct? 22 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: No, I did not --23 (Simultaneous speaking) 24 CHAIRMAN HILL: And if you could just Okay. 25 submit something to the alternative condition just so we can

2 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Okay. Um --3 CHAIRMAN HILL: Yes? 4 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: I'm not sure what it is you I know what the condition is, I mean I don't know, I'm 5 6 not sure, do you want an explanation or --7 CHAIRMAN HILL: Sure. No, I appreciate it. Ιf 8 you could provide some clarity again just to how you think 9 I know the Zoning Administrator spoke to it, but, it works. again, just how the Office of Planning thinks that would work 10 11 and how there is teeth to it, because, again, the length that I am trying to get to is, you know, the financing doesn't 12 13 work, this is how this condition is going to work, the 14 community is going to be taken care of, you know, everybody 15 is going to be able to succeed and grow and flourish with, 16 you know, all of the children that are going to be involved. 17 So, okay. Yes, sure? just asking, 18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'm Ms. Brown-19 Roberts, you don't have to answer know, but why at some point 2.0 in time if we move forward and graduate as was mentioned 21 about how -- that reminds me so much of a campus plan. 22 And why at some point, I mean I don't know when 23 we inject it, when we not inject it, should we do it, because I think that would solve a lot of what's going on here. 24 25 see you nodding your head so I finally got something right.

take a look at it.

1	But I think it's important though that we probably
2	look at that at some point in time because that gives the
3	neighbors input, it allows the school to be able to expand,
4	but I'm not sure of the monetary issue, so that may be
5	another issue.
6	So if we could at some point in time respond to
7	that and see if, when that may trigger in or at some point
8	if she continues to, if the school continues to grow it's
9	going to have to trigger in I believe at some point.
10	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Okay.
11	MR. UQDAH: Mr. Chair, can I have two quick
12	questions in terms of process?
13	CHAIRMAN HILL: Sure.
14	MR. UQDAH: Okay. While all of this information
15	is being gathered would the record remain open providing the
16	community an opportunity to respond to the submission?
17	CHAIRMAN HILL: Sure.
18	MR. UQDAH: Okay.
19	CHAIRMAN HILL: I think what we're Okay, sorry.
20	MR. UQDAH: And the second thing is with respect
21	to, I believe Ms. White may have raised it, I'm sorry,
22	Commissioner White may have raised it, and then someone else
23	chimed in behind it, when you have this alternative condition
24	being presented to the ANC I would request that it be the
25	Full ANC and not the Single Member District Commissioner.

1	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. Let me just think about it.
2	So
3	MR. UQDAH: Well, because the Single Member
4	District Commissioner really The Board is required to rule
5	on what the ANC submits. You can ignore the Single Member
6	District Commissioner, as you well know the number of times
7	I've been down here against my own Commission. Nothing I
8	said had any real teeth to it because I was just, I was by
9	myself.
10	CHAIRMAN HILL: Well, Mr. Uqdah, it has teeth to
11	it, you're here, you are talking to us, we're listening to
12	you.
13	MR. UQDAH: Okay.
14	CHAIRMAN HILL: We've been sitting her for an hour
15	and a half, you know, right there is teeth to people coming
16	down and talking.
17	(Simultaneous speaking)
18	CHAIRMAN HILL: and I'm just like, you know,
19	I understand. I heard what you just said.
20	MR. UQDAH: Okay.
21	CHAIRMAN HILL: So let me just think about it for
22	a second. And the Board can also chime in. I don't know how
23	that works. So then you would have to go back to the ANC
24	again. They've already approved this, right, and so you'd
25	have to go back to the ANC again with this one alternative
J	I .

1	condition.
2	MR. KADLECEK: Yes. That would be our
3	understanding, yes.
4	CHAIRMAN HILL: Right. And when I said that I
5	would like something from the ANC how did you interpret that,
6	or what would you think you were going to provide us?
7	MR. KADLECEK: Honestly, we were just talking
8	about that because we were contemplating the same issue of
9	do we need to go back to the ANC and have the Full ANC talk
10	about it, can we just reach out to the Single Member
11	District.
12	You know, I think that, you know, if it were left
13	open I think we could say that we could go to the Single
14	Member District and have her opine on it and either say she
15	talked to the other ANC Commissioners or whatnot
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I wholly, highly object to that.
17	I think the statute and the administrative procedure makes
18	it clear. You get great weight from the Full ANC. The
19	Single Member Districts, sometimes we don't get along.
20	I mean not get along, but sometimes we don't
21	agree, so we need to make sure they didn't come back just
22	to
23	(Simultaneous speaking)
24	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, I understand, I understand.
25	CHAIRMAN HOOD: They went to the full, they came

1	to the full
2	CHAIRMAN HILL: No, well, what I am getting at is
3	that the ANC, they've already been through the ANC and the
4	ANC has already given us their but you're right, they've
5	given
б	CHAIRMAN HOOD: On that issue.
7	CHAIRMAN HILL: Right, okay.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: They've been there on that issue.
9	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. Does anybody else have any
10	thoughts?
11	(No audible response)
12	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. So then I guess go back to
13	the Full ANC because, you know, if they are going to then,
14	it is I'd have to go back and look through the report a
15	little bit more specifically. I mean it would be better if
16	the ANC agrees to that condition because it's not in there
17	right now, and so I don't like having to delay I mean, I
18	just want to, you know, I'm trying to be as reasonable as
19	possible.
20	I'm just trying to get to a process here where we
21	can make a determination upon the standards whether or not
22	you guys should be granted this special exception, so, okay.
23	So if you went back to the Full ANC again you'd go back to
24	the Full ANC just for that one condition.

MR. KADLECEK:

25

That would be my understanding,

1	yes.
2	CHAIRMAN HILL: Right. Okay, all right. Okay,
3	all right. Okay, so you go back to the Full ANC for that one
4	condition, to get their thoughts on that one condition, okay.
5	And, again, you'd have to go and argue in front
6	of them again concerning the financing, okay, so that's where
7	you would be getting your practice.
8	MR. KADLECEK: Right.
9	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, all right.
10	MR. KADLECEK: Yes, that's fine.
11	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, so then we're back to that.
12	So then again to provide clarity, we want something from the
13	Full ANC in terms of that one condition, okay. Okay, so
14	MR. KADLECEK: Well, we can guarantee that we'll
15	go back to them. I guess we can't guarantee that they will
16	produce anything, so we're going to
17	(Simultaneous speaking)
18	CHAIRMAN HILL: Well, they'll have an opinion one
19	way or the other.
20	MR. KADLECEK: Yes.
21	CHAIRMAN HILL: And if they don't have an opinion
22	then that's also an opinion.
23	MR. KADLECEK: Right.
24	CHAIRMAN HILL: But, yes, I understand. So, okay.

So then all that information I would like to get at some

1	point in time as well as you having an opportunity to go to
2	the ANC, and so I'm trying to find a date for that, and then
3	we'd give the opposition seven days to respond after that,
4	and then we'd come back here for a continued hearing just to
5	hear on the items that we discussed. And so, Mr. Moy, are
6	you following all of that?
7	MR. MOY: Yes, I am. Let me work backwards. I
8	think
9	(Simultaneous speaking)
10	MR. UQDAH: Mr. Chair?
11	CHAIRMAN HILL: Just give me one second.
12	MR. UQDAH: The ANC doesn't meet until
13	CHAIRMAN HILL: Oh.
14	MR. UQDAH: The ANC won't meet again until the
15	13th of December if that helps.
16	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. Sure, that actually did
17	help, thank you.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let me ask you, can you make sure
19	they get on the agenda so being a former ANC Commissioner,
20	you can make sure that they are heard.
21	MR. UQDAH: Yes, sir.
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. That's important.
23	MR. UQDAH: I'll tell them you sent me.
24	(Laughter)
25	CHAIRMAN HOOD: They won't get on the agenda.

1	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, so hopefully you're on the
2	agenda for the 13th. Take a second.
3	MR. MOY: Okay.
4	CHAIRMAN HILL: I'm listening to you, Mr. Moy.
5	MR. MOY: No, no. Okay. I was going to add the
6	next time Mr. Hood is back I heard you say this is a
7	continued hearing.
8	CHAIRMAN HILL: Yes.
9	MR. MOY: So Mr. Hood is back on December 20th.
10	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay.
11	MR. MOY: Okay, so if the ANC meets on the 13th
12	CHAIRMAN HILL: The 13th.
13	MR. MOY: And I would imagine, or not, maybe the
14	Applicant might want to respond to that.
15	CHAIRMAN HILL: Yes.
16	MR. MOY: Let's say in six days, but so that
17	could work, you know. So then the only other thing I would
18	need is when the Applicant feels that they can submit their
19	filing and then allow seven days for the parties to respond
20	to their filing, so I'd go back to Mr. Kadlecek as to when
21	the earliest date they can make their filing, hopefully by
22	MR. KADLECEK: Would December 6th for our
23	submission work?
24	MR. MOY: It could work. December 6th and then
25	responses from the parties in a week.

1	CHAIRMAN HILL: So that's the 13th.
2	MR. MOY: Right. And then the continued hearing
3	was when?
4	(Simultaneous speaking)
5	MR. KADLECEK: Or we can shift those a few days
6	one way or the other.
7	MR. MOY: Yes, one way or the other.
8	MR. KADLECEK: Depending on
9	(Simultaneous speaking)
10	MR. UQDAH: I don't know how that would work,
11	December 6th, if the ANC is not meeting until
12	CHAIRMAN HILL: They're going to give all their
13	information except for the ANC stuff on the 6th.
14	MR. UQDAH: Oh, okay, I'm just asking.
15	CHAIRMAN HILL: You'll have an opportunity of a
16	week to respond to that.
17	MR. UQDAH: Okay.
18	CHAIRMAN HILL: The ANC I got a calendar, too.
19	The ANC is on the 13th, right.
20	MR. UQDAH: Right.
21	CHAIRMAN HILL: And then we'll back here on the
22	20th.
23	MR. UQDAH: Okay.
24	CHAIRMAN HILL: So the problem is, right, you
25	would have to get something from the ANC after the 13th and

1	then the parties would have to have time to respond, but we
2	can waive the seven days.
3	Okay. So I am just letting you know, Mr. Uqdah,
4	we're going to waive the seven days, like because Mr. Hood
5	is back here on the 20th, right, and he doesn't come that
6	often, you know, so you don't want to miss your shot.
7	So, okay, so then the 6th you are going to submit
8	all of your filings, they'll have an opportunity to respond
9	back, Mr. Uqdah, to those filings by the 13th. You can
10	respond earlier if you like.
11	You are going to get to the ANC meeting on the
12	13th and then we'll get something from the ANC, hopefully,
13	from the 13th to when we meet on the 20th, okay, or at least
14	you could report on it then if nothing else I suppose, right.
15	And then, Mr. Uqdah, if you want to look and see
16	if they submit anything from the ANC or if the ANC submits
17	anything after the 13th then you can just respond right away
18	or you'll have an opportunity to respond on the 20th because
19	I would assume you are going to be here.
20	MR. UQDAH: Yes, sir.
21	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay.
22	MR. KADLECEK: And I assume we would have the same
23	opportunity to respond to the ANC afterwards?
24	CHAIRMAN HILL: Yes.
25	MR. KADLECEK: Okay. Depending on the timing?

1	CHAIRMAN HILL: Yes.
2	MR. KADLECEK: Okay.
3	CHAIRMAN HILL: And so just to make sure with OAG
4	now, the continued hearing, we just want to hear about these
5	issues, everything else has been taken care of. I don't have
6	to We did opposition, support, ANC, it's just a continued
7	hearing on these issues.
8	MR. COHEN: For the record, yes.
9	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, great, all right. Okay, do
10	you all have any questions?
11	MR. KADLECEK: No. Thank you.
12	CHAIRMAN HILL: Well, thank you very much. This
13	has been very
14	(Laughter)
15	MR. UQDAH: Thank you, Chair.
16	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. Is the Applicant here for
17	Appeal Number 19573? If you could raise your hand if you are
18	here.
19	Okay, so there is someone here. Okay, so we are
20	going to take a all right, we're not taking a break.
21	Apparently we're going straight in, so, Mr. Moy, you can call
22	that case when you get a chance.
23	MR. MOY: Okay, Mr. Chairman. So let me go back
24	to the top of the batting order and recall the case. This
25	is Appeal Number 19573 of Nefretiti Makenta. As the caption

1	advertised, this is an appeal from the decision made on May
2	26, 2017, by the Zoning Administrator, Department of Consumer
3	and Regulatory Affairs, to issue Building Permit Number
4	B1707364, amending Building Permit Number B1603868.
5	This would alter the approved third floor addition
6	in the RF-1 Zone at premises 3616 11th Street, NW, Square
7	2829, Lot 169.
8	As I had stated previously there are preliminary
9	matters to this. I believe there are three. First is the
LO	Motion to Strike from the property owner on Exhibit 33,
L1	motion to Dismiss from both DCRA and the property owner under
12	Exhibits 33 and 36, and there is a third one that came up and
13	I can't recall off the top of my head what that is, but I
L4	think the parties at the table will refresh our memory.
L5	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, great. Thank you, Mr. Moy.
L6	All right, if you could please introduce yourselves from my
L7	right to left.
L8	MR. TONDRO: Maximilian Tondro on behalf of the
L9	Zoning Administrator and DCRA.
20	MR. LEGRANT: Matthew LeGrant, Zoning
21	Administrator, DCRA.
22	MS. MAKENTA: Nefretiti
23	CHAIRMAN HILL: You need to push the microphone.
24	MS. MAKENTA: Nefretiti Makenta, Appellant.
25	MS. MOLDENHAUER: Meredith Moldenhauer from the

1	law firm of Cozen O'Connor here on behalf of the property
2	owners and interveners.
3	MR. DEBEAR: Eric DeBear from Cozen O'Connor also
4	here on behalf of the property owners and interveners.
5	MS. DIAO: Alexis Diao, property owner.
6	MR. SMITH: Graham Smith, property owner.
7	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. Ms. Makenta, have you been
8	sworn in?
9	MS. MAKENTA: No.
10	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. If you could stand and take
11	the oath administered by the Secretary to my left.
12	(Off microphone comment)
13	CHAIRMAN HILL: No, you can just stand. And if
14	anybody else is here that's going to testify and missed the
15	oath if you want to stand as well.
16	MR. MOY: Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the
17	testimony you are about to present in this proceeding is the
18	truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?
19	(The witnesses were sworn in.)
20	MR. MOY: Thank you.
21	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, great. All right, okay, so
22	there is some preliminary motions. There was the additional
23	one that you had mentioned, Ms. Moldenhauer, could you repeat
24	that for us again?
25	MS. MOLDENHAUER: Yes, I can, and then I am

1	actually going to be having to leave just due to the timing,
2	but my colleague, Mr. DeBear, will be making the rest of the
3	arguments.
4	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay.
5	MS. MOLDENHAUER: Just so that way the Board knows
6	as I step out. I apologize. But the initial, the third
7	preliminary motion was a Motion to Strike the filing that was
8	submitted at 8:58 a.m. this morning.
9	CHAIRMAN HILL: And which exhibit number is that,
10	39?
11	MS. MOLDENHAUER: I don't I think it was 39.
12	MR. DEBEAR: Thirty-nine.
13	CHAIRMAN HILL: And the reason to strike?
14	MR. DEBEAR: It was not filed more than three days
15	before today's hearing as required under Subtitle Y, 302.18.
16	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay.
17	MR. DEBEAR: And there is no Certificate of
18	Service, I apologize.
19	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. Sure.
20	(Simultaneous speaking)
21	CHAIRMAN HILL: Wait, give me a second, sorry.
22	And then there is also the other motion in terms of timing
23	again, which was the Motion to Strike, what was that again?
24	MR. DEBEAR: The Appellant's Pre-Hearing
25	Statement.

1 CHAIRMAN HILL: Right, okay, and that was because 2 it came in 16 days rather than the 21? 3 MR. DEBEAR: Yes. 4 CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. Mr. Tondro, you had a 5 comment? 6 MR. TONDRO: My apologies. I was just going to 7 also support the Motion to Strike, Exhibit 39, and just point 8 out that in addition to Y, 302.18, there is also Y, 302.14, 9 which is a revision that Appellant cannot add any new 10 document or witness unless it is in compliance with Y, 302, 11 which would be 18. CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. All right, Ms. Makenta, you 12 13 are aware of what is being asked at this point in terms of 14 your timeliness and why, you know, these things are coming 15 in? I'm really actually first interested in the first 16 17 motion, which is to strike, because your filings came in 16 18 days rather than 21 days, can you explain your reason for 19 And if you would push the microphone button that delay? 2.0 there. 21 Well, the date of the hearing is MS. MAKENTA: 22 today, it's November 15th, and so that was submitted October, 23 I believe the 11th, so the code from what I understand says 24 that it can't be 21 days before the date of the public 25 hearing.

1	So technically because of the administrative delay
2	and the hearing being today I did meet the 21-day deadline
3	for the hearing because it was filed October 13th and the
4	hearing is November 15th, so that's more than 21 days.
5	CHAIRMAN HILL: Mr. DeBear?
6	MR. DEBEAR: The Motion to Strike was filed when
7	the hearing was less than 21 days before her filing, it then
8	got moved. We have not withdrawn it. I would certainly
9	still assert that she did not comply with that requirement.
10	CHAIRMAN HILL: I understand, okay. All right,
11	so unless the Board has any other issues on that motion I am
12	going to deny that motion and we are going to accept the
13	documents into the record. Is the Board okay with that?
14	(No audible response)
15	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, so that's on a consent
16	motion, so we're denying that Motion to Strike. The one that
17	just came up today again, so you filed something today?
18	MS. MAKENTA: Well, that is I didn't really need
19	to file that. That's my testimony today, so that's my speech
20	pretty much.
21	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay.
22	MS. MAKENTA: So it's just for review if anyone
23	wants to review it later, but as I was pretty I'm not a
24	public speaker and such
25	(Simultaneous speaking)

1 CHAIRMAN HILL: All right, Ms. Makenta, that's 2 great. I understand. MS. MAKENTA: So I have something I want to read 3 4 today. 5 So it sounds like it's CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. 6 your testimony and I would rather not -- I agree with the 7 regulations that have been cited in terms of why we need to 8 strike that. 9 I would. unless the Board has any other 10 thoughts, I would approve the Motion to Strike that exhibit 11 that was submitted this morning, okay. All right, okay, so now we're back to the Motions 12 13 to Dismiss that, Mr. Tondro, you have filed a Motion to 14 Dismiss, and, Ms. Moldenhauer, you have also filed a Motion 15 to Dismiss, so I don't know who went first, but, Mr. Tondro, 16 could you explain again your Motion to Dismiss? 17 MR. TONDRO: Yes, thank you. This is within, and 18 I think it's probably easiest just because of the laundry 19 list of sections for Y, 302 to refer to Exhibit 36, which is 2.0 DCRA's Motion to Dismiss, Page 2 where it says "Motion to 21 just because it calls out the various different Dismiss" 22 sections and I think that may be the most helpful. 23 The point about this was that the Zoning 24 Commission when the new rules were adopted a year ago very 25 clearly laid out a timeline in which various different steps

had to be taken by the appellant to make sure that there was an opportunity for the parties to be able to respond and collect all the information.

And one of the things that I note in particular here is that there is a requirement that at the initial appeal all claims are stated at that particular time and evidence is provided.

There is an allowance for later on, no later than 21 days prior to the hearing for an appellant to provide a supplemental filing. There is also a time, there is another provision that allows for an appellant to file a rebuttal up to three days prior.

But both of those are supplemental, the gist of the regulations that I have cited there is they have to include the full statement and the evidence for that, for the allegations of the alleged violations have to be provided in that initial appeal filing, and in this case that's just not been done.

So in particular I am referring to Y, 302.2, sorry, pardon me, Y, 302.12(h), which requires that all of the evidence has to be made in the initial appeal filing and I went over then in Pages 3 to 4 what we saw as the three different aspects, or three different allegations.

The first, which was about the penthouse, the alleged, the setback. The second one was the issue of the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

1 modification of consequence. The third was just a sort of, 2 a blanket, whatever else that the Appellant could find. And so what my -- We believe that at the very 3 least the second and the third, since there was no specific 4 5 provision stated, that those should be dismissed for failure 6 to state a claim or provide any evidence. 7 We would also argue that that's the same with the 8 first claim there, there was a section, specific section, 9 that was alleged to be violated, but there was no evidence 10 that was provided at the time to support that claim. So 11 that's the gist of that motion. Thank you. 12 CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, great. Mr. 13 DeBear, could you explain your motion? 14 MR. DEBEAR: Yes, Chair Hill. Our motion is 15 really along the same lines as DCRA's motion. Essentially 16 the Appellant has failed to put forth any evidence that would 17 contradict the Zoning Administrator's decision to permit 18 modification to plans that are approved by the BZA and that 19 authority derives from Subtitle A, Section 304.10, and the 2.0 record is bereft of any evidence to the contrary of his 21 authority to do that or why my clients have not met the 22 conditions set forth in 304.10. 23 CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, thank you. Ms. Makenta, are 24 you aware of their Motions to Dismiss and have you read them? 25 MS. MAKENTA: I have read them.

1	CHAIRMAN HILL: And do you have any thoughts on
2	them?
3	MS. MAKENTA: Well, I do. All of the codes that
4	it's really weird here because there are three cases.
5	There is two connected properties
6	(Simultaneous speaking)
7	CHAIRMAN HILL: No, that's okay, that's okay.
8	MS. MAKENTA: We're all the same property. We're
9	all the same
10	CHAIRMAN HILL: There is one case, which is this
11	one that is in front of us.
12	MS. MAKENTA: Well, I guess you asked me if I had
13	a response and I do, so I don't know if you are going to let
14	me respond or
15	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, I'm sorry, go ahead.
16	MS. MAKENTA: So I am aware of them and I guess
17	I would like to say that the case should be decided on its
18	merits and not on the basis of technicalities, and that's
19	what I feel was happening here. This is the third case
20	involving
21	(Simultaneous speaking)
22	CHAIRMAN HILL: I'm just going to stop you because
23	I want to get to the case. So you disagree with them?
24	MS. MAKENTA: I oppose the Motion to Dismiss.
25	CHAIRMAN HILL: You think you've clearly stated

1	something that we can have a discussion with today?
2	MS. MAKENTA: Definitely.
3	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, all right. So I would then
4	ask the Board, I think that we are going to hold these two
5	dismissal motions in abeyance and have the hearing and then
6	we can come back to it later. Does that sound
7	PARTICIPANT: Sounds good.
8	CHAIRMAN HILL: Good, okay, all right. So, Ms.
9	Makenta, we're going to go ahead and have a hearing here for
10	you with your case. Again, I am going to go ahead and I'll
11	put how much time you Sure?
12	MS. MAKENTA: Here is the thing, the last hearing
13	I got ten minutes and I was told that each party can have 60
14	minutes in general, and so I do need more time today than ten
15	minutes for my opening statement.
16	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. I mean I don't remember
17	holding you to ten minutes, but that's okay.
18	MS. MAKENTA: Well Okay.
19	CHAIRMAN HILL: It's basically, it's an hour for
20	the whole production, right, so it's like, you know,
21	testimony, cross examination, questions, but I will, you
22	know, I want you to have your time and definitely we have a
23	lot of questions about what you are saying in terms of what
24	the Zoning Administrator So your appeal is that the Zoning
25	Administrator has made an error.

1	MS. MAKENTA: Yes.
2	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. And the error that Well,
3	I'll let you present your case, but the error again is to the
4	modification of the permit, not to the permit, just the
5	modification of the permit, okay.
б	So that's what we are going to be hearing. We are
7	not rehearing any old cases. We are hearing what you are
8	saying now is the error for your case, okay.
9	MS. MAKENTA: Yes, that's what
10	CHAIRMAN HILL: So I will go ahead and put, you
11	know, 30 minutes up there if you'd like, okay.
12	MS. MAKENTA: Okay.
13	CHAIRMAN HILL: And so we can go ahead and hear
14	your case.
15	MS. MAKENTA: Okay.
16	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay.
17	MS. MAKENTA: Thank you. So I would like to
18	I'm going to just read because like I said I am not a public
19	speaker, I'm not a lawyer, I am a layperson, I am not a
20	zoning expert, and so it's just, it would probably feel more
21	organized if I can just do that. So I would like to just
22	share my statement.
23	Okay. So I would like to state the Zoning
24	Administrator erred in that they did not act in accordance
25	with the zoning regulations, erred in that they did not act

in accordance with the requirements of the summary order. 1 DCRA asserts that the ZA correctly determined that 2 the side roof deck should not be subject to the penthouse 3 setback requirements because the side deck is on the third 4 5 floor and so it's not a penthouse. However, I believe that the Zoning Administrator 6 7 made an error in arbitrarily deciding that the side deck 8 should not be subject to the penthouse setback requirements 9 of Section 1502.1. 10 It is irrelevant that the side roof deck is on the 11 newly created third floor instead of the top floor like the 12 uppermost roof deck and it is irrelevant that it is "not a 13 penthouse." The code does not say that these required setbacks 14 15 are only relevant when they are provided in conjunction with 16 a penthouse and the items on the list under that code are 17 subject to setbacks collectively and independently. 18 The substance of the text is important. For 19 example, the uppermost roof deck at the intervener's property 2.0 is designed to be set back on all sides per this regulation 21 though it is "not a penthouse." 22 That roof deck is designed to be accessed from a 23 spiral stairway in the rear yard, not from a penthouse. 24 Indeed, in their own pre-hearing statement the Zoning

Administrator confirms that "a rooftop deck must comply with

the penthouse setback requirements," and this side rooftop 1 2 deck is no exception to that rule. Further, prior to filing this case the Appellant, 3 me, reached out to a top DCRA zoning official, which pretty 4 much is Number 2 to Mr. LeGrant, in an effort to ascertain 5 6 the possibility of approval of a pergola on my roof to 7 install mУ permitted solar panels due to being 8 disenfranchised and adversely aggrieved by the intervener's 9 10-foot popup that is now blocking my ability to install my 10 panels directly on my roof. 11 And the Number 2 zoning official directly under 12 the ZA responded that it would be "a trellis," which is also 13 on the list --14 MR. DEBEAR: I just want to object on hearsay. 15 MS. MAKENTA: -- and it would therefore be subject 16 to the penthouse setbacks. This requirement was in spite of 17 the fact that the pergola on my roof would have absolutely 18 no remote association with a penthouse. 19 Not only is the setback required because the side 2.0 roof deck, side deck is a roof deck, i.e. a deck on a roof, 21 and subject to the same setbacks as the upper roof deck but 22 because a quardrail is also required per DCMR 12-1307.1. 23 acknowledges Once DCRA that а quardrail is 24 required per their code the quardrail is also independently

required to be set back based on this same zoning code which

states that "any quardrail on a roof shall be set back."

Currently the side roof deck is bound by the parapet party wall, but the parapet party wall cannot substitute as a guardrail, for a guardrail, as it was designed for fire protection purposes between the two houses, mine and theirs, and is not a guardrail.

Additionally, 50 percent of the parapet belongs to the adjoining neighbor, me, and the parapet is covered in flashing for water runoff or whatever purposes and is unable to be divided such that the interveners, hundreds of Airbnb guests could hang over the intervener's parapet guardrail without simultaneously trespassing onto the Appellant's parapet, it's one parapet, it's joined.

Further, even if the jointly-owned parapet could function as and be deemed a guardrail it's use as a guardrail at its current position would also violate Subtitle B, 1502.1, as it is permanently affixed and unable to be set back.

If the parapet wall is transformed into a guardrail it becomes a different structure. Once any structure is placed on that roof it must be set back. Moreover, this parapet wall cannot be a guardrail because it is not level and it is too low.

The 307.1 requires the guardrails to be 42 inches high, but this parapet wall is not only on an angle, imagine

2.0

leaning over an angle, following the line of the adjoining roof as it slopes back, it is also just 24 inches high at the west edge of the side roof deck and 48 inches high at the east edge of the side roof deck. Remember it has to be, the rail has to be 42 inches.

As such, the parapet party wall cannot meet the guardrail height requirement and the interveners are required to install a separate guardrail on their side roof deck and based on 1502.1 it must be set back at least three feet, six inches.

Furthermore, the Zoning Administrator has asserted that the side deck qualifies as a "balcony," which is exempt from Section C, 1502.1, as articulated by their December 22, 2016, guidance.

However, the Zoning Administrator also is making an error here in arbitrarily electing to term the side roof deck a balcony instead of a roof deck pursuant to Subtitle B, 100.1(g), the side roof deck does not qualify as a balcony.

As the zoning regulations do not define balcony or roof, 101.1(g) refers the Zoning Administrator to Webster's Unabridged Dictionary for these terms. Anything that is not defined in the zoning regulations the Zoning Administrator is required to go to Webster's Unabridged Dictionary.

2.0

This version of Webster's defines "balcony" as a "usually unroofed platform projecting from the wall of a building and usually resting on brackets." Though the side roof deck is connected to and attached to the wall of the building it is not projecting from the wall and it is not resting on brackets.

This version of Webster's defines "roof" as "the outside cover of a building structure, including the roofing and all the materials and construction necessary to maintain the cover upon its walls or other support, such as the cover of a house or home, the highest point or reach of something."

Based on the definition as per the code this is a roof deck. The same black roof membrane material currently on the third floor roof is also on the second floor side roof that is adjacent to my property.

And the side roof deck floor is the highest point of reach, based on the definition, of the second floor of that part of the building. DCRA states that the term "roof" would "describe the covering of the top story but not include the top story itself."

Yet a house can have more than one top story covering, more than one roof covering, and in this case the intervener's house has two roofs, a roof on top of a portion of the new second floor and a roof on top of a portion of the new third floor.

2.0

The roof deck is termed a roof deck because it is on -- A roof deck is termed a roof deck because it is on a roof. In this case there are two roofs and there are two roof decks.

Without access it would simply be a roof. As with the upper roof deck any stairwell or ladder access would make this a roof deck. In this case the door access, there is swinging doors, double doors, onto the side roof deck that face my property and the party wall.

In this case -- Okay. In this case the door access onto this roof makes this a side roof deck. Otherwise, it would just be a roof, a roof, but the access makes it a rooftop deck.

While the ZA has the authority to guide his staff through internal unpublished memos and emails, he does not have the authority to ignore the zoning code, and that has occurred here.

If the ZA followed the zoning regulations in deciding whether this side roof deck was a roof deck or a balcony he would have had to refer to Webster's Unabridged Dictionary as required, yet there is nothing in the email, the ZA guidance internal email to his staff, that would make any reasonable person believe that the Zoning Administrator based his decision on or consulted the dictionary's definition in defining what would be a balcony and what would

2.0

be a roof deck.

2.0

The ZA's email states that he decided that any side deck which is less than ten feet wide is a balcony, yet nowhere in the zoning code or in Webster's is ten feet referred to as a decisive factor between a balcony and a roof deck.

As such, to the extent that the ZA approval of the planned amendment which adversely aggrieves the Appellant was predicated on the 10-foot measurement and the ZA decision was arbitrary and capricious and it is not justly upheld by the BZA.

There is no provision in the zoning code that gives the ZA any authority to make arbitrary interpretations that negatively impact an adjoining owner. DCRA's attempting to establish the 10-foot guideline, establish that the 10-foot guidelines memo carriers the weight of actual code.

It's as if they are saying it's ten feet because DCRA said it's ten feet, "because we said so," however, is not supposed to be the determining factor in the ZA being enabled to adversely aggrieve adjoining owners.

The ZA also furnished a diagram purportedly depicting the difference between a side balcony deck and a side roof deck, but the two images are identical. Should I like refer to exhibits, you to the exhibits as I am going through or just keep kind of finish --

1	(Simultaneous speaking)
2	MS. MAKENTA: Can I do that at the end?
3	CHAIRMAN HILL: Sure, you can refer to whatever
4	you want whenever you want to.
5	MS. MAKENTA: Okay. Maybe it will be easier at
6	the end.
7	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay.
8	MS. MAKENTA: Okay.
9	CHAIRMAN HILL: It's your 30 minutes.
10	MS. MAKENTA: Okay. Yes, so Where was I?
11	Okay, so the two images are identical. Moreover, the ZA
12	illustration of the balcony versus the roof deck does not
13	depict at all the context of this case.
14	The diagram provided by the ZA shows two detached
15	houses, not two attached rowhouses. Even further, it does
16	not illustrate attached rowhouses with the architectural
17	feature of adjacent windows inside a window well of a
18	neighbor's property, as are on mine and which form the key
19	basis of concern here.
20	The interveners' erroneously approved north side
21	deck on their second floor roof overlooks 11 south side
22	windows at my property, including windows in bedrooms and
23	bathrooms, which are not at risk and were built with the
24	property more than 100 years ago, and there are two

additional adjoining rowhouses north of mine which also have

these windows inside the window wells.

2.0

As the result of the ZA approval privacy at my property, which I have owned for more than 15 years, and which I will own into the foreseeable future, is unduly compromised and negatively impacted.

Further, my access to light and air are also compromised as the presence of this side roof deck at the edge of the property line with no required setback will effectively turn my precious windows into walls due to the impact of the loss of privacy, so as in closing all, you're going to close the windows because people can see in.

I ask you to -- Well, I am going to come back to that. Okay. No reasonable, unbiased person can deduce that the ZA internal memo is equitably applied in this case. In terming this side roof deck as a balcony the ZA has overstepped its authority and violated zoning regulations. As such, the BZA is supposed to rescind this arbitrary and capricious ZA approval.

The ZA decision to term the immediately adjacent deck on the second floor roof a balcony instead of a roof deck and thereby exempted from the required setbacks is major enough due to its adjacency that the BZA and the Office of Planning is supposed to require that it be broadly published and subjected to sufficient broad, public scrutiny regarding its impacts prior to actual adoption.

The ZA guidance should be rejected by the BZA in this case as the side roof deck is properly termed a side roof deck, not a balcony. DCRA's third assertion is that they correctly approved the revised permit as the revision did not depart from the plans approved by the Board's December 28, 2016, order in the special exception application.

However, the ZA did not act in accordance with this BZA summary order as required. The original order states that "it is, therefore, ordered that this application is hereby granted," this is all a quote, "granted and pursuant to Subtitle Y, 604.10, subject to the approved plans at Exhibit 66."

Yet on April 20, 2017, the Applicants filed revised drawings changing the envelope of the third floor addition and cutting a 7-foot wide, 7-foot deep section into the center of the addition which is visible from the street.

It is a blatant falsehood that the revision "did not depart from the plans approved by the Board's order," as DCRA states. To advance this fraudulent statement DCRA leans on a typo in the summary order.

DCRA writes that "the Board's summary order approved the special exception relief requested subject to the approved plans at Exhibit 66. This Exhibit 66 only showed renderings."

2.0

They write feigning ignorance and of and/or shadily attempting to ignore the most substantive part of the requirement in the order "subject to the approved plans." Does DCRA not know what "approved plans" are? Certainly they know.

DCRA knew that the BZA intended by "subject to the approved plans," what the BZA intended, I'm sorry, and they know that those architectural plans are at Exhibit 8, not at Exhibit 66.

They know that "renderings," i.e. partial sketches, were not intended to substitute for the "approved plans" in this highly technical space before the BZA, yet on the basis of the typo "66" DCRA advances the false claim that the revision did not depart from the plans approved by the Board's order.

Anyone with eyes can see that the revision departs from the plans approved under the special exception application. DCRA should be ashamed of themselves for repeating this disingenuous argument first made intervener's counsel in Case 19510.

One wonders what is motivating DCRA in a manner that arose the faith that the public places in them to care for us all, not just the elite few with the million dollar renovation loan, not just the elite few who can afford to splurge on not just one attorney, but two, including a recent

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

former BZA Chairperson, while consistently misrepresenting themselves to the BZA as financially fragile.

Will the BZA continue to give DCRA carte blanche in their bend over backwards effort to cover the interveners dispute them fraudulently obtaining their first permit and despite DCRA's erroneous release of the revised permit due to the fraud perpetrated by the interveners?

Will the BZA support DCRA in usurping BZA authority for the perpetual benefit of the interveners who acted in bad faith to secure their original permit and to the perpetual detriment of the pro se Appellant and her property rights? Can the BZA please correct the typo in its summary order changing "Exhibit 66" to "Exhibit 8?"

DCRA finally admitted in April 2016 that they erred in approving and releasing the original permit and DCRA, the ZA certainly erred in approving the revised permit in May 2017 because in addition to the other reasons the revision did indeed depart from the "approved plans" and the changes were not sanctioned by or ordered by the BZA as required.

Okay, this is my last point. DCRA asserts that the permit holder, interveners, requested ZA approval for a modification from Board-approved plans allowed under Section A, 304.10, which the ZA granted after review.

However, the ZA was not allowed to approve the

2.0

revised plan based on Subtitle A, 304.10. At least three required criteria in that section were not met prior to ZA approval, and so in approving the revision under that section the ZA also erred.

The code states that the ZA may only approve a modification to approve plans if it does not violate a condition of the order. Here the approved plans were the condition that the ZA violated.

The BZA wrote in the order, I repeat, "it is therefore," caps and bold, "ordered that this application is hereby granted and pursuant to Subtitle Y, 604.10, and subject to the approved plans."

Though relatively few words on the order are emphasized this sentence is. Webster's Unabridged Dictionary defines "violate" as to "interfere with." Here the ZA obviously interfered with a condition of in the order, one, that the "BZA," typed in all caps and bold print.

As previously noted Section 604.10 states that an application shall be required to carry out the construction, renovation, or alteration only in accordance with the plans approved by the Board unless the Board orders otherwise.

As such, the ZA had no authority to issue zoning approval with the change building envelope without BZA approval and a second BZA order. Further, Section 304.10 states that the modification cannot create any need for new

2.0

relief.

2.0

But not only did this ZA violate a pivotal condition in the order but it also created a need for new relief for the adversely aggrieved adjoining owner, myself, due to the ZA's refusal to enforce the required setback and guardrail and due to the invasion of privacy caused by the doorway and walkway to the adjacent owner/Appellant's roof and interior windows.

Section 304.10 states that the building permits that are authorized by an order of the Board of Zoning Adjustment the Zoning Administrator following receipt of a request made pursuant to Subtitle 304.10 is authorized to permit modifications to approve plans in addition to those modifications specifically authorized pursuant to flexibility granted by the order if the ZA determines that the proposed modifications are consistent with the intent of the Board of Zoning Adjustment and the modifications would not violate any condition of the approval included in the order or create any need for new relief.

Though the ZA may have had some discretionary right to determine if the proposed modifications were consistent with the intent of the BZA the second half of this section of Subtitle 304.10 is not based on ZA discretion and as such it says "and modifications would not," separate and apart from the ZA determination that they would not.

As such the ZA had no authority to use discretion in determining if the modifications "would not violate any condition of approval" and "would not create any need for new relief."

The ZA also violated 304.10's required timing. This section states that ZA authorization to permit modification can occur "following receipt of a request," yet the amended plan was approved by the ZA before, not following, the receipt of the Applicant's request.

The ZA approved the revised plan May 2, 2017, the ZA review approval, yet the Applicant's did not submit an application for the request until June 30, 2017, two months later.

The ZA usurped the authority of the BZA and did so not even on the basis of a request, which was required to be in writing per 304.11, and the writing did not occur until June 30th.

Even within his discretionary power the ZA could not have fairly concluded that this affront to a neighbor's privacy upholds the intent of the BZA. The intent of the BZA is to protect and enforce rights of adjacency.

Throughout the zoning code numerous titles state following some version of the as off limits, can substantially have adverse effect on the use or enjoyment of abutting adjacent dwelling any or or property, and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

particularly the light and air available to neighboring properties shall not be unduly affected.

The privacy of use and enjoyment of neighboring properties shall not be unduly compromised. The applicant shall graphical representation, use such as plans, photographs, elevations, sufficient t.he to represent relationship of the conversion.

The BZA may require special treatment in the way screening, et cetera, for the protection of of design, adjacent or nearby properties. Subtitle 304.3 further states that the ZAshall consider the following issues in determining whether any deviation will impair the purpose of the regulations, and that's pretty much the same thing as what I have just listed.

ZA discretion does not allow them to flout the intent and purpose of the BZA, yet in approving the side roof deck with the doorway which it knew would adversely aggrieve and deprive the neighbor of the privacy of use and enjoyment of her property and as a result also deprive her of the light and air available to her, the ZA did just that.

For all of the above reasons the ZA erred in issuing zoning approval under 304.10 and effecting the release of the second permit. Pursuant to Section 304.13 the May 2007 zoning approval is clearly supposed to be overturned by the BZA.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

The modification proposed to the BZA approved "cannot be approved by the ZA pursuant to Subtitle As such, the zoning regulations demand that the interveners return to the BZA with the appropriate application and due to the scope of the issues at hand only significance or modification of special а application, which can give the proper weight to the relative impact of the side roof deck to rights of adjacency, privacy, light, and air, as appropriate.

Lastly, if the modification had been allowed to take its due course by way of special exception application would have before the Board I had an opportunity about its articulate my concerns impact on the use and privacy of my property which the administrative approval deprived me of.

But because DCRA, which admitted that it made an error in releasing the permit, the initial permit, refused to revoke the permit while admitting that they made the error, I was never given that opportunity.

By granting the modification as a revised permit the interveners and the ZA have by their own action inserted discussions about the original permit and the revised permit is inextricably tied to the original building permit.

The Office of Planning or the ANC have not been compelled to make a statement regarding the impact of the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

1	third floor side roof deck. The Office of Planning does not
2	get involved in appeals at all.
3	And the BZA has never been allowed to properly
4	consider the revised design that is related to an order out
5	of a special exception. As the BZA is the ultimate
6	interpreter of the regulations and as this revision comes out
7	of a special exception application adequate weight to the
8	revision by all stakeholders is paramount.
9	And that is my statement. So I guess I should now
10	refer to some of the exhibits that I was speaking of.
11	CHAIRMAN HILL: Sure.
12	MS. MAKENTA: Okay. So I have my exhibit list,
13	or was there something other What is my time?
14	CHAIRMAN HILL: Uh
15	MS. MAKENTA: Oh, it's
16	CHAIRMAN HILL: It's over there, yes.
17	MS. MAKENTA: Oh, wow. Okay, so maybe I can refer
18	to those on his rebuttal or something
19	CHAIRMAN HILL: I mean it's everything that you
20	have into the record, correct?
21	MS. MAKENTA: Yes, it's both of they have
22	exhibits in the record as well that apply.
23	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay.
24	MS. MAKENTA: So I am using their exhibits as
25	well.
l	I control of the cont

1	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. So what is it that you
2	wanted to do, I'm sorry, I don't understand?
3	MS. MAKENTA: I was going to refer to some of the
4	things I was saying, if there was any kind of visual, I mean
5	I, just
6	(Simultaneous speaking)
7	CHAIRMAN HILL: Yes. No, I think we understand.
8	MS. MAKENTA: challenge in visualizing anything
9	that I was explaining I was going to kind of point out some
10	exhibits, but I don't have to do that.
11	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. Well, I think we can ask
12	some questions of you and as we go through this if we have
13	some questions about what you have stated and pointing out
14	in the record where those exhibits are we can ask you at that
15	time as well, okay.
16	All right, Mr. Tondro, do you have any cross
17	questions?
18	MR. TONDRO: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chair. First of
19	all, the requirement for a guardrail, could you say where
20	that was again? You brought up in the very beginning that
21	there was a requirement for a guardrail?
22	MS. MAKENTA: Right. That's the DCMR 12, the DCMR
23	12, yes, 307.
24	MR. TONDRO: And DCMR 12 is otherwise known as the
25	construction codes, I think?

1	MS. MAKENTA: Correct, but that is referred to
2	numerous times in the zoning, in Title 11, the guardrail and
3	handrail.
4	MR. TONDRO: I And you said it 307, is that
5	right?
6	MS. MAKENTA: 307.1.
7	MR. TONDRO: The problem that I am having is I
8	have pulled up the building code, the District building code,
9	which is 12(a), there is no 12 alone. The current District
10	Building Code is 12(a), DCMR 307.1, it's within the Use and
11	Occupancy classification, that's what Chapter 3 is, which
12	deals with High Hazard Group H, so I don't think it's
13	applicable.
14	MS. MAKENTA: It says "a balcony/deck shall have
15	guards, handrails above the walking surfaces."
16	MR. TONDRO: I understand that, but my question
17	is if we can't understand the full context of when that is
18	required by having a correct citation, so is that the only
19	citation you know?
20	MS. MAKENTA: So are you saying that a guardrail
21	isn't required for a deck or a balcony?
22	MR. TONDRO: I do not know I do not know nor
23	do I purport to, and this is the question, I am the one
24	asking the question, what I am trying to understand is is
25	that now that I have indicated to you that I don't think

1	that's the correct reference do you have another reference
2	or
3	MS. MAKENTA: I have one reference, 307, it says
4	"handrails and guardrails," every exterior, and this is
5	another like the penthouse where it
6	(Simultaneous speaking)
7	CHAIRMAN HILL: Wait a minute, just hold on.
8	MS. MAKENTA: Oh, I'm sorry.
9	CHAIRMAN HILL: That's all right. Let him go one
10	at a time. So your question again, Mr. Tondro, we're trying
11	to figure out where the citation was?
12	MR. TONDRO: Right, and that was the extent of my
13	question is trying to understand the citation so that I can
14	understand the context and whether or not it's applicable in
15	this particular circumstance.
16	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. And you are unclear as to
17	whether it is applicable?
18	MR. TONDRO: Right. And I wanted to call
19	Appellant's attention to the fact that at least when I just
20	looked on, following up her reference, that that doesn't seem
21	to be correct
22	(Simultaneous speaking)
23	CHAIRMAN HILL: You do not believe
24	MR. TONDRO: I just wanted to give her the
25	opportunity

1	CHAIRMAN HILL: No, that's okay.
2	MR. TONDRO: if she has another, if she can
3	respond to
4	MS. MAKENTA: I have
5	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay.
6	MR. TONDRO: that's all.
7	CHAIRMAN HILL: Sure.
8	MS. MAKENTA: I have the code copied and pasted
9	here. The title is Guardrails and Handrails and it's 307,
10	307.1, and it starts with general and it refers to flights
11	of stairs, it refers to balconies, porches, decks, ramps,
12	it's kind of like the penthouse list where even though it's
13	"not a penthouse" it's under that section, it independently
14	and collectively governs a balcony, a deck, and so that's the
15	handrail/guardrail code of D.C. related to all of the, I
16	mean, you know.
17	Yes, so that's the code I have. I'm not sure what
18	section it's under, but I'm sure it's applicable.
19	MR. TONDRO: Just Well, okay.
20	MS. MAKENTA: Except that it's 307 Oh, do you
21	mean like subtitle? No, that's not a subtitle, right?
22	MR. TONDRO: What I am trying to understand is
23	there may be a requirement. Let's just say, just so I'm
24	just With your patience and I just want to be clear
25	CHAIRMAN HILL: Yes, sure, all right.

1	MR. TONDRO: You know, there may be a circumstance
2	if you have a balcony that is more than 25 feet high up in
3	the air that projects out 30 you have to have guardrails.
4	If it's a patio that is at roof level, that is at the floor
5	level and there is no elevation change you may not need a
6	guardrail.
7	So for us to understand the applicability of the
8	section you are citing I just need to understand that
9	context. So I am just The problem I kind of have here is
10	that the reference you provide, which you I believe imbue
11	with certain authority because you site the code reference
12	I don't think it exists at least according to the reference
13	you have.
14	So if you have something we could then work with
15	that but until we have the specific reference we can't
16	understand to be able to determine whether in fact it
17	actually applies in this case.
18	MS. MAKENTA: When you say "the specific
19	reference, DCMR 12A-307.1 is not specific enough?
20	MR. TONDRO: It is, but that's inaccurate, because
21	the 12A, Chapter 3, which is Uses of an Occupancy
22	Classification, and specifically 307 deals with high hazard
23	or H Group uses.
24	(Simultaneous speaking)
25	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, so you think it's not

1	applicable?
2	MR. TONDRO: As I am seeing I don't see a
3	reference to a section that would be applicable.
4	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay.
5	MR. TONDRO: So I just want to ask
6	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, that's fine, so he asked you
7	a question
8	(Simultaneous speaking)
9	CHAIRMAN HILL: He asked you question, you
10	answered the question, okay.
11	MR. TONDRO: Okay.
12	MS. MAKENTA: Can I read
13	CHAIRMAN HILL: Sure.
14	MS. MAKENTA: the code that I am referring to?
15	CHAIRMAN HILL: He's asked you a question. I
16	thought you just read the code that you were referring to,
17	and he's saying it's not applicable.
18	MS. MAKENTA: But I believe he is not correct.
19	CHAIRMAN HILL: I understand. I understand you
20	believe that.
21	MS. MAKENTA: It's only handrail and guardrail
22	(Simultaneous speaking)
23	CHAIRMAN HILL: So, that's okay, he's just asking
24	the questions and you can have your opinion, but he thinks
25	that it's not applicable. And so, Mr. Tondro, your next

	102
1	question?
2	MR. TONDRO: Right. Thank you. I just had I
3	think
4	MS. MAKENTA: He thinks it's not applicable,
5	that's the key.
6	MR. TONDRO: One question
7	CHAIRMAN HILL: All right, okay.
8	MR. TONDRO: I'm asking one final question, which
9	is in terms of the context of your being concerned about the
10	windows and the light and so forth coming in and having to
11	wall it in, do you currently live at the property?
12	MS. MAKENTA: No, but I own it, and
13	MR. TONDRO: Have you lived at the property?
14	MS. MAKENTA: Yes, I have.
15	MR. TONDRO: When, most recently, if you don't
16	mind me asking?
17	MS. MAKENTA: That's irrelevant.
18	MR. TONDRO: Okay.
19	MS. MAKENTA: I have to protect my property as the
20	owner of the property.
21	MR. TONDRO: Thank you.
22	CHAIRMAN HILL: He is speaking to the light and
23	air issue I guess, okay, so is that
24	MS. MAKENTA: I have to protect my property as the
25	owner of the property.

1	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, do you have anything else?
2	MS. MAKENTA: They don't live at their property.
3	CHAIRMAN HILL: No, this
4	MS. MAKENTA: They haven't lived there for
5	(Simultaneous speaking)
6	CHAIRMAN HILL: Excuse me, excuse me. All right.
7	MS. MAKENTA: Sorry.
8	CHAIRMAN HILL: We are not going to do this.
9	MS. MAKENTA: Sorry.
10	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. I have to get through this
11	and we're going to get through this. Please turn off you
12	microphone. All right. Okay, do you have any more
13	questions, Mr. Tondro?
14	MR. TONDRO: No. Thank you.
15	CHAIRMAN HILL: All right. Do you have any cross
16	questions specifically to the testimony?
17	MR. DEBEAR: I do. Are there existing windows on
18	your first and second floors facing the intervener's
19	property?
20	MS. MAKENTA: Yes.
21	CHAIRMAN HILL: You can turn on your microphone
22	to answer the question.
23	MS. MAKENTA: Yes.
24	MR. DEBEAR: And can you look out of those windows
25	directly into existing windows on the intervener's property?

1	MS. MAKENTA: Not really. There is like a high
2	window
3	CHAIRMAN HILL: Your question, Mr. DeBear, is why?
4	MR. DEBEAR: Why is that my question?
5	CHAIRMAN HILL: Yes.
6	MR. DEBEAR: Because there is no existing
7	expectation of privacy. There are existing windows that
8	intervener's can look directly into the Appellant's property
9	and that has not changed at all either by the BZA, the
10	original BZA approval, or this modification.
11	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay.
12	MR. DEBEAR: And I do have photographic evidence
13	of that.
14	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. If you would like to submit
15	that into the record.
16	MR. DEBEAR: I would.
17	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay.
18	MR. DEBEAR: Ms. Makenta, looking at those
19	pictures is that an accurate representation of the existing
20	condition at the property?
21	MS. MAKENTA: I believe these are windows on my
22	side not their side, correct? There are basically, there are
23	about five windows on my side. There is a window at the top
24	that's used for A/C or whatever. Like on my side there is
25	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okav. Mr. DeBear. I understand

1	your question.
2	MR. DEBEAR: Okay.
3	CHAIRMAN HILL: So your next question?
4	MR. DEBEAR: That's it.
5	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, all right. Okay, Mr.
6	Tondro, we're going to turn to you when you have a moment
7	here and go ahead and give your presentation. There was a
8	lot of testimony, there was a lot of different points that
9	were brought up, but I turn to you now to hear your
10	presentation.
11	MR. TONDRO: Okay. Yes, good afternoon, Chairman
12	Hill, Members of the Board, Chairman Hood, good afternoon.
13	So I think first of all I would like to just remind everybody
14	as I am sorry if I keep on doing this every time I come, but
15	that the Appellant in this case has the burden of proof under
16	Subtitle X, 1101.2. At least I am consistent on that.
17	Then in terms of moving forward I think we can
18	basically agree that as I understand it that two broad
19	categories of allegations that are raised then by the
20	Appellant.
21	First is the issue of whether or not the side deck
22	should even be allowed, whether it's in compliance with the
23	zoning regulations, and second of all is the issue of the
24	compliance with the BZA plans.

I think in this case, if you will bear with me I

think I would like to sort of deal with the BZA, the issue with the BZA plans first, and then we can go to the merits.

As I stated in my pre-hearing statement at Exhibit 36 on the record the Zoning Administrator made the decision in reviewing the proposed revision that it did not require a modification and that was because, again, the Board Order was very specific that it refer to the plans at Exhibit 66, and you can see I supplied that Exhibit 66 to the original application and that's filed then as Exhibit 36E on the record here, so you can see it if you want to.

I believe that as we understood it there was a reason that the Board referred to these particular plans and elevations, this is our understanding, but that that was because there had been a change in the application in the relief that was requested and that these were, therefore, the updated plans and that was the reason why the Board referred to them.

But honestly the Zoning Administrator doesn't go into interpreting what the Board's intent is, but that's the reason why we have orders. The order, it was a reasonable statement that the BZA-approved plans were subject to Exhibit 66 and Exhibit 66 if you do look at that you'll see that the only elevations that are shown are the front and the rear elevations, which is page one, two, three, four, five, six, seven is the elevations, and then subsequently you can see

2.0

on the pages afterwards a series of photo montages.

Again, presumably the reason why this was what was limited in being supplied and what was limited in terms of the condition of the orders because that directly related to the two relief, the relief that was specifically requested at that time which was to modify the roof turret and to raise the height of the upper story.

So those plans that were a condition of the order relate only to the specific area of relief so it makes sense as we understand that that was why the Board conditioned the approval to those, but it was also the letter of what the summary order said.

As a result the ZA just determined that since the deck here, the roof deck, did not depict, did not contradict anything that was shown on those approved plans, therefore, it was nothing that would require a modification.

Furthermore, it was an actual, a decrease in the actual relief that was being allowed. Nonetheless, the permit holder subsequently said out of an abundance of caution given all of the litigation that has gone on in this particular case they said that they would like to go and file for a modification.

So they filed for a modification, and you can see that, that modification then is Exhibit 36D on the record that I supplied, too. So you can see there this is a form

2.0

that was created by the ZA's office specifically in response to this new requirement in the current zoning regulations and they go through all of the various different conditions that are required for A-304.10, and you can see that in that attached letter going forward through there.

The ZA therefore signed that because the ZA believed, approved the modification because although he believed the modification wasn't necessary, nonetheless, it still met the, it still complied even if the modification was necessary.

I'd just point out that I believe that in this particular case there is sort of a circuitous logic that Appellant is proposing, which is that somehow the Office of the Attorney General made an error in which plan set they were referring to.

Although there was an opportunity for Appellant to file a motion to reconsider if she believed that this was an error, the summary order was an error, that was never done. Appellant has availed herself of every other possible opportunity to litigate this case.

So I think in some sense that opportunity, if there was an error, you know, we live in the world in which we live in which is the world of the order that was, what was presented.

So I think from DCRA's perspective, and the ZA

2.0

acted correctly in first of all saying there was no modification required to allow for this roof deck and, second of all, that if there was one required that he did that correctly and, therefore, there was no need to go back to the Board.

Going to the second issue of the first issue, which is sort of the merits of the deck. Here we have I think sort of a set of different concepts. As I stated in my brief first of all we have a situation where there is a question in terms of the penthouse requirements, right, the penthouse setback, the penthouse requirements of Subtitle C-1502, apply to penthouses, those are the areas I referred to in my pre-hearing statement.

Penthouses are seen as additional to the building envelope that is permitted, so three stories are permitted, the penthouse is there for that area above that third story. The roof deck is part of the third story, this particular -- I should be more precise, the side deck, just to be clear, the side deck is a cutout of the third story within the permitted envelope and, therefore, we would assert it does not fall subject to the penthouse regulations which are relying on that area outside of those three stories.

However, there is an alternative if that Board does not agree with and then it is a roof deck that is where then the ZA had made that determination in response to the

2.0

new regulations that came and these new provisions.

2.0

With the December email that is included as Exhibit 36C on the record with the illustrations that you can see behind the ZA was forced to deal with a situation or trying to understand how does this actually apply, the new requirements of the setback, particularly to guardrails, and he'll provide testimony as to the background of that, but just that's where that came in.

So as a result in this particular case the ZA decided that a 10-foot setback, if you have a deck that is less than ten feet deep then you shouldn't be, then it is effectively as it were a balcony, for lack of a better word.

Balcony was not used in the zoning regulations. The ZA did not look to Webster's because he was not looking to interpret a rule of the zoning regulations. He called it a balcony just for interpretation purposes to describe it and, therefore, within those small sort of areas there was no need to have a setback.

Particularly you can imagine, and, again, the ZA will provide testimony, but you can imagine the situation where you see a building that has a whole series of balconies that are projecting out, if you're going to make each of those balcony railings that are only three feet deep have to somehow now be setback equivalent to the height, they are required to be, what, 42 inches high usually, I think, you're

going to have to have those railing, you have to have the balcony project out even further in order to allow the guardrail to come up and that sort of seemed to be a purpose that didn't seem to make sense, but, again, the ZA can provide more background on that.

In terms of the Appellant's assertion about whether the guidance document should have been provided publically, this was a document that the ZA used, you can see who it was provided to, it was provided to the Office of Planning to alert them and give them an opportunity to feedback as well as to all the zoning reviewers.

This was an internal document. It is able to be appealed, as in precisely today, whenever it is applied to a particular permit.

The reason we supplied it was not to say this is a hard and fast rule, that this is the reason, you can no longer appeal it, it was rather to say there is a logic, he wasn't just willy-nilly interpreting the rule, this is the way, this is the decision, this is what he came by, and this is the reason why.

But, finally, I would assert I think there is also another level which is the guardrail issue which was brought up by Appellant. I had looked online to try to see if I could find that particular provision.

The reason I am questioning it is because the

2.0

1 plans for the building permit, the revised building permit 2 we're looking at, do not appear to require a quardrail. Those were reviewed for compliance with the building codes. 3 So if they don't require a quardrail then it 4 wouldn't be the guardrail that it would have to be setback, 5 6 at most it would be the roof decking, which is probably some 7 six inches high, and the requirement of 1502 would require 8 at most an equal one-to-one setback which if it's the deck 9 that's the object that is being setback it would be the 10 height off the roof so it would have to be setback some six 11 inches, which is probably about the width of the parapet that 12 we're talking about. 13 So Ι think under either of those three 14 circumstances that the ZA was correct in asserting, in 15 approving side deck the as compliant with the zoning 16 regulations. 17 With that, I am going to turn it over to the ZA, 18 if I may. 19 Thank you, So specifically MR. LEGRANT: Max. 2.0 about the differentiation of when an upper level of 21 building that has multiple roofs or areas open to the sky the 22 question becomes when do the penthouse requirements kick in. 23 The general way that I have applied the penthouse regulations is if someone builds a building to the maximum 24 25 building height in terms of number of allowed stories or in

those Districts, or the building, there is not identification of stories, just the maximum height, then as we all know the zoning regulations permit a penthouse subject to several restrictions of height, of FAR, of use, and setbacks from certain edges of the roof.

In a situation such as here where you have a building that has a portion of a lower level that is open to the sky the question is like, well, is that building mass next to it considered a penthouse or not.

And so as we struggled with that issue I came up with the December interpretation, or I codified it in the email to my staff and as Max noted shared with the Office of Planning, as to when do we differentiate a roof that then those features would be subject to the, in this case, penthouse setback requirements of C-1502 from a lesser projection or loosely termed balcony that is not really functioning as a roof adjacent to that adjacent story.

So the 10-foot requirement, which is sort of the middle ground of different court requirements of, we have court requirements of six feet, we have court requirements of 50 feet, I have settled on ten feet as the place where this is a balcony in which it would not make sense to apply the penthouse setback requirements to the railing or the decking because it would diminish the usability of that.

So that was the, this, as Exhibit 36C that sets

2.0

forth how where is the break of, oh, you treat ten feet or more as a penthouse subject to the setbacks, less than ten feet not.

MR. TONDRO: And just -- And I apologize if I didn't do this earlier, but just to facilitate the discussion, again, Exhibit 36A shows what the original permit is.

It shows all four floors. What we are looking at is the top floor, which is the third floor roof plan on the left, and then 36B shows then the revised permit, which is at subject and I tried to highlight in red the area that is the roof deck so you can see where it is coming out.

And I think you can see there that there is no notation of any guardrail either in that presumably because it is immediately adjacent to another roof and there is a parapet.

Again, I did not -- I am not the reviewer who did the building code so I can't testify to that, but what I can say is that this permit was reviewed and determined to be compliant with the building code as is seen right here. So if there were guardrails to be provided those would have had to have been shown or should have been shown there.

And so I think that at most even if this side deck were to be interpreted to be subject to the penthouse rooftop setback it would be only the one-to-one based on the height

2.0

1	of the roof deck off of the roof itself, which I don't have
2	the details here, but presumably it's at most between six to
3	ten inches probably.
4	MR. LEGRANT: And I guess I'll add that parapets
5	are not subject to the setback requirements, the penthouse
6	setback requirements.
7	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay.
8	MR. TONDRO: And with that I will rest. Thank
9	you.
LO	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. All right, thank you, Mr.
11	Tondro. Ms. Makenta, do you have some cross examination
L2	questions based upon the testimony that was just taken?
13	MS. MAKENTA: I do and I also have clarification
L4	questions for the Board. I don't know how I deal with that.
L5	CHAIRMAN HILL: I'm sorry, you can ask I mean
L6	at this point of the hearing what we do is we go ahead and
L7	they have provided some testimony, if you have any, you got
L8	clarifying questions, whatever you want, to call them in
L9	terms of upon the testimony that was given if you have any
20	cross examination questions concerning the testimony that was
21	given.
22	MS. MAKENTA: I do, but I was wondering in terms
23	of clarification, a process, I had a question for you all,
24	so when do I ask that question?
25	(Simultaneous speaking)

1	CHAIRMAN HILL: Well, you can go ahead and ask
2	your question. What's your question?
3	MS. MAKENTA: Okay. Just in terms of this Exhibit
4	66 conversation that's on the summary order, it says "subject
5	to approved plans at Exhibit 66."
6	CHAIRMAN HILL: Yes.
7	MS. MAKENTA: Who is responsible for the
8	technical, you know, just confirming that approved plans
9	equals architectural plans not renderings and those are at
10	Exhibit 8.
11	I just don't understand what the process is of
12	getting rid of that typo. Is that
13	(Simultaneous speaking)
14	CHAIRMAN HILL: Sure. No, that's okay, I
15	understand, I understand.
16	MS. MAKENTA: a technical amendment?
17	CHAIRMAN HILL: I understand. So we are taking
18	testimony here concerning whether or not in your appeal the
19	Zoning Administrator has erred.
20	You have provided a bunch of testimony, one of
21	which is that there was a typo in terms of the exhibit. The
22	Zoning Administrator has provided testimony that that is
23	actually incorrect, that that actually is the correct
24	exhibit.
25	And so we as a Board I guess will determine what

1	we think of whether or not the Zoning Administrator has erred
2	in that. So that's your process question, correct? So I
3	have answered it, correct? We determine it.
4	MS. MAKENTA: So you determine it based on the
5	testimony?
6	CHAIRMAN HILL: We determine it. We are taking
7	your testimony
8	MS. MAKENTA: So look at the order and then you
9	know how
10	(Simultaneous speaking)
11	MS. MAKENTA: I think I understand.
12	CHAIRMAN HILL: Well, no, that's okay. Again, you
13	are here to, you have appealed the decision that the Zoning
14	Administrator has given.
15	You are saying that he erred and we are taking
16	testimony as to why or how he erred and then afterwards we
17	are going to look at all of the testimony and determine
18	whether or not he has erred based upon, you know, it being
19	your case, based upon the proof that you have given. So now
20	Yes, so there you go.
21	MS. MAKENTA: So and then after I cross examine
22	him do I cross examine
23	(Simultaneous speaking)
24	CHAIRMAN HILL: So you'll cross examine the
25	testimony, again, the testimony that was given, so whatever

1	they just now said, then the Applicant will have an
2	opportunity, not the Applicant, the property owner will have
3	an opportunity also to provide testimony and then you will
4	be able to cross examine that testimony as well.
5	MS. MAKENTA: Okay. So I am
6	(Simultaneous speaking)
7	CHAIRMAN HILL: You are asking questions of them.
8	MS. MAKENTA: Okay. So, okay, questions. What
9	is the internal process or is there an internal process at
10	DCRA for overturning a guidance memo or is it only through
11	this appeal process?
12	MR. LEGRANT: Well, as my counsel noted when my
13	office issues guidance, makes determination letters, or any
14	decision those can be appealed, as we are here.
15	In terms of particular cases people come to me
16	seeking guidance. I look at the zoning regulations, I
17	interpret the zoning regulations, I would issue the guidance.
18	If they want to challenge it I inform them they can appeal
19	the matter and
20	MS. MAKENTA: I am just trying to find out the
21	vetting, what is the vetting process I guess in terms of,
22	like is a vote taken before?
23	MR. LEGRANT: Well, no
24	(Simultaneous speaking)
25	CHAIRMAN HILL: Wait, I'm sorry, what's your

1	question again?
2	MS. MAKENTA: Like is I mean what is the
3	process in terms of before you get to the conclusion of this
4	memo? Is there What is the process internally at DCRA?
5	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay.
6	MR. LEGRANT: Right. So one of my charges as
7	Zoning Administrator is to interpret zoning regulations. I
8	analyze the situations where the regulations are not clear,
9	I issue determination or guidance that is appealable to the
10	BZA.
11	MS. MAKENTA: Okay. Why is the date of the ZA
12	approval of the revised permit two months before the required
13	application was filed?
14	MR. LEGRANT: I know you noted the dates. I am
15	not aware of the date, the timeline that you have put forth.
16	I know that the modification
17	MS. MAKENTA: I can show that it is.
18	MR. LEGRANT: form that I signed I signed it
19	on July 11, 2017.
20	MS. MAKENTA: Right. And then there is an
21	application that was dated June 30th.
22	VICE CHAIR HART: Can you speak into the mic a
23	little bit?
24	CHAIRMAN HILL: Speak into the mic, yes.
25	MS. MAKENTA: Oh. I'm sorrv. And then there is

1	an application that was, a request for modification of plans
2	approved by the BZA, that is dated June 30th, but the ZA
3	approval was May 2nd.
4	So the question was why is the date of that ZA
5	approval two months before the required application was
6	filed, which 304.10 doesn't appear to allow?
7	MR. LEGRANT: Well, I don't believe the permit was
8	issued. The permit was not issued I believe until
9	MR. TONDRO: We can find that date.
10	MS. MAKENTA: It was issued at the end of May, but
11	that's even, the permit was even issued a month before the
12	application was filed. So the ZA approval was May 2nd, the
13	permit was issued and then it was a posthumous or a belated
14	application filed.
15	And so the question is why, how did that occur
16	when 304.10 specifically doesn't allow that?
17	MR. TONDRO: I think it was already stated and
18	included in the briefs that the issue was the fact that the
19	ZA determined that the approval of the permit was based on
20	the fact that he did not believe that there was any
21	requirement for there to be a modification under A-304.10
22	because the summary order referred to Exhibit 66 and Exhibit
23	66 did not have, did not show, it showed only the Exhibit 66
24	of the application did, which I believe is 19387, did not

show any area that would be impacted by the revised permit.

1	MS. MAKENTA: Okay.
2	MR. TONDRO: Nonetheless, when the permit holder
3	subsequently came and sought to sort of adopt a belt and
4	suspenders approach just in case they then asked if it was
5	possible for the ZA to review and approve a modification and
6	at that point that was when that was submitted and Mr.
7	LeGrant then responded to that.
8	MS. MAKENTA: Okay. And so that 66 comes up
9	again. You mentioned the 6-inch setback on this roof, side
10	roof deck, and I am trying to understand where that is coming
11	from.
12	The roof deck, for example, on the uppermost roof,
13	if you look at, I'm not sure, it's the plan, it's the first
14	page of the revised plan, A-001, it's in Tab A of the
15	Intervener's Pre-Hearing Statement, but it is set back on all
16	four sides by it looks like about maybe, it's look like, I'm
17	not exactly clear how much is set back, but it's set back on
18	all four sides and it's certainly set back by feet, not
19	inches.
20	So that code Where is this six inches coming
21	from
22	MR. DEBEAR: Objection.
23	MS. MAKENTA: because that
24	CHAIRMAN HILL: Wait, that's okay. Give me one
25	second. Well, first of all so what are objecting to?

1	MR. DEBEAR: Not in evidence.
2	MS. MAKENTA: What's not in evidence?
3	MR. DEBEAR: And she's giving You are giving
4	an estimation.
5	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. So, Ms. Makenta, what is
6	it that your question is again?
7	MS. MAKENTA: So the code says that the setback
8	is a one-to-one setback.
9	CHAIRMAN HILL: In which situation?
10	MS. MAKENTA: For a roof deck or for a trellis or
11	for a guardrail, and with regard to the guardrail situation
12	
13	CHAIRMAN HILL: Right, wait one second again,
14	you're going back into your testimony.
15	MS. MAKENTA: Sorry.
16	CHAIRMAN HILL: I'm just trying to understand
17	again the question you are asking of the Zoning Administrator
18	based upon their testimony.
19	MS. MAKENTA: Oh.
20	CHAIRMAN HILL: And your question is what?
21	MS. MAKENTA: The question is where does the 6-
22	inch setback, because the 1502 setback is related to the
23	height of the guardrail or so, for example, I imagine the
24	roof deck would have a guardrail, right?
25	CHAIRMAN HILL: Mr. Tondro, do you understand the

1	question?
2	MS. MAKENTA: It's not just a platform and so it's
3	
4	CHAIRMAN HILL: Can He's going to answer the
5	question.
6	MS. MAKENTA: Oh.
7	MR. TONDRO: I'm sorry. Yes, I believe I
8	understand the question, correct me if I don't. I believe
9	the question is since the question revolves around how does
10	if C-1502, the penthouse setback, applies, okay.
11	It establishes a one-to-one setback. In other
12	words, the height above the roof
13	(Simultaneous speaking)
14	CHAIRMAN HILL: But you're saying it doesn't
15	apply?
16	MR. TONDRO: Right.
17	CHAIRMAN HILL: Right.
18	MR. TONDRO: We say it doesn't apply, but we say
19	even if it did apply, in this case there does not appear to
20	be any guardrails required by the building code so a
21	guardrail would not be, the structure would have to be set
22	back, it would be only the decking and the decking,
23	therefore, as I stated, I don't have with me the details of
24	how high, but it is presumably some time between six inches
25	or maybe at most a foot above the roof.

1	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay.
2	MR. TONDRO: In other words, the surface of the
3	deck
4	CHAIRMAN HILL: Right, I understand.
5	MR. TONDRO: So that would have to be set back
6	equivalent to its height above the roof, so if it's six
7	inches it would have to be set back from the property line
8	six inches, if it's a foot
9	CHAIRMAN HILL: Right, if it was necessary.
10	MR. TONDRO: Right.
11	CHAIRMAN HILL: Right. Okay.
12	MS. MAKENTA: So the handrail is in actually, it's
13	at OAH, so there is a case at OAH regarding
14	CHAIRMAN HILL: What are you talking about?
15	MS. MAKENTA: They are talking about the handrail
16	and whether or not it's required, that's a part of the
17	building code. So we actually have a case at OAH
18	CHAIRMAN HILL: That's okay. I am, again, asking
19	your questions of the testimony that they provided, and now
20	you're talking about something at OAH.
21	MS. MAKENTA: But I guess what I am saying is that
22	the one-to-one setback that is required for a roof deck, for
23	example, let's say the upper roof deck, that is based on the
24	railing, correct, it's a distance of one of
25	(Simultaneous speaking)

1	CHAIRMAN HILL: Ms. Makenta, I'm sorry, I just
2	don't understand your question. What is your question.
3	MS. MAKENTA: The setback is supposed to be a one-
4	to-one setback
5	CHAIRMAN HILL: If it were a penthouse.
6	MS. MAKENTA: based on the height of the
7	railing. No.
8	No, that code is independent and collective, it's not just
9	it's like the guardrail code, it's independent and
LO	collective. That's the code that, you know, when you walk
11	down the stairs here, that code, that 307 governs all of
L2	that.
13	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay. What's your question again?
L4	MS. MAKENTA: So the setback is not related to the
15	platform of a deck. The setback is related to the height of
L6	the railing. So if this is a rooftop deck then the setback
L7	would be related to let's say they were saying the parapet
L8	wall, the height of the parapet wall, which is
L9	(Simultaneous speaking)
20	CHAIRMAN HILL: I'm just trying to understanding
21	your question.
22	MS. MAKENTA: So let's say if the parapet wall was
23	48 inches high, then it would have to be set back 48 inches.
24	CHAIRMAN HILL: What's your question?
25	MS. MAKENTA: So what I am saying is where in the

1	code does it state that six inches, like where is that coming
2	from, because that's not
3	(Simultaneous speaking)
4	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, all right, all right, you
5	can finish
6	MS. MAKENTA: it's related to the railing?
7	CHAIRMAN HILL: You can stop. You asked the
8	question and I'm trying to understand the question.
9	MR. TONDRO: Yes, as I think I explained the issue
10	is it's a one-to-one setback on whatever structure is
11	determined that has to be set back.
12	CHAIRMAN HILL: Right.
13	MR. TONDRO: Right. That's assuming that the
14	penthouse does apply to this site.
15	CHAIRMAN HILL: Right.
16	MR. TONDRO: Right. Assuming that even if the
17	penthouse does apply to the site
18	(Simultaneous speaking)
19	CHAIRMAN HILL: Right, but you're saying it
20	doesn't apply?
21	MR. TONDRO: Right, we do believe it doesn't
22	apply.
23	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay.
24	MR. TONDRO: But if it were to apply it's only
25	whatever structure it is that's the tallest that

CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, I understand. The answer you've gotten your answer now. You need to move on to ext question. MS. MAKENTA: But the part that's the tallest is rapet wall. (Simultaneous speaking) CHAIRMAN HILL: You need to move on to your next on. MS. MAKENTA: There is no platform. Okay. Okay. I guess the question would be
ext question. MS. MAKENTA: But the part that's the tallest is rapet wall. (Simultaneous speaking) CHAIRMAN HILL: You need to move on to your next on. MS. MAKENTA: There is no platform. Okay. Okay.
MS. MAKENTA: But the part that's the tallest is rapet wall. (Simultaneous speaking) CHAIRMAN HILL: You need to move on to your next on. MS. MAKENTA: There is no platform. Okay. Okay.
rapet wall. (Simultaneous speaking) CHAIRMAN HILL: You need to move on to your next on. MS. MAKENTA: There is no platform. Okay. Okay.
(Simultaneous speaking) CHAIRMAN HILL: You need to move on to your next on. MS. MAKENTA: There is no platform. Okay. Okay.
CHAIRMAN HILL: You need to move on to your next on. MS. MAKENTA: There is no platform. Okay. Okay.
on. MS. MAKENTA: There is no platform. Okay. Okay.
MS. MAKENTA: There is no platform. Okay. Okay.
I guess the question would be
CHAIRMAN HILL: And about, again, how many more
ons do you have?
MS. MAKENTA: Not many.
CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay.
MS. MAKENTA: What do I have time for? What is my
CHAIRMAN HILL: Well, the whole thing is supposed
t an hour and so we're already going way past that, but
ad and please answer your, I mean ask your questions.
MS. MAKENTA: Okay. I guess
CHAIRMAN HILL: We're trying to provide clarity,
ow, that's what we're trying to figure out. We're not
to re-hear your testimony. You are asking questions

1	next question.
2	MS. MAKENTA: So here is the thing, here is the
3	thing, we have a case at OAH currently
4	CHAIRMAN HILL: No, no, no, what's your next
5	question?
6	MS. MAKENTA: This is a question.
7	CHAIRMAN HILL: To them, you are asking them a
8	question, not me.
9	MS. MAKENTA: Okay. Okay. All right, let's see.
10	Okay, it's going to come back to this Exhibit 66 again and
11	it's a question that's related to He's going to say he
12	didn't know. This is all related to the 66.
13	So I guess until there is some deliberation on
14	what is meant by subject to approved plans and what exhibit
15	that is at it's going to be kind of hard to Okay, well
16	he's going to
17	(Simultaneous speaking)
18	CHAIRMAN HILL: I'm going to give you two more
19	questions, okay.
20	MS. MAKENTA: Okay. A lot of my questions come
21	back to the way they have gone about their testimony comes
22	back to 66. One second.
23	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, so do you have anymore
24	questions?
25	MS. MAKENTA: Yes. When you wrote the guidance

1	email and you provided two detached houses as the images
2	regarding did you contemplate rowhouses? Why doesn't that
3	image, that diagram, show the impact of a balcony deck on the
4	side of attached houses as opposed to detached houses and
5	yes.
6	MR. LEGRANT: The images were merely illustrative
7	and the fact that this is a detached house it just helps
8	illustrate that. There was no and there is privacy issues
9	on the rear yard issue that can occur as well.
10	MS. MAKENTA: So the practical impact of that
11	guidance wasn't necessarily fully weighed in the context of
12	rowhouses?
13	MR. LEGRANT: Well, I would not agree with your
14	characterization on that.
15	MS. MAKENTA: Okay.
16	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, what's your next question,
17	your last question I should say?
18	(No audible answer)
19	CHAIRMAN HILL: Ms. Makenta, I'll tell you what,
20	I'll give you one more question but we're going to keep
21	moving on and then if you think about it and if you think
22	what that question is we'll come back to the ZA for a last
23	question. Okay. All right, so
24	MR. DEBEAR: Can I ask just two very quick
25	questions

1	(Simultaneous speaking)
2	CHAIRMAN HILL: Sure. I forgot that you had cross
3	questions.
4	MR. DEBEAR: Yes, very quickly.
5	CHAIRMAN HILL: Yes, sure, go ahead.
6	MR. DEBEAR: To Mr. LeGrant, have you applied your
7	determination, your interpretation, on the balcony
8	consistently since issuing that interpretation in December?
9	MR. LEGRANT: Yes, I have.
10	MR. DEBEAR: And what authority does the Zoning
11	Administrator have to cure mistakes that have been made by
12	DCRA or by staff members of DCRA, just in the permitting
13	process? Can you go back and fix mistakes that have been
14	made previously?
15	MR. LEGRANT: Well, are you talking about mistakes
16	in approving plans?
17	MR. DEBEAR: Or just general mistakes in
18	application of law or approving plans, can you look at them
19	again and say actually I have the ability to cure this and
20	make it right?
21	MR. LEGRANT: Well, I guess I'll put it this way,
22	if I become aware of a mistake made in approving a plan then
23	that can be a basis for re-reviewing the application or
24	revoking a permit. Your general question in curing problems
25	with the regulations themselves is not my purview.

1	MR. DEBEAR: That's it.
2	CHAIRMAN HILL: Okay, all right. We are going to
3	take a quick 2-minute break before your testimony. I do have
4	to mention, Ms. Makenta, since this is your application, I
5	have to go catch a flight and so the Vice Chair is going to
6	take over for me.
7	I will watch the record, I will review the record,
8	I will be very interested to see how this goes. Okay, a 2-
9	minute break.
10	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the
11	record at 3:20 p.m. and resumed at 3:41 p.m.)
12	VICE CHAIR HART: Okay, we will come back to order
13	and we lost our appellant. Thank you for your patience,
14	by the way.
15	Welcome back. Okay, so we will come back to
16	order. We are now at the Intervenor testimony. And Mr.
17	DeBear?
18	MR. DeBEAR: Thank you, Mr. Hart Board Member
19	Hart.
20	I just want to start this off by noting an
21	objection to something the Appellant stated during her
22	testimony, something concerning fraud. And I just want to
23	object based on relevance and not being in evidence.
24	I think that concerned the original BZA case but
25	I'm not certain So I just wanted to note that for the

lrecord.

2.0

I'm going to make this short, shorter than I had intended. I think that DCRA stated most of what my clients would agree to be the basis for denying this appeal.

I wanted to state that this appeal concerns a revision to a building permit, as we know. Graham and Lexie changed their plans to account for a seven-foot cutout around Appellant's chimney. In the original BZA case, Graham and Lexie stated at the hearing that the addition was subject to Helen's chimney and that the assumption was Appellant would provide consent to raise her chimney.

The modification was made because Appellant would not consent to raise her chimney. Now, we understand that that is her decision to make but this appeal could have been avoided by allowing Graham and Lexie to raise her chimney.

Needless to say, Graham and Lexie agree with DCRA's arguments. I think the DCRA stated that it is their legal opinion that a request for modification, pursuant to 304.10 of Subtitle A of the Zoning Regulations was not even necessary but even if it was, this was done in accordance with that provision. That provision allows someone who has obtained BZA relief to modify plans, if it meets certain criteria.

And Graham and Lexie's request met all of those criteria. They submitted the written request and outlined

those criteria and why they are met. And that was submitted to the Zoning Administrator's office in accordance with that regulation.

The modification did not violate a condition of approval in the order. It did not increase, expand, extend any area of relief. It did not create new relief. It did not change the principle use of the property. It did not increase the number of stories. It did not increase the gross floor area of the building. It did not increase the number of dwelling units and it did not increase the number of parking spaces. Those are the criteria under 304.10 that allows you to make this modification, which is, again, cutout which was a direct reaction to Appellant's decision not to allow them to extend the chimney beyond their third floor addition.

The Appellant has raised two clear issues, I think. First, as the Zoning Administrator testified, the third floor balcony that resulted from the cutout is not a penthouse and is not subject to the penthouse setback requirements. I think we went through that in sufficient detail and I don't need to restate all of the Zoning Administrator and Counsel's testimony on that.

But there is an interpretation made by the Zoning Administrator that he testified to he has applied consistently to this exact type of situation. This is not

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

a penthouse and there is no setback requirement.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

The second issue is about privacy, which I believe we responded to in my question to the Appellant in that the existing condition is there is no expectation of privacy, not to mention the fact that it's not relevant to a modification Subtitle A. 304.10. There is nothing in regulation that says the word privacy. There is no -- it's special exception. a modification of not a It's not consequence or significance. There is nothing that requires a consideration of privacy but there is no expectation of privacy. There are windows, as reflected in the two images that I entered into evidence that are on the first and second floor of the Intervenor's property that look directly into the existing windows -- these are all existing windows -- of the Appellant. There is simply no expectation of privacy here.

And I will just finish by saying that I would like my clients to speak in defense of this modification but the ZA was acting under his authority, allowed this change to the plans, and this was all done in accordance with the zoning regulations and none of this was either arbitrary or capricious.

And now I will turn it over to Graham Smith.

MR. SMITH: Hi. Thank you so much for sitting through this and I know we were supposed to have a lunch

break at some point and that's never happened. Everybody is probably pretty beat. I also want to say I appreciate the civility with which you all carry out your deliberations.

And it was very difficult for me to sit through, as a husband and as a father, the attacks and disparaging comments that were set forth in the Appellant's opening comments. I wish I could have responded to them at the moment but I think to cast shade on our family like that is a terrible thing. I think we are very good family. We have been a part of this neighborhood since 2003. We had 22 letters of support when we wanted to do this project and zero letters of opposition.

And you know we have been out of the house, as we were getting ready for and doing these renovations but we look forward to moving back in there and being in our house that we've been in since '03 to raise our family and send them to D.C. public schools and continue being a part of this neighborhood.

So just a couple of things -- I'll just add a couple of things. You know when we originally brought this to you all, the plan was that the wall would go straight up essentially next to that light well. And that was approved by the Board as not being an undue burden on light or air into that area of the Appellant's property. It doesn't really get much light or air anyhow.

2.0

As this modification has happened, it is actually set back several feet from there. So, as modified, it has even less impact than it would have had in the original approved plans. So it seems to me bizarre to make an argument at this point that somehow the modification imposes problems.

I would just double what Eric was saying about the privacy thing. As you can see in those photographs taken from our place into the Appellant's rooms, there are blinds in those windows. There are blinds because there is not an expectation of privacy. You do not put up blinds in a window where you have an expectation of privacy.

So you know to say that somehow somebody is going to stand on a balcony up above and look down at a severe angle and try to like look into a window that they can already see inside of and that somehow limits privacy seems to me very strange.

And finally, I would just say that when we originally came to you all and presented this stuff, we knew that there was this chimney issue that was still outstanding. We had a conversation about that. And you know we would have certainly to building preferred amend it bу up Appellant's chimney or by her building up her chimney, as it seemed like the DC area was asking at the time but this was certainly also part of the realm of possibilities.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

1	So we have done as we said we would do and make
2	sure that we hewed to the law, to the code in terms of making
3	sure that the chimney was not impacted or put out of
4	compliance.
5	MS. MAKENTA: Objection.
6	VICE CHAIR HART: I'm sorry. First, I understand
7	that what is it that you are objecting to?
8	MS. MAKENTA: I'm objecting to
9	VICE CHAIR HART: And normally it is a no, no,
10	it's fine. It's a specific thing that he that Mr. Smith
11	just said.
12	MS. MAKENTA: I guess I would call that hearsay,
13	if something's not
14	VICE CHAIR HART: Call what hearsay?
15	MS. MAKENTA: Well, he's talking about the chimney
16	and it's not true what he's saying. So I don't know how else
17	
18	VICE CHAIR HART: He stated that they tried to get
19	into an agreement with you, I guess as the homeowner just
20	let me hear me out and that that agreement wasn't
21	you didn't come to an agreement. So now they are having to
22	do something to their property in effect to become in
23	compliance with the regulations.
24	And so I think that that is kind of it's not
25	really hearsay. That's kind of the factual way in which we

1 went about it. So, I'll let him finish and you can ask your 2 questions. Okay? I just want to add quickly -- I'm 3 MR. DeBEAR: sorry, Graham -- that the chimney discussion is in the BZA 4 5 transcript for their original application. I believe it was So, I just wanted to add that. 6 December 14th, I think. 7 VICE CHAIR HART: That's fine. Thank you. 8 The last thing I would say is that in MR. SMITH: 9 addition to you know the fact that we're a good family and 10 we're trying to be part of the neighborhood, it's hard to 11 hear the Appellant make characterizations about our financial 12 situation, which she knows nothing about. 13 incredible litigiousness Her has SO expensive, financially and emotionally, for our family. 14 Ιt 15 has been incredibly difficult to have to go in front of so many different bodies and intervene trying to just maintain 16 17 our ability to like improve our house, which was a wreck 18 before we went into this. And we are going into massive debt 19 and we're going into debt to be able to defend our right to 2.0 And I don't know why she would feel like she would do this. 21 know anything about our situation or would try to represent 22 that to you. 23 So thank you, aqain, for hearing this. Т 24 appreciate it.

Thank you.

VICE CHAIR HART:

1	Mr. DeBear?
2	MR. DeBEAR: Nothing further.
3	VICE CHAIR HART: Okay. So now we will get into
4	the cross-examination. Ms. Makenta, do you have questions
5	that the Intervenor has questions about the testimony that
6	the Intervenor has just provided?
7	MS. MAKENTA: Yes. You have these two images of
8	windows. I have 11 windows on my on the east, west, and
9	north side of my property. You have two pictures here.
10	How many windows do you have that face my on your
11	property that face my property?
12	MR. SMITH: There's one window on each floor.
13	MS. MAKENTA: You have two windows, right? So I
14	have 11 and you have two. So there is certainly an
15	expectation of privacy, additionally
16	MR. SMITH: I'm not sure why that follows.
17	MS. MAKENTA: I have two I have 11, you have
18	two but that's fine
19	VICE CHAIR HART: Let's move on to the next
20	question, please.
21	MS. MAKENTA: Let me get through the next
22	question.
23	And also, for example, my north side windows,
24	because I also have two there is a group of five houses
25	and we have these windows on both sides. I also have those

1	same two windows that they are referring to but I can't see
2	in my neighbors' property.
3	MR. DeBEAR: Objection; testimony. This isn't a
4	question.
5	MS. MAKENTA: So the question is my north side
6	windows, for example, are these houses originally had
7	about ten-feet ceilings. They are about eight feet from the
8	floor.
9	MR. SMITH: That's not true.
10	MS. MAKENTA: So
11	VICE CHAIR HART: Let's
12	MS. MAKENTA: So the question is how high not
13	based on your renovation but the two windows that you are
14	claiming remove my expectation of privacy in my 11 windows,
15	somehow, how high are those how high were those before
16	your rented before you renovated or began renovating your
17	property? Because you moved the floors up, or you moved them
18	down as part of your renovation.
19	VICE CHAIR HART: Ms. Makenta. Ms. Makenta, this
20	is a really long question.
21	MS. MAKENTA: Oh.
22	VICE CHAIR HART: The question is, can they see
23	from their property into your property right now. Is that
24	what you're asking?
25	MS. MAKENTA: No. The question is simply before

1	the renovation
2	VICE CHAIR HART: Let's talk about
3	MS. MAKENTA: were your windows eight feet high
4	from the floor?
5	MR. SMITH: No.
6	MS. MAKENTA: From the hall?
7	VICE CHAIR HART: Okay, so the answer was no, they
8	were not eight feet tall.
9	MS. MAKENTA: Okay. I have full-size windows.
10	These are pictures of full-size windows. And I have 11 full-
11	size windows. And all of my windows have blinds, regardless.
12	So it's not true what he's saying
13	MR. DeBEAR: Objection. This isn't a question.
14	MS. MAKENTA: about privacy and blinds.
15	VICE CHAIR HART: Well, the
16	MS. MAKENTA: But the question is the question
17	is I'm sorry. The question is, the two windows that you
18	are referring to that are on two floors on your property,
19	which in mine, for example, I have an air conditioner in
20	MR. DeBEAR: Objection. I'm just waiting for a
21	question.
22	MS. MAKENTA: Are they full-size windows?
23	MR. SMITH: I don't know what you mean by full-
24	size. I mean they are like this big
25	MS. MAKENTA: Okay, mine are not full-size windows

1	and I assume yours are not as well.
2	MR. DeBEAR: Objection.
3	MS. MAKENTA: Correct?
4	MR. DeBEAR: I'm sorry, Chairman.
5	VICE CHAIR HART: Okay, hold on.
6	MS. MAKENTA: Well this is a full-size
7	VICE CHAIR HART: Hold on. Excuse me. Excuse me.
8	For everybody, let's just calm down a little bit. Okay?
9	You are asking questions about the size of the
10	windows. Is that the question that you have? Okay, are you
11	asking if the windows in the Intervenor's property are the
12	same size as the windows in your property. Am I correct?
13	MS. MAKENTA: Are they this size?
14	VICE CHAIR HART: Am I correct? Am I correct?
15	You are asking if they are the same size. Okay.
16	So the answer is either yes or no. Are they the
17	same size; yes or no?
18	MR. SMITH: They're a different size than that,
19	plenty big enough to see across the
20	VICE CHAIR HART: Okay, that's all we need. Next
21	question, please.
22	MS. MAKENTA: Okay. The application if your
23	application had been properly brought before the BZA Board,
24	your
25	VICE CHAIR HART: Can I ask actually, when you

1	are asking questions, you've stated that it was not properly
2	brought before the BZA because you've made an assumption.
3	I would ask that you, when you are asking
4	questions that you actually make them factual about what they
5	have brought forward. The BZA case has already passed.
6	We are only looking at this specific issue about
7	the
8	MS. MAKENTA: Appeal.
9	VICE CHAIR HART: The appeal appealing the
10	permit that allowed the side deck to be constructed.
11	And again, all you are focused on is the testimony
12	that they gave. Okay.
13	MS. MAKENTA: This is related to privacy.
14	VICE CHAIR HART: But the question that you gave
15	was a question on
16	MS. MAKENTA: Can I finish my question?
17	VICE CHAIR HART: Because you are asking questions
18	about an order that wasn't properly given and I am telling
19	you that that is what you stated in your question.
20	So I'm asking you to just refrain from that.
21	That's all. So if you can ask a question now, thanks.
22	MS. MAKENTA: I was asking about the modification
23	application, not the special exception.
24	VICE CHAIR HART: We could have a conversation
25	between you and I but really what we're trying to do is have

1	conversation you are asking questions of the Intervenor
2	at this point.
3	MS. MAKENTA: I'm sorry but my phrasing of a
4	question may not be perfect. I'm not a lawyer.
5	VICE CHAIR HART: It's not about being perfect
6	MS. MAKENTA: And so I would just ask that you
7	VICE CHAIR HART: It's not about being perfect.
8	I'm just
9	MS. MAKENTA: can bear with me a little bit
10	VICE CHAIR HART: I am asking
11	MS. MAKENTA: because I am trying to
12	VICE CHAIR HART: I am asking that as you are
13	asking questions to not to to make them factual.
14	MS. MAKENTA: I'm trying.
15	VICE CHAIR HART: Okay, that's it. Thank you.
16	MS. MAKENTA: Do you agree that those windows, for
17	example that you mentioned, those two windows under okay
18	that the expectation of privacy could have been evaluated
19	before the BZA under the modification any of those
20	modification or under the modification under a
21	modification?
22	VICE CHAIR HART: What do the windows again,
23	what do the windows have I know they brought them up but
24	what do the windows have to do about this deck?
25	MS. MAKENTA: He's saying that there is no
ļ	I control of the cont

1	expectation of privacy.
2	VICE CHAIR HART: The deck, though.
3	MS. MAKENTA: What I'm saying is
4	VICE CHAIR HART: That's what I'm trying to focus
5	on, the deck.
6	MS. MAKENTA: Right. They can hang over their
7	the side of their deck and look into my windows.
8	VICE CHAIR HART: Okay and so we've established
9	two things.
10	MS. MAKENTA: This is a privacy
11	VICE CHAIR HART: Excuse me. We've established
12	two things. One, that there are windows on both sides of the
13	walls. There are different sizes of the windows. That there
14	is a deck that is overseeing the court, I guess, that is
15	created there. I think we've all established all of that.
16	MS. MAKENTA: Okay.
17	VICE CHAIR HART: So I'm not looking to ask I'm
18	trying to get to the question about I don't think we need
19	to know the size of the windows. We understand that there
20	are windows. You can see out of windows.
21	MS. MAKENTA: Okay.
22	VICE CHAIR HART: So that's it. Thank you.
23	MS. MAKENTA: Okay. So, let's see.
24	You mentioned the chimney. You said that the
25	fraud is not in evidence. Is it possible that I refused
I	I

1	but the fraud is in evidence, once you mentioned the chimney,
2	because the fraud was related to a chimney application being
3	submitted in my name under my property by your clients
4	without my permission?
5	So when you say the fraud is in evidence, once you
6	mentioned the chimney. I will say that.
7	But at any rate, is it possible that I refused to
8	allow you to extend the chimney because of the fraudulent
9	application submitted by your clients? Is that even
10	possible?
11	MR. SMITH: I don't think any of that is a fair
12	characterization of anything and I think that the OAH said
13	that the DCRA properly
14	MS. MAKENTA: Thank you. Thank you, that's the
15	answer.
16	MR. SMITH: issued the permit.
17	VICE CHAIR HART: Well, actually, I'm the one
18	asking the making sure that we are in order here.
19	MS. MAKENTA: Okay, I'm sorry.
20	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you. That's okay. Thank
21	you.
22	Do you have any other questions?
23	MS. MAKENTA: I get a closing statement, correct
24	or no?
25	VICE CHAIR HART: Well we have to actually

1	MS. MAKENTA: After?
2	VICE CHAIR HART: The DCRA has to give their
3	cross-examination of the Intervenor at this time, that is,
4	if you have no other questions.
5	I'll take that as a no.
6	MS. MAKENTA: Yes, thank you. That's fine.
7	MR. TONDRO: Thank you, Vice Chair Hart. I just
8	have a couple of questions.
9	To clarify this issue with the windows, looking
10	at Attachment 36B, which shows the roof deck, just so that
11	we understand
12	MS. MAKENTA: A
13	MR. TONDRO: 36B as in boy. Right. And I'm
14	sorry, A-100 is the sheet and this is the one that shows the
15	revised plan, I believe.
16	And so I'm asking the Intervenor just to clarify
17	his answer Vice Chair Hart's question before, I believe that
18	you are discussing the windows that you are raising are
19	the two windows show on the second floor plan and the first
20	floor plan that are directly below the roof deck.
21	Is that correct?
22	MR. SMITH: That's correct.
23	MR. TONDRO: And so, therefore, the reason you are
24	bringing them up is because those windows then look have
25	the same viewpoint into the windows of the Appellant as

1	would be visible from the roof deck?
2	MR. SMITH: Actually, no. I mean they have a much
3	better view than you would ever be able to get from a roof
4	deck. And so all I was saying is that I don't think one
5	could have an expectation of privacy when you have windows
6	that look directly into your windows. So there is no
7	negative impact by having a balcony there because the privacy
8	doesn't exist.
9	MR. TONDRO: In other words because the windows
LO	on the Appellant's side, those specific windows that she has
11	are already visible through the windows on the first and
12	second floor in yours.
13	MR. SMITH: That's correct.
L4	MR. TONDRO: Thank you. That's all.
15	VICE CHAIR HART: Okay. So now that we have gone
L6	through the testimony, we are going to actually go through
L7	closing for I want to see each of you. I haven't done an
18	appeal. So, bear with me.
L9	MS. MAKENTA: I was supposed to get one last
20	question.
21	VICE CHAIR HART: I'm sorry?
22	MS. MAKENTA: The Zoning Administrator, before he
23	left, he said I got two. Is it too late?
24	VICE CHAIR HART: That's fine. That's fine.
25	Let's ask a question, please.
I	

1	MS. MAKENTA: Okay. Subtitle B, 1502.1 states
2	that penthouses, screening around unenclosed mechanical
3	equipment, rooftop platforms or swimming pools, roof decks,
4	trellises, and any guardrail on a roof shall be set back from
5	the edge upon the roof which it is located as follows: A
6	distance equal to its height from the side wall of the
7	building upon which it is located.
8	VICE CHAIR HART: And your question is what?
9	MS. MAKENTA: I'm missing part of the doggone
LO	code.
11	Why do you believe that that code does not apply
L2	to this roof deck?
13	MR. LeGRANT: As DCRA has presented its case, we
L4	do not agree that that is a roof deck subject to those
15	provisions.
L6	VICE CHAIR HART: Okay.
L7	MS. MAKENTA: That's fine for now.
L8	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you. So now we're going
L9	to go to closing and order.
20	I'm looking at I know I shouldn't be looking
21	at this. I will look at OAH OAG, excuse me I keep
22	saying that OAG in the sequence for closing.
23	MR. COHEN: That's fine. That's fine, Vice Chair.
24	The closing arguments are in the same order as
25	each of the parties presented.

Thank you. 1 VICE CHAIR HART: Oh, okay. That was 2 easy. So the Appellant is first. 3 4 MS. MAKENTA: Oh, okay. Sir, how much time do you want to allow 5 MR. MOY: for the closing? 6 7 VICE CHAIR HART: Let's put ten minutes on it. MS. MAKENTA: Ten minutes? 8 9 You want to do seven minutes? VICE CHAIR HART: 10 I don't need much time. MS. MAKENTA: 11 VICE CHAIR HART: Let's do five minutes, then. 12 MS. MAKENTA: So I guess I would just like to 13 close in saying that this has not been a cakewalk for me, by 14 It is unfortunate that I have been kind of pulled into 15 baptism by fire, having to learn as I go just to protect my I wish my property 16 property interest and property rights. 17 wasn't so unique. I mean you have no idea. This has been 18 one of the worst years of my life because of having to try 19 to just protect my interests. 2.0 And it is not my fault that the D.C. Regulations 21 force you to go in one place to dispute a building code, and 22 one place to dispute a zoning code, and another place to 23 dispute a heritage tree DDOT situation. My property is, unfortunately, extremely unique. Not many people I think are 24 25 it's not common, as common, to have a heritage tree in

your backyard, where the DDOT person said to me you know your tree is probably -- in 20 years, it's probably the second biggest tree in the backyard I've seen at any D.C. property. Oh, gosh. Why me?

These windows on the side, you know the neighbors to the south are you know living their lives and going about their lives. And I just wish I wasn't to the north you know. And so these windows, gosh, who knew a year ago that I would be here fighting for light, and air, and privacy?

And it's just -- and you know it's a nightmare for them. It's a nightmare for me as well. And you know I'm just trying to muddle along with the little resources I have and do the best that I can but it has not been easy and I resent the implication that I am somehow enjoying this or that the pain is one-sided.

This case has merit. It is not frivolous. I don't have the time or energy to deal with what I'm dealing with. But I'm to the north. I have a heritage tree. I have these 11 windows at the center of my property and I've owned the property for 15 years. I don't plan to sell it.

And so unfortunately, this is my fate. This is not something that I would ever choose for anyone.

And so I just ask that in the last hearing the BZA chairperson, when he deliberated and came back, he says oh, I feel sorry for them. And I said to myself, wow. My

2.0

property has been flooded because of their construction. My tenant has been displaced because of their construction. And so I just ask that when you all go and deliberate, that you do so without bias.

I feel that this process for me -- I'm not a government entity. I don't have the power or the name recognition of the people sitting beside me but I deserve fairness as well. And I deserve a thoughtful consideration and I deserve to be treated -- I just ask that when you go and you vote, I just hope that you will seriously weigh and consider how you would feel if this side roof deck was suddenly owned your house forever suddenly you positioned at the edge of your property, hundreds of Airbnb people can be hanging over this deck looking at down into your windows. How would you feel if you were suddenly thrust into this situation where this thing is suddenly at the edge of your property, it was never subjected to any proper -- it wasn't subjected to the proper official scrutiny by the appropriate officials, by the Office of Planning and the BZA? How would you feel if DCRA used arbitrary methods, in my opinion, and internal email and measures a ten-foot or less Why not nine feet? Why not six feet in terms of quideline? the setback?

And the idea of saying that we don't know what approved plans means, I mean that's just shocking to be

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

1 sitting here hearing that from DCRA. Not that specifically 2 -- I'm sorry but that's Exhibit 66. It's just --But at any rate, how would you feel -- before you 3 I just hope that you will imagine this happening to 4 5 Imagine yourself meeting the deadline to contest it, 6 availing yourself of your rights, and then imagine your 7 commissioners reaching an unjust conclusion or a conclusion 8 involving any level of favoritism, either to DCRA or to the Intervenors, or to an ex-BZA colleague. 9 10 Just imagine if you weren't sitting there and you 11 were sitting here. That's all I'm asking before you take a 12 vote. Yes. 13 I wish my property wasn't unique. Oh, and another thing I've had to deal with is 14 15 they sit there and they act like they are so innocent. And 16 it is so interesting to watch. I mean I had to go to the 17 City Council to have them remove a dumpster that they put in 18 front of my house instead of theirs. So --19 Objection. Again, MR. TONDRO: this 2.0 something that was --21 VICE CHAIR HART: Can we --22 MR. TONDRO: Oh, sorry. 23 VICE CHAIR HART: Can we let her finish, please? 24 So literally, the city councilwoman MS. MAKENTA: 25 emailed me to apologize because I had fought for two months,

1	can you please remove the dumpster from my house.
2	VICE CHAIR HART: I understand that these are
3	MS. MAKENTA: Okay.
4	VICE CHAIR HART: I understand that these are
5	MS. MAKENTA: I'm sorry, I'll wrap up.
6	VICE CHAIR HART: I'm just saying that
7	MS. MAKENTA: Yes.
8	VICE CHAIR HART: your five minutes is up.
9	MS. MAKENTA: So thank you for hearing me. Again,
10	my last thing is I just ask that you treat this with fairness
11	because that's not how I feel like I've been being treated
12	from when I first, unfortunately, had to start this process.
13	That's all I ask.
14	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you.
	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you. DCRA.
14	
14 15 16	DCRA.
14 15 16	DCRA. MR. TONDRO: Thank you, Vice Chair Hart, Chairman
14 15 16 17	DCRA. MR. TONDRO: Thank you, Vice Chair Hart, Chairman Hood, Board Member White.
14 15 16 17 18	DCRA. MR. TONDRO: Thank you, Vice Chair Hart, Chairman Hood, Board Member White. So I think, first of all, I want to just sort of
14 15 16 17 18	DCRA. MR. TONDRO: Thank you, Vice Chair Hart, Chairman Hood, Board Member White. So I think, first of all, I want to just sort of take a step back, remember that the issue here is an issue
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	DCRA. MR. TONDRO: Thank you, Vice Chair Hart, Chairman Hood, Board Member White. So I think, first of all, I want to just sort of take a step back, remember that the issue here is an issue of an appeal of the decision by the Zoning Administrator.
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	DCRA. MR. TONDRO: Thank you, Vice Chair Hart, Chairman Hood, Board Member White. So I think, first of all, I want to just sort of take a step back, remember that the issue here is an issue of an appeal of the decision by the Zoning Administrator. As such, it is an appeal of the decision that was made by the
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	DCRA. MR. TONDRO: Thank you, Vice Chair Hart, Chairman Hood, Board Member White. So I think, first of all, I want to just sort of take a step back, remember that the issue here is an issue of an appeal of the decision by the Zoning Administrator. As such, it is an appeal of the decision that was made by the Zoning Administrator in careful review based on his expertise
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	DCRA. MR. TONDRO: Thank you, Vice Chair Hart, Chairman Hood, Board Member White. So I think, first of all, I want to just sort of take a step back, remember that the issue here is an issue of an appeal of the decision by the Zoning Administrator. As such, it is an appeal of the decision that was made by the Zoning Administrator in careful review based on his expertise of the Zoning Regulations and interpretation. And that's the

application, where it is the applicant that has that burden of proof. But in this case, it is the Appellant who has the burden of proof.

As I said before, DCRA here believes that the ZA did not err and that the Appellant has failed to meet that burden of proof to show that he did in approving the permit.

Again, just to briefly hit the highlights again, in terms of the question of whether or not a modification was required, the ZA did not believe that it was required, that any modification under A, 304.10 was required because the summary order in BZA Application 19387 specifically stated at the bottom of page 2, in bold, in caps, subject to the approved plans at Exhibit 66. I don't think it gets clearer than that.

That was what the ZA reviewed. The ZA looked at As we stated, Exhibit 66 was in response to a Exhibit 66. change in the request, the reduction in the request for relief for that special application and, therefore, it showed the plans, the elevations and so forth that were shown at related t.hat. time to that requested area of relief. Therefore, it didn't seem like there was anything obvious that was out of place or why there was any typographical error that the ZA would have to somehow inquire about.

Again, had there been an obvious error, there was an opportunity for the parties to file a motion to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

reconsider. That did not happen, as far as I am aware.

Nonetheless, when the permit holder asked for the possibility of just doing the Belt and Suspenders approach of having also the modification in 304.10, the ZA reviewed it and went through, as you heard from Intervenor's counsel, when through the list of the various different provisions that 304.10 refers to that requires that the ZA review. nowhere, as Intervenor's counsel stated, nowhere is there an issue of privacy involved in those, unlike, for example, the modification for minor flexibility, where the ZA is able to give two percent flexibility for deviations from matter of riaht. There, there is some privacy issues that addressed but not for modifications of the Board order, provided it meets all those other criteria, including that it is consistent with the Board's order. The ZA did that.

Moving onto the subject matter, the issue of the side deck itself, again, DCRA's position is that, first and foremost of all, looking at Subtitle C, 1502, which is penthouse setbacks, the section preceding that is penthouse height. After that is penthouse area. All three of those only, therefore, we believe apply to an area that is a penthouse which is, by definition, above the permitted building envelope. In this case, you are allowed three stories, so the penthouse starts at above that third story.

Nonetheless, even if the Board were to determine

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

that they believed that that is an incorrect interpretation by the ZA, the ZA then believes that first of all, if there is a handrail that is required, that under the guidance that he provided in December, that he codified in December, that that internal guidance establishes that there is -- that for guardrails, they shouldn't apply, as long as there is a relatively limited depth of a balcony. Then, it should be treated as a balcony.

Again, as I think I had indicated before, part of that is otherwise wound up in this situation where if you were required to have a guardrail on those projecting balconies that we see all throughout the city on these new buildings that go up, and that is required to be four feet or three and a half feet tall, you would have to have the balcony itself stick out another three and a half feet beyond the guardrail, which I don't think makes any sense and doesn't seem to be reasonable in terms of the interpretation of the Zoning Commission.

But the issue in terms of that guidance document, we included it to indicate that this was not applied will-nilly. The Zoning Administrator carefully considered this, reviewed this, and then applied it consistently across all different properties.

Again, it was an internal document precisely because it was for the -- to make sure that all the zoning

2.0

reviewers used the same playbook. And if there is an opportunity, if the BZA determines that this was incorrect, somehow, the opportunity for redress is precisely as is happening right now. In other words, this is when that guidance is applied to a specific permit, then a person can appeal the permit, as is done in this case.

But finally, again, as I stated, that even if the penthouse, if the BZA disagrees with the interpretation that the penthouse does not apply to the allowed third story, that in this particular case, there does not appear to be a guardrail required by the building code, which case, the required one-to-one setback would only be based off the roof deck height itself, which would probably be minuscule, some six to maybe ten inches, depending, which would probably be encompassed by the setback from the parapet wall itself.

So for that reason, then, DCRA asserts that there is -- that the ZA correctly approved -- reviewed and approved the revised permit allowing the side deck and, therefore, that he did not err in doing so and requests, respectfully requests that the Board agree or also determine that the ZA did not err in approving the revised permit and, therefore, dismiss the appeal.

Thank you.

VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you, Mr. Tondro.

Ms. Moldenhauer or Mr. DeBear?

2.0

1 MR. DeBEAR: That would be me. I want to thank the Board for the patience today. 2 I know this has been a long day. I just want to -- I don't 3 think I need to rehash the legal argument that counsel for 4 5 DCRA just stated but I just wanted to be clear that this is 6 an issue not of a BZA approval. This is an issue of whether 7 a modification of the plans were needed and if so, out of an 8 abundance of caution, if that modification was correctly 9 granted.

This is not an issue of air, light, privacy, Airbnb. All these allegations made by the Appellant are not relevant.

This is a case of the Appellant wanting her cake and to eat it, too. The Intervenors wanted to raise the chimney. When she said no, which is her right, they said okay, we'll revise the plans. Now she challenges that revision to the plans. But the Zoning Administration correctly authorized a modification to the plans that were approved by this Board almost a year ago today.

I would just add that the Zoning Administrator is within his authority to do that and is in his authority to interpret this to be a balcony and not a penthouse.

And we would ask that the Board either grant DCRA's motion to dismiss or deny this appeal. Thank you.

VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you very much, everyone.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

And I'll speak for the Board but I will let the Board speak. I think the case -- I understand that the case has been contentious and you know it is what it is. I don't feel that I have the ability to rule on this case today and I need some time to kind of think through some of these things, some of the testimony that has been given.

And with that, Ms. Makenta, I have to say that times take exception I, at Ι to some οf the characterizations that you've made to both the BZA and about the BZA and about some of the people that are in the room. And I just don't -- it's in the -- you're looking at me It's in the testimony that you have provided quizzically. and also the document that you provided as well.

And I just find that it would be helpful to be able to understand the facts of the case. And I think that you provided a lot of information for us today. I appreciate that. But again, I think that some of the testimony, and I was talking about it a little bit earlier, we are all trying to be civil and trying to understand what each other's points are. And it is not helpful to move away from that.

And so I would just leave you with when you are providing information to and testimony to folks at a Board or OAH, or whomever else that you are moving on with, that you try to keep to the facts that are at hand because -- I understand that there a lot of emotions that come out with

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

properties and you have your perspective on things. The Applicants -- the Applicants -- the Intervenors their perspective on this. We understand that these are your homes and properties. And so I'm just making sure that you understand that.

And you may not have meant it that way but it was taken that way. So I just wanted to make sure that you were aware of that.

But again, I will let the rest of the Board speak and we can -- again, we are going to have to find out what the meeting date is going to be for this. It's not going to be next week because we actually have next week off. So at earliest -- actually it's probably not going to be in the next two weeks because we have a pretty rough schedule on the 29th. So regardless, I will open it up to my other Board members.

MEMBER WHITE: I think you covered a lot. I mean it's hard not saying something for like two hours. But in doing that, I just want to make sure you all know that I listen to every case fairly. You know I don't have any skin in the game in terms of coming to a certain resolution and I know we kind of chastised you, Ms. Makenta, a little bit. But I think you were beat up on a little bit as well and I think that comes from the whole issue of you representing yourself.

2.0

1 But regardless of that, I mean our task is really 2 to just look at the request, look at the law, look at the facts and come to a fair resolution. 3 So I'm committed to doing that for anybody that 4 comes before the BZA. You know there's no improper intent 5 6 with any of my colleagues in trying to give everybody an 7 opportunity to be heard and to come to a resolution. Ι 8 didn't realize it would take this long today. 9 have a job on a daily basis. I told them oh, I'll be 10 finished by 3:00. I lied. So, hopefully, they won't hold 11 that against me. 12 But it is definitely, just as a D.C. resident, 13 this is something that I do to give back to the community to 14 be able to utilize some of my expertise to help individuals 15 come to a resolution on these types of cases and I'll just 16 leave it at that. 17 ZC CHAIR HOOD: I want to concur with both of my 18 colleagues. Sometimes we have to be careful of what we 19 insinuate or say about Commission members or Board members. 2.0 I could tell my story of how I got here, too. 21 it wasn't because of some glorious ride down North Capitol 22 It was because of trash in my neighborhood. Street. 23 anyway that's a whole other issue. It's a whole other issue. 24 But I will say that the Appellant seems -- you

seem to me to have done your homework. I don't always agree

1	with the ZA or anybody. I don't always agree with everything
	with the ZA of anybody. I don't always agree with everything
2	you said. But I think that the vice chairman was exactly
3	correct. Some of the accusations you made, when I hear that
4	stuff but I get over that. I've been here long enough now
5	no, it's time for me to talk now. I get over that because
6	what I try to do, I think I try to get at the issue at hand.
7	And I think the vice chair summed it up the best, so I don't
8	want to extrapolate and keep going on that because when you
9	said something about our former BZA colleague, I looked down
LO	and I said now I'm probably the only one who served with Ms.
11	Moldenhauer.
12	So I started thinking well, don't take that
L3	personally because if you go back and watch some of the
L4	tapes, I will say in public to you, me and Ms. Moldenhauer
L5	went back and forth up here quite a bit. So you know and
L6	that's just the way it is. That's the process. I don't
L7	always agree with the ZA.
L8	But let me get back to the let me get focus
L9	back to the issue at hand. Mr. LeGrant, this interpretation
20	that I saw, have you exercised that previously?
21	MR. LeGRANT: Yes, I have.
22	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Let me ask you do you think
23	it needs to be would it be to the point that we need to
24	memorialize it in the Zoning Regulations?
	Imemorrantiae to the donting regulactions.

MR. LeGRANT:

25

I always believe that when I issued

guidance that it may be questioned, that to codify it in the Zoning Regulations is certainly a good idea. And the Commission, itself, can look at that guidance and see if it is something that is consistent with their intent, change it if they wish, or codify it as is.

ZC CHAIR HOOD: So maybe that's something that we need to make sure that we put on our laundry list of things. I'm not going to say it's a corrective measure because I'm not sure what my colleagues have. But I want to make things more predictable. So anything to make it easier on the residents of this city, I think that we should be able to look at that.

So let's make sure between the two of us or all of us, Mr. Tondro, all of us, make sure that we get it on our list, our laundry list of things -- I'm not going to say correct -- things to look at and try to make them more efficient and effective for residents of this city.

But I associate myself with the vice chair and I hope that Appellant doesn't think that nobody's beating up on her. I think she has done her homework, whether we agree with her or not, and I'm going to be looking at her testimony and her presentation to us because I think she's done a lot of leg work and my hat is off to you. So I wanted to make sure you knew that.

Thank you, Mr. Vice Chair.

2.0

1	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you. So I think we'll
2	actually look to Mr. Moy, our secretary, to
3	MS. MAKENTA: Can I just apologize?
4	VICE CHAIR HART: It's just
5	MS. MAKENTA: I wasn't talking about you all.
6	I've had to deal with many government officials. I wasn't
7	talking about
8	VICE CHAIR HART: That's fine. It's fine.
9	MS. MAKENTA: I'm sorry.
10	VICE CHAIR HART: What I was trying to let you
11	understand that it was not just us. There were other
12	accusations and other information that is or ways in which
13	situations were described and things. And again, I don't
14	need to get into it but I'm just letting you know that words
15	matter, which is why we read through this.
16	Anyhow, so Mr. Moy, we are probably looking at the
17	beginning of December.
18	MR. MOY: Yes, sir. I think I heard you say that
19	the Board would need approximately two weeks. And if it is
20	for a decision meeting
21	VICE CHAIR HART: Yes.
22	MR. MOY: then two weeks would set you for a
23	decision on December 6th.
24	VICE CHAIR HART: Yes.
25	MR. MOY: If you go to the next hearing, the next

1	date would be December 13th.
2	VICE CHAIR HART: I think the December 6th is
3	enough time. They're not asking for anything else.
4	MS. MOLDENHAUER: Chairman Hart, can I just point
5	out that on December 6th, we're supposed to
6	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Let me just say this. I actually
7	would like to be here for this case, Mr. Chair.
8	VICE CHAIR HART: Okay.
9	ZC CHAIR HOOD: And I know nobody wants to put it
10	off a long time but I won't be back until the 20th.
11	VICE CHAIR HART: Oh, that's I forgot.
12	ZC CHAIR HOOD: So and I won't be here. I know
13	nobody wants to put it off but I'm not going to make it back
14	on the 6th, unless you all just want me to send me a proxy.
15	And I think this is significant enough for me to be able to
16	be here and deliberate.
17	VICE CHAIR HART: I apologize. I forgot that you
18	were not going to
19	ZC CHAIR HOOD: That's all right, I'm used to it.
20	VICE CHAIR HART: No, I'm glad you brought it up.
21	I was thinking that you were part of us. You're always here,
22	Mr. Hood.
23	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Thank you, Mr. Vice Chair because
24	the chair doesn't think that. Thank you very much.
25	VICE CHAIR HART: So Mr Moy it looks like maybe

1	the 20th that we're looking at. So December
2	MS. MOLDENHAUER: And all of the parties here
3	would actually have to be at the Office of Administrative
4	Hearings on the 6th anyway.
5	VICE CHAIR HART: Okay, so that's out.
6	MS. MOLDENHAUER: So that actually wouldn't work.
7	VICE CHAIR HART: Okay. Listen, I appreciate it.
8	So I think the 20th is going to be so we are going to be
9	coming back on the 20th for actually, you don't have to
10	be here. You can be here if you would like but we will have
11	this for excuse me.
12	If I didn't say, the hearing is closed for this
13	particular case and we will have this as a public meeting for
14	a decision on the December 20th.
15	So thank you all very much. Have a good evening.
16	Enjoy dinner.
17	Folks, sorry for the I know it's been a long
18	day for you all. I appreciate you all staying, those that
19	are in the audience.
20	So we have the agenda that is on the that is
21	in the bin to the back of the room. And we have we are
22	going to be going down the list of cases as they are set on
23	the agenda, starting with 19564 of Tammika Thompson.
24	But I wanted to ask if there were anyone that
25	needed to leave and needed to leave because there is a prior

1	commitment, if you could talk to the secretary because we're
2	trying to make sure that we can kind of hear things.
3	If there is nothing if there is no objection,
4	we would like to just move through the rest of the agenda but
5	I wanted to give at least some of you an opportunity to state
6	your case.
7	You have to come to the mike. And if you're
8	talking about the agenda, you can ask
9	PARTICIPANT: There was someone that came and he
10	had to leave. Is there a way that he can have something
11	read? I don't know how that works.
12	VICE CHAIR HART: I mean the only way that you can
13	you can add in the question was around well as long
14	as it's submitted testimony, that's fine for us. It's in the
15	record.
16	So, Mr. Moy?
17	MR. MOY: I'm sorry. Where were we?
18	VICE CHAIR HART: No, I just wanted to know.
19	There was a question about someone had to leave that gave
20	testimony that wanted to give testimony. The actually did
21	provide written testimony. So I think we have that in the
22	record. I'm not sure which case it was but as long as they
23	provided it, that'll work for us.
24	And I didn't know if you had any other changes
25	that you wanted me to be aware of.
l	

1	MR. MOY: No. I think if it is who I think it is,
2	they would be able to hand that in when the case is called
3	and then we would put that into the record.
4	VICE CHAIR HART: Sorry, folks. Could you bear
5	with me for just a minute more?
6	Okay, Mr. Moy, if we could move to the next case.
7	And we did make a change and that's 19605, if you could call
8	that case, please.
9	MR. MOY: Yes, sir, thank you. So if I could have
10	to the table the parties to Application 19605 of 1331 Taylor
11	Street, LLC. As captioned and advertised for special
12	exception relief under the Residential Conversion Regulations
13	of Subtitle U, Section 320.2. This would convert a one-
14	family dwelling into a three-unit apartment house in the RF-1
15	zone. This is the premises at 1331 Taylor Street, Northwest,
16	Square 2822, Lot 15.
17	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you, Mr. Moy.
18	Good evening or good afternoon. So, if you could,
19	please introduce yourselves.
20	MR. CHARLES: Reuben Charles and I'm with the
21	developer group. And address, I think, was the other thing
22	you needed?
23	VICE CHAIR HART: Yes, please.
24	MR. CHARLES: I live at 5100 Tilden Street,
25	Northwest, Washington, D.C.

1	MS. WALLER: And my name is Rose Waller of
2	MotleyWaller. I represent the applicants.
3	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you. And Ms. Waller, are
4	you going to be giving us the presentation? I mean it's a
5	presentation are you going to be speaking for us? I don't
6	know which
7	MS. WALLER: Yes.
8	VICE CHAIR HART: That's fine. And you may begin.
9	MS. WALLER: Okay. Well
10	VICE CHAIR HART: Just all we're looking for is
11	just explaining your just a brief explanation of the
12	project that you have submitted to us. That's what we're
13	looking for. It doesn't have to be long.
14	MS. WALLER: Okay. No, we my the Applicants
15	have a single-dwelling unit at 1331 Taylor Street, Northwest,
16	that they would like to it's a two-unit building that they
17	would like to add an additional unit.
18	So we are asking for special exception relief to
19	add an additional unit.
20	VICE CHAIR HART: Okay. And is that it?
21	MS. WALLER: Yes.
22	VICE CHAIR HART: Okay, I didn't know if the Board
23	had any questions for this applicant.
24	MEMBER WHITE: I would just ask, you are asking
25	for special exception, if you could just kind of maybe give

an overview of why you believe you meet the criteria in order 1 2 to get a special exception relief. You know there is a 3 specific regulation that covers it. Is there something outside of the 4 MS. WALLER: application that you are looking for in particular? 5 6 MEMBER WHITE: Well just the criteria in terms of 7 -- let me just look at -- what's the case number for this 8 one? 9 So this is a special exception for a residential 10 conversion under Subtitle U, Section 320.2. I can see that 11 you have got no report for the ANC. DDOT doesn't seem to 12 have an objection. We will, obviously, listen OP's 13 feedback as well. But in terms of the relief under that particular 14 15 section, I didn't know if you had any supporting information 16 about why this conversion would be in the best interests of 17 the community, why it meets the criteria, or any feedback with respect to that. 18 19 don't see that you have any letters 2.0 opposition. So, I don't have any severe concerns about the 21 relief you are asking for. 22 Okay. The addition of a third unit MS. WALLER: 2.3 does not impact the light and air available to neighboring 24 properties. It does not infringe on the privacy of use and 25 enjoyment of neighboring properties and does not intrude upon

т	line character of the heighboring properties.
2	VICE CHAIR HART: And did you say you went to the
3	do you all go to the ANC 4C or can you just describe what
4	the interaction has been with the ANC?
5	MS. WALLER: Okay. Our first contact with the ANC
6	was on June 14th of this year. We requested a meeting to
7	present our plans for this project. We have met with a
8	Single Member District of the ANC with some of the neighbors
9	and we have also been in contact with some of the neighbors
LO	of the some of the adjoining neighbors of the property.
11	And of course, you have two letters of support and
12	Mr. Charles can talk more to his interactions with the
13	neighbors.
L4	Between June 14th of this year and October 27th,
15	I made several attempts to schedule a meeting before the ANC
L6	and I actually have copies of email correspondence between
L7	myself and Mr. Zach Teutsch, who is the Single Member
18	District person, who is also the chairperson of the ANC for
L9	4.
20	VICE CHAIR HART: Is that in the record, the
21	email?
22	MS. WALLER: No. No, it's not.
23	VICE CHAIR HART: Would you
24	MS. WALLER: But I do have copies.
25	VICE CHAIR HART: Can you oh. I was going to

tell you to give them -- Mr. Moy is over there.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

If you could give copies, I think it would be helpful to have that just in the record so that we understand kind of why there isn't an ANC report. I don't think it's a deal breaker but I think it is helpful to at least understand it.

MR. CHARLES: While counsel is doing that, we met on two or three occasions with the neighbors. On the first occasion we met with the ANC, had three or four of the neighbors come by, state whatever concerns they had. There was a development on the same street, in fact, two or three houses down, I think it's 1326, that was done about two or three years ago.

So we had the neighbors adjoining that property and again, two or three other neighbors coming just to express whatever concerns they had about what we attempting to do or proposing to do. They went through the They raised questions about underpinning. desian. Thev raised questions about the design of the fence of the rear yard, some building materials. We just addressed whatever concerns thev had and have since been in regular conversations with the two adjoining neighbors. And to date, I think have received their support beyond the actual letters they provided.

But we are extremely communicative. They all have

1	my telephone numbers and we gave that to the three neighbors
2	on either side so if any of them had questions, they could
3	reach us at any time.
4	So I think we have done everything within our
5	power to be available and supportive.
6	VICE CHAIR HART: I appreciate it.
7	MR. CHARLES: Sure.
8	VICE CHAIR HART: Do the Board members have any
9	other questions for the applicant?
10	(No audible response.)
11	VICE CHAIR HART: Hearing none, let's go to the
12	Office of Planning. Mr. Golden.
13	MR. GOLDEN: Good evening, Mr. Vice Chair and
14	members of the Board.
15	The Office of Planning is recommending approval
16	for this special exception relief. And I will go ahead and
17	rest on the report in the record but I am available for any
18	questions, if you have any.
19	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you, Mr. Golden.
20	Any questions for the Office of Planning?
21	(No audible response.)
22	VICE CHAIR HART: Hearing none, thank you.
23	Okay, so next we will move to hear if the ANC is
24	actually here for the case.
25	Is there anyone in opposition to the case?

1	Anyone in support of the case, please come
2	forward.
3	Okay, no one has come forward. So back to the
4	Applicant. Do you have any closing comments that you would
5	like to make?
6	MS. WALLER: No.
7	MR. CHARLES: No, but we intend to do everything
8	we told the neighbors we will do and be consistent in our
9	interactions with them throughout the process, as we have
10	been over the last three to four months.
11	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you. Board members, do
12	you have any other questions for the Applicant?
13	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Mr. Chairman, no I don't have any
14	questions. I'm ready to put a motion. I think the record
15	is complete. As stated, I think our reach out to the ANC 4C
16	has been provided and no response may have been whatever
17	the case it may have been but I know this ANC is definitely
18	responsive.
19	And with that, I would move that we approve BZA
20	Case 19605 request for special exception relief pursuant to
21	Subtitle U, 5201.1 from U, 320.2 to allow for a three-unit
22	apartment building. And I would ask for a second.
23	VICE CHAIR HART: Seconded.
24	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Oh, you have got to carry the
25	motion.

	230
1	VICE CHAIR HART: I know. It kind of dies hard,
2	doesn't it?
3	All in favor of the motion, say aye.
4	(Chorus of aye.)
5	VICE CHAIR HART: Any opposed?
6	(No audible response.)
7	The motion carries.
8	MR. MOY: The staff would record the vote as three
9	to zero to one or rather three to zero to two. This is
10	on the motion of Mr. Anthony Hood to approve the application
11	for the relief requested, a second of the motion by Vice
12	Chair Hart; also in support, Ms. May. We have a member not
13	participating, a seat vacant. The motion carries.
14	VICE CHAIR HART: Summary order, Mr. Moy.
15	MR. MOY: Thank you.
16	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you.
17	Mr. Moy, the next case, if you would.
18	MR. MOY: Yes. So if we can have parties to the
19	table to Application 19564 of Tammika Thompson. The
20	application, as amended, for a special exception from the
21	residential conversion requirements of Subtitle U, Section
22	320.2, including waivers in the rear addition requirement of
23	Subtitle U, Section 320.2(e) and the chimney requirements of
24	Subtitle U, Section 302.2(f).
25	This would convert an existing one-family dwelling

1	into a three-unit apartment house with a rear addition in the
2	RF-1 zone at premises 428 Randolph Street, Northwest, Square
3	3236, Lot 69.
4	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you, Mr. Moy.
5	Good afternoon. Could you please introduce
6	yourselves and if you give your name and your address?
7	MR. GOODMAN: Sure. Jonah Goodman representing
8	ANC 4C.
9	VICE CHAIR HART: I'm sorry?
10	MR. GOODMAN: Jonah Goodman.
11	VICE CHAIR HART: Jonah, thank you. I'm sorry.
12	It's been a little long day. So I apologize.
13	MR. CROSS: Michael Cross, architect, 2001 S
14	Street, Northwest.
15	MS. BACHER: I'm Emily Bacher also with the
16	architect's office, 2001 S Street, Northwest.
17	VICE CHAIR HART: Okay. So we will have a
18	presentation and you can begin whenever you'd like.
19	MS. BACHER: Thank you, Chairman Hart.
20	So we are here with R. Michael Cross Design Group
21	representing the client, our clients Tammika Thompson and her
22	husband, Brian Young. As stated, we are looking for relief
23	under U, 320.2 converting a single-family row home into a
24	three-unit condo. And
25	VICE CHAIR HART: I'm sorry, I need to do this and

1 I apologize. I want to make sure that -- have all of you 2 been sworn in? 3 MS. BACHER: Yes. I kind of figured you had but 4 VICE CHAIR HART: I just wanted to double-check. Thank you. You may continue. 5 We've all been here since 9:30. 6 MS. BACHER: 7 I thought as much but, again, VICE CHAIR HART: 8 like I said, it's been a long day. So you may continue. I hear you. 9 MS. BACHER: Thank you. 10 So we are largely conforming to the requirements There is a little bit of confusion as to 11 of that section. 12 whether or not -- what we're seeking to waive. We are 13 looking actually only to waive the ten-foot addition 14 requirement. 15 The chimney, we had had some back and forth with the Office of Planning on the chimney issue and we were able 16 17 to get a signed letter of approval to extend the neighbor's 18 So we are not seeking to waive the chimney chimney. 19 requirement. We will be conforming with that. So it is only 2.0 the ten-foot addition we are looking to waive. 21 So we represent Tammika, as I stated before, 22 Tammika and her husband, Brian. They have lived in this 23 house for 13 years and they are looking to develop their own 24 accommodate their unique family property in order to

There are the two of them and they have three

situation.

school-aged children. One of their children is anticipated to need to live either at or near home as an adult. Ideally, in an additional unit next to, within their own building property. So that's where they are looking for a full family-sized unit to accommodate themselves, another unit to accommodate their son as an adult, and then a third family-sized unit to help finance the construction of this project to make it a feasible construction for them.

They are looking to waive the ten-foot addition so that they can produce units that are large enough to accommodate their family, as well as other families, which was a concern voiced by the neighborhood. And we've worked with them to make sure to step back the development so that it doesn't extend -- so that the impact of the extension is as minimal as possible.

The actual addition is 31 feet at the cellar level but above the cellar level it is a 19 foot addition. So there is a stepping back that happens, as you go up on the property and that allows a little bit more light in there, as was discussed as well in the Office of Planning Report.

So we were able -- and we really thank the Office of Planning for their report in support of our application. We were unable to come to an agreement with the ANC commissioners as regards to this project. We do, however, have 27 signed letters of support from neighbors within the

2.0

1	ANC district and within the 200-foot radius of the property,
2	including a non-opposition letter from the adjacent property
3	owner.
4	And I think that's you know a pretty good summary
5	of where we're at. We're happy to answer any questions. We
6	appreciate all of your time today and can fill in any blanks
7	that you might have.
8	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you, Ms. Bacher. I wrote
9	it down and I wasn't sure if I was pronouncing correctly.
10	MS. BACHER: Yes, that's correct. Thank you.
11	VICE CHAIR HART: So I did have a question. You
12	just stated that you have a you said non-opposition letter
13	from one of the neighbors?
14	MS. BACHER: Yes, that's correct, one of the
15	adjacent neighbors. So like the next-door neighbor.
16	VICE CHAIR HART: Yes, I was just trying to
17	understand. So what about the neighbor?
18	MS. BACHER: The other neighbor we have been in
19	contact with but we haven't been able to get anything from
20	them.
21	MR. CROSS: Both neighbors are developers. The
22	one that we do not have is actually an out-of-state owner.
23	We have been in touch with his architect expediter and Tim,
24	himself. Unfortunately, the conference call that we arranged
25	with him he did not join. We haven't been able to catch up

1	with him to get a signature or discuss the project.
2	VICE CHAIR HART: So the neighboring properties
3	are owned by developers?
4	MR. CROSS: Both immediate neighbors are owned by
5	developers. They are not occupied.
6	VICE CHAIR HART: So they are unoccupied. Okay,
7	thank you. I was trying to understand if you were saying
8	they were occupied by the developer but you're just saying
9	they are owned by it.
LO	And can you talk about the ANC vote I mean they
11	were pretty close and that kind of process a little bit
L2	more? The vote was, if I am reading this correctly, four to
13	three to one. Is that right?
L4	MR. CROSS: Maybe we can let the
L5	VICE CHAIR HART: I know, I just I'll hear from
L6	the ANC.
L7	MR. CROSS: But yes, our experience was that we
L8	did present to them. We ended up postponing so that we could
L9	have more interaction with the community. Our clients was
20	able to work directly with dozens of his neighbors there.
21	We were unable to get some sort of other forum to round up
22	some of the folks any of the folks that had stated some
23	sort of opposition off the record.
24	But yes, we did present to the ANC. There was
25	only one person present that spoke with any opposition.

1 VICE CHAIR HART: And the opposition not from the 2 ANC but from the neighbors, can you characterize that? Is it -- how would you characterize it? 3 4 MS. BACHER: So we only -- well we actually only have one letter of opposition that we have. 5 And so that's 6 the only one that we can speak to but I'm sure Jonah would 7 be happy to talk about the other concerns that the neighbors 8 that he spoke with had. But I can speak to that specific 9 opposition letter, if you would like. 10 VICE CHAIR HART: Yes, please. 11 MS. BACHER: So they made three points in that 12 opposition letter. Their concerns were -- they are not an 13 adjacent neighbor but their concerns were light and air. 14 They were concerned about the issues of flooding 15 and sort of storm water management and they were concerned 16 about the neighborhood moving away from family-sized --17 family units that can accommodate families to just kind of 18 one-bedroom condos. 19 So in regards to that, with regards to the light 2.0 and air, our addition, as I stated earlier, steps back. 21 that does help with the light and air. These lots are very 22 So despite the addition, there is still a 57-foot rear 23 yard from even the farthest part of our addition. 24 And on top of that, these are all -- the rear

yards on this side of the street face the south, so there is

So the impact 1 a lot of sunlight that comes into them as is. 2 would be -- there will be an impact but it won't be quite as bad as I think some people would imagine. 3 4 In regards to storm water, you know D.C. has very stringent requirements for green. As you are aware, in this 5 6 zone, it is a 20 percent pervious area -- permeable area 7 The building as drawn -- the construction as requirement. 8 drawn shows a 35 percent permeable area. So it is well above 9 what D.C.'s already stringent requirements are. 10 And with regards to the family housing situation, 11 we went through a process of making sure that the units were 12 able to accommodate families. Actually, the existing house, 13 as it is, only has two legal bedrooms and one bathroom. 14 are proposing three units, two that are three-bedroom, and 15 one that is two-bedroom plus a den. 16 VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you. Do my other fellow 17 Board members have any questions? 18 MEMBER WHITE: Yes, my only question -- I'm 19 looking at the last exhibit on the list. It's an ANC letter. 2.0 They expressed some concerns about -- well Do you see that? 21 they asked that the Applicant agree to a number of requests. 22 I don't know if you saw them. 23 Oh, the ANC letter that has the four MS. BACHER: 24 requests at the back end?

MEMBER WHITE:

25

Yes, can you speak to those?

1 MS. BACHER: Yes, I can speak, I believe so. MEMBER WHITE: 2 You thought I was talking about 3 something new, huh? 4 MS. BACHER: I just didn't know. I just want to 5 make sure we're on the same page. 6 Yes, I got you. MEMBER WHITE: 7 I have that letter right here. MS. BACHER: So 8 let me look at it so I make sure that I have it. 9 MEMBER WHITE: Okay. 10 MS. BACHER: That's not it. No, I got it. 11 The one it's got pest abatement, stairwell access, 12 is that the one? Okay. 13 So in terms of what we've got here, we have for 14 pest abatement, we have no problem doing that. The stairwell 15 access we might need to discuss with Jonah a little bit. Ι 16 thought we had come to an agreement on that, that we were 17 providing two parking spaces in the rear of the property and, 18 therefore, they were willing to waive that. But I'm not sure 19 why that is not in the letter so I might be incorrect about 2.0 where we landed on that. 21 We can certainly -- and then with regards to lead 22 that is also something that would be absolutely 23 I mean these are -- like the pest abatement, water, doable. 24 is stuff I mean we recommend our clients do as a matter of

like just we don't even -- it's not even a question.

1	The only we would be willing I think our
2	client would be willing to work on the stairwell access. I
3	think there was a little bit of confusion about where we
4	landed on that with the ANC but maybe I'm sure Jonah can
5	clarify.
6	VICE CHAIR HART: Mr. Hood, do you have any
7	questions?
8	ZC CHAIR HOOD: I was just looking it over but
9	I'll wait until we get to the ANC. I have more questions
10	about their letters than anything.
11	VICE CHAIR HART: Then I think we can move to the
12	Office of Planning. Mr. Mordfin.
13	MR. MORDFIN: Good evening, Chair and Members of
14	the Commission of the Board. I'm Stephen Mordfin and the
15	Office of Planning supports this application.
16	The Applicant is requesting one waiver, at this
17	point, the waiver, as the Applicant indicated, for blocking
18	or impeding the function of the chimney has been addressed.
19	So that is no longer an issue. And they are just requesting
20	the one waiver, which is to increase the length of the
21	addition beyond ten feet to 31 feet.
22	As the Applicant indicated, most of the addition
23	will be 19 feet just on the basement level. And then also
24	the other thing has to do with the size of these lots, which
25	lare deen lots. And what that does is that changes the way

the addition will affect the neighboring properties because 1 2 you still have a significant rear yard. In addition, oftentimes we check and we contact --3 4 we see if there are any comments from the adjoining property In this case, it is rather unusual but both of them 5 6 are vacant. There is nobody living in them. So there is 7 nobody to comment on it because there are no residents there. 8 And we also requested that the Applicant provide 9 some kind of siding on the side of the addition so it wasn't 10 just plain solid, I don't know, material but to try and make 11 it a little bit more interesting to look at for the people who will live up and down that side of the block to see, to 12 13 make it more interesting. And the Applicant did comply with 14 that and submitted additional drawings. 15 So in light of that, and that also it is in conformance with all of the other criteria for the granting 16 17 of the special exception. So in light of that, the Office 18 of Planning recommends approval of this application. 19 Thank you. 2.0 Thank you, Mr. Mordfin. VICE CHAIR HART: 21 Do the Board members have any questions for the 22 Office of Planning? 23 I know I have a question. Mr. Mordfin, I know 24 this may be putting you on the spot but I need to understand 25 something in the exhibits. The ANC raised a question about

another case and I don't know if you are aware of the ANC report and that case that they referenced. And, if you could, speak to that.

The question that they are raising is, again, each one of the -- each of the BZA cases are reviewed on their own merit but the ANC is noting that there is a similar case on the same street and, in that case, the Office of Planning had not recommended that particular case, the addition in that case.

And I think it would be helpful for us to kind of understand where that -- the differences that we're talking about here so that we can look at this on its own merits but understand just in the fuller context.

And I'm assuming you understand which case I am speaking of.

MR. MORDFIN: Yes.

VICE CHAIR HART: Okay, thank you.

MR. MORDFIN: I think some of the difference in this case is we also look at the adjoining neighbors, which in this case, there weren't any. There was nobody that was going to be impacted to be able for us to have any discussions with or to read any submittals from them about how they thought this was going to adversely impact them because the entire time that this case has been going through, they have been vacant.

2.0

1	Another thing I think has to do I think because
2	of the way this one steps back, I think it does make it
3	different. Although the basement does go out 31 feet, I
4	think it makes a difference. The 19 feet is much less. And
5	for most of it, that's what will appear as you go up and down
6	the alley. The basement will stick out but the rest of the
7	floor, the main floor, which goes out to the front, will be
8	above that 31-foot extension. And I think the way with the
9	deep lot and the 19-foot I think it makes a difference
10	just in this specific case, with the way it appears.
11	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you. I do appreciate
12	that. That's helpful to understand this in its context.
13	Do the other commissioners Board members have
14	any questions?
15	Does the Applicant have any questions for the
16	Office of Planning?
17	MS. BACHER: I really I have another example
18	of why this case is different from that BZA case, that other
19	BZA case. I can say that now or later.
20	VICE CHAIR HART: Sure. It's related. So, why
21	not?
22	MS. BACHER: Yes. So all the points that Mr.
23	Mordfin brought up are very good and relevant. I'd also like
24	to add that that, I believe, is on Varnum Street. And in
25	that case, the yards are on the north sides of the buildings

1	so they already have a very limited light supply. So
2	restricting it even more would have been detrimental.
3	Again, in our case, the yards are on the south
4	sides of the buildings and, consequently, there is a lot more
5	sunlight. And both yards on either side will still be
6	getting sunlight for most of the day.
7	VICE CHAIR HART: I appreciate that. Thank you
8	very much.
9	No other questions for the Office of Planning.
10	Okay, we will now go to the ANC. Mr. Goodman,
11	welcome. Thank you for waiting patiently.
12	MR. GOODMAN: Sure. So just a couple of
13	clarifications. I wrote the letter, so my apologies. It is
14	incorrect. We can remove the roof deck stairwell. We have
15	already addressed that and come to an agreement. So one of
16	the four stipulations in the bottom of the letter, that
17	should have been removed. My apologies.
18	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you very much. Can I ask
19	the OAG a question about this?
20	The ANC has approved a they have provided us
21	with some conditions and one of those conditions is something
22	that they no longer want to include. Do we just strike that?
23	Do we have to have another ANC report or what?
24	MR. COHEN: The ANC no longer wants to include
25	that condition or the Applicant does not?

1	VICE CHAIR HART: Neither one.
2	MR. COHEN: Well then the Board
3	VICE CHAIR HART: And they have just stated the
4	ANC has just stated that they are not wanting to include
5	that.
6	MR. COHEN: Sure. The Board would just not
7	include that as a condition in the order.
8	VICE CHAIR HART: That's fine. I just wanted to
9	make sure that there was nothing that we needed to do other
10	than that.
11	MR. COHEN: No, if the record reflects that
12	VICE CHAIR HART: Okay.
13	MR. COHEN: if that's the case, I think it's
14	okay.
15	VICE CHAIR HART: Yes, I mean it is the exhibit
16	includes it and
17	MR. COHEN: Sure.
18	VICE CHAIR HART: I just wanted to make sure
19	that someone is not going to ask well, why is that not in
20	there.
21	MR. COHEN: Sure, I understand.
22	VICE CHAIR HART: There was a reason for that.
23	MR. COHEN: Okay.
24	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you very much, Mr. Cohen.
25	MR. COHEN: Yes, sure.

1 VICE CHAIR HART: You can continue. for 2 MR. GOODMAN: Sure. So additional clarification, this ANC has taken two votes on this case. 3 4 The September 1, which you have noted, which was a four to 5 three to one vote, the three, and I can't speak for all 6 three, but the question was they were looking to get more 7 time to allow the Applicant to work with the neighborhood. 8 The Applicant had turned down several asks to have community 9 meetings. 10 The next ANC meeting was not going to be before the BZA hearing before we asked for a postponement. 11 12 had to take a vote on it but several members wanted to 13 essentially postpone it before we could ensure that we got 14 a postponement. So that was the concern there. 15 In the November meeting, we came back and we 16 amended the document and we re-voted on it. We are a ten-17 person commission. Only six were present at this meeting it 18 was a five to one vote. Two of the three people that opposed 19 on the first vote supported this second one. So nine of the 2.0 ten commissioners have gone on the record, I believe at this 21 point, to oppose both special exceptions of this case. 22 Let me go through. So the ANC has heard from 23 about 15 --24 ZC CHAIR HOOD: Can I just ask you a clarifying

question because I'm still not --

1	MR. GOODMAN: Yes.
2	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Okay. So it was four, three, to
3	one
4	MR. GOODMAN: Yes.
5	ZC CHAIR HOOD: the first time you all took the
6	vote. And you did that to get more well, you had more
7	time to work with the applicant and try to bridge some of the
8	gaps, right?
9	MR. GOODMAN: We had to weigh in in order to be
10	available for this meeting. Before we knew we were going to
11	postpone, we agreed with the Applicant to postpone after that
12	ANC meeting but we wanted to take a vote because our next
13	public meeting would have been after the BZA hearing. So we
14	wanted to weigh in.
15	ZC CHAIR HOOD: So to postpone the vote, that was
16	unanimous?
17	MR. GOODMAN: Yes.
18	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Okay. So the next vote when you
19	all were supposed to work together, it seems like some people
20	switched sides. And I think you mentioned that but it kind
21	of went past me because the vote was five-zero-one, I
22	believe.
23	MR. GOODMAN: Five-one-zero.
24	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Five-one-zero, okay.
25	MR. GOODMAN: Correct.

1	ZC CHAIR HOOD: I'm trying to go off the top of
2	my head.
3	So with the five-one-zero vote, what happened,
4	some people switched?
5	MR. GOODMAN: In the first vote, two of the four
6	people who voted in favor of opposition were not present for
7	the second vote at the meeting. Two
8	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Okay, additional people came.
9	MR. GOODMAN: Additional people came on. Two of
10	the people that voted against opposing in September are now
11	supporting opposing this. So in total, I believe there are
12	nine commissioners that are now supporting either in the
13	September motion or the November motion to oppose this of the
14	ten of us.
15	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Okay.
16	MR. GOODMAN: I mean I just want to clarify. It
17	seems like it's a close vote but I believe about nine out of
18	ten are actually standing in opposition to this.
19	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Okay. So let me ask you another
20	question. In the opposition, whose single member is this
21	your Single Member District?
22	MR. GOODMAN: This is mine, yes.
23	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Okay. All right, thank you.
24	MR. GOODMAN: Sure.
25	VICE CHAIR HART: You may continue.

MR. GOODMAN: Yes, so ANC has heard from about 15 neighbors who oppose this project. I understand not many of them have filed opposition letters with the BZA. The ANC doesn't actively solicit letters in support or in opposition to projects that come before.

The ANC also recognizes that the Applicant has gained letters of support from I think we have now said 27 residents. Several of them we're just noting are outside of the 200-foot notice area. They are still residents in this area but they are beyond that and at least one house, it is our understanding that it is an Airbnb resident and not residents of D.C. This was a case that came up in a previous case I was working with you that went into, I believe, testimony on that.

So I'm not protesting it. I believe they have about 20 that the ANC is agreeing with that are in support of this. And then we believe there is an additional about 15 who have come to the ANC for opposition but I believe only one actually filed opposition directly with the BZA.

So just in terms of where the awareness of and how we voted on it.

I basically have three reasons that the ANC has been opposed to this. As we discussed this in two cases just this morning, there was this whole question that came up about a ten-foot extension and what is really the regulations

2.0

wanting. And in very explicit cases, the Board talked about a 30-foot extension and whether that was in the spirit of this ten-foot by right allowance. And you very explicitly said that ten feet is kind of a starting point, that there needs to be 11, 12, 13 feet to fit whatever conditions require, that that is essentially allowable and permissible. But the Board made a very clear distinction between what a 30-foot extension is, and what a 10-foot or 10 to 13 area foot extension is.

So given that, and given that the ANC looks at these regulations and says that by right is ten, we feel that 30 is excessive. The ANC has gone to the Applicant and made a compromise that we would support the three-unit exception if they came back to ten feet by right and the Applicant has turned us down.

The second point is if the BZA wants to encourage Applicants to work with community, I don't think this is the case to grant that Applicant their special exception. I have been with you before, a previous case in August, where the Applicant spent about five months with community meetings, getting neighborhood support, reinforcing the square, doing additions to the alley. This project is directly behind this house. The Board made special notice to say how excited they were to see that community involvement and that's what BZA cases and ANC should be.

2.0

In this case, the ANC has asked the Applicant, when this first was filed, to hold community meetings and the ANC was denied several times and they refused to hold meetings.

They eventually came around to it and they have done tremendous work doing footwork getting these letters. But it's been a very problematic case to the point that at the last meeting, the Applicant directly verbally threatened me and I had to be escorted from the meeting by fellow commissioners and driven away from the library.

It's a challenging, challenging case with them in that there is tremendously strained relations and lack of involvement with the Applicant in terms with working with ANC or the community.

The last third point here is that this is, while the case that I mentioned earlier on Varnum is four blocks away, I can stand on 4th Street and see this house and I can look up the hill and see the intersection where Varnum is. This is a contiguous RF-1 zone. These are the same houses built at all the same time. And while each case, I agree, is a unique case, this is an almost identical lot size, midblock, not on an alley, not on a corner, northwest facing, very deep lot, where OP and BZA has denied a 27-foot extension and this case is looking at a 31-foot extension. And yes, the sun does rise and set in the more southerly side

2.0

but almost all the other details of that case are nearly identical.

In that case, the Office of Planning went on the record in the transcript for that case saying that a three-story unit and 20 feet does impact the neighborhood, quote. You know I think it has privacy implications. There is now a rooftop deck. There is a stairwell that goes to the first and second level.

And you know this creates a large plank wall. I understand that they are introducing green space on the side but it introduces a large plank wall that is going up against adjoining properties.

In that same case, same transcript on that record, the chairperson of this BZA stated it is kind of the pop-back that I am having the issue with. I wish I could just say okay, that's great but, again, we have gone through this so many times with the ten feet and that's what the Zoning Commission got to, which is, that you can go back ten feet from the existing property line and you guys, in this case, are trying to go back 20 feet.

Those are two reasons why we opposed -- I said 27. They actually amended it to 17 and the 17 was objected to in this case. Yes, we are looking at 31-foot rear addition. And while the second floor and third floor may pop back to 19, that's still significant. That's still double what is

2.0

by right permissible in this area.

2.0

You know I think the fact that there is some precedent in this SMD within four blocks, within this year with this same case, I would like you to consider that and understand this. The ANC looks to the BZA in how you review cases in terms of how we recommend it to our own commission and neighbors. That if you have ruled against something already, it's a very smart case, we use that to ask neighbors to compromise and come to a conclusion that should pass based on the merits of what the BZA has ruled previously.

I think the ANC would like us to treat these cases, while unique, fair and equitably across the neighborhood when they are in such close proximity to each other.

The ANC would like to BZA to ask the Applicant to go back and work with us on a compromise, so allowing a three-unit exception but asking this to come closer to the by right ten-foot allowance to keep the precedent.

VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you, Mr. Goodman.

Do the Board members have any questions for -- any other questions for the ANC? Lesyllee.

MEMBER WHITE: I just had one question -- well a question regarding this particular property. I mean there are no adjoining neighbors on either side and I think that has played into, or at least was part of the contributing

factor for Office of Planning's support, possibly. Maybe I should let them speak for themselves with respect to that. But do you think that should be a consideration in terms of granting the relief that the Applicant is seeking in this case?

And also, there are a lot of letters of support. So I wanted to see what your thought was with respect to that.

MR. GOODMAN: Sure. So while the two properties are vacant, they can either support this or they can't oppose this. So there is really no standing from any of these neighbors.

There will be neighbors in these houses, hopefully, in the future. You know we have a density problem. We have a housing problem.

The ANC wants to get people into these houses. Eventually there will be neighbors. And just because the one property that abuts this will have a 30-foot wall doesn't mean two houses away is not also negatively impacted by this.

If you look at the square and the rear addition of this, this isn't common and this doesn't happen in any of the other houses. The neighborhood will have to live with this. It's not just the two adjoining properties that have to live with this and the consequences of a 30-foot wall that they are going to stare at in their yard.

2.0

1 While there is additional yard space back there, 2 these neighbors don't live on their parking pads. They live up front where this wall is and where this is abutting these 3 4 properties and this property line. So I do think it is a 5 tremendous impact on other neighbors in this, yes. 6 MEMBER WHITE: Okav. 7 Okay, so the issue -- I think the ZC CHAIR HOOD: 8 Office of Planning said there are no neighbors on either 9 What's going on on both sides? side. 10 MR. GOODMAN: Sure. There are houses. They are 11 vacant homes. So 430 is currently going under 12 development. They have not requested any special exceptions 13 So they are, essentially, flipping the house or variances. 14 by right, which they are permissible to and which we are 15 asking this applicant to do. The other side, the house is vacant and it is on 16 17 the market for just under \$1 million as a show of a house. 18 So somebody is sitting on it for some reason and not putting 19 people in it. 2.0 Was this the neighborhood ZC CHAIR HOOD: Okay. 21 that helped the Zoning Commission develop those regulations 22 for the ten feet or for the pop-back? Was this one of the 23 neighborhoods? 24 I came on midterm last MR. GOODMAN: I'm unsure. 25 So I've only been on for about 14 months. year.

ZC CHAIR HOOD: Oh, okay. So you all believe that it's more than just whether or not there are neighbors next door. You all believe that that is going to really change if you extend what's already allowable. And I know they had discussion earlier there about this but if you extend what's allowable, you all believe that that's going to change the character. Is that where you are going with this or you want to continue to have a dialogue?

I'm not following a lot of this about as far as the going back. I understand you don't want it to go back 30 feet or whatever -- 19 feet. Why is that, because it's the character of the neighborhood or why is it? Just tell me why.

MR. GOODMAN: Yes, just the density of the character of the lot being put there. In the case that we talked about, 19418, OP, one of their reasons for objecting to it is that this character doesn't exist anywhere and this would be setting tremendous precedent for all the other houses to do this.

The same thing with this square. You know we don't have 30-foot rear additions elsewhere in this area. We have some other houses within the area who have come in through old zoning regulations that were allowed to go slightly larger. Not in this square. These other neighbors aren't facing that.

2.0

1	So yes, I think this tremendously is going to
2	impact it.
3	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Okay. All right, thank you.
4	Thank you, Mr. Vice Chair.
5	VICE CHAIR HART: And actually I have a question
6	for the Applicant. The penthouse that you are looking at,
7	what is the distance from the front of the building? Do you
8	know?
9	I was just trying to understand if you could
10	actually see that from the street. I didn't
11	MS. BACHER: I am going to have to possibly
12	estimate.
13	VICE CHAIR HART: The reason that I'm looking at
14	
15	MS. BACHER: It is going to be at least, what 27.8
16	feet from the front of the building, 27 feet, 8 inches from
17	the front of the building.
18	VICE CHAIR HART: Do you have any images that show
19	what this looks like from the street?
20	MS. BACHER: From the street, yes. Well, from the
21	street what we have is an elevation. We don't have a view.
22	VICE CHAIR HART: I know. That's what I I mean
23	I'm looking at what is this I think page 11 of your
24	revised drawings, Exhibit 31. It's the revised drawings that
25	you all submitted.
ļ	

1	And so page 11, it says BZA 11, I'm assuming that
2	is what that is. Yes, that actually has the penthouse on top
3	of this. And as I'm looking at it, I don't know how far
4	how wide the road is. So I'm not exactly sure. It almost
5	seems like I am going to see that penthouse and it just looks
б	really tall on this.
7	You know you have a roof deck. You have decks on
8	the front and on the rear of the building. And then there
9	is this kind of penthouse that goes up to the roof deck and
10	it just seems really, really high. And I didn't know what
11	that view was.
12	I don't know about the rest of the Board. I would
13	actually like to see that view to understand what that is.
14	MEMBER WHITE: That's not enough.
15	VICE CHAIR HART: Yes, I'm not exactly sure Ms.
16	White is showing me another image. I'm not exactly sure what
17	this image is oh, it's on the front of the application.
18	Where is this view taken from? Is that like on the street
19	or is that on is there anything from across the street?
20	That's what I'm trying to get to.
21	MS. BACHER: Sorry about that. That view is going
22	to be from I believe the sidewalk on the opposite side of the
23	street but I would have to double-check because I can't
24	remember I don't know exactly where that camera is placed.

VICE CHAIR HART: I mean I don't know about the

1 other Board members. I just would like to understand what 2 that looks like. 3 MS. BACHER: Okay. 4 VICE CHAIR HART: And I just don't feel like I It seems really tall to me. 5 have that. I mean I know you 6 have -- you're limited at 35 feet and you are at the 35-foot 7 with the third addition -- the third floor. The penthouse 8 is on top of that and even though it is set back a number of 9 feet, 20-some odd feet, it still seems tall to me. 10 seems kind of prominent. MEMBER WHITE: You can see it from the front. 11 Yes, and I'm thinking you are 12 VICE CHAIR HART: 13 And it's just like -going to be able to see that. 14 MS. BACHER: The regulation is one-to-one, which 15 it is greater than one-to-one but if that's -- if we're going to -- I don't know what the policy is going to be but I mean 16 17 if we need to -- if we are going to do like an extended 18 hearing, we can submit that information. 19 Yes, I mean I don't know. VICE CHAIR HART: leave it up to my other Board members but it is just helpful 2.0 21 for me to understand that. 22 Yes, I agree. I'm going to ask ZC CHAIR HOOD: 23 some, a little more, too, added to what you are seeing. 24 would like to see this placed down to the circumstances that 25 exist now, what you are asking for -- the rear part that you

1	are proposing. And I would like to see it, you know what I
2	mean?
3	VICE CHAIR HART: A prospective rendering, is that
4	what you are looking for?
5	ZC CHAIR HOOD: A prospective
6	VICE CHAIR HART: An aerial.
7	ZC CHAIR HOOD: What actually exist.
8	VICE CHAIR HART: Oh, oh, oh. You want to see
9	what it looks like.
10	ZC CHAIR HOOD: I want to it put in to what
11	actually exists, what is there now.
12	VICE CHAIR HART: The rear or the front?
13	ZC CHAIR HOOD: I want to see both, all of it to
14	see how it works all the way around.
15	VICE CHAIR HART: And the
16	ZC CHAIR HOOD: I don't want to put an undue
17	burden on anybody or cost but if you could do that minimally,
18	I would appreciate it. I think that will show what you are
19	trying to look at.
20	VICE CHAIR HART: Is this beyond what we have on
21	the front page of the
22	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Yes, it's beyond that.
23	VICE CHAIR HART: Okay.
24	ZC CHAIR HOOD: It's much beyond that.
25	VICE CHAIR HART: So I think what we are looking

1	for is just some views definitely from across the street.
2	Chairman Hood talked about the rear as well, just to kind of
3	understand what this is.
4	And I think part of this is for us to really
5	understand this. And again, I understand that it may be sent
6	back.
7	The penthouse, to me, seems like it is fairly
8	large and I just get to a wow, okay. I know that that is not
9	necessarily what you are for but it is helpful for me to
10	understand the entire kind of project.
11	You know I think that's it. I don't want to say
12	too much more about it.
13	I think I understand most everything else that is
14	going on with this. And I'm not necessarily sure we need to
15	have a continued hearing. I think it's more if you could
16	submit this and then we could have a meeting on it. I'm
17	looking to the other Board members to make sure that that's
18	okay.
19	MEMBER WHITE: So it would just be a decision?
20	VICE CHAIR HART: Yes, I think it would not be a
21	continued hearing. It would be a decision meeting but it's
22	really just to try to understand that.
23	MEMBER WHITE: And since it's going to be a
24	decision hearing, would it be I'm assuming it would be
25	acceptable to accept three of those conditions that were in

1	the ANC letter as part of our analysis of whether or not we
2	are going to grant any type of relief, excluding the
3	stairwell portion.
4	MS. BACHER: Well, absolutely those three. And
5	the ANC did waive that stairwell. But if we feel that it is
6	too prominent, we can absolutely look at cutting it back, if
7	that would be helpful. I mean we're willing to work on that
8	as well.
9	VICE CHAIR HART: I would appreciate it. I mean
10	I don't want to cause another problem with different height
11	roofs and things because I know that can be some kind of an
12	issue for penthouses that are not the same height roof.
13	So I am not trying to get it in to another issue.
14	I'm just trying to understand what that kind of looks like
15	from the street in that it doesn't exist now and I think that
16	that may be somewhat a prominent feature as you move forward.
17	So Mr. Moy, actually I haven't finished the
18	hearing. So we have heard from the ANC.
19	Is anyone here in opposition to the project?
20	Anyone here in support of the project?
21	Okay, so I think at this point we can I don't
22	know if the Board wants to talk anymore. No.
23	I think we can close the hearing at this point and
24	we will ask we've asked for these pieces, these other
25	nieces of information

1	And Mr. Moy, we are looking at this as being a
2	decision. Again, I know the docket is pretty full for the
3	29th so it is probably the I don't know.
4	MR. MOY: Well, let me think. Okay, we'll start
5	there. If the Board sets this for decision on the 29th, and
6	if the Applicant can submit the additional 3D drawings or
7	axonometric drawings as requested.
8	And is the Board going to allow the ANC to respond
9	to those drawings or not?
10	VICE CHAIR HART: I thought the ANC would have
11	their I thought they were able to respond, regardless.
12	MR. MOY: Yes, they can. Well, I would have to
13	put this into the time line.
14	VICE CHAIR HART: You're just saying the time
15	line.
16	VICE CHAIR HART: Yes, I would give them an
17	opportunity to do that. I don't know. I'm asking our OAG
18	a well.
19	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Board's discretion.
20	VICE CHAIR HART: Fine.
21	MR. MOY: Can the Applicant submit, make their
22	submission how long would it take to file, a week, this
23	Friday, or because I would like to give the ANC enough
24	time to respond to your drawings.
25	MS. BACHER: Friday might be pushing it.

1	MR. MOY: Monday, the 20th or do you need a full
2	week?
3	MS. BACHER: So if we submit the 22nd then there
4	is a week until but you want the ANC to be able to respond
5	before that?
6	If we submit the 22nd, then the hearing or the
7	decision hearing would be on the 29th, that's a week. Is
8	that not enough time?
9	VICE CHAIR HART: Well, what ends up doing is then
10	we wouldn't
11	MR. MOY: It would be December 6th.
12	VICE CHAIR HART: Yes, I mean we would move it to
13	December if it did.
14	MS. BACHER: Oh, I see. Yes, probably by Monday.
15	End of day Monday?
16	VICE CHAIR HART: That works for us.
17	MR. MOY: Okay. So that would be Monday, November
18	the 20th. The ANC would have more than seven days to
19	respond, if they want to. And then the Board can make its
20	decision on the 29th.
21	VICE CHAIR HART: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Moy.
22	MR. MOY: Thank you.
23	VICE CHAIR HART: I think we're finished. Thank
24	you very much for coming. Enjoy the rest of your evening.
25	The next case, Mr. Moy, when you're ready.

1	MR. MOY: All right, thank you Mr. Vice Chair.
2	That would be Application 19572 of SIM, S-I-M, Development,
3	LLC captioned and advertised for variances from the
4	nonconforming structure requirements of Subtitle C, Section
5	202 and the parking requirements of subtitle C, Section
6	701.5. This would add two stories containing 16 units to an
7	existing two-story, 9-unit mixed use building. This is an
8	MU-4 District at premises 1916 15th Street, Southeast, Square
9	5766, Lot 845.
10	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you, Mr. Moy.
11	And we have a full contingent. When you're ready,
12	if you could, introduce yourselves from my right to the left.
13	MR. JONES: Phinis Jones. That's spelled P-H-I-N-
14	I-S.
15	MR. BELLO: Toye Bello, representing the
16	Applicants, SIM Development, LLC.
17	MR. CRUICKSHANK: Neil Cruickshank, Architectural
18	Solutions, also for the Applicant, SIM, LLC.
19	VICE CHAIR HART: What's your last name again?
20	MR. CRUICKSHANK: Cruickshank.
21	VICE CHAIR HART: Can you spell that? Sorry.
22	MR. CRUICKSHANK: I think I can. C-R-U-I-C-K-S-H-
23	A-N-K.
24	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you.
25	MR. CRUICKSHANK: It's a mouthful.

1	MR. ANDRES: Good afternoon, Vice Chair Hart,
2	Erwin Andres with Gorove/Slade Associates.
3	MS. KENNEDY: Good evening. Karinne Kennedy, a
4	resident and landlord on 15th Street.
5	MEMBER WHITE: Can we get the address?
6	MS. KENNEDY: I'm sorry, 1920 15th Street,
7	directly across the alley from the property in question.
8	MS. AGYEI: Dorcas Agyei, resident Historic
9	Anacostia, address 1926 15th Street.
10	VICE CHAIR HART: Can you spell your last name
11	again? I'm sorry.
12	MS. AGYEI: The last name is A, as in apple, G,
13	as in George, Y-E-I. And the first name is D-O-R-C-A-S.
14	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you.
15	MS. ECKLES: My name is Linda Atherton Eckles.
16	I love about 120 feet from this building. I'm a multi-term
17	ANC commissioner and chair of ANC commissions in the past and
18	served eight terms in those capacities.
19	VICE CHAIR HART: Welcome.
20	MR. MULLER: Good evening. John Muller, long-time
21	community reporter, renter on the 1400 block of W Street
22	across from Mr. Frederick Douglass' Washington, D.C. home.
23	MS. GUNNELS: Good evening. My name is LaTasha
24	Gunnels and I am a resident of Historic Anacostia. I am
25	homeowner on W Street and I have lived there for three years

1	MS. FULLER: Good evening. Greta Fuller, ANC
2	Commissioner 8A06. I've been a commissioner in Anacostia now
3	for four or five terms. I can't remember anymore.
4	But I'm here today I'm not the Single Member
5	District representative but I'm here to speak on behalf of
6	some of the residents in the vote at the ANC.
7	VICE CHAIR HART: Okay. Thank you very much.
8	So I'm assuming Mr. Bello, are you okay. Okay,
9	you can start your presentation when you would like.
10	MR. BELLO: And I will just try to summarize it.
11	I understand that it has been a long day.
12	The proposal that we have before for this project
13	is to construct two floors of addition plus a habitable
14	penthouse to an existing two-story building. The two areas
15	of
16	VICE CHAIR HART: Can you hold I'm sorry. Can
17	you hold on one second?
18	MR. COHEN: Mr. Vice Chair, just for the record,
19	there were a couple of preliminary matters for the Board's
20	attention.
21	VICE CHAIR HART: Yes, I apologize for that.
22	MR. COHEN: And we apologize to the Applicant.
23	VICE CHAIR HART: Mr. Bello, I should have caught
24	that and I did not but I will catch it now before we start
25	into this.

	So there were some preliminary matters that we
	needed to I guess deal with. One was with regard to I guess
	a posting concern. And this is the posting concern was
	with regard to whether or not the posting was done in the
	appropriate fashion and I guess I will look to our OAG to
	give me a little bit of help with it. Are we making a
	motion, too or are we
	MR. COHEN: Well, Mr. Vice Chair, from what I
	understand, the posting wasn't accurate in terms of what
	substantively was on it.
	For the Board's consideration, I presume, is
	whether or not they feel that waiving the procedure and
	technical requirements of the posting excuse me of the
	posting requirements in the Zoning Regulations, whether or
	not the Board feels that would prejudice the parties, given
	the fact that we have so many people here today.
	MR. MOY: Mr. Vice Chair, if I may intervene.
	VICE CHAIR HART: Please.
	MR. MOY: This issue was promulgated because there
	is a letter in opposition in the record from which is, I
	believe, Exhibit 52, which raises discrepancies in the
	posting requirements.
	VICE CHAIR HART: And so we have to really this
	is to determine whether we should be waiving this provision,
1	gorrogt 2

1	MR. COHEN: That's correct.
2	MR. MOY: You may ask staff, again, to reply, to
3	respond to that, Mr. Vice Chair.
4	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you, Mr. Secretary.
5	Mr. Bello, you are aware of this particular
6	concern that was raised?
7	MR. BELLO: I am aware and there is a good
8	explanation for it, Mr. Vice Chairman.
9	This application has been postponed twice. One
10	at the requests of the Applicant in order to respond
11	adequately to some of the issues raised by the ANC. The
12	second postponement was actually at the behest of the ANC
13	itself, after we presented to the ANC and the ANC thought
14	that the community members needed a little bit more time.
15	So the dates for the hearing that was posted
16	reflected the original date of the hearing, which was October
17	25th but the community at large, the ANC and everybody was
18	very aware of this application because we had to meet with
19	them severally.
20	So I do not feel that anybody is prejudiced by
21	what the claim of the opposition is.
22	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you.
23	Does the Board have any questions for the
24	Applicant on this?
25	(No audible response.)

1	VICE CHAIR HART: Hearing none that's fine.
2	So, I guess it's up to us. I mean it seems as
3	though folks are actually would you like to say something?
4	MS. AGYEI: Yes.
5	VICE CHAIR HART: Actually, one of you can speak.
6	It's fine.
7	And are you the person that actually submitted the
8	thank you. Ms I'm sorry.
9	MS. AGYEI: Agyei.
10	VICE CHAIR HART: Agyei?
11	MS. AGYEI: Yes.
12	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you.
13	MS. AGYEI: So what he is speaking to does not
14	is not what we are disputing. And I have pictures.
15	Unfortunately I don't know how to make this work but I can
16	show
17	VICE CHAIR HART: Can you actually give the
18	pictures to the Secretary?
19	MS. AGYEI: Sure. And they are also submitted but
20	I don't know the best way to describe it.
21	So what he is speaking to is the actual placard
22	that is visible has the date of the 25th. What we're
23	speaking to is because that building is on the corner of a
24	major throughway, which is Good Hope Road, and that is
25	lintersects with 15th Street there was not a posting also on

1	Good Hope Road street, so that people walking by could see
2	that actually something was going to be happening with the
3	building.
4	VICE CHAIR HART: So you are saying that it was
5	just inadequately posted.
6	MS. AGYEI: Correct.
7	MEMBER WHITE: The absence.
8	MS. AGYEI: Absence. There was the absence of the
9	placard on Good Hope Road.
10	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you.
11	Mr. Hood?
12	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Mr. Chairman, can I ask Mr. Cohen,
13	if you could let me know, does it specify? I know it has to
14	be a place that is conspicuous and noticeable but does it say
15	in our regulations exactly where it needs to be placed?
16	MR. COHEN: If you will allow me an opportunity
17	to check up on that, I would appreciate it.
18	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Okay. I just can't remember this.
19	Okay, we'll give you some time because I remember off the top
20	of my head that it has to be a certain but it doesn't
21	necessarily say exactly.
22	Anyway, I'll wait and see what it says. I don't
23	want to go off my memory.
24	VICE CHAIR HART: Yes, Mr. Hood, I did
25	ZC CHAIR HOOD: You have it?

1	VICE CHAIR HART: Yes, it looks like I have the
2	documents here. And I know this is not the entire one but
3	I think the part that we need to be aware of, the notice
4	this is oh would you like to give
5	MR. COHEN: I believe the relevant regulation and
6	section that you are asking about is Subtitle Y, Section
7	402.4 and I'm just going to read it verbatim: The notice
8	required by Subtitle Y, Section 402.3 to be placed upon an
9	applicant's property shall be posted in plain view of the
10	public at each street frontage on the property and on the
11	front of each existing building located on the subject
12	property.
13	Those are the requirements for the Board's
14	consideration.
15	ZC CHAIR HOOD: All right, Mr. Bello, I know you
16	know this very well. Why was it not how many were posted,
17	just one, two, or what? I know they usually give out two or
18	whatever.
19	MR. BELLO: And we do have the affidavit of
20	posting and the two photographs. Both streets were posted,
21	Mr. Chairman.
22	MS. AGYEI: The pictures that are before you
23	present what have been there for the last month or so.
24	ZC CHAIR HOOD: I believe these are from, Mr.
25	Chairman, Exhibit 37. I think it's 37. Yes, I wanted to
	· ·

close it back up -- 37.

2.0

VICE CHAIR HART: Yes, I see the affidavit of posting on this. So I guess -- I mean the image that we have shows the posting -- the affidavit of posting, it looks like it's two different places. Yes, I think I am looking at that correctly. It looks like it is on two different places, I guess on two different walls of two different streets but I see in the image that Ms. Agyei provided, one of them is no longer on the wall as it sounds like it should have been.

I understand that all of us -- it seems as though all of us are here. And I understand the issue that you're raising up. I think that it is a valid point to make. I will say, though, that we are all here at the table and that we have at least understood -- I understand there may be more people that wanted to come. I do understand that.

I'm trying to kind of weigh the people that have actually made their -- have taken time the time to come here --

MS. AGYEI: I just wanted to make sure that that's just noted in the Board that we potentially would have had the opportunity to engage more people, had they known about it.

VICE CHAIR HART: Yes, and I appreciate your bringing up about the concern. I don't know how the other Board members feel about it. Feel free to chime in.

1	ZC CHAIR HOOD: We also have more than one way of
2	advertising. I think folks from the 200 feet advertisement
3	
4	VICE CHAIR HART: Yes, that's true.
5	ZC CHAIR HOOD: I think it's also in the D.C.
6	well nobody really reads it, not even me, but the D.C.
7	Register. I'm not saying go to that point but I mean we have
8	more than one avenue to advertise.
9	I'm more concerned about if it's not up there, if
10	it's not properly noticed, I'm more concerned about making
11	sure that people got and I think our record is complete
12	that everyone within 200 feet at least got a notice.
13	VICE CHAIR HART: And you can
14	MS. AGYEI: My neighbor can speak to that. She
15	is right next door.
16	MS. KENNEDY: I'm right next door to the building.
17	I did not get any type of notice. I did talk to Mr. Jones
18	and Ms. Wilcher and they explained that they had a mailing.
19	But when I go on your website and pull down their list of
20	mailings, my address is incorrect. So I did not get one.
21	VICE CHAIR HART: Yes, and I'm not sure how to
22	correct the addresses here you know for this.
23	Yes, ma'am.
24	MS. ECKLES: I'd like to also state that I am
25	within that radius. I did not get a notice of this. But to

1	not acknowledge the importance of proper notice on the Good
2	Hope Road side, which impacts the whole neighborhood, as
3	opposed to this little side location over at 15th Street,
4	where nobody goes anyway. So if that was not there, it might
5	not be substantive.
6	MS. AGYEI: It's not that nobody goes but may not
7	be as noticeable.
8	MS. ECKLES: But to not placard and publicly
9	notice Good Hope Road, I can guarantee you it says why the
10	few of us are here.
11	VICE CHAIR HART: It seems like a lot of folks
12	here.
13	MS. ECKLES: No, trust me.
14	VICE CHAIR HART: No, no, what I'm saying is
15	MS. ECKLES: This is not a lot of people.
16	VICE CHAIR HART: What I'm saying is you could
17	have a hundred people here. What I'm saying is that there
18	are people that actually were aware of this and actually
19	spent the time to come down here, which we appreciate. Don't
20	get me wrong. I think that that's great to see that.
21	MS. ECKLES: I'm one of them.
22	VICE CHAIR HART: Mr. Cohen, one question about
23	right now what we're looking at is whether or not this is
24	this was posted correctly but what is do you have an
25	opinion on how long the posting you know the image that

т	we have for the affidavit of posting includes the sign on
2	you said Good Luck Road?
3	MS. ECKLES: Good Hope Road.
4	VICE CHAIR HART: Excuse me, Good Hope. And the
5	image that we have that Ms. Agyei I'm sorry, I keep on
6	looking at that and I'm like provided does not have that
7	on there.
8	So there's a point in time that that sign no
9	longer was on there. So it was on there at some point but
10	just didn't stay on there. I mean that is what I would
11	assume from this.
12	MR. COHEN: Mr. Vice Chair, you might get
13	frustrated with my response. I'm not equipped to give my
14	opinion.
15	VICE CHAIR HART: Yes, that's fine.
16	MR. COHEN: I can tell the Board that the Board
17	should consider any prejudice or if there is any good cause
18	as to whether or not these procedural deficiencies should
19	affect when this hearing is to occur.
20	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you I do appreciate that.
21	That is information.
22	I think that the Applicant has shown that they
23	have document, made the poster on this street. I understand
24	that it may not be on there now. I do also understand that
25	you all are here and I think that we should be forward with
ļ	

at least having the hearing.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

You do not have to agree with it. I'm just telling you this is my opinion on it. And I think that we could be able -- I think that I would be in support of waiving that particular provision. I could hear from the rest of my Board members if they have any opinion on this and if they want to sway me, I'm open to that as well.

I mean I can see that maybe more MEMBER WHITE: people would have been here but I think we've got a pretty adequate number of people to at least get started with hearing the case now. And the people that perhaps do want submit something in writing would still have an opportunity to do so, unless we close the hearing and the record today, which I don't know whether or not we will get to that point or not.

VICE CHAIR HART: Mr. Hood?

DC CHAIR HOOD: I think that is one of our options. Board Member White is exactly correct. I think we leave the record open. I think we have people here on the stand about the notice, the placards because I, actually downtown, put one back up myself. So I know that it happens. It does come down, people take it down.

But let me ask you this, Mr. Bello. Were you aware that the placard come down? Because it looks like one was posted on Good Hope.

1	MR. BELLO: I wasn't aware that the placard came
2	down. I don't want to get into the case ahead of it but we
3	have very substantial and significant community interaction
4	over this case.
5	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Because I know periodically
6	the applicants ride by and make sure that their stuff is
7	still up for this very reason.
8	But I would agree with the Vice Chair and also
9	with Ms. White. I think Ms. White has a good remedy.
10	Towards the end, we can leave it open for comments, to get
11	some of those people that you all say that may not have
12	gotten notice.
13	As the Vice Chair said, you may not disagree but
14	you've been here. You've been here all day and we don't take
15	that lightly. And we're also going to operate on the merits
16	of the case. We can get to the case and that way we can make
17	our discovery as we move forward.
18	Thank you, Mr. Vice Chair.
19	VICE CHAIR HART: Yes and actually one other
20	thing. After we kind of finish with this, I think that we
21	are in agreement that we are waiving this particular
22	provision so we can move on from that.
23	Mr. Moy, because I just thought about it, I just
24	want to make sure if everyone has actually been sworn in.
25	I'm assuming all of you have but you have not? Okay,

2 please stand so that the Secretary can administer the oath. (Whereupon, the witnesses were sworn in.) 3 4 VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you. And Mr. Moy, Ι 5 think there is another issue regarding the supplemental 6 filings and this is with regard to the traffic study. 7 believe MR. MOY: Yes, Ι ${\tt Ms.}$ Aqyei, if Ι 8 pronounced your name correctly, she was the person who raised 9 So she can speak to that and then the that discrepancy. 10 Board can move forward with that. 11 VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you, Ms. Agyei. 12 Thank you. We just want to put on the MS. AGYEI: 13 record that the Applicant was not in compliance with the 21-14 day prior rule of getting you all the traffic studies so you 15 could review and make notes as you wanted to, and preside 16 adequate questioning him if you had chose to. 17 He submitted on the 10th of November of this year. 18 VICE CHAIR HART: And I will -- I'm sorry. I'm 19 looking at the actual provisions in the Zoning Code. 2.0 So as Ms. Agyei just said, the traffic study was 21 prepared by a transportation consultant. That was submitted 22 to us on November the 10th. DDOT actually submitted their 23 So that was -- the Applicant's report on October 13th. 24 transportation consultant submitted their report after DDOT 25 submitted their report. So there is a time lapse there.

anyone in the audience who has not been sworn in,

And I will also read I guess the applicable Zoning Regs. This is 300.13 -- Subtitle Y, as well? Okay.

If the application includes a report by a

If the application includes a report by a transportation consultant or expert, the Applicant shall provide a copy of the report to the DDOT on the same day of filing with the Office of Zoning. So that is one aspect of it.

Subtitle Y, 300.14: No later than 30 days before the date of the public hearings on the application, the shall file with the Board traffic Applicant any transportation reports to be submitted in support of the All such reports shall include the resume of application. the expert who prepared the report and there are some other things but I think the piece of this is about being no later than 30 days before the date of the public hearing.

And so it looks as though the Applicant has submitted their report a few days before the public hearing and the question is whether or not we want to, I guess, waive that provision.

So any -- the only thoughts I had on this were really it would have been very helpful for DDOT to be able to have seen the traffic study. So having the transportation consultant submitting their report after the DDOT report isn't that helpful for us.

MS. AGYEI: And then also, we are in the same

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

1 predicament with the ANC. They submitted the traffic studies 2 of the ANC the same date five minutes before the ANC voted 3 on November 7th. 4 VICE CHAIR HART: Okay. Well, that's the ANC. That's their particular concern. 5 6 MS. AGYEI: Okav. 7 MS. VITALE: It was a concern. None of the 8 commissioners had read it and we didn't even know what it was 9 saying. 10 No, I know. VICE CHAIR HART: What I'm saying is 11 about the transportation consultant and submitting to DDOT. 12 DDOT submits their reports to us and so we are reviewing 13 I understand that you're saying that it wasn't -- they 14 weren't able to -- the ANC was not able to apply it or at 15 least understand it because they had gotten it so late. 16 So the question is do we think that that should 17 be waived, actually both of these should be waived. I'm not 18 sure what happens if we don't waive them and maybe that 19 further Ms. White's concern about having a continued hearing. 2.0 We may take some testimony today but actually have a 21 continued hearing and have DDOT be able to provide us with 22 information regarding the transportation study so that we can 23 get their full understanding of the transportation concerns. 24 ZC CHAIR HOOD: I would agree, Mr. Vice Chair. 25 We can do a limited scope. We can do the transportation and

1	what other outstanding issues. And meanwhile while we are
2	doing that, we can go ahead with whatever we have tonight.
3	VICE CHAIR HART: Yes, I agree.
4	ZC CHAIR HOOD: But while we are doing that, we
5	can also get another placard and put up, even though we would
6	only leave it open for limited scope hearing on
7	transportation and what other issues we come up with this
8	evening. And then they can do as Ms. White has already
9	mentioned, is to provide written testimony.
10	VICE CHAIR HART: So I think we are
11	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Question: How did the ANC vote
12	on something
13	VICE CHAIR HART: I don't know.
14	ZC CHAIR HOOD: and they are saying they didn't
15	read it.
16	VICE CHAIR HART: I don't know.
17	MS. AGYEI: That's a very good question, sir.
18	VICE CHAIR HART: We're not at the ANC so we have
19	to go with things that are in front of us right now.
20	MS. AGYEI: That's a very good question, sir.
21	VICE CHAIR HART: If we could
22	ZC CHAIR HOOD: I was talking to the Vice Chair.
23	VICE CHAIR HART: Yes.
24	ZC CHAIR HOOD: I wasn't talking to the ANC or
25	nobody. I was just making that statement out loud.

1 VICE CHAIR HART: I appreciate that. I knew who 2 you were talking to. 3 Mr. Bello? 4 MR. BELLO: Yes, sir. We don't have a problem 5 with how the Board decides to proceed. But I would have the 6 record that DDOT did not predicate their report on the 7 requirement for a traffic study, rather a requirement for an 8 approved transportation demand management plan. 9 For the record, I sent a copy of this traffic 10 report to DDOT and DDOT had no problem with it. I also sent 11 a copy of the study, the traffic report to OP as well. And one of the reasons, in fact the central reason 12 13 for the postponement requested by the ANC was for 14 Applicant to provide them with a traffic study, not that DDOT 15 required it. VICE CHAIR HART: I understand that. There still 16 17 are requirements under zoning that we have to make sure that 18 we are following. And someone has brought up some concerns 19 and so we are trying to address those concerns and understand 2.0 where we are with them. 21 And we will hear from the Office of Planning and 22 go through the hearing as we need to. 23 ZC CHAIR HOOD: And I think, Mr. Vice Chair, I 24 think you are exactly right. Mr. Bello, understand the

position we are in.

25

We want to make sure nothing comes back

1 on any of us, including us. 2 So we have procedures that we have to follow, as But I think the Vice Chair is exactly you already know. 3 4 right to make sure that all of our bases are covered, as we move forward in this case. 5 6 VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you, Mr. Hood. 7 So with all of that, Ms. Agyei, I think what we 8 are going to do is to have a second hearing to talk about the 9 transportation concerns, and transportation report, and all 10 There may be some other concerns for that second of that. 11 So you can talk to your folks that weren't able to 12 make it today and maybe they can make that new date. 13 But right now I think what we are going to start, 14 I think all of the preliminary stuff is over. We can start 15 with Mr. Bello and your presentation. Then we will go from 16 Thank you. there. Excuse me, Mr. Vice Chair. 17 MR. MOY: How much 18 time? 19 VICE CHAIR HART: Let's say ten minutes. 2.0 MR. BELLO: That's fine. 21 VICE CHAIR HART: That's fine? Okav. 22 All right the first project at this MR. BELLO: 23 property is to construct two additional floors on top of an 24 existing two-story structure and a habitable penthouse. The

Applicant is before the Board of Zoning Adjustments because

it is compelled to be before the Board of Zoning Adjustments because of the preexisting condition of the subject property.

The two areas of relief sought here is to allow a construction of an addition, an enlargement to an existing nonconforming structure Subsection C, under Chapter Section 202.2(a) and (b) and that request is precipitated by the fact that the preexisting building already occupies 91 percent of the existing lot. So there isn't anything the Applicant can do in the way of an addition without coming to the Board of Zoning Adjustments and that's forced upon the by the preexisting condition of pre-1958 structure.

The second relief is a special exception from the parking requirement. That exception also is forced upon the Applicant because there is nowhere on the lot that the Applicant is able to provide the three parking spaces that are required in order to increase the aggregated density of dwelling on this property from its preexisting 9 units to 25 units.

So the extraordinary situation of condition of property is with respect to the existing improvement upon the property, an improvement which predates the May 12, 1958 adoption of the 1958 Zoning Regulations. And the special exception provisions under Section 703.2 only requires that the Applicant comply with just one of those conditions. And

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

291 one of those conditions is the inability of the Applicant to 1 2 provide the on-site parking spaces. The request here is for 100 percent variance from 3 the parking requirement and those requirements are limited 4 5 to just three parking spaces. I would want the architect to run through the 6 7 design project but the application does not require or 8 request any other relief. We will be compliant with the 9 density, if there are requirements or limitations for the MU-10 4 zone, it would be within the height restrictions and we 11 would meet all of the requirements that are applicable to 12 this application.

I would like to turn it over to the architect to walk you through the design drawings. Thank you.

MR. CRUICKSHANK: So as stated by Mr. Bello, in doing the design we tried to make sure that the addition that we are doing would have been done as a matter of right, had the property not been noncompliant.

So we carefully did an FAR study and a lot area study make that we stay within what to sure those requirements would have been. And also because the new zoning codes allow us to do a penthouse, we went ahead and added a habitable penthouse to help increase the amount of units that were applied to the property.

So the first slide up there is the existing

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

property layout. As you can see, it has very little yard left open. The second slide we are showing there shows the proposed addition that sits on top of the existing property and the darker L shape on top of that is the footprint of the penthouse.

This slide shows the cellar, basement renovation where we were able to add two units. Based on some comments from DDOT, we also went back and added some bicycle parking, lockers in the basement that are accessed right off of the proposed new elevator that we are adding to the property.

The existing first floor where there are retailers, we have not increased the retail space. The only thing we have done there is added a stairwell on one side of the retail space for a second means of egress from the upper apartments we added. And on that level, we have located an area for trash storage, as well as some public bike parking And again, was able to add, in this case, one, two, spaces. three apartment units on this floor.

This was the existing apartment, floors with apartment units. And we just reconfigured it. The owner asked us to try to find a way to develop the property with all two-bedroom units. So that's what we did. That's what we were able to do.

The third floor is the first floor of the addition. The third floor and the fourth floor are

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

practically identical. Because of the Zoning Code requirements we need to do some Green Area Ratio and we are using this spot on the roof to comply with that green area ratio. We also take the opportunity to provide a little bit of a roof deck spot of the amenities to the apartments.

Again, the fourth floor, like I said, is almost identical to the third floor.

And this is the penthouse unit. We were able to get two three-bedroom penthouse units and then we used the rest of the roof around the penthouse unit to complete our Green Area Ratio requirement with a green roof and again another small roof deck for the tenants.

This is the elevation on Good Hope Road. What we are proposing to do is to refurbish the existing brickwork and then provide a lighter material as we are adding on top of an existing building and we will probably have to go down and reinforce the existing foundation. So we want to do that mitigation as little as possible.

But the proposed addition, in terms of the Building Code is going to comply with a III-B construction type to maintain the existing construction type that is already existing on the site, which essentially requires like a 2-0 exterior. Load-bearing wall and all the interior structure will be wood. And the proposed fenestration will be some type of a pre-Fenestra and board material.

2.0

1	This is the elevation on 15th Street, where the
2	existing entrance is. We will maintain the existing entrance
3	to access the new upper floors.
4	This elevation is off of the existing alley.
5	And the final elevation is the elevation adjacent
6	the property on 15th Street.
7	It is a very straightforward, I think. I am open
8	to any questions that you may have.
9	VICE CHAIR HART: Do the Board members have any
10	questions? No? Ms. White? Okay.
11	Sorry, Mr. Bello?
12	MR. BELLO: Yes, in that case, I would like to
13	turn it over to Mr. Jones to walk us through some of the
14	community outreach efforts that we embarked on for this
15	application.
16	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you.
17	MR. JONES: Thank you, Vice Chair Hart, Ms. White,
18	and Chairman Hood. I changed my opening to say evening
19	instead of this morning. It is right to be before you.
20	My name is Phinis Jones, as I have indicated. I
21	live at 1844 I'm sorry 1845 Woodmont Place, Southeast,
22	four blocks from the property off Good Hope Road.
23	My firm was engaged to do the community outreach.
24	We reached out to the ANC and we met with them in an
25	executive meeting. They met in the executive meeting on

9/18. They asked us to come to the full ANC meeting on 10/3 and we did. We presented to the ANC on 10/3. They asked us would we consider a delay so that we could go to the community. And we said we would.

In so doing, they wrote a letter to you asking you to extend the hearing, which would give us more time to go and meet with the community. We, indeed, met with the community at the site. We met the community at this site on 10/10/17 and talked about the project with them in length -- at length.

At that meeting, we were requested to meet with the principal at Ketcham School. We did -- by one of the homeowners next door. We met with the principal at Ketcham School on 10/27/17.

We went back to the full ANC meeting on 11/7. And the morning of 11/7, I would like to add that we provided the ANC early morning the full transportation report to the ANC chair to be distributed to the members.

Upon arriving at the meeting, I brought courtesy copies because we had already provided them to all the ANC members for the meeting and circulated them to the meeting at the night but they had received them prior to them.

One of the things that in the Executive Committee meeting on 9/13, the ANC asked us would we consider a community benefit package. And we did. The ANC laid out

2.0

that community benefit package. I indicated that I would bring it to the developer and the developer approved all parts, everything that the ANC had asked for in that community benefit package. We submitted that to the ANC as well.

One of the items in that community benefit package was a cash payment to Ketcham School and that was the purpose of the meeting with the principal at Ketcham School to see how she wanted those funds to be used at the school. And she decided that she would like them to be used for the Teacher-Parent Association, which we have agreed to do.

From the meeting with the principal, she had one request that we would put a camera in the alley behind the building. I brought that back to the developer and they agreed to that as well.

So, clearly, we have been engaged. I should point out that the last meeting of the ANC on 11/7, the ANC approved the projected four to two, in a vote four to two. And the chairman asked me would I continue to work with the community to work out their concerns and I walked outside of the hearing and met with the two ladies and said we are still open. We are still wanting to work with them to address their concerns in the community.

Thank you.

VICE CHAIR HART: Mr. Bello?

2.0

1	MR. BELLO: Yes, sir, I would like Mr. Andres to
2	speak briefly about the traffic study.
3	MR. ANDRES: Good evening. Erwin Andres, Vice
4	President and Principle of Gorove/Slade Associates.
5	I guess before I get started, I guess
6	procedurally, should I go through this if the next sort of
7	meeting is the transportation related one? I just don't want
8	to waste anybody's time.
9	VICE CHAIR HART: Yes, why don't we just hold on
10	and we'll talk about it at the next meeting?
11	MR. ANDRES: Okay. But I do want to make a brief
12	statement in that our study was done after DDOT had issued
13	their letter, primarily just to answer ANC questions. DDOT
14	had no issues and they have identified that in their report.
15	They have identified four conditions that the Applicant is
16	willing to and agreed to implement.
17	So our report was not necessarily done for DDOT,
18	which is typically the way we do it, but was specific to
19	answer any questions by the ANC.
20	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you.
21	Mr. Bello?
22	MR. BELLO: And that's our presentation, Mr. Vice
23	Chair.
24	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you very much. Do the
25	Board members have any questions for the Applicant?

ZC CHAIR HOOD: Actually, yes, I want to ask Mr.

Jones and Mr. Bello. I took two points out of this. And typically this only happens in the PUD. You're giving out amenities and you met at the site.

MR. JONES: Yes.

ZC CHAIR HOOD: Yes. To me. I don't see a lot of

ZC CHAIR HOOD: Yes. To me, I don't see a lot of that when it comes to this type of development. So I'm actually -- actually I was sitting here thinking all other cases that come in front of me, I'm going to start pushing some of that. I mean because that's a big deal.

But how did we get to the community amenities?

This is not a PUD. How did we get there? I don't want to undo it. I'm just curious how we got there.

MR. JONES: Well, let me address the site first. The young lady nameless in this case, I mean she owned the building next door to the building and that's why we got to meet at the site. We called her up. My staff called her up. We agreed to a meeting and we met at her building on her front step of her building. And that's the site of the building on 15th Street.

To your question about the amenities, when we met with the ANC in the executive meeting, the amenities came up and asked would the developer be amenable to a community benefit package. Mr. Bello was there at that meeting back on the 18th of September. And they laid out what they

2.0

1	thought would be a community benefit package and Mr. Bello,
2	representing the developer, agreed to it on the spot.
3	There's been a few things added since that time,
4	which he and the developer has agreed to.
5	ZC CHAIR HOOD: All right, thank you.
6	MEMBER WHITE: Is that benefit package in the
7	record or is that something you would be willing to share?
8	MR. JONES: Yes, we submitted it to the ANC but
9	I am certain I have a copy here available.
10	MR. BELLO: It is Exhibit 40.
11	MEMBER WHITE: Okay, thank you.
12	VICE CHAIR HART: And Mr. Bello or Mr. Jones, if
13	you could speak to the I mean there was an issue of kind
14	of mailing out and the 200-foot radius, all the folks that
15	were there. Did you get some of the mail back? I mean it
16	was mailed out so I'm just trying to understand. Some of the
17	folks that are here have said that they didn't either receive
18	something, or wrong addresses, or whatever. So could you
19	speak to that please?
20	MR. BELLO: I actually can since that is a
21	function of the Office of Zoning. They did do the mailing
22	out and verification.
23	VICE CHAIR HART: Then I'm asking the wrong
24	people.
25	MR. JONES: Mr. Vice Chair, if I may add, when we

met with the neighbors, the young lady who indicated here
that she did not get a letter, she did express that to us
because we were going door-to-door knocking. The reason how
we reached the neighbors in the first place, a staff member
was going door-to-door, got their names and we had a
subsequent meeting with them.
She did indicate to us that she did not get a
letter and we told her the letters were mailed out by the
office here. But in addition to that, we went door-to-door
and knocked and that's how we found out back on 10/3 that,
according to her, she did not receive the letter.
VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you very much for that.
I had a question about whether or not Mr.
Jones, you talked about having a meeting on-site and most of
these meetings that you are talking about basically happened
within the last month.
MR. JONES: Yes, I can
VICE CHAIR HART: So were there any meetings prior
to that month? I mean it is a fairly sizeable development
that we're talking about, especially in this corner. I just
didn't know if you had actually met prior to the past month.
MR. JONES: Our first with the ANC on 9/13 and we
continued to meet since that date in the Executive Committee
meeting.
VICE CHAIR HART: Okay, thank you.

1	Do the Board members have any other questions?
2	MEMBER WHITE: No, I don't have any.
3	VICE CHAIR HART: Okay, let's hear from the Office
4	of Planning.
5	MS. VITALE: Good evening, Mr. Chair and members
6	of the Board. Elisa Vitale with the Office of Planning.
7	OP recommends approval of the requested relief for
8	an addition to an existing nonconforming structure and for
9	relief from the minimum parking requirements, subject to the
10	TDM conditions that were put forward in the DDOT memo.
11	This concludes my report and I'm happy to answer
12	any questions. Thank you.
13	VICE CHAIR HART: Do the Board members have any
14	questions for the Office of Planning?
15	I'm assuming, Ms. White, you don't have one.
16	MEMBER WHITE: I don't.
17	VICE CHAIR HART: Okay. Your mike is on. That's
18	why I was asking.
19	MEMBER WHITE: Sorry.
20	VICE CHAIR HART: And so, Ms. Vitale, you are
21	saying that you believe that the Applicant has met the
22	variance requirements. Could you kind of talk about that in
23	a little bit more detail?
24	MS. VITALE: Certainly. There are two areas of
25	relief for this particular case. One pertains to the
I	

addition to an existing nonconforming structure. And as put
forward in the OP report, the unique situation here is the
fact that this is a pre-1958 existing building. The
Applicant, obviously to create a conforming structure on the
lot would have to demolish portions of the existing building.
You know generally, that's not something that we would
recommend an applicant do to create a conforming situation.
The additional floors that the Applicant is proposing, as
well as the penthouse, would meet lot occupancy. They are
at 61 percent, which is below the maximum permitted lot
occupancy in the zone of 75 percent for projects that comply
with the Inclusionary Zoning provisions, which this project
would.
The second area of relief relates to parking.
Again, the property, given the existing structure on the lot,
does not provide adequate space to provide the three required
parking spaces. We did look at the property. There is
access through Metro Bus. There is proximity to Metro Rail
stations, as well as on-street parking in the area. So we
believe that the test was met with respect to the requested
parking relief.
VICE CHAIR HART: Okay, thank you.
Does the Applicant have any questions for the

.....

MR. BELLO: No, Mr. Vice Chair.

Office of Planning?

1		VICE CHAIR HART: Okay. So now we're going to the
2	ANC. Is	there a representative from the ANC that is
3	representir	ng the ANC? Okay so
4		MS. FULLER: I don't know if I'm necessarily
5	representir	ng the entire ANC.
6		VICE CHAIR HART: I'm only asking for the ANC
7	because the	ere is a portion a part of this hearing, we will
8	hear from	the ANC. Then we will hear from parties in
9	opposition	and parties in support.
10		MS. FULLER: I am not the Single Member District
11	ANC. So I	cannot.
12		VICE CHAIR HART: And that's fine. And that's Ms.
13	Fuller?	
14		MS. FULLER: Yes.
15		VICE CHAIR HART: Okay, thank you. I appreciate
16	that.	
17		So anyone here in support of the application?
18		Anyone here in opposition to the application? I'm
19	assuming th	nat it is all of you that are sitting here.
20		And why don't we start with Ms. Kennedy? Have I
21	got that co	orrect?
22		MS. AGYEI: Can you take me first? Because I have
23	to move my	car, if that's okay.
24		VICE CHAIR HART: Yes, that's fine. We have
25	it's three	minutes for each of you so you have up to three
J	1	

minutes. You don't have to take it all.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

MS. AGYEI: Only three minutes?

VICE CHAIR HART: Yes, it's for people that are -for folks that come to give testimony that are representing
themselves as an individual, then they have three minutes.
For folks that are here representing an organization, they
have five minutes. And so that's where we are.

MS. AGYEI: Okay. I first want to state that it's not that people are opposed the development, it is opposed to the development as they have it presented. And I feel like everyone is missing in this, as you all have heard throughout the day, that these are our homes. These are our investments. These are where we have to live. This is what we have to live with. And someone made that statement and that is a very good statement.

This is what we have to live with. This is not what you have to live with if you're four blocks up This is not what you have to live with if you are street. blocks blocks down. ortwo over, or across This is what you have to live with if you are a northwest. 19 15th Street resident and that's who we are.

And I have heard this term a lot, nonconforming building. And a lot of things that have happened when people have been renovating, they have used the building as-is and they have renovated within the constructs of that building.

And I don't understand why the developer is not taking the opportunity, the challenge to do that with this building, considering that is in fact a 1950 building.

And my concern is if you agreed to this development as-is, you are going to change the landscape of Historic Anacostia, even though this building may not be directly in Historic Anacostia, it borders Historic Anacostia that I believe starts in 1920 and Karinne can speak to that.

And then also with that, we didn't -- there was a lot of lack of transparency with the developer in the community. And during the meeting that Mr. Jones is speaking to, which was kind of an impromptu meeting on-site, we voiced our opposition at that time and we also voiced our opposition to our Single Member District ANC, who at that time told us he wouldn't vote on it but then turned around and voted on it.

So there is a lot of frustration that the voices of the people that actually live on that street are not being met or not being heard and that people aren't listening to what our concerns are.

And then also I know that you said you're going to talk about the transportation next time so I won't really talk about that, other than on the design.

He's saying that and you said that well, people have access to Metro. They have access to bikes or whatever

2.0

1	the other transportation you said is. If you are going to
2	make this someone's home and it's a three just think about
3	it. These are going to be three-bedroom homes. So people
4	with three-bedroom homes, their only source of transportation
5	is going to be a bike or a Metro or the bus? So I just think
6	that is being ingenuous to say that these people that live
7	here are not going to have cars and that that's not going to
8	impact our parking and the surrounding community.
9	And I don't know in the reports that are given to
10	you all if they actually present you with pictures so you can
11	actually see the visual impact or if it's just write-ups of
12	what they're envisioning is going to happen or not happen.
13	So that's my concern.
14	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you very much.
15	MS. AGYEI: You're welcome.
16	VICE CHAIR HART: Ms. Kennedy?
17	MS. KENNEDY: Good evening.
18	VICE CHAIR HART: Actually, I'm sorry. Do the
19	Board members have any questions for
20	ZC CHAIR HOOD: She's leaving.
21	MS. AGYEI: I can take questions.
22	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Something you said earlier,
23	I want to ask you well, let me just ask you, since you're
24	here. How far is the I am trying to get my orientation
25	right How far is the new well I don't know if it's new

1	now, the Salvation Army? How far is that?
2	MS. AGYEI: It's about a 15-minute walk from home
3	and I'm 1926. Yes, it's about a 15-minute walk.
4	ZC CHAIR HOOD: So you think the design of this
5	building I guess you've seen more than what we have you
6	seen other than what we have here on the screen?
7	MS. AGYEI: Sir, this is all that was shown to us
8	at the ANC meeting.
9	ZC CHAIR HOOD: And you think that's going to
10	change the character or that's going to change the
11	MS. AGYEI: It is.
12	ZC CHAIR HOOD: No, you said it was going to
13	change Historic Anacostia.
14	MS. AGYEI: It will change the character of the
15	landscape of our current neighborhood. Ketcham Elementary
16	School, which I think there may be some photos of Ketcham in
17	the packet of pictures that I sent to you all.
18	This structure, unless I am incorrect, would be
19	taller than Ketcham Elementary School, making it now the
20	highest item on our block, which would be higher than
21	VICE CHAIR HART: Can you make sure you're
22	speaking into the mike. I'm sorry.
23	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Yes, you don't have a mike. Thank
24	you.
25	MS. AGYEI: If this building, the way I understand

1	is supposed to be 60-feet high, it would be higher than
2	Ketcham Elementary School, which is now right now the highest
3	item on our block and it would be higher than Karinne's home,
4	the building structure that is like right now kind of level
5	to the existing building.
6	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Okay, I had another question.
7	MS. AGYEI: And I have a
8	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Well, I'll ask somebody else. I
9	can't think of it.
LO	Okay, thank you.
11	MS. AGYEI: So I think you can see the building
L2	height in one of the pictures.
L3	I have to move my car but I do plan on coming
L4	back. Do we get to cross-examine like the other people did?
L5	No? Okay.
L6	VICE CHAIR HART: No.
L7	Ms. Kennedy.
L8	MS. KENNEDY: Are you saying go?
L9	VICE CHAIR HART: Yes, please.
20	MS. KENNEDY: Okay, again, I'm Ms. Kennedy and I
21	do, I live directly across the alley on the 15th Street side
22	of the building in question. Yes, that's me.
23	So my concern is, and I don't want to go deep into
24	parking because you all are going to discuss that at a later
25	date. However, I do know that Mr. Jones explained to me that

1 one of the requirements of any resident --2 VICE CHAIR HART: Can you also speak into the 3 mike? I'm sorry. 4 MS. KENNEDY: Okay, I'm sorry. 5 VICE CHAIR HART: Yes, it's okay. 6 One of the requirements of anybody MS. KENNEDY: 7 that was going to reside in the new building is that they 8 would not be able to register their vehicles at that address, 9 in an attempt to alleviate the parking issue. 10 I'm a native Washingtonian. I do not think that, 11 although I'll give him an A for effort, I do not think that 12 is going to stop people from bringing their cars. All you 13 need is D.C. tags to park on that street as it is. I also think that it's kind of a small block that 14 15 is divided by an alley. So we have four -- my building, 16 three homes, the alley that you have this large structure 17 that takes up the whole other half of the street. So we're 18 talking about 25 three-bedroom units that potentially is 75 19 more people on this small block. So that's another concern 2.0 I have. 21 When I moved on 15th Street back in 2003, there 22 nobody on that block. Everything around 23 abandoned, including the building he's talking about and 24 including my neighbors' homes. I lived there alone on that

block for two years. I fought to have trash picked up that

piled up for four months. I fought to have my mail So for me to go through the hard part -- and delivered. again, I'm going to reiterate it's not that we don't want the building developed. We do. I just think that what I thought was two more floors but it's really three more floors, I just think that's overkill. I think it's overkill and I think it's easy for someone to do that lives in Virginia and never has to come to the hood and never has to deal with any of the issues that may arise where I live at. And I feel like I opened, I reopened that block. Nobody lived on that block when I came.

My building was also abandoned for I want to say eight years and I dusted it off, and shined it up, and I moved in, even though I was the only person there. And I just don't want to feel like my concerns don't matter because of big business because somebody wants to -- and I'm not saying this to be offensive but they're not doing this building for free. You know there is supposed to be some type of return and I understand that but I just don't want to feel like that I was the brave person that went on the block by myself and now I don't have a say so and it's like okay.

Yes, he did come and talk to us. It was very impromptu and how that meeting came about was because we were complaining. We found out that day what was happening.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

	311
1	Somehow, somebody got in touch with him. He called somebody
2	and goes oh, we're going to meet you today. So it wasn't
3	planned. That was how the meeting happened and it did happen
4	on my porch. And we spoke about our opposition about the
5	development as they're proposing it now, not that we don't
6	want it developed.
7	So, that's where I am with it.
8	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you very much, Ms.
9	Kennedy.
10	Are there any questions for Ms. Kennedy? And I
11	just had one quick question.
12	You're not opposed to if this didn't have the
13	two floors on it you're saying that you would be that's
14	the issue that you're looking at?
15	MS. KENNEDY: I'm going to tell you how much I'm
16	willing to compromise. I say split the difference. Split
17	the difference. There's two floors as it stands now. You
18	want to add two more. Let's split the difference; add one.
19	I'm willing to compromise but that's not what they
20	want.
21	VICE CHAIR HART: And the reason that you're
22	looking at going down one floor is because you think this is
23	out of the scale of the development along the road, that it's
24	just out of scale.
25	MS. KENNEDY: I think esthetically it will blend

1	in more with what we already have.
2	VICE CHAIR HART: Okay.
3	MS. KENNEDY: I think as far as parking, as far
4	as foot traffic, you have less people to deal with.
5	VICE CHAIR HART: Okay.
6	MS. KENNEDY: So, I'm fine with that. I just
7	think that three floors, I just think that's a lot.
8	VICE CHAIR HART: Okay, thank you.
9	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Ms. Kennedy, you mentioned about
10	the parking issue and I think you said Mr. Jones mentioned
11	that it would was it RPP or they would be on their leases
12	that they couldn't have cars. Which one was it?
13	MS. KENNEDY: They could not register their
14	vehicles at their address. And I want to add. If I can add
15	to that, what that is if this goes forward, what that's
16	going to force us to do is to apply for zone permit parking,
17	which would then affect the teachers at Ketcham who have to
18	run out every two hours to move their car. That's why we
19	haven't done it because we don't want to affect the teachers.
20	We want them to be in class teaching.
21	If this happens, we have no other choice so that
22	we'll be able to park.
23	ZC CHAIR HOOD: So if he puts it on the leases,
24	is that where we're going?
25	MR. JONES: Mr. Chairman, Chairman Hood, let me.

1	This continued to come up by the chair of ANC. And each
2	meeting of the chair of the ANC he talked about some
3	development where you can prohibit people from registering
4	their car at that address.
5	My staff member continued it at the meeting. It
6	was my staff, Vickie, who was with me, continued the
7	conversation from the chairman. I don't understand it. I
8	don't know anything about it and I don't know how that works.
9	I never brought that up.
10	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Okay.
11	MR. JONES: While I'm speaking, let me just say
12	at the very first meeting, the ANC got a full set of plans.
13	As a matter of fact, Commissioner Fuller and I, at the very
14	first ANC meeting was trying to go through them because she
15	was telling me she didn't understand them. They got a full
16	set of the plans and not just one page.
17	Thank you.
18	ZC CHAIR HOOD: So there are two ways. RPP, I
19	guess is what is on the lease.
20	VICE CHAIR HART: Can you tell them what RPP is,
21	just so they know that?
22	ZC CHAIR HOOD: You know I'm not a fan of RPP.
23	VICE CHAIR HART: I know. I just wanted to make
24	sure that you read that.
25	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Nobody wants me to get on my
ļ	I and the second

1 soapbox about RPP. 2 But anyway, RPP is residential parking and what it does -- and I think that's where you all are going. 3 4 don't want to hurt the folks who are working over at Ketcham 5 because it's two hours. I know it's around the city they had 6 some problems with people who work like take care of our 7 cities have to keep running out. Maybe, if it's open to the 8 Applicant, maybe they want to look at the lease. I don't 9 know. 10 You know it's something to look at because I do 11 know that it's done all over the city. More RPP and then we 12 starting to hear about the leases. If that's a -- if parking 13 such a major issue but I'm waiting for us to get to that 14 point. Okay. 15 Thank you, Mr. Hood. VICE CHAIR HART: 16 Yes, ma'am, you're next. 17 MS. ECKLES: You know I'll speak last. 18 VICE CHAIR HART: You actually have to speak into 19 the mike. 2.0 I'll speak last but can we ask a MS. ECKLES: 21 question to clarify that? 22 VICE CHAIR HART: That's okay. 23 RPP, how can you legally require MS. ECKLES: 24 somebody to register at another address, if that's not their 25 legal address? DMV allows you to? I mean it has the rigors

1	of where you register your car. It has to be truthful.
2	VICE CHAIR HART: I mean there's a question out
3	there and I don't think we want to get into RPP right now,
4	Mr. Hood.
5	ZC CHAIR HOOD: We don't want to get into RPP.
6	MS. ECKLES: No, no, I'm not talking
7	VICE CHAIR HART: And actually and honestly, we're
8	going to be having another discussion about just the
9	transportation aspects of this.
10	So I understand the question and I don't know, Mr.
11	Moy, maybe it's good to have somebody from DDOT here to be
12	able to respond to some of the questions that we get at the
13	next hearing but just a thought.
14	Ms. Fuller. Have I got that right?
15	MS. FULLER: Yes.
16	VICE CHAIR HART: And you also have three minutes.
17	MS. FULLER: Okay. My name is Greta Fuller. I'm
18	here today representing the ANC 8A06 because it is the SMD
19	that is adjacent to ANC 8-05 where this property sits.
20	I oppose the vote for the special exception on the
21	mere fact that I believe that we didn't get the questions
22	answered that we need for the parking relief and for the
23	overall development of the site.
24	Mr. Jones is correct that he gave us a set of
25	plans. I was not at the ANC executive meeting where all

these other POMANTs and CBA and all of that took place. I was only at the first October, I believe it was October meeting, ANC meeting. And as the secretary, I haven't even seen the letter, if they sent -- if the ANC sent a letter of support to show that the vote was actually four yes and two no.

I only became involved --

VICE CHAIR HART: It was submitted.

MS. FULLER: Oh, okay, but I never saw it, as a commissioner.

VICE CHAIR HART: It's Exhibit 53.

MS. FULLER: Okay. I'm only involved here today, like I said, because I'm adjacent and because the residents at ANC 8-05 was not getting any response from their commissioner. So they reached out to the commissioner that was adjacent to the property to hear their concerns.

Their concerns was that the property was too high. Even I don't quite understand the height of the property according to Ketcham Elementary. And these are questions that I'm asking at an ANC meeting, when they only have 10 to 15 minutes to present, when I feel like we really should have had a separate meeting with all the residents that are involved and anyone who wanted to come and the developer, so that he could express to everyone what the design was and not a 15-minute meeting. I don't think that you can really

2.0

2.3

understand, ask questions, review, and look at. So that was a problem for me.

The second problem that I had was that we got the traffic study right when it was time for the vote. And you're right, Mr. Hood, I don't know how they could vote on something and they couldn't even understand what the traffic study said, hadn't read it, or anything. And if the chair did have the traffic study, I looked in both my emails and I never received a traffic study except for the hard copy that was given to Mr. Jones as a courtesy during the ANC meeting.

So they asked me for a vote and I haven't even reviewed and I just couldn't, in good faith with all the residents, vote on something or agree to something that I don't understand.

I am not against this project but I think that there are things that still need to be cleared up with the residents so that they understand exactly what is going on and what their parking concerns, and any other concerns that they may have.

I personally called Mr. Jones, I believe it was yesterday or the day before, and just asked him to postpone it so that we could really get clarity and understand. He said that he did not want to; he already did it; and the ANC had voted on it; and that was it.

2.0

And as far as parking, I want you guys to really understand. I was at a hearing, it was Monday, for Martin Luther King Gateway of which the disposition. So we're having new buildings revised, which we are so happy about, from Good Hope Road, 1201 to 1215, which is bringing over 250 new employees and retail at the bottom.

We're also rehabbing 1909 Good Hope Road -- 1909
-- I'm sorry -- Martin Luther King through 1913 Martin Luther
King is where the historic facade fell. So that's more
parking that's needed.

If you also go to Good Hope and 13th Street, you would see that the entire block, it's kind of like a strip mall, is already being renovated for more stores, retail, housing. And if you cross the street, next to the -- it's called the Goalpost, on the same street, Good Hope Road, less than a block away, there is new construction and opening up with housing there.

So I have a big concern for the people that are saying that they have parking issues. So even though they gave this report that there is a bus, there is Metro, and there is bicycles, nobody's talking about all the construction and the renovation that's going on along Martin Luther King.

We also have a new Busboys and Poets coming. We have a new Maple View Flats on Martin Luther King.

2.0

2.3

1	VICE CHAIR HART: You're actually over.
2	MS. FULLER: Okay.
3	VICE CHAIR HART: Yes, you're through.
4	MS. FULLER: Okay, so I just want you to really
5	hear that it is not just this is new construction. We have
6	new construction going up and down the street and parking is
7	important, at least that we understand. That's all.
8	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you.
9	MS. FULLER: Thank you.
10	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you.
11	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Can I ask a question?
12	VICE CHAIR HART: Yes, by all means.
13	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Commissioner Fuller, I have known
14	you a while. I know you have been a commissioner for some
15	years. You've been in the trenches so I want to commend you
16	for all the hard work you've done over the years and I've
17	thought you've always been very fair.
18	Let me ask you a question. Did you vote in the
19	four-two vote?
20	MS. FULLER: Yes, I did.
21	ZC CHAIR HOOD: You were the two and actually your
22	vote was a protest vote.
23	MS. FULLER: Yes.
24	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Was it a protest? I'm not putting
25	words. I'm just trying to understand.
	I and the state of

1	MS. FULLER: My vote was no because I felt like
2	the community had not satisfied their questions. If their
3	questions and even my questions were satisfied, I most likely
4	would have voted yes. And I want to be clear, I am for this
5	building being renovated. I am excited about bringing you
б	know larger units to the community but we must be clear on
7	what is actually happening and that is what I think is not
8	happening here.
9	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Yes, I see that all over the city.
10	Now let me ask you now you're the secretary and
11	I don't know how you all send letters out. And I'm not
12	condemning the ANC because I think what the ANC commissioners
13	do is a lot of work. But you're the secretary and you didn't
14	you know that we had a letter?
15	MS. FULLER: I am the secretary. I know that you
16	probably got a letter but I never saw the letter. I never
17	read the letter. I never created the letter. I'm sure it
18	came from our chair.
19	ZC CHAIR HOOD: So most of the time when we get
20	letters from the ANC I'm not trying to school you because
21	you've been around a long time most times it comes from
22	the chair and the secretary.
23	MS. FULLER: Exactly.
24	ZC CHAIR HOOD: They usually sign both. We have
25	some in our files that say the chair and the secretary. So

1	next time, maybe the letters should have the chair and the
2	secretary's name on it. That's just a hint.
3	MS. FULLER: I totally agreed. I have asked many
4	times when letters go out you know to like step this back.
5	And it should really be a final review of the ANC as a whole
6	to see what we're actually writing. What we vote on and what
7	we write could be two different things.
8	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Okay well, let's see how
9	this goes. Thank you very much.
10	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you.
11	Ms. Gunnels, is it?
12	MS. GUNNELS: Yes.
13	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you. You have three
14	minutes as well.
15	MS. GUNNELS: Okay, so I'm not going to read what
16	I wrote because we're going to discuss the traffic study at
17	a later date.
18	VICE CHAIR HART: That's correct.
19	MS. GUNNELS: But again, kudos to you guys for
20	sitting up there for so long. I don't know how you do it.
21	But I live two blocks from this project on W
22	Street and I am not opposed to the development of the
23	building but I am concerned about parking. I am also
24	concerned about the height of the building because the
25	building borders Historic Anacostia and I am concerned that
	I and the second

1	if this five-story building gets built, it's setting
2	precedent and I'm concerned about other developers trying to
3	build five-story buildings in Historic Anacostia, when we
4	have two-story wood frame homes all around that area. It's
5	a residential neighborhood.
6	And I would also like to see the developer reach
7	out a little more to people around the community. It's not
8	enough to just come and show up with like a picture. I would
9	like to see something tangible for us to take home, like
10	maybe a PowerPoint presentation, something for us to take
11	home and look at. And just engage with us a little more and
12	you know maybe we can work with you and make a better
13	building.
14	So just a little more outreach. I'm not against
15	this project but I would like for you guys to work with us.
16	That's it. Thank you.
17	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you.
18	VICE CHAIR HART: Mr. Muller?
19	MR. MULLER: Yes, thank you. Good evening,
20	everyone. Thank you for moving this forward and not taking
21	a lunch and dinner break. I'll just quickly get through
22	this.
23	My name is John Muller, a resident of the 1400
24	block of W Street, Southeast, across the street from the
25	Frederick Douglas National Historic Site on Old Jefferson

Street in Old Anacostia. The street names were changed in 1908. So Jefferson Street is old. 15th Street was named after Zachary Taylor, Taylor Street. I just wanted to mention that.

I'm here to testify with regards to BZA Application 19572 for the development of 1916 15th Street, Southwest, a long-vacant laundromat at the corner of Good Hope Road and 15th Street, Southeast.

I attended an ANC 8A meeting on Tuesday, October 3, 2017, where this application was first introduced to the community at large. I was unable to attend November's previous meeting or the recent meeting in November 2017. Τ was not able to attend that ANC 8A meeting, where it is my understanding, it's been communicated today, that what I observed at October's meeting was essentially repeated in that the community still has not seen any architectural any transportation studies. I'm in drawings nor community, not the ANC. I am in the community of which I am the community and people here are, as everyone else here is a community.

I was so taken aback, as a resident and someone who has been attending ANC 8A meetings since about 2008-2009 in my capacity a community reporter, I was so taken back by what I saw, and this happens all the time, that I wrote a quick summation and distributed it to the community listsery.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

With you indulgence, I will just read this in full. This is kind of a summary of what went on and I wrote just like right after this happened.

So at last night's ANC 8A meeting, October 3, 2017, a presentation was made by a group applying to BZA for the old laundromat at 15th and Good Hope Road. The group had no PowerPoint, no handouts, no easels and placards; nothing to show anyone.

ANC commissioners acted as though they had never heard of the group before and, for a number of minutes, while the meeting was going on, the presenting group at ANC spoke before a filled meeting room of 60 to 70 people.

So like this I while the ANC meeting is going on.

It's like huddle up and call you know 36 pitch sweep. That was like -- it's hard to accept that these things go on over, and over, and over again. And that really bothers me.

Audience opposition was near uniform, which was as much a result of what little was communicated as with how it was communicated. Eventually, an oversized book with the architectural designs for the two-story addition and a penthouse was passed around and Tasha sent me the plans that had been available online for months. I think like in March these were filed online. But you know just the dynamics of the community is just like people didn't know that.

In my hand was the -- and at this meeting --

2.0

before I went to the meeting, I went to the BZA schedule and found out that they were planned or scheduled to go before you guys on -- I'm sorry, I'm over time -- October 11th. In my hand was a BZA schedule for October 11, 2017. This group was scheduled for second that day.

I passed the paperwork to Commissioner Troy Dante
Pressworth while the meeting was going on and told him this
is what is important. All the conversation is nothing
because no one even mentioned that they were going before the
-- it's incredible.

This information of their pending date on October 11th was not shared by the group nor the ANCs at any time of the presentation. I posed the question, public question, as a reporter, asking the group were they on the BZA schedule for October 11th. They said they asked for a continuance to October 11. I asked again, saying the paperwork that I had in my hand, that I printed out that day, indicated that they were on for October 11th. They insisted it was October 18th.

At the end of the meeting, a number of people approached me and asked me to share the information about the upcoming hearing because they had no idea like what I was talking about.

I have been reporting on community meetings in Anacostia since 2009, when I used to write for the Washington Times. So, I've seen this stuff over and over again. Very

2.0

1	little very little has changed in terms of the way that
2	these things are processed administratively.
3	And you know I go to war for Ward 16 ANC meetings.
4	The stuff that happens at ANC 8A does not happen elsewhere.
5	It is not accepted.
6	So and I know that is really not like an issue for
7	you. I know that's not like pertinent to this conversation.
8	I just have to say that.
9	And I mean Ms. Dickerson of W Street, who is an
10	elderly lady, she was just like absolutely beside herself.
11	And so that's what happened at the meeting October
12	3, 2017, as I saw, heard, and understood it.
13	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you.
14	MR. MULLER: Thank you very much for your time.
15	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you very much, Mr. Muller.
16	And Ms. Atherton Eckles? Have I got it right?
17	MS. ECKLES: I have to totally reconsider what I
18	would have intended to say. It's sort of a well-practiced
19	40-year experience of going before Boards and asking them to
20	understand why communities like Anacostia feel so estranged
21	from the regulatory process, so oppressed by it, and in my
22	more extreme moments, exploited by it.
23	And when you don't understand the importance of
24	the failure to properly placard Good Hope Road, you are
25	missing the whole point of why Good Hope Road is the rough,

raggedy, tough part of the neighborhood that I'm pretty sure none of you live in.

We are bound by two streets, Good Hope Road and Martin Luther King. You made reference to Salvation Army. That's not on Good Hope Road. That's clear up MLK. Okay? But we only have those two choices, as do anybody making that perilous trip over the 11th Street Bridge, either to suburban Maryland, to Hillcrest at the top of the hill. We don't have that option. We are dependent on that God-loved street called Good Hope Road that cannot and will not ever be widened one inch.

This building is unique. You could ask a hundred people walking down the street in Anacostia and say where is this building and they wouldn't know because it has been vacant so long. It is a zero property line building out to both sidewalks and has been vacant so long and is so -- it is not an abandoned building. It never was abandoned but it is derelict but evenly so. It's not part of it is about It's just been this big, until you scrape off to fall in. the uglies of it, big solid building that goes out to zero property line on both sides. And it just -- people just forget it's there because it has not been a functioning part of the community for so long.

Now anytime you have the possibility of nine apartments and small-scale retail standing vacant for that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

number of years, you have to say why. We've got 80 to 100 running feet on Good Hope Road that has been vacant for When you say those lovely words, Well, quess what? nonconforming building and then it is sort of nonconforming, what does it have big ears or something? is a nonconforming building because it never brought to the table, when it came, adequate parking, either for its smallscale retail functions, or its functions as an apartment building.

I'm one of the few people in the room that remember it when it functioned. I'm probably the only person in this room that has ever been inside of it in direct relation to this as an application process. It has been vacant.

And as everyone itemized, we want to see this building developed. We don't want to see it multiply two and a half times the things that made it a non-working building to begin with, which is you can't have viable retail in buildings that can't get deliveries, that can't get trash. You can't have 25 three-unit apartment buildings upstairs that can't park anywhere because what they're going to do, is they are, by right, they are going to park around and around. They won't park much in front of me. I'm over on Minnesota Avenue. I'm in my grandmother's house that two people have owned it in 80 years. But they will irreparably

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

damage the single-family historic houses that immediately surround this on the back side.

And I will beg your indulgence for a little historical sense of why it is not in the Historic District, because, again, I'm pretty sure that I'm the only person that goes back to when it was declared a historic district and how that negotiation went.

Number one, there is only two reasons it's out of the Historic District: because God-loved Frederick Douglas lived up the hill; and the second is because the residential base was so strong it was negotiated.

If we would let the gerrymandering go on on the facade line down on Good Hope Road to exclude the commercial buildings, because there were people who said, oh, God, if you go historic, there will never be real development down there. Well, there can't be because we don't have service alleys. We do not have depth of street. We do not have parking. And this was back in the late '60s we didn't have adequate parking.

Anybody that drives that road, no matter their destination, that drives Good Hope Road will tell you this location is a continual bottleneck, primarily because of Ketcham School. And don't get into this thing about hype about Ketcham School. Ketcham School sits way back from Good Hope Road and is beautiful. It's a nice school. But you

2.0

look up Good Hope Road and you don't even know it's there because it's set back and is nowhere comparable to a zero property line four-story facade along the Good Hope Road, which has no other buildings over two stories in the immediate environs. The scale of the commercial corridor there is limited itself.

This building never worked when it was building verv well. It had continual vacancies, continual both in the apartments that exist and in the retail space it utilizes But it will doubly doom that part of Good Hope Road and its environment to double the size and not bring one parking place to the table. That's beyond comprehension. And I'm not even -- I'm sparing you the irregularities of the process so far but I'm asking you to understand the criticality of notices in a neighborhood like Anacostia because it always wants to say we didn't get notice. It always wants to say didn't the letter. get But I'm an eight-term commissioner. When I look you in the eye and said I don't get a letter from Zoning, trust me. I didn't get the letter.

But understand that the placard process is the vestige of -- it's like the Magna Carta. Notice is critical to a community. Then, if they don't come to the meetings, if they don't go to the ANC and raise Cain, that doesn't mean that a few handful of people, including myself, can come down here and purport to be the community.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

1	VICE CHAIR HART: No, I appreciate that and I
2	MS. ECKLES: I don't think so.
3	VICE CHAIR HART: No, no, I have been in doing
4	planning for about 20 years. So I appreciate it. I do
5	understand it.
6	MS. ECKLES: But have you been living in a
7	neighborhood that
8	VICE CHAIR HART: I've lived in many different
9	places. So I appreciate your passion and
10	MS. ECKLES: It's not my passion, it's the
11	neighborhood's and that's what makes me mad.
12	VICE CHAIR HART: I understand. And I think the
13	I appreciate that you have spent your time here today,
14	that all of you have spent your time here today.
15	MS. ECKLES: I've done 40 years of these things.
16	VICE CHAIR HART: We are not going to decide this
17	today because that's why we have the continued hearing. We
18	heard you and wanted to actually hear this and also hear from
19	some of the community. And I understand that you're saying
20	that there are others in the community that were not able to
21	come here today.
22	MS. ECKLES: My concern is that you waived the
23	notice placard. That's a matter of regulation and of law.
24	Okay, and you just waived it like okay, we'll waive it. You
25	hadn't even heard that there was a transportation study

1 irregularities in this meeting. 2 I'm not asking that you didn't have this meeting and I am very grateful that you have offered the opportunity 3 4 for those people who did make the sacrifice to come down 5 here. But for you to just, with no real understanding 6 7 of the rigor of that regulation that notice be appropriate, 8 for you to not acknowledge the centricality of Good Hope Road 9 to the community's perception of what's going on. And lastly, for you to not notice the damage you 10 11 do, yourselves, when I've got to go back and say well, they 12 just waived the notice because people love to say we didn't 13 get a notice. 14 ZC CHAIR HOOD: Can I, Mr. Vice Chair? 15 VICE CHAIR HART: Sure. I think we took care of that 16 ZC CHAIR HOOD: 17 notice issue earlier because what we said there are some 18 things we are going to look at. So that was done an hour 19 I don't know, maybe you might have missed that part but 2.0 we will reiterate it. 21 I didn't miss it. MS. ECKLES: 22 ZC CHAIR HOOD: Yes, we will reiterate it. 23 I want to explain to you why I know the difference between the Good Hope Road and I know the difference between the MLK. 24

I walked Good Hope Road for many years with the Fairlawn.

So I know all about Good Hope Road.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

My point was the Salvation Army helped jumpstart some of that old Martin -- yes it did on MLK because I voted on it. I've been here. I've been here 20 years.

And when I looked at this project, and I know about that area of Good Hope Road and I know about the historic part around that area, and I'm looking at this and I'm saying okay, now, all of the other communities in this city are trying to move -- I'm going to give you an example.

Αt first. little hesitant Ι was а in neighborhood about Hecht's Warehouse. Now you can't keep me out from over there. Best thing going because something over there jumpstarted it. And when they first, you didn't go there in the daytime. Now you qo over there. everybody's there. You can't even get in there because everybody's pushing to get in there. Ivy City Steakhouse. Everybody's there. I don't have to go downtown to all those fancy -- I can stay right in my neighborhood now.

And I use that a lot on the Zoning Commission when other neighborhoods -- yes, we made a sacrifice and I was a little taken aback at first because we wouldn't go over that at night. Now try it. If you haven't tried that, try it.

But my point is that I think that what we started earlier, to your point, is that we are going to remedy the placard issue. But we also -- you all have been here all day

and we didn't just waive it, waive it off because you heard me ask Mr. Bello to make sure it's placarded again. coming back again for the transportation. The record is going to be kept open. So you might have missed that.

I didn't miss it. MS. ECKLES:

ZC CHAIR HOOD: We left that open for all those people who want to chime in and want to give us some input on what's going on in that area. You might disagree with that process but this ain't our first rodeo. We have to balance this and that's what I think we did today, especially for those who have been here all day.

You know you may disagree with it but a lot of people have been here all day.

And then quess what? Here's the other thing. When you come down here all day and don't hear from us, then you go in front of the City Council. And when I have to go down for the oversight hearing, I have to answer questions, the chair of this board and myself. We answer those questions. Not that we don't mind doing it because at the end of the day, it's about balancing and making sure we try to do the best answers for the best of the city. what this is all about.

You and I can talk all day but go right ahead.

No, I don't want to talk all day. MS. ECKLES: I was with the people that were down here. I didn't want the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

1	hearing to not move forward but I wanted to be darn sure that
2	in the pressure of time and stuff that it had another
3	component after this failure to notice was remedied. And
4	that was not clearly you know you haven't suggested how
5	it's going to be remedied or any rigor to the remedying of
6	the placarding. In other words, it is a regulation. It is
7	not an opinion. And so normally speaking, somebody over here
8	would say well they can remedy that by doing this, this, and
9	this.
10	But when you turn to Mr. Bello, who is on their
11	side and say okay, we are going to work out something for you
12	
13	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Let me ask you this no, I
14	didn't say that. Who puts up the placards?
15	MS. ECKLES: They do.
16	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Hold on. Mr. Moy, do you put the
17	placard up?
18	That's why I went to Mr. Bello. I did that an
19	hour ago because I want him to re-placard it.
20	MS. ECKLES: But you didn't mention that as a
21	remedy.
22	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Did anybody else not hear me
23	mention that as a remedy?
24	VICE CHAIR HART: And that was
25	MS. ECKLES: You mentioned you were going to go
	I and the second

1	to Mr. Bello but the remedy was not clarified so that I can
2	go back to my to the community and say there is going to be
3	placards over there.
4	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Okay, well let me clarify. Mr.
5	Bello, Mr. Jones, and others, please make sure that the
6	placard is up.
7	Okay. As a matter of fact, I want you to go
8	another step. Can you work with her and you all placard
9	together? Can you have time to go down and that way we can
10	no, seriously. I'm not being sarcastic. I'm being
11	serious.
12	MS. ECKLES: I understand you're being serious but
13	that's not I do not participate
14	VICE CHAIR HART: Can you lean into the mike,
15	please? I'm sorry.
16	MS. ECKLES: All I'm asking for you to use your
17	good offices to have the Applicant remedy the situation, not
18	to entwine me to his benefit.
19	VICE CHAIR HART: And that's fine.
20	ZC CHAIR HOOD: That's fine. That's fine.
21	VICE CHAIR HART: And I think we can
22	ZC CHAIR HOOD: You don't have to. I just wanted
23	to make sure that there was somebody who I can count on to
24	make sure it gets placard. But we'll get a picture. I know
25	there is going to be picture there. If somebody from the
l	I and the state of

1	neighborhood wants to go by and take a picture and assure us,
2	give us a confidence level as we move forward, that's the
3	remedy.
4	Thank you, Vice Chair.
5	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you, Mr. Hood, and all of
6	you that have given your testimony today.
7	We are going to continue the hearing. And I think
8	that we need to hear from Mr. Moy and try to figure out what
9	the hearing date might be.
10	Actually, I'm assuming that Mr. Hood is going to
11	be back with us for this. So it's going to be a while.
12	We're probably looking at December
13	MR. MOY: December 20th.
14	ZC CHAIR HOOD: December 20th. Is that getting
15	full? How is that looking? If I have to come back here an
16	earlier date.
17	MR. MOY: What? You come in early?
18	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Not really but the 20th
19	MR. MOY: Well you've already gone through some
20	of this already, right?
21	ZC CHAIR HOOD: So how much do we have for the
22	20th?
23	MR. MOY: Eight cases. This would be the ninth
24	case.
25	VICE CHAIR HART: I mean it's fine. I think we're

okay with that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MOY: Yes, we're good; no appeals on that date.

VICE CHAIR HART: So I think what we're looking at is having that -- I will ask the Applicant a few things, in addition to the transportation focus that we're going to be doing at the next hearing. A lot has come up about scale of development in this area and this as being out of scale with the development. And I would like to have a -- I don't know what it is. Maybe it's photographs that show scale.

I think that one of the things that I'm really looking for is we talked about Ketcham School quite a bit and height of this building with the relationship of that. I would like to understand one, those relative heights but also the relative -- the relationship between these. I don't have a good sense of where these are with relation to each So are we talking about a longer distance? other. I mean if it's such a long distance that it's kind of irrelevant, then that's one thing. And so I would like to understand where those two buildings are. So to have the height of this building, I don't know if it is a section or whatever that shows these two buildings with relationship to each other. That would be helpful.

The scale issue, I don't know. I'm not looking for 3D renderings or anything. I'm more looking for what is

1	it along these two streets and these areas that we are kind
2	of relating to one another. As you heard pretty clearly that
3	the folks who came here today that have testified in
4	opposition are saying that this is out of scale with the rest
5	of the neighborhood, or at least along this portion of the
6	street.
7	So I don't know if there are other things and
8	photographs showing what this what you're talking about
9	in terms of your development with regard to other buildings
10	that are next to it on either street.
11	And you have a question.
12	MR. BELLO: Well not so much a question but
13	hopefully an explanation.
14	I'm willing to do a drawing to show the scale and
15	the distance for the what's the name of this school the
16	Ketcham School. But what I was going to mention is that the
17	new Zoning Regs allow this is the new Zoning Regs height
18	limitation and we're not quite at the height limitation. We
19	are a couple of feet below and then we set back for the
20	penthouse. So this is the new Zoning Regulation allowable
21	height limit for this neighborhood in that zone.
22	VICE CHAIR HART: I'd still like to see it, just
23	to have an understanding.
24	MR. BELLO: Yes.
25	VICE CHAIR HART: Because right now, I'm just

1	hearing it and it's helpful for me to see things. I'm
2	visual. So it's just something that I think that would be
3	helpful to have.
4	Yes, Ms. White?
5	MEMBER WHITE: How many units again in the
6	building?
7	MR. BELLO: Twenty-five.
8	MEMBER WHITE: Twenty-five?
9	MR. BELLO: Yes.
10	VICE CHAIR HART: Any other questions?
11	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Mr. Chairman, I would also and
12	I do this all the time and I think you all do this as well,
13	I would ask that the Applicant again meet with Ms. Fuller and
14	those who may not be part of the ANC. If you all could maybe
15	convene a meeting on-site, have a continued meeting, have
16	that continued dialogue. Maybe it was rushed. Maybe people
17	felt like it was rushed. Maybe to have that conversation
18	would help clarify some of the misunderstandings that may be
19	out there.
20	So I would offer you all to do that. Maybe, Ms.
21	Fuller, if you can head that up, along with Mr. Jones.
22	MR. JONES: I will reach out to Ms. Fuller and we
23	will get it scheduled.
24	VICE CHAIR HART: And include, please
25	ZC CHAIR HOOD: So far, we are two for two.

VICE CHAIR HART: -- have drawings, if you have boards with this stuff on it, have handouts. I think people are just feeling like it sounds as though that the folks that are coming and testified are just feeling like we just don't know. That they don't know and that others don't know. While they are not necessarily representing others, they are saying that there are other people that are just feeling left out. And I think it would be helpful to be able to show them.

Yes, ma'am.

2.0

MS. KENNEDY: And can I just add that the other thing that we're feeling is yes, we had the conversation, we had the impromptu meeting -- I went to the ANC meeting but what we're really feeling is that everybody is just checking a box to be able to say yes, I talked to the residents but that they really don't care what we're saying and they don't care what we think. And they are not even considering the fact that we're not saying no. Can we come to some kind of a healthy medium or compromise, where you can get kind of what you want and maybe I might sacrifice something but still get something I want not just you bulldoze me because that's what it feels like.

VICE CHAIR HART: And Ms. Kennedy, is it? I think that you've heard also from the architect that has said that this development is within the actual zoning in the area.

1 MS. KENNEDY: Can I just say something to that? 2 VICE CHAIR HART: I'm just saying that that's something he said. 3 4 MS. KENNEDY: Yes, because Mr. Jones has said it And what I say to that is on my end, it's not 5 to me, too. 6 a question about whether it was legal for you to do it or 7 whether you were in scope to do it. That's not my issue. 8 VICE CHAIR HART: Yes. 9 MS. KENNEDY: I'm not even questioning whether you 10 can do it or not legally. We live there so that's not our 11 issue. 12 VICE CHAIR HART: I know. I was just making sure 13 that you were aware of that. 14 MS. KENNEDY: No, he's --15 VICE CHAIR HART: So what he's also saying is that 16 as long as that zone is -- that zone would encompass other 17 So it may not be just that building that we're buildings. 18 talking about right now but there may be other buildings that 19 are in that same zone that will allow that height and that 2.0 So I'm just telling you to just be aware that is the size. 21 zoning that you're dealing with right now. So just a little 22 point of clarification. That's all. Thank you. 23 I appreciate it. MS. KENNEDY: 24 VICE CHAIR HART: So I think we'll continue the 25 hearing until the 20th. I think that we should have --

1	don't know. Can you give me some dates when the Applicant
2	should kind of respond to
3	MR. MOY: Well, while I do that, Mr. Vice Chair,
4	I don't recall whether or not the Board's already addressed
5	the issue but was the Board interested in having DDOT review
6	the Applicant's transportation study or has that already been
7	resolved?
8	VICE CHAIR HART: I think it would be helpful to
9	have something in the record that just said that they have
10	looked at it or that they agree with it, that they don't have
11	any issues with it, whatever they are going to say about it.
12	I just think that right now that just is I just want to
13	have some finality with that.
14	MR. MOY: Okay, I can pursue that and I'll work
15	in coordination with the Office of Planning.
16	So if we continue the hearing on the 20th of
17	December, then if the Applicant can make their filings so
18	that everyone will have a chance to review the documents,
19	let's say by December 6th or can you submit it earlier than
20	that?
21	VICE CHAIR HART: You have to speak into the mike.
22	MR. CRUICKSHANK: Yes, I can work with that
23	deadline.
24	MR. MOY: Okay, December 6th it is.
25	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Is this going to be a limited
	· ·

1	scope or are you going to open it all back up?
2	VICE CHAIR HART: No, I think it should be a
3	limited scope. I don't want to have this is really to
4	discuss the things that we've
5	ZC CHAIR HOOD: The different issues that we've
6	just spoke about.
7	VICE CHAIR HART: Yes, okay.
8	ZC CHAIR HOOD: So it will be limited to that.
9	VICE CHAIR HART: And the record is going to
10	remain open. So if there are folks that want to be able to
11	comment, they have the ability to do that, if they want.
12	That's it for this case. Thank you very much all
13	for staying with us so late. And I know there are some other
14	folks here. Just waiting, chomping at the bit.
15	We actually have to take like a two-minute break
16	because we've sitting here for a little while. So I
17	apologize for it but we'll be back in a sec.
18	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the
19	record at 7:11 p.m. and resumed at 7:19 p.m.)
20	VICE CHAIR HART: Okay, we're back to order. And
21	the folks that have really been here. You've been here
22	through thick and thin. I appreciate it.
23	Mr. Moy, next case, please.
24	MR. MOY: Yes, with pleasure. This would be
25	Application 19589 of Thad Hunkins, captioned and advertised

1	with special exceptions under Subtitle E, Section 5201 from
2	the lot occupancy requirements of Subtitle E, Section 304.1,
3	rear yard requirements, Subtitle E, Section 205.4, and under
4	Subtitle C, Section 1504 from the penthouse setback
5	requirements of Subtitle C, Section 1502. This would
6	construct a one-story rear addition and roof deck to an
7	existing one-family dwelling RF-1 Zone, 643 F Street,
8	Northeast, Square 861, Lot 188.
9	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you, Mr. Moy.
10	Welcome. I just want to make sure that you've
11	been sworn in. I'm assuming you have but
12	MR. WILLIAMS: Yes.
13	VICE CHAIR HART: Okay. If you could, introduce
14	yourself and if you could, just give a brief description of
15	your project. I think we're pretty familiar with it but just
16	so if you could walk us through it. I appreciate it.
17	MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, my name is Chris Williams.
18	I'm with Landis Architects and Builders here representing the
19	builder and our client, the owner.
20	Our client is a military officer who is stationed
21	overseas currently. He wants to retire back to the home.
22	He wants to take an existing five-foot deep covered open
23	porch and replace that with a ten-foot deep enclosed room
24	that he's going to use for a breakfast room/office space to

be next to his kitchen. And to make it easy, we'll have a

1	roof deck, as opposed to a roof, to keep it as small as
2	possible.
3	That's our case.
4	VICE CHAIR HART: That's very quick.
5	Do we have any questions for the Applicant?
6	MEMBER WHITE: One question would be can you let
7	me know or let us know and share with us whether or not
8	you've gotten any pushback from adjacent owners?
9	MR. WILLIAMS: Both neighbors have submitted
10	letters of approval and support.
11	MEMBER WHITE: Okay and no opposition that has
12	been part of the record, that I could see.
13	MR. WILLIAMS: No.
14	MEMBER WHITE: And ANC feedback?
15	MR. WILLIAMS: It was all positive.
16	MEMBER WHITE: Great, thank you.
17	VICE CHAIR HART: Okay, I guess we'll go to the
18	Office of Planning.
19	MS. MYERS: For the record, Crystal Myers with the
20	Office of Planning.
21	The Office of Planning is recommending approval
22	but we also are recommending an additional or actually
23	only one condition, that the rear yard tree have protection
24	during construction. So it says during construction the rear
25	yard tree shall be protected with securely-installed fencing

1	around the drip line of the tree or with a similar protective
2	measure.
3	But otherwise, we are recommending approval and
4	stand with the record of the staff report.
5	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you.
6	Does the Board have any questions for the Office
7	of Planning?
8	(No audible response.)
9	VICE CHAIR HART: Hearing none, does the Applicant
10	have any questions for the Office of Planning?
11	MR. WILLIAMS: No.
12	VICE CHAIR HART: Okay, thank you.
13	Next we'll go to the ANC. Anybody here from the
14	ANC? No.
15	Anyone here in support of the application?
16	Anyone here in opposition to the application?
17	Nobody else; just you, Mr. Williams.
18	So bringing it back to the Board, do you have any
19	final questions? And actually the only question I had was,
20	Mr. Williams, you've read the Office of Planning report and
21	their condition that they and I can read the condition
22	which is during construction the rear yard tree shall be
23	protected with
24	MR. WILLIAMS: Absolutely. We'll have it on our
25	permanent drawings, no problem.

1	VICE CHAIR HART: Okay, I just wanted to make sure
2	
3	MR. WILLIAMS: Absolutely.
4	VICE CHAIR HART: that it was on there.
5	I went through all of those. Sorry, I'm going
6	through my head the procedure.
7	I've already heard opposition. I asked for final
8	questions. It doesn't look like there are any. I'll close
9	the record at this point. We'll bring it yes, sir?
10	MR. MOY: Sorry to interrupt you. I just noticed
11	I hate to bring this up
12	VICE CHAIR HART: That's fine.
13	MR. MOY: because I know it is really late.
14	It's just a technical aspect. I just noticed that on the
15	Letter of Authorization, typically we have the name that is
16	associated in the authorization letter. It does authorize
17	Lanis Architects and Builders but if the Board agrees if you
18	can supplement the record with the name of the agent.
19	VICE CHAIR HART: Mr. Williams?
20	MR. WILLIAMS: Okay.
21	MR. MOY: Yes, and I would include that into the
22	record.
23	VICE CHAIR HART: I don't have an issue with it.
24	Thank you very much, Mr. Moy, for pointing that out to us.
25	Mr. Williams, if you could supplement the record

1	with that, that would be helpful.
2	MR. WILLIAMS: You just want me to
3	MR. MOY: Upload it into the record.
4	MR. WILLIAMS: upload into the record the
5	authorization with my name on it.
6	MR. MOY: That's correct, yes.
7	MR. WILLIAMS: Got it.
8	MR. MOY: Representing Lanis, signed by Mr.
9	Hunkins. Thank you.
10	VICE CHAIR HART: So with this, I now will close
11	the record. Thank you, Mr. Moy.
12	I'll start. I have read the full record and I
13	felt that listening to the Applicant, as well as reading
14	through the Office of Planning report, as well as the ANC
15	report, I believe that the Applicant has met the special
16	exception criteria and the relief that they are requesting
17	and would be in support of the application, as it has been
18	provided to us, as well as the conditions that the Office of
19	Planning has put forward.
20	Do you have any other comments?
21	MEMBER WHITE: No, I concur with what your
22	comments were, that they met the criteria for the special
23	exception relief for lot occupancy relief, rear yard relief,
24	and also penthouse setback relief under Subtitle C, 1502.
25	So I am supportive of the application with the

1	conditions stated regarding the preserving of the tree,
2	protection of the tree. So yes, I am supportive of it.
3	VICE CHAIR HART: Excellent. And with that, I
4	would like to make a motion to approve Application 19589 of
5	Thad Hunkins, as read by the secretary, including the
6	condition that the Office of Planning has provided.
7	MEMBER WHITE: Second, Mr. Vice Chair.
8	VICE CHAIR HART: We've had a motion and a second.
9	All in favor of the motion say aye.
10	(Chorus of aye.)
11	Any opposed?
12	(No audible response.)
13	The motion carries.
14	MR. MOY: Staff would record the vote as three to
15	zero to two. This is on the motion of Vice Chair Hart to
16	approve the Application for the relief being requested.
17	Seconding the motion, Ms. White. Also in support, Mr. Hood.
18	Board member not participating, board seat vacant. The
19	motion carries.
20	VICE CHAIR HART: A summary order, Mr. Moy.
21	MR. MOY: Thank you.
22	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you very much, sir.
23	MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you.
24	VICE CHAIR HART: Mr. Moy, if you could call the
25	is this the last case?

1	MR. MOY: Yes. Yes.
2	VICE CHAIR HART: And everyone looks so fresh and
3	okay, I'm sorry. I couldn't pull it off.
4	So we're all here and it's pretty late. So, Mr.
5	Moy, if you could read the next case, 19606.
6	MR. MOY: Yes. Yes, I'll read that quickly. This
7	is Application 19606 of St. Albans School, captioned and
8	advertised for a special exception under the use regulations
9	of Subtitle U, Section 203.1(1) to permit an increase to the
10	maximum permitted number of students, faculty, and staff of
11	an existing private school, R-1-B zone, 3101 Wisconsin
12	Avenue, Northwest, Square 1944, Lot 25.
13	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you very much, Mr. Moy.
14	Now, if we could go from my right to left, if you
15	could, introduce yourselves and provide your address.
16	MR. BAAD: Sure. My name is David Baad. I'm the
17	Associate Headmaster at St. Albans School, which is at 3101
18	Wisconsin Avenue, Northwest.
19	VICE CHAIR HART: That's B-O-D-D?
20	MR. BAAD: B-A-A-D.
21	VICE CHAIR HART: Okay, I was nowhere near that.
22	MR. WILSON: Vance Wilson, Headmaster of St.
23	Albans School, 3101 Wisconsin Avenue.
24	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you.
25	MR. ANDRES: Good evening, everyone, Erwin Andres,

1	Gorove/Slade Associates, 1140 Connecticut Avenue.
2	MS. SHIKER: Good evening. Christine Shiker with
3	the law firm of Holland and Knight, 800 17th Street,
4	Northwest.
5	MR. DETTMAN: Good evening. Shane Dettman. I'm
6	Director of Planning Services with the law firm Holland and
7	Knight, same address as Christie.
8	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you very much.
9	And so Ms. Shiker, are you going to be starting
10	the presentation?
11	MS. SHIKER: Yes. Yes, I am.
12	VICE CHAIR HART: Okay.
13	MS. SHIKER: Yes, good evening. Thank you. We
14	are pleased to be here to present this application, which is
15	requesting a very slight increase in the enrollment and
16	employment caps for St. Albans.
17	We are very pleased to be here today with Office
18	of Planning support, with DDOT support, with unanimous ANC
19	support. And all of this support has come because of the
20	close coordination work that we have done during this
21	process.
22	St. Albans, as you may know, is an existing
23	private school that opened in 1909 and has continued
24	operating as a school for boys since that time. While the
25	use predates zoning and is a legal conforming use there have

been several BZA cases over the year which approved construction of additional facilities.

Can you go to the third slide, please?

All right and on the board you can see the various cases since 1971. We had cases in 1976, 1994, and the most recent case, which is the one of most importance to this case is in 2005. That's BZA Case 17320, in which physical construction was approved, as well as athletic fields, physical construction, and there was the enrollment and employment cap that was put on the school at that time.

Over the course of the past 12 years, there have been fluctuations in that enrollment, based on a number of factors that have led us to this application here today. We are seeking to increase the maximum enrollment to 600 students, which is an increase of 21 students, and to increase the corresponding maximum employment of faculty and staff FTEs to 145, which is an increase of two FTEs.

While this application was assigned a new case number, the application is, in fact, a modification to the condition in the 2005 order. This has been a discussion with the Office of Zoning staff and like the past cases for St. Albans, it is considered a new case but I wanted to make sure that the Board understood the relationship to the 2005 order.

In addition, we worked very closely with the Neighborhood Liaison Working Group, which was established

2.0

under the 2005 order, with ANC 3-C, with OP, and DDOT. As a result of that outreach, we have two areas of new conditions to add. I will stress that the 2005 order will not change. It will stand and we are seeking to slightly revise three of the conditions.

And if we could go to the next page, we have done this to make it very easy and we actually have a printout for staff.

The first condition that would change would be the increase -- if the application was approved, it would be the increase in the number of students and the number of FTEs.

The second would be a clarification to condition number 3 and this change comes directly from the conditions that the ANC has requested as part of their unanimous support for this case. So that language from the ANC order has been dropped in exactly. It is similar in context to the old condition number 3 but has a bit more specificity in the language and we've agreed to that.

The final change would come into condition number 5 and it adds a couple of transportation demand management measures that DDOT has requested in its report. Specifically those are that students who are eligible, would be encourage to participate in the D.C. One Program and that the Applicant will include information on establishing carpools in all of its summer and pre-academic year orientation mailings and

2.0

	Meetings. Again, we've agreed to those.
2	In DDOT's report and in the Gorove/Slade report,
3	you would see a comprehensive list of transportation demand
4	management measures. All of those, with the exception of
5	these couple that I am point out now, were originally
6	included in the 2005 order and would continue to be
7	applicable to the operation of St. Albans. These additional
8	ones would come as a direct result of increasing this slight
9	increase for the number of students and FTEs.
10	Therefore, as I've said, we've showed you the only
11	changes to the 2005 order and we are prepared to proceed with
12	a presentation or we're happy to go directly to questions,
13	if the Board feels that it has reviewed the record.
14	So we will follow your direction.
15	VICE CHAIR HART: Does the Board have any
16	questions at this point? Or would you like a presentation
17	or would want to move to a do you have any questions at
18	this time?
19	(No audible response.)
20	VICE CHAIR HART: Okay, that's fine. I don't have
21	any questions. And I don't think that we need to go through
22	a presentation. I think that it's fairly straightforward.
23	MS. SHIKER: Okay.
24	VICE CHAIR HART: What are doing now? So are you
25	finished with your

1 MS. SHIKER: Yes. Unless there are questions, we 2 representatives from the school, Erwin on 3 transportation issues, and then Shane to talk about 4 questions you have with compliance with the special exception 5 Otherwise, I know that there is a representative standard. 6 from the ANC who wanted to speak and, obviously, Ms. Brown-7 Roberts. 8 VICE CHAIR HART: Okay, so let's, because Yes. 9 we are trying to move through the process, let's go to the 10 Office of Planning. If there are any questions, we will give 11 them to the Office of Planning or maybe have some questions 12 for the Applicant at some point. 13 So Ms. Brown-Roberts. 14 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Good evening, Mr. Vice Chair 15 and members of the Board. Maxine Brown-Roberts from the 16 Office of Planning. 17 I will stand on the record and say that 18 recommend approval of the request to increase the number of 19 students to 600 and for the FTEs to go to 145. 2.0 also in support of the other transportation recommendations 21 that were made by DDOT, to which the Applicant has referred 22 this afternoon. 2.3 And I am available for questions. Thank you. 24 VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you. 25 Any questions for the Office of Planning at this

	357
1	point?
2	(No audible response.)
3	VICE CHAIR HART: Hearing none, Ms. Shiker, do you
4	have any questions for the Office of Planning?
5	MS. SHIKER: I do not. Thank you.
6	VICE CHAIR HART: Okay, next we have the ANC.
7	Please join us.
8	If you could, introduce yourself excuse me.
9	If you could introduce yourself, that would be helpful. And
10	also, I'm assuming that you have well, I shouldn't assume.
11	Have you been sworn in today at any point?
12	MS. MAY: No, no.
13	VICE CHAIR HART: Okay. And that's why we don't
14	assume, right?
15	MS. MAY: Yes.
16	VICE CHAIR HART: Mr. Moy, if you could.
17	MR. MOY: Yes, with pleasure.
18	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you.
19	(Whereupon, the witness was sworn.)
20	VICE CHAIR HART: And if you could, state your
21	name and your address.
22	MS. MAY: Yes, my name is Catherine May and I
23	reside at 2800 36th Street, Northwest. I am speaking this
24	evening on behalf of Malia Brink, who is the Single Member

District Commissioner for ANC 3C08. And I held that seat

1 before her from 2005 until January of this year. 2 It's late so I will be very brief. St. Albans enjoys broad support throughout the Single Member District 3 4 and I know that you have two letters on file in opposition 5 to this application and I will speak very briefly to both of 6 those. 7 I also have served on the Neighborhood Liaison 8 Working Group across the past 12 years and St. Albans has 9 been extremely diligent in working with the neighbors to 10 resolve any of the parking and noise issues referenced in one 11 of the letters. is a letter also about the 12 And there tennis 13 And I would just like to go on record as saying that 14 there are a number of constituents who live right across the 15 street from the tennis courts who are in support of keeping 16 the screens up all year round and we worked carefully with 17 the school to find a compromise that would address the needs 18 of both groups. 19 And I'll stop there, unless you have questions. 2.0 I'll open it up to the Board. VICE CHAIR HART: 21 I don't have any questions. Do other Board members have any 22 questions?

going to speak to one of the letters in opposition.

ZC CHAIR HOOD:

trying to wait for Myers to open it up.

23

24

25

I was

I may have missed it but are you

1	Did you speak to it? I might have missed it?
2	MS. MAY: Yes, there was one letter that
3	referenced an increase in noise and traffic as the result of
4	this application.
5	MEMBER WHITE: I have one question.
6	VICE CHAIR HART: Yes, please.
7	MEMBER WHITE: Did you have a chance to read some
8	of the information from DDOT regarding the proposed TDM plan
9	that is potentially going to be incorporated as part of the
10	relief
11	MS. MAY: Yes, indeed.
12	MEMBER WHITE: if it's granted. And I wondered
13	if you had any concerns or whether or not you are 100 percent
14	onboard with those conditions.
15	MS. MAY: I fully support the conditions and the
16	language that the school has agreed to.
17	MEMBER WHITE: Okay, thank you.
18	ZC CHAIR HOOD: And you are the ANC Single
19	District
20	MS. MAY: I was the ANC commissioner across the
21	past
22	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Oh, you were. So you're not
23	speaking on behalf of the ANC.
24	MS. MAY: I'm not speaking on behalf of the ANC.
25	I am speaking on behalf of Malia Brink, the Single Member

1	District Commissioner, who now holds the seat that I held for
2	12 years.
3	MS. SHIKER: And I will just point out, Ms. Brinks
4	was here for quite a while but had to get home because she
5	needed to see her family. She's leaving town tomorrow. So
6	she did issue a letter saying that she could speak in her
7	stead, since she had to leave.
8	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Okay and Nancy MacWood is the
9	chair?
10	MS. MAY: That is correct.
11	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Okay.
12	MR. MOY: Yes, I'm sorry I had neglected to
13	mention that.
14	ZC CHAIR HOOD: That's okay. I was just trying
15	to see where we were.
16	MR. MOY: Yes, that's good.
17	ZC CHAIR HOOD: That's good. Thank you.
18	VICE CHAIR HART: And in the just the letter
19	of opposition, one of the things they bring up is that the
20	school has exceeded the approved cap. And could you speak
21	to just because right now you are looking at the cap of
22	600. And if you could just speak to kind of how you are
23	going to keep within that, I guess.
24	MS. SHIKER: That's correct. And I think I would
25	ask Mr. Baad to speak to that, if that's okay.

1 VICE CHAIR HART: That's fine. I'm just focusing 2 on you because you're the only one who has spoken so far. Sure. A couple of years ago, our Board 3 MR. BAAD: 4 of Governors undertook a study to decide what the optimal 5 size of the school was going to be. And given our 6 restrictions on facilities and programs and also the long-7 term financial sustainability of the school, they determined 8 that the optimal size is 585. So that is going to be our 9 qoal. 10 We're asking for a cap of 600 because we have 11 found, the years, that the admissions in over game 12 independent schools is a little more art than science. And 13 trying to determine what yield numbers will be in a given 14 vear can be а little bit difficult sometimes and. 15 occasionally, you will go over by a few students. 16 And we also tried to extend late deadlines to families who have been with us for many years and they're 17 18 trying to make decisions. So that can be sometimes difficult 19 to hit an exact number. 2.0 Thank you, I appreciate it. VICE CHAIR HART: 21 MR. BAAD: Sure. 22 Does the Board have any other VICE CHAIR HART: 23 questions for the --24 Just a final question, MEMBER WHITE: just to 25 confirm that St. Albans is onboard with the conditions

1	outlined in the TDM plan. I asked the representative for the
2	Single Member District but I wanted to make sure I addressed
3	it.
4	MS. SHIKER: So the TDM, the comprehensive TDM
5	elements that are in DDOT's report, the significant majority
6	are already conditions to St. Albans in a 2005 order and they
7	will continue to govern the site.
8	The three additional conditions, which have been
9	identified in the redline are the only new ones and St.
10	Albans is agreeing to each of those.
11	VICE CHAIR HART: And do we have any other
12	questions for the Applicant?
13	(No audible response.)
14	VICE CHAIR HART: There are while we have heard
15	from the ANC, I actually had not gone through the opposition.
16	And if anyone is here in opposition to the since no one
17	else is here, I would take that as a no.
18	Anyone else in favor of the application?
19	(No audible response.)
20	VICE CHAIR HART: Also, I think you are the only
21	one here that is not actually representing the school.
22	I think that we can do we have any other
23	questions from the Board? I think we can close the record
24	for the case.
25	Hold on.

1 I wanted to note the Board was ready to 2 deliberate. Yes? Okay. I'll start. listened to the testimony and read 3 having through the record that is included in the case, hearing from 4 5 the Office of Planning and their report, their recommendation 6 for approving the application, also support from the ANC3C, 7 as well as DDOT, I feel that I'd be comfortable in supporting 8 this special exception and would like to hear other comments, 9 if you have any. 10 I would concur with you, Mr. Vice MEMBER WHITE: 11 Chair. I think St. Albans, their counsel has done an 12 excellent job in making sure that they continue to be a good 13 I think the request that they're asking for to 14 expand their private school use under Subtitle U, 203.1 is 15 in line with the facts of the case. After reviewing the 16 record, I think they've met the criteria and I don't see any 17 reason not to support it, at this point. 18 ZC CHAIR HOOD: I would agree, Mr. Chairman, with 19 all the support, especially when I see ANC 3C and I see Ms. 2.0 Nancy MacWood and others who have supported this project 21 going forward. I know that's no easy task and I know they 22 don't take no tea for the fever. 23 would be voting this, So Ι in support of 24 especially with the overwhelming support I see here. 25 VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you, both of you, for your

	choughes on it.
2	And the I'm looking at the conditions. So I
3	guess what we're looking at is there are five conditions that
4	the Applicant has stated on this slide that is, I guess,
5	before us. I'm not even sure which exhibit this is. I don't
6	know. Exhibit 49, I think.
7	MS. SHIKER: It's the last exhibit in.
8	VICE CHAIR HART: I think it's 49, at least that
9	is what I have on my screen.
LO	So I would make a motion to approve Application
11	19606 of St. Albans School, as read by the secretary and with
L2	the conditions as I'm trying to think if this is the only
13	other place do we have this in the record, too, besides
L4	this? Is it written in another place?
L5	MS. SHIKER: It is in the PowerPoint that was
L6	uploaded.
L7	VICE CHAIR HART: Yes.
L8	MS. SHIKER: We also have a hard copy we could
L9	submit to you.
20	VICE CHAIR HART: That would be helpful, just so
21	it's cleaner. Because it is kind of the strikeout part.
22	MS. SHIKER: Okay, we'll go ahead and submit this
23	to Mr. Moy. And it shows all of the conditions from 2005
24	with the three changes in the three conditions.
25	VICE CHAIR HART: Okay

1	So I would make a motion to approve Application
2	19606 of St. Albans School, as read by the secretary and
3	including the conditions changes that are in let's just
4	say this is that will be in the record.
5	And do I have a second on that motion?
6	MEMBER WHITE: Second.
7	VICE CHAIR HART: Hearing a second, all in favor
8	of the motion, say aye.
9	(Chorus of aye.)
10	VICE CHAIR HART: Any opposed?
11	(No audible response.)
12	VICE CHAIR HART: The motion carries.
13	Mr. Moy.
14	MR. MOY: The staff would record the vote as three
15	to zero to two. This is on the motion of Vice Chair Hart to
16	grant the modification to the conditions as submitted into
17	the record. The second on the motion, Ms. White. Also in
18	support, Mr. Anthony Hood. We have no other member
19	participating. We have a Board seat vacant.
20	VICE CHAIR HART: Summary order, Mr. Moy.
21	MR. MOY: Yes, sir.
22	VICE CHAIR HART: And if I know that you have
23	submitted it so we have this. I appreciate you all spending
24	your entire day with us. And I hope you have a good
25	afternoon or good evening now, since it's oh, my gosh,

	366
1	it's almost eight o'clock.
2	Have a good evening and I think we stand adjourned
3	actually, are there any other items before the Board, Mr.
4	Moy?
5	MR. MOY: I'd be crazy to mention anything new.
6	None at all.
7	VICE CHAIR HART: With that, the hearing is
8	adjourned. Thank you.
9	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the
10	record at 7:47 p.m.)
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

<u>CERTIFICATE</u>

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Public Hearing

Before: DC BZA

Date: 11-15-17

Place: Washington, DC

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

Court Reporter

near Nous &