GOVERNMENT
OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

+ + + + +

PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY

MAY 22, 2019

+ + + + +

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 10:00 a.m., Frederick L. Hill, Chairperson, presiding.

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT MEMBERS PRESENT:

FREDERICK L. HILL, Chairperson LESYLLEE M. WHITE, Board Member LORNA JOHN, Board Member CARLTON HART, Board Member (NCPC)

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBER PRESENT:

PETER SHAPIRO, ZONING COMMISSIONER

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

CLIFFORD MOY, Secretary JOHN NYARKU, Zoning Specialist

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PRESENT:

ALEXANDRA CAIN, ESQ.

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

BRANDICE ELLIOT MATTHEW JESICK

JONATHAN KIRSCHENBAUM STEPHEN MORDFIN ELISA VITALE

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Public Hearing held on May 22, 2019.

CONTENTS

Case Number 19927, Application of Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of Washington, Inc.

Case Number 19982, Application of Montello 1723, LLC

Case Number 19971, Application GRID Alternatives Mid-Atlantic for the District of Columbia

Appeal Number 19896, Adams Morgan Friends and Allies

Case Number 19-929, Application of 614 Otis, LLC

Case Number 20013, Application of Simon Chan

Case Number 20017, Application of 1128 6th Street LLC

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

2	(10:03 a.m.
3	MR. MOY: All right, if we could have parties
4	to the table. This is to application number 19927 of
5	Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of Washington, Inc.,
6	as caption advertised for special exception under subtitle
7	U, section 203.1-B, to construct a solar array in the R1B
8	Zone. This is a 2800 Otis Street NE square, parcel 167,
9	lot 67 and 68.
10	As the Board will recall, there is a
11	preliminary matter regarding a motion to postpone. And
12	I'll leave it at that, Mr. Chairman.
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, great. Could you
14	please introduce yourselves from my right to left?
15	MS. BREVARD: I'm Commissioner Gail Brevard,
16	ANC 5C01.
17	MS. BATTIES: Good morning, Leila Batties with
18	the law firm of Holland & Knight on behalf of Catholic
19	Charities.
20	MS. CHANDLER: I'm Joyce Chandler, I'm party
21	status, I live at 2870 Perry Street Northeast. I'm
22	adjoining the property.
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, great. Thank you.
24	Okay, thank you guys for coming down. Ms. Batties, you
25	have requested postponement, could you explain that

1	please?
2	MS. BATTIES: Sure, we had our second meeting
3	with the ANC last week. They did not vote to support the
4	project, I think there are still some issues that the
5	applicant needs to review and address with the ANC. And
6	so we've requested that the public hearing be deferred to
7	give us time to continue to work with the ANC and the
8	community.
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. And Commissioner, you
LO	mentioned that I think I saw a filing last night that
11	you guys were opposed to the postponement, but if we did
12	postpone that you were okay with September, was that what
13	I understood?
L4	MS. BREVARD: That's correct.
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, and so if we did
L6	postpone to September, then that would give the applicant
L7	more time to work with you?
L8	MS. BREVARD: That's correct, yes.
L9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, and Ms. Chandler, are
20	you aware of this request for postponement?
21	MS. CHANDLER: Yes, I was aware of it but
22	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay and I'm sorry, and
23	do you have any thoughts on that?
24	MS. CHANDLER: My thoughts is that originally

they met with us, I believe it was in March. And they

	0
	made their presentation, and at time the ANC asked them to
	address our concerns and questions, and we didn't receive
	or hear anything from them until like, a week or so, six
	weeks later. They rescheduled it to meet in
	May and it was weeks that we didn't hear anything, we
	didn't get any feedback, and then when we did get
	questions, their my just quick review of it, the
	questions weren't fully addressed or answered.
	So now I'm, I guess I'm kind of mixed because
	it seems like they had two months to address and reach out
	to us and they didn't do it. And now when the ANC did not
	support it, they're saying, well, we want additional time
	to work with the community.
ı	

So I'm just kind of, I would say, disappointed and mixed in that they're asking for it now when back in March they didn't seem to put much effort into working with us.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, okay. And actually, if you could just -- yes, thanks. When more than one microphone's on it kind of feeds back up here. So, Ms. Batties, so if we did this, I mean, I think the ANC was requesting September because they're off, I guess, in August and thankfully so are we. So when in September might work for you guys?

MS. BATTIES: We were okay with the date

2.0

1	proposed in their letter, which is September 25th.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, Mr we lost our
3	secretary, just hang on a second. Ms. Chandler, would
4	that date work for you?
5	MS. CHANDLER: Yes, the 25th would work with
6	me.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, great. Mr. Moy, it
8	looks like we're going to postpone this to September 25th.
9	Okay?
10	MR. MOY: Okay.
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Unless the Board has any
12	other thoughts. Okay, all right, thank you all very
13	much. Have a nice summer.
14	MR. MOY: All right, Mr. Chairman, I believe
15	the next case application is 19982 of Montello Montello
16	1723, LLC. This application's amended for special
17	exceptions under subtitle C, section 703.2, for the
18	minimum parking requirements of subtitle C, section 701.5,
19	subtitle G, sections 409, 1200 and 1201 from the lot
20	occupancy requirements, subtitle G, section 404.1 and rear
21	yard requirements, subtitle G, section 405.2 to construct
22	a two-story addition and penthouse to an existing
23	one-story commercial building and convert it to an
24	eight-unit apartment house, MU4 zone.
25	This is at 1723 Montello Avenue, Northeast,

1	square 4052, lot 180. As you'll recall, Mr. Chairman,
2	there's a preliminary matter, a waiver of the 21-day
3	filing deadline for supplemental information. And this
4	was to submit a revised self-certification.
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, great. Thank you.
6	Good morning, can you please introduce yourselves for the
7	record, from my right to left?
8	MR. MOY: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure.
10	MR. MOY: Sorry. On this case we also have a
11	Spanish interpreter.
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Oh, all right. Could the
13	interpreter please come forward? If you could, just mind
14	sitting over there. One sec, we'll figure it out. We'll
15	figure it out. If you could please just introduce
16	yourself, let's just introduce ourselves from right to
17	left. You need to push the button there, you need to push
18	the red button. Thank you.
19	MS. WILKINSON: My name is Vera Wilkinson,
20	interpreter for Spanish and English.
21	MS. SHROPSHIRE: Commissioner Keisha
22	Shropshire, on behalf of ANC 5D.
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Commissioner, could you
24	spell your last name for me?
25	MS. SHROPSHIRE: Yes, S-H-R-O-P-S-H-I-R-E.

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, great. Thank you.
2	MR. SULLIVAN: Good morning, Marty Sullivan
3	with Sullivan & Barros, on behalf of the applicant.
4	MR. FRIDY: Moe Fridy, Citadel Architects.
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Could you spell your last
6	name, please?
7	MR. FRIDY: Fridy, F-R-I-D-Y.
8	MR. CLAGGIN: Good morning, Jamaal Claggin,
9	Managing Member for Montello 1723, LLC.
10	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, great. Ms. Wilkinson,
11	if you could just turn off your microphone there. If
12	there's more than one on at a time down there it's
13	fine, but if there's more than one on at a time it feeds
14	back.
15	And again, afterwards, if you guys could fill
16	out your witness cards and give them to the transcriber
17	over there to my right. The translator that you're here -
18	- is the translator here for anyone at the table right
19	now? No. Is there someone that was wishing to speak in
20	support or opposition here that was requiring the
21	translator?
22	Oh, that's pretty good. My board is saying
23	that maybe I should speak that in Spanish. Ms. Wilkinson,
24	if you could just put in the microphone there, and if you
25	don't mind asking if anyone is here wishing to speak in

1	support and opposition, if you wouldn't mind asking that
2	in Spanish.
3	(Spanish language spoken.)
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, so Ms. Wilkinson, I
5	don't know if you're going to be needed yet but you're
6	welcome to just sit back there and we'll see what happens,
7	if someone else shows up or we might ask you to do that
8	same thing again when the portion of the support and
9	opposition comes. Okay?
10	MS. WILKINSON: Okay, thank you.
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Gracias. All right, Mr.
12	Sullivan, I guess you're going to be presenting, is that
13	correct?
14	MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman.
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, if you could just kind
16	of walk us through again, so first there's the preliminary
17	matter of the waiver for the 21-day filing deadline. Can
18	you explain that first?
19	MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, there was some discussion
20	with the Office of Planning on an aspect of relief that
21	wasn't needed for non-conforming structures until we
22	removed that and so the self-certification was updated.
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, but it was removal of
24	something that you were asking for?
25	MR. SULLIVAN: Yes.

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, so I don't think that
2	there's a problem with that in terms of it affecting
3	anyone. Does the Board have any issues with that? Okay,
4	then we'll go ahead and waive the 21-day filing deadline
5	on that.
6	Then the other, in terms of the affidavit of
7	posting, it seemed can you explain when it was posted?
8	I just want to make sure the 15 days, because it seemed as
9	though, the affidavit states that it was posted on 5/6 but
10	then I'm sorry, yes, the affidavit states that it was
11	posted on 5/6 but it wasn't notarized until 5/15.
12	MR. SULLIVAN: So yes, I wasn't aware that was
13	an issue. It was notarized, but it doesn't need to be
14	notarized on the same day it's posted, right?
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: So, you're just telling me
16	it was posted on 5/6?
17	MR. SULLIVAN: Yes.
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, all right. That's
19	fine. All right, okay, so after that, let's see. All
20	right, so Commissioner, you're here wishing to speak in
21	support or opposition, or are you wishing to be a party?
22	I mean, you're automatically a party anyway, but I'm just
23	trying to see are you here in support or opposition?
24	MS. SHROPSHIRE: So, it's in support but it was
25	conditional, there were things that we wanted to be met

1 before we could say, yes, we are in total support of the 2 project. 3 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, so since you're a 4 party, you have an opportunity to ask questions, cross-5 examine, give a presentation, everything like that. 6 So basically what's going to happen is Mr. 7 Sullivan will go ahead and give his presentation, then you 8 can ask questions of that presentation if you have any, 9 and then you'll get an opportunity to give a presentation 10 and then that's when I quess you can tell us all about the 11 ANC's issues and concerns, and then we'll just kind of 12 walk through the hearing as best we can. 13 MR. SHROPSHIRE: Great, thanks. 14 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, great. So Mr. 15 Sullivan, I don't have any particular questions, I quess, for you to address. We'll just go ahead and put 15 16 minutes on the clock, Mr. Moy. 17 18 And you can just walk us through your project, 19 tell us how you are meeting the standards for us to grant 2.0 the relief that you are requesting. And you can begin 21 whenever you like. 22 MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you Mr. Chairman and 23 members of the Board. Again, my name is Marty Sullivan 24 with the law firm of Sullivan & Barros, on behalf of the 25 The subject property is located on a corner applicant.

lot	in Trinidad, it's a very small lot, 1,278 square feet.
The	existing building currently occupies 100 percent of
the	lot, it's a one story building most recently used as a
laur	ndromat.

And the applicant's proposing -- we're in the MU4 zone, the applicant's proposing to convert the existing building to eight residential units and construct a two-story addition. One of the units will be set aside as an inclusionary zoning unit and three areas of relief are required in order to realize this project.

The first is special exception relief from the parking requirement of one space, under C703.2 and special exception relief also from the lot occupancy and the rear yard requirements.

I'm going to turn it over to the architect, Mr. Fridy, to go over the plans. One thing I'll note is that I mistakenly included floor -- a previous set of floor plans. So I'll switch over to the exhibit 48A, which is the current plans when he's talking about those floor plans. Sorry about that. Thank you. Mr. Fridy?

MR. FRIDY: All right. Good morning Chairman, members of the Board. My name is Moe Fridy, Citadel Architects. The building is a corner store that occupies 100 percent --

COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Excuse me, can you pull

2.0

your mic a little closer to you? Thank you.

2.0

MR. FRIDY: The existing building is a corner store that occupies 100 percent of the lot and it's at the intersection of Montello Avenue and Simms Place. What we are proposing to do is to convert this property into an apartment building with three stories, a cellar, and a penthouse.

The entrance of the property will be at -- from Simms Place and basically, if you go to the floor plan, we will have a staircase in the middle. And then one apartment at each side of the building.

So this is the basement floor plan, we have one bedroom plus den, and then another two bedrooms on the other side. Most of the apartments are one-bedroom plus den or two bedrooms, except for the third story and the penthouse, where we have three-bedroom apartments. Duplex three-bedroom apartments.

The cellar will have bicycle parking and the first floor will have a nine-and-a-half by five-and-a-half trash room, nine-and-a-half feet by five-and-a-half feet. The penthouse will have a rooftop deck as well as a green roof. The exterior of the building will be a combination of brick veneer, metal cladding, and cement siding.

VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: Thank you. Just one question for the architect before you go on, Mr. Sullivan.

1	What is the, when you're showing the cellar floor plan, I
2	understand that you have the kind of wells on the I
3	don't know if that's, I don't know what direction that is,
4	but on the left hand side of the slide here.
5	What's the escape plan for the other unit? I
6	mean, because it's just the stairs, there's not a
7	requirement for another way of egress?
8	MR. FRIDY: So, the other unit will have a den
9	and then it goes into the stair. And the bedroom will
10	exit into, will have a bedroom that the window at this
11	window of the property. Is this your question?
12	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: So this is a two-story
13	unit?
14	MR. FRIDY: The basement unit?
15	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: Yes.
16	MR. FRIDY: No, it's a one-story unit.
17	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: Okay, so there are no
18	windows on here well, there's kind of a window. But is
19	that
20	MR. FRIDY: The basement is elevated four feet
21	from the pavement, so we have windows at the top. If you
22	look at the elevation
23	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: Yes, give me a sec.
24	What I was trying to understand was how you did why you
25	needed wells on one side and then you didn't have them on
ı	I and the second

1 the other side. That's what I'm trying to --2 Oh, because DDOT would not allow MR. FRIDY: window wells on Simms Place. 3 That is the reason. 4 VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: Oh, okay. Okay, thank You can go on, Mr. Sullivan. 5 6 MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you. The special 7 exception criteria for the three approvals, first of all 8 there's the general criteria that the proposed relief is 9 in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the 10 zoning regulations. 11 It is so in harmony because it proposes an 12 adaptive reuse of a previously neglected commercial property in the provision of eight new residential units, 13 one of which will be set aside as an inclusionary zoning 14 15 unit. 16 Zoning regulations specifically permit special 17 exception relief requested for lot occupancy rear yard and 18 for the parking relief. And the neighboring properties include a mix of commercial and low-to-moderate density 19 2.0 residential uses. 21 And the project, we believe, will complement 22 the surrounding character of that area and will not tend 23 to affect adversely the use of neighboring properties. Specifically on the parking relief, it's a special 24

exception which the applicant can satisfy under several

considerations, just one of which we need to show.

2.0

Due to the fact that the building occupies 100 percent of the lot, there's no access to any parking and we also were not able to discover any available parking within 600 feet of the subject property.

Regarding the rear yard relief, there are some specific special exception requirements for that. No apartment windows shall be located within 40 feet directly in front of another building, and we believe we meet that requirement, it's proposing windows just on the west and the south sides.

And buildings facing that are over 40 feet away, as you can see on these slides. Regarding lot occupancy relief, there is no special exception, specific special exception criteria, it's just the general criteria so I would refer back to that discussion that we had about meeting the general criteria.

The applicant has attended seven meetings with the ANC, either full ANC meetings or other scheduled meetings arranged by the ANC Commissioner. And the ANC is in conditional support, as you'll hear, OP supports approval and we have three letters in support from nearby neighbors. So that's it if you have any questions.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, does the Board have any questions of the applicant at this point?

1	MEMBER WHITE: Just one question, I just wanted
2	to just verify that you weren't requesting any type of
3	variance relief for a non-conforming structure for this
4	particular application. The second question is, I wanted
5	to know where the IZ unit was located, maybe that's more
6	of a question for the architect. Maybe start with the
7	easier question.
8	MR. FRIDY: The IZ unit is in the basement, in
9	the cellar.
10	MEMBER WHITE: So, it's one-bedroom,
11	two-bedroom?
12	MR. FRIDY: It's a two-bedroom. I'm sorry,
13	it's actually a three-bedroom.
14	MEMBER WHITE: Family-size unit?
15	MR. FRIDY: Right, three-bedroom duplex on the
16	third-floor penthouse.
17	MEMBER WHITE: Good.
18	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: Say that again?
19	MR. FRIDY: Three-bedroom, it's a three-bedroom
20	duplex. The IZ unit.
21	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: So, it's not in the
22	basement?
23	MR. FRIDY: No, it's not.
24	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: Okay, well I mean, you
25	just said two things. I just wanted to make sure

1	MR. FRIDY: No, no, I just it is on the
2	third floor, at the penthouse.
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: That's fine, I just was
4	making sure I got that clear, that's all.
5	MR. FRIDY: My mistake.
6	MEMBER WHITE: Thank you.
7	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: And on the question of
8	the non-conforming, in discussions with the Office of
9	Planning it was determined and we agreed that we didn't
10	need that relief.
11	MEMBER WHITE: I just wanted to verify, thank
12	you. I'll probably ask them the same question.
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay great, anyone else for
14	the applicant? Just why do you think you don't need the
15	relief?
16	MR. SULLIVAN: I would need a second to look at
17	it, I'm not I wasn't focused on that issue and I'd have
18	to look at the discussion behind that.
19	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Why don't you just take a
20	look at that, Mr. Sullivan, while I kind of run through
21	this here. But Mr. Shapiro, you had a question? Okay.
22	Commissioner, so and I'm sorry, Shropshire?
23	MS. SHROPSHIRE: Yes, Shropshire.
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Shropshire.
25	MS. SHROPSHIRE: I know, it's a tongue twister.

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes, it is, Shropshire. So
2	let's see, Commissioner, do you have any questions of the
3	applicant or would you just like to make your
4	presentation?
5	MS. SHROPSHIRE: I'd just like to make my
6	presentation.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So please, go ahead.
8	Mr. Moy, I'm going to put 15 minutes on the clock again,
9	and you can begin whenever you like.
10	MS. SHROPSHIRE: Okay, I'm just going to read
11	my submission. The applicant application was considered
12	at a public meeting of ANC 5D on Tuesday, May 14th.
13	Proper notice of this meeting was given by posting on the
14	ANC 5D.org website, Ward 5 list-serve and Next Door
15	Community Blog.
16	ANC 5D has seven single-member districts, a
17	quorum of four commissioners is required, all seven were
18	present during the meeting. There was a unanimous vote of
19	7-0-0 to conditionally support the special exception,
20	contingent upon the applicant making major revisions to
21	redesign architectural plans and floor plans and request
22	additional information accordingly.
23	That included reducing the total number of
24	units proposed for the lot in order to increase the square

footage for the two and three-bedroom apartments, making

them reasonably sized. The proposed two-bedroom units would range from 464 to 500 square feet, while the quote-unquote family size three-bedroom units would range from 639 and 675 square feet.

And also provide written documentation from the nearby property owners at 1210 Simms Place NE and 1211 Mount Olivet Road, stating their intent to sign covenant and/or easement. Three of the windows that are on the plans are potential safety risks for future neighbors of not having the fire and emergency access unless they obtain letters from these property owners.

We've met with the applicant numerous times during four single-member district meetings on February 16th, March 16th, April 6th and April 27th and three ANC 5D community meetings on March 12th, April 9th and May 14th.

During each of these meetings, the applicant was open to listening to and also considering incorporating some of the community's input, which consisted of the following concerns or requests: the community requested family size units for the building, there were concerns expressed regarding trash room capacity and size, concerns regarding frequency of the trash pick-up for eight units and the impact of the associated noise, concerns with parking due to increased

2.0

street capacity based on increased number of units, concerns regarding safety issues of apartments with unit windows aligned with the property line of adjacent property at 1210 Simms Place, and concerns that drawings did not reflect the actual use of space.

There was some opposition to the larger, taller buildings, concerns that too many small-size units are being proposed for the allotted space. Each subsequent meeting, the applicant returned with minor revisions to the plans, but no reduction in the number of units, rather an increase in the number of units from seven to eight, including a newly proposed cellar unit.

We stated earlier but it bears repeating, the applicant's proposed two-bedroom apartments range between 464 to 500 square feet. The penthouse area provides an additional 175 square feet to the top floor unit, so the three-bedroom units would range from 639 and 675 square feet.

To put the figures into context, according to a November 2018 study by Rent Café.com, Washington DC had the fourth smallest apartment sizes in the US. In their analysis, they found the following average sizes for Washington DC apartments: studio apartments 481, one-bedroom 721 square feet, two bedrooms 990, total average is 736.

2.0

The applicant's proposed three-bedroom units would be smaller than the average one-bedroom in the district. In all BZA cases, the proof of burden is upon the applicant to justify, which the community, the ANC and the Board of Zoning Adjustment should support providing special exceptions.

The applicant is proposing a design where the units are extremely and unreasonably small. Moreover, the applicant is proposing units with at-risk windows that may not provide the fire department with the minimum three-foot access for a public way.

ANC 5D welcomes the opportunity to support this project, as the community wants to see something productive done with the property. However, we believe that the BZA should only provide a special exception if the applicant revises a design to provide realistic sized units for the two and three-bedroom, rather than packing our future neighbors into a building like sardines.

We look forward to discussing these concerns further, thank you for your consideration. And I wanted to add that the applicant, Mr. Claggin, he's been you know he's attended quite a few meetings as we listed and he's been willing to incorporate things, so we are in support of something happening to this property, it's just that we want something that's reasonable for future residents.

2.0

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Does anybody have any
2	questions for the Commissioner?
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: Yes, I do. Ms.
4	Shropshire, so you said something about the alignment of
5	the buildings? What is it?
6	MS. SHROPSHIRE: The windows.
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: Was it the windows that
8	were
9	MS. SHROPSHIRE: Do you have the drawing for
10	that?
11	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: Is it elevation that
12	you're looking for?
13	MS. SHROPSHIRE: It's actually on the property
14	line of the adjacent property at 1210 Simms Place.
15	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: The plans, is it this
16	window here? Okay, so it's the window that because
17	there's a property that's located, that's here.
18	MS. SHROPSHIRE: Yes.
19	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: Okay, and so it's this
20	window that you're talking about.
21	MS. SHROPSHIRE: It's three of them, I think,
22	on each floor.
23	Right?
24	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: Yes, I'm just saying,
25	on this particular floor, they are

1	MS. SHROPSHIRE: I assume. Is that the window
2	that we're referring yes.
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: And so that's because
4	there's no stand-up from the building next to it
5	MS. SHROPSHIRE: Yes.
6	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: Which is a fairly tall
7	building itself
8	MS. SHROPSHIRE: Yes.
9	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: That would, I'm not
10	even sure how they would do that, honestly.
11	MS. SHROPSHIRE: So I think the building that
12	is adjacent to that, the proposed property that's being
13	developed, is the space where the windows are, there is
14	not a building there. I think that they did not fully
15	occupy the lot there.
16	So there is space, but that's why we were
17	requesting the easement or the covenant letter from the
18	property owners to say for the future, and I know that
19	I've spoken with Mr. Claggin about this before, and he
20	explained to me this DCRA process that will happen later,
21	but I wanted, we wanted to be assured that there would not
22	be any future conflicts. So that's why we put that
23	request there.
24	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: Yes, we've had to deal
25	with at-risk windows before, so it is what it is. Thank

1 you. 2 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, anyone else? Thank you, Mr. Chair. 3 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Do you, Commissioner Shropshire, do you all have any 4 5 proposal for what, in your estimation, would be 6 appropriately sized units? 7 So, I don't know the magic MS. SHROPSHIRE: 8 number, but my question to the Board would be, what is the 9 standard size? And maybe you don't have that answer to 10 that right now, but I was wondering if even -- the plans, 11 the original plans started out with seven units. 12 And then when there was a request for 13 family-sized units it increased to eight, and then the 14 cellar unit occurred, appeared. But the sizes of the 15 units were small, so I'm thinking, even if it was, one of 16 the thoughts that I had was if it was a six-unit building 17 with reasonably sized units, based on the numbers that I 18 quoted from the study from the RentCafe.Com, that there 19 would be something more reasonable or realistic for people 2.0 to at least put a couch in and you know be able to live 21 in. 22 It just seems pretty small. 23 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Thank you for that. 24 I just want to make sure I understand, based on your

letter, there were a number of concerns expressed that

1	came out during the meetings. And I appreciate how
2	thoroughly this was documented.
3	The ones that are, provide that conditionality
4	of your support though, it's not all of them, it's the two
5	specific issues about the unit size and the three at-risk
6	windows.
7	MS. SHROPSHIRE: Exactly.
8	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Okay, thank you.
9	MS. SHROPSHIRE: The number of units and the
LO	unit size. The size of so in number one, are the first
11	one that reduce the total number of units proposed, with
12	reasonable sizes.
13	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: All right, thank you.
L4	Thank you, Mr. Chair.
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, great. Commissioner,
L6	so you guys are in opposition then, now, at this point?
L7	MS. SHROPSHIRE: If the conditions are not met.
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Right, I mean, the
L9	conditions aren't being met currently. So, the ANC vote
20	is in approval if those conditions are met, and those
21	conditions are not being met currently. So, you guys are
22	in opposition.
23	MS. SHROPSHIRE: So, I guess we just didn't
24	want to oppose the project, so when we voted, it was to
25	support development of the

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: With the conditions.
2	MS. SHROPSHIRE: Right.
3	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, all right. Mr.
4	Sullivan, do you have any questions for the Commissioner?
5	MR.SULLIVAN: No, thank you.
6	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, all right. Let's see,
7	I'm going to turn to the Office of Planning.
8	MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: Good morning, Chair Hill and
9	members of the Board. Jonathan Kirschenbaum from the
10	Office of Planning, we recommend approval of this special
11	exception relief and we rest on the record. Please let me
12	know if you have any questions.
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, does the Board have
14	any questions for the Office of Planning?
15	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: We had a discussion
16	earlier about the lot occupancy issue, I should say the
17	non-conformity issue. Could you just speak to that a
18	little bit?
19	MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: Sure, so I guess I'll so
20	we've spoken about this before, a couple months ago for
21	another case. So I'll just sort of repeat, I think where
22	the zoning administrator is at and where we're at, the MU
23	zone, when you get a special exception, does not have any
24	provision to get special exception relief from C202.2.
25	As you may know, after you can do the R and RF

zones, so that special exception relief is not even -- you can't even do it. You know, we're basically at the point now where it doesn't make sense to request special exception relief, but then you need a variance because your building is non-conforming.

In this case, the zoning administrator felt that the existing non-conformities for the one-story building right now, is the rear yard, right? There's no rear yard and it's 100 percent lot occupancy.

The special exception relief that the applicant is requesting is to just continue to you know they're just increasing the height of the building and they're not expanding the rear yard. They're not expanding the rear yard non-conformity, and they're not expanding the lot occupancy non-conformity.

It's 100 percent right now and it's going to be 100 percent with the special exception. So, the special exception is contemplating non-conformity, it's already, it just --

VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: I understand what you're saying in terms of the lot occupancy basically not changing, but the FAR is changing. So there is a change on the site, which, I don't know. And I understand that FAR is not being discussed here, but it just is a weird wrinkle. I just don't know, are you guys --

2.0

1	MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: The FAR is conforming,
2	though.
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: I know, I'm just
4	saying. It is still changing but it's almost like we're
5	kind of saying, well, it's not. If you had a 90 percent
6	building, then you'd have the same, we'd have the same
7	discussion?
8	MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: Probably not. I mean again,
9	the special exception is
10	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: That's what I'm saying,
11	it just seems odd that we are, 70 percent is the kind of
12	max, and we're at 100 percent, which is
13	MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: So for the MU zone, you can
14	go to 100 percent lot occupancy via special exception.
15	For instance, and also to just also point out that the
16	special exception criteria in the MU zone is for new
17	buildings and it's for existing buildings.
18	So, if the applicant came in, let's say the
19	applicant tore down the existing one-story building and
20	proposed this building as fully brand-new, C202 wouldn't
21	even be coming up as even a question. There's no
22	non-conformities that exist.
23	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: Okay, it just still
24	seems like an oddity.
25	MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: And we, the Office of

1	Planning and the Office of the Zoning Administrator is
2	well aware of this disjointed issue. So, thank you.
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: Thank you.
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, anyone else?
5	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Mr. Chair, a question
6	for OP. Pardon my ignorance, but is there a this is
7	probably a DCRA issue, not you, but what is the minimum
8	required unit size?
9	MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: So, regarding the units you
10	know, in the District of Columbia, we don't have density
11	requirements in our zoning. So as long as you meet your
12	FAR, you can put as many units as you want in the
13	building, we do not restrict how many units are allowed on
14	a lot in our higher-density zones like the MU zone.
15	And regarding the minimum size of an apartment,
16	zoning doesn't control that, it's building code and I
17	believe it's from 220 square feet, is the minimum size.
18	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Okay, thank you. Thank
19	you, Mr. Chair.
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Does the applicant
21	have any questions for the Office of Planning?
22	MR. SULLIVAN: No, thank you.
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Does the Commissioner have
24	any questions for the Office of Planning?
25	MS. SHROPSHIRE: No.

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. I guess I have just a
2	couple of quick questions for Mr. Sullivan. Mr. Sullivan,
3	in terms of the issues that the Office I'm sorry, that
4	the ANC is raising, those issues aren't affecting any of
5	the relief you're requesting. Correct?
6	MR. SULLIVAN: No, I don't think so. Mr.
7	Claggin can speak to those, if the Board would want to
8	hear some explanation of that?
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure.
10	MR. SULLIVAN: I don't think they're directly
11	related.
12	MR. CLAGGIN: Okay, good morning Mr. Chairman
13	and board members, just wanted to talk briefly about the
14	square footage issue. I've been a licensed real estate
15	agent in Washington DC and Maryland for the past ten
16	years. The way we arrive, I mean, the space is what it
17	is.
18	But we did, I ran a ton of comps just in that
19	Trinidad neighborhood before we were comfortable with
20	designing the units the way they are currently designed.
21	And I have to say that you know I disagree with the
22	Commissioner's opinion on the size of the units.
23	A lot of new construction is taking place in
24	the city you know it's consisting of smaller size units.
25	The way the units are designed they do meet code in terms

Τ	of size of bedrooms, living rooms, and so forth. You know
2	with that being said, I personally didn't see an issue
3	with the size of the units and I thought that it would be
4	advantageous to allow folks to at least get a look at the
5	units and make the decision for themselves.
6	People that are coming into the DC wanting to
7	live in Trinidad, to have them make that decision, and not
8	someone make it for them, to say that, we think offhand
9	that this is too small. Thank you.
10	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, all right. So
11	Commissioner, have you been there for a while?
12	MS. SHROPSHIRE: Yes, I've been a Commissioner
13	since, this is my third term.
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I haven't heard in a while,
15	people coming and wanting to move into Trinidad there,
16	it's been a things are changing.
17	MS. SHROPSHIRE: Yes.
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Things are changing.
19	MS. SHROPSHIRE: I've been well, actually,
20	I've been a resident of the community since 2006, yes.
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Good, good for you.
22	MS. SHROPSHIRE: I have a question now.
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure, go on.
24	MS. SHROPSHIRE: So, I know that there was, in
25	the presentation there was an indication that the parking

1	was being met. Can you go back to those slides? I just
2	had questions, just clarifying how it's being met. I'm
3	not understanding how.
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: He's saying that it's not
5	being met, that they're asking for relief from the parking
6	and there was given reasons why. Correct, Mr. Sullivan?
7	MR. SULLIVAN: That's correct, we have a
8	parking requirement of one space for eight units, or for
9	six, seven or eight units. The requirement would be the
LO	same, so
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Can you clarify again how
12	you're not able to meet that requirement?
13	MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, it's basically a function
L4	of the condition of the property being 100 percent lot
15	occupancy and not having access but through an alley. And
L6	it's also so close to the corner that a curb cut wouldn't
L7	be approved that close to a corner as well.
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right Mr.
L9	Claggin, I guess we're Claggin? Claggin?
20	MR. CLAGGIN: Claggin.
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Claggin. Yes, I mean, in
22	terms of as far as the number or size of the units, you
23	guys are trying to get as many units as you can get in
24	there, I would think is what you're trying to do, that are
25	actually marketable. And one of them is an IZ unit, they

are going to provide an IZ unit but they have to provide an IZ unit.

But actually, I'll just ask one question I guess of the applicant, in terms of like, when you thought about -- so did you look at the six units or the seven units? The reason why you got to the eight, just for financial reasons?

MR. CLAGGIN: Yes. So initially, the plan was to have seven units, so that consisted of five -- I'm sorry, six two-bedroom units and one penthouse. After maybe two, I'm sorry, the basement came later. So initially it was seven with the penthouse.

So after attending the meetings, community meetings, larger family size units became an issue you know, the community said, hey, we want to see larger units. So I came back, met with the architect, and we looked at that penthouse space and we decided to incorporate, instead of having a penthouse, we'll remove the penthouse and create two bedrooms to accommodate the top two two-bedroom units, at the top, at the top level, right?

So, we split the penthouse in half and create a bedroom for this side and a bedroom for the two-bedroom that's on the right side. So the penthouse went away.

And after speaking with the architect, I said, well, how

2.0

1 else can we try to make up the unit that we lost? 2 And we came up with a plan to have below-grade units, and at that time you know we would just be adding 3 4 one, but if the space is there, why not just put two? that's where the eighth unit came from. So initially it 5 was seven, then it went to eight after we decided to 6 7 excavate for below-grade units. 8 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. And you -- I'll get 9 you in one second, Commissioner. And you meeting with the 10 ANC this whole time, I quess it was seven times. 11 okay. Commissioner, you had a comment? So, it wasn't until later on 12 MS. SHROPSHIRE: 13 that the question about square footage came up. 14 in our meetings, there was a question always posed as to 15 why seven units? Can you go lower? And I think that was his limit, and then that's 16 17 when he went back and said, oh, because you guys asked for 18 family size units, we found a way to utilize the cellar 19 space with the architect. So we've increased it to eight, 2.0 and we were like, why eight? That's more units. 21 So, there was never a consideration or we were 22 never presented with a floor plan with less than seven 23 So, I think that that's something that I 24 definitely think could be considered but it hasn't yet.

CHAIRPERSON HILL:

25

But the only reason why you

1	guys are interested in the less than seven units, you're
2	worried about density?
3	MS. SHROPSHIRE: Yes.
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. I'm just going to
5	make one comment, you guys, you've already stated that you
6	are interested, the ANC's interested in seeing this get
7	developed.
8	MS. SHROPSHIRE: Yes, I mean, it's a vacant
9	property right now.
10	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right, does anybody have
11	any more questions?
12	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: Yes. So, Mr. Sullivan,
13	how do you plan on dealing with the at-risk window on the
14	east side of the building or south side of the building?
15	MR. SULLIVAN: I'll have the architect attest
16	to that, but the plan I think is to file a covenant on our
17	end. The neighbor doesn't have to agree to that covenant,
18	the covenant would be that if the building were to ever be
19	close enough to that window to require it to be closed in,
20	that Mr. Claggin would be required to do that.
21	And I don't know if that fully addresses your
22	concern?
23	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: No, no, I'm just trying
24	to figure out, I mean, you have just about all of the
25	bedrooms have some sort of window, and that's usually what

somebody's kind of expecting. Not to have one, I just didn't know. Can you speak to that, Mr. Claggin, about how you perceive that unit that you may have to close the window on?

MR. CLAGGIN: I've spoken with the owner of the adjacent property and he has no plans, at least is what he's telling me now, he has no plans to build, to occupy 100 percent of his lot.

As Marty was just indicating, we would be prepared to sign a covenant indicating that if he did at some point decide to come back before you guys and ask for an exception to occupy the entire lot, then we would close those windows so the units would become, they're currently two-bedroom units, they would become one bedroom and a den.

So that rear unit would lose a window, basically.

VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: Okay, because I can tell you, we've heard cases already, that the people just you know larger buildings than this, that they found, oh, there's something that's happening. Right now, you have an owner that is, you know who the owner to next door, but they could sell in five years. And now they say, I don't want this building, we're going to do something completely different.

2.0

I just was trying to figure out what you were looking to do with that, but just understand that that is a very real possibility regardless of if it's this owner or the next owner.

MR. CLAGGIN: We will be prepared, I will be prepared to let the tenants know you know, that the covenant is there. I don't think something like that would happen overnight, but once we receive notice from the neighbor that they had intention to do that, we would then notify the tenants to let them know you know what's coming down the pike and see if they have any concerns, if they want to move, is there something we can do to assist them in moving.

If they don't want a one-bedroom and a den, if they would prefer a two-bedroom, then we would let them know. I think we would have sufficient time to you know advise the tenants that that was going to happen.

MEMBER JOHN: Just a follow-up question, do you plan to include that information in the lease?

MR. CLAGGINS: Yes because of that, because it is an at-risk window, yes. Yes, we're going to have to let them know that because, you know, like I said I don't think that's something that would happen overnight, but once we are notified, we will put in the lease that, you know, you will be given 30-day notice or however, as much

2.0

1 advanced notice that we're given we will provide that to 2 the tenant. We would let them know that, as well, in the 3 lease. MEMBER JOHN: Just another question, so would 4 the tenant's rent be reduced when the tenant loses that 5 I think that information has to be in the 6 extra bedroom? 7 What happens if you lose a bedroom? 8 MR. CLAGGIN: That's hard, I mean we would give 9 them the option, you know, some may want to move, if they They don't lose square footage, you know, they 10 11 still would have the same square footage but, you know, I 12 understand your question. 13 And we would give them the option if they would like to move, we would refund the security deposit. 14 15 the system would, you know, relocating, you know, it would 16 be completely up to them. 17 But we would accommodate, you know, the tenant 18 at that time once, you know, if the changed did happen. 19 We'd do our best to accommodate. We didn't roll out a 2.0 full plan to, you know, I have that ready for you today 21 but we, you know, I would be more than willing to 22 accommodate, you know, the tenant, if they have to 2.3 relocate. 24 Thank you. MEMBER JOHN: 25 VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: Just one final question

1	and this is, I guess, for the architect. So you're
2	maintaining the existing building and you're building,
3	you're maintaining the existing shell of the building and
4	you're building on top of that? You're punching holes
5	through the existing shell?
6	MR. FRIDY: Correct.
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: Okay, it just seems
8	like a lot of the existing shell is going to be gone. So
9	how much are you retaining of the building?
LO	MR. FRIDY: We were retaining a little bit
11	more, over 50 percent but that's the discussions we will
12	have with DCRA whether whether the
13	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: So that's the wall
L4	that's to the north and the wall that's to the
15	MR. FRIDY: Correct.
L6	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: basically the south?
L7	MR. FRIDY: Correct.
18	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: And then the facades
L9	along Simms and Montello would be you would take down
20	part of it or try to figure out how to deal with, because
21	some of this looks like it's new. I mean, you're putting
22	in
23	MR. FRIDY: Yes.
24	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: you know, windows
25	and doors and, you know, you're kind of adding various

12
things. Is the floor going up too?
MR. FRIDY: Yes.
VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: The floor is increasing
so you can have a basement level?
MR. FRIDY: Correct. Correct.
VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: So you're partially
excavating the site?
MR. FRIDY: Correct.
VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: Okay.
MR. FRIDY: So this is really, you know, we
talked to DCRA about it and I think the regulations now we
will have to get a raze permit anyway, even if we're doing
this. We're not demolishing all of the building. The
guidelines just changed the last couple of months. So
that's something in flux that we still not sure how DCRA
will look at it as a total raze or an addition to an
existing building.
VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: Okay, thank you for the
clarification.
CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right, well I thought we
might actually get all done before lunch, but now I can
see that this is going to go on and so we are going to
actually have lunch. Hey I'm going to get a sandwich, I'm
all good.
So, let's see, the reason why we're asking all

1	these at-risk window questions, it's so interesting.
2	Somebody came back with an appeal to us one time because
3	they were losing their at-risk window. I didn't realize
4	that it had such an effect on all of us that this is now,
5	you know
6	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: No, there's actually
7	several cases that we've had to deal with and it's just
8	trying to figure
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Right.
LO	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: out about kind of
11	how to understand it.
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure. So, Ms. John, you had
13	a question about a condition that I might ask OAG in terms
L4	of
15	MEMBER JOHN: I think I would ask OAG. I would
L6	like to see a condition that the applicant must include in
L7	its lease, that this is an at-risk window and that the
18	applicant will take appropriate steps to compensate the
L9	tenant, if the tenant loses a legal bedroom. Because once
20	you lose that at-risk window, it's no longer a legal
21	bedroom. So instead of renting a two bedroom, one-bath
22	apartment, the applicant is renting a one bedroom and den
23	which is a different price point.
24	And I'm just concerned that you're telling the
25	Board this now, but maybe a subsequent owner does

something different. And then the tenant has to fight
with the landlord/owner at that point to enforce what
you're telling us now. And I expect that you will do what
you've said you would do, but I'm just concerned about
this privacy, and it's not privacy as much as the use of
the rental unit for a tenant. I don't know, I'm just
concerned that the tenant would never know that that
well, might not be able to get any sort of relief, so.
CHAIRPERSON HILL: So my question then to OAG
is, is that something that we have made a condition before
or are we able to make that a condition?
MS. CAIN: I'm not sure if you've done
something to that effect before. I think you would be
able to incorporate language in the lease saying that in
case these windows do have to get closed up down the line,
that the property owner will provide compensation or that
there will be some recourse for the tenant in that unit.
And we need to sort of look at the exact language though.
CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, hold on, the attorney
had something to say?
MR. SULLIVAN: I can see how you can reasonably
relate a condition like that to asking for lot occupancy
relief and I'm sure we'd be happy to do that but I don't
think that you can put details in there about how that's

going to work, other than notice. So if the tenant has

1	notice, then it's a negotiation between whoever owns the
2	property at the time and that tenant. As long as the
3	tenant knows that this could happen and but, to
4	specifically define how that negotiation has to take
5	place, gets
6	CHAIRPERSON HILL: No, at some point, we have
7	to stop in terms of the condition but I'm just trying to
8	see what the condition will be that there will be a
9	condition that for those units that have the at-risk
10	window, the tenants would need to be notified at the time
11	of lease.
12	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: I think it's true
13	they're required to do that?
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Pardon?
15	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: I think so, I think
16	they're required to do it.
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: They're required to do it?
18	MR. SULLIVAN: I'm not a landlord/tenant
19	lawyer. I suspect that tenants are well-protected in this
20	situation just as any other. But I don't know
21	specifically.
22	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: I mean, that that window
23	is an at-risk window, not to to your point, that there
24	would be some kind of relief offered.
25	MEMBER JOHN: I think I might be in the

minority but I don't the like the situation where the tenant has the burden of making sure that the tenant is properly compensated for losing a legal bedroom. Because, you know, that's what is happening. And so I could see a situation where a tenant, in dire need of housing, signs a lease knowing that the tenant could lose this window.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.

MEMBER JOHN: And so I would suggest something like, at the time of lease that the lease will include a provision requiring the landlord to compensate or make other arrangements with the tenant for the loss of this legal bedroom because that's what is happening. It's a different price point.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Okay, I don't think the applicant is opposed to this so I'm just trying to figure out what the condition is, to if that, you know, satisfies the Board. Now before I move on -- okay, so Commissioner, I'm back over here. So you're hearing all this stuff about the at-risk window, right? In terms of the unit size, I mean I'm just letting you know, I don't necessarily know whether that's something that we would have gotten involved in.

And so, I don't know what to say about the -- I mean, you're not going to get your conditions, I mean, I don't think so, in terms of with this application in this

2.0

way. I mean, if we deny it based upon what the ANC has said, that they think is, you know, the units are too small, then, you know, they'll be back to us possibly with another design. I'm just saying they'd have to come back with another design, in order for us to be --

But before I ask any questions, I'm not really asking questions, I guess, about the size of the units, you've been listening to the at-risk window issue. Do you have any questions about that at-risk window issue at this point?

MS. SHROPSHIRE: No, I just wanted to make another statement, like I mentioned in the condition that is a covenant or an easement. So those particular windows, I think that they require easements from both property owners, the two property owners that I had mentioned, 1210 Simms Place and 1211 Mount Olivet Road because -- in order for them to be legal windows.

about here is the fact that they're not, like you're not going to get the other people to agree to not build to that lot line or whatever they can do. And so they're providing the, they're taking care of it on their end which is that if somebody moves in there and they lose the window, then this is what's going to happen.

MS. SHROPSHIRE: I've been listening.

2.0

1 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, no I'm just trying to 2 It helps me to explain if I talk out loud. explain. All right, so I'm going to keep moving along sure --3 4 MS. SHROPSHIRE: Can I just make another 5 statement, like there was the property that I keep 6 bringing up, which is in the picture here, the taller 1210 7 They had a BZA case here in 2013 and they Simms Place. 8 put four reasonably sized units in that building. 9 And I think it's going to be about the same 10 height, it's going to be about the same space and so I'm 11 just, I guess that was of concern that that particular, 12 even they proposed reasonable living size quarters for 13 residents to be in. It wasn't eight units put into the 14 same amount of space. So I just wanted to note that. 15 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, all right. Is there 16 anybody here wishing to speak in support? Is there anyone 17 here wishing to speak in opposition? Could the translator 18 come forward one more time, if you wouldn't mind, Ms. Ms. Wilkinson if you wouldn't mind I don't 19 Wilkinson? 2.0 anything's changed but if you could please go ahead and 21 ask in Spanish if anyone is here wishing to speak in 22 support or opposition? 23 (Spanish language spoken). MS. WILKINSON: 24 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Or support or opposition. 25 Did you say support already?

1	MS. WILKINSON: I said any statement in
2	opposition of the project.
3	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, could you also ask if
4	there's any statement in support of the project?
5	MS. WILKINSON: (Spanish language spoken).
6	CHAIRPERSON HILL: There's someone here wishing
7	to speak? You can come up forward. You need to come up
8	forward and yes, but so you don't seem like you need
9	Spanish translation. But go ahead and come on over here
10	and first, did you get sworn in earlier?
11	MR. HENDRICK: Yes, I did.
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, give me one second.
13	All right, so Ms. Wilkinson, just out of curiosity, do you
14	work for the city, how did we get you, how did you end up
15	here today? You need to push the microphone because
16	I'm curious.
17	MS. WILKINSON: The agency I work for sent me a
18	request to come to this hearing.
19	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. We haven't had a
20	translator before so that's why I'm curious.
21	MS. WILKINSON: Yes, it is TransPerfect.
22	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, there you go. All
23	right well Ms. Wilkinson I appreciate your help and, if
24	you wouldn't mind staying until the end just in case
25	something happens

1	MS. WILKINSON: Okay.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: but we don't need you
3	right now.
4	MS. WILKINSON: All right, I'll stay.
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. Thank you so
6	much.
7	MS. WILKINSON: You're welcome.
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. All right, sir,
9	if you want to go ahead and introduce yourself for the
10	record.
11	MR. HENDRICK: Hello, my name is Marcus
12	Hendrick. I'm a resident of 623 Otis Place NW, Washington
13	DC.
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, Mr. Hendrick. All
15	right, so Mr. Hendrick, are you speaking in support or
16	opposition?
17	MR. HENDRICK: Opposition.
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, so, Mr. Hendrick, as a
19	member of the public you're going to get three minutes to
20	testify.
21	MR. HENDRICK: Oh, sure.
22	CHAIRPERSON HILL: And I'm going to, Mr. Moy if
23	you could just put three minutes on the clock there and so
24	the clocks are located up on the ceiling on either side.
25	And you can begin whenever you like.
	1

MR. HENDRICK: All right, I'll keep this very brief. I have not been involved with the discussions at the Trinidad location but, as a member of the community, I regularly interact with developers in my neighborhood and I just wanted to speak specifically to this question of density and the size of the units.

The ANC has framed it as a question about how big the units are. But, given that the developers are asking for a parking variance for the number of units they have, one way they could have addressed the community's concern about the size of the units is to reduce the number so they could get to the size that the community feels is appropriate.

And the ANC then may have been able to support a variance request for the loss of a parking space, if there were six units that were larger and capable of actually supporting families who wanted to live in a two or three-bedroom home, rather than this sort of small-celled proposal that the developers are proposing.

So I think that the BZA should consider that when they're looking at the parking variance, whether or not the developers have taken the appropriate steps to address the community concerns as they have been presented by the ANC. That's all I have to add, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, great. Thank you, Mr.

2.0

1	Hendrick, for testifying. They're not here for a
2	variance, it's a special exception, just to be clear on
3	that one. And so, does anybody have any questions for the
4	witness? Does the applicant have any questions for the
5	witness?
6	MR. SULLIVAN: No thank you.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Does the ANC Commissioner
8	have any questions for the witness?
9	MS. SHROPSHIRE: No.
10	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, Mr. Hendrick, thank
11	you so much. All right, okay do we have any more
12	questions for the applicant or the Commissioner? Okay,
13	Commissioner, I'm going to let you go ahead and give a
14	little bit of a closing and then, Mr. Sullivan, I'll let
15	you do the same. Commissioner, you can begin whenever you
16	like.
17	MS. SHROPSHIRE: So taking all the information
18	into consideration, the ANC welcomes the opportunity to
19	fully support this project as the community wants to see
20	something productive done with the property.
21	However, we believe that the BZA should only
22	provide a special exception if the applicant revises the
23	design to provide realistic size units for two and three-
24	bedroom or only two-bedroom, rather than having such a

dense building by packing a lot of residents into one

1	space.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, thank you. Mr.
3	Sullivan?
4	MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members
5	of the Board. In closing, I would just reiterate what
6	we've said before, that we think this meets all the
7	special exception requirements, regardless of whether it's
8	seven or eight units.
9	And just to close up the issue on the
10	non-conforming aspect of it, we did ask for that
11	originally. I understand the Zoning Administrator said
12	it's not needed. I get that because we're not increasing
13	an existing aspect of the non-conformity. So there's 100
14	percent lot occupancy, which by the previous use is
15	conforming, under a new use it wouldn't be. But we're not
16	extending that, we're adding to it up.
17	So we're creating new non-conformities but
18	we're not expanding existing non-conformities, either rear
19	yard or lot occupancy. So that makes sense to me now.
20	And that's all I have, thank you.
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, Board Member John, you
22	had some thoughts maybe about your condition?
23	MEMBER JOHN: So the condition would be that
24	the applicant will include a provision in the lease to

notify each prospective tenant of the existence of an

1	at-risk window and the potential loss of a legal bedroom.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, does the applicant
3	understand that condition? Is the applicant
4	MR. SULLIVAN: Yes.
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: comfortable with that
6	condition?
7	MR. SULLIVAN: Yes.
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, all right. Does
9	anybody have anything else they'd like to add? All right,
10	I'll go ahead and close the hearing. Is the Board ready
11	to deliberate? Okay, all right, I can start.
12	I think that it's unfortunate that the ANC
13	I'm, I don't know if confused is the right word, I mean,
14	like the size of the units as to what's a family size or
15	what's not a family size. I mean, I find it's kind of
16	like I don't know if that's necessarily within the Board's
17	or in our purview, I suppose.
18	I mean, we are here to understand whether or
19	not they're meeting the regulations and the standards to
20	ask for what they're asking for. So there are certain
21	standards that we use to analyze whether or not the
22	special exceptions, the relief's going to be granted.
23	I feel that the applicant has met the criteria
24	and their burden of proof for the standards that we look

25 at for this particular application. I think that the

market will bear out as to whether or not, you know, families move in there or if anybody moves in there. I do think that the Office of Planning's analysis in their report, I think is accurate and I would agree with it. I also think that DDOT didn't have any objection to the project.

I think that it's a little bit of a mix in terms of like if this were to get denied. The community wouldn't get to see this get developed for however much longer that would be. So, but regardless of that, I think they've met the burden for us to go ahead and grant this application. And I'll be voting in favor with the condition that Board Member John had put forward. Does anyone else have anything else they'd like to add?

VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: We actually didn't talk about the DDOT conditions. I guess there were several. I mean, it didn't seem like they were that, this is in their report, Exhibit --

CHAIRPERSON HILL: All, yes, I'm sorry.

VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: So each resident should receive a welcome package which includes information about nearby transportation options, ride sharing, car sharing, metro and bike shares. The applicant will offer one-year bike share memberships and then applicant will install trans screen or similar device displaying real time

2.0

1	transportation schedules, and then bike, car share options
2	located within a half mile of the site and then continued
3	coordination with DDOT and a variety of things.
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I appreciate that, Vice
5	Chair Hart, thank you. Yes, I don't have any issues with
6	those conditions being added, as well. Does anyone else
7	have anything they'd like to add concerning the
8	application?
9	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Sure, there was some
10	question about no relief needed from Subtitle C202.2. It
11	was confirmed by the Zoning Administrator and do we need
12	OP to go on the record about that or are we past that
13	point?
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: They did
15	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Okay.
16	CHAIRPERSON HILL: yes, they described what
17	it was and Mr. Sullivan just gave a little bit more
18	information about that, as well. And I understand it, it
19	just seems, it does seem like a little quirk in the
20	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: But we have enough
21	information?
22	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Oh yes, I mean, it's just
23	that it's, it is, yes, I do.
24	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
25	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, anyone else? Okay,
l	I .

1	I'm going to go ahead and make a motion to approve
2	Application Number 19982 as captioned and read by the
3	Secretary, including the conditions that DDOT had listed
4	as well as working with DDOT, as well as the condition
5	that Board Member John read into the record and ask for a
6	Second.
7	BOARD MEMBER JOHN: Second.
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Motion made and seconded,
9	all those in favor say aye.
10	(Chorus of aye.)
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All those opposed?
12	The motion passes. Mr. Moy?
13	MR. MOY: Staff would record the vote as 5-0-0.
14	This is on the motion of Chairman Hill to approve the
15	application for the relief requested along with the
16	conditions as sited in his motion. Seconded the motion is
17	Ms. John. Also, in support, Ms. White, Vice Chair Hart
18	and Mr. Peter Shapiro. Motion carries.
19	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, thank you, Mr. Moy.
20	Thank you all very much. You guys, we're going to take a
21	15-minute break and we'll be back. Thank you.
22	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off
23	the record at 11:09 a.m. and resumed at 11:21 a.m.)
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right. Let's all get
25	started again. We're actually going to go a little bit

1	out of order. The next case we're going to actually hear
2	is 19971, and then we'll go back to 19929. The hope is
3	we'll get through everything before the appeal. And so
4	let's just see what happens. So Mr. Moy, whenever you're
5	ready.
6	MR. MOY: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
7	Again, that would be case Application Number 19971 of GRID
8	Alternatives Mid-Atlantic for the District of Columbia,
9	capture and advertise to a special exception under the use
LO	provisions, Subtitle U §§ 420.1(a) and 203.1(p).
11	This would permit the installation of a
L2	community solar facility, RA-1 Zone at premises South
13	Capitol Street S.E., Square 6274, Lots 800, 801 and 802.
L4	And I believe, Mr. Chairman, under Exhibit 35, if I'm
15	correct, there was on the part of the ANC a request to
L6	postpone?
L7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right. Let's see
L8	where we get. If everyone could introduce themselves from
L9	my right to left.
20	MS. STEELE: Good morning, Chairman Hill. I'm
21	Nicole Steele. I'm the Executive Director of GRID
22	Alternatives Mid-Atlantic.
23	MS. CROFT: Good morning. I'm Jen Croft from
24	the Department of General Services Sustainability and
25	Energy Division.

1	MR. KING: Good morning, Chairman, Board. Emil
2	King, Department of Energy and Environment.
3	MR. WELLS: Good morning. I'm Tommy Wells.
4	I'm your Director of the Department of Energy and
5	Environment.
6	MR. LASKY: Good morning. I'm David Lasky. I
7	am the Construction Manager at GRID Alternatives
8	Mid-Atlantic. Oh, and I do have some additional documents
9	to turn in.
10	MR. OLIVER: Good morning. I'm Kyle Oliver
11	with Vika Capital, a surveyor and civil engineer.
12	MR. IZEVBIGIE: Good morning. I'm John
13	Izevbigie, a consultant of Lightbox Energy. We're a
14	contractor with DGS.
15	MS. HENDERSON: Good morning, Chair and Board
16	members. My name is Commissioner Henderson of the ANC
17	Commission of the Single Member District and also the
18	chair of ANC 8D.
19	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Well, Commissioner,
20	welcome. Council Member, welcome. I'm glad you guys took
21	up all my seats. And, let's see, so Commissioner, I know
22	there was a request, I think, for a postponement. Is that
23	correct?
24	MS. HENDERSON: That's correct.
25	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Could you explain the

1	request, please?
2	MS. HENDERSON: The request was because they
3	did appear at our last working session meeting GRID
4	Alternative along with Emil King in which we did provide
5	them with support letter because there was a lot of
6	information that was implemented into the document.
7	Hopefully, you all have the document, the
8	statement of applicant, that was inaccurate and some
9	information that we wanted to receive as the ANC was not
LO	included. So we refused to move forward.
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: So you guys didn't vote yet?
12	MS. HENDERSON: No, sir.
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So you're asking for
L4	the postponement so that you can get the information that
15	you need or that you were asking for, and then you would
L6	be able to have a vote?
L7	MS. HENDERSON: Well, we actually have our ANC
18	community meeting on tomorrow and we wanted to at least
19	vote first and provide you all a letter of support even if
20	we are supporting it or we're not.
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right.
22	MS. HENDERSON: And we can provide you with
23	that letter Friday after the Thursday vote.
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Who's going to be
25	presenting for you guys?

MR. KING: It's a group effort.
CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Who's going to start
the group effort?
MR. KING: Director Wells.
CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Director Wells? All
right. So in terms of the postponement request, I mean,
you guys have already you haven't spoken to the ANC
yet, or you have spoken to the ANC?
MR. WELLS: Thank you and thank you for giving
us this opportunity. We're very, our team has met with
ANC about, Commissioner, I guess, four or five times, if
that's correct, and we've worked very closely with the ANC
and very eager to get the ANC's support. Also working
with the Council Member and his staff in that area as
well.
CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So, I guess and so
are you guys planning on presenting again tomorrow or
whenever this next meeting is?
MR. KING: We understand that there just needs
to be a motion to take a vote.
CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So, in terms of me
having the information, right?
MR. KING: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON HILL: So then if I would, so my
thoughts in terms of the Board, and you guys can tell me

what you think, is, you know, everybody's here. Like we can go ahead and hear the case and then perhaps leave the record open for the ANC and see what they have to say, and then we could set this for a decision one way or the other after that ANC letter would be put forward. Does that sound good to the Board? Okay.

So Council Member, we're going to keep the record open. Regardless of what happens here today, everybody's here so we're going to go ahead and hear the case and then we'll keep the record open so that we can hear from you're ANC and then we'll probably set it for decision again one way or the other. But, we're going to go ahead and move forward. So we're going to deny your request for postponement, but we are going to go ahead and, you know, leave the record open for you to give us the information that you need or would like us to hear.

MS. HENDERSON: We've provided the information that I have today, and although you're postponing it, the information that I provide, will it be able to actually stop the process moving forward if the information is accurate that I provide?

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes, I mean, you'll be giving us whatever you end up giving us. And then if we think that we need to even continue the hearing, we could go ahead and reopen the hearing to continue hearing from

2.0

1	the ANC or whatever it is with the information you were
2	giving us.
3	Also, we're not going to be making a decision
4	today. So we would be taking that information into our,
5	you know, process to decide whether or not we think this
6	application should be approved or denied.
7	MS. HENDERSON: Thank you.
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So Commissioner,
9	you're here so you can go ahead and, just to let you know,
LO	since you're here and you're a party, you're going to get
11	to be able to, you know, make a presentation if you want
12	to or ask questions if you want to. But, at this point,
13	we're just going to go ahead and move the hearing. Okay?
L4	MS. HENDERSON: Okay. And I do want to add
15	that this is my first time ever attending a hearing, so I
L6	am butterflied all over nervous right now.
L7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
18	MS. HENDERSON: But I do want to read from
19	a document.
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, sure. Well, you'll
21	get that opportunity and you're doing a great job. I
22	mean, the first time I was here, I got to tell you, I was
23	scared to death. Okay.
24	MS. HENDERSON: Thank you.
25	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I'm still actually scared to

death, but I've learned how to fake it. So I'm going to go ahead, Mr. Moy, if you could put 15 minutes on the clock and just, you know, if you need more time, Director, you can please go ahead and do that, but I'm going to go ahead and let you begin whenever you would like. MR. WELLS: Thank you very much. And, thank you for this hearing. Let me also say to the commissioner that I was ANC commissioner for about three terms and I had the same butterflies, just the intimidation. Eventually it goes away a little but not always, but yes. I appreciate that and appreciate your service to your neighborhood and your community in being here today. And as you know, the mayor has set a goal of getting the city carbon neutral by 2050 but also have all of our energy to be from a renewable portfolio by 2032, and that at least 10 percent of the city's energy comes from solar power generated from within the city. And so we have an aggressive goal, and

And so we have an aggressive goal, and obviously we know the city's climate is changing dramatically, and the city had to provide leadership with the failure of the federal government to provide leadership to do this.

This project is funded with the Solar for All program that's funded through the city council, and one of the things about Solar for All is that the energy that we

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

2 projects, we will then share those benefits with residents that have high energy burdens. 3 And so the average household energy burden per 4 year is between \$1,000 and \$1,200. 5 And, so we will select, with the community's input, including the ANC's 6 7 leadership, 750 households around the Oxon Run 8 neighborhood to provide half of their power bill through 9 this power, through this solar installment, installation. 10 Additionally, this is at Oxon Run, where it's a contaminated ground filled site, and it's not suitable for 11 12 It's also federally owned but controlled by the building. 13 So it's not a site that's going to get economic district. 14 development, and it's a site that been followed for quite 15 a while. So the program and projects going forward and 16 17 the particulars will now be provided by my colleagues. 18 Thank you. 19 So with respect to the project team MR. KING: 2.0 we have represented here, again, the government of 21 District of Columbia is the owner of the project. 22 Funding is being provided by the Department of 23 Energy and Environment. Excuse me. The construction 24 management, Department of General Services, Solar 25 Representation by Lightbox Energy, project construction by

develop from solar power from the community's solar

GRID Alternatives Mid Atlantic, and civil engineering by Vika Capital.

So I'm going to provide some project information, specifically about the site. So first, the site location, the subject property is located on the southwestern side of South Capitol Street, S.E., directly on the border of the District of Columbia and Maryland.

The site plan, it's about 15.4 acres in total size. The rows of proposed solar panels will be spaced approximately six feet apart. Our revised plan, which differs from the initial plan that was filed with BZA, avoids impacts to wetlands, which are visible to the south of the bottom right corner in green.

The site plan also adds landscaping to buffer the views along South Capitol Street, which is the only visible area from the community. It's surrounded by commercial uses along South Capitol Street and string buffers to the east, south, and west.

This project complies with our RA-1 zone requirements. It meets the setback requirements on all sides of 20 feet or greater. The panels are approximately six feet tall, which is lower than the RA-1 height limit of 40 feet.

The use is not subject to maximum FAR green area ratio as there are no buildings. And based on the

2.0

1 definition of lot occupancy and building area, solar rays 2 will not count as lot occupancy. However, if the panels did count, the occupancy 3 would be 25 percent, which is below the 40 percent 4 5 permitted in this zone. 6 CHAIRPERSON HILL: And Mr. King? 7 MR. KING: Yes. Can you speak a little bit 8 CHAIRPERSON HILL: 9 to the landscaping, or are you going to? 10 MR. KING: Yes. 11 CHAIRPERSON HILL: In terms of the -- okay, the 12 screening. Thank you. So, with respect to the landscape 13 MR. KING: 14 plan, we had a strategy comprised of three elements. 15 first is to maintain existing trees along South Capitol 16 Street that are maintained by DDOT. 17 The second was to provide for beautification 18 along South Capitol Street, without entirely hiding the 19 solar facility. We believe this is a community asset, 2.0 which should be viewed and welcomed and appreciated by the 21 We're also planning to plant native community. 22 trees and pollinators that provide food and protective 23 shelter for birds, insects, and other wildlife, which is an improvement upon the existing conditions of the site 24

25

now.

1	We can go over this if you have additional
2	questions, but in year one, we propose to add
3	approximately 40 new trees, primarily along the
4	northwestern edge and street frontage and roughly 30 new
5	shrubs. This is a mix of species to improve biodiversity.
6	In the second year, we propose to plant native
7	pollinator meadows around the perimeter in selected areas,
8	again, to improve wildlife habitat and improve the
9	conditions of the site.
10	MEMBER WHITE: Just one question. How do you,
11	what's the ongoing maintenance plan in terms of making
12	sure that it looks presentable on an ongoing basis, not
13	just the early stage of implementing the panels, but is
14	there plan in place for that to make sure it's kept up,
15	clean, mowed, that kind of thing?
16	MR. KING: You're referring to maintenance of
17	the solar equipment and/or the landscaping, or both?
18	MEMBER WHITE: Landscaping.
19	MR. KING: Okay. Landscaping. Yes, so we have
20	an arborist on staff. We're providing the funding for
21	that landscaping and we're looking to incorporate an
22	additional maintenance plan likely through a competitive
23	solicitation for ongoing years to manage that. We also
24	have biologists on staff that routinely manage tree
25	canopies in a variety of settings so -

VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: And with this as well,
so, I understand that you're trying to limit the number of
trees because the trees will, of course, block the sun,
but I'm not exactly sure kind of why you chose the
particular areas that you did. Was there a could you
just talk about the, how you figured out where to kind of
put these and where not to put them.
It just seems a little, 40 trees doesn't seem
like a lot so I'm just trying to figure out what, you
know, how you were thinking about looking at this.
MR. KING: Yes, so again, the landscaping is
primarily on the street frontage to provide a buffer
between the street, the sidewalk, and existing trees. So,
that's why they're congregated there.
This is to the rear of the arrays so it's
behind the system actually. So, it's not blocking
sunlight. And, we expect that the variety of trees and
shrubs will kind of grow in and create, again, additional
habitat that kind of matches the surrounding area. The
rest of it is buffered already by trees.
VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: And so you're saying
also that the area that's here doesn't get any trees
because it is behind some existing buildings that you
don't really need to screen it?
MR. KING: That is correct.

1	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: Okay. And, so, and the
2	area here is along South Capitol Street, so that's kind of
3	why you're looking at having
4	MR. KING: Correct.
5	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: Okay. And, then areas
6	like here or here, you're just not looking at it just, I
7	just don't know why. Because currently there's some trees
8	that are near the creek that's over the, sorry, Oxon Run
9	
10	MR. KING: Yes.
11	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: that's over to the
12	west of this. And, I just was trying to understand how
13	you were looking at doing that. I think there's also some
14	kind of, I know that there's kind of flooding issues and
15	stuff that's going on. So, I just was trying to
16	understand the strategy with respect to some of the, I
17	mean, Oxon Run is about stormwater management.
18	In many ways, it was created for that so I just
19	was trying to figure out how you're dealing with that and
20	you can continue this. I just was, it's just me trying to
21	figure some of that out so.
22	MR. KING: Yes, again, and the short answer is
23	existing riparian buffer along both sides. It's heavily
24	forested already.
25	MR. WELLS: If I could add, we're also funding

a study to look at rewilding Oxon Run so it's not just a 1 2 drainage ditch, to turn it back into an asset for water 3 management. And, so that's an ongoing project in parallel with this. 4 5 VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: I'm assuming that, is there any wildlife down there? 6 7 MR. WELLS: Yes. 8 VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: So well, I'm just, the 9 reason I'm asking is because you have a fence around, an 10 eight-foot fence around this entire site. So, I'm 11 assuming you try to get them out before you build this? 12 Well, we always do, because where MR. WELLS: 13 it is, we will do a search for turtles and other things 14 like that to be sure that they're not fully disturbed. 15 But, most of the wildlife that is there will be able to coexist with what is there. But, yes, in terms of any 16 17 other type of wildlife like deer or something, absolutely. 18 VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: Thank you. You can go 19 I just was, it was more of a curiosity. I appreciate on. 2.0 it. 21 Thank you. Next slide. So, with MR. KING: respect to community engagement, due to the complexity of 22 23 this project, obviously there's, you know, some timelines that had to be considered. 24

So the first part, neighborhood outreach, we

have a web page that addresses the project basics and some frequently asked questions. We're currently conducting door to door canvassing and flier distribution of a flier that's also located on our website.

We've had engagement with multi-family property owners, resident managers, faith-based community and other contacts via ANC commissioners and other community leaders to assist with engagement and we also have a weekly standing office hours in a neighborhood public library, Bellevue Library. So, we have two days a week office hours to talk about Solar for All as well as this project.

Early on, when we first began developing this project in 2017, we worked with Counsel member White to identify potential members of a task force. And, the goal of this task force was specifically to assist the agency in developing a prioritization plan for how the benefits of the system would be allocated.

Not to talk about the site or the project per se but how, once completed, if it were completed, that it would, of how those benefits would be allocated to members of the community.

So we held three meetings in 2018 between July and September and then we have a fourth and final meeting that we're still planning where we'll look at the final prioritization recommendations for once the projects,

2.0

	again, comes online.
2	We also were in attendance at the Department of
3	Parks and Rec and Friends of Oxon Run public meeting in
4	April, April 18th, recently. And, then as far as ANC 8D
5	meetings, we had two work sessions, one in February and
6	one in May, a public meeting on March 28th.
7	And then we requested to come back in April but
8	the ANC couldn't accommodate. Their agenda was full.
9	And, so as mentioned before by Commission Henderson, the
10	final action is expected May 23rd, tomorrow.
11	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Mr. King, just a quick
12	question on this slide. So, the, under the Oxon Run Solar
13	Task Force, that last bullet point, when you say a fourth
14	and final meeting's being planned, which will allow the
15	group to apply this final, you're talking about who's
16	going to benefit from community solar, which households?
17	That's what we're talking about?
18	MR. KING: Correct. How, yes, how the agency
19	will implement
20	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Okay.
21	MR. KING: the plan to actually select those
22	households.
23	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: And I'm just curious,
24	how many eligible households are there altogether in the

area, however you're defining the area, and how many are

1	actually going to benefit from this?
2	MR. KING: Roughly thereabout, oh, 5,000 that
3	kind of fit within some of the parameters and we're
4	looking at proximity to the site primarily. So, we've
5	mapped half mile, one mile, one and a half mile radius and
6	looked at LIHEAP eligible households that we already
7	serve.
8	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: So you're saying there's
9	about 5,000 households that are potentially eligible.
LO	And, how many could
11	MR. KING: Yes, roughly.
12	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: how many could this
L3	community solar project support?
L4	MR. KING: 750, approximately.
L5	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: 750? Okay. Thank you.
L6	Thank you, Mr. Chair.
L7	MR. WELLS: And just for clarification, LIHEAP,
L8	as you probably know, it's assistance we provide to
L9	low-income residents that are unable to meet their energy
20	bills.
21	And so we have identified more than 750
22	households in that neighborhood that have applied for
23	benefits to help with their energy bills but what we need
24	to do is work with the community to prioritize is it
25	retirees, is it large families. Because we already have a

1	pool that's larger than /50 that need assistance with
2	energy bills in that neighborhood.
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: Just one, also,
4	clarifying, I understand that you all had some
5	correspondence with NPS, the National Capital Region.
6	Have you also talked to National Capital East? That, I
7	think, they have their purview over the, this is in their
8	administrative unit.
9	I just didn't know if you had any conversation
LO	with them. And if you don't, that's fine. I just, it
11	would, I would just, not recommend, but I would encourage
L2	you to kind of reach out to them. I know that they, that
13	NPS has the underlying ownership of the other property but
L4	it's just a note, no big conversation about it. Thanks.
15	MS. CROFT: Sure, we can have that conversation
L6	but just for clarification, National Capital East is not a
L7	part of the National Park Service.
L8	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: Yes, they are.
L9	MS. CROFT: They are? Okay.
20	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: Yes, yes, so it's the
21	
22	MS. CROFT: Yes.
23	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: In D.C., you have
24	Na-Mall, which is the National Mall, Rock Creek and
25	National Capital East are the main administrative units in

1	D.C. I think President's Park probably is another one.
2	But, they're, it's the west side, it's the east side of
3	D.C.
4	MS. CROFT: Got it.
5	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: So the west side of
6	D.C. is basically Rock Creek Park.
7	MS. CROFT: Yes.
8	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: And then downtown,
9	where people consider as the national mall, is the
10	National Mall and memorial
11	MS. CROFT: Yes.
12	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: administrative unit.
13	National Capital East is big. They actually go up the B2B
14	Parkway.
15	MS. CROFT: Got it.
16	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: They're a, they have
17	very large purview.
18	MR. WELLS: So, as Director of the OE, I spoke
19	with Bob Vogel, who was the regional director at the time,
20	and he signed off on this in writing.
21	And then, obviously, since he's been moved and
22	they haven't replaced him yet, I've been working with Tara
23	Morrison, who is the superintendent for the east area and
24	she is very involved as well and supportive. But,
25	initially, before Bob Vogel left, he wrote an approval of

1	support for the project.
2	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: I do see that. I
3	appreciate that in the
4	MR. WELLS: Okay.
5	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: in the record.
6	That's very helpful. Thank you.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: And Vice Chair, you know
8	this because of your real job?
9	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: Yes, as somebody that
10	works for the National Capital Planning Commission, I
11	just, we actually reviewed this project early this year.
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Because this isn't our real
13	job. Okay. All right. Please continue.
14	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: If I can, Mr. Chair.
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Certainly.
16	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Thank you. We may get
17	to this later on down the road, but if you could, for the
18	benefit of the Board but also my own edification, if we
19	can just make sure how this relates to what's before the
20	Zoning Commission and the emergency rulemaking.
21	I think this is essentially exempted from what
22	the Zoning Commission is taking up. So, this is going to
23	be able to move forward either way but I'd like some
24	clarification on that and it might help the Board as well.
25	CHATRDERSON HILL: Okay Thanks Commissioner

1 Whenever you guys get to it. 2 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: It doesn't have to be 3 now but at some point. 4 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes, just get us, continue moving through, Mr. King. 5 I think next slide, John, if 6 MR. KING: Okav. 7 we could try to quickly wrap this up. 8 MR. IZEVBIGIE: Yes, no problem. I'll iust 9 provided an overview of Community Solar. It's a program 10 whereby customers or homeowners subscribe to a portion of 11 production or capacity of our solar system and receive 12 adequate credit for it. So this is very beneficial as a lot of 13 homeowners would like to install solar but they face 14 15 certain electrical, mechanical, or financial barriers or 16 the roof is too small, structure is not adequate, the 17 upfront cost is too substantial. So, this is a solution 18 that helps them participate in a solar program and reap the environmental and financial benefits from it as well. 19 2.0 Just on a high level, the design of the solar 21 system, these panels would be affixed to steel beams 22 mounted directly into the ground. They're situated six 23 feet apart and so this will allow for maintenance and also

minimize the impact of row shading that may have on

production.

24

Sorry. The systems will be placed about two and a half feet above the ground so this will allow vegetation and grass to grow and the need to have a cooling system, which will actually improve the efficiency of these systems as well.

At the highest point, this will be about less than six feet, so five feet and ten inches. All in all, it's a pretty straight forward system design and I'm sure the community will benefit from it.

MR. KING: Okay. I'll cover this section quickly on the existing conditions of the brownfield. So, I believe this is in the record but the agency has classified this site as a brownfield because of petroleum hydrocarbon pollution that is a result of migration of those materials from upstream from preexisting fueling stations.

As well, there's some, been illegal dumping on the site and there was a DPW fueling station and some other kind of uses that basically result in this pollution existing.

It's located about 17 to 20 plus feet below the surface and if solar's developed on this site, no future or further remediation or mitigation is required.

So we consider this the highest and best use and it also mitigates the blighted condition and security

2.0

fencing and the site will be in use. And, so that, we hope, will deter future dumping, loitering, et cetera.

It integrates well with wildlife. As we've seen across the globe, solar farms work very well with wildlife. And, then it also allows us to hold the property for roughly 15 to 25 years that allows those hydrocarbons to naturally breakdown in the soil and then the site could potentially be returned to park use or some other use in the future.

MS. STEELE: Okay. And, now, it's me. So, again, Nicole Steele, Executive Director of GRID

Alternatives Mid-Atlantic. I did want to note that I am actually a former land use planner and so this is bringing back a lot of memories and I'm happy to be here and present on behalf of the District of Columbia and GRID Alternatives.

But just a little bit about who we are and why we do what we do. GRID Alternatives is a non-profit, turnkey solar installer. So, we do everything from site origination to the installation process to operation and maintenance of referring back to, how was this system maintained over the life of the project.

When we applied to this RFP two years ago, we took a close look at what the benefits would be to the neighborhood and that's really the important piece of the

2.0

puzzle for GRID because we want to make sure that clean renewable energy is accessible to everyone and we work exclusively in low to moderate income communities and we have a job training model to do those installations themselves.

So we took a look at this project and saw that it was not only on a brownfield, which is a perfect use for a solar installation, and to what Emil was just saying, you know, it allows for the land itself to heal over the 15 to 20 years of the project.

And then once that brownfield has healed over that time, it could be used for another use. And, even the solar panels could be put on top of whatever the development would be on that property.

So we do a number of things. We work in conjunction with the District on a solar job training program. We do tenant engagement and community education around solar and the importance of solar deployment and why it's incredibly important to make sure that everybody's included in this conversation.

So if you want to just go to the next slide. We won the RFP to install this project earlier this year and our role, and why we're here today, is to design and permit.

And then as part of the permitting process,

2.0

it includes a special exception. If that special exception does go through, we will also be in charge of constructing, commissioning, and doing the utility interconnection as well.

I think, really, the important piece of the puzzle, though, is that, you know, we're not only a for-profit solar installer but we really truly engage the community through that installation process. And so we intend on making sure that the surrounding community is able to participate.

In that process then, we'll be hosting community events as part of the installation itself.

Those usually include picnics and just fun days that the community can participate in. So, not only 750 families will benefit from the energy generation from the facility itself, they will also get to be able to be part of it.

And we even do really cool things where, you know, the homeowners that are participating in the install get to sign the back of the solar panels and really make it their own.

And so that it's not a completely esoteric project, not on the roof of their home but they own it and they're part of that conversation and that transition to a new clean energy economy and to the district.

And so today, we're asking a special exception

2.0

for basic utility in a residential community. We feel that the solar install as a ground mount system is fully compatible in a residential community. We meet the setback requirements in the RA-1 including height floor ratio, the green area ratio, and all of that.

We are also looking at making sure that we're meeting the setback requirements from all property lines if we were, you know, a facility itself. And, so we're meeting all of those requirements per that special exception as if we were a building.

And so today, we want to make sure that we're requesting a special exception use for, a basic utility for the Oxon Run community solar array. With that, we can take questions.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Thank you. Thank you. Does the Board have any questions for the applicant? Sure, go on.

MEMBER WHITE: Two questions. The security of the area, how are the panels going to be protected? You know, because the history of the area was a dumping ground. So, one, I'd just like to just quickly hear what your plan is to protect those panels.

And then, two, I think I heard you say that you were integrating the community with respect to training, job training or, can you talk to me a little bit about

2.0

that?

2.0

MS. STEELE: Absolutely. Yes, yes. In terms of the fence details, I can let my staff speak a little bit to that but we do plan to install a no-climb chain link fence that's eight feet tall around the property. That should be adequate to make sure that individuals are not climbing the fence and meddling with the system.

But if there's anything else that you want to add around the fence, I will note that we have other ground mount facilities on multifamily properties in the district that do not need that fencing but that we're taking that extra precaution for fencing here as well.

And we are excited to be cleaning up the site and putting in new landscaping. The sort of really cool part of what we do as GRID Alternatives is that we have a job training program. And, so for all of the installations that we do, we incorporate job trainees into those programings.

And so as part of this project, we will have district residents learning about solar installation and being part of the install itself, going through a training program that we implement in partnership with DOE and DOES, here in the district, called Solar Works D.C.

And we really hope to be able to bring those trainees out on site to learn about what it really entails

to do a ground mount solar facility and a community solar 1 2 facility at that and a large solar facility. And so I think it's a really great opportunity 3 4 not only for residents who are participating in our solar 5 job training program to participate in this install itself 6 but then also potentially receive those benefits. 7 MEMBER WHITE: Thank you. I think that's, those are some great ideas. 8 9 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Thanks. A couple of 10 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Thank you. 11 quick questions. Where are the access points for 12 maintenance and how do you get in and out of this fence? 13 MR. LASKY: Yes, we currently plan to utilize 14 the, kind of the entrance there at the end of Southern 15 I kind of, I can, I wish I could circle it but --Avenue. 16 VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: You can circle it on 17 the one next to you. 18 MR. LASKY: Oh. 19 VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: That one is, yes. 2.0 MR. LASKY: All right. Great. That would be 21 our main site entrance, basically, coming in off of where 22 Southern Avenue kind of dead ends. It's currently the 23 kind of access point to the lot and we plan on kind of 24 maintaining that as the entrance point. There will be a

gated fence, a gate in the fence at that location.

COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: And how, what kind of work have you done around this related to public safety and have you, are you, are there going to be any kind of video monitoring that you've planned or? I just want to hear a little bit about how you've taken up this issue around public safety.

MS. CROFT: We have spoken with our DGS Public Safety Group. They're physical security specialists who did a walkthrough of the site with GRID.

The eight-foot fence should be all that is needed, though, if we're finding that there are security problems, we can look into lighting and cameras, which, right now, would take the project budget over. But, in the following year, when substantial completion is reached, there may be some additional funds for it.

COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Thank you. It would be helpful just to hear from the police department just to, you know, for us, for me, it would be helpful to hear where they see if there's any things that are going to be beneficial upfront. So, yes, I'll leave it at that.

MS. STEELE: I will add that our, the solar facility itself does have remote monitoring capabilities. So, if, you know, a solar panel is to go offline or an inverter was to go offline, we would know immediately and be able to go out and deal with the situation.

2.0

1	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Thank you.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. That's all right.
3	Let's see. Commissioner, so, you're also the chair, is
4	that correct? Congratulations on being elected chair.
5	MS. HENDERSON: Thank you.
6	CHAIRPERSON HILL: It's a great job. Let's
7	see. Commissioner, if you want to go ahead. Do you have
8	any questions that you'd like to ask anybody or you just
9	want to go ahead and give your presentation?
10	MS. HENDERSON: I just want to go ahead and
11	give my presentations.
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
13	MS. HENDERSON: And all the questions for
14	everyone and also the Board members are going to be
15	implemented in the presentation.
16	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So, you can go ahead
17	and start whenever you like.
18	MS. HENDERSON: Okay. Thank you. Good
19	morning, Chair and Board. ANC 8D is here asking the Board
20	of Zoning for an extension to allow ANC 8D great weight
21	with pertaining to providing a purported letter for the
22	project prosed from GRID Alternative Mid-Atlantic for the
23	District of Columbia.
24	There are still questions they have pertaining

25 to the project. Back in October, a task force was put

1	together, which included mixed residents, non-profits,
2	advocates, a faith-based leader, ANC 8D Single Member
3	District Commissioner, no residents, along with other
4	commissioners.
5	When they put together the task force, it was
6	stated that I was on the task force, in which I had no
7	mind, no memory that I was actually placed on this task
8	force.
9	Along on this task force, it was Reverend
10	Donald Isaac, Philip Pannell, Perry Moon, Vaughn Perry,
11	Velma Hammond, Absalom Jordan, who is another
12	commissioner, Olivia Henderson, Nate Fleming, and T'Chaka
13	Sapp, both from the councilmember office.
14	The only people who actually ever attended
15	these meetings was Olivia Henderson and Absalon Jordan.
16	Perry Moon attended the meeting one time but the rest of
17	the members, we have never seen attend one of these task
18	force meetings.
19	All members that attended also was Patricia
20	Carmon, she's the ANC commissioner, Monique Diop, Connie
21	Mobley, Nathan Harrington never attended, Jaqueline Kinlow
22	never attended, and Bernadette Farrell. I have no
23	knowledge of who that might be.
24	So some of the members of the ANC also stated

that they didn't know that they were part of this task

force and if this was going to be put on record, I want to 1 2 state that me as a commissioner would like to be removed off the task force that I didn't know I was part of. 3 So, in regards to the task force, it really, I 4 took it really personal because Emil King stated that many 5 6 people of his team and also GRID Alternative went onto the 7 site. 8 If I was part of a task force, I thought maybe 9 that I, along with the other members, would also go onto 10 the site and see exactly what they were seeing each and 11 every time they stepped on the site. I breathe, I eat, I sleep this community. 12 T've 13 been a commissioner for over ten years. And, for some of the things that they have stated right now today is very 14 15 appalling and humiliating to the community. So this is a \$5.2 million dollar project. 16 17 was stated to us it was a \$5.5 million dollar project. 18 And, when we asked what were they going to do in regards 19 to the existing property, such as the South Capital 2.0 corridor, Southern Avenue that you enter into the 21 building, Emil King stated that they didn't have any plans 22 to do any type of renovation to that front entrance. 23 We know about the safety. We know about the

hanging out in front of the 7-Eleven. And, on the whole

South Capital corridor, we know about the criminal acts

24

that occur.

2.0

So when they're talking about the safety and not securing the gates and things like that, the gate will be secured. But, when we talked, they never reached out to MPD to speak to MPD in regards to safety issues. They only came to the ANC to actually host these meetings.

And when they state an ongoing maintenance plan, DGS is a slumlord already. That property's been probably empty for over 20 years and the grass is known to be overgrown.

And to know that we have contaminated soil on that property, we stopped one project because they tried to put a farm there with fruits and vegetables. They found that the soil was contaminated and they can't really do nothing with the property.

So they come to ANC and say that they want to put a solar farm, which no one has any opposition against it. We do, would like our families over in Ward 8, which is the lower portion, low-income families, to receive a reduction from their energy bill.

However, I live one block away from this property. No one from Mr. Allen, I think that's his name, he never came over to my community. And, we have part of those 750 homes within my community and I'm a homeowner. I've been a homeowner for over ten years. Never got one

notice on my door.

2.0

So it's very upsetting that they have to come to the ANC and they say that they have an office. Yes, they do have an office because when they came to our meeting a month ago, we told them that they need to do some more outreach services. So, they provided the office up at William Lockbridge Library. That was a month ago.

You talk about the wildlife. It was known by MPD officers that talks to me. I'm a known ANC commissioner but I try my best to stay behind the scenes. But, MPD officers told us that they ride through the back of Oxon Run park and they find many deers back there dead and vultures eating off the deers. And, they're trying to figure out why is that?

Well, we know that the soil is contaminated. So, for GRID Alternative not to answer a lot of these questions that we have in regards to placing the solar panels onto the contaminated soil and we don't know.

Maybe those solar panels in years might sink and go into the contamination that they speak on. Don't nobody know what might occur. But, GRID Alternative is not providing accurate information.

What they say that some of these things are set in stone, even if it's the allocation of the benefits.

They already stated that they already know where the

1	benefits are going to. When Commissioner Jordon's been
2	asking them, will Ward 8 families get any part of that
3	benefit?
4	We don't want no CBA. We're not asking for
5	anything. But, we do have individuals in our community
6	that can benefit from it. If it's cutting the grass. If
7	it's security. They never even reached out to us with
8	this \$5. million dollars to even go into a CBA. And, I
9	just think it's really bad and damaging for our community.
LO	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right. So,
11	thanks, Commissioner. Thanks for coming down. So in the
12	letter that you sent last night, it seemed as though you
13	guys were, I'm a little confused. I mean, it seems as
L4	though you guys were taking a vote tomorrow to support the
15	project?
L6	MS. HENDERSON: Well, we're taking a vote
L7	tomorrow to support the project but there's many of us
18	that's, some of us are for it, some of us not, are not for
L9	it. So
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. But, you think that
21	you have the votes to support the project?
22	MS. HENDERSON: I'm not sure.
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right.
24	MS. HENDERSON: And, can I also add
25	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure.
ļ	1

1	MS. HENDERSON: that the letter that was
2	written was not written by me. It was written by
3	Commissioner Diop, who is our assistant chair for ANC 8D,
4	who has been in communication with GRID Alternative and
5	also Emil King in regards to the project.
6	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right. Does the
7	Board have any questions of the witness or the
8	commissioner, I should say?
9	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: I appreciate you coming
10	down. I know that it was not easy but you did well. It
11	was fine.
12	MS. HENDERSON: Thank you.
13	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: It sounds as though you
14	have concerns that are ongoing about things that are
15	happening currently at the site.
16	MS. HENDERSON: Yes.
17	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: And that because there
18	is money to, there's a budget to do this project that
19	there should be some way of also addressing some of the
20	other concerns that you, that the neighborhood has kind of
21	seen around here.
22	MS. HENDERSON: Correct.
23	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: And did you also say
24	that you weren't, you were notified about the project.
25	You just, or were you not notified about the project?

MS. HENDERSON: Well, they definitely came to us. However, the community, in regards to this hearing, if it's a three-lot land, there is one notice on the far end of First and South Capitol Street on that property.

But if they state that their entrance way is going to be Southern Avenue and South Capitol Street where most of the traffic is coming, there's no sign there.

There's no sign next to the Rite Aid that's adjacent to this property.

And even going out to the Rite Aid, paying that business respect, will be great because once they start a demolition or start the project, disturbing any type of field will bring rodents up to alert, you know, that business that maybe you should get an exterminator.

Even in the CBA, they could have said that if there's any rodents that will appear in the Rite Aid or the Walgreens, we will be, you know, liable or we will be held accountable to get them an exterminator because it can come from the project. They might as well as to spend the \$5.5 million on anything but the project itself.

VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: And I appreciate it and I think one of the good things about having the ANC here and you're at the table at the same table as the applicant is, is that they get to hear directly, you know, some of those concerns and then understand how they can address

2.0

1 those. And they'll have to figure that out themselves. I'm just saying it's helpful for you to be here 2 to be able to do that. So I appreciate your coming to 3 4 give us the testimony. 5 Thank you. MS. HENDERSON: And, Mr. Hart, I 6 also want to say at our last working session meeting, and 7 I stated this to Mr. King and he knows my feelings about 8 the whole project, when they stated that I was on the task 9 force and I never went onto that property and Mr. King 10 like pretty much laughed at us in a smirk through the 11 whole meeting. I had to let him like what's funny? 12 is not a funny matter right now. 13 I want to make sure that I'm included, not just as a task force member but the voice for those two 14 thousand residents that I represent within that deprived 15 16 It's very deplorable over there. So I just need 17 him to know that this is a serious matter and whenever he 18 comes to the table, it's no joke at all. 19 VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: Thank you. 2.0 Okay. Anybody else? CHAIRPERSON HILL: 21 I'd like to thank you for coming MEMBER WHITE: 22 by, too, because it's always good to get community 23 feedback and you've been living there a long time. 24 you know, that's why I kept asking about questions about

security and fencing and other things that popped up

today.

2.0

But were there any particular things that you wanted them to address? Maybe that will be in the letter. But were there any, were there like one or two items that you needed to be addressed in order to be comfortable with the project?

MS. HENDERSON: Yes. I need an address, their position on how they're going to clean up and take care of the property or DGS as it is right now today. There's a lot of loitering. There's a lot of hanging out, overgrown grass, trash, debris, just the security part.

And also the health concerns. They say solar panels is not a damage to the community. We told them that we wanted it far enough back that it doesn't play an effect on the community's health.

But it's just the blightness of the project and many people think that our area is becoming, it's going to look like an industrial area rather than an area up and coming like the rest of the District of Columbia.

MEMBER WHITE: Okay. Thank you. I think it would be helpful to maybe have some kind of response to what she just testified to just to be able to add some positive feedback from your organization because they are legitimate concerns.

I mean, it's a brown fill. So I know what a

1 brown fill is. There are all kinds of environmental 2 issues that are, that come with brown fills but there's also a process for cleanup and there's also a process to 3 be able to address some of their concerns. 4 So, I just wanted her to put that on the record 5 6 in case you're not here for the next part of the hearing 7 or discussion. 8 CHAIRPERSON HILL: So, actually before, just to 9 clarify, I quess, I mean, I quess, does anybody have any 10 more questions of the witness? I mean, sorry, of the Okay. So, now turning it over to you guys, 11 commissioner? 12 Mr. King. 13 So, my fellow Board member here had some 14 question about like responding to some of the comments. Т 15 mean, in terms of like the personal things, I mean, we're 16 just trying to figure out what's going on in terms of the 17 outreach to the community. 18 And I guess there were a list of things that 19 have been brought up from the ANC commissioner and, I 2.0 quess, Board Member White was curious as to your comments 21 on some of those. 22 Yes, so, generally, we did our very MR. KING: 23 best to respond to comments as they were raised at each 24 discussion and not only participated in community meetings

but also working sessions. And there was a cookout I

2 understanding what their concerns are. I believe, and we can share this documentation, 3 that we provided most if not all of those responses via 4 5 email since the very beginning. So recordkeeping is 6 really important to us. 7 We've tried to address concerns each time we 8 went back to, and we brought different individuals as 9 well, members of our team, to answer, you know, more 10 specific questions. 11 So, we supplied documentation with respect to 12 site contamination, what was there, our plans for, you know, various activities, prioritization of the benefits 13 and how we were thinking through some challenges. 14 15 So, yes, I think we've always done, to the best of our ability, to respond in a timely manner and will 16 17 continue to do so. 18 MR. WELLS: I would add a couple things. 19 is, and I think the commissioner's aware of this, that 2.0 while the agency's committed to working very closely with 21 the commissioner and the commission, that we also worked 22 very closely with the council member. And had the council 23 member select a number of who he thought should be on the task force for allocating the benefits in the community. 24

attended and just, you know, getting to know folks and

But then we went, not around the council

25

member, but we also tried to reach out to the ANC as well. Still assuming the council member is working with the ANC but also trying to be on the ground ourselves as the executive branch with our ANC as well.

So that, trying to be sure that that works together well and, at the same time, being sure that the council member's aware of exactly what we're doing and involved.

I can say that, again, that our team, you know, two things. One is that we understand and are committed to the ANC having an ongoing relationship that doesn't end with the approval of the project. It continues with the implementation and the management and the maintenance of the site.

That, you know, DGS does cover a lot of properties but this puts DOEE in a closer relationship with, as Mr. King noted, not only with our biologists and our other experts about how to manage the foliage, the trees, our arborist and such for the land who are currently not involved but through this project will be involved.

But also the issue of remediation that's there that Mr. King brought up, that letting the land settle for a period of time, we believe that ongoing, to some degree, and we need to work with the ANC on this, we have to try

2.0

to be sure that the ongoing contamination of the site's
not continuing from the private owners of the gas stations
around there from what we've been able to identify.

And that's should be and must be an ongoing
relationship with the ANC because that's a broader concern
in terms of contamination, primarily from petroleum
besides the dumping.

We do think that this will end the illegal dumping, which has an impact on the watershed and the Potomac and that creek. And we have a direct relationship through DOEE with the Environment Crimes Unit that you may be aware of that we've deployed with them to end illegal dumping that's hitting the watershed area and this will, obviously, be a part of that.

So, I do believe that by bringing in another agency with an area that's historically not been treated or managed well, that the community will be getting much greater attention by having both DOEE and DGS responsible.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Thanks, Director Wells. Mr. King, I guess we could, after this hearing, speak with the commissioner and just remove her name off the task force or whatever is that, you know, she didn't want to be involved in. And so that would be helpful.

Let's see. Do you guys have any questions for the commissioner?

2.0

1	MR. WELLS: Just to any degree that, you know,
2	we realize there's a task force but that doesn't supplant
3	the ANC. And so we're really still at the direction of
4	the ANC of how you want us to engage with the
5	neighborhood. That this task force does not replace the
6	ANC.
7	MS. HENDERSON: And I want to make sure that
8	everyone understands that my role at this table is an ANC
9	commissioner, not being a part of anybody's task force.
10	So I want to make sure that I'm providing my residents
11	along with ANC 8D accurate information.
12	And, also, when you site that, you know,
13	managing that area that's already deprived, even putting
14	the solar panels, as you all heard, have heard stated at
15	this meeting, they don't have no plans for any type of
16	security mechanism. So how could you manage anything if
17	you're not securing it?
18	And MPD is not here, they're here to prevent
19	it. In order for them to prevent crime, illegal dumping
20	or anything happening in our community, someone has to be
21	there actually securing their property and that's not the
22	case.
23	MR. WELLS: Let me reiterate that we have a
24	very close relationship, DOEE does, with the Environment
	1

Crimes Unit. So the first, there's really two aspects.

One is the property and the aspect of illegal dumping that's been going on there for a long time. We believe the fencing, along with quick repairs and managing maintenance of the fencing along with working with the Environment Crimes Unit will address that.

But then the second piece is what one of the Board members brought up. It's the issue of public safety. And the issue of public safety is, needs to be an ongoing relationship with the ANC and DOEE to see if the area, the issues of public safety are ameliorated or exacerbated by the installation along with the fencing.

And that is an ongoing relationship because we're your city agency. We work for you. And so that will be a continuing relationship to amend or change if it needs to be cameras, lights. As you know, whatever needs to be deployed to be sure that we did not create a public safety, that it helps rather than hurts what's already going on there.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So maybe after this hearing, also, you know, you all can have a continued dialogue with the commissioner that's here and, but so, again, Mr. King, you guys are presenting tomorrow, correct? They're just taking a vote and we're just going to see what happens?

MR. KING: That's our understanding, yes.

2.0

Т.	Chairperson nilli. Oray. All light. So a
2	couple of things before I turn to the Office of Planning.
3	I can't believe it's been that long before I turn to the
4	Office of Planning.
5	But there was a, the affidavit of maintenance
6	that you guys put in Exhibit 36, I guess it's dated
7	Monday, 5/20, so it's a little late. It needs to be dated
8	five days before the hearing. So I assume that you're
9	asking for a waiver from that time requirement, is that
LO	correct?
11	It's okay. It's a five-day requirement but so,
12	and you can't talk because you're over there. But that's
13	all right. So, I'm, what I'm asking you is I assume
L4	you're asking for a waiver of the five-day requirement?
L5	MR. WELLS: Yes.
L6	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So I don't really
L7	have a problem with that waiver or granting that waiver.
18	Does the Board have any issues with that?
L9	MALE PARTICIPANT: No, sir.
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right. So we'll
21	go ahead and grant the waiver for the five-day
22	requirement. Next, is that there is an expert in
23	engineering, Kyle Oliver, I guess that's not in the expert
24	book. There was another one for Paul Lanning but Mr.
25	Lanning is not here, correct? Oh, he is here.

1	MS. CROFT: No, John.
2	MR. LASKY: Oh, correct. I do have the, I'm
3	sorry. I probably should have gotten it to you.
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: That's all right. So,
5	first, is Mr. Lanning presenting right now?
6	MS. CROFT: So, John from Lightbox just
7	presented in lieu of Paul Lanning.
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. In lieu of Paul
9	Lanning. Okay. So you are then going to ask to be an
10	expert in solar energy? Oh, you didn't present. Did you
11	present?
12	MR. IZEVBIGIE: Yes, I did.
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: You did provide testimony.
14	Okay. So could you tell us about yourself, sir?
15	MR. IZEVBIGIE: No problem. I've worked with
16	Paul Lanning for about four years, now a consultant to
17	Lightbox Energy. We provide sustainability services to
18	DGS. I was a manager of their initial efforts to deploy
19	solar across the district and currently assist Paul
20	Lanning on an on and off basis.
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Does the Board have
22	any issues with this gentleman being, his testimony being
23	taken as an expert witness?
24	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: Do we have a resume
25	that's on is that what they're handing out here?

1	MR. LASKY: Yes, I have
2	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: I know they're handing
3	out something. I just couldn't see what it was.
4	MR. LASKY: I apologize for not getting that to
5	you immediately. I was trying to deal with the procedures
6	here but, yes, that is what, that is that right there.
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: Yes, that's fine. And
8	if you could just talk about your educational background?
9	MR. IZEVBIGIE: Yes, no problem. I have a
10	civil engineering undergraduate degree. I have a graduate
11	degree in mechanical engineering. I've worked in solar
12	for close to five years now. I'm currently an associate
13	at Strategic Advisory Firm in the D.C. area. We're
14	supporting corporations in their transition to renewable
15	energy so
16	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: How?
17	MR. IZEVBIGIE: In the solar space for quite a
18	while. And just to add, my graduate degree in mechanical
19	was, is a subset of that, it was specifically a clean
20	energy engineering degree as well, so.
21	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: I'm basically sure he's
22	smarter than we are, so I'm fine with this.
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. At least in solar, I guess.
24	Although, maybe in everything. I don't know. So, if you
25	could please, whoever handed this out, make sure this gets

1	submitted into the record, okay, the items that just got
2	handed out?
3	I see there was something about a fence detail
4	it looks like and then a photograph that I think you guys
5	spoke about during your presentation. And then now we
6	have the resume of your expert witness, which we're now
7	going to accept into the record.
8	Let's see. Mr. Oliver, we have your resume in
9	Exhibit 30C, I believe. And, is that correct? Okay. I
10	don't have an issue with Mr. Oliver being accepted as an
11	expert witness. Does anyone else?
12	FEMALE PARTICIPANT: I have no issue.
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right. So we're
14	going to accept you both as expert witnesses. I've taken
15	care of that. So now we're going to go ahead and turn to
16	the Office of Planning.
17	MS. VITALE: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair, members
18	of the Board. Elisa Vitale with the Office of Planning.
19	The Office of Planning recommends approval of the
20	requested special exception relief for a utility use in
21	the RA-1 zone.
22	I know that Commissioner Shapiro had a question
23	about the text amendment that's pending before the Zoning
24	Commission. I'm happy to provide a little bit more
25	information about that.

The Zoning Commission took emergency action in 1 2 Zoning Commission case 19-04. That emergency action would permit a community renewable energy facility as a matter 3 of right, subject to the yard and height requirements of 4 5 the zone in which the CREF is proposed. 6 That emergency expires on June 11th. 7 someone, you know, wanting to pursue a project under that 8 emergency would need to have secured all the necessary 9 building permits prior to that June 11th date. 10 The Office of Planning is continuing to work 11 with the Zoning Commission to refine the text amendment 12 and the Office of Planning is scheduled to go back to the Zoning Commission again on June 10th. 13 We anticipate on June 10th the Zoning 14 Commission could extend that emergency so that folks could 15 16 continue to proceed down the building permit path should 17 they choose to go that route. 18 Certainly, applicants, you know, like the case 19 before you today, who couldn't, you know, proceed under 2.0 the emergency, certainly have the option to come to the

Board of Zoning Adjustment for a special exception, you know, which is what we're considering today.

So there are options for moving forward and then, certainly, the Zoning Commission could take action to adopt formal modifications to the zoning regulations

21

22

23

24

that would, you know, change how community solar is 1 2 regulated in the future. Does the Board have 3 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. any questions for the Office of Planning? Ms. Vitale, if 4 5 you could just, I mean, for us, what we're tasked with, again, is going over the standard in terms of whether or 6 7 not to grant this. Could you just kind of provide a 8 little bit more analysis to how you think they're meeting 9 the standard? 10 Certainly, this special exception MS. VITALE: 11 relief is pursuant to Subtitle U, Section 203.1, and, like 12 I said, this is specific to a utility use. The first criteria speaks to electronic 13 14 equipment facilities. This is not an electronic equipment 15 facility so that's not applicable. The second item speaks to setbacks, screening 16 17 requirements or other safeguards that the Board of Zoning 18 Adjustment may deem necessary for the protection of the 19 neighborhood. 2.0 As we've discussed in detail today, the 21 applicant is proposing to meet all of the required 22 setbacks that would apply in the RA-1 zone. The applicant 23 is also proposing the eight-foot fence surrounding the 24 perimeter of the ground-mounted solar panel installation.

The applicant is also proposing landscaping to

screen and buffer the installation in addition to the proposed new tree and shrub plant material that's shown on the site plan in that kind of northeastern edge.

There is extensive existing vegetation that would also serve to screen the solar panels and that's located along, you know, the west and east and southern borders along the stream valley that's adjacent to where these panels would be installed.

And, certainly, you know, should the Board determine that additional screening or buffering is necessary, that could be included as a condition of the approval.

The third criteria, again, would not be applicable. And then also we look to the general special exception standards. So whether or not this would be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the zoning regulations.

The zoning regulations, you know, contemplate utility uses. There is the special exception requirement in certain zones so as stated previously, we think it meets the special exception review criteria for utility use in this zone. It would meet the side and rear yard requirements for the RA-1 zone.

The fencing, and landscaping, and existing stream buffers, we feel, would provide enough, you know,

2.0

1	separation from the adjoining uses. It is adjacent to,
2	you know, the district lines along the east side and then
3	the back of the commercial that fronts on South Capitol
4	Street to the north.
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Thank you. Does the
6	applicant have any questions for the Office of Planning?
7	Somebody's got to say no in the microphone.
8	MR. WELLS: No, we do not.
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. Does the
10	commissioner have any questions for the Office of
11	Planning?
12	MS. HENDERSON: No.
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. If you think about
14	something later, you just let me know. Okay. Let's see,
15	is there anyone here wishes to speak in support? Is there
16	anyone here wishes to speak in opposition? Okay. Now,
17	we're back to the end.
18	So, Commissioner, is there anything you'd like
19	to add in conclusion?
20	MS. HENDERSON: Well, just in conclusion, the
21	Office of Planning stated that the applicant agreed to
22	just to clean, just the beautification of the property as
23	a whole, around the property itself. I just, it'll be
24	great if we can have that in writing in moving forward.
25	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Well, it seems,

1	that's all right. So, it seems like tomorrow you're going
2	to have your ANC meeting and we'll see whether or not, you
3	know, Mr. King can give you anything that might try to get
4	your vote. And so we'll see what the ANC has to say.
5	So I do have one last thing to ask the
6	applicant, I suppose. DDOT had a condition concerning
7	their approval, which was the, close the existing curb cut
8	and restore the curb and tree box on South Capitol Street
9	SE. You guys are aware of that condition and are in
LO	agreement with that?
11	MR. KING: We're aware, yes.
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. And you're in
13	agreement with that?
L4	MR. KING: Yes.
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right. All
L6	right. Does the Board have any final questions they'd
L7	like to ask or anything? Okay. Then as I mentioned
18	before, we're going to go ahead and keep the record open
L9	for tomorrow's ANC meeting.
20	And so, Commissioner, you think you guys are
21	going to take a vote and in the letter that you didn't
22	write, it said that you would be able to respond within 48
23	hours to provide something to the Board. Do you still
24	think that's the case?
25	MS. HENDERSON: Yes, we'll provide something to

1	the Board by Friday morning.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Wonderful. So then,
3	in that case, the Board will be able to look at whatever
4	it needs to look at for a decision next week and if
5	filing, oh, that's right, we're off.
6	And then if we need to from the, based upon
7	whatever we get from the ANC, if we're interested in
8	reopening the record for a continued hearing, we can do
9	that as well.
LO	But otherwise, we're going to put this on for a
11	decision, Mr. Moy, for the week after we get back from our
L2	holiday, which is June 5th.
L3	MR. MOY: Yes, sir, June 5th.
L4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. So we'll go
15	ahead and do that for June 5th. We're going to take a
L6	quick three-minute break again. We're going to tread
L7	through as best we can. And thank you all very much.
L8	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off
L9	the record at 12:30 p.m. and resumed at 12:33 p.m.)
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right, Mr. Moy. Are we
21	back here again?
22	MR. MOY: Yes, sir.
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So we're going to
24	move some things around, everybody who's here again
25	because this is going to be a little different than I

thought.

2.0

First of all, is everyone here for the appeal that's taking place, which is, let me look for the number, which is 19896? So I'm just letting you all know that if the people for the appeal, if they're all here, whoever wants to come in and can hear.

I'm not calling anybody to the table yet. I'm just trying to make sure everybody's here. Okay. Some people are walking in. All right. Okay. So we're, so everybody's here because I just have to, kind of have to talk through some preliminary matters concerning the appeal.

And so what I'm going to try to do just so everybody else knows, we were going to try to hear the appeal after lunch but I think things might, there might be some preliminary matters that we're going to deal with with the appeal. So we're going to do that first and then we're going to have lunch. Okay

So if you're here and you're not the appeal, then you're going to be probably heard after lunch.

However, before we do hear the appeal, as I said, there were some preliminary issues that have come up.

So I would like to go ahead and make a motion to move to a closed session to seek legal counsel on the matter of the Appeal 19896 and ask for a second in order

1	to take a vote.
2	MEMBER JOHN: Second.
3	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, the motion is made and
4	seconded. Mr. Moy, could you please take a roll call
5	vote?
6	MR. MOY: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. When I
7	call a Board member's name, if you would reply, respond
8	with a yes or no? Mr. Peter Shapiro.
9	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Yes.
10	MR. MOY: Ms. White.
11	MEMBER WHITE: Yes.
12	MR. MOY: Chairman Hill.
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.
14	MR. MOY: Vice Chair Hart.
15	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: Yes.
16	MR. MOY: Ms. John.
17	MEMBER JOHN: Yes.
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So it appears as the
19	motion has passed. So we're going to go ahead and adjourn
20	now for a meeting with legal counsel. And so that might
21	take 15 minutes, something like this, 20 minutes. How
22	long does OAG take?
23	MS. CAIN: I'd say 20 minutes.
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Fine. So we're going
25	to go ahead and adjourn for 20 minutes and we'll be back

1	to hear the preliminary issues that I think we're going to
2	talk about for the appeal. And then, depending upon how
3	long that goes, we might break for lunch.
4	I suggest the people on the other cases still
5	stay until we actually adjourn for lunch just in case we
6	might be able to do one more case. But we'll see what
7	happens. Okay? Thank you.
8	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off
9	the record at 12:36 p.m. and resumed at 1:07 p.m.)
LO	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right, Mr. Moy.
11	Whenever you're ready, if you'd call the appeal.
12	MR. MOY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Board
13	is back in session and the time is about 1:08. If we can
L4	call parties to the table to Appeal Number 19896 of Adams
15	Morgan Friends and Allies.
L6	This caption advertised as an appeal from the
L7	decision made on August 3rd, 2018 by the zoning
18	administrator, Department of Consumer Regulatory Affairs,
19	to issue building permit no. B as in Bravo, 1800516, to
20	construct a new three-story 28-unit apartment house in the
21	RC-1 zone at 1731 Kalorama Road, NW Square, 2563 Lot 98.
22	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. First, a couple
23	things. Has everybody been sworn in?
24	MR. OTTEN: No.
25	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Has anyone else here
	I

1	not been sworn in? If you would, please stand. Anybody
2	who hasn't been sworn in, just go ahead and stand now and
3	take the oath administered by the secretary to my left.
4	(Witness sworn.)
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Thank you.
6	All right. First, let's go ahead and introduce ourselves
7	for the record from my right to left.
8	MS. LORD-SORENSEN: Good afternoon, Adrianne
9	Lord-Sorensen, Assistant General Counsel with the D.C.
10	Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs.
11	MR. LE GRANT: Matthew Le Grant, Zoning
12	Administrator, DCRA.
13	MR. OTTEN: My name is Chris Otten, co-founder
14	of Adams Morgan Friends & Allies.
15	MS. PRINCE: Alison Prince of Goulston & Storrs
16	here on behalf of the owner.
17	MR. HODGSON: Neal Hodgson with Petra Design
18	Build, Design Development. I represent Petra.
19	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, great. Could you
20	spell your last name for me?
21	MR. HODGSON: H-O-D-G-S-O-N.
22	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, great. Mr. Otten, if
23	you could turn off your microphone for me if you don't
24	mind.
25	So, okay, so, you guys, what's happened now is

1	that there are a lot of preliminary, or not a lot, there
2	are some preliminary issues that I'd like to try to get
3	through. So we already had kind of an emergency closed
4	meeting. We talked to the Office of the Attorney General.
5	And so we're not going to take any testimony today.
6	I wanted to go ahead and, you know, have you
7	guys come up before lunch so that we can go ahead and kind
8	of like figure out what we're going to do and then
9	reschedule you all.
10	So for everybody who's still here in the
11	audience, we're going to take lunch after we're done with
12	these preliminary matters. Okay? So there you go.
13	All right. I'm just curious, Ms. Lord-Sorensen,
14	can you try to speak into your microphone. Wow, this
15	switch
16	MS. LORD-SORENSEN: Hello.
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: actually works. Okay.
18	All right. All right. So I'm going to go through some of
19	these preliminary issues. There's several preliminary
20	issues that the Board would like the Board would like to
21	address on the record and also these, all of these issues
22	are going to be put in a memo so everybody can take a look
23	at the memo afterwards by the Office of Zoning.
24	First, the Board's deeply troubled by the

appellant's consistent late and incomplete filings in this

appeal. An appellant is required to provide substantive responses to each of the appeal filings required of Subtitle Y, Section 302, including demonstration of how an appellant has standing and the statement of the alleged violations with all evidence and anticipated testimony.

Any supplemental information additional to that required with the initial filing must be submitted by at least 21 days prior to the hearing. Yet, appellant only submitted its statement on standing yesterday at 6:18 p.m. This prevents the other parties from responding and the Board from reviewing and considering the relevant submissions.

With regards to the motions to dismiss, the Board notes that the first writing rule under Y302.5, establishes that only the first writing of a decision can be appealed and that modifications can only be appealed to the extent of the modification.

In this case, that means that if this appeal of Building Permit B1800516 is dismissed, that the appellant is barred from appealing that permit. If that permit is later revised, that revised permit may be appealed but only to the extent of the changes.

The Board is aware that the property owner has submitted a timely motion to dismiss the appeal for lack of standing and failure to state a claim. The issue of

2.0

the appellant's standing impacts both the underlying appeal and the motion to dismiss.

While the Board is aware that the appellant has filed a response opposing dismissal on the basis of standing, the appellant still has not formally provided written authorization of its agent, Chris Otten, to represent its interests before the Board as required by Subtitle Y302.10. The appellant is, therefore, procedurally unable to present a counter-argument to the substantive elements of the property owner's motion. That's why we're trying to get through this so we can actually hear from everybody.

To allow the Board to properly consider the motion to dismiss the appellant's response, the Board has decided to hold the motion in abeyance until June 5th to allow the appellant an opportunity to correct the underlying authorization and standing issues. The appellant will have one week to submit the following information.

On the matter of standing, the appellant shall provide documentation of Adams Morgan Friends & Allies, AFMA's status as a community organization such as bylaws, names and addresses of members, dates, agendas of public meetings, and any resolutions related to this appeal.

We do need written authorization from AFMA for

2.0

Chris Otten to serve as it's representative before the Board in this matter per Subtitle Y, 302.10.

We also need a written explanation of which specific AFMA members are claiming to be particularly aggrieved by the issuance of building permit B1800516 and the specific nature of those grievances based on the zoning regulations per Subtitle Y, 302.12(f) and (g).

This information will be due to the record by 11:59 p.m. on Wednesday, May 29th. DCRA and the property owner will have one week to file any responses to the appellant's filing including the one submitted on May 21st. These responses will be due by 11:59 on June 5th. The Board will take up this appeal along with any preliminary motions on June 12th.

Any questions regarding the filings or the hearings can be directed to the Office of Zoning. A procedural memo will be submitted to the record on IZIS documenting the requested information and the appropriate deadlines.

The Board would like to note that while the property owner has filed an application to revise the original building permit, DCRA has yet to issue a revised permit. As such, the only subject of this appeal and associated motions in the original building permit,

B1800516. Any future revisions of the permit will

2.0

become part of the appeal only if issued and only, if then, incorporated into the appeal. If this appeal is dismissed or withdrawn, any appeal of a subsequent revision to the permit would be necessarily limited to the revisions proposed by the revised permit, not those retained aspects of the original permit.

So again, if there's any further questions, they can be directed to the Office of Zoning. So, Mr. Moy, did you get all that in terms of what dates we're going to do and what times?

MR. MOY: Yes, sir.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So okay. So that's All right. Does the Board have any other questions or issues that they have to talk about? Okay. All right. Then we'll see you guys on the date that we set forward and for everybody else, we're not taking any testimony. We're not asking any questions. There's nothing we're going to say. We're just going, you know, as of now, there was nothing. The main reason is I don't have somebody in front of me that I can actually talk to in terms of the written authorization. So there was no point in talking to anybody. So with that, we'll go to lunch and hopefully we'll be back around 2:00. Thank you all very much.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

1	the record at 1:15 p.m. and resumed at 1:57 p.m.)
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right. Mr. Moy,
3	whenever you like.
4	MR. MOY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Board
5	is back in session from its lunch recess and the time's
6	about 2:11 p.m.
7	So I believe the next case before the Board and
8	I see the applicant's entourage is entering the hearing
9	chamber. This is Case Application 19-929 of 614 Otis,
LO	LLC.
11	This application is captioned and advertised
12	for a special exception under the residential conversion
13	requirements, Subtitle U, Section 320.2.
L4	This would construct a rear addition and
15	convert an existing attached principal dwelling unit to a
L6	three-unit apartment house, RF-1 zone at 614 Otis Place
L7	NW, Square 30, 3035, Lot 63.
18	The Board last heard this on March 20th, 2019,
19	and continued the hearing to today's hearing session.
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Thank you. Would the
21	parties come to the table? Okay. Great. If you would
22	please introduce yourselves for the record from my right
23	to left?
24	MR. CROSS: Michael Cross, architect.
25	MR. MEEKINS: Bert Meekins, private designer.

1	MR. GREGG: John Gregg, owner.
2	MR. DUNCAN: Adrian Duncan, owner.
3	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Mr. Gregg, you
4	decided to join us at the table today? Yes. Okay. All
5	right. Mr. Cross, are you going to be presenting to us?
6	MR. CROSS: Initially, yes.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right. So if you
8	want to go ahead and tell us what happened since the last
9	time you were here and I guess we'll just start from
10	there.
11	Why don't you guys just go ahead and go through
12	it? I can't remember how far we got. I think but I'll
13	put 15 minutes on the clock, Mr. Moy, just so I know where
14	we are.
15	And, Mr. Cross, why don't you just start with
16	that and we'll see where you get to.
17	MR. CROSS: Yes. Michael Cross. Appreciate
18	you having us back. As discussed, we presented originally
19	on March 20th. We did have a pretty lengthy conversation
20	at that time.
21	This case is seeking relief from 320.2 for a
22	three-unit conversion in an RF-1 zone. It's at 614 Otis
23	Place, which is the south side of the block between Park
24	Place and Water Street.
25	In an effort to reduce the impact of an

addition directly off the rear of this existing home, the design being proposed is a courtyard scheme, which maintains a two-family size principal volume and adds an additional family-size unit in the rear carriage house style addition.

The proposed construction is conforming with the requirements of U320.2, with two exceptions. The first being, we're seeking a waiver from the ten-foot rule regulating the projection of the rear addition -- so to be able to make space for our rear addition off the back of the row house in an effort to maintain light and air for the adjacent neighbors.

The second of which is seeking a waiver from the architectural rooftop provision, architectural rooftop element provision in order to be able to provide a new mansard and dormer that is compatible with the area so to avoid the project looking like an out-of-context pop-up.

While we posted an extensive and thorough response letter into the Exhibit, number 43, I thought I'd simply touch on three key issues here in the opening statement today.

And first to note for the record, I'm presenting from Exhibit 44, which may be erroneously labeled as superseded in the case log.

At our initial hearing, there was a question

2.0

1	about the proposed connection conforming with
2	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Mr. Chair?
3	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure. Go on.
4	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: I just to make sure that
5	we're clear on what you're talking about then. You're
6	talking about 44 versus 45?
7	MR. CROSS: That's correct. We have an
8	additional set of plans in the record should we need them.
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: So which one are the
10	which one are the plans where
11	MR. CROSS: 44 is the plan set that we are -
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Exhibit 44?
13	MR. CROSS: presenting here today.
14	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: So you're saying 45 is
15	just kind of like a plan B?
16	MR. CROSS: Potentially, yes.
17	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Okay. Thank you.
18	MR. CROSS: At our initial hearing, there was a
19	question about the proposed connection conforming with the
20	definition of meaningful connection as outlined in
21	Subtitle B, Section 309.1.
22	We did meet with the Zoning Department at DCRA
23	on April 22nd, following our meeting with you and got
24	verbal approval based on the proposal we presented
25	previously and presenting here today.

1	And we were able to get that in writing just a
2	day or two ago and posted it into the record on May 20th
3	from the Zoning Administrator and that is Exhibit 52 of
4	the case log.
5	That meaningful connection is shown in pages 24
6	and 25 of the exhibit.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Of 44?
8	MR. CROSS: Of 44, yes. And on the screen here
9	now.
10	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Right. I mean, actually,
11	Mr. Cross, now I'm remembering everything more clearly. I
12	think we just going to we'd just like to end up
13	starting to ask question, because it'll be an easier way
14	to kind of go through some of this perhaps.
15	And so if you would, if you just want to go
16	back to that well, go back to that very first slide
17	that you showed me with the or showed us, I suppose?
18	Yes. There you go.
19	So how much room is behind that between the
20	rear of the property between the rear addition and the
21	property line? Are you guys going to put parking back
22	there?
23	MR. MEEKINS: Yes. There's two proposed spaces
24	back there and there's 20 feet in the rear.
25	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. And then, the two

1	adjoining neighbors, you guys already have their support?
2	MR. CROSS: I believe we have the support of
3	the one resident owner. The other property's vacant.
4	(Simultaneous speaking.)
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Which one's the vacant one?
6	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: In this image?
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.
8	MR. DUNCAN: In this and the property, that
9	would be on the right side is the vacant one.
10	CHAIRPERSON HILL: So vacant means you haven't
11	been able to find the owner?
12	MR. DUNCAN: It is under construction and we
13	have reached out but have heard nothing back. On the
14	other side, 616 Otis Place, there's a resident owner,
15	Buckrey Jamison, and he is supporting our project and was,
16	in fact, guided it.
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. And so the when
18	you say, in fact, guided it, right, he wanted to see this
19	solution rather than trying to go back all the way,
20	meaning joining it together and just going back farther?
21	MR. DUNCAN: Correct. He didn't like the idea
22	of a large addition on the main principal front structure.
23	He preferred setting it back with a courtyard design.
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. And have you guys
25	spoken to all the other neighbors on this block? Have you

1	gotten any feedback from them?
2	MR. DUNCAN: Yes. I have. I've been there at
3	least nine times that I documented and we have, I believe,
4	24 signatures of neighbors that was also submitted to the
5	record as an exhibit.
6	MR. DUNCAN: Okay. And you went
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: That's Exhibit
8	MR. DUNCAN: to the ANC and you got their
9	support. The vote was 12-0. And so the ANC didn't say
10	anything about the I mean, again, and I know that you
11	all were here the you all were here the last time.
12	And so it's a new solution or it's not a new
13	solution, it's a solution that we haven't seen a lot of.
14	Right?
15	And so we've seen them before in terms of,
16	like, they've been on the end and so it's again something
17	that I kind of am trying to just understand from the
18	Office of Planning in terms of how this works.
19	And I guess I'm just going to go right to my
20	thing, which is that, you know, is this character scale
21	and pattern of housing along the street or alley, it's
22	basically the alley. Right?
23	And the reason why I'm just trying to talk this
24	through is I believe, you know, whether you can make the
25	case or not for the meaningful connection, I think it

т	seems like you're going to be able to make that case.
2	And then, it just turns out, is this now what
3	we're just going to see and from the next photo that you
4	had which had the aerial photo, I guess, of the whole
5	block. If you go to the next slide there, I think it was?
6	I think maybe it's the first one you showed
7	me showed us. Yes. So, you know, they're all long
8	lots and they're all, you know, have this possible
9	solution, you know, that you could possibly get to.
LO	So then, I guess in terms of the mansard roof,
11	the one that you're proposing is the one that's in the top
12	left corner? Is that correct, Mr. Cross?
L3	You're proposing that mansard roof that I see
L4	in the top left corner of you slide? Yes?
L5	MR. CROSS: Yes. The proposed is the
L6	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes. And then the other
L7	solution that you think the Office of Planning is going to
18	sign off on is the one that's set back, the compromise?
L9	MR. CROSS: The other solution illustrating the
20	alternate option is set back.
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: And that's what you think
22	the Office of Planning might sign off on?
23	MR. CROSS: It seems like that is what they are
24	indicating they would have greater support for. Again,
25	the proposal we're presenting here today is one that was
	I and the state of

1	vetted with the community and
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: He has to go back perhaps?
3	MR. CROSS: supported by the ANC over the
4	alternate.
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Over the alternate, right.
6	The ANC and I'm not necessarily saying that we would
7	possibly, you know, split with the Office of Planning on
8	the mansard roof.
9	I just want to get the clarity around what
10	you're trying to do. So yes. Does I mean, Mr. Cross
11	can continue with his presentation and/or we can start
12	asking questions.
13	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: I mean, might just go
14	to the questions.
15	MR. CROSS: Okay.
16	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: So if you could just
17	walk through the meaningful connection, because I think
18	that that was something and I do appreciate the images
19	because they did help me understand this better.
20	It wasn't clear to me the on the, I think
21	this is west side, the new development that's being
22	that's being that's, I guess, being under construction
23	now, that side is I wasn't sure what the where the
24	grade was in the backyard there and so it was little bit

unclear as to how that grade was hitting your connection

1	or at least would be at the connection? Because I think
2	there's a fence there now.
3	So I just wanted to understand that. Yes.
4	Really was what was this piece where that grade was.
5	Because at one point, I thought it was actually higher.
6	But I think that it's actually fairly flat and
7	that this is sitting on top of that and then, you could go
8	down into the basement or cellar level of your building
9	via this connection.
10	MR. CROSS: I believe that's largely true. The
11	images on your screen, specifically number 27, does show
12	how our volume is not significantly taller than a matter
13	of right fence that you might find between the two
14	properties.
15	Specifically, regarding the meaningful
16	connection and grade, I think the diagrams on 24 and 25
17	speak to that with the most specificity.
18	The grade is best illustrated by number 24
19	where the grade line in the rear is illustrated by the red
20	dashed line.
21	And as you can see, the connection volume there
22	is a hundred percent above grade in terms of the local
23	grade there in the court and the connection through the

space is illustrated in section there on BZA case, page

25.

Where the connection while at the front is entering on the cellar level, you can see that when it makes the actual connection, it is at grade or above grade. And that is the element that we reviewed with the Zoning Administrator. I do believe you're correct that some of the initial materials submitted are unclear simply because architectural standards, you can see that the floor plates of the two building are off. So when we're showing first floor cuts, they happened to end up on different levels. So I think that's where maybe some of the initial confusion lay. VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: I think the initial confusion for me was that we didn't have an understanding of where -- I mean, this red line is new in this and so it wasn't very clear in any of the drawing where that grade was on that property. And I want to say to the west. Is that to the It doesn't matter, but that property that's on the -- yes, the left-hand side, this property -- sorry. that property here. Just trying to understand what that grade was There just wasn't any drawing -- there in the rear. weren't any drawings that showed that.

You provided information now that I'm

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

1	understanding where that grade is. So it's clear to me
2	where that how that connection it sits on the ground or
3	at least sits on the property.
4	So the other question on if you go back to
5	Page 23 of this, so the
6	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: This one?
7	MR. CROSS: No.
8	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: This one. So can you
9	
10	okay. This yes. Can you go back one? Because one of
11	them I don't know. I'm looking at on 44, there's
12	page 23 there is it.
13	Page 23 has this says top of ADU. So what
14	you're doing is comparing what an accessory dwelling unit
15	what a separate building size might be with regard to
16	this? Is that what I'm reading?
17	MR. CROSS: That's correct. I think the most
18	proper term for that would be top of accessory building.
19	The use being dwelling is probably irrelevant to this
20	discussion.
21	But a matter of right accessory building is
22	shown and I'm going to flip back, if you don't mind, to
23	24, because it's just a little bit more zoomed in.
24	It shows that volume in this diagram as well

and I think the point here is first that the gray shadow

1 above the rear proposed mass shows that prior to coming to 2 the Board, in working with the community, we had already conceded seven feet from the matter of right height 3 allowable for this volume. 4 And how the volume with the diagonal hatch, 5 that being a matter of right accessory building, the 6 7 footprint is not largely dissimilar from the 450 square 8 foot footprint allowable in this zone. 9 And that the height is only eight feet taller 10 than that accessory structure would be allowed and the sort of conclusion there is if you see the line of our 11 12 proposed structure, it lands almost perfectly halfway 13 between the matter of right height of a principal building 14 and that of an accessory building. VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: 15 No. I understood that and I think you also -- is the rooftop -- is there rooftop 16 17 access in this image for the building that's in the rear 18 or the whatever you want to call that? We do still show roof decks in all 19 MR. CROSS: 2.0 the floor plans. 21 VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: So -- because it's a 22 little unclear in this, it looks like there isn't a 23 railing around this. So I don't know how you're doing

that and I thought I'd seen in one of the drawings that

So I was a little bit --

there wasn't one.

24

1	MR. CROSS: So you're correct. Some of the
2	illustrations, because we were preparing multiple options,
3	some of the illustrations are not completely accurate per
4	the version we're looking at.
5	The version presented here is to include a roof
б	deck and mansard roof on the front as illustrated in the
7	plans and elevations for this proposal.
8	The front façade is showing the mansard roof
9	with dormer on BZA 12. And you can see the roof deck on
10	the top of that principal structure in 14.
11	And if you flip to 13 and 15, the elevations of
12	that rear most volume, you'll also see the roof deck and
13	exterior access to it on the rear volume.
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Cross, so that
15	meaningful connection, again, so it's a three-unit
16	apartment house so that people are walking through that
17	connection to get to the third unit?
18	MR. CROSS: Yes. The meaningful connection
19	provides both the primary entrance for the rear most
20	volume. Right? So they're entering from the front
21	through that hallway and into their dwelling unit there in
22	the rear.
23	It also serves as the rear access for trash and
24	parking for the front two units.
25	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Right. So it's just it's

1	basically, like, I don't know where you can show me this.
2	It's basically, like, a hallway?
3	MR. CROSS: That's correct.
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: So everybody gets to use it.
5	And then to go well, actually you got it right there.
6	That gray, when you say the matter of right, that again is
7	matter of right if you, in fact, do have a meaningful
8	connection? The gray volume?
9	MR. CROSS: Yes. It's matter of right building
LO	height for a principal building in the RF-1 zone and with
11	the meaningful connection as established by the Zoning
L2	Administrator that would be the matter of right height for
L3	this floor.
L4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Got it. Okay. All right.
L5	We're just going to jump right in the conversation.
L6	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: Yes. Actually, just if
L7	you could get to the sun studies? Because I think that
18	the impacts are and this is, I think, why I was
L9	thinking that it was that I thought that it was the
20	building I thought it was east, west. I realize now
21	that the building is actually facing the north. So the
22	top of this is actually the south.
23	MR. CROSS: That's right.
24	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: Okay. Which is a
25	little bit odd to kind of deal with because otherwise the

shadows look a little different. But if you could talk a 1 2 little bit about -- because you didn't actually provide a kind of matter of right like, what a ten foot might be? 3 These images, what I'm talking about is, you --4 You can go back to them. That's fine. 5 know. The area 6 that we're talking about is this area here, which is not 7 -- which doesn't have any shadow, because there's, of 8 course, no building there. And then, this area here, 9 which is now in shadow at this point in time and I just 10 noted that that happens at several times during -- in the 11 shadow study. So if you could, talk a little bit about 12 how that is not more impactful on the light and air for 13 the neighbor. And I understand that the neighbor may have 14 signed off on it. 15 But the neighbor signs off on it but we have to actually independently look at what the impacts are to be 16 17 able to then say, yes. We kind of agree with that or we 18 may disagree with it. 19 But right now, I'm just trying to understand it 2.0 So if you could just talk about that a and if -- ves. bit? 21 22 MR. CROSS: So first off, as referenced before, 23 we've got a pretty lengthy response letter in Exhibit 43, 24 which does reference the matter of right solar studies

versus the proposed.

It's specifically, I believe, Item 10, Figure 3, showing the matter of right, but in any case, I think that there is shading of these rear yards already existing today at various points during the day.

And that the amount of light and air being observed at the rear of the existing properties by the neighbors may not be the same as what we're seeing in our solar studies, because, yes, there's a shadow from the building.

But they are seeing the entire sky dome above them without the wall of a big apartment building being immediately next to them.

So they have a bigger space that they're within. Effectively, they're within a courtyard as well and that was a more desirable experience as communicated to us by the neighbors and possibly the broader community — than having a wall immediately next to their existing house and a similar shadow, again, and that's based on the ten foot matter of right solution.

VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: And you also found there was -- did the next-door neighbor have any questions about privacy in that they will now be -- if you had a building that was a matter of right, the windows would be on the back looking toward the back.

In this case, you have a building that's now --

2.0

	139
1	whatever, 30 feet away from the back of well, 30, maybe
2	more than that, but about 30 feet away from the back of
3	their house that now have windows looking toward them,
4	which is not a case in the matter of right scenario.
5	MR. DUNCAN: Yes. I met with Mr. Jamison in
6	his home on three occasions and he made it abundantly
7	clear that his opinion, after we came back to him with
8	different options, was he preferred courtyard.
9	And his view of this was that we would no
10	longer have this core exterior staircase providing access
11	to all the units where the new neighbors would be out on
12	their rear decks, which would be sort of immediately if
13	you look at the Figure 2 in our response on Page 4, you

can see that each level would have had a deck and a staircase whereby the new residents would have accessed their units.

And he felt by removing that, he would have more privacy from a rear structure that was sort of moved to the -- moved the massing to the rear of the lot, even if they have windows that are facing both sides.

VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: Okay. I appreciate the responses and, again, our job is to understand what the impacts are and how we believe that that's meeting the standard in the zoning regs.

But I do appreciate the responses and the

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

1	information that you provided. I did see it. I just
2	wanted to hear you all talk about that a little bit in
3	a little bit more detail. So thanks.
4	MEMBER JOHN: So can we go back to the image of
5	the block that shows the mansard roofs? Thank you. So
6	are you saying that you spoke to each of the neighbors
7	along that portion of the block, including Mr. Jamison?
8	MR. DUNCAN: Yes, Board Member John. That is
9	correct. I spoke to all neighbors, in fact, on both sides
10	of the block and number 20 in our response, we, in fact,
11	zoomed in on the different responses there from the
12	neighbors.
13	Specifically, with this block of seven unique
14	oversized lots, where they all have the same roof line.
15	There it is. Correct. So everybody there, but I also
16	sought feedback from everyone on the block.
17	Even people that were further up the block to
18	the west that wouldn't even see this necessarily and
19	across the street, of course. I thought their opinion was
20	really valuable because they would be the ones that would
21	look at it every single day.
22	And I wanted it to be something that they were
23	onboard with.
24	MEMBER JOHN: Thank you. So can you go back or
25	maybe pull up an image of the alternate proposal, which is

to set back the third floor from the front of the building 2 and maintain the mansard roof? So I think I'm going to stay within 3 MR. CROSS: this response document, Exhibit 43. Because it's 4 5 addressed in Item 42, Figure 12, I believe -- showing how if we were to maintain that front mansard condition and 6 7 basically, provide a conforming third floor with a setback 8 from the existing architectural rooftop element's ridge 9 line -- the resulting mass is one that, I guess 10 subjectively, we, and I believe Commissioner Bass is in 11 agreement with this, feel is the pop-up that folks have 12 been objecting to -- and that we were looking to provide a 13 higher quality architectural design that was more compatible with the character of the neighborhood than 14 15 something that was simply conforming and possibly not 16 compatible. 17 MEMBER JOHN: So on this design, could you not include a mansard roof as well instead of the box? Could 18 19 you merge the two things so it doesn't look like a box? 2.0 The zoning administrator --MR. CROSS: No. 21 the code section for architectural rooftop element uses 22 the terms remove, modify or extend. 23 MEMBER JOHN: Yes. 24 And so any type of connection and MR. CROSS: extension would be a modification of that rooftop element 25

1	and not allowed. It would require the same relief.
2	MEMBER JOHN: Yes. Sure. You would need the
3	same relief.
4	MALE PARTICIPANT: Set back.
5	MEMBER JOHN: You would set back the third
6	floor and create the mansard effect with the setback and
7	then, my second question is what would be the line of
8	sight from the third floor across the street?
9	Could you see that this third floor in this
10	design across the street? Because I may as well get to
11	what my question is.
12	I particularly don't like breaking up this
13	block, which has this uniform view of, you know, mansard
14	roofs all along that portion of the block.
15	I would make a distinction as the Chairman's
16	said, I don't know if he agrees with me, that perhaps if
17	this design, as in your preferred option, would be closer
18	to the end?
19	But I see no distinction between what you've
20	proposed and, you know well, this pop-up, in a way. It
21	just breaks the line of sight for that row and I don't
22	know. Go ahead.
23	MR. DUNCAN: Thank you, Board Member John. I
24	appreciate that feedback because I agree that there
25	doesn't seem to be much of a difference as far as how it

1 breaks up this row of homes. And that is why we tried to go with something 2 that would be a better design both architecturally and 3 contextually as it relates to the dormer windows that are 4 5 found on the properties -- on the homes across the street. 6 And furthermore, we -- I think we spoke about 7 this in our response, but I'll just touch on it either 8 By setting it back, it creates, like, a bathtub roof 9 condition, which we would then be passing on to future 10 owners, which makes drainage problems. 11 And that is one of the biggest issues from a 12 building perspective with this three-foot setback because 13 you have the original mansard and then, the rear of it 14 actually slopes down a little bit. 15 And then, you have to get -- now they've said three feet away from the rear of that slope down before 16 17 you go up. 18 So then, you create this bathtub on the roof 19 where you either need to drain it back down through the 2.0 house or try to get it out the front and create a 21 perforation. 22 But it just creates lots of issues and it

MEMBER JOHN: So the three foot is a minimum.

doesn't look as good either is our take and the entire

neighborhood supported that.

23

24

1	It's not a maximum. Right? Could you go further back?
2	The reason I ask, I've seen designs that are set back 15,
3	20 feet from the front where you can't really see that
4	addition.
5	And it doesn't disturb the view of the top of
6	the houses, you know, because you look at them from across
7	the street. So we see those designs all the time.
8	MR. DUNCAN: Correct. We could, but we have
9	decided not to do so because it's an urban setting with
10	limited space and to be able to have a bedroom count that
11	is more appropriate based on feedback from community
12	stakeholders which emphasized repeatedly that the core
13	character of the neighborhood changes when smaller units
14	are built, because it doesn't allow people to begin a
15	family or grow into their space.
16	And it accelerates the turnover period for
17	housing and sets up a cycle of transient neighbors who are
18	less invested in the neighborhood.
19	The existing neighbors were clear about not
20	wanting housing that has a short shelf life in the natural
21	progression of a family and that's why we are not setting
22	that back further.
23	And that's we have that's also why the
24	courtyard design was made to address their concerns.

COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Mr. Chair? So I can't

1	find a picture of your proposed elevation with the pushed
2	forward mansard roof in the context of the row. Do you
3	have one?
4	Not that one. The one you're actually the
5	one you want to do. I see the one that you want to do. I
6	just don't see it in the context of the neighboring
7	houses.
8	(Off-microphone comments.)
9	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: I'm not sure that's the
10	only question that I have. So if you if there's a way
11	to track that down in some way while we're talking or
12	perhaps the other
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Sure. No that's
14	fine. Thanks. I guess, you can take a look at that. I'm
15	going to actually I think we're just going to have a
16	lot of questions with this.
17	This is just going to take a while. So I'm
18	going to turn it to the Office of Planning and I think
19	Office of Planning is just going to repeat their report,
20	but I don't know.
21	So go ahead, Office of Planning, because I got
22	some questions for the Office of Planning.
23	MS. ELLIOTT: I can't wait.
24	Good afternoon, Members of the Board, Chairman
25	of the Board. I'm Brandice Elliot representing the Office

of Planning and the Office of Planning continues to recommend approval of the conversion itself.

And we are recommending approval of the waiver for the rear addition that has been requested, but we are recommending and continue to recommend denial for the removal of the rooftop architectural element.

So there have been a lot of questions and I'm not sure that I have a completely organized way of going through some of the ones that have been asked.

I know the issue of the meaningful connection has been addressed. There is the issue of -- one of the other outstanding issues that we really haven't discussed a whole lot is whether the rear massing -- that the rear mass -- the rear portion of the addition is actually compatible with existing structures in the alley? But the applicant did provide a lot of photographs and some more context demonstrating that it is compatible.

Although the other detached structures along the alley on the same side tend to be single -- or I'm sorry, single level, there are larger apartment buildings and some larger structures on the other side of the alley.

So we do continue to think that that rear structure is compatible with some of the existing forms that you see there. We do continue to have an issue regarding the roof deck on the rear portion of the

2.0

addition.

2.0

The roof deck is permitted by right in this scenario because it's connected to the main dwelling, but we're concerned that because it sort of acts as a detached structure, that perhaps we want to maintain that detached structure character, which doesn't allow roof decks.

And so we do continue to be opposed to the inclusion of a roof deck on the rear mass. But there's no issue with the roof deck on the primary -- or on the front portion of the development.

And the applicant has indicated that it complies with all the regulations. And we also saw a rendering of the meaningful connection itself demonstrating what the neighbors would see.

And we feel a little more comfortable with how that, you know, with -- yes, with how that will appear for the neighbor adjacent to it since it really is just a small extension above an existing fence line.

I'll go ahead and let it sit there. And I'm happy to take any questions you have.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: So yes. So there's -- so you guys, the applicants, you guys gotten rid of the roof deck on the -- I mean, it's not on this picture, but I don't know where the drawings are.

You still have the roof deck on the second

1	whatever the addition. Is that correct?
2	MR. CROSS: We are still asking for that
3	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So then, when you say
4	it's a matter of right, Office of Planning, so we would
5	have to put in a condition that they don't have or it
6	would just be to the approved plans or we'd have a
7	condition that says they can't ever put a roof deck up
8	there?
9	MS. ELLIOTT: So some of the drawings show a
10	roof deck and it looks like some of the more recent ones
11	don't. So I think that the Board would probably have to
12	specify whether or not you'd want to see the roof deck on
13	that rear portion.
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: But then, would you need a
15	condition for it? Because if we didn't and I'm just
16	kind of curious. So then, it would be to the approved
17	plans and the approved plans wouldn't have a roof deck.
18	But you wouldn't have to have a condition
19	necessarily saying that a roof deck couldn't ever be put
20	there?
21	MS. CAIN: If your if the approved plans
22	don't show them and that's what the order is going to be
23	approved to, then I wouldn't think you would need a
24	condition on top of that.
25	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. But

1	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: But the issue is that
2	the roof the plans are not consistent. So there are
3	some floor plans that actually show it, that image that
4	you saw, which is the kind of perspective,
5	computer-generated rendering, that actually did not show
6	it.
7	The section that I talked about earlier, that
8	didn't show it, but there are some sections and are some
9	other plans and drawings that do show it.
10	So I don't think we could talk about the
11	we'd have to talk about, literally, specific images that
12	we were or pages of the drawings that did not include
13	or actually, that included it, because it is very
14	unclear through the various images.
15	And I understand that as the architect has to
16	go through doing iterations, sometimes you just you
17	kind of miss a few things. So I kind of understand that
18	I'm just saying that out of the drawings that
19	we have, there are two different things that we have
20	(Simultaneous speaking.)
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I'm sorry. Yes. I mean,
22	we'll figure it out. I'm just kind of getting clear on
23	something. Commissioner Shapiro?
24	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
25	Question for the Office of Planning. The reason why you

would oppose the roof deck on the rear section, let's call 1 2 it that, that's strictly around privacy for the neighbors? MS. ELLIOTT: Correct. The character that's 3 intended for detached structures is intended to be lower 4 scale and the issue of privacy does come into play. 5 Ι mean, this is already a taller detached structure. 6 7 Any quardrail is just going to continue to add 8 height to it and so our preference is that it remains 9 lower profile and that the privacy of the neighbors would 10 continue to be, I guess, you know, protected. COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: You know, I appreciate 11 12 you describing that. I mean, this -- I think this is for discussion for us as a Board, but I'm not quite sure why I 13 get how the roof deck on the rear section would somehow 14 15 provide more -- less of a -- or more of a privacy issue 16 than what the -- you could do by right on the main 17 structure. 18 So I'm going -- I guess I hear the words you're 19 I don't quite get -- is it about some kind of 2.0 precedent that we're afraid of setting with this? 21 this is kind of an in between approach. 22 MS. ELLIOTT: You know, it all goes back to the 23 intent of the zoning regulations and detached structures were intended to be lower profile. So I think that 24

because this -- the rear mass resembles a detached

1	structure, we would want to maintain the intent that's
2	sort of been set in the zoning regulations into how we
3	in how we treat that structure. Hope that helps.
4	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: I hear you. Yes. Thank
5	you. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
6	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Just another quick one. So
7	the and I don't know if the applicant can pull up that
8	thing that had the gray shading on the detached structure
9	on the matter of right?
10	Yes. No. Yes. Thank you so much. So the
11	matter of right, which is apparently this gray that
12	they've come down. So would that be matter of right?
13	I don't I'm asking the Office of Planning,
14	like, you know, that's thank you. That's a meaningful
15	connection.
16	They've made a meaningful connection. Right?
17	And so they can argue that it should be they should be
18	able to have that massing?
19	MS. ELLIOTT: That would be matter of right
20	height and that argument could certainly be made.
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. And so and this is
22	a special exception. That's what I'm just trying I
23	mean, this is not a variance, like. So everybody on this
24	row could start to do this. Right?
25	It's just a special exception and so if I were

1	an applicant, I'd be arguing possibly for that height. I
2	mean, everything's different. Like, they've gone to
3	and I respect very much that you guys have gone through
4	this whole process.
5	I may have mentioned it many times. It's just
6	this is somewhat new and so for me to get over this, we're
7	going to have to talk it through a lot because that means
8	I just don't want to argue about it anymore.
9	I'll be, like, you know, okay. Fine. We did
10	this. This is a nice solution. This solution everybody
11	signed off. Let's just move along. Okay?
12	But so then, matter of right, they're coming
13	here to the Office of Planning. If I were the developer,
14	I'd be arguing for that extra height. The reason why they
15	don't have that extra height is because they needed to get
16	through the ANC.
17	And so they went ahead and lost that extra
18	height. But you, the Office of Planning, probably would
19	have been okay with that extra height. Correct?
20	MS. ELLIOTT: Well, we didn't review that
21	scenario and I don't feel comfortable saying that we would
22	be comfortable
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: That's all right. That's
24	okay.
25	MS. ELLIOTT: would be okay with it.

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Pardon me?
2	MS. ELLIOTT: I don't feel comfortable saying
3	that we would be okay with that.
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure. But it is a
5	possibility that somebody could come and argue that before
6	you?
7	MS. ELLIOTT: They could yes.
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. great. Anybody else?
9	Okay. Does the applicant have any questions for the
10	Office of Planning?
11	MR. CROSS: No questions.
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Does sure. Go
13	ahead.
14	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Did you find the picture
15	I was looking for? Was that from a previous document or
16	did you is somebody drawing in the back room?
17	MR. CROSS: No. I wish. I guess the origin of
18	this design is we are actually not the original design
19	architect and so this design was given to us by the client
20	from another architect.
21	This is the original proposal he provided with
22	the original conceptual design.
23	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: So what's before us
24	right now is at least from the in terms of the
25	articulation, in terms of the size, the colors maybe not,

1	but this is what that the size of what you're
2	proposing?
3	MR. CROSS: I think that this generally
4	represents the scale and intent of what we're showing in
5	our proposal in Exhibit 44.
6	CHAIRPERSON HILL: And when you went sorry.
7	And when you went to when this iteration was going
8	through, did you guys have the meaningful connection thing
9	and the thing in the back?
10	Or was this design just going back 20 feet or
11	something?
12	MR. CROSS: No. The conceptual design shown
13	here included the courtyard scheme.
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
15	MR. CROSS: So when the ten foot scheme that we
16	had originally developed, was not was questioned by the
17	neighbor, looking for more of a courtyard scheme, the
18	courtyard scheme was introduced by another architect shown
19	here.
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: And so the courtyard was
21	introduced by wasn't introduced by you? I'm sorry, Mr.
22	Cross.
23	MR. CROSS: No.
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
25	MR. CROSS: We did not come up with that

Τ	concept.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. And so that concept
3	was driven by the discussions with the neighbor. The
4	neighbor and the other the previous architect came up
5	with that solution?
6	MR. CROSS: Yes. And I think that's it an
7	important note. I didn't really make it in my opening
8	comments. It is in the response letter, but to the idea
9	that this is a new concept, there are two other BZA cases
10	that approved this very concept.
11	And they were done by this other architect and
12	that's why my client went directly to him because he had
13	the scheme that the neighbor was looking for.
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: And so did they go through
15	the ANC with that previous architect?
16	MR. CROSS: Those are different cases that we
17	were not
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: No. No. This case,
19	your case. Did the previous architect so I'm seeing
20	the owner shake no. So the previous architect you guys
21	are the ones that went through the ANC?
22	MR. CROSS: We did.
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: With this design and, Mr.
24	Cross, I know you've brought it up and I think it's great,

because I was here for both of the ones that you keep

referring to.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

And so -- and you put them in the record and one, I quess, just again how it kind of just overall, I mean, besides all of the things that we need to do to approve it, one was almost basically at the end, which it wasn't.

And then, the other was at the end next to, like, a big apartment building. And so it wasn't exactly like this and so that's why I'm just trying to figure out where we're going in the future so I don't have to strugale.

Anybody else got anything? MEMBER JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I would just comment, I think this is where we're going in the future. I think we're going to see these, you know, these designs in the middle of a nice neat row of mansard roofs and we're going to see courtyard designs. That's my

So okav.

Now, I mean, my only comment is MEMBER WHITE: I think the concept is unique that ves. I mean, I agree. because it -- at least from the rear, it doesn't -- it's not as intrusive to the adjacent neighbors and the neighbors in the rear because you have a little bit of an open space between the two structures and you've got that meaningful connection.

prediction.

1	I'd be interested in, at some point, I don't
2	know if you have it here, but seeing what that actual
3	meaningful connection looks like from the interior of the
4	building to see exactly how people are able to maneuver
5	from one building to the next.
6	But I note that the Office of Planning and the
7	Zoning Administrator have weighed in in terms of this
8	being a meaningful connection, but at some point, I think
9	we've got so many different options in the record.
LO	So I don't have any other questions, but I
11	think we'll need to finalize the plans we're actually
L2	going to be approving for this application if we get to
L3	that point today.
L4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right. Is there
L5	anyone here wishes to speak in support? Great. Come on
L6	forward. I think you got sworn in earlier. Correct?
L7	Okay. Great.
18	MR. HENDRICK: That's correct.
L9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure. If you could please
20	state your name for the record?
21	MR. HENDRICK: Hello. My name is Marcus
22	Hendrick. I'm a resident of 623 Otis Place NW. That's
23	just down the block from this property.
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So, Mr. Hendrick, as
25	you remember, you'll have three minutes to speak and, Mr.

2	As from the previous time that you're here or
3	previous case, that is. And you can begin whenever you
4	like.
5	MR. HENDRICK: All right. Hopefully, I can be
6	a little more help on this case since I'm a resident and I
7	had a chance to prepare my testimony a little bit.
8	I just want to say that I have appeared before
9	the BZA a number of times in my capacity as the president
10	or vice president of my neighborhood civic association,
11	generally, in opposition to zoning variances.
12	So this is actually the first time I've
13	appeared in support of a project and only the second time
14	I've been involved with an exception.
15	So I understand that the process is different
16	in that you guys are looking more to see if sort of
17	administrative or sort of requirements, regulatory
18	requirements, have been meet.
19	And if they've been met, you move it along, but
20	to the extent that the neighborhood input is helpful in
21	the criteria that are a little more subjective regarding
22	the character and scale of the neighborhood the sort of
23	use and enjoyment of the properties, I do feel that we as
24	a community have some value to add there.
25	And so I'll speak briefly on two elements of
J	

this project that you've been asking a number of questions about. The first is the rear addition, moving the massing back away from Mr. Jamison's windows.

So I was actually one of the people to suggest to the owner that if they were going to be seeking an exception, that they try and find a way of maintaining the character of the neighborhood in the sense that these are family-sized homes.

Most of these houses are single-family homes, sometimes with an English basement. A lot of the folks that have come in to develop and do things by right, slice them into two or three one or two-bedroom units, which then change the character of the neighborhood.

And, you know, we don't get a chance to weigh on that because it's option by right. So with the original proposal, which was ten foot back, the units, I think, were two bedroom and we asked if they could find a way, if they would be asking for an exception, to try and make as much of the units family size as possible.

And moving the mass back, gave them an opportunity to sort of adjust the footprint of each unit in a way that they were able to put more bedrooms in it without just doing a really long extension in the back.

So the shadow plans sort of show you where the shadow is on the ground floor, but they don't do a great

2.0

1 job of showing how it effects the back wall of the 2 property. And a lot of us in these houses, most of our 3 day-to-day living is on the first floor, which is kind of 4 elevated a bit, almost the second floor for some houses 5 6 because their basements are usually only partially 7 lowered. And those, like, so when you moved the mass 8 9 back, he gets his light on his rear windows near his 10 kitchen most of the day. And if you put the mass towards 11 the front, the shadow is on that. Very quickly on the mansards, the neighborhood 12 13 The folks on the north side, the houses is on a slope. 14 are built in such a way that the porches are main level as 15 the street drops. So further down the block, the porch is 16 17 basically on the second floor. On the south side of the 18 street, all the houses are, like, on street grade. 19 And so, Ms. Judy, my neighbor down the block, 2.0 when she looks at this house across the street, regardless 21 of whether you put the box towards the back or not, she's 22 going to be able to see that box. 23 And in our neighborhood, we tend to prefer -- I know there's a sort of architectural debate about whether 24 25 when you're adding to a historical home, the addition

2 to blend the original architectural design. In the community meetings I've been to at our 3 neighborhood on our little block, the preference, as 4 5 Commissioner Bass has made clear a number of times is more 6 to try to blend the new with the old. 7 And so the new mansard, which sort of puts 8 everything up front, but adopts that style is the 9 preference for us and if you put a box on the roof and 10 push it towards the back -- it's not really going to hide 11 it from of the people on the block, because their porches 12 are so high, we're going to see it all the time anyway. 13 So I'm hoping that I've addressed the main 14 issues here. Yes. You know, I just want to close by 15 saying the rear addition, which keeps these family-sized units of three bedrooms, keeps more with our character 16 than use as a block in the neighborhood -- than a by right 17 18 division of this home into three small condos for folks 19 who that are going to move in and then have to move out 2.0 when they have kids. Thank you. 21 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right. Thank 22 Does the Board have any question for the witness? you. 23 MEMBER JOHN: One quick question. 24 Yes, ma'am. MR. HENDRICK: 25 MEMBER JOHN: Can you comment on this design

should be clearly extended additions or if they should try

1	that's on the screen right now? This is the first design
2	that I don't believe was briefed to the ANC. It was
3	briefed to the ANC? Okay.
4	So what is your view of this design? Because
5	there's a mansard roof that's sort of continued and with
6	the dormer in the front.
7	MR. HENDRICK: Right. So our
8	MEMBER JOHN: Which matches the window at the
9	on the second floor.
LO	MR. HENDRICK: The second floor. Right. So my
11	preference and the preference that I've heard from members
12	of the community most frequently is that we would prefer
13	this what's on the picture now, where you extend the
L4	mansard and try and blend the new height with the original
15	architectural design as opposed to pushing a box a little
L6	further back, which may or may not match.
L7	But you're going to see that box anyway for my
L8	neighbors on the north side of the street. So we would
L9	rather have the whole think look sort of uniform, even if
20	it's a little taller than its neighbors because you can't
21	hide it.
22	MEMBER JOHN: So you do know this is not what's
23	being proposed? This was an earlier version. Correct?
24	Is this what you're proposing?
25	MR. HENDRICK: Yes. The proposal

1	(Simultaneous speaking.)
2	MR. HENDRICK: I actually looked over the
3	documents and they're a little confusing, but my
4	understanding was that they're asking for a mansard and
5	dormer windows as opposed to what the Office of Planning
6	has proposed.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Anyone else? Okay.
8	All right. Thank you, sir.
9	MR. CROSS: I can
10	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sorry. Yes. You can ask
11	some questions
12	MR. CROSS: two questions.
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: of the witness, sir.
14	MR. CROSS: Yes. Just to confirm, the image on
15	the screen here is consistent with your understanding of
16	the mansard roof that's being proposed?
17	MR. HENDRICK: Yes. That it would have the
18	sort of shingled mansard on the side and dormer windows on
19	the third as opposed to a visible mansard with a recessed
20	extension to the back.
21	MR. CROSS: And that's preferred to you?
22	MR. HENDRICK: That's my preference.
23	MR. CROSS: And do you have any input on some
24	of the privacy concerns about a rear a roof deck on the
25	rear volume?

1 MR. HENDRICK: I haven't really given a lot of 2 thought to the rooftop element. I don't really have a concern one way or the other about the deck. 3 -- I have not really given a lot of consideration to that. 4 5 MR. CROSS: Thank you. 6 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Thank you. All 7 Anyone here wish to speak in opposition? right. 8 So I'm going to turn to the Board just a Let's see. 9 little bit. 10 I mean, if you guys are ready -- so you're 11 excused. Thank you so much. Thank you for coming down. 12 If -- yes. So I'm perfectly happy going into -- I mean, 13 I'm keeping the record open and we can talk about this for a while, because I'm perfectly happy going into 14 15 deliberations and I think it'll be interesting to 16 deliberate because that's what we're going to do. And then -- but if we -- I'd rather just go 17 18 ahead and do it as opposed to, like, you know, I mean, I 19 think all the plans are there. If you guys want to talk 2.0 about, you know, whether or not we're going, you know, the 21 mansard roof versus whatever it is. 22 And we can kind of figure out, you know, I'm 23 just trying to gauge as to what plans we're actually going to be approving. I don't want to have to have the guy 24

come back again with new plans.

1	I mean, if, you know, we can get to the
2	deliberations today, then, let's go, you know, if the
3	Board thinks they're kind of ready to deliberate, then
4	yes. Go ahead.
5	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: Yes. No. Mr. Chair,
6	I'm ready. So we can talk about the drawings
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right. So let's
8	try to figure out at least kind of what we're talking
9	about. So there are the drawings that have, I guess, the
10	whatever, the thing that the the mansard roof's been
11	sort of the mansard roof has not been changed and
12	there's the bathtub that's been created. And so what does
13	the bathtub plan look like? Can you pull that up for me,
14	Mr. Cross? And which Exhibit is the bathtub plan in?
15	MR. CROSS: I believe that is Exhibit 45 and
16	CHAIRPERSON HILL: So 45 is a full set of
17	plans?
18	MR. CROSS: It is. I believe it's a full set
19	of architectural plans. I don't know if it has all the
20	additional diagrams that 44 does.
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Does it have the roof deck
22	on the back
23	MR. CROSS: No.
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: thing?
25	MR. CROSS: So the two differences in 45 versus

44 is that 45 shows the, I guess, the matter of right 1 2 condition at the front with regard to architectural rooftop elements and not needing that waiver. 3 4 And it shows a compromised position of not showing the matter of right roof deck on the rear volume, 5 6 which I just want to real quickly say, correct my 7 statement earlier. 8 We're not seeking relief from that. That is 9 understood to be a matter of right element. 10 Sure, of course. CHAIRPERSON HILL: Please go 11 ahead. And I just have to say 12 VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: 13 this because I feel like we've -- we've seen this a couple of times over the last kind of last month. I do not like 14 15 alternative plans. I like having one set. 16 That's what we're 17 I know that folks like putting them in there, looking at. 18 but I think what it ends up doing is well, we talk about 19 I'm not really sure. this or that? 2.0 And then, it becomes this, you know, well, this 21 is -- this drawing -- so tried to make sure that these 22 drawings weren't here. We weren't sure if you were going 23 to be okay with this. 24 Well, you all have -- the applicant's have one

proposal that's before us and that's what we should be

1 looking at. 2 This -- the number 45 or Exhibit 45 is just not helpful because we are having this conversation about 3 plans that we're not even really going to be looking at. 4 5 I mean, it should be this is what your proposal is. 6 This is what we're approving. Not, well, you 7 want to choose this or this. I'm not going to go into two 8 things, because that means I'm doing more work to try to 9 figure out well, do I like this one or that one? 10 I'm not doing that. You all have your proposal 11 that is before us. We've had the thing last week where 12 they wanted to do a supermarket or a café. And they're, 13 like, you have to decide one. 14 You decide what you want to do and you 15 submit it to us and then, we decide what that is. So I 16 have an issue with having the two sets. I mean, you can kind of tell I'm kind of -- it makes me a little bit too 17 18 -- I don't know. It adds a little bit more confusion and I don't 19 2.0 think it's very helpful. So I just think that we should 21 be looking at 44 and that's it. 22 CHAIRPERSON HILL: There's no response, just --

or actually, is there a response? So I quess there's a

So wait a second, wait a second.

I'm just trying to process now. You're coming

response.

over here.

23

24

1	So I'm sorry, Ms. John? Wait. Sorry.
2	Commissioner?
3	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Again I, you know, for
4	me cut to the chase. I like the mansard roof that they
5	proposed. I think it's fine to have a rooftop in the
6	back. Everything else about this seems fine to me.
7	And that's where I'm at. It's pretty
8	straightforward. I have no problem with it.
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right. So then, we're
10	going to have these deliberations, because I was and
11	may pardon me?
12	(Off-microphone comment.)
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: No. We're not closing yet.
14	I mean, I'm trying to figure out whether we're going to
15	need anything else from them. Right?
16	Like, the reason why I'm asking what we're
17	doing is because I don't like I don't want them to lose
18	the mansard roof. Okay?
19	And so but I don't really know how I feel
20	about the thing in the back anyway. So I was just
21	thinking about abstaining. So, you know, I don't how to
22	abstain.
23	I'd be, like, just use the word abstain. I'm
24	was, like, hey, you know, and so that's what I'm trying to
25	figure out. Will they need anything else from the

1	applicant and you all don't need anything else from the
2	applicant
3	FEMALE PARTICIPANT: No.
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: other for them to choose
5	which plans they're submitting. And, Ms. John, do you
6	need anything?
7	MEMBER JOHN: I would like to say what I like
8	so you can figure out where we are. I've been pretty
9	straightforward.
10	I like the mansard, the extended mansard roof
11	with a dormer as was shown in the rendering that I asked
12	the neighbor about. I don't know if that is fairly
13	depicted in the plans because I can't get that from here.
14	So and I agree with Office of Planning's
15	suggestion that we not have a roof deck in the back and I
16	agree that there's a meaningful connection and other than
17	that, I should be able to support this application.
18	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: I missed one thing you
19	said. On the roof deck on the back, was that a yes or a
20	no for that one?
21	MEMBER JOHN: No.
22	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: That was a no. Okay.
23	So we're almost aligned.
24	(Simultaneous speaking.)
25	MEMBER JOHN: Almost aligned except you don't

1	like the image the design that
2	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: No. I do. I agree with
3	you. I think we're saying the same thing.
4	MEMBER JOHN: Okay.
5	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: So what's on I have
6	in front of what I have in my computer, if you could go
7	to BZA 01 on 44. So the first page of 44, that's it.
8	That's the one you like. Right? Because that's the one
9	that I like.
10	MEMBER JOHN: Yes. Assuming that's the same
11	one in the rendering.
12	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Yes.
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So I think I know
14	where we are. Right? I mean, and I'm thoroughly happy or
15	I should say that I don't I just know where we are.
16	So you're now so can you show us whatever
17	exhibit it is that has the mansard roof has been removed
18	and, you know, that's what's there. Right?
19	And then, that doesn't have the roof deck in
20	the rear. Is that anywhere in your has not been
21	removed? Oh, it has the roof deck in the rear?
22	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Well, it's split around
23	the roof deck.
24	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: The images have the
25	roof deck in it. In this set, the images have the

1	drawings have the roof deck in it. So
2	(Simultaneous speaking.)
3	CHAIRPERSON HILL: In the rear. In the rear.
4	(Simultaneous speaking.)
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: But Lorna was not Lorna
6	was not supporting in the rear.
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: I know.
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Right.
9	MEMBER JOHN: May I please state what I said?
10	So we retain the mansard roof to keep the uniformity of
11	all the mansard roofs on the block.
12	But the extension is as it is here on the
13	image. Did I is that clear?
14	MR. GREGG: You two are saying the same thing.
15	He's just saying
16	MEMBER JOHN: Okay.
17	MR. GREGG: you removed the existing mansard
18	roof and kind of build up. Right? Is that what I'm
19	MEMBER JOHN: No. No.
20	MR. GREGG: saying, Chairman Hill? No?
21	MEMBER JOHN: No.
22	MR. GREGG: All right. Never mind.
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: That's okay. So we're
24	and we'll fix this in the future where we won't let
25	anybody, you know, they can just come with us with the

1	plan, then I'll be done.
2	I heard what you were saying, Vice Chair Hart.
3	But today, we're where we are. And so let's just kind of
4	work through this a little bit.
5	So the rear I'm just trying to understand.
6	So the rear deck, okay, because I just want to get to a
7	set of plans that we're all talking about.
8	So the rear deck Commissioner, you were fine
9	with the rear deck and on the accessory dwelling unit and
10	Ms. John you're opposed to the rear deck. Okay? So
11	there's a split right there. Okay?
12	MEMBER WHITE: So I have a question.
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure.
14	MEMBER WHITE: So what is the ANC's position
15	again on the rear deck?
16	CHAIRPERSON HILL: You can ask the applicant.
17	MEMBER WHITE: Mr. Applicant?
18	MR. CROSS: The ANC has no express concern
19	about the rear deck to my knowledge. I think, if I may to
20	kind of help bring this into a conclusion for you guys,
21	we're seeking relief from 320.2 for the third unit.
22	We're seeking two waivers. One from the
23	ten-foot rule to be able to do this rear volume. And one
24	for the waiver of the rooftop element in order to remove,
25	modify or extend the front mansard roof.
l	I control of the second of the

1	The rooftop deck on the rear volume, is
2	something that OP cites in their report. However, it is
3	not something that we're seeking relief from today, as we
4	believe
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Cross, I'm going to
6	interrupt you. I totally got you and I appreciate trying
7	to help us out. We're trying to we understand the two
8	waiver and part of the two waivers is whether or not we
9	think that there's going to be any adverse impact by that
LO	other thing that you have in the rear.
11	And one of our Board members thinks that that
L2	roof deck, they're agreeing with OP, could provide more of
L3	an adverse impact. So that's why the roof deck it's no
L4	longer a it's not a matter of right because you can't
15	do it anyway until you are here before us. Right? So the
L6	mansard roof, we're going to work through.
L7	So the roof deck, right, so I got a split on
L8	the roof deck. Okay? And who else is going to split on
L9	the roof deck? Who wants the roof deck? Who doesn't want
20	the roof deck?
21	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: I'm okay with the roof
22	deck.
23	MEMBER WHITE: I'm fine with it as long as
24	there's no ANC protest against it. So
25	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So you need to get

1	so now I need new plans again. That's what I'm trying to
2	get to. Right? Because I got nothing I don't have
3	anything okay. Well, I'll tell you why I need the
4	plans.
5	Give me one second. So then now there's the
6	mansard roof. Okay? So, Ms. John, the mansard roof is
7	and this is where the applicant can help me out, there's
8	the plan that the mansard roof remains. Okay?
9	That the Office of Planning supposedly is in
LO	favor of. Okay? And that's the one that has the setback.
11	Could you show me a picture, please, of the mansard roof,
12	the plan with the mansard roof remaining which is the
13	compromise thing? Right. So that's the mansard so
L4	that's not the one you're speaking of. Correct, Ms. John?
15	MEMBER JOHN: No. It's the one in the
L6	rendering.
L7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So Ms. John is
18	opposed to the Office of Planning rendering. Okay?
19	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: As am I.
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes. So now we're back to
21	this one, but
22	MEMBER JOHN: Does this one have the mansard
23	roof on it?
24	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: 44A 01.
25	MEMBER JOHN: Can we go back to the rendering?
	I .

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: You need a
2	MEMBER JOHN: Can you go back to the rendering
3	that you showed me? Okay. Is there are there plans
4	with that?
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: The mansard roof has been
6	removed on that in that rendering.
7	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: That's two very slightly
8	different
9	MR. GREGG: Yes.
10	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: versions of the same
11	drawing.
12	MR. GREGG: Exactly. Thank you very much.
13	It's just the one on the right has a cornice. The one on
14	the left doesn't have the cornice. The one on the left's
15	consistent with all the other roof lines on that block.
16	We actually went back and forth about that. We
17	chose the one on the left because it's more similar than
18	all the other houses where they have that kind of little
19	pitch in the front.
20	As opposed to the one on the right, has that
21	little cornice. That's the only difference. It's a very
22	minor architectural detail that we actually really care
23	about.
24	And we had discussions about and that's why we
25	have two and we apologize. That's because of the two

1	of us here going back and forth about which is more
2	esthetically appealing. And we should not do that
3	anymore. It's actually it was me. So they are
4	supposed to represent the exact same thing, though.
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: So okay. All right. So you
6	don't have any plans, however, with the rear rooftop deck?
7	MR. CROSS: We do.
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: And this particular in
9	this set
10	MR. CROSS: In this set
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: In this set?
12	MR. CROSS: Exhibit 44, shows the rooftop
13	deck in all of the architectural plans. Some of the
14	graphical illustrations do not show it graphically, as you
15	see here.
16	However, all the architectural plans, as you
17	see here on BZA 13 and 15, you see the rail of the rooftop
18	deck and elevation and
19	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
20	MR. CROSS: the access is
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
22	Okay, so Exhibit 44 are the plans that have the
23	rooftop deck on the whatever. The ADU, the ADU. And
24	the and has the mansard roof removed in 44.
25	Okay. All right. So you guys are voting on

1	you guys. You guys are talking about 44. Okay? All
2	right. So do we need anything else and then we can
3	deliberate on 44?
4	Okay? All right. So you guy have anything
5	you'd like to add in conclusion?
6	MR. CROSS: No, sir.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right. So we'll close
8	the record. All right. Is the Board ready to deliberate?
9	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: Yes.
10	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Please go ahead.
11	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: All right. I think I've
12	been pretty clear with where I am on this. I think,
13	Commissioner John, the only thing that we differ on is
14	that rooftop, the rear section rooftop.
15	But in terms of the mansard roof, I think we're
16	in the same place around it.
17	MEMBER JOHN: Right. And I'm fine with rooftop
18	deck and the rear structure. It's not a significant issue
19	for me. I'm more concerned about the mansard roof.
20	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: And if I understanding
21	correctly, you and I are in the same place
22	MEMBER JOHN: Yes.
23	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: in the mansard
24	MEMBER JOHN: Yes.
25	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: in the front. Okay.

1	MEMBER JOHN: But I don't know how to vote,
2	because I don't know which is which.
3	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: So I think we're but
4	that's I think that's right. We want to make sure
5	we're talking about the same thing. We're talking about
6	the elevations in 44.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.
8	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Right.
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: We're talking about the
10	plans in 44. You guys
11	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Okay.
12	MEMBER JOHN: The elevations in 44, I'm fine.
13	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Okay. So
14	MEMBER JOHN: Elevations in 44, I'm fine with.
15	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: So that's all I have,
16	Mr. Chair.
17	MEMBER WHITE: Yes. I think they've responded
18	to all our concerns. I mean, the main issue regarding the
19	meaningful connection, I'm comfortable with that.
20	I'm comfortable with the version of the mansard
21	roof that Board Member John talked about and I'm pretty
22	much in support, you know. I think Exhibit 44 was the one
23	that we're going to try to go with.
24	So I don't have any concerns. I'm willing to
25	support the roof deck. I don't see anything in the record

1	that communicates any concerns on the part of the
2	neighbors. So I'm ready to move forward.
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: So I was going kind of
4	back and forth on this because I had some issues with the
5	understanding the meaningful connection.
6	I didn't think that there was sufficient
7	information previously. I think the applicant has
8	provided that information.
9	So I can be able to support that aspect of it
10	as well as the project itself. I did not like and I
11	still or well, I shouldn't say still.
12	I think that the understanding what the
13	neighbor is stating that he is in support of the
14	application and that the reason the rationale for this
15	particular project to have the building in the rear is to
16	provide for more light and air.
17	I understand it and I will continue I think
18	we're going to have to look at these things as we always
19	do, looking at them as individual projects and individual
20	applications that come before us.
21	Regarding the mansard roof removal, I again,
22	originally, I'm not I'm usually not in favor of
23	removing them. If you're removing them, then usually it's
24	set back.

I understand the context here and I appreciate

everyone coming in -- the sorry -- Mr. Hendrick that came in to give us some information about the -- what their perspective was, the civic association perspective was.

And I would be in support of this particular

application for the Mansard roof. I didn't quite -- I understood the issue that the Office of Planning brought up regarding the rear deck, but it seems as though you have windows that are able to look into the neighbor's yard, again.

So the privacy issue doesn't seem to be -- it either you don't allow windows and you don't allow the deck or you allow both.

So I just didn't see that you could take away the windows that look at the back of the people's houses, but -- I'm sorry. Keep the windows and then take away the deck, just didn't seem to be congruent to me.

So I think that the deck and the windows are -while they would be able to see into somebody's house, I
think that -- or the back of somebody's house, I think
that the ability for -- to provide a separation between
the units may be more helpful in this particular instance.

I do appreciate the architect's changing -there was a, I guess, a stair in the rear of this -actually, it's shown in this image. Yes. I think that
it's helpful to have that stair kind of a little

2.0

re-oriented to allow that courtyard space to actually be a 2 courtyard space. And I think that's it. So in general, I'd be 3 4 in support of the application. I wasn't sure I was going to get here, but I think I finally did get there. 5 6 that's it. 7 So this took an hour CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. and a half. So I'm going to take -- we're going to take a 8 9 break after this before we go to the next case. I'm going 10 to have my little say. 11 And then, we're going to take a vote. 12 again, as I -- we've gone -- I mean, I think it's really 13 interesting, because, again, even though the applicants, 14 and we said this on the record already a couple times. 15 Even though the applicants brought up two cases that have been before us, I mean, I remember looking at 16 17 I think they were farther apart. It was a deeper them. 18 lot. 19 I think it was at the end -- it was almost at 2.0 the end of the row. And so the almost at the end of the 21 road doesn't seem like -- I'm just kind of talking this 22 through a little bit more. Right? 23 And so -- and the other example, again, was 24 up against an apartment building and so, you know, one

side was already knocked out. So I do think there's a

25

1

2	And I do think, then, that we're going to have
3	people coming before us that are trying to go get all that
4	they can get. Right? To the top, like, you know, why
5	not? Right?
6	And so my issue with it was that, again, and
7	the only thing I had to kind of hang my hat on was the
8	character of the alley. You know, that was the because
9	I think that the Office of Planning's analysis, I think is
10	pretty accurate.
11	It's just whether or not this is now going to
12	be a solution kind of moving forward and what our position
13	is now going to be on that.
14	And I'm just going to keep talking it through
15	for me, because I just want to, please. Is that the
16	windows at the back, right, they're now looking into
17	everybody else's yard. Okay?
18	And so, as you just stated it again, before,
19	there's now a roof deck. I mean, I was at least I
20	mean, I would have been opposed to the roof deck.
21	And then the removal of the mansard roof, a
22	long time ago, I voted for something to remove a rooftop
23	element and I felt I thought on further
24	reconsideration, I possibly would have voted differently.

The mansard roof line, is all -- they're all

meaningful connection.

1	mansard roof, so they're the same they're all there.
2	Right? So now, they're all just going to kind of come and
3	go.
4	I mean, I do understand, like, maybe the pop-up
5	looks worse, but, you know, 50 years from now, 100 years
6	from now, you might like the line of mansard roofs and the
7	pop-ups will have blended in and people have gotten used
8	to the pop-ups.
9	And be, like, wow, what a nice line of mansard
10	roofs. So I'm going to be abstaining, because I actually
11	don't know what I'm going to think about this in the
12	future. Okay?
13	So that's why I'm not clear. Okay? I mean, I
14	think that the lots deep, the connection is meaningful.
15	You know, when we're having people now arguing about the
16	meaningful connection, I mean, everybody's using that
17	hallway.
18	They're taking their trash out. They're going
19	to get to parking out there. So that's a meaningful
20	connection. It's heated. It's air conditioned. So
21	somebody else can make a motion.
22	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: So I'll make a motion
23	to I got to get the actual case now before me. Gosh.
24	Okay. Well, I think I yes. I think I have that one.
25	MALE PARTICIPANT: The other thing.

1	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: I have it if you want.
2	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: No. I got it.
3	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: You got it?
4	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: So to approve
5	application I'll make a motion to approve Application
6	19-929 of 615 Otis Street, LLC, as read and captioned by
7	the secretary.
8	And we're looking at Exhibit 44 as the images
9	that or yes. Exhibit 44 is the plans that we are going
10	to be approving. So do I have a second?
11	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Second. I'll
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: The motion is made and
13	seconded. All those I think I still get to do that
14	part. The motion being made and seconded, all those in
15	favor say aye.
16	(Chorus of ayes.)
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All those opposed? All
18	those abstaining? Aye. The motion passed, Mr. Moy.
19	MR. MOY: If staff would record the vote as 4-
20	1-0. This is on the motion of Vice Chair Hart to approve
21	the application for the relief requested.
22	And as mentioned in the motion, these are as
23	shown on Exhibit these are plans as shown on Exhibit
24	44. The second motion is Peter Shapiro, also support, Ms.
25	White, Ms. John and Chairman Hill abstaining.

1	Motion carries, sir.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Thank you. Thank you
3	all very much for the learning experience. Bye-bye.
4	MR. CROSS: Thanks for your time.
5	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off
6	the record at 3:31 p.m. and resumed at 3:47 p.m.)
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right. Mr. Moy, you can
8	call it whenever you like.
9	MR. MOY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So I
10	believe the next case before the Board, if I can have
11	parties to the table, is Case Application Number 20013 of
12	Simon is it pronounced Chan, C-H-A-N? This is
13	captioned and advertised for a special exception under
14	Subtitle U, Section 802.1(a). This would permit an animal
15	boarding use in the PDR-4 zone. This is at 1025 Brentwood
16	Road, Northeast. This is parcel 143/108.
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Good afternoon.
18	We've lasted a long time. If you could, please introduce
19	yourselves for the record from my right to left.
20	MS. OLIVER: Darlene Oliver, ANC 505.
21	MR. HUBIG: Karl Hubig, business owner.
22	MR. COLLINS: Melvin Collins, business owner.
23	MR. HUBIG: So Chan is the property owner. And
24	they had signed off on actually myself representing them
25	during this.

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Okay. All right.
2	And so, Ms. Oliver, you said you're the ADC? Oh, ANC, I'm
3	sorry.
4	MS. OLIVER: ANC
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: ANC, oh, okay.
6	Commissioner, I'm sorry. I didn't hear you. Okay.
7	Great. So is it Mr. Hubig, Hubig? All right. So you're
8	going to be presenting to us?
9	MR. HUBIG: Yes.
10	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. If want to, go ahead
11	and tell us a little bit about the project. I mean, I
12	think we, we've been here all day now. And so I'm going
13	to try to work through this as efficiently as possible. I
14	see there's a commissioner here who's been here a long
15	time as well.
16	So the, I suppose if you could, just kind of
17	walk us through what you're trying to do. And then if you
18	wouldn't mind, again kind of speak to the hours of
19	operation that you think you might have, as well as kind
20	of the number of animals that you think you might be
21	housing and just start from there. Okay?
22	MR. HUBIG: Sure. Karl Hubig once again. We
23	are doing a doggy daycare, doggy boarding. So our bulk of
24	our traffic will be during the day between 8:30 to
25	probably 5:30, no more. And then we will be doing some

1	boarding overnights depending on major holidays, things
2	like that. What else did you all want to know?
3	CHAIRPERSON HILL: How many animals do you
4	think you might be housing?
5	MR. HUBIG: We'll do during the day probably 20
6	to 40 depending. And then on the weekends so far as
7	overnights, it depends, you know. Obviously, bigger
8	holidays we have more people. But on the average, it's
9	two to six a night maybe.
10	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. And how do you think
11	you guys are going to be handling pet waste?
12	MR. HUBIG: We have another service that we
13	outsource that to. So we'll be starting. Actually, that
14	will be our next phase will be us doing that position.
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
16	MR. HUBIG: Going out and doing like a scooper
17	pooper kind of business.
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
19	MR. HUBIG: But currently we'll be outsourcing.
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Got it. All right.
21	Does the I'm sorry. Does the Board have any questions
22	for the Applicant? Okay. Commissioner, would you like to
23	speak to why you're here?
24	MS. OLIVER: Okay. Good afternoon.
25	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Good afternoon.

1	MS. OLIVER: I'm here
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you for staying so
3	long.
4	MS. OLIVER: No problem. The, Mr., I'm sorry,
5	Hubig I found out, we talked yesterday concerning this
6	project. And I informed him that he has not presented to
7	the community or to the ANC. And those are two things
8	that he has to do to move forward his project.
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So you guys haven't
10	presented to the ANC yet?
11	MR. HUBIG: We did not. We've reached out
12	several times. There was no response. So, actually, I
13	timestamped it and recorded it and went to the zoning
14	office. And I said, look, I've reached out a lot of
15	times. What should we do? And it's actually in that
16	grouping of paperwork. And they said, well, you provide
17	more than a burden of proof on that. And we approve your
18	position. So we're not trying to go around the ANC or
19	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure. So, Commissioner, do
20	you know why they haven't ended up on an agenda yet?
21	MS. OLIVER: No one knew about them. I did not
22	receive a notice.
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
24	MS. OLIVER: And I know the ANC did not receive
25	a notice.

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
2	MS. OLIVER: So
3	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Are you the SMD for this
4	project?
5	MS. OLIVER: Yes.
6	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So then you would be
7	trying to hear from them at the next ANC meeting?
8	MS. OLIVER: I can't predict what's on the
9	calendar for the next meeting. But I've talked to Mr.
10	Hubig. We've talked several times in trying to find a way
11	to move this along very, very fast. We've come up with
12	one solution. I don't know if we're going to be able to
13	push it through.
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: What was that solution?
15	MS. OLIVER: To have an open house at his
16	facility this weekend, pass out flyers, get the community
17	to come down actually to his facility so they can actually
18	view it. And then we'll, you know, we'll talk. And if
19	they approve, then we'll move on to the next phase.
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: When you say if they approve
21	you'll move on to the next phase, so you're saying that's
22	kind of like your executive committee type how
23	MS. OLIVER: No, this is the community.
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Right.
25	MS. OLIVER: It will be the community.

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: But when I'm saying the
2	next, I mean, for us the next phase I guess is how they
3	get to present to the ANC. So I'm just, I'm trying to
4	understand when that might actually happen.
5	MS. OLIVER: I can't, I don't know the next ANC
6	calendar, I mean, agenda. I should say agenda. I don't
7	know what that is at this point. That's something we are
8	working toward. But first we want, I wanted to help him
9	get through the community SMD meeting as fast as possible
10	because they are facing a deadline. So I'm really pushing
11	the SMD meeting right now
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
13	MS. OLIVER: to get it done this weekend.
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Mr. Hubig, how long
15	have you guys been trying to reach out to the ANC?
16	MR. HUBIG: Sixty days. Actually, we have
17	three phone calls and seven emails stamped in there.
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Where is the
19	MR. HUBIG: I think actually
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Where is that in the
21	exhibits?
22	MR. HUBIG: It should actually well, I
23	talked to the gentleman next door. But he had me fill out
24	a form that's in there. It should be in your paperwork
25	CHAIRPERSON HILL: There's a whole bunch of

1	paperwork. So that's why I'm trying to figure out which
2	exhibit it is. But we can go ahead and do that. So what,
3	there was a deadline that the Commissioner mentioned that
4	you guys were up against.
5	MR. HUBIG: Yeah, so the reason that we even
6	had that discussion with the zoning gentleman across the
7	street is that we said in two weeks we actually have to
8	leave where we are. So we don't have a space to continue
9	forward. So that's why we agreed, you know, we, they put
10	us onto this date originally is because our lease
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: You're somewhere else right
12	now.
13	MR. HUBIG: Right.
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: You're operating somewhere
15	else right now.
16	MR. HUBIG: Right.
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: And so your facility has
18	already been completed?
19	MR. HUBIG: No. So there's two different
20	places in that space. So there's a garage space, and then
21	there's a front kind of room that's already for the most
22	part finished. For the time being, we haven't taken any
23	dog boardings. We're only doing doggy daycare because
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: You're currently doing doggy
25	daycare where you are now

1	MR. HUBIG: Yes.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: in the facility that's in
3	the application.
4	MR. HUBIG: No.
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
6	MR. HUBIG: It's a different facility. It's a
7	friend's facility that they have a license. It's another
8	dog walking facility. And we actually bring our clients
9	there currently.
10	So now they've been kind enough to let us be
11	for the last 60 days. We're running out of time. And to
12	be honest with you, they're, they own another business
13	there. It's the same business, and it's kind of a
14	conflict of interests. But they made the exception for us
15	to be there. They were trying to help us out in the
16	meantime.
17	So now we're we don't want to overstay our
18	welcome. So this is why that time crunch was happening.
19	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure. So, Commissioner, do
20	you get a sense of, I mean, I know you're not, you can't
21	vote for the whole ANC or anything. But, I mean, I've
22	seen the pictures. I've seen the application. I've seen
23	where they're trying to do this. And I didn't really have
24	any issues with particularly what they're trying to do.

Do you know if, do you have a sense of what the community

1	might think of this?
2	MS. OLIVER: I think the community will be very
3	grateful to have him in our neighborhood.
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, because it seemed like
5	it was, it would seem like it was a place that could be
6	using some care.
7	MS. OLIVER: Yes.
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right. So you
9	would prefer, the ANC would prefer that this would be I
LO	mean, we're going to hear the hearing. We're having the
11	hearing now. What I'm trying to understand is do you
L2	think that the ANC would rather this is postponed to the
13	point where this gentleman's business might go out of
L4	business.
L5	MS. OLIVER: I don't, I know the ANC would not
L6	want that to happen. When you say postponed, what do you
L7	
L8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Well, I'm just trying to
L9	understand the timing of this a little bit
20	MS. OLIVER: Yeah.
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: because he said he's up
22	against a two-week window.
23	MS. OLIVER: Right.
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Or two weeks you said? Two
25	weeks. But even then, actually, we, couldn't, you

1	couldn't get an order that fast anyway if you had
2	MS. CAIN: I mean, if there's
3	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Because if the ANC is
4	opposed
5	MS. CAIN: If the ANC
6	CHAIRPERSON HILL: or if there's no ANC
7	report
8	MS. CAIN: You don't need the ANC report to
9	render a decision. If there is an ANC report in the
10	record, the Board can give it great weight. The testimony
11	that's been given today by the ANC Commissioner you can
12	take as part of your decision-making ability. It just
13	won't be given great weight in the record because there's
14	nothing in writing.
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: But in terms of a summary
16	order, you don't have, we don't have anything from the
17	ANC. So you couldn't do a summary order?
18	MS. CAIN: No, we would still be able to do a
19	summary order. It would just be noted that, you know, the
20	ANC Commissioner, excuse me, provided oral testimony at
21	the hearing, but an ANC report was not received.
22	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Okay.
23	MS. CAIN: One other thing, Mr. Chairman
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure.
25	MS. CAIN: the ANC does have seven days

Τ	after this hearing to supply written documentation of the
2	testimony that was given. So that's the other timeframe
3	that could be used.
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right. We'll
5	keep going through this. We're going to continue to go
6	through the hearing. What I was just trying to
7	understand, Commissioner, is that it's unclear to me as to
8	when they're going to be on the agenda again, meaning you
9	can't say because you don't get to decide. And so you
10	don't know what the agenda looks like for your next
11	hearing, your next ANC meeting. And your next ANC meeting
12	is when?
13	MS. OLIVER: I think it's June 15th.
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: June 15th.
15	MS. OLIVER: I think.
16	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. That's all right. So
17	you're like the second week of June or something.
18	MS. OLIVER: Yeah.
19	CHAIRPERSON HILL: So if they weren't to get on
20	that, and that's already now past their two-week window
21	although to be quite honest, sir, I mean, that's pretty
22	I don't even, whether you got an order or not within that
23	seems pretty unlikely. So, but still, you don't know if
24	it would be this June 15th or it might be July.
25	MS. OLIVER: I don't know.
l	I and the state of

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: You don't know. And then
2	you guys are off in August, correct?
3	MS. OLIVER: Yes.
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right. So,
5	again, Commissioner, as a party, you've, is there anything
6	else you'd like to add to your testimony and/or do you
7	have any questions for the Applicant?
8	MS. OLIVER: I don't have anything to ask the
9	Applicant. Although, I would like to see the plans. I
10	haven't seen the plans yet. But I do think that having a
11	dog grooming facility in walking distance of my
12	neighborhood would be a great asset and a benefit to the
13	community.
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. The plans are in, I'm
15	sure they're in, sorry, Exhibit 5 in the record. And,
16	Commissioner, you had a question?
17	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: It's a question for the
18	Applicant.
19	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Please go ahead.
20	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: So, you know, part of I
21	think what we're all hung up about is this tight deadline
22	that you're proposing, which, you know, come up with a
23	plan B, so, because that's going to take some of the
24	pressure off around this conversation.
25	The ANC has things that they, you know,

1	appropriately want. And I hear what you're saying about
2	the 60 days. I can't find anything in the record that
3	speaks to what you were describing. I believe what you're
4	saying. I just don't see it anywhere in any of our
5	documents.
6	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: It's Exhibit 11.
7	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Okay.
8	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: It says questions to,
9	for BZA. And it just says that, I guess this is from Mr.
10	Hubig saying that he's contacted and written several
11	emails to, and he tells, says the three individuals, the
12	Councilmember Kenyan McDuffie, the Chairman of the ANC 5C.
13	And then also there was a email to Commissioner Oliver,
14	but it's to the ANC email address.
15	And so I don't know if, I don't know how folks,
16	because sometimes I've seen ANC members use personal email
17	addresses. Sometimes I've seen them use the kind of city
18	email addresses. So I'm really sure which one you use.
19	But it has the, the email address they have is
20	5C05@anc.dc.gov, which I'm assuming is the email address
21	for you.
22	But they said that they had reached out via
23	these emails to these three, to you and the two other
24	folks. And so they were just trying to figure out what to

do, you know, what they should be doing now.

MR. HUBIG: So I asked for advice in the office
across the hall. And they just said just document that
you asked for advice at this point and that you wrote
these emails, because we couldn't actually get onto the
docket at all until then. And then it was another 60
days. And I said, look, we're running kind of into a time
window. And he said, well, submit this. And, you know
VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: Yeah, no, I think
that's good. I think just in the future it's always
helpful. I mean, the ANC meetings are always open.
MR. HUBIG: Yeah.
VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: And so you can always
just show up, not saying that you were going be at one,
but at least you could meet the people in person, because
I got to say, emails are just really hard. We all get
flooded with emails.
MR. HUBIG: Yeah, I'm sure.
VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: And so it's just, it
can be a little bit more difficult to get to somebody that
way.
If you were and I do understand that you are
in a time crunch. If I were in a time crunch this much,
I'd be going to the meeting itself to make sure that I was
able to get in, you know, face to face with them to
understand if they had any questions, because if she had

1	come in and had some issues or said that, on, well, we
2	want this, this, whatever, then we're having to, as our
3	general counsel said, we have to give that great weight.
4	And so
5	MR. HUBIG: Right.
6	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: that could, that may
7	work against you if you don't make sure all this stuff is,
8	you know, this correct, is in order. So just some helpful
9	suggestions.
LO	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Do you have so,
11	Commissioner, so you didn't have any questions for the
12	Applicant. You don't have any further testimony?
13	MS. OLIVER: No, sir, I don't.
L4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. I'm going to turn to
15	the Office of Planning.
L6	MR. MORDFIN: Good afternoon, Chair and members
L7	of the Board. I'm Stephen Mordfin. And the Office of
18	Planning recommends approval of this application as it's
L9	in conformance with the criteria for the use and
20	recommends approval and is available for any questions.
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Does anybody have any
22	questions for the Office of Planning? Does the Applicant
23	have any questions for the Office of Planning?
24	MR. HUBIG: No, sir.
25	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Does the Commissioner have

any questions for the Office of Planning? 1 2 MS. OLIVER: No, sir. 3 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Is there anyone here who 4 wishes to speak in support? Is there anyone here who 5 wishes to speak in opposition? Is there anything else 6 either the Commissioner or the Applicant would like to add 7 in conclusion? 8 No, sir. MS. OLIVER: 9 MR. HUBIG: No, sir. 10 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Does the Board have 11 anything else before I close the record? Okay. Going to 12 Is the Board ready to deliberate? close the record. 13 I can start. I think that I guess, you know, I think that 14 15 the Office of Planning's analysis is accurate. I think I 16 agree with their analysis in terms of how the Applicant is 17 meeting the criteria to get the special exception. 18 I'm appreciative that the Commissioner has come 19 down here to provide testimony as to what the ANC would 2.0 I suppose I'm a little torn in that, given like to see. 21 the fact that the Applicant appears to be under a time 22 situation with their business and that they have I believe 23 documented in the record their attempt to reach out to the 24 ANC, although it has been unsuccessful, I fear that in 25 postponing a decision or, I'm sorry, postponing a decision

to wait for the ANC, for them to testify to the ANC, it 1 2 could harm the Applicant and then cause, the community would also be harmed. 3 So I would be of the mind of keeping, as OAG 4 had mentioned, the record open or the record is already 5 6 The ANC can submit anything even seven days after 7 the hearing in terms of into the record. So that would be 8 something that I would be open to the ANC doing and 9 welcoming obviously. 10 But I am in, I think that DDOT had no 11 objection. And I think that I would, you know, given the 12 Applicant and given the photographs that I've seen and also kind of what they're trying to do with that 13 14 neighborhood, I don't want to stand in the way of this 15 application at this moment. So I'm going to be voting in 16 Does anyone else have anything they'd like to 17 add? 18 VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: Yeah, just one point. 19 Affidavit of maintenance, was there a waiver that we 2.0 needed to talk about? I have a note about it. And I just 21 don't know if -- sorry. 22 MS. CAIN: It was submitted to the record. 23 It's the last exhibit. 24 VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: That's fine. But I 25 second. Did you make a motion?

1 CHAIRPERSON HILL: No, I haven't made a motion 2 Does anybody have anything else that they'd like to vet. add? 3 Mr. Chair, I would just say I'm 4 MEMBER WHITE: 5 in support of the request based on the feedback that we've 6 gotten from the Office of Planning, as well as, you know, 7 the initial feedback that we got from the Commissioner in 8 terms of qualifying that there is a demand for this type 9 of service in your area. 10 I've also closely looked at the plans, as well 11 as they've responded very well in terms of the number of 12 animals, the boarding process. And I haven't identified 13 any adverse impacts with respect to this application. 14 I think they've met the special exception criteria. 15 will be voting in support. COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Yeah, I'm fine, Mr. 16 17 I think to your point that the ANC actually will Chair. 18 have an opportunity to weigh in and that they're, if they 19 choose to weigh in, then we will be able to give that 2.0 great weight, even if we make a decision today there still 21 will be that opportunity, then I'm comfortable moving 22 forward. 23 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okav. Great. Ms. John? 24 MEMBER JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I'm also in support 25 of the application. And even though we cannot give the

1	Commissioner's testimony today great weight, I do
2	appreciate her coming down to let us know at least her
3	initial impression of the application and that the project
4	would be an asset to the community. And so I would be
5	able to support the application.
6	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Thank you.
7	All right. I'll make a motion to approve Application
8	Number 20013 and ask for, oh, I'm sorry, as captioned and
9	read by the Secretary and ask for a second.
10	MEMBER WHITE: Second.
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Motion made and seconded.
12	All those in favor say aye.
13	(Chorus of aye.)
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All those opposed. The
15	motion passes, Mr. Moy.
16	MR. MOY: Staff would record the vote as five
17	to zero to zero. This is on the motion of Chairman Hill
18	to approve the application for the relief requested.
19	Seconded the motion is Ms. White, also in support, Ms.
20	John, Vice Chair Hart, and Mr. Peter Shapiro. The motion
21	carries.
22	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right. Thank you, Mr.
23	Moy. Thank you all very much. Commissioner, again,
24	thanks for staying so long.
25	MR. HUBIG: Thank you.

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right. Mr. Moy, let's
2	call the last one.
3	MR. MOY: All right. That would be Case
4	Application Number 20017 of 1128 6th Street LLC as amended
5	for a special exception under Subtitle F, Section 5201,
6	from the lot occupancy requirements of Subtitle F, Section
7	304.1 to construct a three-story addition, a rear
8	penthouse addition, and to convert a principal dwelling
9	into a six-unit apartment building, RA-2 zone. This is at
10	1128 6th Street, N.W., Square 449, Lot 40.
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Could you
12	please introduce yourselves for the record?
13	MR. ADEMILUYI: Sure. Good afternoon. My name
14	is Oluseyi Ademiluyi, Seyi for short. And I'm the owner
15	of the property.
16	MR. BOSTAN: Good afternoon. My name is Sahnur
17	Bostan. I'm the architect for the project.
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. I know one of you
19	haven't been sworn in. Have both of you been sworn in?
20	Okay. If you could, both please stand and take the oath
21	administered by the Secretary to my left.
22	MR. MOY: Do you solemnly swear or affirm that
23	the testimony you're about to present in this proceeding
24	is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?
25	Thank you.
J	I .

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right. Could you
2	oh, you did introduce yourselves for the record. All
3	right. So there's a preliminary matter of the 21-day
4	filing in that there's a waiver request. So you're aware
5	of this in that you're filing something underneath the 21-
6	day filing. And so you'll need, so you're requesting a
7	waiver from that. Is that correct?
8	MR. BOSTAN: Yes, and we uploaded a waiver
9	request written.
10	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. And why is it late?
11	MR. BOSTAN: We went through historic board
12	review on this project. And originally, we had a
13	penthouse, so we had to strike down the penthouse
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So you're removing
15	something in terms of
16	MR. BOSTAN: Yes.
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: your request? Okay.
18	MR. BOSTAN: Yes, that's the reason.
19	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right. I don't have any
20	issues with that waiver. Does the Board have any issues
21	with the waiver? Okay. All right. So we'll go ahead and
22	grant you the waiver for the 21-day filing.
23	Then the next is this affidavit of maintenance.
24	Do they not have an affidavit of maintenance, OAG? I'm
25	just a little confused.
	I

1	MR. BOSTAN: We did upload that. And I checked
2	I believe Robert before the meeting.
3	MS. CAIN: There's nothing in the record
4	currently that's the affidavit of maintenance. There is
5	an affidavit of posting but not maintenance.
6	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So when did you post?
7	When did you post?
8	MR. BOSTAN: Whenever that the photographs, I
9	believe a couple days after that I believe.
10	CHAIRPERSON HILL: No, I mean, how long have
11	you had the placard up?
12	MR. ADEMILUYI: The placard, I don't know the
13	exact date I put it up. But I know it was well over the
14	minimum amount of time that was required.
15	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: The date of the
16	affidavit of posting is, looks like May 3rd at 2:00 p.m.
17	MR. ADEMILUYI: I would have to check.
18	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: Is that March? Is that
19	I can't tell if that's March or May. It looks like
20	is it 05 or 03?
21	MR. ADEMILUYI: 05, that's May.
22	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: Okay. So it would be
23	May 3, 2019?
24	MR. ADEMILUYI: Yes.
25	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: That's affidavit of

1	posting not maintenance.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So the affidavit of
3	maintenance means that you've maintained the placard. All
4	right. And so you needed to submit an affidavit of
5	maintenance so we know that you've actually maintained the
6	placard.
7	MR. ADEMILUYI: I understand.
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: So I don't know what the
9	Board wants to do. I mean, you know, have you maintained
10	the placard?
11	MR. ADEMILUYI: Yes.
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
13	MR. ADEMILUYI: And I was there what's
14	today? Today is Wednesday. I was there on, actually two
15	days ago. And the placard has been maintained. It's been
16	there the whole time.
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So what does the
18	Board think of the affidavit of maintenance and that the
19	gentleman here under oath has
20	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: I'm fine, Mr. Chair.
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right. So we're
22	going to waive the affidavit of maintenance.
23	MR. ADEMILUYI: Thank you.
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right. So
25	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: And I'll say just to

1	add one thing.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure.
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: We do have a ANC report
4	on this.
5	MR. ADEMILUYI: Yes.
6	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: And I think that that
7	also helps with the affidavit of maintenance. It's, we
8	have something from the community that says that, you
9	know, they've, whether or not they support it or they are
10	favoring this, but I think that's also helpful. So
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I agree. Thank you. Thank
12	you, Vice Chair Hart. All right.
13	So, gentlemen, if you want to go ahead and walk
14	us through your proposal, if you want to tell us about
15	what you're trying to get done or what you're trying to do
16	I should say, as well as the standard in which you're, and
17	speak to the standard as to why we should grant the
18	application.
19	I'm going to put 15 minutes on the clock, Mr.
20	Moy, just so I know where we are. And you can begin
21	whenever you like.
22	MR. BOSTAN: Yes. I know it's been a long day,
23	so I'll try to keep it short. Again, like it's stated, we
24	are converting this single-family townhouse into actually

five units, not six units.

The waiver we're asking today is, the special
exception we're asking today is for the lot occupancy.
And the extra occupancy we are asking, I believe it's 66
percent instead of 60, is for the stair we are putting in
the back. That's the stair that's going from first to
second floor in the back. That counts as lot occupancy.
So we're asking special exceptions so that we can have
that stair in the back.
The stair, we have some shadow studies. Like
say, it's one story. It doesn't cause any adverse effect

The stair, we have some shadow studies. Like I say, it's one story. It doesn't cause any adverse effect to the neighbors. It doesn't block their sun. And their privacy is also not impacted in our, as shown in the exhibits.

I mean, the history of the project, like I mentioned, there was a penthouse. It's been struck down. So, on the last exhibit, I believe it's 33, is the most accurate drawings. And the stair used to go up to the third floor. We took it down to the second floor. So it's only going one story up instead of two.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Does the Board have any questions for the Applicant? Okay. I'm going to turn to the Office of Planning.

MR. JESICK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the Board. My name is Matt Jesick. The Office of Planning is happy to rest on the record in support of

2.0

	che applicacion. Inank you.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Does the Board have
3	any questions for the Office of Planning? Does the
4	Applicant have any questions for the Office of Planning?
5	MR. ADEMILUYI: No.
6	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I do have one question I
7	guess. There was this, and I can't remember what it was,
8	something about the color, the ANC had requested a
9	particular type of color. Can you speak to this?
10	MR. BOSTAN: Yes, on the ANC meeting, one of
11	the ANC members, they mentioned that the use of dark metal
12	panel color will be too strong for the residents across
13	the street. I mean, it's not seen from the street. But
14	the people across the street on the upper levels, they may
15	see this. Historic didn't have any issues. So we are
16	going to use a lighter color on the project. And that was
17	a personal preference of one of the ANC members
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. It was the personal
19	preference of one of
20	MR. BOSTAN: Yeah.
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Or I shouldn't say personal
22	preference. Well, you got feedback.
23	MR. BOSTAN: The personal comments.
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: You got feedback from one
25	commissioner

1	MR. BOSTAN: One commissioner.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: And they thought maybe that
3	a lighter color would be helpful.
4	MR. BOSTAN: Yes, something that matches with
5	the building.
6	CHAIRPERSON HILL: And you are in, that's what
7	your plan currently is.
8	MR. BOSTAN: That's our intentions, yes.
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right. Okay. Is
10	there anyone here who wishes to speak in support? Is
11	there anyone here who wishes to speak in opposition? Is
12	there anything else you would like to add at the end?
13	MR. ADEMILUYI: Not
14	MR. BOSTAN: I mean, ANC is in support of this
15	in the letter. So
16	MR. ADEMILUYI: And HPRB.
17	MR. BOSTAN: And HPRB is I believe in two days.
18	So they are in concert.
19	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right. Does the
20	Board have any final questions before I close the record?
21	Okay. I'm going to go ahead and close the record. Is the
22	Board ready to deliberate? Okay. I can start.
23	I didn't really have any issues with the
24	application. I thought that the analysis that was
25	provided by the Office of Planning was well thought out.

1	I also am glad to see the ANC was in support. And they
2	did have a suggestion concerning color. And the Applicant
3	seems as though they're going to take that into
4	consideration.
5	So I do think that they've met the standard
6	with such to grant the special exception. And I will be
7	voting in favor. Does anyone else have anything they'd
8	like to add?
9	Okay. I'll go ahead and make a motion to
LO	approve Application Number 20017 as captioned and read by
11	the Secretary and ask for a second.
L2	VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: Second.
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Motion has been made and
L4	seconded. All those in favor say aye.
15	(Chorus of aye.)
L6	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All those opposed? The
L7	motion passes, Mr. Moy.
L8	MR. MOY: The staff would record the vote as
L9	five to zero to zero. And this is on the motion of
20	Chairman Hill to approve the application for the relief
21	being requested. Seconding the motion is Vice Chair Hart,
22	also in support Ms. John, Ms. White, Mr. Peter Shapiro.
23	Motion carries, sir.
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Thank you,
25	Mr. Moy. Thank you, gentlemen.

1	MR. ADEMILUYI: Thank you very much.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Moy, is there anything
3	else before the Board today?
4	MR. MOY: Not from the staff, sir.
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Then we stand
6	adjourned.
7	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off
8	the record at 4:18 p.m.)
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 Board of Zoning Adjustment

Date: 05-22-19

Place: Washington, DC

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

Court Reporter

near aus &