GOVERNMENT OF

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

+ + + + +

PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY

DECEMBER 20, 2017

+ + + + +

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

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

ANTHONY HOOD, Chairperson

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

CLIFFORD MOY, Secretary

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PRESENT:

MARY NAGELHOUT, ESQ.

## OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

MAXINE BROWN-ROBERTS
BRANDICE ELLIOTT
CRYSTAL MYERS
STEPHEN MORDFIN
KAREN THOMAS
ELISE VITALE

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Public Hearing held on December 20, 2017.

## CONTENTS

Application 19572 - SIM Development, LLC	4
Announcements	50
Application 19581 - Latin-American Montessori Bilingual Charter School	51
Appeal 19632 of AMT-Varnum LLC	130
Appeal 19573 of Nefretiti Makenta	133
Appeal 19650 of Corner Market Store	140
Appeal 19656 Mark and Cynthia Moyer	148
Appeal 19655 of Benjamin Flowers	153
Appeal 19600 of Team Washington, Inc.,	
d/b/a Domino's Pizza	160
Application 19630 of Elodie Goirand and	
Andreas Xenophontos	226
Adiourn	257

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

	I KOCEEDINGS
2	10:08 a.m.
3	CHAIRPERSON HILL: So, it looks like we're moving
4	onto the hearing cases. And if you could, Mr. Secretary,
5	call the first case.
6	SECRETARY MOY: Thank you. That would be this
7	is a, as you'll recall, a continued hearing, Case Application
8	Number 19572 of SIM, S-I-M Development, LLC.
9	This is an Application for variances from a
10	nonconforming structural requirement of Subtitle C, Section
11	202, and the parking requirements of Subtitle C, Section
12	701.5, which would add two stories containing 16 units to ar
13	existing two story nine unit mixed-use building in the MU-4
14	at premises 1916 15th Street Southeast, square 5766, lot 845.
15	This was last heard by the Board on November 15.
16	And I believe the Board left the record open. This is a
17	continued hearing, but left the record open and determined
18	to hold a continued, limited scope hearing to focus on any
19	transportation issues.
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: And Mr. Vice Chair, I wasn't
21	here for the original hearing. But just to let the Board
22	know, I have read the entire record and watched all of the
23	testimony.
24	But since you were chairing, I think maybe it

would be just appropriate that you continue to chair and I

1	can just stay quiet.
2	VICE CHAIR HART: Why thank you, Mr. Chairman.
3	Much appreciated.
4	So, I think for this case we have some preliminary
5	matters that we need to address. There is a postponement
6	request for ANC 8A.
7	And this postponement request is connected to the
8	ANC 8A's, I guess they're rescinding their support of the
9	project. And so they're just rescinding their support by a
10	vote of zero to excuse me, four to zero to two. And
11	that's Exhibit 64.
12	Does the Board have any any comments on the
13	postponement request?
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Vice Chair, I'd be
15	interested to see if the ANC is here. Whoever made the
16	request? I'm sorry, who's the ANC?
17	Oh, okay. I'm sorry, sir. I guess and
18	actually, Mr. Vice Chair didn't mention, but I guess,
19	VICE CHAIR HART: Yes.
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I don't know if you want
21	everybody to introduce themselves.
22	VICE CHAIR HART: You're right. And thank you
23	very much for coming. If you could introduce yourselves from
24	my right to my left.

MR. PRESTWOOD:

25

Absolutely. Good morning, Mr.

1	Vice Chair. Troy Donte Prestwood, Chairman advisory
2	Neighborhood Advisory Commission 8A.
3	MR. JONES: Phinis Jones representing the
4	Developer on Community Outreach.
5	MR. SEMLER: Peter Semler representing Capital
6	Intelligence, opposed to the development.
7	MR. ANDRES: Good morning. Erwin Andres, Vice
8	President and Principal with Gorove/Slade Associates.
9	MR. CRUICKSHANK: Morning, Neil Cruickshank,
10	architect, Architectural Solutions, LLC, owner.
11	MS. KENNEDY: Good morning. Karinne Kennedy, 1920
12	15th Street. I'm a resident directly across from the
13	proposed property.
14	VICE CHAIR HART: You have to push the button.
15	There you go.
16	MS. AGYEI: Dorcas Agyei, 1926 15th Street. A
17	resident opposed to the development.
18	MS. MUHAMMAD: Holly Muhammad, ANC 8A.
19	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you. And so the ANC, Mr.
20	Don Prestwood, thank you. I had put down Donte and I
21	realized that it wasn't.
22	MR. PRESTWOOD: I go by Donte. That's fine.
23	VICE CHAIR HART: No. Mr. Prestwood, could you
24	talk a little bit about the necessity for the postponement?
25	MR. PRESTWOOD: Absolutely. So

1 VICE CHAIR HART: For your -- why you're proposing 2 it. So, our communication to 3 MR. PRESTWOOD: Sure. 4 the BZA was in twofold. One was to let you know that we 5 rescinded our support from the vote that we made back on 6 November 8, 20 -- November 7, 2017. 7 And then secondly to ask for a postponement. The 8 postponement is to allow more time with the developer and the 9 residents to continue discussions with regards to how this 10 will impact the community. 11 When we first voted in support of this, 12 Commissioner that represented that area felt that, you know, 13 that everything that he had asked for, the developer was 14 going to do. Had reached out significantly to the community. 15 Had, you know, garnered the support that was 16 Had, you know, full support of everyone involved. 17 And what we later found out was that that was not 18 necessarily the case. As the ANC became aware that many, 19 many residents were very upset with what was about to occur. 2.0 My understanding is that the design, the scale, 21 the scope, the size of the building, the additional floors, 22 the traffic study that was done, was insufficient. Addition 23 to that, they remain unsatisfied with the type of building 24 materials that were being proposed by the Applicant, and what

impact will have on the overall character

25

neighborhood.

2.0

And so what we propose was that the developer and the residents continue to discuss these issues. We understand, and I did note that in my communication to the Board that on November 30, 2017 that the developer and the community did participate in a meeting where they began to discuss these things.

But my read out of that meeting was that I was not complete. That it was just the beginning of a discussion that they -- my understanding is that they need to continue.

And so, what we decided to do was to ask that the Board would, you know, direct the Applicant to ask that the sup -- that they hold off on moving this forward.

We're asking you rather, if you will hold off on approving this while we allow that process to take forward. The ANC is fully prepared to provide additional comments on this based on what the outcome of that conversation is with the Applicant and the residents in a letter of support or a letter of non-support.

VICE CHAIR HART: Okay. So, Mr. Prestwood, you noted that there is -- that there was initially some conversations, but that the information that you received, or that the other ANC member, the single member district received was -- was it that they were -- that there were other conversations that had happened? That actually didn't

1	happen?
2	I mean, I'm a little confused as to
3	MR. PRESTWOOD: Sure. And I can
4	VICE CHAIR HART: As to the time line.
5	MR. PRESTWOOD: Absolutely. So I can tell you
6	that one of the things that we had requested from the
7	Applicant was that we be provided with an impact study for
8	traffic and parking.
9	We did receive that. But we received that on the
10	day of our public hearing back on November 7.
11	As a result of that, the other Commissioners and
12	the community, or rather I should say, did not feel that was
13	sufficient time for them to inspect that record. Even though
14	we know that was uploaded to the BZA case records.
15	The community and many of them are here, did not
16	feel that was sufficient time for them to inspect the record.
17	To actually go over that. To even bring in a third-party to
18	examine that.
19	To see in fact if, you know, if that's sufficient
20	for them to be able to walk potentially have to walk
21	blocks from their park wherever they can find parking to
22	their home. Which is what some of the scenarios played out
23	may look with this additional structure in the community
24	adding 25 units I believe.

So that was one of the things that came up.

The

1	other issue was, I believe, that the community benefits
2	agreement the Applicant did in fact agree to a number of
3	conditions that we had discussed as a commission.
4	But, I don't believe, and the Applicant is here,
5	the representatives are here, that they in fact had these
6	conversations with the community. They had them with us.
7	But not necessarily with the community. At least
8	fully. And so, they have not fully vetted or have added
9	their input as to what they believe would be sufficient for
10	them to want to approve this particular project.
11	So those are the two things there, Mr. Vice
12	Chairman.
13	VICE CHAIR HART: And also, Mr. Prestwood, there
14	was the vote was four to two to zero at that at that
15	the last ANC well, I shouldn't say the last, the ANC
16	meeting on November 7.
17	MR. PRESTWOOD: That's correct.
18	VICE CHAIR HART: And you're saying that's when
19	you received the transportation information on this same day.
20	Or maybe at that meeting.
21	MR. PRESTWOOD: Yes. So, we received the
22	transportation study and the benefits agreement that day.
23	The commissioner moved it forward.
24	And the commissioner the area moved it forward.
25	There was a vote to support it. But then after we understood
l	I and the second

1	what was fully in it and then once the community really began
2	to dissect it and to understand what was in it, there was
3	enough of a reason for us to say maybe we should pull back
4	on this and give this more time and consideration to go
5	forward.
6	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Vice Chairman, I'm
7	VICE CHAIR HART: Yes, sir?
8	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'm not catching up. I'm
9	moving a little slow, I guess, this morning.
10	VICE CHAIR HART: Okay.
11	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'm not understanding again,
12	the letter, and I know Chairman Prestwood, I know you've
13	explained it probably twice already.
14	MR. PRESTWOOD: Um-hum.
15	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Maybe I need you to do it a
16	third time so Anthony Hood can understand it now.
17	MR. PRESTWOOD: Okay.
18	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'm looking at okay, let me
19	ask my question this way. On the letter we have, the
20	previous ANC vote where you all voted to support, four to two
21	to zero.
22	MR. PRESTWOOD: Yes.
23	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: What was that vote what was
24	the information given to the ANC on that vote? I'm trying
25	to figure out if there was a presentation made, what changed

1	from this vote to that vote, other than the transportation
2	report?
3	And how come that I see you, Ms. Muhammad. Let
4	me finish let me ask the Chairman, you all have a
5	chairman, so what changed? Unless maybe Ms. Muhammad can
6	echo it. But what changed, Chairman Prestwood, to now to
7	where we've gotten here? What information happened from what
8	you all heard, the information you got there to vote in
9	favor, too now asking us to postpone, which I don't have an
10	issue yet.
11	And then also, rescinded the vote. How did we get
12	to that to this?
13	MS. MUHAMMAD: Can I
14	VICE CHAIR HART: So, I think well, I'll let
15	the ANC just
16	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Ms. Muhammad Ms. Muhammad
17	wants to go ahead.
18	VICE CHAIR HART: Yeah. I know. I'll let Mr.
19	Prestwood and then Ms. Muhammad she can echo that.
20	MR. PRESTWOOD: So, Ms. Muhammad would like to add
21	something. So, I think we what happened for us was that
22	we did we moved forward I guess you could characterize
23	it that we moved forward too quickly.
24	That we the information that we had at the
25	time, we did not fully, I think fully ingest. And so or

1	the commissioner for that area did not fully ingest.
2	And so what we did was, once we had a chance to
3	do that, because the commissioner for that area supported it.
4	So we supported the commissioner.
5	But once we had a chance to fully understand it
6	and vet it and then the community actually had a chance to
7	inspect the record, then that's when the additional insights
8	and understanding came back to our to our commission.
9	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Is this is this Commissioner
10	Fuller?
11	MR. PRESTWOOD: This is Commissioner Hawkins, AL5
12	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Trevon Hawkins. Okay.
13	VICE CHAIR HART: And just one other question.
14	Is there a for Mr excuse me, Chairman Prestwood, is
15	there a particular piece of the parking and traffic
16	assessment that you are was there a parking issue that you
17	are, you know, more sensitive to?
18	Or that the community has been more sensitive to
19	that kind of came to light after this? Is there a specific
20	thing?
21	Or is this kind of a general concern that you're
22	raising?
23	MR. PRESTWOOD: I think for the ANC it's general.
24	But I do know that there are members of the community here
25	that can speak to the specifics.
	I and the state of

1	Because there are some very specific items in that
2	parking study, Mr. Vice Chair, that are of great concern to
3	the residents. Especially around the increase or the usage
4	of spaces in that neighborhood and what would do to those who
5	live in that area who may need to park blocks away in order
6	to get to their homes.
7	I know that's an issue that has come up. I also
8	think that there has been a question about the independence
9	of the parking study.
10	If that parking study was done by a third-party
11	without any connection to either my too either the ANC or
12	to the Applicant. And I think that was also another
13	question that was raised.
14	But, again I would like to note that there are
15	residents here who can speak specifically to your question
16	about any particular issues with the parking study. Thank
17	you.
18	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you. Commissioner
19	Muhammad, you have a few words to add to this?
20	MS. MUHAMMAD: Yes, excuse me. Yes sir, I do.
21	And just to on November 7 at our ANC public meeting, the
22	SIM Development project was on our agenda for a vote.
23	And we're starting the meeting when we get the
24	agenda. So when I saw it on there for a vote, I began
25	questioning it because at our October 3 public meeting, ANC

meeting, we told -- we asked the representatives to come back in November with a parking study and do a presentation of the development.

Because we hadn't -- the community hadn't even

Because we hadn't -- the community hadn't even seen what it looked like. So we asked them to come back and do a presentation of the development with the parking study. Which is what they agreed too.

So when we saw it on the agenda, the other commissioners, we didn't know anything about any discourse with Commissioner Hawkins regarding having that on the agenda to -- for a vote. Because we didn't have the parking study.

So when we got to that vote, they started passing the parking study down the table to us. Well, we don't have time in the meeting to read a parking study and get questions answered for the community before a vote.

So, they determined that they would go ahead and place the vote anyway. And myself and Commissioner Fuller were the two that opposed.

And we opposed because we did not have time to review the parking study or to ask questions. Or the community to even hear what was in the parking study.

So when that came letter came down, I wasn't able to come to the last hearing. Commissioner Fuller came back and said that we were required to, of course, have another meeting with the community so that we could get some of this

2.0

1 information across. We did review the parking study. And there are 2 some very serious questions about the study because it looks 3 4 overstated. 5 We haven't had a chance to talk with DDOT, to 6 confer with them about the study, on behalf of the community. 7 The community was there in mass because they wanted this vote to be rescinded, because we didn't have an opportunity to do 8 9 our due diligence before the vote. 10 So, we asked that it be postponed. There was 11 another issue in the initial letter that came down regarding 12 that vote that talked about a variance for non-conforming 13 structure requirements. 14 Well, we didn't even have that information. So 15 that vote was never taken. And that was part of the reason 16 we rescinded also. We need time to try to review these 17 issues 18 thoroughly and give the community the opportunity to respond. 19 So that they fell that they're adequately represented, before 2.0 we can actually vote on as Commissioner Donte said, either 21 for or against the project. 22 And we haven't had that opportunity. And that's 23 why we ask that you postpone this Application today. 24 VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you Commissioner Muhammad.

One thing I'll -- just a point of clarification.

25

1	In the letter that we received, that's Exhibit,
2	I don't know what Exhibit this is, 53. Which is the ANC
3	letter in support, the November 8 letter.
4	MS. MUHAMMAD: I don't have that.
5	VICE CHAIR HART: It does state that the four to
6	two to zero vote was in support. And I'll read this.
7	Support of BZA Application 19572 of SIM
8	Development for a variance from the nonconforming structure
9	requirements of Subtitle C, 202, and parking requirements
10	from Subtitle C, 701.5. So those two things were included
11	in that.
12	I mean, I just want to make sure that we were
13	that
14	MS. MUHAMMAD: They were included in the letter.
15	But this was not the vote that was taken.
16	VICE CHAIR HART: Okay.
17	MS. MUHAMMAD: The vote was only taking taken
18	for the relief from parking enforcement parking
19	requirements.
20	We only became aware of this information in the
21	letter after the last hearing when we were able to see the
22	letter. When we had the November 30 meeting, Ms. Dorcas
23	brought the letter to that meeting.
24	And we were able to see that that was in the
25	letter. We didn't realize that that was in the letter.
J	I and the second

1	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you.
2	MS. MUHAMMAD: We had no knowledge even at that
3	time that we needed to vote on that. Because we didn't have
4	it in our in our packets.
5	VICE CHAIR HART: Commissioner
6	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Ms. Muhammad
7	VICE CHAIR HART: Oh, I'm sorry.
8	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let me just ask ask Mr.
9	Prestwood,
10	VICE CHAIR HART: Yes.
11	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I distinctly remember this
12	Board asking the Applicant to come back and go out to the ANC
13	for the same issues that I'm hearing. And they're now saying
14	that they haven't had time.
15	So, I'm concerned. What happened? How long has
16	it been? Because when was the last time we were here?
17	Thirty days ago?
18	Okay. So it's been 30 days. We, and particularly
19	myself, and I think the Board agreed with me, to go back out
20	to the community.
21	And I think at that hearing, Mr. Prestwood you
22	were here. And I know Ms. Fuller. That's why I called Ms.
23	Fuller's name. I remember seeing her here.
24	Where you here Mr. Prestwood?
25	MR. PRESTWOOD: I was not here. I watched it

online.
CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Okay.
MR. PRESTWOOD: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Maybe you were at another
hearing that I was at.
MR. PRESTWOOD: Yeah.
CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. And so anyway, I
remember Ms. Fuller being here. And we specifically asked
that the Applicant go back out and come back and talk to the
ANC and the community.
And at that time I think my colleagues will
remember that he agreed to do that.
MR. PRESTWOOD: Um-hum.
CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Or they agreed to come back
out. And some of those same issues that I'm hearing
Commissioner Muhammad saying today, are the same issues that
I heard at that previous hearing.
So I'm trying to understand what happened at that
meeting that this Board asked the Applicant to go back out?
From what I'm hearing, it sounds like nothing.
Let me go to the Chairman for the ANC.
MR. PRESTWOOD: Okay. And will recognize
MR. PRESTWOOD: Okay. And will recognize Commissioner Hood, the two residents who are here, who are

I would just back up just one second and say that

1	the initial letter, Mr. Vice Chairman, was it had an
2	editing error in it. We had copied the entire verbiage for
3	the application and put that in the November 7 letter.
4	And that's how that error got in there. That we
5	voted for not just the nonconforming structure, but also the
6	parking relief.
7	In this letter that we dated December 6, explains
8	as much. It talks about the error and what we were trying
9	to do in terms of the rescinding of the vote.
LO	In terms of what happened at that meeting that the
11	developer and the community had on November 30, Commissioner
12	Hood, I would like to recognize, we have two residents from
13	that community here. They could speak, I think,
L4	extemporaneous in terms of what was what transpired and
15	what the conversation was.
L6	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let me do this before you go
L7	there. Mr. Vice Chair, is that the road that you want to go
18	down? Or do you want to deal with the postponement issues?
L9	VICE CHAIR HART: I'd rather deal with the
20	postponement issues then this
21	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Let me let me hold
22	off on getting into those kind of merits. And I figure we
23	I don't want to go too far.
24	VICE CHAIR HART: Yeah. Because we actually

haven't heard from the Applicant yet. And we have to hear

1	from the Applicant.
2	And I'm not sure if Mr. Jones, you're going to be?
3	MR. JONES: I'm going to.
4	VICE CHAIR HART: Okay. Thank you.
5	MR. JONES: Thank you Mr. Vice Chair and members
6	of the Board. And the Chairman. Let me say that we started
7	this process in October, early October in the executive
8	meeting of the ANC.
9	As I testified before when I was here, there was
10	a request for a community benefit package. We agreed with
11	everything that was requested, the developer did.
12	In that meeting we requested the ANC requested
13	a transportation study. We brought on a transportation
14	consultant.
15	And in the October meeting the transportation
16	consultant appeared before the ANC. And we engaged him at
17	that point to do the study.
18	As soon as the study was completed, we transmitted
19	that transmitted that to the ANC office. The what
20	you've heard testified to today, is they got some courtesy
21	copies at the meeting.
22	I believe it was the morning of the meeting that
23	it was transmitted to the ANC office. And of course, we have
24	no control over how it gets to its members.
25	But, I just thought it would be nice, in case

1	someone said they had not received it, I brought some
2	courtesy copies to the meeting to all the commissioners.
3	And there was a vote. The single member district
4	member voted moved the motion. And it passed four to two
5	and one.
6	It is my understanding that in this last meeting
7	the same single member district member still supported. He
8	was one of the two who supported it. And I'm not certain of
9	that. And you can inquire.
10	But the developer is prepared, and let me just
11	explain. When we came back in that last November meeting,
12	and presented. And the board asked that we go back and meet
13	with the community. We did that.
14	And the community basically, the two members that
15	are here, basically does not want the additional units on the
16	building. And the report has been filed.
17	It's not going to change. The transportation
18	committee report has been filed. It was filed in your
19	package before you heard the case.
20	The commissioners had it. At their own admission,
21	they got it on November 7. And they still haven't had time
22	to read it.
23	That was a tactic to delay this project to kill
24	it. The developer would like for you to make a decision.
25	And will live with the Board's decision, whatever that

1	decision is.
2	MS. MUHAMMAD: I have a question.
3	VICE CHAIR HART: Please.
4	MS. MUHAMMAD: When you said that there was
5	there were some issues with the additional units, can you
6	give me a little bit more detail about that?
7	MR. JONES: Yes. The two members of the community
8	who live adjacent to the building have asked us in the last
9	meeting to just develop the building as it is. Without any
10	additional units.
11	There was a question about parking. The building
12	it existed it's a renovation. It exists on the footprint
13	of the land, 90 98 percent of the land.
14	There was some discussion, could we go under the
15	building and build parking underneath the building? And we
16	explained that the building is there.
17	And there is no space for parking as it exists
18	today.
19	MEMBER WHITE: How many units are we talking about
20	again? It's in the record, but
21	MR. JONES: Let me turn to the architect.
22	VICE CHAIR HART: You have to speak on the mic,
23	please.
24	MEMBER WHITE: Twenty-four, is that right? Okay.
25	MR. CRUICKSHANK: Yeah. We were able to get 25

1	units into the building.
2	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you.
3	MEMBER WHITE: Okay. That's I wanted to know.
4	MR. JONES: But I want to reemphasize. We've been
5	before the Board. We've been to the ANC since early October.
6	The developer is prepared to live with the decision of the
7	Board. Thank you.
8	VICE CHAIR HART: And Mr. Jones, also you said
9	that you met with the ANC executive committee in October.
10	And at that point they requested a transportation plan?
11	MR. JONES: Yes.
12	VICE CHAIR HART: And then you hired somebody and
13	then had a report delivered to the or sent to the ANC the
14	morning of the ANC meeting?
15	MR. JONES: Slightly altered. We hired them. The
16	report had not been done for the October meeting.
17	VICE CHAIR HART: Yes.
18	MR. JONES: We appeared to the October meeting
19	with the arch with the transportation engineer. He
20	explained what they what he was going to do.
21	And he explained that their scope was greater than
22	that, that DDOT was asking for. But we engaged him to do
23	what the ANC asked. And in the November meeting, we then
24	delivered that report to the ANC.
25	VICE CHAIR HART: Okay. Do the Board members have

1	any other questions?
2	MEMBER WHITE: Who's the company you used for the
3	transportation study?
4	MR. JONES: He's here. He can speak to that.
5	MEMBER WHITE: Yes. You are yeah. We've
6	chatted before. But I didn't remember.
7	MR. ANDRES: Yes. My name again is Erwin Andres
8	with Gorove/Slade Associates.
9	MEMBER WHITE: Okay. And you're one of the
10	partners on the deal too?
11	MR. ANDRES: Yes. Yes, I am.
12	MEMBER WHITE: Okay.
13	MR. PRESTWOOD: Mr. Vice Chairman, if I could just
14	clarify a couple of things.
15	VICE CHAIR HART: Yes.
16	MR. PRESTWOOD: The Applicant met with the ANC 8A
17	executive session in September 2017. They then appeared at
18	our October public meeting. That date I don't have before
19	me. And they came back for the November 7 meeting for the
20	vote.
21	And the other thing I wanted to clarify was that
22	yes, the transportation study and the a list of benefits
23	that the Applicant was prepared to provide to the community
24	for this project was transmitted to both myself and to
25	Commissioner Hawkins on the morning of or the afternoon

1	really, on November 7, 2017. Which was the day of the public
2	meeting for November.
3	And then the last point I wanted to clarify was
4	that so Mr. Haw it is correct, Mr. Jones is correct that
5	Mr. Hawkins moved the motion on November 7. However, for
6	December 5, he abstained.
7	VICE CHAIR HART: Okay.
8	MS. MUHAMMAD: Can I
9	VICE CHAIR HART: I think we've gotten the
10	information that we need at this point. We still have to go
11	through the whole the rest of the hearing.
12	So, this is just to decide whether or not this
13	should be this should be postponed and moved to a
14	different date. That's what we're kind of having the
15	decision on.
16	MS. MUHAMMAD: All right.
17	VICE CHAIR HART: So, do the Board members have
18	anything to I'm going to bring it back to the Board to see
19	if you what our discussion is.
20	I think we've heard from the from the ANC. And
21	then the Applicant regarding this kind of transportation
22	issue. And actually, we haven't heard from the Applicant
23	regarding the motion to postpone.
24	I mean, I know that you just said that you'd
25	rather you want to move forward with it. Do you have any
ı	ı

1 other thing -- anything else you want to say? 2 We would like for the Board to MR. JONES: No. 3 make a decision, up or down. And we would live with that decision. 4 5 VICE CHAIR HART: Okay. Thank you. 6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'll be frankly honest, Mr. 7 Chairman, I'm very disappointed. Because I specifically led 8 the charge, I believe, with the support of my colleagues on 9 the Applicant going back and working with the community on 10 some of these issues. 11 And then to come back and still say we need more time and be in the same place. I'm having some problems with 12 13 that. And that's why I asked, what went on? 14 Nothing? 15 Because, you know, that was some time that I asked for that 16 to be done, so we can work out some of these issues. 17 So we can come back with a decision, whether it 18 be up or down. And then we'll make our decision with the 19 merits of the case. 2.0 I'm not sure if giving some additional time, I 21 would be inclined -- I've heard the Applicant say, take it 22 I would be inclined to maybe give -- I wouldn't 23 go back -- wait for the next time Anthony Hood is here. 24 But I would go back to giving them -- because 25 sometimes it takes more than one time to understand what we

1	want you to go back and do. But it sounds like maybe they
2	understand it this time.
3	But I don't know. I'm not sure. I can do as the
4	Applicant said, vote on it today. Or give them maybe two
5	weeks, the ANC two weeks this time. Because I think we gave
6	them quite a bit of time, which I hadn't been here in a few
7	weeks.
8	So, or two weeks to not necessarily have to be
9	able to look at something that I believe they already have.
10	Or they were given maybe a half a day before they had their
11	meeting.
12	Because it would be it's always good when the
13	ANC comes back and the community comes back on one accord and
14	make it work. Because I think it's a and a situation
15	like that is very beneficial to a community when you can get
16	everybody onboard.
17	Sometimes you can't get everybody onboard. But
18	when you can, I think it's a win/win for all of us. So,
19	that's my comment.
20	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you Mr. Hood. Ms. White?
21	MEMBER WHITE: Yeah. I don't like, you know, kind
22	of stalling and preventing things from moving forward.
23	But at the same time, I would be more in favor of
24	giving the community maybe a couple more weeks to work
25	quickly with the developer to try to resolve some of the

1	outstanding issues that they have.
2	Now I don't think the community can necessarily
3	say we're going to try to do what we can to stall the
4	development of this project. Because you have to look at the
5	rules and regulations.
6	But, because it's a very large project, it's high
7	profile. Apparently a significant number of members of the
8	community haven't been able to weigh in on the project,
9	unless it causes a severe financial hardship to the
10	developer, I would be in favor of at least looking at it for
11	the first week in January.
12	VICE CHAIR HART: Mr. Chairman?
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: So I just had a couple of
14	questions. So for the developer, I mean, as far as like I
15	know that you have been in opposition to the postponement.
16	The ANC had asked for 60 days.
17	If in terms of a postponement, if there was one,
18	what kind of an impact does it have on the project? If it
19	was like, you know, two weeks, 30 days, 60 days, what now
20	does it affect the project?
21	MR. JONES: Mr. Chairman, we could live with a
22	couple of weeks. And I'll withdraw my concern about the
23	Board making a decision and if it's reasonable timing.
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So, I'm sorry, I'm going
25	to I see their attorney arrived. Mr. Chairman, just give

_	like one second.
2	And Commissioner, just give me one second.
3	Because I just want to make sure that I'm clear on a couple
4	of things. Because what we're talking about here, I just
5	want to understand.
6	So, the first question, I guess I kind of had was
7	even maybe for either OAG or maybe Chairman Hood could even
8	answer this. As far as the community packages and things
9	like that, is that more kind of like a zoning commission
LO	thing like?
11	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: This is a and I think I said
12	this previously, this is not a PUD.
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Uh-huh.
L4	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: That actually is grand. I
L5	haven't seen that before. And I'm not taking one side or the
L6	other.
L7	But actually, I've never seen a PUD come down with
18	what's being requested. I mean, not a PUD. I'm getting
L9	mixed up with the PUD.
20	I've never seen an amenities package these are
21	from
22	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Right. I'm just so it's not
23	normally something that we see?
24	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: No. It is not. It's unheard
25	of

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Right. So this is something
2	that would be of benefit to the community. At least as far
3	as that what they did.
4	The and the ANC, and either Commissioner
5	Muhammad or Mr. Chairman
6	MS. MUHAMMAD: Can I speak to this please?
7	Because I wanted too just I want the Commission to
8	understand that there's no effort on behalf of ANC 8A to stop
9	this project.
10	What we are trying to do, if we were given all of
11	the information that we needed for the community in advance
12	so that we could review it, and if they had come and did the
13	presentation like they were supposed to, we probably wouldn't
14	even be going through this.
15	But we I mean, we're obligated to the community
16	to do a due diligence with these developments in the
17	community. So there is no effort on our part to just try to
18	stop this development.
19	What we're trying to do is represent the community
20	the best to our ability. And when we have all of what we
21	need in front of us, in a timely manner, we can do that.
22	But in this case that did not happen. And all
23	we're asking for is a little more time.
24	As I said, we didn't even know anything about this
25	variance for nonconforming structure. That wasn't included

1	in the packet that we were given. We found out about that
2	on November 30.
3	So what I'm asking is that we be given additional
4	time, as much as you're able to, so that we can just try to
5	get these issues resolved with the community. And we want
6	to come back on one accord. That's our whole purpose.
7	So, there is no effort on behalf of the ANC to
8	just stop this project. What we're trying to do is just make
9	sure that the community is treated in the manner that they
10	should be.
11	Give us what give us the information we need.
12	Let us discuss it. Come and discuss it with us. If you can
13	make adjustments, then do that. You know, that's all we're
14	asking.
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Yeah, Commissioner
16	Muhammad, I thanks for clarifying that. That's what
17	I mean, all that sounds very reasonable.
18	And it's not something that you know, we wouldn't
19	think you guys have the opportunity. When's your next
20	hearing?
21	MS. MUHAMMAD: Our next our next public meeting
22	is January 9 because of the holiday.
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So, would the developer
24	be hap able to get on that agenda again?
25	MR. PRESTWOOD: Yes. We can make it happen.

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So then you would have
2	enough opportunity to give the commissioners all the time
3	they need from now until January 9.
4	And then would be able to do a presentation again
5	on January 9. I don't mean to step on your toes here.
6	VICE CHAIR HART: By all means, Mr. Chairman.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: So then you would have until
8	January 9 to make a presentation again. And then the ANC can
9	make a vote again, one way or the other?
10	MR. PRESTWOOD: Yes, sir.
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Because as of now, Mr.
12	Chairman, as I've seen, I was a little confused as far as
13	like what the original vote was, was it was four to two,
14	zero. And then the next vote was four to zero to two.
15	So, it seemed like two sat out. Right? Okay.
16	And then two switched.
17	MR. PRESTWOOD: One switched.
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: One switched. Right. That's
19	okay. I just
20	MR. PRESTWOOD: No. One switched.
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: One switched. Okay.
22	MR. PRESTWOOD: One switched. It was in the
23	affirmative.
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Once again, it doesn't
25	matter. Four to zero to two. And then four to two to zero.
	1

1	It doesn't matter.
2	But what I wanted to clarify now from what the OAG
3	has given us is that you all haven't actually given us any
4	information. You've asked to pull your previous letter.
5	So we don't actually have a letter from you right
6	now. You just pulled the previous letter.
7	MR. PRESTWOOD: That's correct.
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So if you could then
9	have the hearing on the 9th. And then give us something.
10	Right? Okay?
11	And then and I know that I'd be inter and
12	I'm going to turn this back over again. I am
13	VICE CHAIR HART: Why thank you, Mr. Chairman.
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: But, I'm actually just asking
15	questions.
16	VICE CHAIR HART: That's fine.
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: So,
18	VICE CHAIR HART: I asked you to ask questions.
19	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Thank you. That I am
20	curious at hearing a little bit more clarity of the Office
21	of Planning in terms of I did watch the whole
22	presentation. I read the whole record.
23	But I'd just like to hear a little bit more about,
24	you know, the specifics of the report. And then the other
25	is that there are people here.

And I, you know, depending upon what we do in 1 2 terms of a postponement -- I mean, this is where I kind of 3 am right now, just real quick. Definitely, you know, that they have a chance to 4 go ahead, the ANC has a chance to get all the information 5 6 they need. Do another presentation on the 9th. Get another 7 vote on the 9th. 8 And then I don't know if we need a continued 9 Or we could just go to a decision after hearing or not. 10 But get whatever we, you know, if we hear that. 11 everybody here now, I don't know if we need to hear from 12 everybody again. 13 But then go to a decision or not. And then I know 14 that Chairman Hood is back on the 31st. 15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Actually, I'm back on the 17th. 16 I've just been notified. 17 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So then I would propose 18 the 17th where Chairman Hood is back here again. Because he 19 was here on the first time and this time. 2.0 And would be able to either, whatever we end up 21 doing in terms of deliberation of the continuance. But 22 just kind of my open public meeting discussion that's 23 thoughts. 24 VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Much 25 appreciated. Yeah, and it's -- I mean, I've been listening

1 to all of this. 2 And I think that the concerns that while their concerns the ANC has raised, about the traffic 3 impacts, they're -- they wanted to have a kind of a further 4 5 discussion about the traffic impacts. This, you know, case has -- while it is only a few 6 7 parking spaces that are -- that they're asking for relief 8 from, it still is parking. There is -- it's a related type 9 of thing. 10 And I think that having a -- and I actually think 11 it may be better to have a continued hearing. Because we may 12 actually have questions for the ANC or others. 13 So, I think that postponing the -- accepting the 14 postponement request or approving it, is kind of where I'd 15 be leaning. And scheduling it for when the -- Chairman Hood 16 was back in January would be helpful. 17 So, that's kind of where I am with this. And I 18 don't know if the Office of -- I mean, it just seems -- yeah, 19 I mean, they're going to have to come back again anyway. 2.0 I mean, I think the testimony issue, it just seems 21 a little bit -- it seems a little bit odd to have the 22 testimony if we're going to be postponing this. 23 So, that's the kind of issue that I have.

Yeah.

to wait until they've had an opportunity to interface with

MEMBER WHITE:

24

25

I mean, my opinion would be

1 each other. And perhaps certain things can be resolved. 2 Because if they testify today, then their opinions might be different then what they will be potentially on 3 But I -- but again, I think it's important for 4 January 17. 5 the community to be able to weigh in on this and look at the 6 full record. CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I don't think 7 I would agree. 8 that Commissioner Muhammad's ask is too much. 9 My only problem is I thought we had been down that 10 road when I asked them to do it the last time. That's what 11 I'm having a problem with. 12 So I'm hoping we don't come back with the same 13 I think her ask is not -- I don't think it's too result. 14 much to ask what she's asking for. 15 And I would agree that I think we need to postpone Even though it seems like we already had the hearing. 16 17 But, I think we need to postpone this because that 18 way the community can operate on the information at hand. 19 operating on what they have right now of 2.0 apparently they didn't feel like they had time to review it. 21 If I'm misstating something, somebody can correct 22 But I'm going by what I've heard. 23 So I think it's better then moving the fashion 24 when everybody has all the same information, we're all

operating off the same sheets of music. Or singing off the

VICE CHAIR HART: And finally I'll add that this
has been postponed a couple of times already. And I think
that this is -- I think we should -- while I am supportive
of having, I quess, a little further conversation about this,

6 I understand that there may be some issues that still are

7 unresolved.

same sheets of music.

Because there are issues about transportation.

But there are also issues about -- Chairman Prestwood talked about scale, scope, you know, sufficient materials of the building. And those things are not transportation related.

So, yes. So, yes, Ms. Agyei? Thank you. I was

13

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

1

MS. AGYEI: I'm just going to make a factual statement without giving any opinion. I was at the October 3 ANC meeting.

And the issue is, we didn't even find out what the building was physically going to look like until after our November 15 hearing here with Zoning. So as of November 30, the only picture that we had of how the building was going to look was the 3D diagram that I believe you have.

I'm not sure what Exhibit it is. So, it was not until November 8 -- December 8, I'm sorry, that we actually had the full renderings of what the building was going to look like. December.

1	And they first came to us in October. So it's not
2	a matter of like, why are you all stalling? We didn't even
3	know what the building was going to look like.
4	The only thing that was online in the Zoning, when
5	you go to the Zoning online board website, is just kind of
6	like the technical drawings, or I guess the architectural
7	drawings of the picture.
8	We didn't even have any renderings of what that
9	physical building was going to look like until December.
10	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I believe the whole case file
11	is uploaded, correct? The whole case, everything we have is
12	on the case file.
13	MS. AGYEI: Yeah. They never submitted any
14	renderings to you all until December.
15	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. But I'm just saying, so
16	from this point going forward it is.
17	MS. AGYEI: So at this point I feel like we
18	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: You can hit review and you can
19	get the whole case file.
20	MS. AGYEI: Yeah.
21	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: You'll see exactly what we
22	have.
23	MS. AGYEI: Yeah.
24	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. All right.
25	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I've got a question. So, of
ļ	

1	the witnesses that are here, members of the public, there's
2	three of you. So, are you guys going to be you can just
3	raise your hand.
4	Are you all or I guess I don't know, if you
5	I guess you have to say yes in the microphone. Are you going
6	to go to the ANC meeting on the 9th?
7	MS. AGYEI: Yes.
8	MS. KENNEDY: Yes.
9	MR. SEMLER: It's not determined. My issues are
10	more city wide on strategic. And there's other reasons why
11	I'm opposed to the project.
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So you don't know if
13	you're going to be at the ANC meeting or not.
14	MR. SEMLER: I'm a Ward Five resident. But a city
15	business owner.
16	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So you all right.
17	So you don't know. And then as far as the as far as the
18	coming here on the 17th, you would be able to come on the
19	17th?
20	MS. AGYEI: Yes.
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
22	MS. KENNEDY: Yes.
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. You'd be able to come
24	on the 17th?
25	MR. SEMLER: Yeah.

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: You need to speak in the
2	microphone.
3	MR. SEMLER: Oh, yes.
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
5	MR. SEMLER: But I'd like to will I be able to
6	testify today?
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: No. There's no test we're
8	not taking testimony today. We're just talking about the
9	postponement issue.
10	And so the so once again
11	MR. SEMLER: What I'm raising are issues that will
12	may make the postponement in fact we might not need it.
13	Because these are issues raised on economic opportunities,
14	moral turpitude
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: No. I don't think so.
16	MR. SEMLER: Regarding development.
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: We're definitely postponing.
18	MR. SEMLER: Well, I put my I gave my letter
19	as a record to Secretary Moy. So it should be in the record.
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
21	MR. SEMLER: And then I will be publishing again
22	on something related to moral turpitude, possible corruption,
23	strawman and fraud involving this property. Which should
24	have been raised in the first place rather than this
25	variance.

1	So, this is on the record. Office of Attorney
2	General may have to look into it. So, I would like to put
3	this and this is all on the record. Thank you, sir.
4	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Chairman, this is a are
5	you representing the Capital Intelligence?
6	MR. SEMLER: Yes. I'm a
7	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.
8	MR. SEMLER: And we're in the business of we're
9	creating 40 jobs at our office.
10	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: We have and this sir
11	VICE CHAIR HART: Sir. Sir, hold on. Hold on.
12	Hold on.
13	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Now, I'm going
14	VICE CHAIR HART: Hold on. Okay. So, thank you.
15	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. All right. Some things
16	are within our jurisdiction, Mr. Chairman. And I my quick
17	review of this, this is actually not proper before us.
18	But anyway, so I
19	MR. SEMLER: But it's in the record, sir.
20	VICE CHAIR HART: Sir, excuse me, you're just
21	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: It's in the record. That's
22	fine. But I don't want us to get here on the 17th and then
23	we have to go through all that.
24	MR. SEMLER: That's why I just wanted to testify.
25	So we wouldn't have the 17th. Because these issues would be

1	raised. And the Attorney General's Office could even
2	investigate it.
3	CHAIRPERSON HILL: So so, excuse me, sir.
4	Excuse me sir, you're just a member of the public. You get
5	three minutes. You've just taken a minute and a half. Okay?
6	So, just give me a moment here. All right? So,
7	again, on the 9th, you're going to have a meeting on the 9th.
8	The ANC meeting is going to take place on the 9th.
9	Mr. Jones, I guess your group will go present on
10	the 9th. And I would, you know, do your best obviously to
11	come with diagrams, everything like that.
12	The issues that are before us aren't necessarily
13	design issues. We're like more, you know, we are zoning and
14	the standards with which we can approve or deny the variances
15	and the special exceptions, and the parking relief.
16	I mean, the things that they're asking for are not
17	necessarily design issues. I'm just letting you know.
18	So, you guys but, you can talk all you like at
19	the ANC meeting and see what you can do with the developer.
20	And I'm sure the developer would very much like to get an ANC
21	positive vote.
22	And if he has to change some materials or do some
23	different things to it, I would think he'd like to get the
24	vote. If the color has to be different or some of the
2 5	liggues to work with the community

I did want to 1 But again, to finish my questions. 2 go over the Office of Planning. And if you could just, again since I -- as I said, I did watch the whole hearing. 3 4 read the record. 5 But I'd like to hear again a little bit in terms 6 of your reviewing the standards as to how the Office of 7 Planning is getting to the approval of this. I mean, 8 understand the whole like, the nonconformity with the first 9 floor. 10 And then if you could just kind of walk me through 11 And also for the benefit of those that are here, walk 12 through your analysis. 13 Certainly. Good morning Mr. Chair, MS. VITALE: Elisa Vitale with the Office of 14 members of the Board. 15 Planning. As outlined in the Office of Planning Report that 16 17 was dated October 27, the Office of Planning recommends 18 approval of the requested relief. The first area of relief 19 C202.2. variance That's а for addition an 2.0 nonconforming structure. 21 Normally in this zone the MU-4 zone, you can have 22 75 percent lot occupancy. The existing building is at 91 23 percent. 24 So, for the Applicant to make any improvements to 25 the property, to expand it in anyway, they're already over

1	the maximum permitted lot occupancy. So that's why that
2	variance kicks in.
3	The additional construction that the Applicant is
4	proposing at this property would in fact be below 75 percent.
5	So they're meeting that lot occupancy on the additional
6	floors that they are proposing to construct.
7	We believe the variance test has been met for that
8	addition to a nonconforming structure. And that argument is
9	outlined in our report.
10	With respect to the special exception, we've
11	discussed this. They need relief from the minimum required
12	parking.
13	They're required to provide three spaces. They're
14	proposing to provide zero spaces onsite. The parking test
15	is a special exception.
16	There are a number of criteria that the Board
17	should follow in evaluating that request. We've analyzed
18	those criteria in our report.
19	Again, the existing structure is at 91 percent.
20	So it takes up the majority of the property and does not
21	allow sufficient space to get parking onsite without the
22	Applicant demolishing a portion of the existing structure.
23	So, that kind of is the first criteria. And then
24	other issues that we look at are access to public
25	transportation.

1 The property is about one mile from the Anacostia 2 Metro Station. It's also served by Metro bus lines that run on Good Hope Road and Minnesota Avenue. 3 In looking at kind of common evaluation metrics 4 for properties, it has a high walk score, a high transit 5 6 The bike score is 53, so that's a bit lower. 7 there are -- there is the ability to work to good services 8 and jobs in the neighborhood. 9 I think that those are the key points from the 10 criteria for the parking relief. I know at the last hearing 11 it requested that the District Department of was 12 Transportation kind of weigh in again. 13 The initial DDOT memo indicated support for the 14 requested variance and special exception. The supplemental 15 DDOT report reiterated that recommendation for approval of 16 the requested relief. 17 This concludes my summary. Ι can answer 18 additional questions. Thanks. 19 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Thank you. Thank you. 2.0 Mr. Vice Chair, I'm good with everything. Thank you. 21 VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you, Ms. Vitale and 22 So, I'll kind of bring it back to us about -- it 2.3 sounds like everyone would like to have a -- all the Board 24 members would like have to а postponement for this 25 Application.

1	It looks like we're looking at the 17th, Mr.
2	Secretary. And do you need for us to say that we are
3	actually vote on this? Or have you heard enough to
4	SECRETARY MOY: No. The staff has heard enough.
5	VICE CHAIR HART: Okay.
6	SECRETARY MOY: I mean, it's clear that this can
7	continue to January 17. And it sounds like from what I've
8	heard it's a continued hearing?
9	VICE CHAIR HART: Yeah. I think that it should
10	be. I don't know if anyone else has any objection to that?
11	(No audible response.)
12	VICE CHAIR HART: Okay. So, I think it should be
13	a continued hearing. The one caveat is when we're getting
14	the ANC report. Because if they're meeting on the 9th, the
15	17th is the next week. If I am adding that correctly.
16	SECRETARY MOY: Yeah. It's eight days.
17	VICE CHAIR HART: Well, I just want to make sure
18	that no, I just need to make sure that we have a, you
19	know, an ANC report in a, you know, if we give them a
20	deadline for the report itself.
21	SECRETARY MOY: Yeah. I would hope that well,
22	January 9th is a Tuesday. So perhaps if the ANC can file
23	it's resolution or letter by the end of the week, or the
24	Monday of the following week, which would be January 15.
25	VICE CHAIR HART: And we don't have any issue with

1	the seven day?
2	SECRETARY MOY: Well, it's a continued hearing on
3	the 17th.
4	VICE CHAIR HART: Yeah.
5	SECRETARY MOY: So, everyone's coming back on the
6	17th.
7	VICE CHAIR HART: Yeah. I just want to make sure
8	that that's not a that's not an issue. I just wanted to
9	make sure that wasn't an issue. That's all.
10	Having to waive the seven days. That's that's
11	I mean. Does the board have anything else they'd like to
12	bring up? Okay.
13	MEMBER WHITE: I think there was an issue about
14	when Martin Luther King holiday was. But
15	SECRETARY MOY: The 15th.
16	VICE CHAIR HART: I think they should I think
17	that the Friday is fine then.
18	MEMBER WHITE: Okay.
19	VICE CHAIR HART: Mr. Secretary, how about the
20	Friday then?
21	SECRETARY MOY: Okay. So, we're looking at the
22	ANC filing by Friday the it would be Friday the 12th.
23	VICE CHAIR HART: Mr. Prestwood, does that
24	timeline work for you?
25	MR. PRESTWOOD: We will make it work.

1	VICE CHAIR HART: Okay. I just want to I'm
2	just making covering our bases here so we have that.
3	MR. PRESTWOOD: Right. Yeah. I understand.
4	VICE CHAIR HART: Okay.
5	MR. PRESTWOOD: Can I also just ask that rather
6	than waiting until January 9 for the ANC meeting that we
7	encourage the Applicant and the community to meet before
8	then?
9	VICE CHAIR HART: Oh, I'm actually looking if
10	you guys want to meet this week, next week, any week before
11	then, it's up to you.
12	MR. PRESTWOOD: Yeah.
13	VICE CHAIR HART: We're just trying to set forward
14	the time line for us. And we're leaving it up to you to fill
15	that time line in to get us to have some report filed to
16	us so that we understand what your position is on this, and
17	any additional or remaining concerns that you have for the
18	case.
19	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: But I just want to go on record
20	Chairman Prestwood, that's a very good point. We I
21	encourage you I think we all encourage that as the Vice
22	Chair just mentioned. Please do so.
23	MR. PRESTWOOD: Okay. Thank you.
24	VICE CHAIR HART: I would concur with that. Thank
25	you very much Mr. Hood.

1	So, I think with that we will see you all on the
2	17th. And thank you very much for coming.
3	SECRETARY MOY: Mr. Vice Chair, I just
4	VICE CHAIR HART: Yeah. Hold on for a second.
5	SECRETARY MOY: For clarity on the staff's part.
6	VICE CHAIR HART: Yes.
7	SECRETARY MOY: This is a continued hearing. So
8	the record is open. So, meaning that
9	VICE CHAIR HART: Yeah.
10	SECRETARY MOY: Filings can still be entered into
11	the record. Okay.
12	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you. We're going to take
13	a five minute break. Thanks. Actually, maybe a three minute
14	break.
15	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the
16	record at 11:05 a.m. and resumed at 11:21 a.m.)
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right, Mr. Moy, let's go
18	ahead and get back started. Let's all get back together.
19	And we have some announcements.
20	Let's see, we're going to go a little bit out of
21	order because there's some timing issues. We're going too
22	next hear from Application 199581 as soon as Mr. Moy gets an
23	opportunity to announce it.
24	We're then going to have the Appeal. Which is
25	19632. And then after that we're going to follow in order

1	again.
2	And yeah. So we'll do that. And it's just a
3	festive day here to have everyone with us. You know, it's
4	our last day before the holiday.
5	And well, the last thing actually, now that I
6	realize it while I'm making announcements, we are going to
7	break for a lunch. Meaning we're going to have lunch for the
8	first time in the whole time I've been here.
9	And it's going to be at around 12:30. So
10	wherever we are kind of around 12:30, we're going to break
11	for about like 20 minutes. So, just to let everybody know.
12	Okay. Mr. Moy?
13	SECRETARY MOY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
14	So again, as the Chair has said, if I can have
15	parties to the table to Application Number 19581 of Latin-
16	American Montessori Bilingual Charter School to the table.
17	This is for a special exception under Subtitle U,
18	Section 205.1(a). This would establish a public charter
19	school in the R-16 Zone. This is at premises 5000 14th
20	Street Northwest, square 2711, lot 802.
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Let's see, if you all
22	could introduce yourselves from my right to left, please?
23	MR. STRAND: Good morning, John Strand, 1501
24	Emerson Street, Northwest.

Talib-Din Uqdah,

MR. UQDAH:

1373 Jefferson

1	Street, Northwest.
2	MR. ZAYETS: Good morning. Jerry with Building
3	Hope.
4	MR. KADLECEK: Good morning. Cary Kadlecek with
5	Goulston & Storrs.
6	MS. COTTMAN: Diane Cottman, LAMB.
7	MR. VAN PELT: Good morning. Dan Van Pelt with
8	Gorove/Slade Associates.
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So Mr. Kadlecek, I'll
10	let you kind of get situated there. There were some things
11	we needed from you and talked about at the last hearing.
12	Maybe you can just kind of update us as to where
13	you are with everything?
14	MR. KADLECEK: Yes. We'll do that. We're going
15	to give a very brief presentation. Just running through
16	those seven things that the Board had requested.
17	Just two things I want to hand in. Since our
18	filing on December 6 we've actually been working with CNDI-LA
19	some more. And we've refined our conditions a little more.
20	So I just want to I want you to have the latest
21	set of conditions that we have sent to the parties in all
22	positions.
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. But that's not in the
24	record currently?
I.	1

MR. KADLECEK: That's not currently in the record.

1	We just we
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So you need to put it
3	in the record afterwards. And give us the copies now. Okay.
4	MR. KADLECEK: Yeah. We just sent it to them
5	yesterday. So I just wanted to make sure the Board has the
6	latest.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
8	MR. KADLECEK: And then there's also just a letter
9	that we got from one of the lenders that just goes to the
10	argument about the financing that we had written about.
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
12	MR. KADLECEK: All right. So we're just going to
13	go in order of
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yeah. Why don't you give me
15	a second. I actually want to see this thing.
16	MR. KADLECEK: Okay.
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So this is the condition
18	packet that you passed out to CNDI-LA. CNDI-LU? CNDI-LA.
19	Yeah.
20	MR. KADLECEK: So, just to give you background,
21	we had a meeting with them on Monday. And we attempted to
22	try and craft another set of conditions as a result of that
23	meeting.
24	So that's what this reflects. So I just wanted
25	Two to make gure this is the latest set of senditions that

1	the Applicant has agreed to in corresponding with them.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: And are you going to read
3	I thought you were going to walk through them. I'm sorry.
4	MR. KADLECEK: Do you want to go through all them?
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yeah. Please. Go walk through
6	them, yeah. Please.
7	MR. KADLECEK: Well, we're going to start actually
8	with the transportation piece first. And then I think it
9	makes sense to get to that condition last.
10	
	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Sure.
11	MR. VAN PELT: Okay. Let me go ahead and I'll
12	walk you through a couple of things. A performance
13	monitoring plan that has been agreed to, or at least the
14	highlights of that, what's been agreed to.
15	And then talk a little bit about mode splits.
16	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Now, I'm sorry and again, it's
17	in the conditions here? Is that what you mean?
18	MR. KADLECEK: No. No, that's in our December 6
19	filing.
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
21	MR. KADLECEK: Which is Exhibit sorry, I
22	believe it's Exhibit 121.
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: It's always bad when you get
24	to the three digits.
25	MR. KADLECEK: Yeah. Yeah, so Exhibit 121 was our

1	December 6 filing.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
3	MR. KADLECEK: And that has all the information
4	that the Board had requested. The seven items that the Board
5	had requested an explanation of.
6	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Thank you.
7	Okay. All right, please continue. I'm sorry.
8	MR. VAN PELT: Okay. No problem. So, in that
9	submission, a performance monitoring plan will include
10	elements such as a student/faculty enrollment numbers, the
11	total entering vehicle counts for the students and faculty
12	during the morning peak hour.
13	Mode splits for students and faculty. Vehicle
14	occupancy counts, queue lengths, and the documentation of the
15	TDM efforts that have been put in place for the prior year
16	at LAMB.
17	The data will be collected at the school for the
18	PMP in order to obtain the necessary information that was
19	identified in the PMP. Those are the items I just described.
20	The data collection will include a combination of
21	manual counts, video counters, and surveys in order to most
22	accurately obtain the necessary information.
23	The video counting equipment will be used for the
24	vehicle counts. As they will provide a more accurate account

of that.

1 But manual counters, actual people, will be used 2 for most of the other data. As it requires having people onsite to make these very specific observations for the PMP. 3 The data will be collected on a typical day once 4 5 This is consistent with all of the traffic studies 6 that are performed in the District and with PMPs that are 7 implemented at other schools in the District. 8 A typical day as dictated by DDOT and industry 9 standards is represented by a day in the middle of 10 semester or marking period when traffic patterns have set 11 into a routine. And when the weather is favorable. 12 it's unaffected by holidays. 13 A typical day is not meant to represent the worst 14 case scenario conditions. But it's meant to represent an 15 Although multiple days of counts may show average day. 16 slightly different results. 17 Any typical day is considered acceptable to 18 represent average conditions over an extended period of time. 19 And it's what's deemed by DDOT to be appropriate condition 2.0 for planning and design. 21 We will have DDOT review our data collection 22 regime for the PMP before we begin. DDOT will review then 23 the PMP itself and ensure that the stated conditions are met once we submit it to them. 24 25 This means that the number of entering vehicle

trips does not exceed the 295 vehicle trips during the morning peak hour. And that queue lengths do not spill over into public space.

DDOT will have access to all of the data that's collected for the PMP. And they will ensure that the analysis performed is in line with District and industry standards.

And if these conditions are not met, the Applicant will be required to revise the TDM plan and/or pickup/drop off operations plan itself. The PMP was reviewed with DDOT before submitting into the record.

And it's our understanding that DDOT is in agreement with the PMP's elements and the methodology. The Applicant will perform an annual PMP starting in the first year of LAMB's operations at the site.

The submission of performance monitoring reports will continue until one, a minimum of three years of reports have been submitted, or LAMB increases its enrollment to a maximum of six hundred students, whichever is later.

And two, the two latest consecutive years demonstrate that the school is in compliance with the monitoring plan. Based on the projected student enrollment for LAMB these conditions are expected to result in at least a minimum of seven years of reporting.

One other thing I want to point out is that DDOT

2.0

had requested in their staff report that monitoring begin once the student enrollment had gotten to about 90 percent, or 540 students. We are committing to start it at year one, at the very beginning.

So just speaking quickly about mode split projections. The mode split projections that were used in the comprehensive transportation review were based on existing information provided by LAMB.

These mode split projections were considered to be conservative as they did not fully take into account how the consolidation of the two existing campuses would impact mode split.

So, provided also in the submission is a -- what we could expect expected mode splits to be after consolidation of Kingsbury. We took a little deeper look at the information provided by LAMB to determine a projected mode split that we believe is possible at the new campus.

The projected mode split is based on addresses of LAMB families that live in the vicinity of the new location, the adequacy of non-auto accommodations between the schools and family homes, and the number of families with multiple children attending LAMB.

And that's shown in the supplemental submission we expect that the auto mode split will be -- will likely be lower. And that those trips would shift over to walking and

2.0

1 biking modes. 2 And I think with that, I think to touch on the transportation I'll pass it over to Diane. 3 4 MS. COTTMAN: Good morning. I just want to speak briefly about the conditions we expanded under the good 5 6 neighbor policy. 7 And basically LAMB will work. And it was in the, 8 I think, presentation previously that we will work with CNDI-9 LA and with the West Educational Campus PTO to make sure that 10 we create a community committee. 11 Nine members, really pretty split down the middle 12 with four LAMB and four community members. So it will be one 13 LAMB administrator, two LAMB PTO members, a LAMB parent who lives in that specific ANC 4C, four community residents, 14 which would include CNDI-LA West, and the ninth member would 15 16 be the ANC 4C 02 SMD Rep. 17 These meetings would be quarterly in person. 18 we'd create the calendar meetings at the start of the school 19 And make sure that everyone signs off on that. 2.0 And basically the purpose of those quarterly 21 meetings then would be to work out any concerns. Hopefully 22 to highlight that -- those things that work well, so that we

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

And the key to that would be making sure that we

can make sure that we repeat them.

mitigation strategies as needed.

23

24

25

And then create any

notify the community prior to any large events. And that LAMB and West would also coordinate their calendars so that there are no conflicts there along with different fundraising opportunities where there was the possibility of some conflicts.

And that's sort of in the beginning, hopefully what we would be able to move forward with. Is sharing best practices and not just talking about crossing guards. But, how can we best educate children at both places.

Let's see, I explained, make up of committee. Enforcement of conditions. I mean, basically all that we've said in terms of the good neighbor policy, they are enforceable because they're tied to the alternate condition regarding achieving a certificate of occupancy upon growth.

MR. ZAYETS: Good morning. Jerry with Building Hope. So, last time we were here you guys asked a little bit of background information on the funding of charter schools. And we provided a little bit of a narrative. I'll just summarize that narrative.

So Building Hope, the reason we exist is essentially we bridge the gap between what the facility's allocation is -- the way the facility allocation is funded for the schools, and the capital needed initially to get them into a building.

So the way it works is, when a charter school

2.0

files for a charter, they get permission to operate the 1 2 And then they have to essentially find financing on their own to be able to obtain a facility. 3 4 So what Building Hope does, is we step in. We help them secure the financing. 5 And we often quarantee And we sometimes even provide gap funding to cover 6 7 any short comings of any debt service. 8 So the way it works is unlike a private school 9 that may have endowments or may have the ability to raise 10 tuition, public charter schools get a fixed allowance. 11 Currently in the District of Columbia charter schools receive 12 3,190 dollars per student. So, that is their facility's allocation. 13 14 is separate from the money that they get from the District 15 to run the program, teachers, and just various things to 16 operate the school themselves. 17 So, anything -- any payments that they have to 18 make to cover debt service or rent or utilities outside of 19 essentially directly number, comes the out 2.0 programming budget. 21 So that means if they're spending more on mortgage 22 or rent or utilities, they essentially have to cut staff or 23 change their program in a way where the bill -- where the school functions. 24

So that's the biggest difference between a private

school and charter schools. As far as from a lending perspective, there was a question brought up to me and asked, what's the difference between a buy right project or something that has a BZA component or something that has the alternative condition?

The biggest distinction from a lending point of view is that our proposed condition provided that LAMB meets the condition entitles LAMB to a building permit. That is the big difference between a BZA process where to a lender there is subjectivity it, and there's potential risks.

So that is the key distinction between what is essentially done by an administrative process through DCRA or the BZA.

And then the last part was -- is there were some questions as far as what Building Hopes role and how we're going to work with the transition.

So, we will be a co-Applicant on the loan with LAMB essentially during the interim period. Once -- provided this case moves forward, Kingsbury leaves, LAMB will have sufficient enrollment to cover the debt service on their own and take over that particular loan.

So that's when we would essentially step out. And any money we would put in the deal would come out. And then we would use those funds to fund other charter schools.

So that's the financing summarized.

2.0

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Mr. Kadlecek, I mean,
2	I'm just going to go over to Mr. Uqdah and see what they have
3	to say over there.
4	Do you have anything else you want to tidy up
5	with?
6	MR. KADLECEK: No. I mean, if you
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: And then the Office of Planning
8	had so, I'm still not clear as to what the Office of
9	Planning is recommending. So, just trying to get it all
10	straight.
11	MR. KADLECEK: Sure. Sure. I just if you want
12	us to highlight any of the conditions. Other then all I'll
13	say is what I gave you is the reason I put it in a redline
14	form was because this reflects the changes to the conditions
15	that we made since our submission, Exhibit 122.
16	And this is the result of working with CNDI-LA.
17	So I just wanted you to understand that that's these are
18	all the changes that we've agreed to in the last, basically,
19	24 hours to augment the conditions even more.
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
21	MR. KADLECEK: But other than that, we don't have
22	anything to add.
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: We'll come back around to you
24	and see what happens.
25	MR. KADLECEK: Okay.

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Could you please introduce
2	yourself?
3	MS. BARRY: Sure. My name is Maria Barry. I'm
4	the ANC Commissioner for SMD 02 of 4C.
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Oh, welcome Commissioner Barry.
6	MS. BARRY: Thank you.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: That was great. So, two
8	things. You need to fill out witness cards at some point.
9	And then I don't think you've been sworn in. Correct?
10	MS. BARRY: Correct.
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Mr. Moy is not here.
12	Oh, great. Mr. Moy, if you could if anybody has not been
13	sworn in and they're planning on testifying, if you could
14	please stand and take the oath administered by the Secretary
15	to my left.
16	No, no, right here. Just stand there and raise
17	your right hand.
18	SECRETARY MOY: Thank you Mr. Chairman.
19	MS. BARRY: Stand here?
20	SECRETARY MOY: That's fine. Do you solemnly
21	swear or affirm that the testimony you are about to present
22	in this proceeding is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing
23	but the truth?
24	MS. BARRY: I do.
25	SECRETARY MOY: Thank you. You may be seated.

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Chairman Hood, you said I can
2	do that actually?
3	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I've done it myself.
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Oh, really?
5	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.
6	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I'm going to you'd think I
7	would have it memorized by now.
8	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: If he's not here, I'll do it.
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Oh, you can do it? I want to
10	do it. You know, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.
11	SECRETARY MOY: Yeah. That sounds good to me.
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I'm going to do that at my
13	family dinners. Okay.
14	Let's see. So Mr. Uqdah, if you would please tell
15	me where we are with this? Or where you guys are.
16	MR. UQDAH: Yes, sir. First I'll start with the
17	Applicant's conditions that were just submitted.
18	We only received those yesterday. And that I'm
19	not holding that against the Applicant. Because we only met
20	this past Wednesday in the councilman's office where we
21	agreed to try to work I'm sorry, Monday.
22	Yeah, because today is Wednesday. That's how this
23	stuff is running together.
24	We only met in the councilman's office Monday
25	where we began the first process of trying to work through

1	these conditions. Which were delivered to us yesterday
2	afternoon midday.
3	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. That's all right. So
4	you went to Councilman Todd's office to work together?
5	MR. UQDAH: Yes.
6	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. I'm just going
7	to kind of move through this as best I can.
8	Have you had a chance to look at these? And do
9	you agree with these? Do you have any more comments?
10	MR. UQDAH: I have not we would need more time
11	to look at it. I have not personally looked at a single word
12	of them because of the obligations that I've took under in
13	order to make sure that we had our response to the
14	supplemental information into the BZA in a timely manner.
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So you can't say right
16	now whether or not you can agree to these conditions that are
17	in front of us?
18	MR. UQDAH: No, sir. Not the ones that are
19	presented. I can certainly agree to the ones that we
20	presented.
21	But we just haven't had time to review them.
22	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right. Mr.
23	Kadlecek, I mean, do you know if there would and I now
24	don't know what we're going to do with this.
25	If you know, do you think there is any bumps in

1	the road that still need to be smoothed out in terms I
2	mean, this is a long list of conditions.
3	And so, you know, do you know if there's anything
4	else that you are probably going to have to work through?
5	Or they're just going to need a little bit more time to read
6	through this, and then they would be onboard.
7	MR. KADLECEK: I don't want to speak for them.
8	But what I will say is, we have been trying to move the
9	needle from our side as far as we can.
10	That's why yet again, we've added more conditions.
11	I think now we're at if you take the sub conditions, I
12	think this is over 50 conditions.
13	I think that is demonstrative of how much LAMB is
14	willing to be sensitive to this.
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I don't disagree. I'm just
16	asking if you think so you can't give me an answer if you
17	think that they had a little bit more time to look through
18	it, if there wouldn't be any more concerns.
19	MR. KADLECEK: I don't think that they're going
20	to agree to them. And I think that as much the more we've
21	given the more it seems like we've never really gotten the
22	same sort of response in kind.
23	So, I think it's
24	MR. UQDAH: Mr. Chair, I would disagree
25	CHAIRPERSON HILL: One at a time.

1	MR. UQDAH: With Mr. Kadlecek.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Uqdah, just give me one
3	second.
4	MR. UQDAH: Okay.
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I'll give you a chance.
6	MR. KADLECEK: So I think that, you know, I think
7	that a commitment to essentially 50 conditions is a pretty
8	significant commitment.
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
10	MR. KADLECEK: And I'm not sure that LAMB can
11	commit to anymore. I mean, that side
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. I understand your point.
13	And that's fine. And Mr. Kadlecek, honestly, we just got
14	these too.
15	MR. KADLECEK: I understand that. Right.
16	CHAIRPERSON HILL: So, I also don't know what to
17	do at this point. Right?
18	MR. KADLECEK: No. I know.
19	CHAIRPERSON HILL: So
20	MR. KADLECEK: But I thought it was only fair to
21	let the Board know that
22	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I appreciate that.
23	MR. KADLECEK: That we have come even further.
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I can see that you have done
25	some work.

1	MR. KADLECEK: Yeah.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: And I think you've done a lot
3	of work. And I think that and the Commissioner is here
4	from the ANC, who I assume is going to speak in support. And
5	so or may not. I don't know.
6	But, okay. So, you need more time to look at
7	these conditions?
8	MR. UQDAH: First, what I wanted to say is this.
9	First of all, there are not 50 conditions. When CNDI-LA
10	submitted its conditions to the BZA and to the Applicant, all
11	we did was took their, I think 28 conditions and detailed
12	them.
13	Where we are right now is in a matter of function.
14	In other words, they may have one line or one sentence where
15	we have two.
16	It's the same condition. We're just putting more
17	detail to it. I'll just give you one example.
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: No, that's good Mr. Uqdah. I
19	believe you. And I understand.
20	MR. UQDAH: Okay.
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: What I'm trying too under
22	you guys had an issue
23	MR. UQDAH: So we're not we're not that far
24	apart. We are actually closer then what we were two weeks
25	ago.

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So so, again, what
2	I understood from we've heard we took a lot of
3	testimony on this, right? And so and you guys were in
4	opposition to it.
5	You got party status. And so, supposedly I mean,
6	the issue that you all have is transportation and congestion.
7	And whether or not what they say is going to happen
8	MR. UQDAH: Noise.
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Is actually going to happen.
10	MR. UQDAH: Design. Lighting.
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Noise. Right. Okay.
12	MR. UQDAH: Everything that's associated with a
13	special exception.
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I understand.
15	MR. UQDAH: Um-hum.
16	CHAIRPERSON HILL: So okay. Does the Board
17	have any questions for anybody right now?
18	(No audible response.)
19	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. I'm going to turn to the
20	Office of Planning. So because you had a supplemental
21	report. And can you explain the supplemental report a little
22	bit? Because I was because the Applicant was not in, if
23	I'm not mistaken, in support of the condition that was on the
24	supplemental report.
25	I'm not if you can just explain the
I	I and the second of the second

1 supplemental report again to us, please. 2 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and For the record, I'm Maxine Brown-3 Members of the Board. Roberts from Office of Planning. At the November 15th Public 4 5 Hearing, the Board asked of OP to do two things. 6 One was the condition, I thought it was identified 7 on Page 28 of the Exhibit 114, and I have excerpted exactly 8 what the condition said at that time. 9 And the Board asked to explain what it meant, 10 similar to what the Zone Administrator had done when he was 11 here. And so subsequent to that, I spoke to both the 12 13 Applicant and CNDI-LA, and we expanded on it a little more 14 just to make it clearer. 15 And in the report, what I also did was to take 16 condition step by it step as to how 17 implemented. And you can see that in Steps 1 through 8. 18 So, that's an explanation of that condition, okay? 19 The second question that was asked of us was to 2.0 outline what would trigger a Campus Plan for this school. 21 And as I explained under Item Number 2, there are 22 three types of so-called campus plans, which is the Campus 23 Plan that regulates colleges and universities. The second was for Medical Campus Plan, and the third was for private 24

school.

1	There's nothing in the zoning regulation that
2	talks about a plan for a charter or a public school, and
3	therefore, none of these regulations would apply to them so
4	that was the answer to that, the Campus Plan regulations do
5	not apply to the charter school.
6	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, thank you. Does anybody
7	have any questions for the Office of Planning? Does the
8	Applicant have any questions for the Office of Planning?
9	MR. KADLECEK: No, thank you.
10	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Does party status have any
11	questions for the Office of Planning?
12	MR. UQDAH: I do, yes, just one brief question.
13	Where you put forth the condition as you stated
14	it in your report, that one paragraph, is that the same
15	paragraph that OP anticipated that both the Applicant,
16	CNDI-LA, and the ANC would respond to?
17	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Actually, it was just to
18	explain what the condition meant.
19	MR. UQDAH: No, don't misunderstand my question.
20	I see what the condition is after Kingsbury departs.
21	What I have a concern about is that as this matter
22	was moving forward, no one addressed, except for CNDI-LA, the
23	implementation factor. And I'm not sure whether or not

1	either the Applicant or the ANC is in agreement with that or
2	in disagreement with it.
3	Where they may accept the alternate condition, are
4	they also accepting the implementation? Does that make
5	sense?
6	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: No.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: What's your question, Mr.
8	Uqdah? I'm sorry.
9	MR. UQDAH: There are, in your reporting, you
10	offered
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Office of Planning did.
12	MR. UQDAH: in Office of Planning's reporting.
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: The supplemental or where?
14	MR. UQDAH: No, no, the actual supplemental.
15	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Okay.
16	MR. UQDAH: Dated December 13th. You say the
17	following would be the steps taken to implement this
18	condition.
19	Now, the condition is that one paragraph that is
20	at the top of your report. At the Public Hearing, the
21	Applicant submitted the following condition, all right?
22	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.
23	MR. UQDAH: What I'm trying to understand is: if

1	this condition is accepted, does it also mean that we're
2	accepting the implementation of the condition?
3	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Okay.
4	MR. UQDAH: Is that clear enough?
5	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Yes, I think I understand it.
6	Okay, so the condition, as shown in I think the second
7	paragraph, which was the one that we had at the Public
8	Hearing, okay?
9	MR. UQDAH: Yes.
10	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Subsequent to that, we looked
11	at it and thought that, and I spoke to you also about it, and
12	I was convinced with your argument that it did not include
13	other issues, such as the noise and all the other
14	requirements of the special exemption.
15	And so it was expanded on to include those things.
16	Then the list is just an explanation of how that condition
17	would be implemented.
18	MR. UQDAH: Okay, then that answers my question,
19	but now I have a question to the Board. Is that
20	satisfactory?
21	I mean, does that explanation of how it's going
22	to be implemented, is that just as enforceable as the
23	condition itself?

	75
1	Because if it's not, then why explain it?
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: That's okay.
3	MR. UQDAH: I mean, that may seem elementary to
4	you all, but it's important to us.
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: So, what I understand from your
6	question is that the Office of Planning has explained how
7	that condition would be implemented, and then now you're
8	asking whether that's enough of an explanation for the Board?
9	MR. UQDAH: Not an explanation for the Board, but
10	are those implementation conditions, will that be attached
11	to the alternate condition?
12	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: No.
13	MR. UQDAH: Well, then, why have them?
14	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Here's what I was trying to
15	do.
16	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
17	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: The condition is there; this
18	is the recommendation of the Applicant. That's the
19	condition.
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes. We asked the Office of
21	Planning as to explain how it was going to work out.
22	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Right, there was confusion as
23	to how it was going to work.

	76
1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Right.
2	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: So, that's what I tried to do.
3	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I understand. Okay.
4	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: So, it is not expected that
5	Numbers 1 through 8 would be a part of the conditions that
6	would be
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I understand.
8	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: If the Board accepts this
9	condition, the explanation portion of it does not expect it
10	to be part of the
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I understand. Okay. So, Mr.
12	Uqdah, we'll just have to see how it goes. It was whether
13	or not the Board think that that's enough for us.
14	MR. UQDAH: We're still on the same page. We're
15	rejecting the condition?
16	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Right. All right, so, okay,
17	does anybody have any more questions for the Office of
18	Planning?
19	Okay, the ANC Commissioner is here. Would you
20	like to speak? I'm kind of curious as to you came down and
21	so you weren't here originally, correct?
22	MS. BARRY: For the first hearing?
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.

1	MS. BARRY: No, but I watched part of it online.
2	I had to start at a new job.
3	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, so you're here to testify
4	for the ANC?
5	MS. BARRY: I didn't know that there was going to
6	be testimony, but I was here just to lend any supporting
7	clarification to our letter of support or whatever, if any
8	other
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: So, were you there for the
10	Hearing? Were you a Commissioner at that time?
11	MS. BARRY: For your November Hearing?
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: No, when you guys were hearing
13	about this case at the LAMB School?
14	MS. BARRY: Yes, I had been on the Commission.
15	Yes.
16	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, I'm sorry, I just got a
17	little confused. Right, so you did hear the case, and again,
18	if you could just clarify, then, the position of the ANC?
19	MS. BARRY: Yes, the ANC has submitted a letter;
20	we passed a resolution in November that was submitted in
21	advance of your first Hearing on the case.
22	And that letter of support looked at the Office
23	of Planning and the Department of Transportation's

recommendations, and we supported that. 1 2. I think it was by -- I can't recall exactly what 3 the votes were, but it was in support. That was in November. Then, at the November Hearing that the BZA had, 4 5 I believe on November 15th, you had requested, since the 6 Office of Planning had revised their original statement, that 7 it would be important for the ANC to revisit just that one 8 recommendation from Office of Planning, in terms of number of students. 9 10 And that is exactly what we did. The ANC 4C voted I submitted the letter and we voted in 11 in support of that. 12 There were seven people at the Meeting and we voted. 13 CHAIRPERSON HILL: It was six to zero to one, it 14 looks like. 15 MS. so there was six people in BARRY: Yes. support and one person who abstained. 16 17 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, and at that Meeting, were there Members from CNDI-LA that also testified in opposition? 18 19 MS. BARRY: since September, October, Yes, 20 November, and our December Meeting, this has either been 21 through community comment or, as its own agenda Item, has been on the agenda. We've heard both from supporters from 22

the community as well as representatives from CNDI-LA.

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: And so the ANC was satisfied
2	in terms of the concerns that CNDI-LA had brought up. They
3	were satisfied enough to approve the project?
4	MS. BARRY: Yes, almost unanimously.
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, thanks. Does anybody
6	have any questions for the Commissioner?
7	All right, Mr. Uqdah and Mr. Strand, I guess at
8	this point, I mean, we had a continued Hearing and there was
9	some information that we wanted.
10	And at this point, where I am, and actually I'm
11	going to ask one more question of the Applicant if I could,
12	but I guess we might ask for a conclusion from you guys, if
13	you want to give one in a moment?
14	But Mr. Kadlecek, what I got from the record, and
15	maybe I'm not correct, is that you were not in agreement with
16	the Office of Planning's condition?
17	MR. KADLECEK: No, that's not correct.
18	We are in agreement with it, and in fact, you'll
19	see in what we submitted to you today, we actually, in
20	deference to CNDI-LA, we added that we would give them more
21	notice about when we were going to apply for a Certificate
22	of Occupancy.

It didn't state it previously, so we added that

	80
1	we would give them at least 30 days' notice. They had
2	expressed
3	CHAIRPERSON HILL: And where is that in your
4	conditions?
5	VICE CHAIR HART: That is Number 30.
6	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thanks. The Vice Chair just
7	told me Number 30 from the end.
8	MR. KADLECEK: Yes, it's number 30.
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
10	VICE CHAIR HART: And I'm assuming that the party
11	in opposition, Mr. Uqdah, you have the I'm over here. You
12	were looking and I wanted to make sure I know it's hard
13	sometimes to know who's talking.
14	But you said you just received this list of
15	conditions yesterday?
16	MR. UQDAH: Yesterday, mid-day yesterday.
17	VICE CHAIR HART: That's fine, but you do have a
18	copy of them? It's just you have not had the chance to
19	review them?
20	MR. UQDAH: That's right.
21	VICE CHAIR HART: That's fine.
22	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, Chair?
23	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Kadlecek? Sorry, where did

	01
1	Condition 30 come from?
2	MR. KADLECEK: Condition 30?
3	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes. Whose idea was that?
4	MR. KADLECEK: So, if you recall, we brought that
5	up at the last Hearing.
б	And the reason that it evolved that way was when
7	we saw that the Office of Planning was recommending that the
8	school return to the BZA when they want to increase their
9	student enrollment once Kingsbury, the other school in the
10	building, leaves, I heard from Building Hope and LAMB that
11	because of the financing, that was a big problem for them.
12	So, then what we thought about was, well, we
13	understand that we have to be accountable in our growth, and
14	so we came up with that condition as a way to be accountable,
15	to have some mechanism that prevents the school from
16	expanding, if they are not complying with the conditions that
17	are otherwise in the order, including the Performance
18	Monitoring Plan.
19	So, we thought it was a good compromise to satisfy
20	what the concerns we heard were, but at the same time, not
21	creating the concern from the lender.
22	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'm having you explain the
23	wrong condition, but thank you for the information. I'm

1	looking at 12.
2	MR. KADLECEK: Oh, 12, okay.
3	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: But thank you, though. I was
4	on the wrong page, but thank you.
5	MR. KADLECEK: 12, okay. So, 12, the Committee,
6	so after the last Hearing, one of the items that the Board
7	had requested was some more explanation about the Committee.
8	In one of the older versions of our conditions, there was a
9	very short statement about forming a Committee.
10	So, we took the Board's request to mean that you
11	wanted more substance to what that Committee would be. And
12	so this was our attempt at providing clarity on what that
13	Committee would be and how it would operate.
14	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And who did you pattern this
15	after? I'm sure you've looked through the records at the law
16	firm and probably
17	MR. KADLECEK: We didn't, actually. Actually, the
18	Applicant came up with it first, and then I sort of tweaked
19	it, but they actually came up with the concept on their own.
20	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay, and I'm hoping, I don't
21	know, I believe, Mr. Uqdah, you already knew about the
22	Liaison Committee and all that, right?
23	MR. UQDAH: We know about it now, and in our

response to that submission, we were totally against it 1 2. because, one, it doesn't work in our favor. Two, it's an odd number which leads me to think 3 4 that there's going to be some sort of voting authority. 5 we're walking into a condition where we're already outnumbered, what's the point? 6 7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay, yes, because of the 5-4. 8 MR. UQDAH: Yes. VICE CHAIR HART: Just a little clarification on 9 10 this, it's 5-4 in your favor because there are -- I'm looking 11 at it and it says four Members are from the ANC or CNDI-LA, 12 and then the ninth Member was -- and maybe I was mistaken in 13 this -- I thought the ninth Member was the ANC's Single 14 Member District Commissioner. 15 I'm not saying that that's -- I'm just saying that 16 it's not the school's --17 MR. UODAH: This is a new condition that they have 18 Secondly, I want this Board to keep in mind introduced, one. 19 that the reason CNDI-LA is here is because we're not being 20 represented. We have no --21 Mr. Ugdah, come on, I would CHAIRPERSON HILL: 22 just say one thing. All right, never mind. Let me go back to my original 23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD:

1	point. I've seen these work and I've seen them not work, so
2	most of the ones I'm talking about are the ones that work.
3	That's why I want to know who we got the pattern
4	after. I believe that the organization probably have
5	patterned after somebody. I'm sure this is nothing new under
6	the sun.
7	Some of these actually work and some, I've seen
8	them work, actually campus plans in other areas, and I've
9	seen them not work.
LO	So, I was just looking at this and I'm hoping that
11	Mr. Uqdah and the party opposition will have a chance to
L2	really digest this and understand. Because this could be a
13	very significant tool to making everyone coexist.
L4	But I just wanted to find out who did you pattern
L5	it after?
L6	Because if it was after one of those ones that I
L7	know don't work, then I would say let's look at one of the
L8	ones that does work, and work with the opposition, depending
L9	upon what happens as we move forward.
20	MR. KADLECEK: Yes, and I think it was
21	intentionally not patterned after anything because the idea
22	was to think about how to make it as fair as possible.
23	I mean, to Mr. Hart's point, it really was

05
intended to be balanced.
And four people from the school, four people from
the community, and then the ANC person we elected to be on
the Committee, because that person would be the neutral
party. They're supposed to represent anybody.
CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And all of them are voting
Members?
MR. KADLECEK: I don't think there's voting.
CHAIRPERSON HOOD: There's not voting?
MR. KADLECEK: I don't think there's supposed to
be voting. I mean, the only voting, I think, that occurs is
there's a piece of that condition that involves producing a
written record of the meeting.
And that also helps to the alternative condition,
if you will, showing that the school's been in compliance
with holding these meetings, that there's a produced written
record of the meetings.
CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So, how do we get the outcomes?
Maybe I'm with Mr. Uqdah, maybe I need to read this a little
more and study this, how this is going to going forward.
Because if there's no voting mechanism, I don't
know. How do we get to the outcomes?

MR. ZAYETS:

23

So,

If I may just make a statement?

part of what we heard, as I've done plenty of these ANC involvement real estate transactions, is we wanted to demonstrate -- because this is a two-step process.

One is this special exception that we're seeking today for occupancy of 300 students.

There's a second one, which is very important for the school, and that's the second piece which is going to come three to five years.

But the key to that thing, in order for LAMB and us to make that happen, we need to demonstrate to the Zoning Administrator that we are meeting regularly and there are records being produced, and that they're being documented.

And we're going to submit these records to the Zoning Administrator only then, once we trigger the second C of O. And until we demonstrate that properly, our Condition Number 30 basically will not permit us to expand to 600 students.

So, the intent of all of these other conditions is to basically keep a record of the community involvement, and then cap it at the end with a summary, where we're going to submit all these documents to DCRA and, ultimately, the Zoning Administrator.

Then we'll say, okay, you guys have met the

2.

1	previous 27 conditions, you are now entitled to your C of C
2	and increasing your enrollment. So, that's the intent and
3	that was the whole goal.
4	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: But my point is, and I just
5	read it while you were talking, not that I was ignoring you.
6	
7	It says at least six members of the LCC must agree
8	to the report before it's adopted as the official record of
9	the meeting. So, there is a vote, at least the way I read
10	that, that last line.
11	MR. KADLECEK: Yes, that's what I was getting at.
12	I think that was to make sure that everyone is in agreement
13	that that's
14	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So, it goes back. So, we do
15	have a voting mechanism?
16	MR. KADLECEK: Yes, but I thought you were asking
17	about voting on policies or procedures or something like
18	that.
19	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: No, no, I'm talking about
20	so I think you've answered my question. Thank you.
21	MEMBER WHITE: I mean I think that this Committee
22	process could be very, very helpful because it will give
23	everyone access to information.

1	So, if this isn't successful, it could have a
2	direct impact on your ability to move to the next level to
3	expand your student population.
4	So, I hear your concerns about it, but it does
5	give you a direct entree into conversations that directly
6	impact the neighborhood.
7	MR. UQDAH: The concern that I would have, and
8	I've just been looking this over, is that what we represent
9	is the impacted neighborhood, not just 4C.
10	4C is made up of ten Commissioners, seven of whom
11	primarily represent Petworth, three of whom represent 16th
12	Street Heights, which is the impacted community.
13	To say in this document that there are going to
14	be four Members from ANC 4C, including CNDI-LA, that doesn't
15	give us but perhaps one seat at the table.
16	The other three representatives that are mentioned
17	here could be from Petworth, and that is a concern. I mean,
18	just looking at that one instance would be a concern.
19	And so when it is time to vote, we'll be
20	outnumbered.
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Uqdah, I did want to say
22	something. So, you're not in the ANC where the school is
23	located? I forget that part.

	89
1	MR. UQDAH: Me personally?
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Personally, yes.
3	MR. UQDAH: My building is.
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Your building is, okay.
5	MR. UQDAH: That's how I got involved with this.
6	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I guess I was trying to guess.
7	You are represented by the ANC. The ANC did take a vote.
8	There are elected officials that are the ANC. You were a
9	previous Commissioner.
10	MR. UQDAH: Mr. Chair, and I won't insult any of
11	you all's intelligence, I've put all of my responses to the
12	ANC's vote into our submission, and I've been real clear.
13	They are not being honest with you when they say
14	that there was several Hearings in this matter, that they
15	heard from CNDI-LA. They did not.
16	I provided you with email documentation to show
17	that we were rejected twice in making presentations before
18	this ANC.
19	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, all right. Okay, sorry,
20	Mr. Strand?
21	MR. STRAND: Mr. Chairman and Members of the
22	Commission, I just wanted to summarize quickly the point of
23	disagreement comes down to what happens at that point of

escalation, as was described, from 300 up to the full 600? 1 2. In the original Office of Planning recommendation, that escalation point was a trigger for the Applicant to 3 4 return to the BZA and demonstrate that they have been in 5 compliance with whatever conditions. And for the reasons that have been described, 6 7 that's not a viable option for their financing. 8 The issue for the community is if that's -- so 9 then it was changed so that the Applicant returns to the 10 Administrator and DDOT with a demonstration compliance with the conditions that are before us, and which 11 12 none of us have had a chance to thoroughly digest. 13 But as was described, we've had а lot of 14 conversations around the conditions. We are in agreement 15 with a whole bunch of them, as you will see. 16 But the two issues that we still have disagreement 17 on is: what happens at that trigger-point to demonstrate that 18 the goodwill of the Applicant and the adherence to conditions that we've been discussing are being met? 19 20 And what happens, as was requested by this Board 21 when we met last month, when you all met last month, of where's the teeth in this if something should go south? 22 What happens if the -- because what we're dealing 23

with is one day of data collection per year to demonstrate that the traffic is working out. And that gets submitted to a report on a typical day.

But those data are collected on the school grounds, and they meet the requirements of the DDOT for other schools, but those other schools are not in an R16 special zoning overlay, which requires a whole bunch of additional protections for a community that has been impacted in the way our community is.

And I'm an immediate neighbor of the school and have those concerns that have already been expressed to you.

But our real issue is in these reports that get generated quarterly, and I agree with Commissioner White, this could be a very promising mechanism for managing and surfacing issues.

But if there are issues that are problematic and they become intractable because there's a lot of traffic pouring out onto Piney Branch Road when they were supposed to be using 14th Street, and we can't get the parents to comply or things still haven't been rectified, what is the teeth when those reports go to the Zoning Administrator?

Does the Zoning Administrator have enforcement authority to address these things? We don't know that. We

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1	know you guys do. But the issue is
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: The Zoning Administrator has
3	enforcement capabilities.
4	MR. STRAND: So, that's actually I think where
5	we're stuck, is we don't know how these conditions get
6	enforced beyond
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I appreciate that, Mr. Strand.
8	And Mr. Kadlecek, what I don't understand is I
9	thought that this was going to get addressed, as to that was
10	the whole point of all us meeting. Where's the teeth? And
11	you all explained and Mr. Jerry?
12	MR. ZAYETS: Zayets, Zayets. Jerry, first name.
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: You explained the trigger-
14	point, I thought, in terms of that the Zoning Administrator
15	is going to look at whether or not you've met all your
16	conditions. And then he will determine whether or not to
17	grant the next level.
18	MR. ZAYETS: Phase of C of O and next level of
19	occupancy, when the Kingsbury folks leave.
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Right, and I guess, just what
21	I'm hearing here is that, and they haven't had a full chance
22	to look at all of these conditions exactly, but they don't
23	think that they're going to have a real opportunity to

1 participate. 2. Now, whether I believe it's a real opportunity or not, we can read a little bit more into this. But there is 3 4 something in these conditions now that provide an opportunity 5 for CNDI-LA to participate and give feedback. And also, Mr. Ugdah, you shouldn't be the ones 6 7 that get to load the vote your way either. 8 It's a fair understanding, and this is the part 9 that I also -- you know, I can't tell if you guys just don't 10 want this, or you're really just really worried about it, you 11 know? 12 teeth, again, So, the is that the Zoning Administrator is going to get to determine whether or not 13 14 these conditions have been met, before you turn it up to the 15 600, right? 16 And we then maybe just have to look and see 17 whether think there's actually any teeth we in conditions, I suppose. 18 19 Yes, that's right. MR. KADLECEK: 20 MR. ZAYETS: Yes, if I may, Mr. Kadlecek, I'll 21 just restate. So, the Zoning Administrator that -- I'm sorry, 22

demonstrate to the Zoning Administrator

shall

94 Applicant is in compliance with all other relevant approvals, 1 2. meaning everything that was set forth initially, they would 3 need to review that we complied with. 4 So, meaning, we're saying that we're going to 5 plant some trees; we'll need to demonstrate, as part of our 6 building permit application when we apply for that C of O, 7 fact did build those trees, in put 8 barriers, and met these TDM standards. 9 So, we will need to put a large packet together 10

and submit that as part of our application, and then the DCRA folks will have to basically look at that and make sure we met the BZA conditions.

And then, obviously, there's another stipulation in here that says we have to provide notice to the CNDI-LA folks prior to that submission of the application.

Right, so the idea is that CNDI-LA MR. KADLECEK: should be allowed to participate in that process. there's a 30-day notice provision.

They are given notice before LAMB even applies for that Certificate of Occupancy to expand its count.

If they are in disagreement with what the school is doing, that they're not complying with the condition, they're certainly able to tell the Zoning Administrator that

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

as well. 1 2. I mean, it's up to him to determine whether he thinks the school's in compliance, but if he thinks the 3 4 school's not in compliance, then it's fully within his 5 authority under this condition to just say, I'm sorry, you to the BZA because I 6 have to go think you're not in 7 compliance. 8 VICE CHAIR HART: Mr. Kadlecek? 9 MR. KADLECEK: Yes? 10 VICE CHAIR HART: In this Condition 30 that you've 11 outlined, one of the things I think that may be missing is 12 the conditions that you handed to us today, which don't have an Exhibit Number. 13 14 So, that's why I'm making sure that you understand 15 that. It says, after Kingsbury departs the property, LAMB 16 shall notify CNDI-LA at least 30 days before LAMB applies for 17 a Certificate of Occupancy. 18 But I guess the issue -- and it says some other things as well --- but what I'm reading there is that LAMB 19 20 shall notify CNDI-LA at least 30 days before the C of O, 21 before you apply for the C of O? 22 MR. KADLECEK: Correct.

VICE CHAIR HART:

23

So, I guess the part that I

think may be missing is that it's not just notification of CNDI-LA, it's actually letting them see the information and giving them that 30-day period to be able to review the information, and then provide some comments.

Because, then, the ZA is going to say, well, has this been done?

It will, I think, give -- if you include not just notification but having the report, that CNDI-LA would then be able to have that information prior to -- because you could kind of say we're going to do this, just inform them with a letter, and then actually have the information in the report to the ZA, to the Zoning Administrator, and give CNDI-LA that report on the same day as you give it to the -- you could do that simultaneously.

And that could be a problem.

MR. KADLECEK: That's a point -- and maybe we can change it to say that we would give them the full application that we would present.

VICE CHAIR HART: Yes, and I think that that may be helpful for Mr. Uqdah.

If you receive that, then at least you have the ability to see what is being -- because I think part of this issue is around just the unknown, and there's a lot of

2.

unknowns with this.

2.

You don't exactly know what the -- I mean, in this case, we didn't have the exact data, the exact language, for the Commission to know whether or not you'd be supportive or not supportive of them.

Now, there are 35 listed here. You may be in support of 33 of them, but you can't say that you are in support of 35 of them because you don't really know what is contained in them.

And so it seems as though some of this is kind of nuanced, and because of all of this, I think part of it is I think I need time to kind of look through these conditions before I would be able to decide on this case.

And I think the change that I suggested may be helpful, too, as you're kind of going through this process.

But I appreciate the information that you've provided, Mr. Uqdah Mr. Kadlecek, about kind of where you are. And it seems like you're close, but there may be some overarching --

MR. KADLECEK: And like I said, the latest version that you have before you was our attempt to take the version that CNDI-LA had filed into the record, they had submitted a list of conditions, and this was our attempt to take from

that and merge it with what we had submitted into a form that 1 2. the school was agreeable to. Now, obviously, the school wasn't going to agree 3 to everything that CNDI-LA had proposed, but it was 4 5 attempt to find that middle ground. Mr. Hart, if I may add one more 6 MR. ZAYETS: 7 comment. This is the Co-Applicant. 8 So, as part of the DCRA submission process, there 9 was as requirement that says whenever you're doing work on 10 neighbors' properties, you have to submit full construction drawing certifications. 11 12 The idea is -- this was derived off of that -- in 13 essence, that you were to provide your neighbor with 14 documentation prior to the submission. And that's actually 15 a requirement as part of the DCRA application. 16 So, the idea is that we would do the same. But 17 in essence, instead of a drawing, there also would be maybe 18 a Dropbox link or a giant packet of files or something else that we would put together and then provide it to CNDI-LA. 19 20 But it's essentially derived after that same idea 21 that's currently in place. VICE CHAIR HART: No, I understood that. 22 I think it was just around what would be given and what the timing 23

Because the C of O is going to be -- you will submit this information for the C of O, but it's are you giving the letter to CNDI-LA 30 days, or are you giving the full length of everything?

And it sounds like Mr. Kadlecek is amenable and

And it sounds like Mr. Kadlecek is amenable and maybe you are, too?

MR. ZAYETS: We are.

Well, the only information that's actually missing is we have to do renovations so we're actually going to be submitting a building permit application as part of the C of O. It's not just the C of O.

So, the C of O is going to come in August, but the building application's going to go in in May or April.

So, it's not going to be a significant packet because we have to renovate the Kingsbury folks in to fit LAMB. So, I completely understand and that totally makes sense.

MR. UODAH: I think we should --

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Give me one second, Mr. Ugdah.

So, Mr. Kadlecek, you understand what Vice Chair Hart was speaking to in terms of your Condition Number 30?

MR. KADLECEK: Yes, no, that makes sense and I

23

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	think we're in agreement with that.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, and if you change that,
3	you could just never mind. I was going to say you could
4	highlight it in a certain way, but you understand how you
5	could change that condition?
6	MR. KADLECEK: Yes.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, Mr. Uqdah?
8	MR. UQDAH: I just want to address a couple of
9	things.
10	One is that in our submission in responding to the
11	Applicant, I believe we asked for 90 days.
12	And the reason that we asked for 90 is because of
13	the Zoning Administrator's own testimony at the last Hearing,
14	where he advised us what his authority actually was.
15	And when it got down to the point of whether the
16	condition has been met or not, he says, and then if any
17	citizen or any member of the community lodges a complaint
18	about a particular condition, my office would investigate
19	that.
20	And I just don't know in this instance if 30 days,
21	you know, 30 days' notice to us, is going to be enough time
22	for us to gather this information, this Dropbox file, to look
	1

at all the reports, and then be able to go down to the Zoning

1 Administrator with some cogent arguments, should there be 2. any, and then whether or not he's going to have time to 3 investigate it. And I don't know what that means. Secondly --4 5 Mr. Hart, you had a comment? CHAIRPERSON HILL: 6 VICE CHAIR HART: Yes, just the Zoning 7 Administrator's going to have to spend time to actually 8 review the application itself. So, while you have 30 days, 9 30 days is prior to the Zoning Administrator actually getting 10 the documents. And so you have kind of a running start to 11 be able to then make some comments that you may have. 12 They could be general comments, they could have a lot of specificity to them, but making the ZA aware that 13 14 there are some concerns is something that --15 That you would provide to the CHAIRPERSON HILL: 16 Zoning Administrator. 17 VICE CHAIR HART: Yes, but you could provide --18 You'll have their report 30 CHAIRPERSON HILL: 19 days before they give it to the Zoning Administrator, so that 20 you'll have a chance to look at those and then provide 21 comments to the Zoning Administrator if you disagree with 22 anything they're about to submit.

VICE CHAIR HART: And the ZA's going to have to --

the ZA, Zoning Administrator, is going to have to figure out 1 2. what the issues are with a particular case before they -- and 3 they're going to kind of go through the conditions which are 4 35 conditions to be able to say, well, have they met this, 5 have they met this? And that process is going to take some time to go 6 7 So, it's not going to be like you only have 30 8 days, it's going to be like you have time. 9 And I don't know what the timing is at DCRA, but 10 there is going to be some time to be able to kind of deal 11 with that. 12 So, I understand the issue that you're bringing 13 I think that there's a way to kind of deal with that. 14 It's not an instantaneous kind of approval once it just gets 15 dropped at the --16 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Kadlecek -- I'm sorry, Vice 17 Chair Hart -- just so I got that, in your condition, because 18 I don't know if you understood this, 30 days before you submit to the Zoning Administrator, you're going to submit 19 20 to CNDI-LA? 21 MR. KADLECEK: That's the intent --22 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, all right. -- for the reasons that Mr. Hart 23 MR. KADLECEK:

1	explained.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, that's great. And so
3	that will be before we submit the application. Because
4	again, we're submitting a building permit application.
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, so that will be in your
6	condition?
7	MR. KADLECEK: The intent was for CNDI-LA to know,
8	before we even go down to DCRA, that it's coming.
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So, all right, I'm going
10	to go back to the Office of Planning real quick, because I
11	thought there was something that you had issue with, with
12	these conditions.
13	Is that not true?
14	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: No.
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Thank you.
16	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: I think one thing
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: It was the previous report, I'm
18	sorry, that I was thinking of.
19	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Yes, I wanted to continue to
20	emphasize in our previous report that we had asked that LAMB
21	submit details of the gymnasium to the BZA for review prior
22	to construction, either as part of that review or as a

modification.

1	CUATODED CON UTILITY Well and The section of the se
1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Well, now I'm confused. They
2	haven't submitted say that again, please?
3	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: As part of the application,
4	LAMB is supposed to be doing a gymnasium, a new building.
5	And so we had recommended that, as a condition at
6	that time, that they submit to us or to the BZA, as a
7	modification, details of the plans.
8	It's going to be like it is under review.
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, so Mr. Kadlecek, can you
10	add that into the conditions?
11	MR. KADLECEK: It's not something we currently are
12	in agreement with but
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: It's the gymnasium.
14	MR. ZAYETS: I understand. Part of it is we don't
15	know when that's going to be financed, but we know it could
16	be in five years or eight years so
17	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: It doesn't matter.
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: We're still going to be here.
19	MR. ZAYETS: I understand.
20	(Simultaneous speaking.)
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: definitely not going to be
22	here, but this place will still be here.
23	(Laughter.)

1	MR. KADLECEK: Yes, I assume you're going to want
2	another set of conditions anyway.
3	CHAIRPERSON HILL: So, go ahead and redo the
4	conditions, okay? If you can, give okay, so what are we
5	going to do?
6	Okay, so, Mr. Uqdah, do you have any this is
7	a continued Hearing. I always forget the Office of the
8	Attorney General, whether we have to do it again.
9	We did support an opposition the last time,
10	correct? We just heard from the ANC, so we're done with that
11	portion of the Hearing?
12	MS. NAGELHOUT: It's up to you. I wasn't here
13	last time. You do have to ask for
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right, okay, I'm just going
15	to do it. I was hoping the answer would be a better lawyer
16	answer, but it wasn't.
17	So, if anyone here wishes to speak in support,
18	does anyone here wish to speak in support? Anyone here wish
19	to speak in opposition? Please come forward.
20	MR. KADLECEK: Sorry, Mr. Hill, if I may?
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure.
22	MR. KADLECEK: You did go through support and
23	opposition last time.

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I did but now I'm doing it
2	again.
3	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Chairman, can I say a word?
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Please, go ahead, sir.
5	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'm taking really a lot of
6	attention to what Mr. Uqdah said about the liaison vote,
7	being in that situation myself, where I had four ANC
8	Commissioners that lived blocks away, and the most impacted
9	people.
10	So, I'm just going to ask, I'm not going to get
11	into it, but I'm just going to ask that you all re-look at
12	balancing that a little more.
13	I don't want to undo anything the ANC has done but
14	I want you all, the ANC, Mr. Uqdah, and the Applicant,
15	depending upon how this moves forward, let's re-look at how
16	this Liaison Committee is broken out. I'm just going to ask
17	you to do that.
18	And I don't want to undo anything from my
19	frontline electric workers, but I'd just like for us to look
20	at it again.
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, so, Mr. Kadlecek, you
22	need to just take a look at it. Chairman Hood is not saying
23	you have to he's not trying to undo anything you did, but
j	1

1	just take a look at it.
2	The people wishing to speak in opposition, could
3	you please come forward?
4	SECRETARY MOY: While they're coming to the table,
5	Mr. Chair, just for the record, on November 15th, the Board
6	did take rebuttal and closing from all parties.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Thank you. It's okay,
8	we're still good.
9	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman?
10	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes?
11	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: I have to leave, I have a
12	flight to catch.
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: No, I have a flight to catch,
14	too. All right, thank you very much, have a nice holiday.
15	Okay, so I remember seeing you. I'm sorry, now,
16	did you guys come and testify the last time? You didn't
17	testify? Okay.
18	So, we heard testimony, and if it's the same
19	testimony, then you can try to make it a little bit
20	basically, there's a lot of new stuff that's gone on.
21	The gist that I'm getting or I think the Board is
22	getting is all of the different concerns that have been
23	brought up.

1	So, I understand you're in opposition. I'm going
2	to go ahead and put three minutes on the clock for each of
3	you because that's what we're supposed to do.
4	And also, just to let you know, what the Office
5	of the Attorney General pointed out was, again, we did do
6	this.
7	So, this is now something that we're just doing
8	because I'm being, what's that thing? Mr. Moy always says
9	it. Abundance of caution, thank you, abundance of caution.
10	So, please, if you could start here to my left,
11	introduce yourself, and you need to push the button on the
12	microphone.
13	MS. DINE: Sure. Amy Dine, and I live at 1500
14	Farragut Street. I'm adjacent to the property.
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: You can just go ahead and give
16	your testimony right now, that's all right.
10 17	MS. DINE: Sure.
18	Okay, so I guess my main points are simply that
19	CNDI-LA, I feel, as a group, we're trying to think about how
20	to be welcoming but also be respectful of ourselves and what
21	we bought into as homeowners in an R16 that has an overlay,
22	in a neighborhood that has already been impacted by 35
23	percent of it is non-residential before there was an overlay

So, my main point is there's an overlay for a reason, and because the Board agreed that at a point, enough was enough of the impact of non-residential uses of the

to protect the nature of this beautiful neighborhood.

5 property within the overlay.

1

2.

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Therefore, my objection to LAMB coming in and expanding up to 600, I feel we're being rather generous to say up to 300.

And the reason there's this discussion about teeth is there are some of us who feel very strongly that 600 is not acceptable under any conditions. And I want to make that really, really clear. Let alone expanding beyond it.

There is a public school across the street on 14th Street that is expecting to expand to 600 children. That is talking about 1,200 elementary school children.

LAMB's population, by definition, serves the City beautifully as I tried to make clear, I feel very strongly, about the wonderful program for the City.

But for this neighborhood, that is impacting in not the way it's intended, on a property that was never built to be a school. It was built to be a residential home for elderly people.

And living right across the street from it, yes,

1	these are my personal problems, but that's why we're here and
2	that's why we're citizens and talking about it.
3	It's less than 60 feet from where the playground
4	is operating, it's actually probably more like 40, from my
5	bedroom window and from home office window.
6	So, that's what I'm just saying, is I wanted to
7	make sure that there are zoning overlays for a reason, and
8	there was a consideration.
9	And that's really just what I want to emphasize.
10	Thank you.
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, thank you.
12	MS. JOHNSON: Good morning, my name is Kia
13	Johnson. I live at 1406 Emerson Street. I appreciate the
14	opportunity to speak.
15	First, I'd like to say that our ANC has not
16	adequately represented the directly-affected neighbors. We
17	were not properly notified in a timely manner before. We
18	were not given notice of the school coming.
19	Maria Barry, her recommendation does not take into
20	account the people who live directly adjacent to the school.
21	That's why we formed this Committee, to represent our needs,
22	because we did not feel like we were being represented by our
23	ANC.

	111
1	That being said, we are just a small number of all
2	of the people in the neighborhood who have concerns about
3	this. There are many more who have work in other childcare
4	concerns that could not be here. So, this is just the tip
5	of the iceberg.
6	So, having said that, my neighbor, Amy, has said
7	a lot of the things that I wanted to say. But our community
8	has been adversely impacted by a lot of traffic. We have had
9	many accidents.
10	My street, up until we just managed to get our
11	street turned into one-way street, we had 3,600 cars a day
12	coming down our street.
13	This was not another school coming, this is, you
14	know, a tremendous amount of traffic that the Department of
15	Transportation helped us mitigate by turning our street into
16	a one-way street.
17	So, we have serious traffic problems already that
18	need to be taken into consideration without drop-offs of two
19	schools that are increasing their enrollment.
20	So, the noise, I happen to work an overnight
21	shift. I sleep during the day a lot. I have problems
22	sleeping during the day. I do it three months a year.
23	So, these are the type of things that need to be

1	taken into consideration when you're impacting a community
2	that is already overburdened with churches. If I stood on
3	my front step, I could hit four churches and four schools
4	just from my doorstep.
5	So, keeping that in mind with the number, that we
6	are not against the school coming, we are just trying to keep
7	the enrollment to not 600. 300 we have signed up on.
8	And the school has about 120, 130 students now,
9	so we're thinking about going from 120 students to 300, which
10	is a big increase, and then a couple years down the line,
11	600, with the same across the street.
12	So, I just want you guys to kind of get a picture,
13	and maybe even come and visit the neighborhood so you can see
14	what we're talking about, seeing all the schools and all the
15	traffic that's already there.
16	Thank you.
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, thank you. Sir?
18	MR. CLEAVES: I'm Henderson Cleaves. I'm a
19	resident of 1515 Gallatin Street, so it's catty-corner from
20	the property. I just want to reiterate what my neighbors
21	have said here.
22	16th Street Heights is essentially in the

commuting corridor from Maryland to downtown. It hosts four

13th

2. Street, and Georgia Avenue. There's a lot of traffic coming through there at 3 4 It's already very dangerous to cross the street 5 on zebra stripes with children. That's going to get worse, We're going to add a lot more cars. 6 7 I think we should bear in mind that if this zoning 8 is not approved, the school will not increase stop 9 functioning, right? 10 There will still be a place for children to go to school tomorrow and everything's going to be fine, right? 11 12 This doesn't have to happen for this school to function as 13 it is. 14 The new location is not at the center of gravity 15 of the student body as it exists, right? 16 We've heard testimony from LAMB parents whose 17 commutes will be improved by the relocation. We have not from the many 18 heard testimony whose commutes 19 worsened, right? Naturally. 20 But perhaps the thing that concerns me the most 21 is the fact that there is a community public school directly across the street from this proposed relocation site. 22

major arterial roads -- 16th Street, 14th Street,

I don't see anybody addressing what the potential

23

1	negative impacts on that community school could be from this.
2	And that really worries me a lot because community public
3	schools are glues for communities, right?
4	That's where neighbors go to school together.
5	These kind of charter schools are not that type of
6	institution.
7	So, those are my concerns.
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, great, thank you. Does
9	the Board have any questions for the witnesses?
10	Okay. Thank you guys very much.
11	MS. DINE: Thank you for the opportunity.
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, you all want to come
13	back? Did we lose Mr. Strand?
14	MEMBER WHITE: Yes.
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Oh, okay. All right, well, I
16	am glad we talked to everybody. I mean, again, the concerns
17	that everyone has is continuing to be highlighted with the
18	area here.
19	And, Mr. Uqdah, we've seen you before, but I
20	appreciate and I hope your community also appreciates the
21	time that you're putting in here for this.
22	And I'll let the Board speak however they want,
23	but again, it seems to continue to be this trust issue as to

whether or not before the turnover goes from 300 to 600, everyone's going to feel as though they're satisfied with the capability and the possibility to make that move.

And so what I'd like to do now in terms of continuing with this process is give you, Mr. Uqdah, an opportunity again to close with whatever you'd like to.

And then Mr. Kadlecek, you'll again have a chance for a rebuttal and closing as well.

But I know that what we're going to do probably is ask to have all of the conditions that we've talked about here again gone over with Mr. Uqdah and Mr. Strand to just see if he can get any closer.

The one condition that Mr. Vice Chair Hart mentioned in terms of clarification how it would give CNDI-LA a little bit more understanding of how they'll be able to submit information to the Zoning Administrator if they disagree with what you're submitting to the Zoning Administrator, when you do the 300 click increase.

So, actually let me think, I might be getting this incorrect in terms of the process, because this one got a little bit confusing for me.

So, Mr. Uqdah, do you have any cross in terms of anything that's been said by Mr. Kadlecek?

2.

1	MR. UQDAH: Mr. Chair, with all due respect to
2	this Board, my preference at this point would be for us to
3	just move into some sort of summation because the Committee
4	has submitted voluminous documents coming from us making our
5	statements about as clear as we could possibly make them.
б	I don't have any cross examination any more than
7	I would submit to this Board that I would be more concerned
8	with those conditions that this Board would agree, as well
9	as the Applicant, that we come together and submit to you all
10	some agreed-upon conditions.
11	And not have you just accept our conditions or
12	just accept their conditions without us having the
13	opportunity to be able to review them.
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: We're going to give you that
15	opportunity.
16	MR. UQDAH: Okay.
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: And so, Mr. Kadlecek, do you
18	have anything in terms of cross, rebuttal, or conclusion?
19	MR. KADLECEK: Before I get to that, there's just
20	a process question I guess I just want to understand first.
21	At the conclusion of this Hearing, then, it will
22	just be a matter of us submitting conditions for the Board
23	to consider.

1 | Is that where you were going?

CHAIRPERSON HILL: I'm going to see what happens with the rest of the Board, but kind of where I am is that after this Hearing, I would like to see whatever the conditions are that you have now refined -- after giving Mr. Uqdah an opportunity to look at them -- and see if you can't get together, right?

If not, whenever you submit your conditions, Mr. Uqdah, you'll have seven days after that date, whatever date we decide on in terms of when we're going to see those conditions, you'll have seven days to respond to any of the submissions.

So, if you guys disagree with whatever it is, if you disagree with the conditions or if you want to submit new conditions, that's your opportunity to reply back to the conditions that we're asking for in terms of the clarification.

I know you guys just got this today and we just got this today.

I think we have gotten a little bit more clarity as to how this might function better with some of the suggestions that have come up here from the Board, and that would be where I am.

1	And then after this, we just put it on for
2	decision. And so that's where we are.
3	MR. KADLECEK: That's what I was trying to
4	understand. Thank you.
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, all right.
6	MR. KADLECEK: I did have a couple of
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I think Mr. Uqdah, you're done,
8	correct?
9	MR. UQDAH: Well, I'm hearing what you're saying
LO	but if I could just state this, and someone let me know if
11	I'm on the right track?
L2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure, go ahead.
13	MR. UQDAH: When I leave here today, it is my
L4	understanding that we are to look at the conditions that were
15	submitted to us yesterday.
L6	And should we submit comments to the Applicant as
L7	to our response to those conditions?
L8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: What I would hope is that you
L9	have an opportunity and there will be enough time for this
20	to kind of work its way through that you would have an
21	opportunity to look at these conditions, make some comment
22	on those conditions, confer with the Applicant again, see if
23	you can agree to whatever issues you have with the

1	conditions.
2	And then the Applicant would submit whatever those
3	the Applicant would eventually get an opportunity to
4	submit whatever conditions they approve, okay?
5	And then you would have seven days to be like, we
6	submitted something that was nothing like this, we don't
7	agree to any of this. And you can talk through it.
8	And then the Board would have a chance to look at
9	both those and make a decision.
10	MR. UQDAH: Here is my concern, and this will be
11	the last statement on these conditions.
12	I have asked several times for everyone involved
13	in this the Applicant, the ANC, and the Councilman to
14	look at the conditions that CNDI-LA has presented to them and
15	tell us which one of those conditions do you not like.
16	What I'm not happy with is that I'm being asked
17	to consider the Applicant's conditions, but the Applicant is
18	not being asked to consider our conditions. And that seems
19	to be a little imbalanced.
20	That's unfair because we have presented conditions
21	that were based on the Applicant's conditions, but we
22	presented them in detail.

So,

23

what is it about those details that the

1	Applicant and the ANC and the Council representative do not
2	like? That's a simple question.
3	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I mean, Mr. Uqdah, we're not
4	up here to
5	MR. UQDAH: I don't mean to frustrate you.
6	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I'm just saying, we're not up
7	here to negotiate all the different conditions. It would
8	take even an hour longer than we've been here now, or maybe
9	longer than that.
10	And I'm not trying to discourage you in terms of
11	the conditions that CNDI-LA put forward. It's their
12	application, so they're the ones that are putting the
13	application forward.
14	MR. UQDAH: All right, so that answers that
15	question.
16	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I'm just saying it's their
17	money, it's their application, it's what they are doing.
18	And then the Board gets to determine, based upon
19	the input from the ANC, which we give great weight to, and
20	also the Office of Planning, which we give great weight to,
21	whether or not they meet the standard for us to either
22	approve or deny whatever they're asking for.
23	MR. UQDAH: I can see that point.

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: And in this case, they're
2	asking for a special exception to allow this from happening
3	I mean allow this to happen.
4	And I don't want you to be confused because I
5	don't want to be confused, in that we're going to go ahead
6	and get some conditions.
7	You're going to have an opportunity to look
8	through everything, you're going to have an opportunity to
9	give your comments to Mr. Kadlecek.
10	Mr. Kadlecek will have an opportunity to talk with
11	CNDI-LA and agree or disagree with whatever you all come up
12	with, and then you're going to submit something to us.
13	And then you will have an opportunity to either
14	agree or not agree with what is submitted, and then we'll
15	have a chance to vote.
16	MR. UQDAH: That's fair.
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Mr. Kadlecek, it's back
18	to you.
19	MR. KADLECEK: Thank you, that actually made it
20	very clear so I appreciate that. I just wanted to end with
21	a very few short, final points.
22	One is, I know it probably goes without being
23	said, but I just wanted to be clear that the school is not

1 insensitive to what the intent of the R16 zoning overlay is 2 about.

I mean, that is why the school has tried as hard as it can to compromise, find middle ground, and be sensitive to the concerns.

I don't know any charter school in this city that is willing to agree to 35-some odd conditions. I think that is a demonstration of good faith in the school's interest in trying to find common ground and work together with the community.

The other thing that I wanted to point out is there is, in fact, pretty broad support for this school in many aspects. There are over 60-some letters in the record of support for the school.

Many of those are residents of the ANC 4C. There is a lot of support for the school in this location, so I just don't want that piece to be lost.

And then, finally, what seems to sort of underpin a lot of this concern, I think, is this idea of we don't know what's going to happen in the future, and that's an understandable concern.

But I want to remind the Board that LAMB already operates in three different locations. I think if LAMB were

problematic in those locations, that information probably 1 2. would have come out at some point by now. CNDI-LA has been very thorough in the information 3 they've provided to the Board, and I think the reason that 4 there's been no information about that is because LAMB is a 5 6 good neighbor. 7 is a demonstrated history of there 8 operating in neighborhoods and that they're a good neighbor. 9 So, I think that's another thing to keep in mind 10 when thinking about whether these conditions are workable, because we know that LAMB has a track record of operating on 11 12 three campuses in three different neighborhoods and being a 13 good neighbor. 14 So, thank you. 15 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, does the Board have 16 anymore questions for anybody? 17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I don't want to undo, I'm 18 definitely not going to undo anything that you mentioned, but I just want to put my thoughts out there. 19 I'm still having a problem, and I know this goes 20 21 way back, I'm still trying to figure out why, and I think I'm sure Mr. Kadlecek's going to tell me it's financial, why 22

they're not coming back to the Board as

23

they do

increases. I haven't gotten over that yet.

2.

I've heard the conversation, I understand a lot of it's financial. And I also understand the Latin Americans among us who are buying charter schools that have excellent reputations across the city. I'm aware of all that.

But also, as they move forward with these conditions, my recommendation also would be to add what you've already said, not to mix it up anymore. I've seen the Applicant as well as the parties in opposition, sit down.

First of all, see what you agree on. Start from there, and then start trying to craft and work together what you disagree on, and see if you can find tools to put the language the way you can always agree, so when they come back to us, it will make it a lot easier.

So, we won't have to sit up here and look at 35 conditions or however many there are, 40, 30, whatever it is, and it makes it for us a little easier.

Start off with you agree, and then the ones you disagree, and I'm just throwing this out there, the ones where you disagree, see if you can make it so it works for both.

That's just where I am on that, so that's my two cents.

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, so all right. So, what
2	I think was the timing, so now, how long now, Mr. Moy, I'm
3	going to turn to you a little bit, and maybe I'll ask the
4	Applicant and CNDI-LA.
5	How much time do you think you need, Mr. Uqdah,
6	in terms of reviewing this, and then working with Mr.
7	Kadlecek to kind of determine which conditions you can live
8	with, can't live with?
9	I mean, I do want to start off, and I do think
10	that we would be hopeful that you're trying to get to a place
11	where you feel comfortable if this were to move forward, and
12	that's what I kind of think.
13	And it sounds like there has been a lot of time.
14	If you went all the way to Councilman Todd's
15	office and you all met again a couple times, this is almost
16	turning into a job for you as well, Mr. Uqdah, that you're
17	not getting paid for.
18	And so it sounds like you're a Board Member up
19	here.
20	So, the time that you need, I mean, it can only
21	be like a week, right, to kind of look at those conditions
22	and see what you'll think you have issues with?
23	MR. UQDAH: Rami, I'll let you address that

1	because my schedule's a little more flexible.
2	MR. RIHANI: I already was sworn in, but my name
3	is Rami Rihani, I live at 1505 Emerson.
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, Mr. Rihani, I'm sorry,
5	Vice Chair Hood just pointed out something Chairman Hart,
6	sorry. Chairman Hood is back Hart, Hood Chairman Hood
7	is back here on the 17th again.
8	So, if we work backwards from the 17th. So the
9	17th is a Wednesday. So, if we can get your final stuff, Mr.
10	Kadlecek, by the 9th, okay?
11	So, Mr. Uqdah, if you see by the 9th, after you
12	guys have talked by the 9th, you'll see what Mr. Kadlecek is
13	submitting.
14	And then you have seven days after that to submit
15	something to the Board, if you have any concerns about what
16	Mr. Kadlecek is submitting.
17	Hopefully, the only thing you submit to the Board
18	is that we've come to an agreement, and we believe that
19	they're going to do their best not that they're going to
20	do their best we have ways in which to feel confident that
21	this is going to work.
22	And so the 9th, Mr. Kadlecek, you'll submit?
23	MR. KADLECEK: Yes, and like we mentioned, they

1	already have our draft, so we'll just wait for a comment.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, so get comments to them
3	as soon as you can, okay?
4	MR. RIHANI: Excuse me?
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure, of course.
6	MR. RIHANI: What Vice Chair Hart was saying about
7	Condition 30, are you going to first revise that to what
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Actually, why don't you revise
9	that first, Mr. Kadlecek?
10	MR. KADLECEK: I'll make the two revisions that
11	we talked about today, and then we'll send you that. But
12	otherwise, it will not be any different than what we sent
13	yesterday.
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
15	MR. RIHANI: I think if you do that, and then
16	we'll
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, so, Mr. Kadlecek, that
18	won't take you by this afternoon, right?
19	MR. KADLECEK: We'll do that today.
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, so go ahead and flip
21	that, and then you're going to have the conditions with the
22	changes to Condition Number 30 by the end of today.
23	But you can look at all of the other conditions

1	right now, okay?
2	So, all right, does anybody have anything else?
3	Okay, so, Mr. Moy, we're back here on the 17th for a
4	decision.
5	SECRETARY MOY: Okay, January 17th for a decision.
6	Responses from CNDI-LA and also I believe the ANC,
7	if they wish to, by the 16th of January, and the Applicant
8	to file hopefully an agreed-upon set of conditions by January
9	9th.
10	Right?
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes, as the ANC, you're a party
12	so you can submit whatever has been you are a party to
13	this case. So, the ANC is able to submit anything went
14	through, anything that's been submitted.
15	So, on the 9th, Mr. Kadlecek is going to submit
16	his conditions, and then you can also submit something by the
17	10th, if you like, and I'm looking at the ANC.
18	And you're welcome to speak into the microphone
19	if you have a question.
20	MS. BARRY: I have a clarifying question. Does
21	that have to be based at our ANC Meeting if we have to
22	comment?
23	I'm just confused about what's expected because
24	we've now sent two letters, two
25	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure, there's nothing the ANC

1	needs to submit. If they want to submit, they can submit by
2	the tenth.
3	MS. BARRY: Okay, and then as a party in this
4	case, I have not been included in the negotiations, which is
5	fine.
6	So, they're just going to be working out because
7	I know some Members have rejected the idea that I've been
8	involved.
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: No, that's okay.
10	And I apologize, this is just because of the
11	regulations, I was just trying to clarify that the ANC has
12	an opportunity, and Mr. Kadlecek, as an attorney, can clarify
13	it a little bit better possibly, that you have an opportunity
14	to comment on what it is in the record.
15	So, you don't have to comment; I'm just letting
16	you know that option is there for you.
17	MS. BARRY: All right, thank you.
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Mr. Moy?
19	SECRETARY MOY: No, I think Staff doesn't need
20	anymore.
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Are we all clear? Okay,
22	then, happy holidays and see you on the well, or you can
23	watch on TV.

1	We're going to just, you know, do a decision on
2	the 17th. Okay, that's it.
3	MR. ZAYETS: Thanks, everybody. Thank you.
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Moy, I know we talked about
5	a break, but why don't we go ahead and do the next case, the
6	appeal, and then we'll take a break?
7	So, after this next case, which is 19632, then
8	we're going to take a break. So, we're going to take 20
9	minutes at least, after this is done. Just thought everybody
10	should know.
11	SECRETARY MOY: Okay, that is Appeal Number 19632
12	of AMT-Varnum LLC.
13	This is a decision made on August 23rd, 2017, by
14	the Zoning Administrator, Department of Consumer and
15	Regulatory Affairs, to deny Building Permit B1611940 to
16	construct a new three-story flat.
17	This is in RF-1 Zone at 1523 Varnum Street NW,
18	Square 2698, Lot 46.
19	As the Board will recall, our motion's to
20	intervene by John Stokes under Exhibits 20, 21, and Ms. Leila
21	Joseph under Exhibit 22 and 23. And there were other last-
22	minute filings last night from parties.
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, great. There's some

1	preliminary motions here. Are the interveners here? The
2	interveners are not here, okay.
3	All right, could you please introduce yourselves,
4	from my right to left?
5	MR. TONDRO: Yes, Maximilian Tondro on behalf of
6	the Zoning Administrator and DCRA.
7	MR. SULLIVAN: Martin Sullivan from Sullivan &
8	Barros, on behalf of the Appellant.
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right, so as I understand,
10	the preliminary matter is that there has been a request to
11	postpone. And as I understand it, DCRA is fine with that and
12	the Applicant is fine with that?
13	MR. TONDRO: Yes, Chairman Hill.
14	MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, it was our request.
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, and I'm sorry, part of
16	why I was really interested in getting through this now is
17	I had thought the interveners were going to be here.
18	But also, you don't have any issues with the
19	interveners being given intervener status?
20	MR. TONDRO: On behalf of DCRA, we consent. We
21	have no objections.
22	MR. SULLIVAN: And on behalf of the Appellant, we
23	also have no objection.

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, so if the Board is
2	comfortable with this, I would go ahead and grant intervener
3	status to the interveners, as well as grant the postponement.
4	Mr. Sullivan, I didn't see, when were you trying
5	to postpone until?
6	MR. SULLIVAN: Our request was the 10th or the
7	earliest convenient date thereafter.
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: The tenth. So, I think the
9	17th, Mr. Hood is going to be back here again. Well, Mr.
10	Hood, you already ran in.
11	Okay, so we're going to move it to the 17th, okay?
12	Mr. Moy, is that all right?
13	SECRETARY MOY: Okay, I have it.
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right, and I don't know,
15	if the interveners are watching, I would hope that they could
16	possibly get together and act as one. But I guess we can
17	work that out and see when they get here.
18	But, the interveners, if you are watching, please
19	know what will be asked of you when you come. Be ready to
20	present. Thank you.
21	All right, thank you gentlemen. So now we're
22	going to take a 20-minute break. All right.
23	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the

1	record at 12:54 p.m. and resumed at 1:27 p.m.)
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right, Mr. Moy, we're ready
3	to get going again? Okay. I think, actually, if we can go
4	back to there was a decision case that we put off,
5	correct?
б	SECRETARY MOY: Yes, there was. Okay, the second
7	and last decision-making case is Appeal Number 19573 of
8	Nefertiti Makenta.
9	This is captioned as the decision made on May 26,
10	2017, by the Zoning Administrator, Department of Consumer and
11	Regulatory Affairs, to issue building permit number B1707364,
12	amending Building Permit B1603868 to alter the approved
13	third-floor addition in the RF-1 Zone at premises 3616 11th
14	Street NW, Square 2829, Lot 169.
15	Again, this is a decision-making case and there
16	are preliminary matters to this record.
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, great, thank you, Mr.
18	Moy.
19	Is the Board ready to deliberate?
20	MEMBER WHITE: Yes.
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, so what was happening
22	here with this particular case again is that we were set for
23	a decision today and the DCRA had put in a request to open

the record.

2.

And I can't recall the date in front of me right now but they had requested to open the record to submit some clarification concerning the argument concerning Penthouse.

And we opened the record for that, for their comments, and then after that, the parties would have seven days with which to respond to that Exhibit.

The Applicant had requested later filing -- I'm sorry, had requested to submit something late because they had missed the seven days, and also had requested for a postponement to the Hearing.

So, what I had decided was to go ahead and grant the Applicant time to present to that Exhibit. And that time that we allowed the Applicant was supposed to be yesterday at 5:00 p.m., so that it would give us enough time to look at the information and then still make a decision today.

The Applicant missed that deadline and we didn't receive anything from the Applicant until this morning.

The Applicant also, in the submission, asked for some motions, one of which was to reopen the record to allow that into the record, and then also to continue to ask for a postponement. And there was some issues about a testimony from an ANC Commissioner.

135 out of an abundance of caution now, I 1 2 would, and please, after I'm through, any Board Members speak up in terms of their thoughts on this, I would go ahead and 3 4 move to grant in part, and deny in part, in terms of the 5 motion. I would be approving to reopen the record to allow 6 7 the information that the Applicant had submitted into the 8 record. 9 I would not be granting a postponement, although, 10 this is basically what is going to end up happening, but 11 would not be granting a postponement. 12 And based on what information was put forward, there was information that an ANC Commissioner was here at 13 14 the last Hearing and did not have an opportunity to speak. 15 And to speak to that point, the way that it is 16 supposed to happen in terms of appeals is that we, the Board, 17 say that all parties please come to the table for appeals. 18 The ANC is an automatic party to anything that has taken place, including that appeal, and they should have come 19 20 forward, and they would have had an opportunity to speak. 21 The fact that the ANC didn't know that and that

announcement made, the announcement wasn't made, and then the

that

there

was

thought perhaps

22

23

they

going

to

be

an

ANC Commissioner didn't speak.

2.

I'm a little surprised that the Applicant would not have pointed out that the ANC Commissioner is here and would like to speak, given the fact that this has been an extremely long case, and the record is extremely full, and this has been litigated for quite some time.

I would like to point out again for the record that I left at one portion during the testimony and have reviewed the entire record again, including the testimony that was given after I left. I watched the video and read through the record.

So, what I would be putting forth towards the Board is that granting the motion to reopen the record now for limited testimony only from the ANC Commissioner, I guess, Sharon Farmer, and that would be written testimony.

And then we would be able to take a look at that written testimony and then the parties would have only seven days, which is the regulations, per the regulations, seven days to respond to that testimony.

After that seven-day window is closed, we will not be taking anymore testimony, and the testimony that we would be taking is only that of the written testimony from the ANC Commissioner.

1	This is not to reopen the record or reopen an
2	argument about the appeal. It is just merely for the parties
3	to comment on whatever the ANC Commissioner may or may not
4	submit.
5	I don't know whether they are going to submit
6	something. And then we could set it for a decision date.
7	I would further state that since this has been a
8	very long case and this has been very much litigated in a
9	variety of different ways, and that Chairman Hood is here and
10	has been here for the testimony, I would ask that perhaps,
11	again, everything seems to be loaded up now onto the 17th,
12	and I apologize Mr. Hood, but put this back on for the 17th
13	for decision so that Chairman Hood can speak to the decision.
14	Does the Board have any thoughts on anything I
15	just said?
16	MEMBER WHITE: No, I would agree with you, Mr.
17	Chair, that we allow that period of time for the ANC
18	Commissioner to submit written testimony by I missed the
19	date that you said? within seven days.
20	So, I think January 17th is a good date for us to
21	have the decision. So, to be cautious, I think I agree with
22	you that we should at least give them opportunity to submit.
23	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I would concur. Mr. Chairman,

1	lac we move forward ac you all have gaid an abundance of
	as we move forward, as you all have said, an abundance of
2	caution, and also, proceed with caution.
3	There's been a lot of things that have been added
4	and taken away in this appeal and I think that going forward
5	now, I think that if we allow I know your motion is to
6	reopen the record.
7	I definitely agree, reopen the record just for the
8	ANC person and then allow responses within seven days. I
9	think that's the way to do it.
10	And also, I would appreciate us making a decision
11	on the 17th when I return, because I want to look at some
12	more things on this case.
13	Thank you.
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, so, Mr. Hart, are you
15	okay?
16	So, Mr. Moy, then, we're going back to the we
17	would ask, and if you would, Mr. Moy, please reach out to the
18	Commissioner and let the Commissioner know that we're
19	reopening the record for any written testimony that she might
20	have to give.
21	And we'd like that testimony no later than the 9th
22	of January.
23	Because if we do the Hearing on the 17th, seven

	13)
1	days from that gives you until the 16th for us to get
2	responses.
3	Or is it the 15th?
4	SECRETARY MOY: And that would be January 9th,
5	then, from the ANC, right? Which is a Tuesday?
6	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.
7	SECRETARY MOY: And seven days response would be
8	Tuesday, January 16th?
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.
10	SECRETARY MOY: Responses from the parties and a
11	decision on January 17th?
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.
13	SECRETARY MOY: Very good.
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: And so just to be clear again,
15	this is only to reopen the record for written testimony from
16	the ANC Commissioner who, I guess, was here and
17	unfortunately, did not have an opportunity to testify.
18	And so we're going to get written testimony from
19	that, then all parties can submit any responses to that
20	submission by the 16th.
21	And the record is only open for that; we're not
22	taking anything else.
23	SECRETARY MOY: Understood, and Staff will reach

	out to that ANC person.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, all right. Does the
3	Board have anything else to add? Okay, all right. Thank
4	you, Mr. Moy.
5	All right, Mr. Moy, if you can call our next
6	Hearing case?
7	SECRETARY MOY: All right, thank you, Mr.
8	Chairman. I believe we're back to the top of the batting
9	order, which is City Corner Market, correct?
10	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.
11	SECRETARY MOY: If so, then if I can have the
12	parties to the table to Application Number 19650 of City
13	Corner Market, Inc.?
14	Captioned and advertised for special exception
15	under the use provisions of Subtitle U, Section 254.
16	This would permit a corner store in the RF-1 Zone
17	at premises 2601 Sherman Avenue NW, Square 2884, Lot 61.
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, thank you. Good
19	afternoon, if you could please introduce yourselves, from my
	afternoon, if you could please introduce yourselves, from my right to left? And you need to push the microphone.
19	
19 20	right to left? And you need to push the microphone.

	141
1	MS. CHAN: Yes.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. If you could just
3	introduce yourselves?
4	MS. YOHANNES: Good afternoon, Sidon Yohannes on
5	behalf of the Applicant.
6	MS. CHAN: Hi, good afternoon, I'm the City Corner
7	Market owner. My name is Yin C. Chan.
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Your last name is Chen, C-H-E-
9	N?
10	MS. CHAN: C-H-A-N. Thank you.
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Is it Ms. Hanas?
12	MS. YOHANNES: Yohannes.
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yohannes, sorry. Okay, so Ms.
14	Yohannes, you're going to be presenting to us?
15	MS. YOHANNES: Yes.
16	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. I don't really have a
17	lot of questions in terms of the overall presentation.
18	If you could go ahead and again just let us know
19	what you're intending to try to do, and then if you could
20	tell us how you're meeting he standards for us to approve the
21	project, in terms of the special exception?
22	I'm going to put ten minutes on the clock, just
23	so I know where we are in terms of the length, Mr. Moy. And

1	you can begin whenever you like.
2	MS. YOHANNES: Sure. City Corner Market is
3	located at 2601 Sherman Avenue in RF-1 Zone.
4	So, Applicant seeks a special exception under
5	Subtitle U, Section 254.14, to operate a constant constrain
6	corner store for retail use with off-premises sales of beer
7	and wine.
8	Currently, City Corner Market is operating as a
9	corner store or as a retail grocery store and has been doing
10	so since May 1, 2014.
11	The property has been used as a retail grocery
12	store for over 20 years, and even beyond that, before 2010,
13	was selling off-premises beer and wine.
14	Applicant satisfies the special exception
15	requirements of Subtitle U, 254.14. City Corner Market is
16	located at the intersection of Sherman Avenue and Euclid.
17	It's not within 500 feet of any eating establishment or
18	another retail general-use corner store.
19	And Applicant's use will not create noise,
20	traffic, deliveries, or other objectionable conditions, being
21	that that property has been used as a grocery store for over
22	20 years there.
23	And it serves the people in the community,

primarily serving nearby residents, and there is no anticipated adverse impacts from traffic or from noise, because nothing really is changing except for the request for off-premises sales of beer and wine.

And as you probably can see from the Exhibits that have been submitted, there's been great support from the community and the Applicant.

The owner of City Corner Market has been trying to get their license, their ABRA license, their liquor license, for the past couple of years, and the ANC has been, before our firm got involved, really involved in trying to push this forward.

Regarding some of the other provisions and requirements of the corner store regulations, the market is on the ground floor and it's less than 1200 feet. The Applicant will have about two to three employees.

The proposed hours of operation would be from 9:30 a.m. to 9:30 p.m., Sunday through Thursday; Friday and Saturday, 9:30 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. There is no changes regarding any of the signage.

The Applicant does not intend to have any outdoor seating or any amplified music of any sort on the outside.

And I just want to, I guess, press that this

2.

establishment has just a lot of support and has had support since 2014. You can see the Exhibits, Exhibit 31, 32, 37, 42, 43, and Exhibit 48 to 50.

We've submitted a petition that is from 2014 regarding the liquor license, and that was just to show -- because, initially, what ANC did back in 2014 was take a vote for supporting the ABRA application, as well as the anticipated BZA application.

No BZA application was submitted at that time, and so they did another vote last month, just for the BZA application that was submitted. And I think also submitted to this Board a letter of support and resolution, signing off and saying that they support this establishment.

So, this proposal and this application, and if the Board grants this application, will not adversely affect the neighborhood or the neighboring properties. And we believe that it's in harmony with the intent of the regulations.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, great, thank you.

There was a couple of conditions that the Office of Planning had, and if you could just tell me whether or not you're in agreement with them?

The hours of operation shall not exceed 9:30 a.m. to 9:30 p.m. on Sunday through Thursday, and 9:30 a.m. to

2.

1	10:00 p.m. on Friday and Saturday?
2	MS. YOHANNES: Yes.
3	CHAIRPERSON HILL: No more than 15 percent of the
4	ground floor area of the ground floor of the store shall be
5	devoted to the sale of alcoholic beverages including beer and
6	wine to be consumed off-premises?
7	MS. YOHANNES: Yes.
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right, I'm going to
9	turn to the Office of Planning.
10	MS. THOMAS: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair, Members
11	of the Board. Karen Thomas with the Office of Planning. We
12	reviewed this application. We don't have anything further
13	to add than what's in our report.
14	We accept the fact that this corner store has been
15	in operation for over 20 years, and the Applicant in this
16	case is just requiring special exception relief to provide
17	the sale of beer and wine for off-premise use.
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, great, thank you. Does
19	the Board have any questions for the Office of Planning?
20	Does the Applicant have any questions for the
21	Office of Planning?
22	MS. YOHANNES: No.
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Is there anyone here

1	from the ANC? Is there anyone here who wishes to speak in
2	support? Is there anyone here who wishes to speak in
3	opposition?
4	All right. Is there anything else you would like
5	to add?
6	MS. YOHANNES: No, that's it.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right, then I'm going to
8	go ahead and close the Hearing. Is the Board ready to
9	deliberate?
10	Okay, after reviewing the record, and then
11	particularly the report from Office of Planning as to how the
12	criteria is being met, as well as the great weight that we
13	give to the ANC 1B, which was in support 11-0-0, including
14	their analysis.
15	I don't really have any issues with the special
16	exception request.
17	Does anyone else have anything to add?
18	MEMBER WHITE: No, I would just say that it
19	appears they've been in business there for a number of years
20	and seems to have been a good neighbor to the community.
21	So, I think they've met the criteria and the
22	record should reflect that they've met the special exception
23	criteria under Subtitle U, 254 for corner-store use.

	11/
1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, then I'll go ahead and
2	make a motion to approve Application Number 19650 as
3	captioned and read by the Secretary, and ask for a second?
4	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Second, I'm sorry.
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: The motion has been made and
6	seconded. All those in favor?
7	(Chorus of ayes.)
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All those opposed? The motion
9	passes. Mr. Moy?
10	SECRETARY MOY: Before I read the vote, I'm
11	assuming your motion included the two conditions, correct?
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Oh, I'm sorry, thank you, Mr.
13	Moy. Yes, it did include the two conditions.
14	SECRETARY MOY: So, the Staff would record the
15	vote as 4-0-1. This is on the motion of Chairman Hill to
16	approve the application for the relief requested, along with
17	two conditions.
18	Seconding the motion, Mr. Hood; also in support,
19	Ms. White, Vice Chair Hart. We have a Board seat vacant.
20	The motion carries.
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: A Summary Order, Mr. Moy?
22	SECRETARY MOY: Thank you.
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you, thank you so much.

1	MS. YOHANNES: Thank you.
2	SECRETARY MOY: The next case application, I
3	believe if I can have parties to the table to Application
4	Number 19656? this is of Mark and Cynthia Moyer, captioned
5	and advertised for variances from the floor area, ratio
6	requirements, Subtitle F, Section 302.1, non-conforming
7	structure requirements, Subtitle C, Section 202.2.
8	This would construct a rear attic dormer in an
9	existing one-family dwelling, RA-2 Zone, at premises 2517 Q
10	Street NW, Square 1287, Lot 820.
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right, if you could please
12	introduce yourselves, from my right to left?
13	MR. ROUSE: Michael Rouse, Principal Architect at
14	Michael Patrick Rouse Architecture, PLLC.
15	SECRETARY MOYER: Mark Moyer, owner of the
16	residence 2517 Q Street NW.
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right, Mr. Rouse, I suppose
18	you're going to be presenting to us?
19	MR. ROUSE: Correct.
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I've really got to tell you,
21	we have a lot of things going on today and so I don't really
22	have a lot of questions for you. I think it's really pretty
23	straightforward.

If you want to go ahead, however, and tell us a 1 2. little bit about the project and then the how you're meeting 3 the relief for the request. And then I will turn to the Office of Planning to 4 5 hear their thoughts, which you already know, because it's in the record. 6 7 But, please, start whenever you like. 8 My clients, Mark and Cynthia MR. ROUSE: Sure. 9 Moyer, owners of the property at 2517 Q Street, want to put 10 on a third-story addition on the roof. addition would be within the 11 This building 12 footprint, it would not increase the lot coverage. 13 However, it does put us over our FAR requirements, 14 so we're seeking a variance relief from that, and also, a 15 relief for additions to structures 16 currently non-conforming. 17 The FAR, when all is said and done with the dormer at the top, gets us to I believe 1.98. 18 19 Because our lot is shallow and narrow in size, 20 it's an undersized lot for that area, it's the smallest in 21 the neighboring seven, it is land-locked. Therefore, it has 22 to have its parking space on the property, which serves as

a ground-floor garage.

1	With the dormer, if we were to back out the FAR
2	with the dormer, our lot would still be one of the smallest
3	out of the seven. I believe it would be 1105 if we kind of
4	did it backwards.
5	We feel that granting this variance, there's no
6	detriment to the public good since the dormer is located in
7	the central mass of the building.
8	So, there's no blocking of light and air of the
9	neighbors and we feel that if the variance is granted, it
10	will not substantially impact or impair the intent, purpose,
11	or integrity, again, because of its size.
12	It would be such a small addition.
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, all right, thank you.
14	Mr. Moyer, you've been here all day. Things seem to be
15	working well for you,
16	but do you want to say anything?
17	SECRETARY MOYER: No, my wife and I intend to make
18	this our primary residence and, thus, we're trying to add the
19	bedroom.
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, I didn't want you to feel
21	cheated since you've been here all day.
22	SECRETARY MOYER: I appreciate it, thank you.
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Can we turn to the Office of

1	Planning, please?
2	MS. ELLIOTT: Good afternoon, I'm Brandice Elliott
3	with the Office of Planning, and we are going to go ahead and
4	stand on the record as recommending approval for the
5	requested FAR variance.
6	I'm happy to answer any questions you might have.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, does the Board have any
8	questions for the Office of Planning?
9	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Ms. Elliott, I do have a
10	question. Did Chairman Hill get your name right?
11	MS. ELLIOTT: Most of the time. I'm sorry, I
12	can't think of a time when Chairman Hill hasn't gotten my
13	name correct, but we've come a long way.
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, I'm being blindsided up
15	here. I mean literally from the left. Okay, other than that
16	question, does the Board have any questions for the Office
17	of Planning?
18	All right, does the Applicant have any questions
19	for the Office of Planning? Okay. Is there anyone here from
20	the ANC?
21	Is there anyone here wishing to speak in support
22	of the application? Is there anyone here that wishes to

speak in opposition of the application? All right.

1	Sir, back to you, do you have anything else you'd
2	like to add?
3	MR. ROUSE: No, not at this time.
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, I'm going to close the
5	Hearing. Is the Board ready to deliberate?
6	Okay, well, as I obviously mentioned, we read
7	through the entire record and I think that it's very clear
8	in terms of the explanation that the Office of Planning has
9	provided into how the standard is being met.
LO	And so as well as the support of the ANC 2E and
11	how they have come to their determination in how the standard
L2	has been met, I don't have any issues with this application.
13	Does the Board have anything else they'd like to
L4	add?
L5	Okay, then I'm going to go ahead and make a motion
L6	to approve Application 19656 as captioned and read by the
L7	Secretary, and ask for a second?
18	MEMBER WHITE: Second.
L9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: The motion has been made and
20	seconded. All those in favor?
21	(Chorus of aye.)
22	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All those opposed? Motion
23	passed, Mr. Moy.

	133
1	SECRETARY MOY: Staff would record the vote as 4-
2	0-1. This is on the motion of Chairman Hill to approve the
3	application for the relief requested.
4	Seconding the motion, Ms. White; also in support,
5	Mr. Hood, Vice Chair Hart. We have a Board seat vacant. The
6	motion carries.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right, great, a Summary
8	Order, Mr. Moy?
9	SECRETARY MOY: Yes, thank you, sir.
10	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, thank you all very much.
11	All right, Mr. Moy.
12	SECRETARY MOY: Okay, if we can have parties to
13	the table to Case Application number 19655? This is Benjamir
14	Flowers, captioned and advertised for special exceptions
15	under the non-conforming structure requirements, Subtitle C,
16	Section 202.2, Subtitle G, 1200, from the lot occupancy
17	requirements of Subtitle G, Section 40441, and from the side
18	yard requirements of Subtitle G, Section 406.2, and under
19	Subtitle G, Section 1201, from the rear yard requirements,
20	and Subtitle G, Section 405.2, to construct a two-story rear
21	addition to an existing one-family dwelling, MU-4 Zone, at
22	premises 508 7th Street SE, Square 903, Lot 23.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, good afternoon.

23

If you

	154
1	could introduce yourselves, please?
2	MR. FOWLER: Mike Fowler from Fowler Architects.
3	MS. FLOWERS: Mary Miller Flowers from 508.
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, great. Were you both
5	sworn in today? Okay, Mr. Fowler, are you going to be
6	presenting to us?
7	Okay, I guess there's a little bit of, or there
8	has been, kind of discussion as to whether or not you need
9	an area variance for this.
10	Are you aware of any of this? You need to speak
11	into the microphone, sorry.
12	MR. FOWLER: Sorry, no.
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. I guess some of this has
14	been discussed, that it would be under special exception, and
15	then some would be under an area variance.
16	And I guess I'm a little confused as to the
17	information that I got from the Office of Planning, as well
18	as the information I've gotten from the Office of the
19	Attorney General, as to where we are with this.
20	And so I guess could you clarify again the relief
21	you're requesting?
22	MR. FOWLER: Sure.
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Can you speak directly into the

1	microphone? Sorry.
2	MR. FOWLER: Sure. We are requesting special
3	exceptions from light coverage, rear-yard requirement, and
4	side-yard requirement in non-conforming structures.
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right, Ms. Nagelhout, I'm
6	sorry, if you could help clarify a little bit for me the
7	thoughts on whether it's an area variance?
8	MS. NAGELHOUT: He has asked for three items of
9	relief under G409, which is the provision that applies in the
10	MU Zone. That would be lot occupancy, rear yard, and side
11	yard.
12	But if you see G409.1 says exceptions to the
13	development standards of this Chapter, meaning Chapter 4 in
14	Subtitle G that applies in the MU Zone.
15	And the provision on enlargement of a non-
16	conforming structure is in Subtitle C, so that aspect of this
17	project would require area variance relief because it's not
18	part of the relief mentioned in Subtitle G.
19	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Does the Office of
20	Planning understand and agree with this?
21	MS. THOMAS: No, I wasn't aware of this at all,
22	and that's not an interpretation that I've ever seen.

So, this is not my case, I'm sitting in for Bryan

1	Golden, who left, so I just assumed it was a special
2	exception, a typical special exception relief addition to
3	single-family dwellings.
4	MS. NAGELHOUT: It's not a typical special
5	exception because it's in the MU Zone, not in one of the R
6	Zones.
7	But if you look under 5201, Subtitle D5201, it
8	lists all the areas of relief you can get under that section.
9	And one of the those provisions is enlargement of a non-
10	conforming structure.
11	But we're not in an R Zone, we're in the MU Zone,
12	and I don't see anything in Subtitle G that says you can get
13	a special exception from something in Subtitle C.
14	I don't see anything in G that says you can waive
15	anything by special exception other than what's listed in
16	Subtitle G.
17	MS. THOMAS: I would have to get some
18	clarification of that from the Zoning Administrator, or get
19	additional time to review this.
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, so Ms. Nagelhout, just
21	so I'm clear, again, the variance part is which one, the non-
22	confirming structure?
23	MS. NAGELHOUT: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.

Okay, so Mr. Fowler, and the reason why this matters, well, there's a lot of reasons why this matters, but if we went ahead forward with this and, in fact, you got approved for special exception, and you really needed a variance, you wouldn't get your permits.

So, you'd be back here again anyway, and I know this is frustrating, but I'm trying to make sure that you're getting what you need before we go through all this.

So, what I would do is I would postpone this again now to give you an opportunity to speak with the Office of Zoning -- Office of Planning, sorry -- and clarify the discussion that just happened here, as to whether or not you really need a variance.

Because it seems as though you need a variance, and if you do, then there's no point in going through this because you're going to get rejected with your permit.

And so that's what I would state for the Board.

Does the Board have any other thoughts? Okay. So, are you following me?

MR. FOWLER: Yes, and I apologize, we don't do a lot of work in the MU Districts. That's why this one kind of slipped through.

	130
1	I guess my question would be we have support,
2	neighbor support, ANC support, CHRS support, and if we change
3	the application to request the variance, do we need to go
4	through those groups again?
5	Because the project itself
6	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I'm only smiling because I know
7	that you have to, since you're going from a special exception
8	to a variance, you're going to have to re-post because it's
9	a much higher level of relief.
LO	And so I don't know, Mr. Moy, then you would have
11	to go back to the ANC again?
12	SECRETARY MOY: I would defer to OAG on that,
13	although, I have been consulted that I would not need to do
L4	the full 40 days.
15	So, that would be in your favor, but you for sure
L6	should refile, yes, refile, your burden of proof for the
L7	variance standards. Okay, re-post.
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: So, and Ms. Miller I know that
19	this but again, the reason why is that if we went through
20	this and you didn't get it, you wouldn't get your permit.
21	And so Mr. Fowler, I would go ahead and ask you
22	to work with the Office of Planning to see what your next
23	steps are.

1	In terms of the timing now, you're going to have
2	to re-post and so, perhaps, Mr. Moy, I can just let the
3	Applicant work with you in terms of when to reschedule this?
4	SECRETARY MOY: Yes, well, I can tell you now.
5	In terms of the Board's docket, I think what would
6	accommodate your docket for the month of January for this
7	case would be the 31st.
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, but then I guess I just
9	don't know if that means so, we can put you on the 31st
10	and if you need to postpone from there, then you can let us
11	know.
12	Meaning if you get in front of the ANC, if you
13	have to post for the 40 days, if there's any issues.
14	otherwise, we'll see you back here on the 31st.
15	MR. FOWLER: Okay, thank you.
16	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, sorry about that. And
17	Mr. Moy?
18	Can you make sure that Ms. White, because she had
19	to leave, is aware of the fact that she'll have to read in
20	for the 31st, or at least what took place today?
21	SECRETARY MOY: Will do, sir.
22	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. All right, Mr. Moy,
23	whenever you'd like.

1	SECRETARY MOY: Okay, so the Board is at Case
2	Application Number 19600 of Team Washington, Inc., d/b/a
3	Domino's Pizza, pursuant where the caption advertises for
4	special exception under Subtitle U, Section 513.1C, and
5	pursuant to Subtitle X, Chapter 10.
6	This is for a variance from the use conditions of
7	Subtitle U, Section 513.1C1, which would establish a fast-
8	food and food-delivery establishment in the MU-27 and R-13
9	Zones, at premises 2330 Wisconsin Avenue NW, Square 1300, Lot
10	815.
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right, good afternoon. If
12	you could please introduce yourselves from my right to left?
13	MR. DONNER: Robert Donner with Team Washington.
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I'm sorry, can you say your
15	name again, sir?
16	MR. DONNER: Robert Donner.
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Donner, thank you.
18	MR. R. ISEN: Richard Isen, Isen Brothers, LLC.
19	MR. M. ISEN: Michael Isen, NAI Michael.
20	MR. VIANI: Mark Viani, Bean, Kinney, & Korman.
21	I'm an attorney for Team Washington.
22	MR. WILLLIAMS: And Zach Williams with Bean,
23	Kinney as well.

1	MS. MARCUS: I'm Phyllis Marcus. I live on 137th
2	Street next to the parking lot. We would be the parking lot
3	for Domino's Pizza.
4	MS. RADULESCU: I am Adriana Radulescu, I live in
5	the neighborhood at 2238 Observatory Place, NW.
6	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, could you give me your
7	last name again?
8	MS. RADULESCU: Radulescu, R-A-D-U-L-E-S-C-U. I
9	submitted for a witness but it was not sworn in.
10	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, I'll swear you in, thank
11	you. But before I do, are you guys here with the Applicant,
12	or are you here in support of opposition?
13	MS. MARCUS: I'm in opposition, I live next-door.
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Oh, you both are in opposition?
15	Okay, we'll have a time for you. So, it's not right now.
16	You can just sit on back for now. But I can swear you in,
17	so if you want to stand?
18	MS. MARCUS: I was sworn in already.
19	CHAIRPERSON HILL: You were? Okay, so, Mr. Moy,
20	if you could swear in Ms. Radulescu?
21	SECRETARY MOY: Do you solemnly swear or affirm
22	that the testimony you are about to present in this
23	proceeding is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the

	102
1	truth?
2	MS. RADULESCU: I do.
3	SECRETARY MOY: Thank you.
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right, thank you. We'll
5	get to you guys all later. Mr. Viani, I guess you're going
6	to present?
7	MR. VIANI: Yes, sir.
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, so there are some issues
9	in terms of the application. We've obviously read the record
10	and have seen all the different Exhibits in terms of the
11	criteria and what you're trying to do.
12	I suppose you can go ahead and talk a little bit
13	more about the project as well as there are a variety of
14	conditions that the Office of Zoning has submitted if this
15	were to move forward.
16	I suppose the biggest thing that I'd be interested
17	in hearing from you is the report from the Office of
18	Planning, and they're in denial of that currently.
19	And so it is kind of a variance standard is a
20	difficult standard to get by and we'll kind of get through
21	their reasonings after we hear your presentation.
22	So, I am going to put 15 minutes up there. Mr.
23	Moy, if you don't mind?

	103
1	Just so you have enough time to kind of explain
2	what you're trying to do, what your Applicant's trying to do,
3	and how they meet the test for us to approve the special
4	exceptions as well as the variance, and go ahead and speak
5	to the report from the Office of Planning.
6	MR. VIANI: Okay, yes, it's been a long day so I
7	will
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Oh, this one's kind of short.
9	MR. VIANI: Yes, we will
10	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Just to let you know. Our long
11	day's 8:00 p.m.
12	MR. VIANI: Much respect.
13	I think, you know, looking at the Office of
14	Planning report, I think their concern is mostly on the
15	variance aspect of this, which is dealing with the 25-foot
16	setback from residential zones.
17	So, I'll talk a lot. We've submitted a lot of
18	supporting information about the special exception standards
19	in general, and I'll walk through that as we go through
20	discussing the project.
21	But I think really, the tip of it all focuses on
22	the variance issue, and we'll certainly focus mostly on that.
23	But with that, Zach's got the do you want to get the

plans?

2.

I guess the first thing's that important to say is what we're talking about here is relocation of the Domino's that's been serving Georgetown since 1987, 1986 timeframe. Their property is being redeveloped, all right?

They're located down on Prospect Street, further down in Georgetown. They've been there, they have an active customer base, they have 18 employees. They've been there for 30 years.

They've been a good member of the community, they've been actively involved in the community, and all we're doing is literally relocating, which I think is probably to a more appropriate location because we'll be actually in a shopping center at this point.

But that's what happened. This is not a new store, this is a store relocation.

With us, we have Robert Donner, from Team Washington, we also have the property owners. The property itself is Calvert Center.

The Calvert Center is, if you're going up Washington, the 2300 block of Washington, right across the street from where right now the shuttered Whole Foods is.

It's a small shopping center built in the late

'40s, mid to late '40s, and it has essentially five bays, two of which are consolidated and had been used up to about a year or so ago as the El Salvadorian Consulate.

Next to that is the bay that's used by Bruegger's Bagels; next to that is a bay used by U.S. Post Office; and the last is Chipotle, which Chipotle came before a similar special exception back in 2010 before this Board.

And prior to that, Chipotle actually replaced a Pizza Hut that had been there previously.

The property is about three-quarters of an acre. The property is split-zoned, MU in R-13, and what happens is the R-13 portion of the property is primarily the parking lot, which is the back of the property.

The property has been required to get a special exception to continue operating that, and they do that, and right now those are valid for about 15 years. It most recently came by about two years ago and got another special exception for that.

There is a history of these types of uses on this property, all right? and that's really what we're trying to do here.

Since the El Salvadorian Embassy vacated about a year or so ago, really even before that, when they knew that

2.

the El Salvadorian Embassy wasn't going to -- they would start looking for replacement tenants.

And as you're probably aware, it's not a really good time for retail real estate. Actually, the Bruegger's Bagels is closing as well. They closed, yes. So, Bruegger's is pulling out of D.C.

So, you'll see on the record we've submitted a list of all the folks that they talked about, and in about a year or so, a little more than a year, of trying to find new tenants and not able to get tenants for this site.

They finally got Team Washington because Team Washington was just relocating its store from down the street. They're very lucky to have that case and to have that client.

They're only taking half the space that takes up the old El Salvadorian Embassy, and they're actually getting it at a lesser rent. That's just the state of the market.

The reason I'm talking about this is to talk to you about the practical difficulties associated with a site like this, a site that is uniquely burdened with this split zoning.

When we talk about the variance, the variance is needed because if you look at the standard, the standard is

2.

for this fast-food or food delivery, you have to have no part of the lot on which the use is located shall be within 25 feet of a residential zone.

Well, if the lot itself is split-zoned, you're by default, incapable of meeting that standard.

Now, what else can you go ahead? You can try to continue to find other retail tenants and you can have been trying and trying and trying.

No one goes through this process and keeps getting left at the altar and not getting money for this thing, having to pay the notes on their significant financial difficulty.

Plus, you have the question of you have a shuttered black out-window frontage there that makes the property not look good. Because combined with all the other retails near it, it provides a detriment to the community and a detriment to the usability of the property along Wisconsin.

So, we're finally able to get a user to come in, all right? And more importantly, what's great about this thing, it's a different kind of Domino's. I think if anybody watches the NFL, you've probably seen the ads there.

Domino's is changing the format of their stores, all right? It's not just going to be kind of a small little

2.

168 -- you show up there, there's a little desk and you either 1 2. pick your food up right at the desk, and they also run 3 delivery services. It's going to be more of a pizzeria thing. Ιt 4 5 will be a sit-down restaurant, and I'll let Zach talk a little bit, show a little bit of these things. 6 7 There will be places where people can come up there and the kids can watch their pizzas being made and a 8 9 little more interactive. And what we're hoping is --10 CHAIRPERSON HILL: If you want to go ahead and put 11 up the -- Mr. Moy, where's the camera there again? I don't 12 know if you put it right on the easel there. Bring the easel 13 up, just bring the easel up and just move it forward. 14 MR. VIANI: So, the new way to try and get retail 15 to work is try and make it more interactive. 16 In our case, we think that's also going to, 17 frankly, provide a better street frontage and there's some 18 activity there. 19 But people will come up there, they'll order, they

will be able to watch their pizzas being made. If you have kids or so, that's always kind of a fun thing.

And there's the ability to sit down there as well and eat at a restaurant. Can you show them the one where the

20

21

22

kids can step up and things like that?

2.

So, this is our first store like this in D.C. that'll be this way. But we think it's going to be a really good something to enliven the streetscape, enliven the street frontage, contribute to retail activity on this site.

You know, also at the time when frankly this thing is now going to be sandwiched between you have a blank space, you're taking half the blank space and the space that was immediately the other side is now closed Bruegger's.

This is in light of the practical challenges and the unique circumstances applied to this property from the split zoning, this is what we were able to do to basically come up with the best kind of use we could have there.

All right, so let's talk a little bit about the special exception standards. Special exception standards talk, and I'll rely on, we've submitted out Statement of Justification.

There's a lot of other criteria in there talking about how impacting Federal facilities and things like that. We are next to the Naval Observatory.

I won't get into great detail on that but in terms of harmony with the MU Zone, harmony with the community, harmony with adjoining properties, what we're proposing to

do is a pizzeria.

2.

You've had pizzerias that have functioned effectively there before, you've had other fast-food delivery services, and food delivery services that have functioned there well before.

You've had the Bruegger's Bagels, you've had a Pizza Hut there, we've got a Chipotle, all right? When the Chipotle came through, this Board approved that back in 2010.

For reasons that no one can understand, there was no request for a variance at that time, they just recruited. Although, the same criteria applied. You still had the same split zoning.

When you look at the Staff Report, the Staff Report says they -- we met with Staff ahead of time and I appreciate Crystal and them sitting down and talking to us.

And I think everybody understood that, ultimately, this is a good use for the property, but the question is, what was the vehicle?

We chose special exception and we chose the variance because as we've always understood, following the code, special exceptions are kind of presumptively valid as long as you show you meet the criteria.

Variance is a more extraordinary running, and it

1	should be narrowly tailored to meet the limited conditions
2	to provide effective relief, just to prevent injustice and
3	practical difficulty.
4	Based on that, we said, okay, we're in the MU
5	Zone, we'll get a special exception for this food delivery.
6	But because we are incapable of meeting that
7	standard, that one little standard, that 25-foot setback,
8	because the residential zoning line is actually on our
9	property, we will seek a variance for that thing.
LO	And in doing so, we actually went ahead and we
11	took a look at what other cases in the area, other types of
L2	uses that have faced a similar situation, other split-zone
13	properties.
L4	Just down at the 1800 block, about 4 blocks south
15	of us, is the Paisano's that came through I guess it was last
L6	year.
L7	2016, yes, that came forward in that's Case
L8	Number BZA Number 19658 and that was approved on January 12,
L9	2016.
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Could you repeat that number
21	again?
22	MR. VIANI: Yes, sure, and I can submit all these
23	to the record.

Paisano's is BZA Case 19158 and that was January 12th of 2016, and that presented the same circumstance, where you could actually fit the store in the MU Zone but you had residentially-zoned property right immediately behind the Split zone, same lot. property. And so looking through Staff's analysis on that, they said, you know, well, this is not going to create a threat to -- there was actually a, I forgot the name of it, rec center right behind it. not going to present а threat t.o the community, it's consistent with the kind of uses typically had along Wisconsin Avenue. And therefore, they approved that variance in that case and they approved that special exception. You'll see the same thing with the Noodles & Company case, which is actually about four blocks north, and that's BZA 18328 and that approved in March of 2012. The exact same circumstance, where you have these lots that are extended and they're bi-zoned, they're dualzoned. And again, they also went ahead and dealt with the variance in that case. CHAIRPERSON HILL: I'm sorry, can you tell me that 18328? one?

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1	MR. VIANI: 18328, sir.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you.
3	MR. VIANI: And that's March of 2012, and that's
4	for Noodles & Company.
5	And so there is a history and a pattern, and this
6	seemed to be the best vehicle because we were trying to find
7	the right way to kind of be consistent with how the Districts
8	have traditionally handled these things and frankly, how the
9	community, when you look at the local approval, how the
10	community has locally handled these things in this area.
11	So, that's what we've been trying to do.
12	The property use is going to be we are not
13	required for parking because we're so small, not required
14	priority of parking. We're doing the five parking spaces in
15	the back just to provide that.
16	We are keeping the same hours they've always had
17	in the store, from 10:00 a.m. to midnight, Monday through
18	Thursday, and then 10:00 a.m. through 3:00 a.m. Friday,
19	Saturday, and Sunday.
20	The exact same hours, the exact same employees,
21	and the exact same folks that are just down on Prospect that
22	are being moved to the new site.
23	It's the same use, just relocated, and this time,

I would submit, in probably a better location, instead of mid-block on Prospect, which is kind of a quasi-retail residential street. It's going to be in a shopping center.

If you take a look in the record, we're aware of some of the concerns expressed by members of the community. More specifically, you'll see there's a petition, 122 people, many anonymous, but there's people who signed up for that.

And, you know, I understand where they're coming from. This is their community, this is their home. People want to make sure it's appropriately controlled. They're concerned about traffic, they're concerned about operations, noise, things like that.

And this was all addresses when we went through the ANC. Unfortunately, she had to leave at 1:00 p.m. but our single-member District Commissioner, Ms. Blumenthal, was here and she was here to speak on behalf of the ANC.

As you'll see, we talked about this at the ANC meeting. The ANC heard the concerns, took them seriously, tried to incorporate those concerns in the approval by the ANC.

And we have agreed to all those conditions as a condition of approval, and so we do take it seriously. We're going to have to continue to be good neighbors just as we

2.

were down at Prospect, and we want to be good neighbors here.

There are concerns about the rat problems that are all over D.C. You know, well, we have rat problems we try to control at the site down in Prospect. They'll be working to make sure that we don't contribute to rat problems here as well.

Trash, there's conditions where we've committed to three times a day as part of the closing, opening, and pre-dinner procedures, to go out there and we don't expect that we're going to be producing a lot of trash on Wisconsin or in the area because that hasn't been our experience.

At the other store, we're going out there and policing it. We've got restrictions on the drivers. We'll be using drivers at the back and then after certain hours, drivers will be parking along Wisconsin.

We've tried our best to meet the needs of the community. I think the ANC, when they came through it, they did a measured response of this, and they came to a decision to vote in favor of this.

This was not just the ANC as a whole. You heard earlier where there were people saying, well, those are Members of the ANC but not our District.

This one's a single-member District and this

2.

person was here. Unfortunately, a lot of us are sick, she was feeling ill and had to leave at 1:00 p.m. I've just got over a really bad cold myself.

So, that's where we are right now. We do believe that we meet the terms of the special exception.

We are harmonious with the needs for the MU District, we are harmonious for the residential district, I think as evidenced by the fact that the special exception for the back half of this site here, residentially zoned, for a parking lot.

We'll be using it as a parking lot. There were concerns about vehicles turning out of the parking lot. We've committed to adding a mirror.

You're talking about three or four delivery vehicles, no more than the usual kind of activity you'd find from these kind of stores. But we're going to still provide training and we'll provide a mirror for that parking lot.

We're trying to take it seriously, we're trying to work in good faith with the community. This use does meet the requirements of the MU Zone; we just can't meet this one variance standard.

And so with that, I don't know if there's anything really much more to add.

2.

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, does the Board have
2	questions for the Applicant?
3	VICE CHAIR HART: Just a quick question.
4	Mr. Viani, are the other properties that are along
5	this, you called it where retail establishments are located,
6	are they all within the same split zone?
7	MR. VIANI: Well, there's a lot of properties that
8	are split-zoned. The property immediately adjacent to us is
9	a condominium and I think that has some retail on the first
10	floor but it's a four-story condominium.
11	They're all split-zoned.
12	It's basically if you take a look at, and I don't
13	know if we don't have a copy of this. But if you look at
14	the zoning map, they literally just kind of say here's the
15	MU Zone. It just tracks along Wisconsin.
16	And in some cases it will pop out a little bit to
17	where it's not too far to go out of line so you get an entire
18	lot covered.
19	In this case, it just kind of tracks right down
20	there and it just kind of arbitrarily bifurcates the
21	property.
22	VICE CHAIR HART: The reason I was asking was
23	whether or not your property had a similar issue than other

1	properties that are there.
2	I mean, it's trying to get to the we look for
3	things that are what is unique about this particular
4	MR. VIANI: This is unique.
5	VICE CHAIR HART: Just hold on a second. So, if
6	the properties that are adjacent to yours could actually have
7	the same concern, and may be just a few, but it's trying to
8	understand that uniqueness issue.
9	And I'm looking at it, I'm realizing that the
10	zoning is on the back of the OP report. They include a
11	zoning map, which is Exhibit Number 56, that shows where the
12	zoning is located.
13	I think it's the last page.
14	MR. VIANI: Yes. All right, it largely tracks
15	along people's property, where you see the properties
16	immediately to the north of us.
17	There's a commercial property that's slightly
18	split-zoned but really, you have residential properties on
19	the back end on 37th Street.
20	The properties we talked about that received
21	similar relief a) was our property, but b) the Noodles &
22	Company and the Paisano's are to the north and south of us.

Those were in properties, if you look at the record, they

1	clearly reference the fact that those properties were split-
2	zoned too.
3	And you just had this requirement to meet 25 feet
4	but, again, the requirement is no part of the lot on which
5	the use is located can be 25 feet. So, it's not a question
6	of it's even if the use.
7	In this case, we have a fairly substantial lot.
8	Even if the use is set back 25 feet from where the actual
9	design was, that doesn't meet the standard.
10	The standard is if you're on that lot, no part of
11	that lot can be within 25 feet. Well, that zone's already
12	on there. It precludes it.
13	VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you.
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Maybe you mentioned this and
15	I missed it, because I remember in your presentation I saw
16	the Bruegger's to the left and then the Chipotle.
17	And so Chipotle came before us, again, for this
18	same relief?
19	MR. VIANI: Chipotle came before you for a special
20	exception. The same standards were applicable and the same
21	requirement was applicable, and for some reason, there was
22	no request for a variance there.
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: And you don't remember how long
24	ago this was?
25	MR. VIANI: Yes, actually, we do. That was

1	November 9th, 2010, and that's Case Number 18137. Hopefully,
2	I didn't get Chipotle in trouble here.
3	VICE CHAIR HART: There's also the zoning reg
4	changes in 2016.
5	MR. VIANI: That's correct.
6	VICE CHAIR HART: That's the only thing that has
7	kind of happened between 2010 and now.
8	And I don't know the specificity of whether or not
9	this particular change would have been captured in there.
LO	MR. VIANI: Mr. Hart, that's actually a really
11	good question. I would say for the provisions you're talking
L2	about there, essentially, they were recodified.
L3	These same standards applied back in 2010. They
L4	applied in 2012, they applied in 2016. It's just they never
L5	got a variance.
L6	And also for the Bruegger's there's no history of
L7	a special exception.
L8	VICE CHAIR HART: And are you saying that you are
L9	absolutely sure that they didn't apply? Or are you saying
20	that it is your interpretation that they didn't?
21	MR. VIANI: We pulled the file on that case and
22	it's a special exception approval. There's no mention of the
23	variance.

1	VICE CHAIR HART: What I'm trying to get to is
2	there are subtle changes that happened to the zoning that's
3	happened to the zoning regs in that time period, and I don't
4	know if a subtle change has made this more of an issue now
5	than it was back then.
6	And I was trying to gather from you whether or not
7	you were and I understand you saying you're looking at the
8	previous documentation to determine that.
9	But I didn't know if there was something you said,
10	okay, well, we know that the language is exactly the same
11	from well, the ZR58, the zoning regulation from '58 and
12	the zoning regulations that are 2016.
13	MR. VIANI: Zach, you worked on that aspect of it,
14	and yes, I believe the language is exactly the same. It
15	essentially just got recodified in there.
16	VICE CHAIR HART: Okay, thank you.
17	MR. VIANI: Paisano's got the approval. Before
18	that Chipotle, you actually had a Pizza Hut there. Now, we
19	have no evidence that they ever got a special exception.
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: And so the Bruegger's, again,
21	you didn't see anything?
22	MR. VIANI: That's correct, sir. : There's no
23	special exception for the Bruegger's.

Anybody got anymore CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. 1 questions for the Applicant? All right, I'll go ahead and 2 turn to the Office of Planning. 3 Good afternoon, Crystal Myers for the MS. MYERS: 4 5 Office of Planning. As you know, the Office of Planning is recommending denial. 6 7 We feel that the Applicant has not proven that 8 there is an exceptional situation resulting in a practical difficulty in meeting the requirement that the lot be 25 feet 9 10 away from a residential-zone property in order to do a fastfood and delivery service on the property. 11 12 Just to remind everyone, the way we look at it is 13 we review the variance test when it comes to that particular 14 criteria in the special exception. 15 And the test is that there be an exceptional 16 situation resulting in a practical difficulty to the owner. 17 So, when we looked at this, I know that it's been mentioned 18 the property has been split-zoned or is split-zoned. 19 itself is not what we consider That in an 20 exceptional situation because, as has been noted, there's 21 quite a few properties out there that have been split-zoned. We're looking at this as more the split zoning has 22

resulted in a practical difficulty to the owner and we did

not feel that a sufficient argument had been made on that particular issue, as well as the other issues the Applicant had mentioned.

I know that a little bit later on in the process, the Applicant submitted a letter saying that there's been a difficulty in renting out the property.

But it's only been in the market for about a year and we don't feel that a year is sufficient enough time to use that as an argument to support that it is unreasonable.

The way we look at it is that that space could still be used for any of the various different uses under the mixed-use zone for MU-27 or I guess even for the residential zone, as well as the special exception uses that it would meet all the criteria for.

Now, the Office of Planning has said that if the Board decides to approve the project, we feel that the ANC's conditions should be included with the approval, and we did include in our report that any new lighting should be low-level and downward.

And other than that, I just want to note that the Office of Planning had talked about this with the Applicant and we put in our report that because this Applicant does not meet all of the criteria for the special exception, perhaps

2.

184 it should have come in as a use variance because it doesn't 1 2. meet the special exception criteria. This was just a suggestion, this isn't something 3 that -- this was self-certified so this isn't something that 4 5 the Zoning Administrator had said or anything along those 6 lines. 7 But just in looking at this application, we were 8 wondering if it should just be looked at as a use variance rather than having to take it through the different steps of 9 10 the special exception criteria. And another thing I would note, I know that a 11 12 couple of past cases have been mentioned. 13 I just want to make note again that we look at 14 every case individually and the arguments presented in those 15 it's reviewed according to the issues 16 situations. 17 And so, yes, sometimes a variance is approved, but in this case, we do not feel that the arguments 18 19 sufficient to recommend approval of this case. 20 So, with that, we'll stand on the record of the 21 Staff Report. 22 Ms. Myers, the question that I VICE CHAIR HART:

had was around the -- and I'm looking at the zoning map that

you had on your Page 6.

2.

And what I was really trying to understand is it looks as though the lot that we're looking at actually is on both 37th and Wisconsin. And it doesn't look like a lot of the lots actually border both of the streets and are a split zone.

It looks as though most of the lots are either short and they only front on one street, or they are -- actually, that's it.

This is one of the few lots that actually goes on both streets and it fronts on both Wisconsin and 37th, if I'm reading this correctly.

MS. MYERS: We noted that this is I believe the largest lot with this situation. Now, the fact that it touches both Wisconsin Avenue and 37th Street we did not put in the report.

But we did note that it is one of the largest, and another thing we did note is that it's the only one zoned R-13 and MU-27.

I believe the other one's R3 in MU Zone, however we would still need the argument that that has resulted in a practical difficulty to the Applicant, and that was not there.

We just noted that there are unique things about the lot, we would definitely say that, but the test is that a unique situation results in a practical difficulty.

And as has been mentioned in the past, there's been other uses in this particular space, on this lot, that have been okay in the past.

And so the variance test is a pretty extensive test and so we would want that argument to be I guess crystal clear that it's difficult to do something else.

VICE CHAIR HART: And I appreciate that, and from what I am also hearing from you, it doesn't sound like you are saying, and it sounds like the last statement that you said, which was that there possibly could be arguments to be made, they just haven't presented those arguments in a way in which you can say you agree with them.

And I'm not trying to parse words --

MS. MYERS: No, no, what I would say is, you know, and I'm not saying anything out of step with what the report says, we note that there are unique situations with this lot, we note that.

And I'm assuming out there, there's a variety of different lots of there that you can note unique situations, but the test is that it results in a practical difficulty.

2.

And for that argument, we did not have that 1 2 argument there. We didn't think split-zoned was enough and, yes, 3 it is large and split-zoned but we've also seen other types 4 5 of businesses operate in this space that were in compliance. So, why is it this situation you can't? 6 7 VICE CHAIR HART: But just the one thing, just the 8 one note, I will note that from the Applicant's testimony, 9 they have said that the variance test did not come up, and 10 I don't know why it didn't come up, I'm not going to opine on that, but it didn't come up in the other cases. 11 12 So, they were only going to be looking at special 13 exceptions, which is a lower standard. And so there may be 14 an approval for those cases and just this particular issue 15 is not prevalent. 16 It's not like somebody said, well, this is a 17 variance and then we're accepting the variance. That wasn't 18 even something that was raised. 19 So, it is an odd thing that those issues about the 20 variance tests were not raised previously but are now being 21 And I'm not saying it's right or wrong, I'm just 22 saying that's where we are. And so the other uses that were here, it seems 23

1 like there may have been some -- maybe a lesser standard for 2. them to be at this location. And so right now it's a harder standard to be able 3 4 to locate here, and I'm not sure if that's just a statement 5 or if there's a question. I wouldn't disagree with that. 6 MS. MYERS: 7 We're looking at what the case is presenting today 8 with the regulations and how we interpret them today, and we 9 agree with the Applicant that a variance is a appropriate for 10 that criteria. But seven years ago, it looks like that was not 11 12 a necessity. So, any project that would apply for a use 13 variance in this particular site would be looked at in the 14 same way. 15 But apparently, seven years ago, there was 16 different way of reviewing it. So, it's just a matter of 17 2017 review process. 18 VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you. 19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And I'd ask Ms. Myers, 20 wondered, as we went along, did we make a mistake -- and I'm 21 just sitting here thinking all this through -- as we did the ZR'16? 22

We have a lot of things we have to correct.

1	me, I know all about that.
2	But I'm just curious because I know in times past,
3	if I can recall, and I know that was under the '58
4	regulations, the split zone was an issue. So, I'm trying to
5	figure out what did we do in ZR'16?
6	I'm just trying to get my arms around all this.
7	What did we do, now, to cause this kind of a problem?
8	And I've heard loud and clear, I've heard it
9	enough, where most people are moving out the City and
10	whenever I hear that, I take pause. What are we doing
11	the object is not to run anyone out the City.
12	I think the object of the ZR'16, at least the
13	policies behind all that, was to make it easier for people
14	to stay and be able to expand with the space we have.
15	So, I don't know how split-zoning now is not
16	I'm trying to figure out now why split-zoning is not a
17	factor, I guess that's what I'm trying to get to.
18	And I know some of this probably predates you,
19	some of it probably predates me, but I'm just trying to
20	figure out, because I know we have used that in the past.
21	If you want to respond, that's fine, if not,
22	that's something I have to figure out.

MS. MYERS:

The only thing I would say is I think

previously, there was an office use, a Consulate use, on the 1 2. site, and the residential side of the site is a parking lot. 3 And that's got its approvals for special exception. I know that was one of the arguments presented 4 5 here, and we agree that that parking lot is appropriate as a commercial use. 6 7 And there's businesses that it's okay to have a 8 business in the mixed-use side and have a parking lot on the 9 residential side. 10 And so that was a solution that the Applicant or the property owner had come up with for the split zoning 11 12 situation that has been working to a certain extent. 13 But apparently, the Consulate has left and so the 14 new business coming in, that's the one that this has 15 challenge with special exception requirements. 16 quite meeting it. 17 But our argument is that there's other special 18 exception uses and by-right uses that you could still 19 consider, or provide evidence or some sort of arguments that 20 would make us more understanding or weigh out better that 21 these uses, it would not work. And that's where we're just missing here. 22

We're not saying that a pizza location or a pizza

1	business in this property is a yes or no, we're just saying
2	we need the arguments to support that variance for the 25
3	feet. And that's where we're not quite there yet.
4	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay, so that goes back to Vice
5	Chair Hart's first initial statement about is there something
6	out there that you can help to build to make that argument?
7	I think that's where you were going.
8	I would concur with the Vice Chair on that. So,
9	okay, thank you, Mr. Chairman.
LO	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right, Mr. Viani, do you
11	have any questions for the Office of Planning?
L2	MR. VIANI: No. First of all, Ms. Myers, thank
13	you.
L4	We did sit down and talk beforehand and we walked
L5	through this thing, everything she's saying in terms of the
L6	history of the discussions and trying to figure out how do
L7	the challenge is correct.
18	Really, what it boiled down to was how we both
L9	perceived the issue. We see the property as being uniquely
20	burdened with this split zoning, and the question is what's
21	the practical difficulty in terms of that?
22	And how do you show that you've experienced
23	practical difficulty by application of that split zoning

there, without this variance mechanism or without going through maybe another use variance?

But we tried to go the least expansive variance mechanism. You're precluding a whole range of uses that are otherwise permitted in the zone of the MU Zone.

But it's not like we went out shopping for pizza places or for fast-food places. And it's not like knowing -- she's correct, there was an El Salvadorian Embassy here that took up two of the bays.

This is only taking one half of that. They're still going to have part of it vacant. That didn't just vacate with no notice.

The property owners, and I have the property owners right here, they can convey the same thing I'm going to say right now, which is people know they're going to be terminating the lease.

So, you spend that time beforehand shopping the property, trying to find new tenants, and you'll take anything willing to go there.

It just turned out, and the record is, we have two years of trying and trying and trying, whether it be fast-food folks, whether it be office folks, whether it be a range of uses. You don't say, hey, I want to take half my space at

2.

less rent and go through this land-use approval process.

You try to get a whole bunch of things, but finally, sometimes, you are just faced with these practical difficulties with the split zoning and it precluding uses, and the softness of the market and the conditions you're in that really kind of put you at a disadvantage to other properties near it.

That's where we are and that's how a practical difficulty has impacted us, and that's our practical difficulty. And I think our unique circumstance is the split zoning.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. I'm going to ask you to kind of go over it again in terms of how you're meeting the variance criteria, which I've heard several times today.

But one of the items that you've been hanging onto the argument in terms of the practical difficulty is the length of time that it's been vacant. And so that --- we'll get to you in one second. And so that's one of the items that you're speaking of.

And what you're now mentioning again is that the previous standard was going to get out -- you had notice, a year's notice, and so you start shopping around. And so it's really like two years you've been kind of looking to take on

1	a new tenant.
2	Okay, all right, so does anyone have anything for
3	the Applicant before I move on? Okay, all right, great. Is
4	there anyone here from the ANC? Is there anyone here wishing
5	to speak in support?
6	Is there anyone here wishing to speak in
7	opposition? If you guys could come forward?
8	MS. MARCUS: Okay, I guess, can I go? Let me just
9	clarify
10	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Hold on one second. You need
11	to introduce yourself again.
12	MS. MARCUS: Oh, I'm Phyllis Marcus. I live next-
13	door to the parking lot, the infamous parking lot.
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Ms. Marcus?
15	MS. MARCUS: Yeah.
16	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
17	MS. MARCUS: M-A-R-C-U-S.
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, so Ms. Marcus, you're
19	going to have three minutes to present your testimony.
20	MS. MARCUS: Okay.
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: And so go ahead and begin
22	whenever you like.
	1

MS. MARCUS:

23

One, the El Salvadorian Consulate

1	moved out two or three months ago. That space has not been
2	vacant for a year.
3	Two, Prospect avenue or Prospect Street is
4	commercial, it is not residential. Chipotle is different in
5	the sense they close at 10:00 p.m. and there's no delivery.
6	I can't answer as to Paisano's and the noodle
7	place. Also, the condo has no commercial
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, Ms. Marcus, I'm going to
9	restart your clock to three minutes. Let's hear your
10	testimony first.
11	You were basically just trying to cross-examine
12	what their presentation was and so I'd rather hear your
13	testimony
14	MS. MARCUS: Oh, my objections? Okay.
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes, exactly. So, I'm going
16	to put three minutes back on the clock again and you can
17	begin whenever you like.
18	MS. MARCUS: Okay, my objections are as to the
19	hours, the being open until 3:00 a.m. or noon, 12:00
20	midnight, and that's different than Chipotle, which is open
21	until 10:00, it doesn't have delivery. Bruegger's only
22	closed at 3:00 in the afternoon.
23	That increases the chance of crime in the

neighborhood by bringing people from outside the neighborhood 1 2. if you're open until all hours of the night. It also and it disrupts the 3 increases the traffic, the noise, 4 neighborhood. 37th Street is a residential street with fairly 5 Having the pizza place, Domino's, would 6 expensive houses. 7 affect the enjoyment and our safety. 8 Also, there's increased traffic from the cars 9 going in and out. 10 And the rodents, the garbage cans are in the back 11 there, not on Wisconsin Avenue. I had to drive to Chipotle 12 Monday, because the rodents at night are so bad, and park 13 near the door. 14 They're running rampant in the parking 15 There's garbage, food containers in the parking lot; 16 awful. 17 The rodents have affected one in five townhouses. 18 We had three different exterminators last year in order to 19 get it contained. A fast-food restaurant just increases the 20 rodent activity. 21 say again that And I'll the ElSalvadorian 22 Consulate, which is great, moved out two or three months ago.

They were an appropriate tenant.

1	I guess we believe Chipotle is different as I said
2	and this is not a commercial area. I would hardly call it
3	a shopping center.
4	It's a group of like three or four stores,
5	including a post office. So, for those reasons, I am in
6	opposition of Domino's coming in.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, great, thank you. Yes?
8	You've got to state your name again, and again we'll put
9	three minutes on the clock for you.
10	MS. RADULESCU: Thank you. I'm Adriana Radulescu
11	and I live at 2238 Observatory Place NW.
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Maybe just lean just a little
13	bit forward into the microphone?
14	MS. RADULESCU: Sure. I lived in Glover Park for
15	20 years and I've seen what was in that so-called shopping
16	center. It was a Blockbuster.
17	When Blockbuster left, there were many years when
18	that property was vacant and then the El Salvadorian
19	Consulate came in. The property was never, and continues not
20	to be, very well maintained.
21	The enclosure for Chipotle was built maybe two,
22	three years ago. It's not that long ago. And that's not an
23	enclosure that missed the requirement. It's not a brick

1	enclosure, it's a wood enclosure.
2	So, that's a bit of a sidetrack but I'll go back
3	to my points. I provided already a letter in opposition for
4	the record; it's Exhibit 58.
5	And I feel that with the ANC as well, the
6	opposition of the neighborhood to this business. It's
7	not taken seriously into consideration.
8	There was a petition of 122 people, that's a lot
9	of people, plus the other letters that were submitted in
10	opposition to the Board.
11	And I know from my conversations with neighbors
12	that nobody really wants a business there, and the reasons
13	are that the neighborhood is already saturated with fast-
14	food.
15	We have three pizzerias, one of which has an open
16	store so people can see. There's nothing new about how to
17	make pizza.
18	There is a sit-down restaurant that is up the
19	street. Actually, he wanted to give a testimony in honor of
20	that but he had to leave.
21	We feel that it takes away from the local
22	businesses which are not chain in the neighborhood.
23	And the other thing is all the clauses that were

negotiated by the ANC are, to me, from my point of view and many others, they are very generic.

It relies on Domino's Pizza's goodwill, and somebody will have to police this all the time. So, that was asked at the ANC meeting.

What is the recourse of the neighborhood if Domino's Pizza does not respect those clauses? What do you do? Do you call the police? Do we call the Board? I feel it's very hard to keep them in check.

And the other thing, it's traffic and it's not that much traffic that it would generate, but the way the drivers will be behaving. And it happened to me, actually, yesterday.

I was crossing Whitehaven, coming from Wisconsin Avenue, a Domino Pizza driver in a car almost ran me over because he did not stop at the pedestrian crossing, but went way ahead from me because, of course, a car moves faster than a pedestrian.

And our neighborhood, 37, it's a one-way street. All the other streets go in a zig-zag of one-way streets that are very narrow.

In addition to all the Uber and the Lyft, and all these pick-up services and other deliveries that come. I

1	feel that we don't need another burden with Domino's.
2	And to me, I haven't heard from them anything
3	about serving the neighborhood. They just want a better hub
4	to serve Georgetown University, which is probably their main
5	clientele.
6	Thank you.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, thank you.
8	As far as the conditions from the ANC, if they
9	were approved within the record, then they become conditions
10	within the order, and so then you would submit I think to the
11	Zoning Administrator, who then polices.
12	And you would complain to the Zoning
13	Administrator, and they'll come out and if they're not in
14	compliance, they'll lose their permit.
15	MS. MARCUS: But what does that mean exactly?
16	What happens when you lose your permit?
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: You can't do business anymore.
18	And I'm sorry, you to have to speak into the microphone, but
19	that's okay.
20	So, all right, does the Board have any questions
21	for the witnesses? Okay, all right, great.
22	Thank you all very much.
23	Okay, I guess one comment, so the property owners,

1	have you guys owned it since it was the Blockbuster?
2	MR. M. ISEN: We've owned it since
3	CHAIRPERSON HILL: You have to speak into the
4	microphone, sorry.
5	MR. M. ISEN: We've owned it since the early '70s.
6	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, so I actually know the
7	property, I remember the Blockbuster. I remember videotapes.
8	So, the argument, and I'm just asking a question,
9	you don't have to get too deep into it, so the discussion
10	that it was empty for a long time after the Blockbusters,
11	before the Ecuadorian Embassy, was it empty for a long time?
12	MR. M. ISEN: No, sir.
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, how long do you think it
14	was empty?
15	MR. M. ISEN: I'm sorry, I'm not used to a
16	microphone. It was empty for around I'm sorry, I'm Mike
17	Isen, I'm his son. I assist with the leasing of the property.
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure.
19	MR. M. ISEN: So, Blockbuster, if you might
20	indulge me, Blockbuster occupied 6000 square feet, and as
21	retail's gone, stores are getting smaller, soft-goods like
22	Blockbuster became rarer and rarer.
23	Whenever I ask this, I say who here has Amazon

1	Prime, and I'll ask who has Amazon Prime and who doesn't have
2	it in the room.
3	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure, no I got it. So, the gap
4	between the Blockbuster and the Ecuadorian Embassy was around
5	how long?
6	MR. M. ISEN: Well, you have to remember, also the
7	Bruegger's was part of Blockbuster as well. So, we were only
8	able to lease 4000. So, as the center's gotten and time's
9	marched on, Blockbuster was at 6000 feet.
10	So, it took about a year and a half to get the
11	Bruegger's in, which was 2000 feet, and it took around a year
12	to get the Consulate in the remaining 4000 feet.
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, I appreciate that. And
14	then just to the comment that the Consulate's been out for
15	about three months now?
16	MR. M. ISEN: That's wrong.
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: The Consulate's been out for
18	a year?
19	MR. M. ISEN: The Consulate moved out first or
20	second week of January in 2016.
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, all right.
22	MR. M. ISEN: And by the way, just for the record,
23	we have no existing negotiations of any kind for the space

1	next-door to it. Domino's is only taking half of the vacancy
2	if this is approved. We have no prospects for the remaining
3	2000 square feet.
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, and I understand. I'm
5	sure your attorney has let you know where you are right now
6	with this. It's the variance issue that you're having a hard
7	time getting past, and part of that practical difficulty is
8	the inability to rent the property.
9	And so the Office of Planning disagrees with a
10	year or two years or whatever it is in terms of how long it
11	takes to rent the property. And so that's brought you to
12	this point.
13	MR. M. ISEN: And Bruegger's closing is no vote
14	of confidence in the overall strip. I mean, there's more
15	vacancy in Glover Park and Georgetown than I've certainly
16	ever seen in 21 years.
17	I've never seen vacant store fronts.
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, and Mr. Isen, I got you.
19	I mean, the problem with us in terms of the Board is we have
20	the standards that we have to go through.
21	I wish that you didn't have to be here and that
22	you could just go ahead and rent your space.

And so but you are here, and so does the Board

1	have any further questions? I do have one last question for
2	Mr. Viani. Viani?
3	MR. VIANI: Viani.
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Viani. But does the Board have
5	anything else? Okay, great.
б	So, Mr. Viani, if you can again, I mean I'm having
7	the hardest time here with the variance, okay? And you knew
8	that was what was going to be the problem, and we've heard
9	the Office of Planning.
10	And can you walk me through again how you're
11	getting to a practical difficulty with just walk me
12	through it again?
13	MR. VIANI: All right. You have the
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: You have to lean into the
15	microphone.
16	MR. VIANI: You have the unique condition that we
17	have this split-zoning, okay? That without a variance
18	opportunity automatically precludes a range of uses that
19	would otherwise be permitted by special exception under the
20	Zone. All right?
21	That's a practical difficulty right there, and so
22	then, bringing forward the application here, we have for two
23	years been marketing this property, all right?

And also trying and trying and trying and constantly getting nothing sticking, nothing there, and this creates an additional burden.

It creates a real, tangible, practical difficulty that isn't suffered by other properties that aren't similarly split-zoned. It's not just a question of being near the residential zone. The residential zone is actually on our lot.

So, if you just read a strict meaning of the provision, you can't fit that in there but for this variance.

What is the purpose of the variance? The variance is to provide a narrow amount -- the variance is an extraordinary level of relief and providing a narrow amount of relief for a limited circumstances where otherwise, you would have injustice or practical difficulty.

Without even trying to market it, you're already experiencing practical difficulty. Then you spend two years trying to actually market it unsuccessfully, only to get your one tenant that you can possibly get in here? And they have to take this thing through this process.

I don't know that you get much more of a definition of practical difficulty.

We are very sensitive to the community concerns.

1	This thing did go through the ANC processes.
2	This thing went through three meetings with the
3	ANC, and there were concerns about fast-food, there were
4	concerns about restaurants, there were concerns about other
5	types of uses.
6	There were concerns about the El Salvadorian
7	embassy.
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, I'm going to stop you.
9	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Is there anything else that's
LO	different or unique, other than the split zoning? Anything
11	else?
12	MR. VIANI: The split zoning, I would say the
13	different, unique about the property. I would say the fact
L4	that the property has access on two roads.
15	You're not going to find that with most properties
L6	in the area, and it's precluded from full utilization of
L7	those resources either way because we have to have this
18	special exception for the parking.
L9	And then just the split zoning creates a problem.
20	It's a unique parcel
21	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I get the split zoning, I get
22	the split zoning. What I'm trying to do now is search for
23	something else that's unique.

1	MR. VIANI: Access to both the fact that the
2	existing properties pre-date the current application of
3	zoning.
4	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: It pre-dates '58?
5	MR. VIANI: The building was built in the '40s.
6	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: What year in the '40s?
7	MR. R. ISEN: I really don't know. I know we
8	acquired it in the early '70s. I don't really know.
9	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. And is there anything
LO	else?
11	MR. R. ISEN: I'm almost positive it was 1946.
L2	It was just after World War II.
13	MR. R. ISEN: Well, one thing, there was a height
L4	limitation because of the Vice President's home. So, we
15	can't go up more than
L6	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So, is your property the only
L7	one that can't do that? Your property's the only one, right.
18	MR. R. ISEN: Next-door is a four-story
19	condominium building. That was built before I guess 9/11.
20	And so they were exempt. There's a few properties
21	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So, the rest of them can't do
22	it as well, right?
23	MR. R. ISEN: A few properties, yes.

	200
1	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So, I'm just trying to find
2	MR. R. ISEN: How many of them can actually see
3	the Naval Observatory from one of our neighbors on our side
4	of the street. There aren't that many. Calvert, Licker, I
5	guess
6	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let me ask you this. Do you
7	need some time to think about it?
8	MR. VIANI: I think the split zoning creates the
9	unique circumstance but I don't know if it's a practical
10	difficulty. What else is unique about the property?
11	The property was, as we said, constructed
12	predating zoning. The property has access to two roads.
13	These are practical concerns, these are physical
14	challenges when it comes time to trying to sell the
15	opportunity to be a tenant in this property.
16	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Anything else?
17	MR. VIANI: I guess I would just kind of refer to
18	the fact that every case has to stand on its own but if you
19	look at the history of how these similarly-situated uses have
20	been treated, this is the vehicle by which we handle them.
21	You get a special exception for the use, and if
22	you're within 25 feet of this zone, it will look towards and
23	see is there going to be an impact to the property or

1	something like that?
2	And with Paisano's, with Noodles & Company, that's
3	been the case. It wasn't, apparently, reviewed as a concern
4	when it came to Chipotle, but in this site you had
5	Chipotle replaced a Pizza Hut.
6	You've got a Bruegger's on there. This is a
7	restaurant where we're going to be having people coming,
8	sitting down and eating too.
9	It's not just a delivery thing. And it's not a
10	question of also people there was a comment about is this
11	the serving of Georgetown?
12	This has served the same area since 1986 and it
13	served in the other place without any adverse impacts in the
14	community, no crime, no noise, no light violations. It
15	worked very well.
16	CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay, thank you.
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you, Chairman Hood. A
18	couple of things; I got a little confused during your
19	presentation in the record.
20	The photographs that you had were from the back
21	there. The front of the retail would be on Wisconsin,
22	correct?
23	MR. VIANI: That's correct.

210 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, and the conditions that were put forth from the ANC, you agreed to all conditions and there was one, I quess, that the Office of Planning iust mentioned in terms of if liahtina installed, it would be downward lighting. Was that in any of the conditions? I don't think that was in any of the MR. VIANI: conditions but I don't think we were proposing any new lighting, other than we did require for signage. And for signs, it would only just be the one sign consistent with their -- that sign may be internally lit but

there's no --

CHAIRPERSON HILL: But you would not have any opposition to a condition if a lighting were installed it would be downward lighting?

> No objection at all. MR. VIANI:

VICE CHAIR HART: Mr. Viani, in Exhibit 53, which is the letter that I think you -- oh, this is Mr. submitted regarding the -- your attempts to be able to try to market the site. In the second paragraph, the end of the paragraph, you said despite the efforts that you've made all over the past I'll say year, two years, whichever, but you despite these efforts, numerous potential tenants

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1	rejected the space. Why did they reject the space? What was
2	their rationale?
3	MR. M. ISEN: Every situation is different. For
4	our most recent tenant we had, it was a company called
5	European Wax.
6	It was a 100-unit, 150 chain that provides waxing
7	services and they said it was too close to Georgetown. I'm
8	sorry, to Dupont Circle, where they just opened.
9	They're looking to do fewer stores and they felt
LO	that it just didn't meet their requirements. Previous to
11	that, we went fairly far down the road with one of the local
L2	banks. It was under a little bit of confidentiality.
L3	It was one of the banks, and they really didn't
L4	like the fact that from a security standpoint, you have a
15	Wisconsin Avenue entrance for walking and then you also have
L6	the back entrance which you also have to maintain for fire
L7	code, because it's 100 feet long.
L8	So, you have to have rear access as well and they
L9	just couldn't make security work there. That was another
20	example.
21	We had a veterinarian office that didn't feel that
22	the neighborhood had dense enough demographics to justify
23	opening up a location there. I'm trying to think what else

1	has come up.
2	VICE CHAIR HART: And what I'm looking for is
3	understanding if there are issues about the building itself
4	or there are issues about I mean, the bank sounds like it
5	was probably the building itself.
6	But there's going to be other decisions that
7	possible potential tenants, I guess, would have to want to
8	move in. And I know that they can range.
9	MR. M. ISEN: No, no, I'll say some of the others
10	that I
11	VICE CHAIR HART: I was just trying to understand
12	
13	MR. M. ISEN: No, I understand. I'll give you
14	Bruegger's sorry.
15	VICE CHAIR HART: That's okay.
16	MR. M. ISEN: I mean, Bruegger's has been part of
17	the consolidation kind of going on in retail.
18	They were recently acquired by Einstein, which is
19	owned by Caribou. But another reason that people have given
20	me, one of the main ones actually I get from a lot of
21	retailers, is that there's no day-time traffic in Glover
22	Park.

That is actually kind of a market condition that

	213
1	people don't feel there's any real day-time traffic.
2	There's no office in the area. The Consulate
3	probably kept Bruegger's in business for years.
4	They actually ended up moving to Silver Spring on
5	Philadelphia Avenue and I think moved out of the city,
6	notwithstanding the fact that the Consulate's around the
7	corner and we did try to market it to other Consulates.
8	But it's been a variety of reasons. Some of them
9	have been overall economic reasons, some of them have been
10	building-specific reasons.
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: And how long was the consulate
12	there did you say?
13	MR. M. ISEN: Ten years, and I will say they had
14	a right to terminate after five years and we spent a
15	considerable amount of money to retain them, to prevent them
16	from exercising their option to terminate.
17	And actually, we made them an offer to renew,
18	which was significantly below what they were paying. It was
19	in the neighborhood of 40 percent less, to keep them as a
20	tenant. Because it's costly, it's time-consuming to just
21	split these spaces up.
22	Actually, where Bruegger's was split was

relatively easy because the way the space lays out.

	ZIT
1	But here, there's actually a staircase in the back
2	of this 4000 square feet, which has to maintain access and
3	it's going to be hopefully in Domino's space, but it also
4	creates it's expensive to split spaces and bring in
5	utilities, sprinklers, et cetera.
6	Thank you.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, all right, I only have
8	one last thing, I suppose.
9	I know the Chairman was going to speak, from the
LO	ANC. I guess they had waited here.
11	And the Chairman was going to speak from the ANC
L2	and so they left, right? Is that who it was?
L3	MR. VIANI: I think she's the Chairman. She's
L4	also the single-member District.
L5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: And they voted unanimously for
L6	the Domino's regardless of kind of I guess some of the
L7	opposition they got from the community.
L8	I'm just curious as to what was their
L9	justification for it or why did they want it?
20	MR. VIANI: I think their justification was we
21	felt that they met the standard.
22	They felt that they met the concerns that were
23	expressed by the community through the conditions, and there
ļ	

was concerns generally about what's going on with the retail 1 2. environment in Glover Park. There was recognition that this is a relocation 3 of a basic -- this is a locally-owned franchise. 4 5 local business; it employs 18 District residents. This was not a new thing coming in there, so they 6 7 that, but there qot past were concerns 8 lively activity providing retail, right there, being 9 concerned with what's going on in the area generally towards 10 the retail environment. They felt, I think, some of the concerns raised 11 12 about safety, access, ramps, things like that, could be 13 addressed through the conditions. 14 Some of the other desires to have a small local artisan business and stuff like that were not realistic in 15 16 terms of the market. 17 And the reality was there was an opportunity here 18 and they thought that it was a good opportunity to move 19 forward. 20 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right, does anybody 21 have anything else? You got your chance to All right. 22 speak, I'm not really sure why you're raising your hand.

It's okay, you can come on forward for a second.

1	You have to speak into the microphone, sorry, and you have
2	to re-introduce yourself.
3	MS. RADULESCU: Adriana Radulescu, I live at 2238
4	Observatory Place NW. I want to address some of the points
5	about the foot traffic and the difficulty of finding tenants,
б	commercial tenants, in Glover Park.
7	There are actually several office buildings in the
8	area. There is a branch of the Chinese Embassy. I mean,
9	they go to Sweet Green, which is a little South of that.
10	There is another big office building, I don't know
11	the address exactly.
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, that's okay. I
13	understand what you're getting at but you've had your
14	opportunity to testify. I don't think you're saying anything
15	new in terms of
16	MS. RADULESCU: What I want to say is this, that
17	the type of business like Domino's, it's what makes no foot
18	traffic.
19	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Right, okay, I understand.
20	MS. RADULESCU: There's nothing attractive about
21	it.
22	CHAIRPERSON HILL: That's not true. I like
23	Domino's, it's okay. Okay, you'd be surprised who's in my

	217
1	area.
2	(Laughter.)
3	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Exactly, you take my people any
4	time over Domino's. Right, so, okay, let's see. I don't
5	know where I am so I can't decide today, I don't know about
6	you all, and so the attorney's just blankly staring at me
7	across the table.
8	I'd be interested in hearing, I guess I don't
9	even necessarily need a whole lot, I just need a little time.
10	And so I don't know what the Board Members need, if anything
11	further.
12	I'm having a difficult time with this actually.
13	I don't know if there's anything that the Board Members can
14	help us get to a place.
15	The only thing I suppose that I might ask from the
16	Applicant is even just a summary as to how you're meeting the
17	variance test again.
18	I know it's in the record, I know I can go back
19	through it and all that. You can do a one-pager. It's not
20	anything that's going to be I don't even know if I need
21	that.
22	We'll see what happens with the other Board

Members here, if they need anything. I don't know.

VICE CHAIR HART: Mr. Chairman, yes, I guess I am somewhat struggling with this, struggling is probably not the right word, but I think that it is, and the questions I was asking were really around, and the I know the Chairman has just asked for it, it's really around the first prong of the variance test.

And at the very end, we started, and I think it was Chairman Hood that started asking about some of the other conditions that are going on. And I know we've talked about quite considerably about this, so I'm not really going to go there.

But there was a discussion about when this building was built, this building was built before the '58 regs, that there is this overlay zone regarding the kind of height aspect.

But even though that's not necessarily at issue here, there could be a limitation in terms of how much you could -- if you wanted to rebuild this or if you wanted to build something new to be able to market that, then you'd have to be able to deal with that zoning issue.

And if you could also talk a little bit about the connection between the fact that this is one of a few lots that actually connect that front -- I shouldn't say front --

that sit on both Wisconsin and 27th -- 37th, sorry.

And I think that that may be helpful to kind of understand that, and if there are any other things that you come up which that connect to that acceptable-situation issue, that's the part that I'm still kind of dealing with.

MR. VIANI: We'd be happy to comply.

VICE CHAIR HART: I think that the other prongs, I'm kind of okay with but it's this one that I'm still not sure.

And the Office of Planning, in their testimony, Ms. Myers said that there wasn't enough information in the record for her to be able to recommend approval of the application.

And I was asking whether or not -- well, because there is not enough information, then she can't get to that decision, the approval decision.

And so I think that's why we're kind of looking at beefing up the record for that, just so that we have that understanding. But I think that's kind of where I am with it.

I'm not saying that Ms. Myers is going to change the recommendation after it, but I think that it sounds as though there needs to be still some additional information

2.

to be able to kind of understand. 1 2. And I don't know if, Ms. Myers, if you need to be able to weigh in after they provide this information, Mr. 3 Chairman, either, if we want to have that, it may be helpful. 4 5 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure, that would be great. But that's just my view. 6 VICE CHAIR HART: 7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Chairman, I don't have much 8 I agree with you and the Vice Chair. to add. The only thing is about the one page. 9 I think you 10 said you didn't know if we needed it or not? And I think it goes to what the Vice Chair mentioned. 11 12 We need those bullet points if we can get over 13 that first prong, and that additional information, so the 14 Office of Planning can review and see if we can get there. 15 And then we can deal with everything else accordingly. 16 So, let's see if we can get that lift. And I'm 17 not pro or con, I'm not going against it. 18 I've also heard what the opposition has said as 19 well, but I always like to at least get the Office of 20 Planning and its support behind -- I mean, I don't vote 21 whether they support it or not, but I think that we can do

a little more work to get us all there in that first prong.

So, I don't have anything else to add.

22

1	VICE CHAIR HART: One last thing, there was one
2	piece of testimony that one of the opposition members made,
3	and that was around the hours of operation. And I didn't see
4	the hours of operation; I don't know if we had that?
5	Okay, that's what I thought. The hours were about
6	where you're parking, when the delivery cars could park in
7	the back or in the front.
8	MR. VIANI: Just 10:30 in the morning and then the
9	afternoon, they go to Wisconsin.
LO	VICE CHAIR HART: And I just didn't know if there
11	was any discussion that you've had with the community, and
L2	maybe it's just I missed it, but the community about hours
L3	of operation.
L4	MR. VIANI: All that was part of there were
15	three ANC meetings on this, and so all that was dealing with
L6	these were all discussed. Hours of operation, vehicle
L7	traffic, noise, smell, trash, all that was discussed.
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: But, I'm sorry, it's just the
L9	hours of operation of the parking lot, correct?
20	MR. VIANI: Well, there's two.
21	For the ANC, it was just the hours of operation
22	of the parking lot, but we've also in the record talked about
23	the hours that we would be proposing to operate, which are

1 the standard hours they're currently operating in the store 2. right now. 3 And that's in the record. Which Exhibit is that again? VICE CHAIR HART: 4 5 Because I missed that. 6 It should be in our Statement of MR. VIANI: 7 Justification. I know that it's 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m., 8 Sunday through Thursday, 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. -- 2:00 a.m. 9 sorry. 10 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 a.m., Sunday through Thursday; 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 a.m., Friday, Saturday, Sunday. 11 12 the current hours that they operate. 13 VICE CHAIR HART: Okay, thank you. 14 And actually, now that Vice CHAIRPERSON HILL: 15 Chair Hart mentioned this in terms of the conditions, the 16 Office of Zoning has mentioned that the conditions need to 17 be rewritten so that it's the Applicant rather than Domino's. 18 Because if it's not Domino's, then it's just going to be the Applicant. So, if you wouldn't mind providing the conditions 19 20 that have been listed from the ANC and then just replacing 21 Domino's with the Applicant. 22 And then also add that seventh condition, concerning if lighting were installed, it would be downward 23

1	lighting.
2	MR. VIANI: Will do.
3	CHAIRPERSON HILL: And so do you understand
4	everything in terms of
5	MR. VIANI: What we're looking to do is come back
6	and provide you more information to reach a decision on the
7	variance, whether we're met the standard or not.
8	I believe we understand the specific sub-points
9	you've gone on to talk about. We also want to come into with
10	revised conditions that remove references from Domino's and
11	change it to Applicant.
12	In addition to that, add in the condition from OP
13	about downward lighting, which we're happy to do.
14	And we can get that to you pretty quickly, with
15	the understanding that we would CC OP and let OP then further
16	provide additional feedback based on our additional
17	submission.
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, so I'm now going to put
19	this on for decision, and I was going to put it on decision
20	because you've been here all day now and I'm going to tag
21	Chairman Hood again for the 17th so he can hear and actually
22	deliberate with us.

Because it is something that's going to need a

1	little bit more deliberation I think than just a write-in.
2	So, if Chairman Hood, you're back here on the 17th
3	for the decision on the 17th, and then the Office of
4	Planning, we'd like any kind of feedback that they might be
5	able to give.
6	I'm just trying to back up some dates here. When
7	would you be able to give this to us?
8	MR. VIANI: I think given the impact of the
9	holiday, we could probably do it by the first week in January
10	or right on the 31st.
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. I'm just trying to
12	figure out the Office of Planning.
13	We don't need anything until everybody has to has
14	their seven days, in terms of I guess just parties.
15	So, if we could have whatever the Office of
16	Planning might submit supplementarily by the 9th of January?
17	And you'll get us your stuff by the 5th?
18	VICE CHAIR HART: Mr. Chairman, I was just asking
19	if we could get it by the 5th, then the Office of Planning
20	could give us a report by the 12th.
21	And so we're not actually having to wait until the
22	16th to actually get it.
23	MR. VIANI: We will make sure we get it in by the
ļ	

1	5th.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, and that's right, now I'm
3	going to go back to the seven days again.
4	Ms. Nagelhout, again, if the Office of Planning
5	submits a report, then parties, which would be these people,
6	I mean the Applicant, as well as the ANC, have seven days to
7	respond. Correct?
8	I'm sorry, your mic's not on Ms. Nagelhout.
9	MS. NAGELHOUT: I'm not sure that applies to OP,
10	rather than submissions from parties.
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: So, OP can submit whenever they
12	submit and then the seven-day rule doesn't apply?
13	MS. NAGELHOUT: I think that's correct.
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, well, we'll go with that
15	for now. So, then, right, so you're asking for say that
16	again.
17	VICE CHAIR HART: It's just a suggestion so that
18	the Applicant submits their information by January 5th and
19	then OP can respond to that by the 12th, just giving them a
20	week to be able to do that.
21	And then we have the case on the 17th.
22	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Moy, is that good?

SECRETARY MOY: That's good with me.

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, do you understand?
2	MR. VIANI: No later than the 5th.
3	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right, anything else?
4	I'm going to close the hearing and we're just
5	going to have a decision on the 17th, and we're going to take
6	a quick two-minute break, and happy holidays, you all.
7	MR. VIANI: Thank you guys very much. Thank you.
8	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the
9	record at 3:21 p.m. and resumed at 3:35 p.m.)
10	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right, Mr. Moy, you can go
11	ahead and call it whenever you like.
12	SECRETARY MOY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
13	So, the Board is back in session. It's 3:37 and
14	that would be Case Application Number 19630 of Goirand
15	Elodie Goirand, I hope I I try my best and Andreas
16	Xenophontos.
17	This is captioned advertised for a special
18	exception on your Subtitle D, Section 5201 from the lot
19	occupancy requirement Subtitle D, Section 804.1.
20	This would permit an existing rear garage R-15
21	Zone at premises 4540 Lowell Street, Northwest, Square 1608,
22	Lot 68.
23	Mr. Chair, there are two party status requests.
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, let's have the Applicant
25	first come to the table.

	227
1	MR. XENOPHONTOS: Good afternoon.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Good afternoon.
3	MR. XENOPHONTOS: My name is Andreas Xenophontos
4	and I am the spouse of the owner of the property, my wife.
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, Mr. Xenophontos?
6	MR. XENOPHONTOS: Very good, yes.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you.
8	Okay, all right, well, first all, thank you for
9	being here. Thanks everybody for waiting this long.
10	This is going Mr. Xenophontos, this is going
11	to take us a little while to kind of work out because there's
12	a bunch issues on here that I'm not terribly sure we're going
13	to be moving forward in this particular way today.
14	So, there are two party status individuals that
15	are looking to be included as members of party status. And,
16	then, there's a whole type of rights that comes forward with
17	that.
18	What I'm kind of struggling with, and I guess this
19	is what the Board is still kind of struggling with is, the
20	reports that we've gotten from the Office of Planning and
21	their interpretation and also whether or not the Board
22	believes that you really should be here for an area variance
23	and not a special exception.

1	So, two things, like are you like, I don't know
2	whether you have had counsel before or you're just
3	representing yourself?
4	MR. XENOPHONTOS: That's correct.
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
6	So, do you know the have you read the Office
7	of Planning's report?
8	MR. XENOPHONTOS: I have.
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
10	And, they are in agreement, or not they're in
11	agreement, they have given us a report that doesn't really
12	have any recommendation to the special exception because they
13	believe this should be an area variance. Okay?
14	And, the is what I understand, even the Zoning
15	Administrator believes this should be an area variance.
16	And so, if even if were to go, and I'll kind
17	of let the Board members also chime in, but I want to be
18	clear on this, even if we, the Board, thought that this might
19	be heard as a special exception, and then hear the special
20	exception, and given the information in the record, which is
21	pretty heavily against you right now, if we were able to get
22	to the point where we thought that it was a special exception
23	and approve the special exception, when you go to your
24	permitting, the Zoning Administrator would say, no, you need

So, you wouldn't get your permit.

an area variance.

1	MR. XENOPHONTOS: But, I don't need a permit. The
2	garage is already there. What I'm trying to keep is the
3	garage.
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Well
5	MR. XENOPHONTOS: Actually, the roof of the
6	garage.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I understand.
8	So, maybe then the Zoning Administrator is saying
9	that you're not supposed to have the roof of the garage,
10	right?
11	MR. XENOPHONTOS: That's correct.
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
13	MR. XENOPHONTOS: In order to meet the lot
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Right.
15	MR. XENOPHONTOS: occupancy requirement
16	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Right.
17	MR. XENOPHONTOS: that was high as long as I
18	remove the garage roof
19	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I don't know if removing the
20	garage roof puts you in compliance and, by right, then, you
21	know, then that's great, then you should go ahead and do that
22	if I were you.
23	MR. XENOPHONTOS: No, he said that
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: So, I don't know that's
25	that would the reason the point at hand, what I'm

trying to figure out and trying to get you to understand is that, the Office of Planning, via their report, is not making a recommendation that this is a special exception.

They are, in fact, making a recommendation that this is an area variance. So, we wouldn't even be able to argue as -- we wouldn't be able to hear the case as to whether it's a special exception or not.

And, even if we did, when you went to go get, you know, the -- when you went to get the decision as to whether you needed to tear down something or not, they would say, you're not here with the correct -- sorry, ruling. You need an area variance. Okay?

And so, I'm just trying -- and you'll feel free to explain. So, really, the two things that I see is, and I'm going to ask the Office of Planning kind of their thoughts, as well as I will ask the Board their thoughts and I'll give you an opportunity to comment about what I'm saying.

But, your options would be to, at this point, if they Board's with me, which I think they kind of are, then we think you need an area variance. Okay?

And, if you need an area variance, then we can't hear this now. So, we'd either dismiss this, okay, because you're not here for the right variance or, and I'd have to even look with the Office of OAG or you could reapply as an

2.0

2.3

1	area variance and then you'd have to go through the
2	placarding and everything that needs to take place in order
3	to do an area variance.
4	So, we'd be putting you off for a couple months
5	to go through that process.
6	You would then go through that process again with
7	the Office of Planning and the ANC and then you would be back
8	before us.
9	MR. XENOPHONTOS: May I respond to that?
10	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Certainly.
11	MR. XENOPHONTOS: Initially, I applied for an area
12	variance, that's what I did. And then, I received from this
13	office, and this is the documentation which I give you now
14	today, telling me that I don't need to apply for variance,
15	I can apply for a special exception because my lot occupancy
16	is at a 50 percent and it's an R-20 or in the R Zone covers
17	by that.
18	So, that's why we changed it from an area variance
19	to a special exception.
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, give me one second, give
21	me one second, give me one second.
22	MR. XENOPHONTOS: Of course I have given to you
23	right now this.
24	VICE CHAIR HART: Was that the information that
25	you just passed to us?

1	MR. XENOPHONTOS: Yes, the documents from Ms.
2	Allison Myers.
3	VICE CHAIR HART: Give us a second.
4	MR. XENOPHONTOS: Which they are very kind helping
5	me to go through this process because I'm not an attorney,
6	et cetera.
7	And please take a look at the second page.
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right, while we're doing
9	this, I'm trying to figure out what this is. And so, the
10	Board well, let I don't want to go too far out of
11	order, I'm just trying to understand, I don't want to waste
12	your time or our time here if you have to be here for
13	something else, right?
14	And so, and you're already, unfortunately been the
15	last person here and
16	MR. XENOPHONTOS: And also, this is our second
17	time at the BZA for this same permit, for the same property
18	and it's not done. This is our second time here.
19	The first time, we spent \$35,000 in legal fees to
20	come here.
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: No, that's okay.
22	When were you here? Oh, believe me, I know all
23	about the fees, so, you know.
24	MR. XENOPHONTOS: Yes, so
25	CHAIRPERSON HILL: So, last time you were here was

1	when?
2	MR. XENOPHONTOS: In, I have to see now, in 1983
3	2013.
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, that's the 2014 things
5	that were going on, right.
6	And, again, that brings up another question which
7	is that, you know, you had in 2014 said that you were at 30
8	percent and now you're at 34 percent. So, the question was,
9	what happened between now and then?
10	And so, I'm just trying to tell you there's a
11	couple of little things that you might be arguing about
12	later. I'm just not sure if you're going to be arguing about
13	it right now.
14	MR. XENOPHONTOS: If you want me to, I can tell
15	you, it's very simple.
16	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
17	MR. XENOPHONTOS: If you see one of the
18	documentation I have supplied and you have it in front of
19	you, it's a test wall done in 2012 by the DCRA.
20	A test wall, what does it mean? They come over,
21	they make sure the lot occupancy is correct because whatever
22	you say you're going to build, you have done the foundation.
23	You have the forms, they approve that.
24	Then, I got a letter from the DCRA's Zoning

Administrator telling me, it's at your disposal also, telling

234 me that I passed lot occupancy, building height and FAR. 1 2 Then, we thought we're clear, erroneously. Ι don't doubt that we are about, and I understand that the 3 garage exceeds the lot occupancy of 30 percent. 4 5 So, when they're giving us a test wall, they 6 approved it. 7 Second, they give us a letter saying we are clear 8 of the lot occupancy. We think we're good. And then, we're 9 living in the house for two years, living in the house and 10 they come after two years and they tell us, guess what, 11 you're exceeding lot occupancy so you have to demolish your 12 garage roof. 13 So, this is case that goes for five years. we'd like to have it to bring it to an end. 14 The last time 15 I came here, every single person in the neighborhood within 16 200 meters -- feet, most of them, they are in favor of us, 17 and you have that recommendation also. 18 Except one person was against us. Now there are 19 many more, of course, that are sitting behind me. But, guess 2.0 what? Why are they, you know, I don't want to blame the DCRA 21 for everything. I am not, I am not here to do that. 22 are doing their work, they are overworked. We are a lot of 2.3 us asking them things. 24 Their mistakes cost us dearly, But, quess what?

You know, we have three law suits.

1	have to sell everything, we have to finish the house because
2	the Zoning Administrator, the first time, he ruled on us that
3	because we removed the rotten wall that we raised the
4	building, even though we lived in the house. We have water,
5	electricity, we have a garage.
6	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I understand, I understand.
7	I get it, okay.
8	MR. XENOPHONTOS: And, we make good money I'm
9	almost finished my home.
10	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure.
11	MR. XENOPHONTOS: Okay? And, you know, if, you
12	know
13	So, the problem and then, he based his decision
14	on the rule who doesn't exist in any book. The 48-inches
15	rule.
16	So, he brought us here, we spent \$35,000 in legal
17	fees, \$32,000 in legal fees because we had no other option.
18	So, if you're telling if we say we object to
19	that, we have to the court system, our house will be there
20	unfinished. So, we have no option. We came here and we got
21	a variance.
22	But, guess what? They ruled on us on something
23	that's not exist in any book and it's part of your package.
24	The rule of the the famous rule of the 48 inches.
25	If somebody can be kind enough to show us in which

1	book, in which
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Xenophontos, I do have t
3	stop you. You said you were just about finished.
4	MR. XENOPHONTOS: Okay.
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: So, that's okay.
6	And so, just to let you know, you're talking abou
7	a lot of different things as we get into the cases. Okay
8	So now, I'm just going to go back to the first one which i
9	whether or not you're here for the right thing and whethe
10	or not we should even continue with this. Okay?
11	So, I'm actually going to go to the Office o
12	Planning just to provide a little bit of clarity because, a
13	this point, again, what I understand is that you're no
14	giving us any kind of analysis because you don't believe thi
15	should be a special exception but an area variance.
16	And, if you could help to clarify that and specif
17	as to why that is, that would help the Board as to whethe
18	or not we should be here or we should come back again for a
19	area variance.
20	MR. MORDFIN: Good afternoon, I'm Stephen Mordfin
21	And, the Office of Planning reviewed not only thi
22	application, but the previous one, BZA 18659 and the orde
23	that came with that case.
24	In that application the Applicant had applied fo

variances to front and side yard setback from the Wesley

1 Heights overlay district. And, the reason they needed to 2 apply for that was because there had been a front porch 3 attached to the previous house that the Applicant had intended to retain and then build a new house attached to 4 5 that. They demolished the structure with the exception 6 7 of that front porch. 8 Then, their structural engineer, the Applicant's 9 structural engineer determined that the structure was 10 decayed, it was rotting and it had to be removed. 11 And, once that happened, the Zoning Administrator 12 determined that the entire structure had been removed and so 13 it was going to be a new structure. And so, the Applicant could no longer apply to build onto his previous structure, 14 15 even though it was just a front porch because there was 16 nothing left and it was a new structure. 17 So, he had to get front and side yard relief 18 because those were not conforming to the Wesley Heights 19 overlay district. 20 And, in that order from what the Board approved several years ago, the -- I pull this quote from the order, 21 22 the Applicant's project was initially considered an addition 23 to the original dwelling.

ultimately undertaken by the Applicant, the nature of the

However, because of the degree of demolition

24

1	development changed such that the project was considered new
2	construction.
3	So, if this is new construction, then the
4	Applicant is not entitled to get special exception relief for
5	the size of it. Not for an addition to it, but for the
6	construction of it because it's brand new and the 5201 which
7	allows you to get a special exception allows you to build on
8	to an existing principle structure which this is not, it's
9	a new principle structure or build onto or construct a new
10	accessory structure.
11	There is an accessory structure, but that's not
12	the subject of this for increasing the lot occupancy. It's
13	preexisting, it was preexisting in the previous Applicant and
14	I believe it's also preexisting 1958.
15	So, that's the reason why we believe that this
16	then has to be a variance because it doesn't meet the
17	requirements to be a special exception.
18	MR. XENOPHONTOS: May I add to this?
19	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Just one second.
20	So, but the building is already there?
21	MR. MORDFIN: The building is now there, yes.
22	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes. And so, how did he get
23	the permits to build the building?
24	MR. MORDFIN: Well, in the previous application,
25	he did submit site plans. Indicated on that, it also said

1	over the area where the existing garage is, it said garage
2	to be demolished.
3	So, that was part of the way the Applicant made
4	the lot occupancy work was because of the size of the
5	dwelling, he couldn't keep the entire accessory structure,
6	so he proposed to remove the garage so that the lot would be
7	in conformance.
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So, then, again, what
9	the Applicant would need to do is come back before us for an
10	area variance to make the argument?
11	MR. MORDFIN: Yes.
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Does the Board have any
13	questions of the Office of Planning?
14	(No response)
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: And I apologize, so, it's been
16	a long day
17	MR. XENOPHONTOS: You can I'm Andreas.
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Xenophontos?
19	MR. XENOPHONTOS: Yes.
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: You wanted to say something?
21	MR. XENOPHONTOS: Yes. First of all, the garage
22	was an existing building before 1960. That's the case.
23	Second, we have no doubt and we don't dispute the
24	fact that originally, we put the garage to be demolished to
25	meet the lot occupancy percent of the Wesley Heights overlay.

1	However, when the structure when the test wall
2	was conducted by the DCRA and approved and filed, and then
3	we received this notification that we're in compliance with
4	everything, we simply erroneously thought we can keep the
5	garage and we've had it there for two or three years until
6	the neighbors start complaining why the garage is still up
7	there?
8	So, they come after us. You know, we finished the
9	construction. We've lived in the house happily for two years
10	and now they're coming and telling us, oh, you're above the
11	lot occupancy.
12	So, we're not going to blame them, so we are
13	trying to get an exception, a variance just to solve the
14	problem.
15	We've been dealing with this for four years. So,
16	we've had not one day of peace. We don't know what's going
17	to be next.
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, I
19	MR. XENOPHONTOS: We don't know.
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Well, I think that, I
21	mean, unfortunately, and I'm sorry you had to wait here this
22	whole time, but I think you have to come back for an area
23	variance.
24	I mean, I don't think that this is something that
25	we're going to be able to hear today.

1	MR. XENOPHONTOS: I agree and
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: And so, with I'm going to
3	look to, again, I guess OAG in terms of like, if an Applicant
4	changes from a special exception to a variance, they then
5	how does the whole or I'm looking at Mr. Moy then, how
6	does the whole posting work and how can they get as quickly
7	back here as possible?
8	SECRETARY MOY: Given the rules, it's a 40-day
9	posting and it's a re-advertising.
10	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
11	SECRETARY MOY: For the variance, so that takes
12	us into January.
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
14	SECRETARY MOY: The end of January.
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
16	And then, you would go back before the ANC for a
17	variance or you wouldn't have to?
18	SECRETARY MOY: I would think so, if he'd made a
19	presentation with the ANC for the special exception
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Right.
21	SECRETARY MOY: the ANC doesn't know that it's
22	for a variance and
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I mean, or he wouldn't have
24	anything? I mean, right now he has
25	SECRETARY MOY: Yes, he wouldn't have anything,

yes.

2.0

CHAIRPERSON HILL: -- a denial. So, okay.

So, what we're going to then is we're trying to make this as quickly as possible for you as well. And so, you're going to have to re-post, re-file as an area variance. I would suggest again going back before the ANC and seeing if you can make your case and argument to get them to approve the area variance.

Work with the Office of Planning in terms of the area variance relief and then you'd be back before us again.

And, at that time, we could hear and also take the party status.

So, when the application comes back, then we would go ahead and, again, you would just apply again for party status for that -- give me one second -- for that -- I mean, y'all can come up in a second because you've been here all day, but like we're not going to hear this now, and so there's no reason to give you party status on something we're not going to hear.

And so, they're going to have to re-post for an area variance and he's going to come back for an area variance. So, at that time, you would go ahead and just, again, file for party status as the area variance.

You know, you guys are immediate next door neighbors, so usually the Board, you know, I can't say for

1	sure, but the Board allows seeks okay, anyway.
2	Actually, the party status people could you come
3	forward just for a minute? You can just sit over there to
4	your left if you'd like.
5	If you could please just I thought there was
6	just two of you, but that's okay so, if you could please
7	just introduce yourselves for the record.
8	MR. BAKER: My name is Peter Baker.
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Baker? Okay.
LO	MR. BAKER: Baker. I reside at 4546 Lowell Street
11	with my wife, Sally, who's here.
L2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, great.
13	MR. BAKER: And
L4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, that's okay, I just
15	that's okay.
L6	Sir?
L7	MR. WEISSMAN: My name is Steve Weissman. I live
L8	at 4536 Lowell Street next door.
L9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, okay.
20	And you, ma'am?
21	MS. GREEN: My name is Sandy Green and I live at
22	3115 Foxhall Road, which is also next door, but just around
23	the corner.
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. But, I thought there was
25	lonly two party status requests

	244
1	MR. BAKER: Sandy had registered in opposition
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, okay.
3	MR. BAKER: but not as a party status.
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, all right.
5	MS. GREEN: I didn't know the different, I
6	apologize.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: That's all right.
8	So, what I you see what's happening and so,
9	what I'd like you to do is just we're going to find out
10	a date here for when we can put this back on the calendar and
11	so you can go ahead and apply for party status.
12	Well, I guess they don't have to even reapply.
13	SECRETARY MOY: They still have it's still a
14	live request.
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: So, we could do this now?
16	SECRETARY MOY: Yes, okay, fine.
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: So, yes?
18	MR. XENOPHONTOS: I well, I have an objection
19	for them being party status.
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
21	MR. XENOPHONTOS: They missed the deadline.
22	CHAIRPERSON HILL: That's
23	MR. XENOPHONTOS: They had three years to go after
24	me and they missed the most important deadline. If this was
25	so important

	2 15
1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, give me one second, I'm
2	sorry.
3	MR. XENOPHONTOS: Yes.
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I don't remember seeing
5	anything, Ms. Nagelhout, about a deadline being missed.
6	MR. XENOPHONTOS: Yes, two weeks.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Excuse me.
8	MS. NAGELHOUT: Well, the party status the
9	deadline for party status is based on the hearing date in
10	this application. So, so long as they filed, I think it's
11	14 days before the hearing date
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Right.
13	MS. NAGELHOUT: I think these two requests
14	two of the requests that were filed into the record are
15	timely.
16	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, all right.
17	So, then you two gentlemen, we're going to go
18	ahead and give you party status. Okay? And, the reason
19	being is your immediate next door neighbors. Okay?
20	And, what I'd ask, if you could, when you come
21	back, if you could work together and present as one if
22	MR. WEISSMAN: We don't have the same identical
23	concerns.
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: They're not the same concerns?
25	MR. WEISSMAN: We have overlapping, but they're

1	not identical.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Not identical?
3	MR. BAKER: We have a shared driveway.
4	MR. WEISSMAN: I share a common driveway with Mr.
5	Xenophontos
б	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
7	MR. WEISSMAN: which means that the presence
8	or absence
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, that's okay.
10	MR. WEISSMAN: of that garage has consequences
11	for me and no one else.
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I got you, that's fine. I was
13	just trying to I was just hoping that they were all the
14	same and we could all do one.
15	So, what happens with party status is then you all
16	will get the same time as the Applicant. Okay?
17	MR. WEISSMAN: I understand.
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: So, okay, great. So then, you
19	know in the cross
20	MR. WEISSMAN: I have one big problem. I know for
21	certain that I will be gone out of town the first two weeks
22	of February.
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So, we'll see where we
24	can put this. Okay? I think it will take the Applicant a
25	little bit of time regardless of how this works out

1	So, okay, well, thank you all very much.
2	MR. WEISSMAN: And, you're putting the entire
3	community through this process again because it has to go
4	before the ANC as well.
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.
6	MR. WEISSMAN: Okay, you understand
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Oh, I understand it all. I got
8	you, yes. If I could wave my wand and just, you know, do it
9	one way or the other. But, I mean, this is our process. And
10	so, it needs to come back for an area variance.
11	MR. WEISSMAN: And, he states that he was ill
12	advised by
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, I'm just saying, I don't
14	want let's we're going to have all our time to go
15	through and I appreciate you guys staying here. I'm just
16	if I knew that this was going to go this way earlier, I
17	could have saved y'all a lot of time. But, I didn't realize
18	this was going to happen until now. So, this is where we
19	are.
20	Mr. Moy, so in order to get back here for an area
21	variance, what dates do you think would be good or possible?
22	SECRETARY MOY: I think any dates after January
23	including January 31st and afterwards.
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
25	SECRETARY MOY: So, January 31st, of course, is

1	the last day in January.
2	MR. WEISSMAN: My problem is I won't be here.
3	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, give us a second, you
4	said the first two of February is what you said?
5	MR. WEISSMAN: That's correct.
6	CHAIRPERSON HILL: So, what week of February will
7	you be back?
8	MR. WEISSMAN: Let me look on my iPhone, I can
9	figure it out. I apologize.
10	CHAIRPERSON HILL: That's all right.
11	MR. XENOPHONTOS: And, Mr. Chairman, I will
12	should I ask now?
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Certainly, go ahead.
14	MR. XENOPHONTOS: You know, I'm going to need to
15	be get to find an attorney at this time because I was
16	thinking this is something very simple and I can do it by
17	myself.
18	But the area variance I think is a much difficult
19	and, you know, so we are going to need time to
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
21	MR. XENOPHONTOS: get an attorney.
22	CHAIRPERSON HILL: You can that's all right,
23	I'll give you more I want you to have your best
24	opportunity and I'm glad that you know that this is a high
25	bar, right?

1	MR. XENOPHONTOS: Of course.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: And so, would you like more
3	time?
4	MR. XENOPHONTOS: Well, I need time enough, first
5	of all, it's going to be very costly for us to find an
6	attorney and retain him.
7	Second, after we're through all of this process
8	again, one more time, so we need time to put ourselves
9	together.
10	Third, you know, I mean, I was, you know, I've
11	been hoping that I can solve this now, but, of course, I
12	cannot so I have to wait.
13	Now, another thing, I was threatened actually just
14	outside in the hall by an attorney of the DCRA that if we
15	don't demolish your garage, I'm going to be putting you fine
16	\$4,000 every day. I mean, he came to my face
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, give me one second. I
18	appreciate it
19	(Simultaneous speaking)
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I find that very I don't
21	even want to get into that. But so
22	MR. XENOPHONTOS: I have rights.
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: So, I'll well, sir, we all
24	have rights, we're here to talk about our rights, right?
25	And, I think you have a pretty good in what I'm trying to say

1	to you that this won't work for you right now. So, you might
2	as well forget that. Right?
3	And so, your next opportunity is exactly to get
4	legal counsel, to go talk to your legal counsel and talk
5	about an area variance and then go through that process.
6	You can have as much time as you'd like. Would
7	you like more time? You tell me what I'll tell you what,
8	for now, why don't we say the end of February?
9	MR. XENOPHONTOS: That will be ample time to put
10	a final assessment
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
12	MR. XENOPHONTOS: I'm not objecting to any of
13	this, I want to do right for the first thing. And, that's
14	what I did the first time.
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes, I don't and I
16	understand, I understand. I guess we have read a lot of the
17	case and I think there are a lot of questions that we have.
18	But, I understand nobody wants to be here. Okay?
19	And so, you know, so go ahead, the end of
20	February, Mr. Moy.
21	SECRETARY MOY: Mr. Chair, you should know we
22	the Board already has is already entertaining an appeal
23	case on the 28th.
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Of February?
25	SECRETARY MOY: Oh, this is okay, forget what

1	I just said, this is fine, the 28th will work.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, the 28th of February.
3	Okay, great.
4	So, we'll see you back here on the 28th of
5	February. You now have two party status people, so you have
6	to make sure that you notify them, okay, about anything that
7	goes on. And, we'll see you on the 28th.
8	MR. XENOPHONTOS: May I ask a question?
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Certainly.
10	MR. XENOPHONTOS: Because I don't want to go and
11	be wrong. So, what does it mean, how does the DCRA is
12	notified by this? They're going to start penalizing \$4,000
13	a week a day as he said outside? So, how do they the
14	DCRA put a stop into this?
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, that's an interesting
16	question. I actually don't know.
17	MR. XENOPHONTOS: I mean, and how do I reapply
18	today or I have to be 30 days before or I have a limitation
19	when to reapply?
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, hold on one second.
21	So, the Office of Zoning across the hall, although
22	they're probably closed, well no, they still might be open,
23	could possibly help you with the process in terms of what you
24	need to do. Okay?
25	I would, you know, find a lawyer, but they will

1	be able to tell you the process in terms of placarding this
2	and the 40 days that are necessary to notify everyone.
3	Right?
4	As far as the question on penalties, I actually
5	don't know. Do you know? Does anybody know?
6	MR. WEISSMAN: Can I say something or am I not
7	allowed to talk?
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Just one second, I'm just
9	asking the one I'm trying to get the one question.
10	Can you guys okay, y'all got to give me second,
11	right. I'm sorry, sir.
12	Mr. Mordfin?
13	MR. MORDFIN: Yes, my understanding, although
14	somebody would have to confirm it is that if the Applicant
15	is in process of obtaining a relief that DCRA is not going
16	to issue fines until a decision is made. And then, at that
17	point, whatever the appropriate action would be taken.
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, all right.
19	MR. WEISSMAN: This has already appeared before
20	a judge in a hearing for the earlier fines.
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, I'm just trying to the
22	gentleman asked a question, that's what I understand the
23	answer to be. So, we're going to be back here again and we're
24	accommodating you in terms of the time you're not going to
25	be here.

	253
1	And so, the 28th, you said, of February, Mr. Moy?
2	SECRETARY MOY: Yes, sir.
3	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, all right.
4	Is there any more questions to that?
5	MR. XENOPHONTOS: Yes.
6	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Someone has a question
7	from no, I'm sorry, so, I guess you're with the person
8	with the party status? So, if you could come on you have
9	to go you have to come here to the microphone. And, did
10	you get sworn in earlier?
11	Okay, you have to state you name. You can sit
12	down for a second because I have to it's a webcast. State
13	your name please and ask your question.
14	MS. BAKER: Sally Baker, 4546 Lowell Street.
15	A simple question, if you could clarify what the
16	40-day process is?
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure, the 40 days is for
18	posting, correct, Mr. Moy?
19	SECRETARY MOY: That's correct.
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: The placard out in front of the
21	house, the side, yes, public notice.
22	MS. BAKER: And, it should be there for the full
23	40 days prior to the hearing date would be when the clock
24	you start back counting back from the hearing date?
25	SECRETARY MOY: Well, the regulations state that
ı	

1	the posting of the sign should be there 15 days prior to the
2	hearing date. But, since which applies to the first
3	scheduled notice of the hearing which is today. So, I'm
4	assuming the sign is still up, correct?
5	So, he may, although it's silent on the rules as
6	to writing the new scheduled hearing date, I usually tell
7	Applicants that there's no harm in doing that with the new
8	hearing date.
9	MS. BAKER: So, it's
10	SECRETARY MOY: Keep the sign up.
11	MS. BAKER: Okay, and I'm sorry, I'm not clear.
12	Is it 15 or 40 days, though, 15 is what I thought I heard you
13	say?
14	SECRETARY MOY: For the actual posting of the
15	signage.
16	MS. BAKER: Okay, so the 40 days is something
17	different?
18	SECRETARY MOY: Yes. That's the number of days
19	for public notice
20	MS. BAKER: Okay, okay, different than the posting
21	of the sign?
22	SECRETARY MOY: for the variance, yes.
23	MS. BAKER: Thank you.
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. That's all right, I
25	learn something new again. I always forget myself.

	255
1	Okay, yes, sir? That's okay.
2	MR. XENOPHONTOS: Yes, I'm sorry taking your time.
3	CHAIRPERSON HILL: You don't have to.
4	MR. XENOPHONTOS: I need to put it together.
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I want you to understand.
6	Sure.
7	MR. XENOPHONTOS: So that I understand, I mean,
8	as long how far ahead from the February 28th I have to
9	reapply, 30 days, 40 days? So, do I have to go tomorrow, you
10	know, like Christmas time to apply, reapply or shall we have
11	a little time?
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: OAG do you have some
13	MS. NAGELHOUT: It could be considered an
14	amendment of the existing application, so he should check
15	with OZ to see what kind of paperwork, there should be a new
16	self-certification form.
17	And then, it's not a brand new case with a new
18	case number, it's new filings in this case.
19	SECRETARY MOY: What I would do, sir, is after
20	this, because the office is still open until 5:00 since
21	you're already here, I would stop by.
22	MR. XENOPHONTOS: In the offices where
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Just directly across the hall.
24	MR. XENOPHONTOS: Where Ms. Myers is?
25	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes, exactly, yes. That's

	256
1	okay.
2	MR. XENOPHONTOS: Well, I
3	CHAIRPERSON HILL: No, that's perfect.
4	MR. XENOPHONTOS: It's my second visit.
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: So, okay. Yes, no, that's
6	good.
7	All right, okay. So, then, go across the hall,
8	they'll help you get straightened out and we'll see you back
9	here on the 28th of February.
10	MR. XENOPHONTOS: Unless if I find another
11	solution with the DCRA.
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure.
13	MR. XENOPHONTOS: And, put this to bed.
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Oh.
15	MR. XENOPHONTOS: Because I'm absolutely sick of
16	this.
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Right, right, okay. All right,
18	happy holidays.
19	MR. XENOPHONTOS: Happy holidays and thanks for
20	hearing us.
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you, bye. I'm sorry,
22	hold on. So, Mr. Moy, is there anything else before the
23	Board?
24	SECRETARY MOY: There's nothing from the staff,
25	sir.

	257
1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right, okay.
2	We stand adjourned.
3	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the
4	record at 4:08 p.m.)
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
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: 12-20-17

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 &