GOVERNMENT
OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

+ + + + +

PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY

SEPTEMBER 30, 2020

+ + + + +

The Regular Public Hearing of the District of Columbia Board of Zoning Adjustment convened via Video Teleconference, pursuant to notice at 10:49 a.m. EDT, Frederick L. Hill, Chairperson, presiding.

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT MEMBERS PRESENT:

FREDERICK L. HILL, Chairperson LORNA JOHN, Board Member CHRISHAUN SMITH, Board Member

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

MICHAEL TURNBULL, Zoning Commission Member

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

CLIFFORD MOY, Secretary

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

MAXINE BROWN-ROBERTS JENNIFER BROWN ANNE FOTHERGILL CRYSTAL MYERS MATTHEW JESICK

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PRESENT:

JACK RICE, ESQ.
DANIEL BASSETT, ESQ.
ALEXANDRA CAIN, ESQ.

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Regular Public Hearing held on September 30, 2020.

CONTENTS

	\mathbf{p}_{I}	AGE
Application No. 20312, District Department of General Services for a Special Exception to Construct an ADA Accessible Elevator at Ross Elementary		
School	•	4
Application No. 20203 Congressional 1018 Bryant LLC .	•	15
Application No. 20267 of Frank Jackson	•	40
Application No. 20275 of Charles and Dara Mooney	•	49
Application No. 20279 of HJB Properties LLC	•	53
Adjourn		75

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

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
(10:49 a.m.)
MR. MOY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Board is
back in session in the public hearing session of today's
hearing. And the time is at or about 10:49. So shall I call
the first case, sir?
CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes. Are you going to do that
one that we pulled off the
MR. MOY: That's correct.
CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes. That's good.
MR. MOY: Okay. So that would be Application
Number 20312, of the District Department of General Services,
captioned and advertised for a special exception under
Subtitle F, Section 4910.1 from the rear yard requirements,
Subtitle F 4906.1 to construct an ADA-accessible elevator at
the back of Ross Elementary School building in the RA-8 Zone,
at premises 1730 R Street, Northwest, Square 155, Lot 821.
CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right. Thank you, Mr. Moy.
I guess, Mr. Young, if you've let everybody in. I'm waiting
for somebody's camera to come on, or someone to introduce
themselves.
MR. COHEN: Yes sir, hi Mr. Chair. This is
Christopher Cohen, with Holland and Knight for the record,
on behalf of the applicant.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Mr. Cohen, are you

1	choosing not to use your camera, which is fine, I just want
2	to know.
3	MR. COHEN: No. I'd like to, just give me one
4	second. You think I'd figure this out by now. Yes. We're
5	all good.
6	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great.
7	(Simultaneous speaking.)
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Who good morning. And who
9	else is with you here today?
LO	MR. COHEN: I have Ms. Maria Gorodetskaya, with
11	Shinberg Levinas, the architect on the project, and Mr. Burt
12	Jackson with the Department of General Services as well.
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. I don't see them in the
L4	room.
15	MR. YOUNG: They're both calling in. So I just
L6	unmuted both of them. So they can speak now.
L7	MS. GORODETSKAYA: Good morning. This is Maria
18	with Shinberg Levinas, the Project Manager for the project.
L9	MR. JACKSON: And good morning. This is Burt
20	Jackson with DGS. Good morning.
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Good morning. All right. Mr.
22	Cohen, I'll go ahead and let you kind of Mr. Cohen, did
23	you wear a tie for us today?
24	MR. COHEN: Always. Always, Mr. Chair.
25	CHAIRPERSON HILL: That' I'm going to wear a

tie. Next week, I'm going to wear a tie. It's been a while.

MR. COHEN: I didn't mean to impose that kind of pressure. It's just to put me in the right mindset.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: You don't have to worry, you won't change us. We're not getting paid, Mr. Cohen. But thank you, Mr. Cohen. Let's see. If you want to go ahead and walk us through the application. I'm sure you heard, we pulled you off of the expedited review. If you can tell us a little bit about what your client's trying to do and why you believe they meet the criteria for us to grant application.

As I did state, I didn't think that it was prejudicing any parties by moving you to the hearing today, because it seems as though you've done a lot of community outreach. But if you could kind of speak to how this wouldn't prejudice any parties to go ahead and have this hearing with you today. And you can begin whenever you like.

MR. COHEN: Sure. Thank you, Mr. Chair. And good morning, and good morning Vice Chair John, and Mr. Smith, and Commissioner Turnbull. Thank you for having us this morning. And I appreciate, even though we didn't get on the expedited agenda, that we were moved to today and the first case.

On behalf of the applicant, again, for the record, my name is Christopher Cohen on behalf of the District Department of General Services, and with me is Ms. Maria

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

Gorodetskaya, and Mr. Burt Jackson.

2.0

2.1

And in this case, this is hopefully a rather simple case. This case involves the proposed addition of an ADA accessible elevator on the back of the school building. Specifically, the Ross Elementary School building, which is located at 1730 R Street NW. The applicant needs rear yard relief from the requirements that are applicable to the public school buildings in the RA-8 Zone.

And as we'll go through this presentation today, we'll share and demonstrate how the application satisfies the general review criteria under Subtitle F, Section 901.2. And briefly, I'll just summarize the case record to this point, as you noted, Mr. Chair, we do have the support of the ANC. They submitted a letter into the record in support, which is Exhibit 34. We also appreciate the fact that OP recommends approval of this application. That's indicated under Exhibit 39.

I will also note that the property is located within the Dupont Circle Historic District, and the applicant is pleased to share that it has concept approval from the CFA, and is submitting for final permit, I believe, tomorrow. Ms. Gorodetskaya will speak more to that.

And I'm sorry, one more thing. Anticipating that we might be on the public hearing agenda, we also submitted a presentation into the record. I didn't know if Mr. Young

could pull that up. And of course, the presentation materials are supplemental record.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: That's all right. Actually, Mr. Young, if you just want to go ahead and pull that off. Why don't you just kind of tell us about it, Mr. Cohen?

MR. COHEN: Okay. That's totally fine. Well, with that, then I'll bring in Mr. Jackson on the phone because he'll speak more to the project and the overall modernization effort and how this elevator addition is integrated and why it's so important. So if we can get Mr. Jackson on the line, that would be great. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Jackson, can you hear us?

MR. JACKSON: Yes, I can. Thank you very much.

Just to briefly describe the building. This is an existing school building. It was built over 100 years ago, 130 years ago, and as part of the modernization program, part of the scope of work is to include an ADA accessible elevator to the rear of the building.

There's also modernization efforts that are going on within the building. As you can imagine, the property within this urban environment, right now the population for the kids is continuing to grow, so we're trying to expand the school to accommodate that growing and needing population.

But the topic for today is the elevator, which is desperately needed for this structure. To be located on the

2.0

2.1

side of this existing building, which fronts on R 1 There's an alley to the rear of the building. 2 Street. that is our request today is to be allowed to build this 3 4 structure. 5 once this structure the way Now is it's currently designed and I'll defer to my colleague with 6 7 Shinberg and Levinas, but the structure in keeping, the new 8 elevator structure will be in keeping with the existing 9 It will be a brick facade. We've gone to great 10 lengths to design an elevator shaft that is the least square footage impact to the square footage and footprint of the 11 12 building. So I think what we're talking about today should be fairly straightforward, 13 and as а benefit to these elementary school kids. 14 15 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right. Mr. Cohen, is that it? 16 17 MR. COHEN: I'd like to bring in Ms. Gorodetskaya. She'll speak a little bit more to the design of the elevator 18 19 and how it doesn't -- it's installation wouldn't create any 20 adverse impacts at the back of the building. 2.1 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. 22 can supplement COHEN: She Jackson's MR. Mr. 23 testimony. 24 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.

MS. GORODETSKAYA:

25

This is Maria

Good morning.

Gorodetskaya with Shinberg Levinas. So we've been working with DGS and DCPS very closely over the last few months to develop the plan for this design. The biggest challenge here is that the existing building has a very typical historic footprint. It's a square pinwheel plan, symmetrical, so the challenge was to figure out where to place the elevator to allow that ADA access to all levels of the school for the students.

We worked closely with HPO and CFA to determine what is the best placement for this elevator shaft. And with their input and agreement, and support for our plan, the proposed location for the elevator is at the rear, where it's least visible and has the least impact to the historic nature of the building.

The back of the building fronts an alley. It's just a service part of the lot. So we felt that this was the most appropriate location. The other aspect of the design was to select the smallest footprint, the smallest elevator that we could specify for this installation.

So we've worked with DGS to gain their approval to go with an elevator that's not typically allowed anymore, but has the smallest footprint to really minimize the impact to the rear yard.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Does the Board have any questions for the applicant? No. All right. I'm going to

2.0

2.1

1	turn to the Office of Planning.
2	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Good morning Mr. Chairman and
3	members of the BZA. For the record, this is Maxine Brown-
4	Roberts from the Office of Planning. The Office of Planning
5	recommends approval of the requested rear yard extension and
б	we stand on the record. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and I'm
7	available for questions.
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. Does anyone have
9	any questions for the Office of Planning? Mr. Cohen, you
10	started to say something. You're saying no, correct?
11	MR. COHEN: I'm sorry. I was on mute. No, Mr.
12	Chair, we have no questions.
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right. Great. Ms.
14	Brown-Roberts, nice to see you. I haven't seen you since you
15	came back.
16	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Thank you.
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right. Let's see. Okay.
18	Mr. Young, is here anyone here who wishes to testify?
19	MR. YOUNG: We have no one signed up.
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Mr. Cohen, do you have
21	anything else you'd like to add at the end?
22	MR. COHEN: I don't, Mr. Chair. Thank you very
23	much. I appreciate it.
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right. I'm going
25	to close the hearing. Is the Board ready to deliberate?

Okay. All right. I can start. I didn't have an issue with the application. I did think that it was something that we could not have decided in expedite or review. I will agree with the Office of Planning's analysis, as to how they're meeting the criteria. I do not think there's going to be an adverse impact for this particular elevator. And I think that it's something that is obviously needed.

The ANC was also in support and indeed, I have no objections. I thought it was pretty straightforward, and I'm going to be voting to approve. Mr. Turnbull, do you have anything you'd like to add?

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I would just add that you have this historic building, and so trying to bring a historic building up to compliance, and especially with this ADA elevator, I think it meets the criteria for special exception. I think that was the way to go. And I think it has no impact on the neighbors. I think they've done a lot of work in placing it, architecturally, they talked about what they did. I think it blends in very well.

I think that there's no impact on the neighbors, the houses and the apartment buildings across the street. So you're right. I think it's right to be approved, and I will be voting in favor of it.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Smith?

MEMBER SMITH: I do agree that Mr. Chairman's --

2.0

2.1

2.3

1	Mr. Turnbull that the placement of this elevator will have
2	minimal impact on the surrounding properties, abutting an
3	alley. So there wouldn't be any impacts there. I would
4	thank the applicant for keeping the size of the elevator
5	fairly compact to reduce the size of their request. So other
6	than that, I would support their request for a special
7	exception.
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. Vice Chair John?
9	You're on mute, Ms. John.
10	VICE CHAIR JOHN: So I agree with everything
11	that's been said and I have nothing to add. I did want ask
12	a question of Mr. Cohen, which is out of order, but just want
13	to be sure that you filed an affidavit of maintenance.
14	MR. COHEN: Yes, Vice Chair John, we did. That
15	is Exhibit 41 in the record.
16	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. Thank you.
17	MR. COHEN: Thank you.
18	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
19	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. All right. I'm
20	going to make a motion then to approve Application Number
21	20312 as captioned and read by the Secretary and ask for a
22	second, Ms. John?
23	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Second.
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: The motion was made and
25	seconded, Mr. Moy. Could you please take a roll call vote?

1	MR. MOY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. When I call
2	your name, if you would please respond with a yes, no, or
3	abstain to the motion made by Chairman Hill to approve the
4	Application as captioned and advertised for relief. And
5	seconded by Vice Chair John. Zoning Commissioner, Michael
6	Turnbull?
7	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes to approve.
8	MR. MOY: Mr. Smith?
9	MEMBER SMITH: Yes to approve
10	MR. MOY: Vice Chair John?
11	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Yes to approve.
12	MR. MOY: Chairman Hill?
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes to approve.
14	MR. MOY: Staff will record the vote as four to
15	zero to one and this is on the motion of Chairman Hill to
16	approve the Application as advertised and captioned.
17	Seconding the motion is Vice Chair John, also in support,
18	Zoning Commissioner Michael Turnbull, and Mr. Smith, and of
19	course, Vice Chair John and Chairman Hill. We have a Board
20	seat vacant but the motion carries on the vote of four to
21	zero to one.
22	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right. Great. Thank you,
23	Mr. Moy. Thank you, Mr. Cohen.
24	MR. COHEN: Thank you very much. Appreciate it.
25	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Bye-bye. Mr. Moy, feel free

1	to call our next one whenever you can.
2	MR. MOY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So that would
3	be Case Application Number 20203 of Congressional 1018 Bryant
4	LLC, advertised and captioned for a special exception under
5	the New Residential Development Provision, Subtitle U,
6	Section 421.1. This would construct a new eight unit
7	apartment house. This is in the RA-1 Zone at premises 1018
8	Bryant Street NE, Square 3870, Lot 42.
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Let's see. Mr.
10	Ferris, are you with us? Can you hear me?
11	MR. FERRIS: Yes. It'll be Mr. Kadlecek
12	presenting today though.
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Oh, got it. Oh, Mr. Kadlecek,
14	how are you?
15	MR. KADLECEK: I'm good. How are you?
16	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Haven't seen you yet, I don't
17	think.
18	MR. KADLECEK: It's been a while. I had a baby
19	so I was gone for a while.
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Wow, congratulations.
21	MR. KADLECEK: Thank you.
22	CHAIRPERSON HILL: You make it sound like you had
23	a lot to do with that.
24	MR. KADLECEK: Just a little.
25	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Let's see. All right. So Mr.

1	Kadlecek, I guess you're going to be presenting to us. Could
2	you introduce your team, if you wouldn't mind.
3	MR. KADLECEK: Sure. Again, for the record, I'm
4	Cary Kadlecek with the law firm of Goulston & Storrs. With
5	me today are my colleagues, Lawrence Ferris, Brian Athey of
6	Congressional Capital, who's the developer and the applicant,
7	and Michael Cross, who's the architect. I believe that they
8	are all on.
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Commissioner Montague,
10	are you do you want to introduce yourself, please, sir?
11	MR. MONTAGUE: Commissioner Jeremiah Montague Jr.,
12	Chairman of ANC 5-c.
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right. Hi Commissioner.
14	You kind of broke up there just a little bit. So we'll see
15	how your internet, you seem to be kind of jumbled, but we'll
16	see what happens.
17	MR. MONTAGUE: Do you want me to repeat it?
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: You can. Go ahead and repeat
19	it. I just want to see if it's working.
20	MR. MONTAGUE: My name is Commissioner Jeremiah
21	Montague, Vice Chair ANC, 5-C.
22	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. It worked, thank
23	you. All right. Okay, let's see then. Mr. Kadlecek, why
24	don't you go ahead and just walk us through your application
25	and what your client is trying to propose, and why you

believe that they're meeting the criteria in order for us to grant the relief requested. I'm going to put 15 minutes up on the clock just so I kind of know where we are. But if you go over, you go over. And you can begin whenever you like.

MR. KADLECEK: All right. Thanks. We're going to give a brief presentation and well actually walk through the plans a little bit because they have changed since they were filed back in November of last year. So if Mr. Young could maybe put the presentation up.

Just to get a brief overview. We're here today concerning the redevelopment of 1018 Bryant Street NE into an eight unit multifamily building. The property's zoned RA-1, so the requested relief if the special exception under U 421 for new residential development. Except for this relief, the proposed project conforms to the RA-1 development standards.

Since filing the application back in November of last year, the applicants had an extensive and ongoing communication with the community and the ANC. This started with a community meeting back in February. But since then, the community has become overwhelmingly supportive, which Brian Athey will describe in greater detail. Based on feedback from nearby residents and the Office of Planning, the project design was substantially overhauled to better reflect the character of the other existing development on

2.0

2.1

from nine to eight units. 2 3 Michael Cross will describe the design of the project and the changes in greater detail. Just before we 5 get into more specifics of the presentation, I want to note that we have reports in support from the Office of Planning 6 7 at Exhibit 47, DDOT at Exhibit 38. ANC has also submitted 8 a report in support at Exhibit 48. And there's a petition 9 support submitted by surrounding residents at Exhibit 49. 10 And with that, I will turn it over to Mr. Athey. 11 MR. ATHEY: An interesting experience. It started 12 off with some opposition, you know, actually quite a bit of 13 opposition. And then --14 I was muted. CHAIRPERSON HILL: I'm sorry. How 15 do you pronounce your name, sir? Athey? 16 It's Athey. That's correct. MR. ATHEY: 17 Mr. Athey, I think missed the CHAIRPERSON HILL: very beginning of what you said. 18 19 MR. ATHEY: Okay. 20 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Can you start again? 2.1 MR. ATHEY: I'm happy to start again. Sure. name is Brian Athey, I'm the president of Congressional 1018 22 23 The applicant here. Bryant Street LLC. As you may know, 24 this project started with opposition in the very beginning. Are you able to hear me okay? Yes.

this block of Bryant Street, and the unit count was reduced

This project started with opposition in the very beginning. We went to an ANC meeting where the neighbors made it clear they opposed the initial nine unit project. I took that really as an opportunity to reach out to the neighbors and have extensive dialogue. I spoke to Raymond Chandler, who's really kind of the Block Captain, on numerous occasions.

I started meeting with the community, you know, first I believe it was in, you know, February or March. We, you know, met at Carolina Kitchen. I sat with everyone, we talked at length. Had lunch. I think that helped, you know, helped significantly. We were scheduled to meet a month later, and then with the COVID outbreak, you know, we couldn't meet in person.

Then we exchanged multiple emails and phone calls through the course of the next six months. Then proceeding with Zoom calls over the course of the last really month and a half on multiple Saturdays, in which we went from what started as a really sort of a modern farmhouse style, and then I took the neighbors feedback to say, look, we need to tone this down. Make it more consistent with the neighboring properties. And I think that's what you see with the facade that's on the screen.

And then we incorporated things like, you know, of course, we have a trash enclosure in the rear. We have,

2.0

2.1

you know, we were asked to put a metal fence in public space in the front of the property to match the other fences along the street. You know, we were asked to add some greenery in the front in the public space as well. And, you know, really what started as a tough experience with some opposition, having resulted in me what I think's really relationship with the community, you know, with Raymond Chandler and with several others. And, you know, they, the neighbors suggested we reduce the scope of the project from nine units downwards, so we went from nine to eight.

You know, I think it's a really, really a cool project because each of the units has its own separate entrance and, you know, which obviously is attractive for a lot of different reasons. But you know, overall, this was really a project where dialog and understanding sort of, I think, kind of carried the day. It took a lot of -- you know, I want to have a positive impact and, you know, in the And I took the feedback to heart and tried to community. community I'm really work with the know, and, you appreciative of their dialogue and feedback, and now, I think their support is reflective of that.

So that's really all I have.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Thank you, sir.

MR. ATHEY: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Kadlecek?

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

MR. KADLECEK: Yes, Mr. Cross is just going to walk you through the plans really quickly. The architect.

MR. CROSS: Sure. Thank you. As mentioned, Michael Cross, architect. If I can have Mr. Young possibly escape out of the full screen mode so that we can see the pages to cycle through them a little faster, I'd appreciate it. Possibly hitting Control H to hide the toolbars when we escape out.

The project's located at 1018 Bryant Street, as mentioned. That's on the north side of Bryant between Rhode Island and 12th. There you go. Perfect. If we could go to the next slide, please. The project that we're proposing at this property is designed to be a fully detached eight unit condo building. As mentioned, all of these units will have their own exterior entrances and that all units are multistory family sized two bedroom, two bath units ranging from 820 to 1000 square feet.

The project is located within a half mile of the Redline Metro Station at Rhode Island Avenue, and is adjacent to the Rhode Island and 10th Street bus stop. While only one parking space is required, the project is currently proposing five parking spaces. Next slide please. As mentioned by Mr. Athey, we worked extensively with the community on this project. Initially it was a nine unit building with a very modern facade. As you see on the left side of your screen

2.0

1	here. And when we, the owner met with the community back
2	just prior to the COVID shutdown in March, and received their
3	feedback on the actual facade of the building, as well as,
4	you know, feedback on a lot of other aspects of the project.
5	It was after that meeting and in conjunction with
6	OP that we worked on revising the facade to better fit into
7	the community. Later on, in August, we ultimately reduced
8	the number of units from nine down to eight, with the support
9	of the ANC. And as mentioned at that time, we also updated
10	some of the site plans to include some more landscaping at
11	the front of the property along the sidewalk. You can go to
12	the next slide. We appreciate you time and welcome any
13	questions that you might have.
14	MR. KADLECEK: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chair,
15	that concludes our presentation and we're happy to answer any
16	questions.
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thanks Mr. Kadlecek. Mr.
18	Cross, I'm a little confused by that little house. Is that
19	little house part of the project?
20	MR. CROSS: On the slide that you see on the
21	screen now, the center property is the eight unit condo
22	building. The two adjacent properties are the existing
23	single-family dwellings shown here for context.
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Because in your slide deck, I
25	think it was like on B4 or something, you just had one of the

1	homes.
2	MR. CROSS: I mean you don't
3	(Simultaneous speaking.)
4	MR. CROSS: As a photograph?
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: No.
6	MR. ATHEY: Michael, I think he may be referring
7	to the slide that showed the comparison of the old facade to
8	the new facade, or not?
9	MR. CROSS: That's possible. Yes. If we go two
10	slides
11	(Simultaneous speaking.)
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: No, that wasn't it. It's okay.
13	MR. ATHEY: Okay.
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I'm just being clear. We're
15	just talking about that property in the middle. That's all.
16	MR. CROSS: That's right.
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: And Mr. Kadlecek, what did the
18	neighbors say on either side?
19	MR. KADLECEK: I'll leave that to Brian. I know
20	he's had dialogue with pretty much everyone on the block.
21	MR. ATHEY: My dialogue with the neighbors on
22	either side, I've spoken to the son of one of the neighbors
23	on one of the sides who actually talked to me about his own
24	potential future, you know, development plans of that
25	property. But and I haven't, I don't recall speaking

directly to the other neighbor.

2.0

At least, I mean, there was no opposition or nothing that was noted by, you know, most of my dialogue has been with, you know, Raymond Chandler, Justin, Kelly Mitchell-Carroll, multiple other neighbors. And it's been over the course of six months. So I'm not even quite sure. It's really been a group thing. I've invited everyone to multiple Zooms and we've interfaced as a collective.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Does the Board have any -- Mr. Young, if you could pull the slide deck down so I can just see everybody. Thank you. Does the Board have any questions for the applicant? Commissioner Turnbull?

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I just wanted to get back to the Exhibit 31 had lots of individuals in opposition. And you mentioned the name Raymond Chandler. So, I guess I'm confused. You say you haven't talked to the neighbors on either side?

MR. ATHEY: I'm not saying that, I didn't say that. I can look up who the direct adjacent. What I did say was that I spoke to the children of one of the neighbors who spoke, was speaking on behalf of the family. And that's direct neighbor inquired about development plans and potentially developing both properties together. I'd have to look up which neighbor is on the other side. I've talked to so many of the neighbors, I can't recall exactly who is

the direct neighbor on the other side. 1 2 (Simultaneous speaking.) Raymond Chandler and many others are 3 MR. ATHEY: 4 fully in support. 5 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: You know, and I appreciate all your efforts to talk to people. But I guess one of the 6 7 key items in getting approval is that, you know, we have this 8 multiple list of people in opposition, and their arguments 9 as to why they are in opposition. But two of the key ones 10 would be the people adjacent to the property. So that's part 11 the key issues because they're the most intimately affected by the project, by the new apartment building. it would be good to know what they think. 13 14 We don't have any current opposition MR. ATHEY: 15 though, to this project. COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: 16 There what? 17 We don't have any current opposition MR. ATHEY: to this project. Any opposition was back several months ago, 18 19 it was months and months ago. 20 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: So is there any Exhibit 2.1 that would so state that there's no opposition? 22 Well, I think if you look at the MR. KADLECEK: 23 petition in support, that's at Exhibit 49. That lists all And, you know, we can't say it like person for 24 the people. person, like, you know, who was in the initial petition

But I think that it's quite clear based on the number of people who signed onto Exhibit 49, that there was definitely a seat change in terms of people supporting the 4 application. COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. Again, my point was just clarifying the neighbors on either side. And I haven't heard anything one way or another on them. I'd just like to If you can do that, that's fine. clarify that. That's all. If you can't do that, that's fine too. CHAIRPERSON HILL: I'm just going to interrupt You don't have anything from the next door Right. neighbors and the Commissioner is here, meaning the ANC Commissioner, Mr. Montague, is here. 13 So we can talk to him. But what you're just saying is right. There's nothing from 14 There's nothing from either of the immediate either side. 16 next door neighbors in the record, one way or the other. That's what I believe Commissioner Turnbull is asking. The answer is either yes or no. So that's correct. 18 MR. KADLECEK: That's correct. Although I will I'm looking at the Exhibit 49. It looks like the residents of 1020, which is adjacent, Bryant Street, did sign the petition in support. 22

23 Okay. CHAIRPERSON HILL: So you got one of the 24 sides.

25 MR. KADLECEK: Yes.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

15

17

19

2.0

2.1

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Commissioner
2	(Simultaneous speaking.)
3	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Is that the side with the
4	gable end of the building?
5	MR. KADLECEK: 1020 would be
6	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: With the sloped roof.
7	MR. KADLECEK: To the east.
8	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: That's the side with the
9	more boxier look of the building?
10	MR. KADLECEK: Yes.
11	(Simultaneous speaking.)
12	MR. KADLECEK: You're saying to the left if you're
13	
14	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: The right side of the
15	building is more squared off and faces one unit. The other
16	side has the gable and it's, the left side of the building
17	has a gable and it's got a sloped roof on the other neighbor.
18	So I'm just wondering which neighbor.
19	MR. KADLECEK: Yes. So 1020, if you're looking
20	at the front of the building, 1020 would be to the right.
21	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: To the right. Okay.
22	MR. KADLECEK: Yes.
23	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Thank you.
24	
21	MR. ATHEY: And just to clarify, just look through

to at length about my development plans, their future plans. They asked me if they could use the front of the property for a wedding. And, you know, I looked into insurance and the whole thing. They're, you know, I don't have anything in the record stating they're in support, but I've talked to them, you know, at length. If they were in opposition, we'd certainly know about it.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: All right. Thank you.

Also just to jump in and put a little MR. FERRIS: more color on this, Commissioner Turnbull. Brian spoke a little bit about this but basically, the process that we had with the neighborhood residents was that when we met with them in February and started to have a sense of their concerns, we scheduled an in person meeting again in March, that was noticed to everyone on the block and surrounding blocks posting fliers throughout bу the neighborhood on people's doors.

And everyone was invited to come, have lunch, and talk about the project. We had that meeting in March and then COVID hit. And then we scheduled another virtual meeting in August, and the same notice was given all around the neighborhood by posting fliers on everyone's doors.

So it wasn't just coordinating with the Block Captain, as Brian said, it was posting notice on everybody's doors for each meeting. And then we had a second meeting two

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

weeks later at the end of August. So anyone who would have had issues had plenty of opportunity. So in addition to having individual conversations with each of the neighbors, there's also been, and I think that's what the petition in support reflects, that very comprehensive approach to working with the neighbors. So I thought it would be helpful to kind of put a little more color on that.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: That's good to know. I'm glad you took all those concerns to heart and actually went out and have done the necessary communication with the residents. I think that's, that was very prudent of you to do that, and I appreciate it. Thank you.

MR. FERRIS: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right. Commissioner Montague, do you have any questions and/or would you like to give a presentation?

MR. MONTAGUE: I'll speak slowly so that the tech Not so much questions for the applicant. can catch up. In terms of the presentation, we have submitted our 129 in of the project. We have, the Commission diligently followed this project and its development through the single-member district, Commissioner Darlene Oliver and we will say that as projects go, this is one that got it right in that the project, the applicant, and the owner met respectfully and diligently with the community and responded

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

to their needs.

2.1

2.3

And thus, we have a project that's acceptable to everybody that lives in the vicinity as opposed to, I tread lightly on saying this, a similar project which is in the neighborhood, which didn't get it the way it should have been done. So we are very appreciative, as is the community, of Mr. Athey and his company in this development project. So that's why ANC 5C has thrown its support behind this because the community has worked hard, and had their concerns addressed.

There was one minor thing, which there was a revelation in another BZA case heard earlier today where there was a suggestion regarding RPP, and that DDOT may now indeed have a means to prevent people in such projects from getting RPP. I would think that Commissioner, excuse me, Zoning Chairman Hood said that he would look into it and he would report back to the BZA in general on that subject.

But as the, in this project, they are providing five onsite parking spaces, which reduces the loss of on street parking. And so ANC 5C having submitted it to our Board, we stand on our record as in favor of this project.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Thank you, Commissioner. And Mr. Commissioner, I think that as far as that RPP thing goes, I even, I don't think that there is technology yet with DDOT. It actually does single out a

1	particular building from RPP or not. I know that that's
2	something that Chairman Hood was going to maybe speak to, or
3	look into. But I don't think it exists yet, just to be
4	clear.
5	MR. MONTAGUE: Oh, no, no. When it was said, I
6	said, oh really? But at least it's something to roll in the
7	back of people's heads that it may become a possibility.
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. All right.
9	Let's see. Does anyone have any questions for the
10	Commissioner? Is okay. The applicant doesn't have any
11	questions for the Commissioner?
12	MR. KADLECEK: No questions, thank you.
13	MR. ATHEY: No questions.
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right. I'm going
15	to turn to the Office of Planning.
16	MS. MEYERS: Hello.
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Hello.
18	MS. MEYERS: Crystal Meyers for the Office of
19	Planning. The Office of Planning is recommending approval
20	of this case and we stand on the record of the staff reports.
21	I'm here for questions.
22	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Does anybody have any
23	questions for the Office of Planning? Okay. Does the
24	applicant?
25	MR. KADLECEK: No questions, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: 1 Okay. Mr. Young, is there 2 anyone here wishing to testify? 3 MR. YOUNG: We have no one signed up. 4 CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right. Does the Board have 5 anything before I close the hearing? If so, raise your hand. Mr. Kadlecek? 6 No. 7 MR. KADLECEK: Nothing further. Thank you. I'm going to close 8 CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right. 9 the hearing. Is the Board ready to deliberate? 10 well gosh, I hate to do this. I'm reopening the hearing because I have just one question for Commissioner Montague. 11 12 So Commissioner, I mean, we get a lot of activity from your ANC, and we see you actually quite a bit personally. 13 When you say they got it right, what does that mean? 14 15 MR. MONTAGUE: It's not trying to be catty. are projects which come to our community, which basically 16 17 bulldoze their way into, here we are, these are our rights, And the interaction and this is what's going to happen. 18 between applicant, developer, and the community falls very, 19 20 very short of an amicable solution at the end. 2.1 In this particular case, Mr. Athey and his company 22 worked hard and even in the face of almost insurmountable 2.3 opposition at the beginning, was able to work with the 24 community and incorporate their concerns, and then go back

and verify that his changes reflected what the community

wanted.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

So if you do that, you're getting it right. If you don't do that, you're going to have a bumpy road until your building is standing, and it will be less received by the community along the way.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Well, Mr. Athey, you know, we the Commissioner quite а bit, see congratulations to you and the outreach you did. It sounds like you're a pretty patient person. And if children, maybe you can teach Mr. Kadlecek about being And if not, then whatever. patient.

All right. Okay. Going to go ahead and close the hearing again. Does somebody else want to start the deliberations? I've been talking a lot. Mr. Turnbull, let's start with you.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Oh, God love you, Mr. was, I'd say, I'm this Ι not sure, interesting, this is, what a difference a day makes, or a week, or a month, or whatever it took. But it seems, I mean, if you look at the set of drawings that were originally done, and you look at the proposed drawings, it's really night and And it's, I don't know whether it was the skill of Mr. -- Mr. Athey's suddenly, or whether it's Montague, or the the applicant's team that suddenly said, look, we've got to do something here. We've got to really make a change.

So it sounds like there must have been some very interesting community meetings going on when they talked about this piece of property. And I would say the skills of the architect were highly evolved and really went to town in making a change on this project. Because obviously, the first building was basically a box. Not saying anything about the architect's original project. But I think the box didn't just fit in and I think the community recognized that. I think Mr. Athey probably recognized that and said look, we've got a problem. Let's go back to the drawing board. Let's meet with the people to talk to them and come back with a project that's really going to fit in and make everybody happy.

And I mean if you look at the original opposition list. there's а lot of names on that list the neighborhood that are saying, look, we don't want this. Now bulldozer technique obviously ended sure Commissioner Montague is going to say, you know what, project here is going to be, this raises the bar for development in our neighborhood. And this is going to be the standard that we're going to be looking to do.

And I think Mr. Athey and his team have raised the bar and set the standard. I think, again, going back to the original project, the way it was designed, was a project that could go anywhere. But now it's tailor-made, it fits in with

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

the neighborhood. Could you tweak it a bit more, yes, sure. You could maybe do a little more tweaks, but I think it works. And I think significant effort was done to make it work. And I think the applicant's team had done their homework.

I mean, some of those meetings are known to be very contentious and they can get -- a lot of people can get upset and maybe not quite like the debate we saw last night, but I'm sure you had a lot of people that were like, eh, you know, whiny and complaining about a lot of things. But I think this project, the way it is now, works. And I think that the -- I will be voting in favor of supporting the I think a lot of effort was done on this application. project and I think it's to Commissioner Montague and the ANC, and their team, and Mr. Athey and his team, and so I would be voting in favor of this. I think it's a standard that a lot of developments should be doing like that.

Mr. Chair, hopefully that starts us off.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. Mr. Smith?

MEMBER SMITH: Mr. Turnbull, you started off well. You took the words out of my mouth, honestly. I would say there's a quote here from the ANC letter from Mr. Raymond Chandler that says that this is how projects should come to the community. And I've been a planner in other jurisdictions and I've seen developers ram through their

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

projects and they, you know, dig their feet in when they come to the Planning Commission and then the approval body as a whole and try to ram their project through.

And I would like to thank the developer for taking of the community fully into thought concerns redesigning this project. Not only redesigning the project, reducing the number of units of within the building from nine to eight out of the concerns of the larger community. the project, the response that you received really reflects your appreciation for that community. Because there was a lot of letters in opposition to the original project as it was presented, and now you have an ANC that is in support with a large list of residents that are abutting and within the surrounding neighborhood that are in support of this.

So I would say a job well done. This is definitely something that we want to see more of and I would support this application.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Vice Chair John? You're on mute, Ms. John.

VICE CHAIR JOHN: So once again, I'm benefitting from being at the end. And, you know, Mr. Smith and Mr. Turnbull have really said it all. I would like to offer my personal congratulations to Mr. Athey. Did I say that right? For taking so much care to design a project that fits in with the neighborhood. And we have seen, since I've been with the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

Board, many projects where, you know, it's a little box, like what we saw before, and it's just, you know, stuck into this neighborhood and doesn't look like the neighborhood. But it meets the standards. And so sometimes, you know, the density meets the standards, but it still really doesn't work for the community.

And I think because of all of the development that's taking place, I think we need to be more mindful of things like that. This is a beautiful project and I really have no hesitation in supporting it. And I appreciate the work of everyone involved, including OP. OP had some suggestions, Office of Planning had suggestions as well, and the neighbors. And that the developer was able to listen to the other side.

Sometimes people just don't listen. Sometimes people just want to be seen and heard. And I don't want to be on soapbox, I could get there very easily, but I just want to thank you and aside from meeting the regulations, which is the most important thing, I think this project shows a lot of thought. So congratulations.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Thank you, Vice Chair John. Mr. Athey, you should go play the lottery. Like I don't know what, like you don't do this -- good for you. And everybody's saying nice things, like, you know, you should be happy with your team. And I also would concur with

2.1

2.3

1	all the words that were said. But yes, you're having a good
2	day, man. You should quit today. You should go home, like,
3	you should stop working today, now.
4	All right. I would agree yes, Ms. John?
5	VICE CHAIR JOHN: It's very hard to make
6	Commissioner Montague happy. I'm just saying.
7	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes. Well, this is all
8	accurate and so I also agree with everything that my
9	colleagues said. I would actually again, point out that I'm
10	in agreement with the Office of Planning's analysis as to how
11	they're meeting the regulations and the standard. And how
12	the standard's being met for this particular application.
13	So I'm going to make a motion to approve
14	Application Number 20203 as captioned and read by the
15	Secretary, and ask for a second, Ms. John?
16	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Yes, second.
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Motion made and seconded. Mr.
18	Moy, could you please take a roll call?
19	MR. MOY: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. When I
20	call your name, if you would please respond with a yes, no,
21	or abstain to the motion made by Chairman Hill to approve of
22	the application for the relief being requested, seconded by
23	Vice Chair John. Zoning Commissioner Michael Turnbull?
24	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes to approve.
25	MR. MOY: Mr. Smith?

1	MEMBER SMITH: Yes to approve.
2	MR. MOY: Vice Chair John?
3	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Yes to approve.
4	MR. MOY: Chairman Hill?
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes to approve.
6	MR. MOY: Staff would record the vote as four to
7	zero to one. And this is on the motion of Chairman Hill to
8	approve the application. Seconded by Vice Chair John. Also
9	in support, Mr. Smith and Zoning Commissioner Michael
10	Turnbull. We have a Board seat vacant. Motion passes four
11	to zero to one.
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Thank you.
13	MR. KADLECEK: Thank you.
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right, Mr. Moy, after that
15	feel good one, can we just shut down for the day also? Can
16	we just go ahead and, you know, stop?
17	MR. MOY: Well, for a couple minutes, sir.
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes. All right. You can go
19	ahead and call our next one if you like.
20	MR. MOY: All right. That would be case
21	Application Number 20267 of Frank Jackson. And this
22	application is captioned and advertised for a special
23	exception under Subtitle D, Section 5201 from the side yard
24	requirements of Subtitle D Section 206.3, pursuant to

1	requirements, Subtitle D, Section 304.1. This would replace
2	the rear deck addition to an existing attached principal
3	dwelling unit in the R-2 Zone at premises 736 Delafield
4	Street, NE, Square 3788, Lot 51.
5	Mr. Chairman, just to note for you that there
6	I suppose this would be a preliminary matter regarding the
7	affidavit of posting under Exhibit 32. It's deficient in
8	that it's a day late for filing and there are no photographs
9	on that. And it was not notarized. But of course, as the
10	Board is aware, during this COVID-19, the Board has been
11	lenient on postings that were not notarized, affidavits that
12	were not notarized. That's it.
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Thank you. All right,
14	Mr. Young, if you want to invite everybody in. I don't know
15	if we got everyone.
16	MS. NAYLOR: Yes. Everyone's in. It's just
17	Gabriel Nathaniel.
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Is that Ms. Nathaniel,
19	Mr. Nathaniel?
20	MR. NATHANIEL: Mr. Nathaniel.
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Mr. Nathaniel, are you
22	not using your video, which is fine. I just want to know.
23	MR. NATHANIEL: Yes. I can use it.
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Nathaniel, that's all right
25	if you can't. I don't know, can you hear me? Are you trying

1	to use it?
2	MR. NATHANIEL: No, I can hear you. I'm trying
3	to use it. I think it's loading up now.
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Oh, all right.
5	MR. NATHANIEL: But I'm here, nevertheless.
6	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Well, while it's loading
7	actually, why don't you just don't worry about it because
8	I just want to hear you. You can still present your
9	testimony verbally. So Mr. Nathaniel, if you could go ahead
10	and walk us through your application, why you believe you're
11	meeting the standard for which we can grant the relief
12	requested. Yes, Ms. Cain?
13	MS. CAIN: You probably should address the issue
14	of the affidavit of posting first.
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.
16	MS. CAIN: I do understand from the Office the
17	Zoning that the applicant tried to submit a notarized copy,
18	I believe within the 24 hours. They are able to request to
19	admit that into evidence during this hearing. Or you can go
20	ahead and waive the provision. It's sort of up to the Board.
21	But the applicant should address that first.
22	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Nathaniel, did you hear all
23	that?
24	MR. NATHANIEL: Yes.
25	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Can you, is that accurate and

1	can you explain why you're late with your affidavit? You had
2	an issue with the notary?
3	MR. NATHANIEL: Yes. The original posting, the
4	original affidavit wasn't notarized. We contacted the owner,
5	has since had it notarized and it's been uploaded to the
6	record along with the picture of posting. I believe the
7	owner just kind of got the dates mixed up and didn't have the
8	information in time.
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Mr. Nathaniel, actually,
10	did you introduce yourself for the record? You're not the
11	owner?
12	MR. NATHANIEL: No. I'm not the owner. My name
13	is Gabriel Nathaniel. I'm here on behalf of the owner. I
14	have a Letter of Notification entered into the record also.
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Are you the architect?
16	MR. NATHANIEL: No. I am a representative of the
17	contractor. The general contractor that's building this
18	project.
19	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right. I don't have
20	an issue with the affidavit of posting unless the Board does.
21	I'm going to go ahead and allow it into the record. All
22	right? We're going ahead and doing that, Mr. Nathaniel. And
23	so, Mr. Nathaniel, can you explain to the Board why you
24	believe we should grant this application?
25	MR. NATHANIEL: Well, just briefly, Mr. Jackson

is looking to expand the main level of his home. He's been in contact with this neighbors and he's seen other structures similar to what he's requesting. And he's obtained the consent and approval of this neighbors and feels as though that this will expand his comfort and joy of his home.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right, Mr. Nathaniel.

Okay. So I'm going to turn to the Office of Planning. Can

I hear from the Office of Planning, please?

MS. FOTHERGILL: Good morning. For the record, I'm Anne Fothergill with Office of Planning. Good morning everyone. I'm representing the Office of Planning for piece 20267, 736 Delafield Street, NE, and we have recommended approval and found that it meets the criteria for both the special exception for the side yard, and the variance for lot occupancy. And I can go into more detail if you like.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes, Ms. Fothergill, can you kind of explain your opinion of the variance in particular.

But you can talk about (audio interference).

MS. FOTHERGILL: Sure. I do. So in this case, the exceptional commission of the property for the variance test is this is significantly a substandard lot in the R-2 Zone. The (audio interference) lot area in the R-2 Zone is 3000 square feet, and this lot is 1300 square feet. So it's significantly substandard on its own, and also compared to the two adjacent properties. It's also a row dwelling, which

2.0

2.1

is a nonconforming building type in this zone. So it has no access to light and air from the sides. And it has a slope, a significant slope from the front of the property to the rear, which means it can't do a ground level patio that wouldn't count towards lot occupancy. If they want to get access to light and air at the ground level, it would have to be a deck because of the slope.

are exceptional So those conditions the property that are specific to this property, and then they, in order to construct a rear deck, the minimum lot occupancy And they can go up to 50 for this zone is 40 percent. percent by special exception, but they are already at, basically, 50 percent without any rear deck. They have a small rear deck right now that is over 50 percent. order to construct this deck, which would add 80 square feet to the deck they have currently, they would need a variance to get to 58.9 percent lot occupancy. And because of the substandard lot, it is very hard to meet the lot occupancy requirement of 40 percent for the R-2 Zone, when you have a significantly substandard lot.

So they are proposing, I believe it's an 120 square foot rear deck that would bring them to 58.9 percent. And that would provide them with some outdoor access at the ground level and light and air, which is consistent with the zone, and we find that it meets the three prongs of the

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

variance test.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

In terms of the special exception for the rear yard, I mean for the side yard, my apologies. They, as I mentioned, it's a row dwelling, and they have zero side yard. And we, again, went through the criteria in the report and found that it meets the criteria because it is this nonconforming row dwelling building type in the R-2 Zone.

And I'm happy to take any questions.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you, Ms. Fothergill.

Does the Board have any questions for the Office of Planning?

Commissioner Turnbull.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Thank you, Ms. Fothergill. Just looking at the Zone Map of the plan for this area, it looks like there's actually, there's one other lot that's sort of looks like this, and the rest are all, they all do But it looks like down the street, there have side yards. is another one just like this. I'm kind of curious how that How most of them have the eight foot side yard, develops. but there's these two properties got sort of sandwiched between them. So Ι see what you're saying uniqueness of these. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Anyone else for the Office of Planning? Mr. Nathaniel, do you have any questions for the Office of Planning?

MR. NATHANIEL: I do not.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: 1 Okay. Mr. Young, is there 2 anyone here wishing to testify? 3 We have no one signed up. MR. YOUNG: 4 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Ms. Fothergill, it's 5 nice to see you also as well. So nice to see people from the Office of Planning. 6 7 MS. FOTHERGILL: Thanks. All right. 8 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Let's see. I'm 9 going to -- Mr. Nathaniel, do you have anything else you'd 10 like to add at the end? MR. NATHANIEL: No, thank you. 11 12 CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right. I'm going to close the hearing. Is the Board ready to deliberate? Okay. 13 I can I would agree with analysis that was provided by the 14 Office of Planning, as well as that of the applicant. 15 I also 16 would agree, or not agree, I also am pleased to see that the 17 ANC had submitted their support because I know that that was something that I was looking for for a little while, and I 18 19 think this is a relatively straightforward in terms of how 2.0 they're meeting the criteria for me to feel comfortable 2.1 granting the relief that's being requested, due to the 22 standards and the regulations. And so I'll be voting to 2.3 Mr. Turnbull, do you have anything you'd like to 24 add?

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL:

25

Mr. Chair, I do not.

Ι

concur with your analysis and would agree with the Office of Planning's report. And I think that what they're asking for is almost minimal in a way. It's not really an impact at all. So I would be voting in support also.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Smith?

MEMBER SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I don't have anything else to add. I think the request is reasonable from the applicant. And I will also note that because this is an open deck, it's not a closed deck, that there shouldn't be any restrictions to light and air, or any impacts to the neighboring property owners as a result of this addition. I understand that it takes up more lot, no, it takes up lot occupancy because of the definition of how it's elevated. But I don't think it will have an impact. So I will support.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Vice Chair John? You're on mute, Ms. John.

VICE CHAIR JOHN: I can support the application for a variance. I thought OP's written analysis as well as testimony this morning stepped through all of the criteria for a variance, particularly the size of the lot, and the shape of the lot which makes it difficult for the occupant to put in a deck, you know, at ground level. So I can support the variance and the special exception.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right. Great. Thank you,

Ms. John. All right. I'm going to go ahead make a motion

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

1	to approve Application Number 20267 as captioned and read by
2	the Secretary and ask for a second, Ms. John?
3	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Second.
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: The motion's made and seconded.
5	Mr. Moy, could you please take a roll call?
6	MR. MOY: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. When I
7	call your name, if you would please respond with a yes, no,
8	or abstain to Chairman Hill's motion to approve the
9	application for the relief requested, seconded by Vice Chair
10	John. Zoning Commissioner Michael Turnbull?
11	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes to approve.
12	MR. MOY: Mr. Smith?
13	MEMBER SMITH: Yes to approve.
14	MR. MOY: Vice Chair John?
15	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Yes to approve.
16	MR. MOY: Chairman Hill?
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes to approve.
18	Staff would record the vote as four to zero to
19	one. And this is on the motion by Chairman Hill to approve
20	the application, seconded by Vice Chair John. Also in
21	support, Mr. Smith and Zoning Commissioner Michael Turnbull.
22	We have a Board seat vacant. The motion carries four to zero
23	to one.
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Thank you.
25	Thank you, Mr. Nathaniel. All right. Mr. Moy, was there,

1	and maybe I missed it, did 20275 get postponed?
2	MR. MOY: That's going to be up to the Board. I
3	was going to suggest when I called the case. The preliminary
4	matter in this is to hear the status of the application from
5	the applicant.
6	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right. So you can
7	call it when you get a chance.
8	MR. MOY: That would be case Application Number
9	20275 of Charles and Dara, D-A-R-A, Mooney, captioned and
10	advertised for a special exception under Subtitle E, Section
11	5201, from the lot dimension requirements of Subtitle E,
12	Section 201.7, to convert the basement into a new fifth
13	apartment unit in the existing apartment house in the RF-1
14	Zone. This is at premises 1350 Queen Street, NE, Square
15	4076W, lots 57 and 58.
16	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sorry. Can you just hang on
17	one second. Okay, great. Thank you. Is it Ms. Brown?
18	MS. BROWN: Can you hear me now?
19	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I can hear you now.
20	MS. BROWN: Okay.
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Ms. Brown, are you choosing not
22	to use video, which is fine. I just want to know.
23	MS. BROWN: No. I thought I had it on. I see
24	myself, but clearly you don't. One moment. So it's just
25	showing me a preview. Is there something that I need to do?

CHAIRPERSON HILL: I guess if you like, the only 1 2 thing I know is at the very bottom, it says start video. 3 Start video. Got you. MS. BROWN: Okay. Sorry. 4 User error. 5 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. 6 MS. BROWN: Okay. 7 CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right. So Ms. Brown, 8 guess there is, I mean, there's a lot of things that are 9 going on that we still don't have yet with this. 10 assume you're asking for a postponement. 11 MS. BROWN: Correct. 12 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Where are you with all of this and when do you think you'll be ready for us? 13 14 MS. BROWN: I'm thinking it's going to potentially 15 be about a month. There are a lot of things that are going 16 on that are outside of my control. One of them is that we 17 need a new DCRA referral memo. So we've been working since probably the beginning of August to get that. 18 haven't received it yet. 19 The reason we need the referral 2.0 memo is, we were notified by the Office of Zoning that the 2.1 recent zoning text amendment 19-14 under Subtitle E 201.7, now stipulates that minimum lot dimension requirements are 22 23 no longer permitted to be approved by a special exception, 24 which is how our application was originally submitted.

So now it has to be amended to request via a

variance relief. So that's why we need the new DCRA referral memo. Once we have that, then we can proceed with revising the burden of proof, re-noticing the neighboring property owners, and requesting the ANC 5-D and 5-D07 vote of support at their next meetings.

So all of this is contingent, basically, upon the new DCRA referral memo, which we're still waiting to get.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Mr. Moy, then when can come back with this, if they're saying maybe a month. When do have time to try to hear this again?

I would like to hear from the OAG MR. MOY: Okay. on this as well regarding the public notice But so I'm looking at, requirements for the variance. checking in November. So I'm looking at rescheduling this, assuming that the additional information is recorded into the record, the reschedule date of mid to late November. Unless OAG tells me it should be longer than that. Otherwise, I'm looking at a date, as I said, mid to late November. that would put the Board at, one, two, three, four, five, -we have eight cases on November 18th. This will be the ninth case. Or we could put it for the first chairing in December, which is December 2nd, where we have one appeal and four applications, which would make this five applications.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: I'd rather put it on the day with the nine cases.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

1	MR. MOY: Okay. That would be November 18th.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. If like Ms. Cain or Mr.
3	Rice, do you know anything more about the text amendment or
4	the timing?
5	MR. RICE: This is Jack Rice speaking on behalf
6	of OAG's office. I think that November 18 should give is
7	sufficient time. My only concern is Ms. Brown getting the
8	turnaround of the subsequent report. So I think right now,
9	11/18's probably the best date but we'll probably need to
10	touch base with her middle way through.
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. When you say 11 what?
12	19? Is that what you said, Mr. Moy?
13	MR. MOY: It would be November the 18th.
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Oh, I'm sorry. The 18th.
15	MR. MOY: Yes, 18. Of course, depending on Ms.
16	Brown's process, or her timeline, of course that could be put
17	off. But at this point, let's see if we can make November
18	18th work.
19	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Ms. Brown, we'll see you
20	then. All right?
21	MS. BROWN: That sounds
22	(Simultaneous speaking.)
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Unless the Board has any other
24	issues. Raise your hand if you do. Okay. All right, Ms.
25	Brown. I'm sorry, you started saying something.

1	MS. BROWN: No. I said that sounds perfect.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Thank you.
3	MS. BROWN: Thank you so much.
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Bye-bye.
5	MS. BROWN: Bye-bye.
6	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Moy, give me one minute.
7	Okay?
8	MR. MOY: Yes sir.
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Mr. Moy, you can
10	call our last case.
11	MR. MOY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So it would
12	be case Application Number 20279 of HJB Properties LLC,
13	caption and advertised for a special exception under the RF-
14	use requirements of Subtitle U, Section 320.2, including a
15	waiver of the rear additional requirements of Subtitle U,
16	Section 320.2(e) to construct a third story addition, and a
17	three-story rear addition, and convert an existing attached
18	principal dwelling unit into a three-unit apartment house.
19	This is in the RF-1 Zone at premises 1121 Morse Street, NE,
20	Square 4070, Lot 138.
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right. Thank you, Mr. Moy.
22	I guess, Mr. Young, if you can let everybody in. Okay.
23	Let's see. Is that everybody, Mr. Young? Ms. Wilson, can
24	you hear me?
25	MS. WILSON: I can.

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Will you be presenting to us
2	today?
3	MS. WILSON: I will.
4	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Could you introduce your team
5	to us, please?
6	MS. WILSON: Yes. I'm here with Brandon Jackson,
7	who is a representative of the owner, and the architect, Greg
8	Kearley, oh, yes. He's just joined us, is part of the team
9	as well. And Greg and I will be presenting.
10	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Mr. Jackson,
11	have you been before us before?
12	MR. JACKSON: Yes, I have.
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. You look familiar.
14	Welcome back.
15	MR. JACKSON: Oh, thank you.
16	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
17	MR. KEARLEY: This is Greg Kearley, the architect.
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Perfect. I
19	guess, so first there's a motion to waive the one year
20	waiting period for refiling. Right, Ms. Wilson?
21	MS. WILSON: Correct.
22	CHAIRPERSON HILL: So you want to walk me through
23	that motion?
24	CHAIR WILLIAMS: Absolutely. And if Paul can pull
25	up the presentation. There's actually a slide sort of

explaining it and I think it's helpful to see it visually with the regulations.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure.

2.0

2.1

MS. WILSON: It's Slide 2 of the presentation. Thank you. So our original application, the original application was denied on March 7th, 2018. And the Zoning Regulations state that an applicant cannot file a new BZA application until either one year after the order is issued, or one year after the date of withdraw if the application is withdrawn after the decision is made.

At this point, it's been two and a half years since the decision, and we still don't have an order. So the one year timeline for that hasn't even started. So what we did is we withdrew the application on March 6th, 2020, in anticipation of filing this new one. And that at least has started the timeline for second option.

So the specific request in front of you today is to shorten the one year waiting period from the time of withdraw, pursuant to Y-6000.2(f), which states that the Board will grant permission to file a new appointment after a shortened time period only upon motion and for good cause shown, provided the shortened time period will not prejudice the rights of any person.

In this case, regarding good cause, the applicant modified the design and has worked with the neighbors and ANC

	to obtain support, as demonstrated by the ANC resolution in
2	support and four support letters, including that of the
3	adjacent neighbor, who previously opposed.
4	It's been almost three years since we filed the
5	original application. And two and a half years since the
6	decision. And we still have no order. The building has been
7	vacant the entire time, and so at this point, it's there's
8	technically five months, about five months, since we can
9	legally file a new application. Considering there are only
10	five months left, and the community and neighbors are well
11	aware and supportive of the project, shortening the time
12	period should not prejudice the rights of any person. Thank
13	you.
14	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Can you go back one slide, Mr.
15	Young?
16	MR. JACKSON: Can I also add one note in there?
17	There is just one thing that was incorrect. Sorry.
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure, Mr. Jackson.
19	MR. JACKSON: It said that the neighbor was
20	previously, the adjacent neighbor at 1119 was previously
21	opposed, but they actually were in support of the previous
22	application as well.
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Can you go forward one more
24	slide, Mr. Young? Okay. Can you drop the slide deck for a
25	moment, please? Okay. Let's see. So, Mr. Jackson, now I

remember why I remember you. Okay. Because I was here for the previous, you know, one. So let's see, does the Board have any questions about the waiver and/or do we want to have any kind of a discussion about the waiver. I mean, I'm okay with the waiver. Really, again, and I'm talking to my fellow Board members. Because of the fact that it's been two years since they were here.

And I understand in terms of when they officially withdrew their application. think the also that application has changed. And so it's not the exact same application. If it were the exact same application, and maybe this is for a further discussion that we can have later, also with OAG. But this is not the same project. Ιf we were back here with the exact same project, I might have a different opinion about the waiver. But the fact that it is a different project, and that it's been two years since this was here before us, I don't have an issue with the waiver.

I'm going to start again with Commissioner Turnbull, go to Mr. Smith, and end with Ms. John. Mr. Turnbull, do you have any thoughts or comments?

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I would agree with you, Mr. Chairman, I think this project is substantially changed, and as such, I feel they shouldn't have to wait a year to be heard. So I'd be willing to accept the waiver and proceed

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

1	with the hearing. Those are my thoughts.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Smith?
3	MEMBER SMITH: I agree with accepting the waiver.
4	I went back and looked at the previous design for the project
5	at this site, and the differences between this project and
6	the current design are substantial enough for me to believe
7	that it's materially different in nature and I can support
8	the waiver.
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Vice Chair John? You're on
10	mute, Ms. John.
11	VICE CHAIR JOHN: I think I should just leave my
12	
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Ms. John, just to let you know,
14	it's better to be on mute because if you don't know that
15	you're on mute and you say something or do something, it's
16	way better to be on mute.
17	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Oh boy. Oh boy.
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Just my two cents.
19	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Oh boy. So I can support the
20	waiver because of the passage of time. It's been a long time
21	and I think, you know, it's reasonable to allow this
22	application to go forward. I think, although it's the same
23	relief, it's a different design and so on that basis, I will
24	support the request for a waiver.
25	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right. So we're

going to go ahead and grant the waiver, Ms. Wilson. All right. So that being the case, Ms. Wilson, I'm going to put 15 minutes up on the clock, just to begin with. And if you want to walk us through your client's application and why you believe that they're meeting the criteria for us to grant the relief requested, and you can begin whenever you like.

MS. WILSON: Great. Thank you. Paul, could you please bring up the presentation on Slide 4? Thank you. So since the denial, the applicant went back to the drawing board, so to speak. Hired a new architect, and came up with a new design that further limits the impacts on available light and air to the adjacent property at 1119 Morse, by significantly reducing the size of the addition on the second and third stories where the impacts to light and air would be the greatest.

Now we are requesting relief from U-320.2 to convert the building to three residential units and construct a three story rear addition, and partial third story addition. The applicant is also requesting a waiver from the ten foot rule, as the first floor extends 32 feet past the rear wall of 1119 Morse, and the second and third floors extend 16 feet past the rear wall of 1119 Morse.

The proposal includes two parking spaces at the rear of the property and the addition complies with all other requirements of the RF-1 Zone. With that, I will turn it

2.0

over to the architect, Greg Kearley, to give an overview of the plans.

MR. KEARLEY: I am now unmuted, so hello all. Thank you for allowing me the time today. When you go to the presentation, can you go to Slide number 6, please? So in doing the redesign, there was a couple of things we wanted to minimize the impact on the community and the adjacent neighbor. So this is the subject property and as you can see, the third floor addition has been set back so it does not engage with the architectural cornice and mansard roof here.

Please go to Slide, I think we'll jump to Slide, go to 7 and then 8, and you can see this in terms of the context of the neighborhood. So this is a large addition to what would be 1123, and so the impact on this property is nonexistent, really. You'll see this when you look into the design. And then we've been talking with the neighbor at 1119, to minimize the impact that we would have on this property with the addition.

So if you go to Slide, if you go to, if you could, if you could jump to Slide 16. So this is a rendering we have of the rear of the building. And what we've done, it's a layered almost wedding cake type massing of the project, where down at the cellar and first floor, we come out 32 feet, which is actually about 16 feet less than the property

2.0

2.1

located at what would be 1123. And then the biggest impact on the neighbor at 1119 would be the second and third floor. So we set that back an additional 16 feet, so we minimize any negative impact of the development to the neighboring property. And we had extensive conversations with this neighbor, and I think Brandon has submitted that they're now a proponent of the project and we have a letter submitted talking about that.

So in terms of the interior, I don't think we need to get too much into the interior. We have a cellar unit, a first floor unit, and then a second and third floor unit. So but really the redesign centered around having the least impact that we could on the property located at 1119 Morse Street. And so I'm glad to answer any questions about the design, but I wanted to really emphasize that the layering and the stepping back of the massing of the building is the most significant change that we made to the exterior of the property.

MS. WILSON: Thank you, Greg. I'm happy to walk through the special exception requirements and then we can answer any questions, if you have any. I think that would be the best order.

Could you go to the next slide, please? The application safely meets the general special exception requirements, as a special exception is specifically

2.0

enumerated in the Zoning Regulations and the proposal will not adversely affect the use of neighboring properties.

Next slide, please. Regarding the specific requirements of U 320.2, the applicant safely meets those requirements as well. The overall height increase is minimal, and the overall building height will be limited to 32 feet and 2 inches.

Next slide, please. There is an existing residential structure on the property, and the property has a total of 2795 square feet of land area.

Next slide, please. We are requesting a waiver from the ten foot rule. The subject building and the adjacent building to the west are in line. So the addition will extend 32 feet past the rear wall of 1119 Morse, but only on the cellar and the first floor. And the second and third story addition will extend only 16 feet past, as Greg pointed out. It's sort of a wedding cake design and this was to mitigate the impacts to light and air on the adjacent properties.

And as we've mentioned, the owner of 1119 Morse has signed a letter in support. And the ANC also supports the application and waiver. Next slide please.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MR. KEARLEY: And quickly, Alex, I just wanted to mention too that the sun studies we have support that and

2.0

2.1

show the minimal impact of our addition on the neighboring properties.

MS. WILSON: Yes. Thank you, Greg. The addition will not block any chimneys, vents, or solar panels. The adjacent neighbor at 1119 Morse has actually signed a chimney agreement allowing the applicant to raise his chimney.

Next slide, please. The applicant is not proposing to alter any architectural elements original to the building, and is proposing to maintain the existing porch and all original architectural features. And the proposed third story addition is set back seven feet and six inches from the front facade.

Could you jump to Slide 25? I'll go through the shadow studies. I realize these aren't labeled. Apologies for that. So this is the summer solstice, this is the shadow study for the summer months. And as you can see, there is a very small amount of additional shadow at 9:00 a.m. But that shadow is gone by noon.

If you could go to the next slide, please. In the winter months, there is an even smaller difference in shadow, and it's primarily on the roof of the adjacent building. And that shadow is gone by 4:00 p.m.

Next slide, please. In the fall and spring, there is no difference in shadow between the matter of right building, and the proposed addition.

2.0

Next slide, please.

2.0

2.1

MR. KEARLEY: And just quickly too, the reason that the impact is so minimal is the impact is really from the property at 1123. That building, because of how the sun moves from the east to west, that is the building that is casting almost all the shadows on the neighboring property. Since we're set back 16 feet from that, even 16 and then 32 feet from that property, our addition has almost no impact because the impact really is from that larger addition that was built before the Zoning Regulations changed in 2016.

MS. WILSON: Thank you. Regarding privacy, the applicant is proposing a privacy fence between 1119 Morse and the subject property. And regarding character, Greg went into more detail on that, but the buildings to the east are much larger and there are three full stories extending 50 feet past the buildings. So the proposed addition will be considerably smaller than those buildings. Especially on the second and third stories, and should not impact the view from the street, or from the alley.

Next slide, please. Thank you. The applicant has submitted all required plans and materials, and is not aware of any special treatment that may be required. We are requesting a waiver from U 320.2(e), but that waiver is not in conflict with U 320.2(I).

If you could go to the last slide, please. Slide

32. In conclusion, the Office of Planning is recommending approval of the application. DDOT has no objection, and ANC 5D supports the application proposal. And I do want to add how much we appreciate the very thorough ANC report. I believe it was submitted last night. We did attend a number of meetings and wanted to come up with something the ANC and, more importantly, the adjacent neighbor would like and would support.

The effort Brandon spent redesigning the building and the time the ANC and neighbors took to review the design are really reflected in that report. So we really appreciate it and I wanted to thank the ANC. And that is my presentation.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, Mr. Young. Can you drop the presentation for me for a second? All right. Does the Board have any questions for the applicant?

VICE CHAIR JOHN: So I have a question about the chimney agreement. Is it in the record? Or do you plan to submit it to the record?

MS. WILSON: The Office of Planning didn't request that we submit it and it's my understanding that those typically aren't submitted. We did send it to the Office of Planning and that was enough for him. Because it's typically handled at DCRA. We could not get that approved unless we have that from DCRA. So if we didn't have it, we would have

2.0

2.1

1	to come back. But we can submit that to the record.							
2	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Well, I can't remember, Mr.							
3	Chairman, if we've asked for it to be included in the record,							
4	but I							
5	(Simultaneous speaking.)							
6	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Ms. Wilson, I think you're							
7	wrong. You know.							
8	MS. WILSON: Okay.							
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: I'm just laughing because I							
10	also, it's one of those ones where, you know, if you could							
11	submit it into the record, please that would be helpful.							
12	MS. WILSON: Absolutely.							
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.							
14	MS. WILSON: I'll submit it right now.							
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Thank you. Any							
16	other questions?							
17	VICE CHAIR JOHN: No.							
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Smith, Mr. Turnbull?							
19	Somebody's keyboard is on. If they want to mute themselves.							
20	Thank you. Okay. Mr. Jackson, I'm a little curious. So							
21	you've got the immediate next door neighbor to sign off.							
22	MR. JACKSON: Yes.							
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Did they say that, were they,							
24	I mean, I'm just kind of curious. Like what if they try to							
25	do what you're trying to do now, except kind of fill out that							

whole thing? Are you worried about you getting boxed in? Like that, you know, the wedding cake thing.

MR. JACKSON: If they go ten feet beyond us? Is that what you're saying?

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Even if they match. Even if they match your, and maybe I'm getting it wrong, because I'm just thinking out loud. If they match your last floor and try to go straight out.

MR. JACKSON: I mean, I didn't have a concern with that. It wasn't really something I've thought about. From talking to them, I don't suspect they're moving anywhere any time soon. They're kind of remodeling their house and they're in their 60's and early 70's, and they told me they have no intention of moving any time soon.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes. I don't know if that's something that would have to come before us anyway. So I think it would. And so, but I was just curious as to how you got their sign off. But it sounds like you have talked with them.

MR. JACKSON: Yes. We talked a lot. Just kind of, we sat around and chopped it up many, many times, several times. And they can just call and tell me what they're thinking. I'm telling them what I'm thinking, and we just kind of go back and forth a lot, and just, you know, it's really been very, you know, kind of friendly kind of just

2.0

2.1

convo that's been ongoing for a while. 1 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Got it. 2 3 Just trying to do what I can do to MR. JACKSON: 4 make them happy. 5 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Well, congratulations. That's different from the last time. 6 Let's see. I'm going to turn 7 to the Office of Planning. 8 MR. JESICK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members 9 of the Board. My name is Matt Jesick. The Office of 10 Planning is recommending approval of the application and I can virtually rest on the record. The application meets the 11 12 criteria for the conversion of a single-family home into an apartment building, as listed in Subtitle U 320.2. 13 14 In terms of the waiver, as the applicant noted, the materials in the record demonstrate that the impacts to 15 16 adjacent properties would be very minimal as a result of this 17 The largest amount of shadow is actually cast by existing buildings. And the new building would cast very 18 19 little new shadow. So therefore, we were fine with the 20 waiver to the ten foot rule. 2.1 Again, we're recommending approval and I'm happy 22 to take any questions. Thank you. 23 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Does the Board have any 24 questions of the Office of Planning? Okay. Ms. John, don't know if you had a chance to really, I mean, I've gone

1	over the ANC thing. I forgot about that one that we									
2	approved, the carriage house that is a couple doors down.									
3	I mean, there's a lot of things going on on this street. You									
4	know, and so I'm glad that the ANC has had an opportunity to									
5	really kind of take a look at things and allow it to sink in,									
6	as to the kind of changes that are going on there. And I'm									
7	very thankful to the ANC Commissioners for the time that they									
8	spent as well.									
9	So I'm sorry, I didn't have any questions for the									
10	Office of Planning myself. Did the applicant have any									
11	questions to the Office of Planning?									
12	MS. WILSON: No. Thank you.									
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Young, is there anyone here									
14	who wishes to speak in support or opposition?									
15	(Simultaneous speaking.)									
16	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Pardon me? Did you say yes?									
17	MR. YOUNG: No. We have no one.									
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Got it. All right. So									
19	unless the Board has anything else, and if you do, please									
20	raise your hand. Ms. Wilson, do you have anything in									
21	conclusion?									
22	MS. WILSON: Thank you.									
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. I'm going to close the									
24	hearing. Is the Board ready to deliberate? Okay. I can									
25	start. Well, I was actually kind of, one of the things was									

the one year waiting period for the refiling, and I think that we've gotten through that. I think that I would agree with the analysis that was provided by the Office of Planning as well as the thorough presentation by the applicant.

I thought that the property owner has obviously done their due diligence in terms of working with the community and trying to figure out how they might be able to do something that works both for the community, as well as for the project. And I, you know, commend him on his ability to kind of work through this and to kind of stick it through because it's been quite some time. And I'm sure he's very happy to kind of at least get to the next resolution, whatever that might be.

believe that they are meeting the so Ι criteria for which Ι feel comfortable granting the Mr. Turnbull? So I will be voting to approve. application.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm trying to remember the old case. I think I may have sat on it, but I can't remember all of Mr. Sullivan's cases. I'm sort of struggling to remember this one. But it's nice to see the new version of this and the changes that were made. Still we get to the ten foot rule, which is the -- such a nasty rule. And again, I mean, it's there for a reason to safeguard, so I always struggle granting relief to go beyond the ten feet. I don't feel bad going 12 feet, even 15 feet

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

can be worked out.

2.0

But I always worry when I see like 32 feet. Now the thing is, we always look at these cases individually. So individually, I mean, just in carte blanche, when I see 32 feet, I go oh my God, no. But in this particular case, since you've already got an existing building next to it, which is huge, it goes way beyond that, which was under the old rules and regulations, which they were able to get by with.

I'm okay. I can accept this. The fact that they do have, I think it's Exhibit 34, which is a letter from the next door neighbor, neighbors who have agreed and they have no objections to going on with that. I guess, I think, I'm okay with this. But you raise a good point about what if, but the point was well-raised if the next door neighbors want to go up, we're going to get into another situation. But that's a different day. We don't have to worry about that today.

So as long as they've got the letter in there from those neighbors saying they agree with it, and the other building is, it is what it is. So in light of that, I would be, I will vote in favor of agreeing with the, with going back the way they are. So I would approve the application. I'm going to vote in favor of approving the application.

But once again, I always struggle with things

going beyond, especially up to 32 feet. But this is a particular case. It's unique and that's what we always do in the BZA, we look at the uniqueness of the case. And so I would vote in favor. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you, Commissioner. Mr. Smith?

MEMBER SMITH: I share Mr. Turnbull's same concerns of 32 feet, but this particular property has the fortune or misfortune of having two properties to their west, or east, I can't remember. To the left if I'm looking at the front facade, that are substantially larger because they were approved under the previous Zoning Regulations.

So I do want to thank the applicant for going back to the drawing board with their design. And the design I believe, respects the historic nature of the row houses to the right, if I'm looking at the front facade, by setting back that third floor beyond the parapet so that the third floor doesn't overwhelm the properties to the right, when looking at the front facade.

And I think the idea of stair stepping it, like a wedding cake, was a fairly novel idea. I do share the same concerns with the Chairman. That if the property owner that you're speaking of, that they're in their 60's or in their 70's, they come back and do an addition right at the rear wall of your first floor, that would create a large amount

2.0

2.1

of shadows, but again, that's for another day. 1 Thank you to the applicant for coming back to the, 2 going back to the drawing board to redesign and I would 3 4 support this special exception. 5 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Vice Chair John? VICE CHAIR JOHN: 6 Got it. So I'm in support of 7 the application. I think the redesign was really well done. I share everyone's concern about the 32 foot addition. 8 9 I think this is like a waterfall. So the next neighbor, 10 assuming they have the required rear yard, can go back ten feet, and the neighbor to the right, would be able to go back 11 12 to at least 42 feet. And so I think it just keeps going on. Anyway, as Mr. Turnbull said, that's for another 13 day. But for this application, I think the record shows that 14 15 it meets the criteria. 16 Okay. All right. CHAIRPERSON HILL: Great. So 17 we can go ahead and make a motion to approve Application Number 20279 as captioned and read by the Secretary, and ask 18 for a second, Ms. John? 19 20 VICE CHAIR JOHN: Second. 2.1 CHAIRPERSON HILL: The motion has been made and Mr. Moy, could you please take a roll call vote? 22 seconded. 23 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. MR. MOY: When I call

your name, if you would please respond with a yes, no, or

abstain to the motion submitted by Chairman Hill to approve

1	the application for the relief requested, seconded by Vice								
2	Chair John. Zoning Commissioner Michael Turnbull?								
3	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes to approve.								
4	MR. MOY: Mr. Smith?								
5	MEMBER SMITH: Yes to approve.								
б	MR. MOY: Vice Chair John?								
7	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Yes to approve.								
8	MR. MOY: Chairman Hill?								
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes to approve.								
10	MR. MOY: Then staff would record the vote as four								
11	to zero to one. And this is on the motion made by Chairman								
12	Hill to approve the application, seconded by Vice Chair John.								
13	Also in support, Mr. Smith and Zoning Commissioner Michael								
14	Turnbull. We have a Board seat vacant. The motion is passed								
15	on a vote of four to zero to one.								
16	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. All right.								
17	Thank you, you guys.								
18	MS. WILSON: Thank you.								
19	MR. KEARLEY: Thank you.								
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Bye-bye. All right. Mr. Moy,								
21	is there anything we need to do today?								
22	MR. MOY: No. There's no new business from the								
23	staff, sir.								
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Great. Is there								
25	anything anyone would like to share or add? Because we're								

1	done.	Okay.	All ri	ght.	Bye-bye	≘.	We'll	see	you	all 1	next
2	week.	Bye-bye	, we'r	e adj	ourned.	Tha	ank yo	u.			
3	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the										
4	record	at 12:3	7 p.m.)							
5											
6											
7											
8											
9											
10											
11											
12											
13											
14											
15											
16											
17											
18											
19											
20											
21											
22											
23											
24											
25											

<u>C E R T I F I C A T E</u>

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Public Hearing

Before: DCBZA

Date: 09-30-20

Place: teleconference

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 1 aus 8