

## Table of Contents

ZC Case No. 14-11	January 15, 2015, Hearing Transcript Pg. 10	Pg. 2
ZC Case No. 14-11	January 15, 2015, Hearing Transcript Pg. 11 & 15	Pg. 4
ZC Case No. 14-11	January 15, 2015, Hearing Transcript Pg. 13 & 25	Pg. 7
ZC Case No. 14-11	January 15, 2015, Hearing Transcript Pg. 19-20	Pg. 10
ZC Case No. 14-11	January 15, 2015, Hearing Transcript Pg. 27	Pg. 13
ZC Case No. 14-11	January 15, 2015, Hearing Transcript Pg. 25-32	Pg. 15
ZC Case No. 14-11	January 15, 2015, Hearing Transcript Pg. 31-32; 209	Pg. 24
ZC Case No. 14-11	June 8, 2015, Hearing Transcript Pg. 8-11	Pg. 28
BZA Case No. 19517	September 27, 2017, Hearing Transcript Pg. 133, 136-137	Pg. 33
BZA Case No. 20116	October 2, 2019, Hearing Transcript Pg. 193-195	Pg. 37
BZA Case No. 20002	June 12, 2019, Hearing Transcript Pg. 35-41	Pg. 41
BZA Case No. 21335	July 30, 2025, Hearing Transcript Pg. 44-45, 57	Pg. 49
BZA Case No. 19959	April 3, 2019, Hearing Transcript Pg. 217-220	Pg. 53
BZA Case No. 19718	May 2, 2018, Hearing Transcript Pg. 40-41, 46-67	Pg. 58
BZA Case No. 19570	October 25, 2018, Hearing Transcript Pg. 19-21	Pg. 83

ZC Case No. 14-11  
January 15, 2015,  
Hearing Transcript Pg. 10

1 would like to get the sign-in sheet a little early  
2 so I can kind of maneuver that, too.

3 So let's turn it over to the Office of  
4 Planning. Ms. Steingasser.

5 MS. STEINGASSER: Yes, sir.

6 Commissioners, I would also like to point out that  
7 joining us this evening is Art Rogers. He's our  
8 Senior Housing Planner with the Agency. And he'll  
9 be able to answer a lot of questions about housing  
10 on a broader scale than just the issues before us.

11 So, this case is 14-11. It has to deal  
12 with the R-4 zones only. And I've broken the  
13 discussion into two basic themes: building form,  
14 which gets to some of the physical changes that  
15 we're proposing to the zone; and the issue of  
16 conversions, which is probably the more  
17 controversial of the two, and how they work  
18 together.

19 So, let's go to the next one.

20 We started by asking, you know, what is  
21 the R-4? And there's a lot of confusion about the  
22 R-4. This is straight from the zoning  
23 regulations. And what's important is that the R-4  
24 is not an apartment zone. It is not a zone that  
25 is intended for multifamily development.

ZC Case No. 14-11  
January 15, 2015,  
Hearing Transcript Pg. 11 & 15

1                   So we started by looking at the intent  
2 purposes out of the zoning reg. And as you can  
3 see, it talks about its having very little vacant  
4 land. Its primary purpose shall be the  
5 stabilization of the remaining one-family  
6 dwellings. And we took that very seriously.

7                   And then the next purpose statement talks  
8 about that it shall not be an apartment house  
9 district, as contemplated in the general residence  
10 zones, which are the R-5, which are intended for  
11 multifamily and apartment zones.

12                  Go to the next one.

13                  So then we looked at, you know, where is  
14 the R-4? And most of the R-4 is in the center of  
15 town. It buffers a lot of the outlying single-  
16 family lower-density semi-detached, and also  
17 attached dwellings that don't have more than one  
18 dwelling unit. So we see them primarily in the R-  
19 1, R-4, R-5, and R-6 zones.

20                  Some of them, about 40 percent, are  
21 covered by historic districts. And those are the  
22 Mount Pleasant Historic District, U Street, Shaw,  
23 and Capitol Hill Historic Districts. The historic  
24 districts give a certain level of review that the  
25 properties that are not in the historic districts

1 neighborhoods."

2                   And this is really important, and I draw  
3 all of our attention, including the audience, to  
4 this one section, because it talks about  
5 protecting these row house neighborhoods.

6                   And it doesn't just talk about it in  
7 general terms, but it's pretty specific about the  
8 elements and the issues that are instructed to be  
9 reviewed: heights and scale of structures,  
10 consistent with existing pattern, considering  
11 additional row-house neighborhoods for historic  
12 district designation, regulating the subdivision  
13 of row houses in the multiple dwellings.

14                  And then it completes its statement  
15 saying, "Upward and outward extension of row  
16 houses which compromise their design and scale  
17 should be discouraged." So we found this to be  
18 just downright instructive. It told us what to  
19 look at. It told us how to look at it, and it  
20 told us the purpose of the policy and what we were  
21 to look at.

22                  So, the next element we looked at in the  
23 Comprehensive Plan is the addition of floors and  
24 roof structures to row houses and apartments. And  
25 I'm not going to read this out loud, but basically

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.

1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington, DC 20036  
Washington: 202-898-1108 • Baltimore: 410-752-3376  
Toll Free: 888-445-3376

ZC Case No. 14-11  
January 15, 2015,  
Hearing Transcript Pg. 13 & 25

1                   And the R-4 also represents, in terms of  
2 the total District, and that's the District land  
3 that's zoned, that excludes the federal lands and  
4 the water, 11 percent of all of the zone. And  
5 that includes the commercial, the mixed-use, the  
6 waterfronts, the downtown, the special-purpose.  
7 That's 11 percent of all the zoned land in the  
8 District.

9                   So, in addition to these residential  
10 zones, there's also 3,500 acres of zoned land in  
11 the District that can accommodate multifamily  
12 residential units as a matter of right. So we  
13 found that to be a very important issue to think  
14 about in terms of the R-4 and its purpose as being  
15 a residential row-house zone.

16                   So, going now to the proposals, we've  
17 started with building form. And we started to  
18 look at height. So, for the detached, the semi-  
19 detached, the row houses, and the flats, which are  
20 a row house with two units, the matter of right  
21 currently is 40 feet.

22                   We surveyed over 10,300 lots zoned R-4  
23 with residential structures on them. And our  
24 recommendation was to address that height to 35  
25 feet, and to still allow 40 feet, but have that be

1                   And we want those families. We want  
2 those children. They're important both for the  
3 economic health of the District, as well as the  
4 educational reform that's going on. The recent  
5 census figures from the U.S. Census has also  
6 suggested that D.C. is on track to meet that  
7 forecast.

8                   But then we also looked at, again  
9 addressing some of the concerns we've heard about  
10 if the R-4 can't absorb these affordable -- these  
11 housing units, then the housing crisis will  
12 result. Well, what is the land capacity of the  
13 areas that are identified for multifamily? And  
14 those are both in terms of apartments, high-  
15 density to low-density apartments, as well as  
16 commercial.

17                  Every commercial zone in this district  
18 either permits -- most of them actually  
19 incentivize residential. So in order to get your  
20 maximum density, you know, in most of your  
21 commercial zones or most of your waterfront or  
22 special-purpose zones, you have to do residential.  
23 And the City has had that in place for many years.  
24 It has been very long-sighted with that.

25                  So we looked at that capacity. And under

ZC Case No. 14-11  
January 15, 2015,  
Hearing Transcript Pg. 19-20

1 of right. But it does reduce that height from  
2 18.5, which is currently allowed, to 10 feet.

3                   However, it maintains the 18.5 for all  
4 other buildings. So, churches, schools, other  
5 type of buildings that you might see in the R-4,  
6 including existing apartment buildings, would  
7 still maintain their 18.5.

8                   This item actually needs no action  
9 because the Zoning Commission already took action  
10 as part of 08-06A. And if it needs to be  
11 revisited, we could revisit it as part of the  
12 comprehensive rooftop structure case. But it  
13 needs no action as part of this case tonight.

14                   So then we come to conversions, which is  
15 probably the most controversial element. And  
16 there's two types of conversions. There's the  
17 conversion of the residential row houses and the  
18 conversion of nonresidential structures.

19                   And by "nonresidential structures," we're  
20 talking about churches, firehouses, schools, civic  
21 buildings that are typically in residential  
22 neighborhoods that have been converted, no longer  
23 have their intended use, but are converted, often  
24 for residential. We see a lot of them on Capitol  
25 Hill, where it's -- the church on the bottom is on

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.

1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington, DC 20036  
Washington: 202-898-1108 • Baltimore: 410-752-3376  
Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1 D Street, Northeast. It was converted.

2 So we distinguish between those two. And  
3 the original advertised -- the original OP  
4 recommendation was to remove the provision that  
5 allows the conversion of residential row houses  
6 that's been on the books since 1958. It allowed  
7 for the conversion of row houses that predated  
8 1958, but had 900 square feet of land per unit.

9 And over the years, we've been seeing  
10 that encroach more and more into established row-  
11 house blocks. And so we had recommendation  
12 through our setdown report that that no longer be  
13 permitted, but that the nonresidential structures  
14 continue to be permitted and that there be more  
15 flexibility. That was where we were seeing real  
16 problems. It's where we wanted to actually  
17 incentivize the adaptive reuse of these buildings,  
18 whether they were historic or not.

19 And yet, developers were telling us they  
20 were having a hard time making the case. They  
21 were having a hard time filling in old playgrounds  
22 or parking yards where they wanted to maintain  
23 that street wall. So we proposed more flexibility  
24 in that area and removal of the residential  
25 conversion.

ZC Case No. 14-11  
January 15, 2015, Hearing  
Transcript Pg. 27

1 affordability, then let's tie it to affordability.

2 So whence you get to that fourth unit,  
3 that fourth unit and every unit beyond has to be  
4 part of the IZ program. It has to have an  
5 affordability covenant. If we're arguing that  
6 taking these row houses and making smaller units  
7 is the same thing as affordable housing, then our  
8 proposal was to put it in writing and put the  
9 covenant on it.

10 If they can't make the -- if a proposal  
11 can't make the 900-square-feet-per-unit, and  
12 that's important -- again, this is an esoteric  
13 nuance of D.C. zoning. The 900-square-feet is  
14 important because it gets to the density ratio.  
15 In the R-4, you're allowed two units as a matter  
16 of right, but your minimum land area has to be  
17 1,800 square feet. So that ratio of 1 to 900  
18 springs from that.

19 If you can't have that then, have minimum  
20 land area, and you have to get some kind of  
21 variance, which means your density is  
22 disproportionately high compared to the  
23 neighborhood, then we're saying that everything  
24 beyond two units would be subject to the  
25 affordability requirements of IZ.

ZC Case No. 14-11  
January 15, 2015,  
Hearing Transcript Pg. 25-32

1                   And we want those families. We want  
2 those children. They're important both for the  
3 economic health of the District, as well as the  
4 educational reform that's going on. The recent  
5 census figures from the U.S. Census has also  
6 suggested that D.C. is on track to meet that  
7 forecast.

8                   But then we also looked at, again  
9 addressing some of the concerns we've heard about  
10 if the R-4 can't absorb these affordable -- these  
11 housing units, then the housing crisis will  
12 result. Well, what is the land capacity of the  
13 areas that are identified for multifamily? And  
14 those are both in terms of apartments, high-  
15 density to low-density apartments, as well as  
16 commercial.

17                  Every commercial zone in this district  
18 either permits -- most of them actually  
19 incentivize residential. So in order to get your  
20 maximum density, you know, in most of your  
21 commercial zones or most of your waterfront or  
22 special-purpose zones, you have to do residential.  
23 And the City has had that in place for many years.  
24 It has been very long-sighted with that.

25                  So we looked at that capacity. And under

1 the current zoning, it would be 2040 before we  
2 would be pushing the edge of that. And that's not  
3 maximizing the zoning under the comp plan; that's  
4 maximizing the zoning that we have in place.

5 So we don't think that these efforts to  
6 protect the R-4 zone are going to have a  
7 significant impact on the overall growth of the  
8 City to absorb the multifamily units that would  
9 result from that.

10 So, this you can't see, which is  
11 unfortunate.

12 So, this is a summary of the public  
13 hearing notice. And it goes through the various  
14 options on conversion. And even I can't read that  
15 one. Let me get my bigger page.

16 (Pause.)

17 MS. STEINGASSER: So, the number one,  
18 which is what was in our OP report and got  
19 advertised, was that conversion of row houses, the  
20 residential structures, no longer be permitted.

21 The option number two -- again, this is  
22 focusing on residential row houses only -- that  
23 there still be the matter of right, that it  
24 maintain its 900-square-foot per unit conversion  
25 ratio, but that if the issue really is about

1 affordability, then let's tie it to affordability.

2 So whence you get to that fourth unit,  
3 that fourth unit and every unit beyond has to be  
4 part of the IZ program. It has to have an  
5 affordability covenant. If we're arguing that  
6 taking these row houses and making smaller units  
7 is the same thing as affordable housing, then our  
8 proposal was to put it in writing and put the  
9 covenant on it.

10 If they can't make the -- if a proposal  
11 can't make the 900-square-feet-per-unit, and  
12 that's important -- again, this is an esoteric  
13 nuance of D.C. zoning. The 900-square-feet is  
14 important because it gets to the density ratio.  
15 In the R-4, you're allowed two units as a matter  
16 of right, but your minimum land area has to be  
17 1,800 square feet. So that ratio of 1 to 900  
18 springs from that.

19 If you can't have that then, have minimum  
20 land area, and you have to get some kind of  
21 variance, which means your density is  
22 disproportionately high compared to the  
23 neighborhood, then we're saying that everything  
24 beyond two units would be subject to the  
25 affordability requirements of IZ.

1                   And that's basically saying if you're  
2 asking a neighborhood to absorb these units and  
3 absorb a density that's disproportionate, then  
4 let's make it really, really move forward that  
5 public policy.

6                   So that's recommendation two.

7                   Recommendation three gets to the  
8 nonresidential structures. And this is the  
9 churches, the schools, the firehouses. And the  
10 top part talks about special exception, which  
11 means it goes through a public review. It  
12 establishes no adverse impact. It looks to the  
13 issue of light and air, transportation, how a  
14 project would fit in with its neighborhood. And  
15 it would not require the 900-square-feet per  
16 dwelling unit.

17                  And that's important because this is  
18 where we're seeing developers have the hardest  
19 time trying to get a variance to get that density.  
20 So we propose there be no limit on that and that  
21 it be subject to the IZ limits. These are  
22 typically larger lots. The IZ doesn't kick in  
23 until 10 units. And that's another reason that  
24 the lower threshold is important. Very, very few  
25 of these row house conversions meet the IZ level.

1                   So there's an argument that they're  
2 providing affordable housing, but in reality the  
3 IZ doesn't come into effect until they hit 10  
4 units. The 10 units is typically not seen until  
5 they get into a conversion of a church or these  
6 larger civic-type buildings.

7                   Also advertized were two more  
8 alternatives. And they addressed both residential  
9 row house and the nonresidential buildings. And  
10 again, based on whether you met the 900-square-  
11 feet or didn't meet the 900-square-feet, there  
12 would be a limit on four units maximum if you  
13 couldn't meet 900-square-feet.

14                  The final option advertized had to do  
15 with no limit on the number of units regardless of  
16 the land size and that there be no -- and that IZ  
17 would just kick in at its normal rate, which is at  
18 10 units, which we, like I said, seldom see in the  
19 residential row house.

20                  OP's recommendation, based on the overall  
21 public policies, are that if we continue with the  
22 residential row house conversion, that it would be  
23 option number two, that it be tied to a true  
24 public policy of affordability, that that  
25 affordability be at 60 percent of an average

1 median income, and that it would trigger at the  
2 fourth unit, which means that the third unit would  
3 be matter of right without an IZ covenant, and  
4 that if it has to get zoning relief to go forward  
5 that it would tie to the third unit and above.

6                   And that basically sums up what our  
7 recommendations are. And we're available to  
8 answer any questions.

9                   CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you very  
10 much, Ms. Steingasser, for that recap and review  
11 and the recommendations that are being proposed.

12                  Colleagues, again, I'm going to ask --  
13 we're going to have plenty of time to have a  
14 discussion with the Office of Planning, and the  
15 community will have plenty of time to hear us  
16 deliberate. I really would like to hear from the  
17 community this evening, because they are here.

18 But I will tell you that, let's open it up and see  
19 if we have any burning questions that we need to  
20 ask on the front end.

21                  I'm not saying we can't ask questions.  
22 But I want us to be cognizant, because when I  
23 look, I see a lot of people that want to come up  
24 and testify and give us their point of view also.  
25 So we want to make sure that we're courteous to

1 the public. Because we can ask two and three  
2 hours' worth of questions; we usually do. But  
3 tonight, if you're got something burning, let's  
4 ask that, and then we'll go to the public.

5 I didn't shame anybody. I mean, I'm sure  
6 you've got one question.

7 (Laughter.)

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Turnbull.

9 MR. TURNBULL: Yes. Well, thank you, Mr.  
10 Chairman.

11 I want to thank the Office of Planning  
12 for their brief and, I think, a very concise  
13 explanation of the R-4.

14 When you talk about the R-4 as being not  
15 an apartment-house area, but here we get into  
16 apartment-house conversions, I just think for the  
17 public it might -- further explanation about what  
18 kind of impact it is. We're talking about it  
19 being not an apartment area, but at the same time  
20 we're talking about the ability to be able to  
21 convert to apartments.

22 MS. STEINGASSER: Right. Most of our row  
23 house zones in the District predate 1958, which is  
24 when the zoning regulations were adopted. Many of  
25 them go back to the 1800s. And there are many

1 areas where there are existing small walk-ups,  
2 little four-squares, or really larger lots,  
3 really. Especially some of the outer rings you'll  
4 see over in parts of the park where large mansions  
5 came in, and lots were larger.

6                   And the zoning regulations recognized  
7 that in 1958 that some of these could be  
8 appropriately converted if they had the land area  
9 to equalize that density.

10                  And the reason it's important now is that  
11 we're seeing it not only on the end with the 900-  
12 square-feet, but we're seeing it push its way into  
13 mid-blocks and start to put properties together.  
14 We subdivide them. And it starts to gut the  
15 traditional row houses.

16                  And in those areas that are historic,  
17 there is some review. But in the other areas, the  
18 other 60 percent, there is no review. And it  
19 really does start to change the character. And  
20 the single-family row house now becomes part of a  
21 multifamily development.

22                  MR. TURNBULL: Okay. My other question  
23 is, you talked about IZ applying for your  
24 recommendation as to the third unit, the fourth  
25 unit. But am I looking at -- but on a

ZC Case No. 14-11  
January 15, 2015,  
Hearing Transcript Pg. 31-32; 209

1 the public. Because we can ask two and three  
2 hours' worth of questions; we usually do. But  
3 tonight, if you're got something burning, let's  
4 ask that, and then we'll go to the public.

5 I didn't shame anybody. I mean, I'm sure  
6 you've got one question.

7 (Laughter.)

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Turnbull.

9 MR. TURNBULL: Yes. Well, thank you, Mr.  
10 Chairman.

11 I want to thank the Office of Planning  
12 for their brief and, I think, a very concise  
13 explanation of the R-4.

14 When you talk about the R-4 as being not  
15 an apartment-house area, but here we get into  
16 apartment-house conversions, I just think for the  
17 public it might -- further explanation about what  
18 kind of impact it is. We're talking about it  
19 being not an apartment area, but at the same time  
20 we're talking about the ability to be able to  
21 convert to apartments.

22 MS. STEINGASSER: Right. Most of our row  
23 house zones in the District predate 1958, which is  
24 when the zoning regulations were adopted. Many of  
25 them go back to the 1800s. And there are many

1 areas where there are existing small walk-ups,  
2 little four-squares, or really larger lots,  
3 really. Especially some of the outer rings you'll  
4 see over in parts of the park where large mansions  
5 came in, and lots were larger.

6                   And the zoning regulations recognized  
7 that in 1958 that some of these could be  
8 appropriately converted if they had the land area  
9 to equalize that density.

10                  And the reason it's important now is that  
11 we're seeing it not only on the end with the 900-  
12 square-feet, but we're seeing it push its way into  
13 mid-blocks and start to put properties together.  
14 We subdivide them. And it starts to gut the  
15 traditional row houses.

16                  And in those areas that are historic,  
17 there is some review. But in the other areas, the  
18 other 60 percent, there is no review. And it  
19 really does start to change the character. And  
20 the single-family row house now becomes part of a  
21 multifamily development.

22                  MR. TURNBULL: Okay. My other question  
23 is, you talked about IZ applying for your  
24 recommendation as to the third unit, the fourth  
25 unit. But am I looking at -- but on a

1 block character analysis could be considered. Not  
2 a long drawn-out process, but each block has its  
3 own character.

4                   And I think that if a person wants to  
5 build, understand that when you buy a property,  
6 you're given certain rights that other people  
7 can't encroach on. So everybody's here like  
8 saying, "I bought property. What about my  
9 rights?" Well, it goes both ways. It can't just  
10 go your way. If I buy a property and I want to  
11 paint my door pink, I'm allowed to. And you may  
12 not like it, but I can. So, please.

13                  But I think that if you're going to build  
14 on the block, the neighbors' opinions should be  
15 included. At the end of the day, the owner has  
16 the right to do what -- to carry out his plans as  
17 he sees fit.

18                  But I think that if you go block for  
19 block and try to make the addition fit in with the  
20 character of the building, as opposed to creating  
21 this tall tower in the middle of lower row homes,  
22 I think that would be appealing to the developer  
23 from a financial standpoint, because it's his  
24 business, and also appealing to the neighbors, who  
25 really don't have a say in what you can do with

ZC Case No. 14-11  
June 8, 2015,  
Hearing Transcript Pg. 8-11

1 didn't want to necessarily --

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Want to join me? Oh.

3 MR. MILLER: -- join you but I thought  
4 where the Commission landed, given all of the  
5 testimony we received and given what the existing  
6 matter of right zoning is for conversions, which  
7 is basically almost -- as long as there is the 900  
8 square feet of land area, it's a matter of right.  
9 So there's almost an unlimited number if it's a  
10 particularly large lot, which we know that there  
11 are some unusually large lots in the city.

12 So I think we've arrived at a balanced  
13 approach which -- and in the matter of right  
14 scenario all these design criteria were added,  
15 including you know, the no more than 10 feet to  
16 the rear of the adjacent property, and the no more  
17 of 30 percent demolition. I think it, in reality,  
18 is that those criteria, that there will likely  
19 have to be a review process if somebody wants to  
20 propose something that maybe the neighbors might  
21 support, but that doesn't quite meet -- I think  
22 there were at least seven or nine, seven or eight  
23 criteria that's in the proposal. So I thought it  
24 was, that particular issue was a balanced  
25 approach.

1                   Anyone else? Anyone else like to comment  
2 on that?

3                   MR. MAY: So this is a difficult one. I  
4 mean, we certainly didn't get a lot of comment on  
5 this particular topic in the proposed -- from the  
6 proposed regulations. You know, I guess what I  
7 still struggle with is that I think that the  
8 controls that are being put in place here, 35 foot  
9 maximum, 900 square feet of land area per dwelling  
10 unit, the 4th unit at IZ, 30 percent -- no more  
11 than 30 percent demolition of the gross floor  
12 area, 10 foot limit. I mean, all these things add  
13 up to relatively small additions to row houses. I  
14 mean, I think there is a concern that what we're  
15 running into is that people don't want to see any  
16 kind of addition or any kind of incentive for an  
17 addition. And I think what we're experiencing is  
18 that even with two units row houses are growing  
19 exceptionally large and they're not resulting in  
20 more and more affordable housing, necessarily.  
21 They're simply -- I mean, you know, houses that  
22 sell for \$500,000 get split into two condos that  
23 sell for six and \$700,000. And because, you know,  
24 they add a floor and they add the roof deck and  
25 all these other things.

1                   So I mean, I don't know. It's a real  
2 quandary for me because I'm not sure -- you know,  
3 I think that the limits that are being put on this  
4 are actually quite reasonable and allow some of  
5 the larger properties to become multi-unit as they  
6 have for decades. But at the same time we're  
7 seeing, I think, egregious examples of what people  
8 will do when they redevelop some of these  
9 properties. And we're not really even addressing,  
10 you know, what can happen with just flats.

11                  MS. COHEN: No, I concur that there has  
12 been some horrible examples of additions that have  
13 been made and that's why I think we see a lot of  
14 people in the audience and we've received a lot of  
15 comments. And again, if there was horrendous add-  
16 ons or pop-ups as we all like to call them,  
17 continue, there is going to be a problem.

18                  Again, I think all along I did not see  
19 this as a zoning issue but as an architectural  
20 issue, and that we should have looked at it in  
21 that way.

22                  I would think that a lot of people do not  
23 want to see added units to their neighborhood. I  
24 mean, they like their neighborhoods, they're  
25 peaceful, they're where they've put down their

1 roots. But we're a growing city and we need to  
2 have the flexibility to enable other households to  
3 come in to a neighborhood. And we need the  
4 flexibility as an owner to be able to expand  
5 within our own space, or to add our own family,  
6 expanded family. I mean, there's lots of  
7 different cultures who have more than one  
8 household living in a home.

9 So I think that the problem that I see  
10 with this is again, where illuminating personal  
11 flexibility and not necessarily dealing with the  
12 problem, which I'm not saying doesn't exist. But  
13 I think that what we're doing is we're not giving  
14 the people who have done it well, have had  
15 setbacks, have been engaged with their neighbors,  
16 the same opportunity to expand, and there are  
17 tasteful examples throughout the city. So I guess  
18 I just have the same dilemma you have, but I'm  
19 looking at it more as a need to expand the  
20 opportunity to add space in a particular row  
21 house.

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I would --

23 MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chair, I wonder if I  
24 could -- I have to comment on the Vice Chair's  
25 comment. I mean --

BZA Case No. 19517  
September 27, 2017,  
Hearing Transcript Pg. 133, 136-137

1 three units to be retained.

2 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. And just for my own  
3 clarification, I mean, yeah, it's extremely odd for  
4 the 900 square feet and the Office of Planning. So  
5 just so I know again, can you kind of walk me through  
6 again why you are in support?

7 MS. FOTHERGILL: Sure. What we found was the  
8 exceptional condition was that it's an existing  
9 condition that has existed prior to this applicant's  
10 ownership. There have been three units in this  
11 building at least to one previous owner. The building  
12 has been converted, as the applicant mentioned.  
13 There's been reconfigurations of stairs and bathrooms.  
14 And so that leads to a practical difficulty to  
15 compliance because if they had to convert to two units  
16 to go back to a flat, it would be a practical  
17 difficulty to make the renovations to the house. And  
18 also, there's an existing tenant, who is a long-  
19 standing tenant, that would need to be evicted.

20 And so, for this specific case, because  
21 there's no additional impact to neighbors, there's not  
22 a new amount of density coming into the property,  
23 we've found that it meets the variance test,  
24 specifically for this one, not in general for the 900  
25 square feet for all cases across the board.

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.

1100 Connecticut Avenue, NW Suite 810 Washington, D.C. 20036  
Washington: (202) 898-1108 / Baltimore: (410) 752-3376  
Toll Free: (888) 445-3376

1                   So we're just trying to be compliant, and I  
2        guess it's been quite an education process. And you  
3        know, we love the place and we want to have good  
4        people in there that get on with the neighborhood, and  
5        certainly are, you know, the neighbors on either side  
6        have been very supportive, and I think we've also, you  
7        know, partly won over some others that once they found  
8        out how we've been managing the place in the time that  
9        we've had it.

10                  CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, great. Thank you.  
11        Board have anything else?

12                  [No audible response.]

13                  CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right. I'm going to go  
14        ahead and close the hearing.

15                  Is the board ready to deliberate? Okay. I'm  
16        fine to start.

17                  I mean, I'm glad that the applicant has come  
18        down. I've seen you guys here before and everything.  
19                  I hope that you've enjoyed your time here with us the  
20        past few times that you've been with us. And I  
21        thought that, again, the -- what I found enlightening  
22        -- or, enlightening. What I found to be the best  
23        analysis for me was the report from the Office of  
24        Planning and how they had gotten to their analysis in  
25        terms of approving this application. So I had said

1 the 900 square feet is something that they do not -- I  
2 can't even remember the last time that they approved  
3 that. And so, you know, I can then get behind the  
4 application based upon the analysis that has been  
5 provided for the Office of Planning in addition to  
6 that the ANC has been in support of this application.

7                   Does the Board have anything else to add  
8 before I make a motion?

9                   [No audible response.]

10                  CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. I'll go ahead and  
11 make a motion to approve Application No. 19517 as read  
12 by the secretary.

13                  MR. HART: Seconded.

14                  CHAIRPERSON HILL: Motion been made and  
15 seconded.

16                  [Vote taken.]

17                  CHAIRPERSON HILL: The motion passes, Ms.  
18 Rose.

19                  MS. ROSE: Staff would record the vote as  
20 four, to zero, to one, with the motion by Mr. Hill  
21 seconded by Mr. Hart, with Ms. White and Mr. Hood in  
22 support of the motion to approve the application. One  
23 board seat vacant.

24                  CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, great. Summary  
25 order.

BZA Case No. 20116  
October 2, 2019,  
Hearing Transcript Pg.193-195

1 were looking to do two units, even though that is -- I guess  
2 that wouldn't be, that wouldn't be -- that wouldn't come into  
3 play.

4 I was thinking that the number of total square  
5 footage of the lot is 1,400 square feet. I guess you don't  
6 have the 900 square foot per unit requirement for a flat.  
7 So you wouldn't have to deal with that particular issue,  
8 because I was thinking that while that's -- the 1,800 square  
9 feet. So that may not be -- that may be more of a -- never  
10 mind. I was thinking that that might connect into this as  
11 well, but I was remembering -- now I'm remembering that the  
12 900 square foot per unit is really four, really over that two  
13 units.

14 But I understand that what you're looking for is  
15 something that is well below what is required under the  
16 zoning regs. So sorry for the little detour. It just kind  
17 of came to me as I was looking through this, but that's it.

18 CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right. We're going to go  
19 ahead and close the record. I think in terms of  
20 deliberation, I mean I just -- I always find it very  
21 interesting when the Office of Planning, or I shouldn't say  
22 very interesting. Like the Office of Planning in their  
23 recommendations, when we get to this 900 square foot thing,  
24 it rarely -- they rarely veer from where the 900 square foot  
25 rule is.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1                   So in other words, I'm always somewhat kind of  
2 interested as to how the Office of Planning gets to this.  
3 That being the case, I do agree with the analysis that the  
4 applicant has put forward in terms of the financial aspects  
5 and how the property was the way it was, and how we're  
6 getting to the three prongs of the test in order to grant the  
7 variance relief.

8                   So I will be voting in favor of this application.  
9 I'm also happy to see that ANC 1B is in support, as well as  
10 the six letters of support that we've also seen from the  
11 applicant. Is there anything else that anyone would like to  
12 add?

13                  MEMBER JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I would just -- I  
14 agree with you that 418 square feet per unit is really quite  
15 small. But I'm also persuaded by OP's analysis and the  
16 notation that from everything that we know, the property has  
17 existed like this for some time. And so that I think meets  
18 the exceptional condition requirement, and there is the  
19 practical difficulty that I think they described fairly well.  
20 So I would support the application.

21                  CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, thank you. I'm going to  
22 make a motion to approve Application No. 20116 as captioned  
23 and read by the Secretary and ask for a second.

24                  MEMBER JOHN: Second.

25                  CHAIRPERSON HILL: Motion has been made and

1 seconded. All those in favor say aye.

2 (Chorus of ayes.)

3 CHAIRPERSON HILL: All those opposed?

4 (No response.)

5 CHAIRPERSON HILL: The motion passes. Mr. Moy.

6 MR. MOY: Staff would record the vote as 4 to 0  
7 to 1, this on the motion of Chairman Hill to approve the  
8 application for the relief requested. Seconding the motion  
9 Ms. John. Also in support Vice Chair Hart and Zoning  
10 Commissioner Peter Shapiro. No other members present.

11 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you Mr. Moy. Thank you  
12 very much.

13 MR. DETTMAN: Thank you.

14 (Pause.)

15 CHAIRPERSON HILL: So Mr. Moy, there was -- so  
16 there was an applicant who I believe we have tried to reach  
17 out to, who said that they had forgotten; is that correct?

18 MR. MOY: Yes sir. It was a case that we called  
19 earlier, and the applicant was not present. So I asked the  
20 staff to contact the applicant and they said that they had  
21 neglected to appear today. They had -- well yeah, they had  
22 forgotten, and so in that process, they are requesting a  
23 postponement of the Board, postpone their application to a  
24 future date.

25 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes. I'm just kind of talking

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

BZA Case No. 20002  
June 12, 2019,  
Hearing Transcript Pg. 35-41

1 BZA CHAIR HILL: Good morning.

2 MS. MATTIE JOHNSON: My name is Mattie Johnson.  
3 I'm the co-owner of the property at 21 Seaton Place,  
4 Northeast.

5 MS. SALLIE JOHNSON: Sallie Johnson, and I am also  
6 the co-owner of the property.

7 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great. If you guys could  
8 just have one microphone on at a time if you wouldn't mind.  
9 It just kind of feeds back up here. Thank you. Which one  
10 of you is going to be presenting to us first?

11 MS. MATTIE JOHNSON: I will be.

12 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, Ms. Johnson. All right.  
13 Ms. Johnson, if you can just kind of walk us through what  
14 you're trying to do and how you believe you're meeting the  
15 criteria for us to grant the application. I'm going to put  
16 15 minutes up on the clock so you can see on the top corner  
17 there. And you can begin whenever you like.

18 MS. MATTIE JOHNSON: Oh, yes. The issues, we are  
19 trying to make 21 Seaton Place what its legal status is. 21  
20 Seaton Place is a three-unit apartment house. It has been  
21 such since around -- between 1993 and 1994. The issue is the  
22 land area is 1,725 square feet. The requirement for a three-  
23 unit apartment is at least 1,800 feet. And that does not  
24 exist at 21 Seaton Place.

25 We have exceptional circumstances here because we

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 purchased the property in 2002. At the time we purchased the  
2 property, it was already a three-unit apartment house. That  
3 is evidenced by the -- submitted by the neighbors who have  
4 been on that street for 10, 20 years.

5 Not only is that extraordinary that it has been  
6 renovated prior to 2015, prior to the new statute, the other  
7 problem is that it would be an undue burden and hardship on  
8 us, both person and financial, to try to convert it back into  
9 a single family dwelling or a multi-family dwelling.

10 There are no interior walls. These are three  
11 separate units with their own individual access. That would  
12 mean -- if that was even feasible, that would mean knocking  
13 down barrier walls, redoing plumbing which would create a  
14 hardship, a financial hardship. And to be quite frankly, it  
15 is something we would have to decide whether to maintain our  
16 home or to sell it. That's number one. So that's our  
17 exceptional circumstances.

18 We did not do anything to create this situation.  
19 We are not asking to add anything or do anything to the  
20 residence as to what we purchased in 2002. So because of  
21 that, we're requesting a special -- a variance, an area  
22 variance.

23 If you look at the photographs, 21 Seaton Place  
24 aligns with all other properties on the street at 21 Seaton  
25 Place. And Seaton Place, it is the same height of the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 properties surrounding it. It does not interfere with the  
2 air, light, or enjoyment of any other properties in the area.

3 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great. Thank you. Does  
4 the Board have any questions for the applicant?

5 ZC CHAIR HOOD: How did we come to -- I'm just  
6 trying to understand because I know we worked hard to put  
7 that 900 square foot. And I realize that you can't  
8 accomplish that, and I'm just trying to figure out how did  
9 it come to the -- how did you have to come -- I'm just trying  
10 to figure this whole thing out. Because if you were there  
11 before the regulations, then why now are we -- why are we  
12 here? I'm just trying to figure that out. But some of that,  
13 I may ask Ms. Fothergill. Maybe I missed it because you all  
14 are going from -- each unit is going to be about, what, 575  
15 square feet?

16 MS. MATTIE JOHNSON: Well --

17 ZC CHAIR HOOD: Turn your mic on.

18 MS. MATTIE JOHNSON: -- according to an appraisal  
19 that was done for the bank a couple of years ago -- and I  
20 submitted that as one of the --

21 ZC CHAIR HOOD: Okay.

22 MS. MATTIE JOHNSON: -- examples.

23 ZC CHAIR HOOD: Okay. That's the reason.

24 MS. MATTIE JOHNSON: Each unit has 998 square  
25 feet, the three units. And I believe that is because they

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 are counting the basement unit.

2 ZC CHAIR HOOD: They included the basement?

3 MS. MATTIE JOHNSON: Basement. But if we was just  
4 counting the amount -- a square amount, yes, that we have  
5 amount of land that we have above ground, it would be about  
6 -- the Commissioner is right. Correct, it would be about  
7 five-something --

8 ZC CHAIR HOOD: Five-something?

9 MS. MATTIE JOHNSON: -- square feet.

10 ZC CHAIR HOOD: Okay. All right. Thank you.  
11 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

12 BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. Anyone else? All  
13 right. I'm going to turn to the Office of Planning.

14 MS. FOTHERGILL: Good morning. I'm Anne  
15 Fothergill with the Office of Planning. To answer  
16 Commissioner Hood's question, my understanding is the  
17 applicant was going to get a license to rent the third unit  
18 and then it came to light that they don't have the  
19 appropriate C of O. They only have it for two units.

20 And so that's what started this process. That's  
21 why they're here in order to get the appropriate C of O so  
22 that they can rent the third unit. They had a change in  
23 their situation, and so now they are hoping to rent that  
24 third unit. That's my understanding.

25 ZC CHAIR HOOD: Okay.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 MS. FOTHERGILL: And in terms of their  
2 application, while the Office of Planning generally takes a  
3 very hard line on the 900 square feet per unit, in this case,  
4 we did find that they have an exceptional situation that  
5 meets the variance test. And we have recommended approval  
6 and are in support of this application and rest on the  
7 record. But I'm happy to take any questions about it.

8 BZA CHAIR HILL: Does anybody have any questions  
9 for the Office of Planning?

10 ZC CHAIR HOOD: So thank you, Ms. Fothergill,  
11 because I too take a hard line on 900 square feet. But I  
12 think Ms. Johnson -- even before you spoke, I think Ms.  
13 Johnson's testimony persuaded me otherwise. This would be  
14 my first time since we put that rule in place. So thank you.

15 BZA CHAIR HILL: Just for Office of Planning. I  
16 know I saw it again. But how short are they in terms of what  
17 they need?

18 MS. FOTHERGILL: The requirement is 900 square  
19 feet per unit, so that would be 2,700 square feet of land  
20 area. And they have a lot that is 1,725 square feet. So  
21 they're significantly short.

22 BZA CHAIR HILL: All right. Does the applicant  
23 have any questions for the Office of Planning?

24 MS. MATTIE JOHNSON: No.

25 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Is there anyone here

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 wishing to speak in support? Is there anyone here wishing  
2 to speak in opposition? All right. Either Ms. Johnsons, do  
3 you have anything you'd like to add at the end?

4 MS. MATTIE JOHNSON: No, we don't.

5 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. Thank you.  
6 I'm going to go ahead and close the record, close the  
7 hearing. Is the Board ready to deliberate? Sure. I can  
8 start.

9 So I mean, to echo Chairman Hood, I mean, it kind  
10 of is -- I always think it's kind of interesting. The 900  
11 square feet thing is really something that the Office of  
12 Planning never seems to budge on. And so I'm a little  
13 surprised in terms of their analysis. However, I have read  
14 through it and I agree with their analysis. And so I will  
15 be in favor of this application.

16 In addition to that, I guess -- no, actually, I  
17 forgot to ask the applicant. So I'm going to ask the  
18 applicant. The ANC, what happened with your ANC again?

19 MS. MATTIE JOHNSON: Oh, we went before the ANC  
20 and they filed a report to the file, I guess. It was a  
21 unanimous agreement. They filed a report approving it. It's  
22 about Exhibit 52 or --

23 BZA CHAIR HILL: I think it's 58.

24 MS. MATTIE JOHNSON: Yes.

25 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. That's right.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 MS. MATTIE JOHNSON: And we also went before our  
2 civic association, and they approve.

3 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. Okay. So I'm  
4 going back to deliberating here. And so I was just finding  
5 a little bit more clarification in terms of the ANC. But I  
6 am seeing it here that they were in support. And so I think  
7 they've met the criteria and I'm going to vote in favor. Is  
8 there anyone that'd like to add anything?

9 ZC CHAIR HOOD: And I would just -- I think this  
10 is one of those rare cases, and I just would put on the  
11 record that this is not precedent setting. But I think this  
12 is a difficulty as Office of Planning has already mentioned.  
13 I think this is one of those rare cases that actually the  
14 first one I think I've seen which would allow for us to grant  
15 this request.

16 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. I'll go ahead and make a  
17 motion to approve Application No. 20002, as captioned and  
18 read by the Secretary and ask for a second.

19 MEMBER JOHN: Second.

20 BZA CHAIR HILL: Motion made and seconded. All  
21 those in favor, say aye.

22 (Chorus of aye.)

23 BZA CHAIR HILL: All those opposed? Motion  
24 passes, Mr. Moy.

25 MR. MOY: Staff would record the vote as 3 to 0

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

BZA Case No. 21335  
July 30, 2025,  
Hearing Transcript Pg. 44-45, 57

1 combined. In fact, the doors that you're looking at to the  
2 property do not even lead into the same area. One leads into  
3 the ground floor unit and the other leads into a hallway that  
4 diverges into the second and third floor units. It's not feasible  
5 to combine these into two units.

6 There's also a bit of history as to how the Applicant  
7 came to this property. When she acquired the property after her  
8 brother had passed away she relied in good faith on the  
9 longstanding use as a three-unit residential property as being a  
10 valid operation. She maintained and restored the property  
11 following the fire to its original construction which I put up  
12 here and you can see the pre-fire and the post-fire restoration.  
13 You can see that the architecture of the building did not change.  
14 It is as it has always been architecturally. She maintained and  
15 restored the property and obtained a valid building permit to do  
16 so.

17 The BZA actually faced a very similar situation back  
18 in 2018 in case No. 19662 where Mr. Demetrios Bizbikis inherited  
19 a property that, before he owned it, had been erroneously  
20 converted into a four-unit apartment building that did not meet  
21 the 900 foot rule. It had been issued an incomplete Certificate  
22 of Occupancy. I'd like to quote the order that granted the  
23 variance waiving the 900 foot rule in that case.

24 "The Board concludes that the Applicant's good faith  
25 detrimental reliance creates an exceptional zoning history which

1 meets the first prong of the variance test."

2                   The Bizbikis case actually affirmed an earlier similar  
3 finding by the Board in 2012 in case 18452 where the Applicant,  
4 Lynn Myers, acquired a three-story two-unit property as part of  
5 a four person partnership. The partnership converted the  
6 property to a three-unit building, one unit per floor, no direct  
7 access between the floors, similar to this case here. Ms. Myers  
8 then bought out her partners after the work had already been  
9 completed and then discovered that it was not compliant with the  
10 900 foot rule.

11                  She sought conversion to a three-unit building and a  
12 variance. There is only a summary order of that case available  
13 but the burden of proof statement submits that the uniqueness of  
14 the property is justified on the basis that no work, that the  
15 work on the property was completed prior to Ms. Myers' control  
16 and she had no intent to make further changes to the property.  
17 That is also true in our case here. The work has already been  
18 completed. There is no intent to make additional changes and  
19 actually the Applicant in this case did not do the conversion.  
20 If you wouldn't mind going to the next slide.

21                  We also identified three past cases in the vicinity  
22 that were approved to go from two units to three units  
23 establishing that in this area there are a limited number of  
24 three unit buildings. We are not introducing any kind of a new  
25 use. At 2034 North Capitol Street, Northwest, which is on square

1 21335 as captioned and read by the secretary, and ask for a  
2 second. Mr. Blake?

3 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Second.

4 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Motion made and seconded. Madam  
5 Secretary, take a roll call, please.

6 MS. MEHLERT: Please respond to the Chair's motion to  
7 approve the application.

8 Chairman Hill?

9 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.

10 MS. MEHLERT: Vice Chair Blake?

11 VICE CHAIRPERSON BLAKE: Yes.

12 MS. MEHLERT: Board member Smith?

13 COMMISSIONER SMITH: Yes.

14 MS. MEHLERT: Commissioner Stidham?

15 ZC COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes.

16 MS. MEHLERT: Staff would record the vote as four to  
17 zero to one to approve Application No. 21335 on the motion made  
18 by Chairman Hill and seconded by Vice Chair Blake.

19 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. Madam Secretary, if you  
20 can call our next one, please.

21 MS. MEHLERT: Next is Application No. 21336 of United  
22 Unions, Incorporated. This is a self-certified application  
23 pursuant to Subtitle X, Section 901.2 for special exceptions  
24 under Subtitle C, Section 1501.1(e) to allow a penthouse  
25 habitable space on a building within the area bounded by I Street,

BZA Case No. 19959  
April 3, 2019,  
Hearing Transcript Pg. 217-220

1 MEMBER JOHN: Okay. Thank you.

2 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Now I'll turn to the Office  
3 of Planning.

4 MR. COCHRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. OP is happy to  
5 stand on the record, but of course answer any questions you  
6 would like.

7 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Does anybody have any  
8 questions for the Office of Planning?

9 VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: Just a similar question  
10 around the incorporation of this unit into the basement  
11 level. Did you all consider that?

12 MR. COCHRAN: We certainly -- we didn't do a  
13 feasibility analysis. We did look at what the Applicant has  
14 said about the practicality of combining them. I also know  
15 from conversations with DHCD that it's relatively unusual for  
16 there to be demand for a four-bedroom unit, and that's with  
17 respect to IZ units and other things. We're often talking  
18 about the need for larger family units, but the types of  
19 units that, they have more difficulty filling the larger  
20 units than the smaller units.

21 This isn't IZ. It's probably what we used to call  
22 Section 8, but the same kind of profile holds. Going to a  
23 four-bedroom unit didn't seem as desirable as adding another  
24 additional affordable unit.

25 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Anyone else? Okay. Does the

1      Applicant have any questions of the Office of Planning?

2                    MS. WILSON: No, thank you.

3                    CHAIRPERSON HILL: Is there anyone here wishing to  
4 speak in support? Is there anyone here wishing to speak in  
5 opposition? Is there anything you would like to add, Ms.  
6 Wilson?

7                    MS. WILSON: No, thank you.

8                    CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. I'm going to go ahead and  
9 close the hearing. Is the board ready to deliberate? Would  
10 someone else like to start?

11                  MEMBER JOHN: Okay, I'll start. So when I read this  
12 case I thought it was fairly straightforward. It seemed to  
13 me that the Applicant does have an exceptional situation  
14 because the building needs to be renovated and the utilities  
15 are being moved from one big open space utility area in the  
16 basement to the individual units, and that it would make  
17 sense to convert that space into residential space.

18                  I think that the Office of Planning has explained  
19 the difficult in renting a four-bedroom unit for the price  
20 point and the clientele that's anticipated and so based on  
21 OP's testimony and analysis and the Applicant's  
22 representation, I am able to support this application.

23                  CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right. Thank you. Anyone  
24 else?

25                  MEMBER WHITE: Mr. Chair, I would support the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 application as well, especially with the Office of Planning  
2 weighing in on the fact that he believed that they met the  
3 criteria for the area variance test that there is an  
4 exceptional condition as well as a practical difficult and  
5 that it makes sense to modify part of that basement floor  
6 into one unit, and that there's a demand and a need for these  
7 sorts of Section 8-type units in the community. And the price  
8 points made sense to me as well.

9                   So I would be in support of the application. I  
10 believe that we also got an ANC report, too, that was filed  
11 yesterday, so it is supportive of the application as well.  
12 I'll be voting in favor of it.

13                   COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I  
14 agree with my colleagues and if I read the record correctly,  
15 I think it is a benefit to public good that the existing  
16 units and the proposed unit are going to be two-bedroom units  
17 if I read it correctly. And so I think that's a beneficial  
18 aspect to the public good, just speaking to the third prong.

19                   VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: I would, I mean, I still  
20 have some concerns about it. I don't think that the concerns  
21 rise to me not being able to support it, but I think that  
22 it's, I almost think that there could be a case to make this  
23 into a one large unit. I understand, we've heard three  
24 bedrooms, four bedrooms, might be viable but I understand  
25 what the Applicant and the attorney here are describing.

1           And I do understand it being, it could be  
2 practically difficult to incorporate it, so that's where I  
3 am.

4           CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. I have nothing to add. I'm  
5 going to make a motion to approve application number 19959  
6 as captioned and read by the Secretary, and ask for a second.

7           MEMBER JOHN: Second.

8           CHAIRPERSON HILL: Motion made and seconded. All  
9 those in favor say aye.

10           (Chorus of aye.)

11           CHAIRPERSON HILL: All those opposed? The motion  
12 passes. Mr. Moy?

13           MR. MOY: Staff would record the vote as 5-0-0. This  
14 on the motion of Chairman Hill to approve the application for  
15 the relief requested; seconding the motion, Ms. John. Also  
16 in support Ms. White, Vice Chair Hart and Commissioner Rob  
17 Miller. Motion carries, sir.

18           CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, great. Thank you. Thank you  
19 very much. Mr. Moy, do we have anything left for the Board  
20 today?

21           MR. MOY: Not from the staff, Mr. Chairman.

22           CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. We stand adjourned. Thank  
23 you.

24           (Whereupon the above-entitled matter went off the  
25 record at 4:38 p.m.)

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

BZA Case No. 19718  
May 2, 2018,  
Hearing Transcript Pg. 40-41, 46-67

1 unusable spaces.

2 So we felt that that did contribute to the  
3 variance test. And I'll go ahead and rely on our report for  
4 the rest of the items, but I just wanted to add some  
5 clarification. And I'm happy to answer any questions you  
6 have.

7 VICE CHAIR HART: And one of the points that  
8 you're making too is that because the stairwell is an  
9 independent feature that is not in any unit, that if it were  
10 to be incorporated into a unit, then that would reduce the  
11 size of the unit as well as just -- it would eat up a lot of  
12 -- as well as not -- you wouldn't -- it would be hard to  
13 figure out what to do with the area where the existing  
14 stairwell is.

15 MR. THOMAS: Right.

16 VICE CHAIR HART: And so that issue is -- it kind  
17 of compounds itself because the stairwell is not incorporated  
18 into a unit right now.

19 MS. ELLIOTT: Correct. I mean we'd be starting  
20 from scratch. And circulation does eat up a lot of floor  
21 area. And in the end we may not end up with much larger  
22 units through combining the basement and the first floor than  
23 we would have, you know, otherwise.

24 VICE CHAIR HART: Are there any other questions  
25 for the Office of Planning?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1                   Does the Applicant have any questions for the  
2 Office of Planning?

3                   MR. THOMAS: No.

4                   VICE CHAIR HART: Mr. Brown, do you have any  
5 questions for the Office of Planning?

6                   COMMISSIONER BROWN: No.

7                   VICE CHAIR HART: I had to ask.

8                   So, Mr. Brown, it is actually your turn to provide  
9 us with the ANC -- I should say Commissioner Brown -- sorry  
10 -- with the insight from the ANC. If you could just let us  
11 know how the ANC meeting went and then what your final vote  
12 was for this case.

13                   COMMISSIONER BROWN: Good morning, Vice-Chair Hart  
14 and Committee Members. ANC 6E, we have met with the Zoning  
15 Committee as well as they presented to the full ANC. In the  
16 zoning meeting, which I am the chair, we went through the  
17 entire project with them. Their request to add the two  
18 additional units to the building seemed very amenable to us.  
19 We only had one concern and that was regarding egress, and  
20 I believe they have addressed that. So at this point in time  
21 we were in unanimous consent that we could support this, both  
22 in the Zoning Committee and in the full ANC.

23                   VICE CHAIR HART: And the issue with egress was  
24 what exactly?

25                   COMMISSIONER BROWN: We couldn't really readily

1 testimony, I appreciate all of you for coming down,  
2 Commissioner Brown as well. And reading through the Office  
3 of Planning report, the one concern that I had was  
4 understanding the floor plan issue with regard to the  
5 circulation. And after listening to the Office of Planning  
6 report, as I was looking at the plan itself, the proposed  
7 floor plan, I understand that there would be a difficulty,  
8 a practical difficulty in reconfiguring the circulation for  
9 the building so that it could provide access to the -- well,  
10 to provide access to the basement so that could be used by  
11 one of the existing units.

12 So as I felt that you all had met that prong, and  
13 I didn't feel that there were -- and I agreed with the Office  
14 of Planning for the other two prongs of the -- excuse me --  
15 of the variance test, no substantial detriment to the public  
16 good and no substantial harm to the zoning regulations, I  
17 felt that I could be in support of the application to grant  
18 your variance.

19 And I would like to hear. Do the other Board  
20 Members have any comments or anything else that they'd like  
21 to add to this.

22 Very quiet today.

23 MEMBER JOHN: I would just add that I agree with  
24 the report from the Office of Planning, especially concerning  
25 the circulation issue. In looking at the layout of the

1 basement, in one of the exhibits, I could see where the  
2 stairs really in the middle of the building, so you'd really  
3 have to do substantial reconfiguration in order to get usable  
4 space for the first-floor apartment. So based on the fact  
5 that the building is landlocked and you're not adding any  
6 more area, any more space, just adding two units in the  
7 basement, I would concur with everything everyone else has  
8 said and I would be prepared to support the application.

9 VICE CHAIR HART: Okay. So with that I would make  
10 a motion to approve Application Number 19718 of Revie Dow  
11 LLC, as read and captioned by the Secretary. Do I have a  
12 second?

13 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Second.

14 VICE CHAIR HART: All those in favor say aye.

15 (Chorus of aye)

16 VICE CHAIR HART: Any opposed?

17 Motion carries, Mr. Moy.

18 MR. MOY: Staff would record the vote as four to  
19 zero to one.

20 This is on the motion of Vice Chair Hart to  
21 approve the application for the relief being requested.  
22 Seconded the motion, Mr. Peter Shapiro also support Ms.  
23 Lesyllee White, Ms. Lorna John. We have no other Board  
24 Members with us today. The motion carries, sir.

25 VICE CHAIR HART: A summary order, Mr. Moy.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 MR. MOY: Thank you.

2 VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you all very much.

3 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you.

4 VICE CHAIR HART: So moving right along, Mr. Moy.

5 MR. MOY: Thank you. The next case application  
6 before the Board is Number 19730. This is of Sons of Italy  
7 Foundation, caption and advertised with special exception  
8 under the nonprofit use provisions of Subtitle U, Section  
9 203.1(n), and pursuant to 11 DCMR Subtitle X, Chapter 10, for  
10 an area variance from the gross floor area requirements of  
11 Subtitle U, Section 203.1(n)(2), to continue a nonprofit  
12 office use, RF-3 District at 219 E Street, Northeast, Square  
13 755, Lot 32.

14 VICE CHAIR HART: Good morning. If you all could  
15 introduce yourselves.

16 MS. MAZO: Sure. Samantha Mazo from the law firm  
17 of Cozen O'Connor. I'm here on behalf of the Applicant.

18 VICE CHAIR HART: Good morning.

19 MR. ISGRO: Morning. My name is Biagio Isgro, Jr.  
20 I'm the National Co-Chair for the Budget and Finance  
21 Committee for the organization.

22 VICE CHAIR HART: Could you say your last name  
23 again?

24 MR. ISGRO: Last name is Isgro, I-s-g-r-o. First  
25 name Biagio, B-i-a-g-i-o, and that's Jr.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you.

2 MS. JEROME: Carly Jerome. And I am the Director  
3 of Operations and Programming for the organization.

4 VICE CHAIR HART: Good morning to you all.

5 Ms. Mazo, I'm assuming you're going to be  
6 presenting the case to us.

7 MS. MAZO: Yes. Thank you very much. Hopefully  
8 this will be a short presentation. This application.

9 VICE CHAIR HART: Long. I'm kidding.

10 MS. MAZO: Okay. That was a joke, for the record.

11 VICE CHAIR HART: Yes.

12 MS. MAZO: It will not be a long presentation.

13 This application has the support of the ANC, OP.  
14 We also have support from both adjacent neighbors. There is  
15 also support from the CHRS, Capitol Hill Restoration Society,  
16 as well as Architect of the Capitol. So I just wanted to let  
17 that out there.

18 As an initial matter, I'm here on behalf of the  
19 Sons of Italy, which is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization  
20 that's organized and operated for charitable purposes. The  
21 property is located at 219 E Street, Northeast. Sons of  
22 Italy has owned this property and operated their nonprofit  
23 office out of this property since it was constructed in 1980.  
24 As discussed at length in the record, Sons of Italy has --  
25 excuse me -- obtained business licenses for the property in

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 the past, most recently, as recent as 2015.

2                   Really the reason we're here, I know that that  
3 question has come up, the reason we're here is because I  
4 believe Ms. Carly Jerome went down to go obtain a new  
5 business license maybe in the fall and was informed by DCRA  
6 that it couldn't be issued because they couldn't locate a  
7 CofO. So we know we spent some time working with DCRA and  
8 with the Zoning Administer. It was determined that while  
9 there was a CofO that was identified on the business  
10 licensed, it could not be located on DCRA's records. So  
11 essentially the Zoning Administer said just go to the Board  
12 and ask the Board for relief in order to be able to continue  
13 the nonprofit office use at this site.

14                   So the property is laid out as an office. It is  
15 an office. It has never been used as a residence although  
16 it was constructed as a residence.

17                   The background again on the Sons of Italy. They  
18 have -- it's a very small nonprofit organization. And one  
19 thing I do just want to mention is Mr. Isgro is a volunteer.  
20 He volunteers his time for this organization. And he lives  
21 in Albany, New York. And he has been coming back and forth  
22 to Washington to get this issue addressed. And I think, you  
23 know, it's amazing to me of people who contribute that much  
24 to their community and their organizations, and I wanted just  
25 to put that on the record.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1                   The foundation has always operated in a quiet and  
2 harmonious manner. No violations or complaints. Really all  
3 we're here to do is to maintain the status quo. There is no  
4 building expansion, there is no change in operations. We're  
5 really here to be able to get the approval for the Special  
6 Exception and the Associated Area Variance, and to then go  
7 to DCRA. And, in fact, I was just sending an email to Mr.  
8 Whitescarver at DCRA. We're hoping to be able to move  
9 forward through the CofO process very quickly at DCRA once  
10 today is over.

11                  Just very quickly, the foundation has no  
12 conference room -- or no large conference room. It has three  
13 parking spaces. Only one is used. It is -- let's see, I'm  
14 just trying to move forward through the presentation.

15                  VICE CHAIR HART: You should just be able to use  
16 the arrow keys.

17                  MS. MAZO: Okay, perfect. All right.

18                  VICE CHAIR HART: Does that work?

19                  MS. MAZO: I'm having a little trouble with the  
20 mouse.

21                  Okay, let's try this. Okay. As we said, there  
22 are previous building permits and business licenses for the  
23 site, including two business licenses that have been issued  
24 to the Sons of Italy. There is also -- they also have  
25 obtained a certificate of good standing from OTR as recently

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 as 2010. They pay commercial taxes. They have been paying  
2 commercial taxes since at least 2005. The property has been  
3 assessed as a private club. And, just a little bit of  
4 background, up until -- the property had been zoned R-4.  
5 It's now the RF-3, which is the Capitol Hill RF -- R-4 zone.  
6 But under the R-4 zone, a private club was permitted as a  
7 matter of right. That's honestly what we believe the CofO  
8 was for, was for a private club. But when the -- under the  
9 new zoning regs, when they came in in 2016, private club was  
10 no longer permitted as a matter of right and so we are here  
11 for a special exception. But they have been assessed and  
12 paying as a private club.

13 The relief requested. We are here for relief from  
14 the Special Exception Requirements of Subtitle U, 203.1, to  
15 continue the nonprofit organization's use for the purposes  
16 of its office. As one of the criteria of that special  
17 exception is that the property needs to be 10,000 square feet  
18 in gross floor area. This property is approximately 3200  
19 square feet in gross floor area, so we don't satisfy that  
20 requirement. Accordingly, we're seeking an area variance.

21 A question that had come up both from the ANC and  
22 also from OP is just confirmation that this relief, the area  
23 -- the 10,000 square foot relief can be granted as an area  
24 variance, and that has been squarely addressed both by the  
25 DC Court of Appeals in the French case as well as by this

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 Board in other cases. And so, further, there is an OAG  
2 discussion, that the Office of the Attorney General has  
3 opined that this relief can be granted as an area variance.

4 Just very quickly I'm going to walk through how  
5 the property -- the property is -- relief is harmonious, with  
6 the intent. This is the Special Exception Standards. The  
7 foundation satisfies the nonprofit organization definition.  
8 The property was constructed as a residence.

9 It's located only two lots away from commercially-  
10 zoned properties. The foundation has used it for 37 years.  
11 Continuing the current use will not tend to adversely affect  
12 the use of the neighbors. There is no traffic impact, only  
13 four employees. No large events or associated noise. The  
14 status quo will be maintained.

15 I can walk through this, but we satisfy all the  
16 different requirements of the Special Conditions for the  
17 nonprofit. The area variance, just as a general matter, as  
18 this Board knows, area variance can be applied in a more  
19 flexible manner for a nonprofit that's been -- first was  
20 brought forward in the *Monaco* case and has recently been  
21 reaffirmed in the *St. Mary's Episcopal Church* case that came  
22 out in December of 2017. The property is exceptional and  
23 unique when assessing those factors. The Board is aware that  
24 the court has determined uniqueness may arise from a  
25 confluence of the factors. There is a more flexible standard

1 of review for an exception condition for the nonprofit  
2 organization. And also Monaco has -- stands for the past  
3 actions of a permitting authority giving rise to good faith  
4 detrimental reliance can create exceptional conditions.

5 And the exception conditions here are that they  
6 have been using the office for almost over 40 years -- I'm  
7 sorry -- 38 years, that they had basic business licenses,  
8 that we can't find the CofO, we've paid commercial taxes.  
9 And of course as indicated by the prior photo of the  
10 building's internal configuration is non-residential.

11 The practical difficulties here. There is no way  
12 to meet the 10,000 square feet requirement. And it would be  
13 unnecessarily burdensome to force the foundation to move or  
14 sell the building if the nonprofit use cannot continue.  
15 There is no substantial impairment of the zone plan. Again,  
16 close proximity to the mixed-use zones.

17 One thing that I could go back, is that the square  
18 itself is very mixed-up uses. You have -- I'll identify it  
19 at the end, but you've go that the Heritage Foundation,  
20 you've got the Wheat Grower's Foundation, you have a very  
21 large apartment house, you've got a gas station right there  
22 at the corner of Second and Mass. And so there is a lot  
23 going on on that square. There have been no complaints. The  
24 day-to-day operations are proportionate to the building size  
25 and the number of employees, and there are no changes to the

1 operations.

2 You have strong community for this application,  
3 16 letters of support which, as this Board knows, is not easy  
4 to do. I really credit Ms. Jerome with going out and getting  
5 that in particular. We've got letters of support from all  
6 the adjacent property owners. There is no 2017 E Street.  
7 Unanimous support from the ANC 6C, support from Capitol Hill  
8 Restoration Society, and the Architect of the Capitol.

9 This is just an image that was included in our  
10 prehearing statement that identifies where the letters of  
11 support are located, but I would like to just use this -- use  
12 this image to identify that we've got the National Republican  
13 Committee at the corner of E and Second. We've got the Wheat  
14 Growers, you've got the Exxon station on Mass and Second.  
15 There is an apartment house and then the Heritage Foundation.  
16 So the block itself is really a mix of uses.

17 ANC has proposed conditions of approval, a maximum  
18 of five employees and no reception or other events shall be  
19 hosted for outside persons. The applicant accepts these  
20 conditions. And, with that, I will be happy to respond to  
21 questions as will my colleagues here at the panel.

22 VICE CHAIR HART: I thank you very much for a  
23 thorough presentation, as always. I did have a question and  
24 this is a question that actually our Office of Attorney  
25 General was -- wanted us to understand this a little bit

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 further and I am actually interested in this as well.

2 You cite *Monaco* in this case and that's, you're  
3 saying, because this is a public service and these are  
4 inadequate facilities. But in this case, in the *Monaco* case  
5 our OAG is saying that this is a -- that that was really a  
6 case of some different facts. And the fact in particular is  
7 that they were looking for an expansion and that the Court  
8 was really was kind of talking about that case and that was  
9 pertaining to the expansion aspect of that. There is no  
10 expansion that's happening here. This is basically an  
11 existing condition that you're looking to make so that it is  
12 legal, I guess. And if you could just kind of explain that.  
13 And I hope I asked the question correctly, but do you  
14 understand the part that I'm --

15 MS. MAZO: Sure. You know the *Monaco* and that  
16 generation of cases, including National Black Children  
17 Foundation and really as has been more recently reviewed  
18 under the Saint Mary's Episcopal Church case, yes, Vice-Chair  
19 Hart, to your point, the *Monaco* case did address a situation  
20 where there was an expansion of a nonprofit.

21 But the question that we're addressing here is the  
22 fact that as a general matter, the court has determined and  
23 has upheld in numerous cases the fact that the area variance  
24 standard can be reviewed by this Board in a more flexible  
25 manner for a nonprofit. And so, yes, that particular case

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 regards an expansion, but I am very intimately involved with  
2 a case that's currently before the D.C. Court of Appeals  
3 which is to construct a new homeless shelter in Ward 3. And  
4 in that case an order has not been issued, but at the oral  
5 argument before the D.C. Court of Appeals on that case, the  
6 opposition in that case had brought up this exact question:  
7 Could *Monaco* apply in that situation because that was not an  
8 expansion in that instance. This was a brand new building,  
9 which is of course different from our case here which is that  
10 we're an existing building. And the court very clearly said  
11 that *Monaco* applied, would apply. I mean from the dais we'll  
12 have to obviously see what shakes out in the written order,  
13 but the three-judge panel who was hearing that case did very  
14 clearly determine that *Monaco* applied in that case where  
15 there was a construction of a new building.

16 And so I would venture to say that the court's  
17 view of *Monaco* is not simply that it applies only to an  
18 expansion of a nonconforming use or that it only applies in  
19 a very limited instance. I would certainly say that through  
20 the recent iterations and the way it's been applied in *St.*  
21 *Mary's* and then also, quite frankly, in the *St. Thomas* case  
22 that just came down a couple weeks ago, that there is an  
23 understanding that the *Monaco* and the *Monaco* doctrine applies  
24 more broadly than simply in a situation where there is an  
25 expansion of a nonprofit.

1                   VICE CHAIR HART: And there may not be a defined  
2 piece to it yet, but that may actually -- there may be a  
3 limitation that is placed on the *Monaco* ruling -- or not the  
4 *Monaco* ruling, but the -- as you call it -- the doctrine, but  
5 that may be -- that may be coming in the future, we just  
6 don't know what that is.

7                   MS. MAZO: And I agree with that. And, you know,  
8 of course I don't have a crystal ball and I can't  
9 specifically say how the court is going to come down in  
10 particular on that homeless shelter case, but in that  
11 instance the feedback that -- not the feedback but the  
12 language of the judges who were sitting on the bench for that  
13 case, they were clearly of the opinion that *Monaco* applied  
14 squarely to that case, that in that instance the District of  
15 Columbia acting in order to construct these homeless shelters  
16 was to be entitled to the additional deference that *Monaco*  
17 stands for.

18                   VICE CHAIR HART: And you're saying that the  
19 *Monaco* case is relevant here because this is a --

20                   MS. MAZO: A nonprofit.

21                   VICE CHAIR HART: -- a nonprofit.

22                   MS. MAZO: Right.

23                   VICE CHAIR HART: And that's the aspect of it that  
24 you're --

25                   MS. MAZO: Right. Exactly. So that the -- you

1 know, the -- there are two aspects of *Monaco* that I say apply  
2 here, and they have been applied here by this -- by this  
3 Board on numerous occasions. But the first is the general  
4 understanding that the Board reviews the area variance  
5 standard in a more flexible manner for nonprofits. And then  
6 the second, *Monaco* really addresses the question of the  
7 exceptional condition. And *Monaco* has stood for the fact  
8 that there is more flexible standard of review applied for  
9 that exceptional condition prong of the area variance for a  
10 nonprofit organization.

11 VICE CHAIR HART: And do you believe that the --  
12 that your case would work without the *Monaco* doctrine.

13 MS. MAZO: I believe it would. I mean we have a  
14 situation where we've got a nonprofit that's been working  
15 there for 37 years, and the building's internal configuration  
16 is nonresidential. And there have been permitting back and  
17 forth with DCRA.

18 And one thing I wanted to clarify on the record,  
19 there was a comment that the use was not legal. But, in  
20 truth, the use had been licensed --

21 VICE CHAIR HART: And actually I didn't mean to  
22 say that it wasn't legal, --

23 MS. MAZO: No, I know. I just --

24 VICE CHAIR HART: -- I was more saying that it --

25 MS. MAZO: Well, that -- that --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 VICE CHAIR HART: -- hadn't gotten its license in

2 --

3 MS. MAZO: Right, right. That it hadn't --

4 VICE CHAIR HART: Yes.

5 MS. MAZO: The license had not been renewed.

6 VICE CHAIR HART: Yes.

7 MS. MAZO: And, quite frankly, I think we would  
8 be in a very different situation if when the 2015 license had  
9 expired. Two days before that, one of them had gone in and  
10 realized, oh, this is going to expire, we need to go and  
11 renew this license, I am 95 percent sure that they would have  
12 been able to walk out that day with a new license. And even  
13 if that had been the situation, then we would have an  
14 argument, a very strong argument that even if we had to come  
15 to the Board for some reason -- well, I don't think we would  
16 have had to come to the Board for some reason because we'd  
17 have the argument that it was a non- -- the use itself  
18 conforming predating the time -- the little nonconforming use  
19 that was in place at the time of the zoning regulations  
20 change. And if that was an acute situation, then those types  
21 of uses are permitted to continue as a matter of right. So,  
22 you know,...

23 VICE CHAIR HART: I'm sorry for belaboring this  
24 point, but I just wanted to get a little bit of clarity, and  
25 I think you have provided it. And I don't know if the other

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 Board Members have any other questions, but that was the only  
2 one that I needed a lot of clarity around.

3 MEMBER JOHN: Yes, Mr. Vice-Chair. I'm still  
4 struggling with the *Monaco* -- everyone's mispronouncing this  
5 morning -- *Monaco*. *Monaco* case. So I'm glad that you  
6 clarified that as well.

7 Now you mentioned a recent case that you said  
8 would also apply. Can you go into that a little bit more?

9 MS. MAZO: Sure.

10 MEMBER JOHN: *St. Mary's Episcopal*. Thank you.

11 MS. MAZO: No, so there are two cases that have  
12 come out, although numerous cases have come out of the D.C.  
13 Court of Appeals recently, but the first, though, the one  
14 that I'm referring to in particular is the *St. Mary's*  
15 *Episcopal Church* case.

16 MEMBER JOHN: Yes.

17 MS. MAZO: In that case the court upheld the  
18 Zoning Commission's decision to permit the expansion of a  
19 Hillel Building at the GWU campus. And part of the court's  
20 argument there is that the -- or the Hillel, it's not really  
21 *St. Mary's*, but the Hillel was entitled to a reduced standard  
22 of review due to the fact that it was a nonprofit. And so  
23 -- and *Monaco* was referenced and the court found clearly that  
24 the Board may be more flexible when it assesses a nonprofit  
25 organization.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 MEMBER JOHN: Thank you.

2 VICE CHAIR HART: Any other questions? Yes, Mr.  
3 Shapiro.

4 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Just following up on that.  
5 How was the standard of review reduced in that case? I'm  
6 trying to see if it's applicable to this situation.

7 MS. MAZO: Yeah. I mean I have to go pull it up,  
8 I don't remember exactly. But you know I think to the  
9 Board's -- I mean to Vice-Chairman Hart's point, I mean this  
10 -- Monaco -- the courts are clear that Monaco applies here.  
11 But even if you did not want to argue that a reduced standard  
12 was applicable here, that the exceptional condition that's  
13 presented in this case would still satisfy the requirements  
14 of the Board.

15 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Thank you. I mean, Mr.  
16 Chair, that's sort of a direction that I would go with this,  
17 in any case, that it feels appropriate. I just don't want  
18 to even begin set any kind of precedent around reduced  
19 standard in a case like this. But I don't have any  
20 objections to it, frankly.

21 And I did have one other question related to the  
22 issue of the ANC's conditions. Is that appropriate to talk  
23 about now?

24 VICE CHAIR HART: Well, wait until we have the ANC  
25 here, so we could talk to them when they -- at that point.

1                   COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Okay. I'll --

2                   VICE CHAIR HART: So let's just put that on hold  
3 for a minute.

4                   Ms. White.

5                   MEMBER WHITE: Yeah, just one question. I just  
6 want to make sure I'm clear on -- this is a 501(c)(3)?

7                   MS. MAZO: Yes, ma'am.

8                   MEMBER WHITE: So you did file verification of  
9 that. I just wanted to make sure that that's been verified  
10 --

11                  MS. MAZO: We have attested that it's a 501(c)(3).

12                  MEMBER WHITE: Okay.

13                  VICE CHAIR HART: Okay. So I think what we'll do  
14 is go to the Office of Planning. Good morning.

15                  MS. THOMAS: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, Members  
16 of the Board, Karen Thomas with the Office of Planning. And  
17 we are supporting the Applicant's request for variance  
18 relief. We do indeed think the there is an exceptional  
19 situation here. And in an effort to regularize their  
20 paperwork, we do accept the fact that they had been here  
21 since in the 1980s. They have paid their taxes accordingly  
22 as a commercial entity.

23                  And it's unfortunate that neither they can provide  
24 some of their CFOs, and the Office of Planning did in fact  
25 try to do due diligence and search for this and through DCRA,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 and we couldn't find any as well. So we view this as an  
2 effort to regularize their existence as a nonprofit in a  
3 location where they don't meet the area standard. And,  
4 looking back in the records, we don't see any pause for  
5 concern with respect to the substantial detriment to the  
6 public good. It's a small size operation. They have four  
7 employees. We don't see any negative impact with respect to  
8 traffic. There is only one employee who drives. And on the  
9 basis of the regulations, we do not see a substantial harm  
10 to the zoning regulations.

11                   And with that, as we go through the special  
12 exception relief aspect of it, where they are permitted by  
13 special exception and the other criteria, we do believe that  
14 they have met those criteria. So on that, I will rest on the  
15 record of our report. Thank you.

16                   VICE CHAIR HART: Thank you, Ms. Thomas.

17                   Are there any questions for the Office of  
18 Planning?

19                   Do you have any questions for the office of  
20 Planning?

21                   MS. MAZO: No questions.

22                   VICE CHAIR HART: Okay. So let's go to the ANC.  
23 Good morning.

24                   COMMISSIONER ECKENWILER: Good morning, Mr.  
25 Chairman. I was not here this morning, so I believe I need

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 to be sworn in.

2 VICE CHAIR HART: That -- that would be very good.

3 Mr. Moy.

4 MR. MOY: Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the  
5 testimony you are about to present in this proceeding is the  
6 whole truth and nothing but the truth.

7 COMMISSIONER ECKENWILER: I do.

8 MR. MOY: Thank you. You may be seated.

9 VICE CHAIR HART: So, Commissioner Eckenwiler.

10 COMMISSIONER ECKENWILER: Thank you, Vice-Chair  
11 Hart, Members of the Board. Mark Eckenwiler for ANC 6C. As  
12 the applicant indicated we voted last month at our April 11th  
13 meeting, unanimously six-zero, to support this application  
14 with two conditions. I won't consume the Board's time  
15 discussing the legal standards. You've already been through  
16 that with the Applicant and OP, so let me go to the issue of  
17 the conditions that Mr. Shapiro broached.

18 Let me start by saying that Sons of Italy has been  
19 a very good neighbor. The chair, longtime chair of our  
20 commission, lives across the street. I myself live one block  
21 away in the 300 block of E Street, so I'm passed there twice  
22 a day. They're church mice. They are the best neighbors.  
23 You would not know at all but for the sign on the front of  
24 the building that there is a nonprofit use there.

25 However, we do have an issue. And Ms. Mazo

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 averted to the fact that there is a mix of uses. This is  
2 right on the boundary. Second Street is zoned commercial and  
3 Mass Ave of course is mixed use. Mass Ave is zoned mixed use  
4 as well. And partly as a result of our proximity to the  
5 Capitol, we have this ever-encroaching number of function  
6 houses, stealth office buildings, and so there is a problem  
7 including very much on this block. There is a building  
8 directly across the street from this property where there are  
9 frequent functions. We have large vehicles double parked for  
10 hours at a time. It's very disruptive.

11                   And so the conditions that we proposed are  
12 entirely consistent with the Applicant's current use. They  
13 have assented to that. In fact, we gave them a little  
14 headroom there in the event that they need to expand to five  
15 employees. But what we'd like to do is to ensure that if any  
16 successor nonprofit occupies this building, that we have the  
17 force of law to require them to be good neighbors at least,  
18 you know, with respect to these large events that have proven  
19 to be an issue at other nearby sites.

20                   I'm happy to answer any questions.

21                   VICE CHAIR HART: Mr. Shapiro.

22                   COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

23                   I appreciate, Commissioner Eckenwiler, your  
24 support of this and the conditions make sense to me. I don't  
25 have a problem with the conditions. They just seem vague.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 The first one isn't vague. You have a maximum of five  
2 employees. The second one, I'm okay with supporting it the  
3 way this is, but my reaction is I would want a little more  
4 precision with it. So, in other words, I'm not sure how to  
5 define reception or large gathering. And does it make sense  
6 to put a specific number to this again, or, frankly, do you  
7 not care. Do you feel like this is going to be adequate and  
8 the Applicant doesn't have a problem with it. And in that  
9 case I'm not going to dig into it too much. I'm just trying  
10 to figure out who determines what large means or what  
11 reception means.

12 COMMISSIONER ECKENWILER: If the Board prefers  
13 simply to strike the word large and say, you know, no hosting  
14 of functions, I mean it still has to be a function. So you  
15 could have a business meeting where someone comes there, but  
16 we know the difference between a business meeting and a  
17 function. And the truth is --

18 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: But if I can say, we may  
19 know intuitively the difference, but I don't know how to  
20 apply that standard. So for me the issue seems to be you  
21 don't want any more than x number of people showing up at the  
22 building at the same time.

23 COMMISSIONER ECKENWILER: If that would -- I'm  
24 sorry. Go ahead.

25 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: No, it's just that may or

BZA Case No. 19570  
October 25, 2018,  
Hearing Transcript Pg. 19-21

1 a lot of those issues are not within our purview, although  
2 we do take them into consideration and hope that we're doing  
3 our best to kind of like use the -- look at the standards in  
4 which to -- within the regulation and which to, again as I  
5 mentioned, approve or deny.

6 So I was able to look back, go back again with the  
7 Office of Planning's report and the ANC's report and reviewed  
8 the case. And so I do think that the Applicant has met the  
9 standard in order to approve this. There were some  
10 conditions that I -- that the Applicant had agreed to before,  
11 which were that the trash receptacle shall be stored within  
12 the building, that trash shall be taken out through the front  
13 door of the building and the Applicant will schedule trash  
14 pickup three times a week. And those were things that were  
15 going to be added in as conditions.

16 If we were to actually approve this, depending  
17 upon how this discussion goes, I would continue to ask the  
18 Applicant to work with the party in opposition so that as  
19 best as possible alleviate their anxiety or concerns about  
20 the construction.

21 Does the Board have any comments?

22 MEMBER WHITE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I concur  
23 essentially with what you said. I think that they did meet  
24 the area variance criteria. What they're trying to do is  
25 construct an additional apartment in an existing 12-unit

1 apartment house that's located on 220 2nd Street, S.E.

2 So after reviewing the record I think they met the  
3 criteria. They're going to be constructing this additional  
4 apartment in the basement level of this 3-story, 12-unit  
5 apartment house. So this basement level apartment apparently  
6 used to be the laundry room. And so that space is no longer  
7 going to be utilized for that purpose because laundry  
8 facilities are now in every unit. So there are no external  
9 alternations that are going to be happening in the building,  
10 so I think that was also supportive of their case, too.

11 The one question that I had was looking at the  
12 concerns raised by the ANC. If we were to grant the relief,  
13 the question is whether or not we could add a condition that  
14 trash be stored indoors instead of outdoors. I don't know  
15 if that's something that we should discuss, or if that's  
16 something that they've definitely agreed to do. But that  
17 appears to be something that was really raised as an  
18 important issue because of some of the concerns.

19 Even the party that was granted status for this  
20 particular case, Peter Waldron, he had some concerns about  
21 rodents and construction and things like that. So I think  
22 the whole indoor trash issue, even though there's no formal  
23 construction management plan -- but I think the indoor trash  
24 issue is more of an ongoing thing and not just related to the  
25 construction.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1                   But I think just in terms of the criteria for a  
2 variance if they're able to satisfy that particular  
3 condition, I believe that they are not going to create any  
4 kind of detriment to the public good. It's not going to  
5 substantially harm the Zoning Regulations. And I think that  
6 they've presented kind of an exceptional situation that  
7 justifies them being able to utilize the space as an  
8 additional apartment.

9                   CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Thank you, Ms. White.

10                  VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: Yes, the only part that  
11 I would add is; I would concur with my colleagues, I think  
12 that the Applicant has provided sufficient information to  
13 justify why the three prongs have been -- of the variance  
14 relief have been met.

15                  I think -- I agree with the Office of Planning's  
16 report regarding the project and understand that conditions  
17 that we require are -- it would be helpful if the Applicant  
18 were to be okay with them, but we're requiring them because  
19 we think that they are necessary as part of the Zoning -- the  
20 regulations. So they're something that we were -- we would  
21 be imposing on them. I -- whether or not they like them is  
22 somewhat irrelevant, but I would agree with you that it's  
23 always helpful because then we know that they have some  
24 concurrence and they are likely to be following forward --  
25 through with them.