

Summary of Coordination between ANC, neighbors and applicants on BZA case 19887

- November 13 ANC agenda for meeting on November 20 is posted. It does not list Jam Doung/McCoy Sisters for consideration on the agenda. No outreach takes place to neighbors of the unit block of Randolph Place by ANC or the applicants about this meeting.
- November 20 ANC meeting takes place, Jam Doung is added to the agenda. Video of the meeting shows that discussion took less than ten minutes. No neighbors attend but ANC votes to support the application. This ten minute discussion leads to a five page document in support submitted by ANC 5E plus a further 14 page document from Commissioner Holliday.
- December 19 BZA Hearing, applicants were advised to coordinate with neighbors and to share all pertinent information with the Office of Planning by January 16.
- January 6 Exhibit 52, a letter to neighbors is posted by the applicants to IZIS. It does not appear to be distributed to any neighbors at this time (neighbors do not routinely monitor IZIS). The letter on IZIS does not contain any contact details.
- January 9 At least one Randolph Place NW household receives the letter (Exhibit 52) by email and responds asking for a meeting. This letter is not distributed to all interested neighbors at this point.
- January 15 Evening – Exhibit 52 is received for the first time by at least one household as a paper copy in their mailbox.
- January 16 Deadline for applicants to make supplemental filing describing continued coordination with neighbors and OP passes.
- The household who received the letter the previous day responds by email to applicants and copies Commissioner Holliday sharing feedback and asking if a meeting is planned and also shares a scanned copy of the letter on the list serv for the unit block of Randolph Place NW.
- January 17 As a result of this inquiry by a neighbor, Commissioner Holliday arranges a meeting with just two days notice, scheduled for a Saturday afternoon of MLK holiday weekend.
- January 19 Despite the short notice, the meeting takes place and lasts more than three hours. A tentative compromise agreement is developed but not finalized. Attendance is low and some neighbors indicate that they wish to wait until the supplementary Office of Planning report is issued before agreeing to terms. It is also made clear that any tentative agreement will need to be shared with other neighbors who had been unable to attend the meeting due to short notice, and their agreement sought.
- January 20 A draft written agreement is compiled by one neighbor present based on the discussion of January 19 and shared with Commissioner Holliday to present to the applicants for approval prior to presentation with other neighbors in the vicinity of the proposed restaurant.

- January 23 The supplementary OP report is published and some of the neighbors present at the meeting on January 20 indicate that they support the OP report findings, rather than the tentative compromise agreement. At this point the tentative agreement has not been shared with neighbors who were unable to attend the meeting.
- January 24 Commissioner Holliday confirms that the applicants have reviewed and approved the draft compromise agreement. At this point it is too late to reach consensus among neighbors, particularly in light of the publication of the new OP report.
- January 27 Commissioner Holliday requests that a representative neighbor put their name to the draft agreement but no one volunteers. The document is submitted via IZIS anyway without fully clarifying that this does not indicate support for a second floor or for a second floor outdoor terrace or for any conditions that are more lenient than those recommended by the Office of Planning.

It is important to note that despite considerable effort by neighbors in a short time frame, Exhibit 55 does not outline a consensus among neighbors impacted. The process was started too late and with too little time for adequate consultation among those impacted, and it was superseded by the publication of the Office of Planning report which outlines conditions more favorable to addressing some neighbor concerns.

Notable differences between the tentative agreement and the OP report include conditions more favorable to addressing neighbor concerns such as the second floor outdoor terrace (OP report prohibits its use) and opening hours (OP report suggests closing at 10pm on weekdays or 11pm on weekends), if a variance is granted. Other concerns include trash storage (OP report says not on public space) and the loss of parking space if a loading zone or ride share drop off are created.