GOVERNMENT OF

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

+ + + + +

PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

TUESDAY
SEPTEMBER 22, 2009

+ + + + +

The Regular Public Hearing convened in Room 220 South, 441 4th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20001, pursuant to notice at 10:05 a.m., Marc D. Loud, Chairperson, presiding.

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT MEMBERS PRESENT:

MARC D. LOUD, Chairperson SHANE DETTMAN, Vice Chairman MERIDITH MOLDENHAUER, Member

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

KONRAD SCHLATER, Commissioner PETER MAY, Commissioner (NPS)

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

CLIFFORD MOY, Secretary
BEVERLEY BAILEY, Sr. Zoning Specialist
JOHN NYARKU, Zoning Specialist

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PRESENT:

SHERRY GLAZER, ESQ.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 Board of Zoning Adjustment
District of Columbia
CASE NO.Transcript
EXHIBIT NO.null

# OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

MAXINE BROWN-ROBERTS
ARTHUR JACKSON
KAREN THOMAS
STEPHEN MORDFIN
MATT JESICK

DISTRICT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION STAFF PRESENT:

JEFF JENNINGS

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Public Hearing held on September 22, 2009.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM	PAGE
PRELIMINARY MATTERS	9
BOARD ACTION:	
Application No. 17962, Moon Star Carry-Out	11
Application No. 17963, Euclid of Virginia	45
Application No. 17964, Emory United Methodist Church	196
Application No. 17961, Center for Digital Imaging Arts at Boston University	217
Application No. 17993, D.C. Public Library	256
Application No. 17717, Central Unior Mission	a 337

Adjourn

# PROCEEDINGS

10:05 A.M.

CHAIR LOUD: Everybody stay right where you are. We're getting ready to call the morning hearing calendar.

This hearing will please come to order.

morning again, ladies Good and gentlemen, this is the September 22nd Public Hearing of the Board of Zoning Adjustment of the District of Columbia. My name is Marc Loud, Chairperson. And joining me today are Vice Chair Shane Dettman, representing the National Capital Planning Commission. To my left is Board Member Meridith Moldenhauer. Joining us walking to the dais is Mr. Peter May, representing the Zoning Commission. To is Clifford Moldenhauer's left Ms. representing -- I'm sorry, Secretary of the BZA; Ms. Sherry Glazer, Office of the Attorney And on my far left, Ms. Beverley General. Bailey, Zoning Specialist, here in the Office

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

of Zoning.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Copies of today's hearing agenda are available to you and are located to my left in the wall bin near the door.

Please be advised that this proceeding is being recorded by court reporter and is also webcast live. Accordingly, we must ask you to refrain from any disruptive noises actions in the or hearing room. When presenting information to the Board, please turn on and speak into the microphone, first stating your name and home address. When you finish speaking, please off microphone that turn your so your microphone is no longer picking up sound or background noise.

All persons planning to testify, either in favor or in opposition are to fill out two witness cards. These cards are located to my left on the table near the door and on the witness tables. Upon coming forward to speak to the Board, please give

both cards to the reporter sitting to my right.

The order for procedure for special variances is exceptions and as follows: of first, statement and witnesses the Applicant; Government reports including Office of Planning, the Department of Public Works, etcetera; third, the report of the ANC; fourth, parties or persons in support; fifth, parties or persons in opposition; and finally, closing remarks only by the Applicant.

Pursuant to Sections 3117.4 3117.5, the following time constraints will be maintained: the Applicant, Appellant, persons and parties except in ANC in support including witnesses, 60 minutes collectively; Appellees, parties except persons and in ANC in opposition, including witnesses also 60 minutes collectively; individuals, very importantly, individuals are allotted three minutes to testify and only three minutes to So if you're here and you're going testify.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

to testify this morning, you feel your testimony is going to run over three minutes, you have an opportunity to work on that testimony and get it down to three minutes.

time restraints dо These not. include cross examination and/or questions from the Board. Cross examination witnesses is permitted by the Applicant or The ANC within which the property is parties. located is automatically a party in a special exception or variance case. Nothing prevents the Board from placing reasonable restrictions on cross examination, including time limits limitations the and on scope of cross examination.

The record will be closed at the conclusion of each case, except for any material specifically requested by the Board. The Board and staff will specify at the end of the hearing exactly what is expected and the date when the persons must submit the evidence to the Office of Zoning.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

After the record is closed, no other information will be accepted by the Board. If the record is closed at the hearing, no information will be accepted by the Board.

The decision of the Board in these contested cases must be based exclusively on the public record. To avoid any appearance to the contrary, the Board requests that persons present not engage the Members of the Board in conversation.

Again, I want to repeat. The decision of the Board in contested cases must be based exclusively on the public record. To avoid any appearance to the contrary, the Board requests that persons present not engage the Members of the Board in conversation.

Please turn off all beepers and cell phones at this time so as not to disrupt these proceedings.

The Board will now consider any preliminary matters. Preliminary matters are

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

	those which relate to whether a case will or
2	should be heard today, such as requests for
3	postponement, continuance, withdrawal or
4	whether proper and adequate notice of the
5	hearing has been given.
6	If you're not prepared to go
7	forward with a case today, or if you believe
8	the Board should not proceed, now is the time
9	to raise such a matter.
10	Does the staff have any preliminary
11	matters?
12	MS. BAILEY: Good morning, Mr.
13	Chairman.
14	CHAIR LOUD: Good morning.
15	MS. BAILEY: Members of the Board
16	and to everyone, good morning.
17	No, Mr. Chairman, we do not.
18	CHAIR LOUD: Thank you, Ms. Bailey.
19	So let's proceed then with the morning's
20	hearing agenda.
21	Would all individuals wishing to
22	testify today, please rise to take the oath

1 and Ms. Bailey, again, to my far left will 2 administer the oath to you. MS. BAILEY: Please raise your 3 right hand. Do you solemnly swear or affirm 4 that the testimony that you will be giving 5 today will be the truth, the whole truth, and 6 7 nothing but the truth? (The witnesses were sworn.) 8 MS. BAILEY: Thank you. 9 10 CHAIR LOUD: Thank you, Ms. Bailey, and thank you, witnesses, and good morning 11 again to everyone. 12 13 I just want to sort of help me get a gauge on this morning's calendar, we have an 14 ambitious calendar for today. Just by show of 15 16 hands, how many witnesses are here for the Euclid case? 17 Okay, now all the witnesses that 18 19 are here for the Euclid case, were you just sworn in by Ms. Bailey? All right. 20 me see by show of hands again the witnesses 21 that are here for the Euclid case? 22

And of those six witnesses, will any of you be testifying in support of the application? All of you will be testifying in opposition? Thank you.

I'm sorry? There are two that will be testifying in support. Okay. We're going to call that case at the appropriate time. I just want to remind each of the witnesses that

Ms. Bailey, would you like to call the first case?

under our rules you'll be given three minutes

to testify this morning.

MS. BAILEY: Sure, Mr. Chairman. Application 17962 is the application of Moon Star Carry-Out and it is pursuant to 11 DCMR Section 3103.2, for a variance from the use provisions to allow a fast food restaurant under subsection 701.1. The property is located in the C-1 District at 5008 Benning Road, S.E., Square 5340, L95 59.

There is an interpreter here with the Applicant in this case. And if you would

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 please come forward and have a seat at 2 table. And then second, Mr. Chairman, we 3 do have a report from ANC-7E. We did receive 4 that yesterday and it does need to be waived 5 into the record. 6 7 CHAIR LOUD: Thank you, Ms. Bailey, and good morning Applicants. Is ANC-7E's 8 representative here this morning? Okay, I 9 10 guess not. But we do have the report, I think as a preliminary matter, we need to make a 11 decision regarding waiving or not waiving in 12 13 that report. I recall, the report is our 14 15 Exhibit 23. It's dated September 15th, but I 16 think it came in yesterday and it's a report in favor of the application. It indicates a 17 proper notice and a quorum were provided for 18 19 with respect to the application. 20 (Pause.) Five persons were in support. 21

against. Our rules provide that these

reports be submitted prior to the date of the hearing. This was submitted September 21. But Section 3100.5 allows us to waive the rules for good cause shown if there's no prejudice to the parties and would allow us to enter this into our record. We've done that on a number of occasions.

I always think it's very important for the community to be able to weigh in on issues that impact their community. this case -- and typically, personally, we found that there's always little disconnect when reports are due from ANCs right after the summer break, often because many of them don't meet in August. So I'd be perfectly willing to allow this into record, if other Board Members are. Okay.

Mr. May, any thoughts on that?

Okay. So what we'll do then for the Applicant, this is a preliminary matter where the ANC has filed a report late. The report is dated September 15th. We did not receive

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	it until September 21st. By consensus, we are
2	going to allow this report into the record.
3	Did you have any questions or
4	concerns with respect to that?
5	VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Excuse me, can
6	you turn your mic on, please?
7	TRANSLATOR SIU CHEUNG: Do you want
8	me to translate that into Chinese.
9	CHAIR LOUD: Let me just a point
10	of clarification. What's the best way to do
11	this? There's obviously no reason for the
12	court reporter to get the Chinese language
13	version, right? So the best way, I guess the
14	best way to do it
15	TRANSLATOR SIU CHEUNG: I will talk
16	in here when he responds.
17	CHAIR LOUD: That's correct, all
18	right. I think you can turn your mic off for
19	this part and then turn it back on.
20	TRANSLATOR SIU CHEUNG: He says
21	he's okay with admitting that.
22	CHAIR LOUD: Excellent, then we can

1	proceed forward on the merits. Thank you.
2	That's fine.
3	Now why don't we do this. Why
4	don't you introduce yourselves for our record
5	and include your address.
6	TRANSLATOR SIU CHEUNG: My name is
7	Siu Cheung. The address is 1308 McLean
8	Crescent Court, McLean, Virginia 22101. And I
9	am the Chinese interpreter for Fuzhouin
10	Chinese.
11	CHAIR LOUD: Good morning.
12	TRANSLATOR SIU CHEUNG: Good
13	morning.
14	CHAIR LOUD: And if you could have
15	your colleagues introduce themselves or you
16	could introduce them.
17	MR. ZI KUI ZHANG: Zi Kui Zhang.
18	TRANSLATOR SIU CHEUNG: I just
19	asked him to go ahead and state his name,
20	because he can do that. And I'm looking here
21	at this address. It's 3412 Newton Street,
22	Apartment 1, Mount Rainier, Maryland 20712.

1	CHAIR LOUD: Thank you. And than
2	to your left is?
3	MS. XIAO QING ZHANG: My name is
4	Xiao Qing Zhang. I'm Zi Kui Zhang's daughter.
5	My address is 3212 Newton Street, Apartment
6	1, Mount Rainier, Maryland 20712.
7	CHAIR LOUD: Okay, thank you. I'm
8	sorry I didn't get your name. It might take
9	me a while to clarify the names. Are you a
10	witness this morning or you're sitting at the
11	table to support your father?
12	TRANSLATOR SIU CHEUNG: She says
13	she's here to support her father and if needed
14	provide any additional information for his
15	behalf.
16	CHAIR LOUD: Okay, thank you. Have
17	you been sworn in earlier? Okay, excellent.
18	All right, then I think we can
19	proceed. I see the Office of Planning is
20	here, good morning.
21	I think we can proceed with this
22	

of the time necessary, although Board Members, if I get ahead of myself, please stop me, but I think having reviewed what is pretty much a full file in the case, the Applicant needs to make out a case for what's called a use variance. And in order to do that there are three prongs of the test.

Applicant The must show an exceptional situation with respect to application for the relief being requested. It must also show undue hardship, in other words that because of the limitations placed by the zoning regulations on use of this building in this zone, that it creates hardship to the Applicant that prevents the Applicant from using the property in conformance with the zone and your pleadings and your submissions to date have addressed each of these things, but I'm repeating this on the record so that we can truncate the hearing and kind of zero in on what's going to be before us.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Finally, you need to show that there's o substantial detriment to the public good or to the zone plan.

the Office of Planning has report with evidence for submitted our а record as to each of these prongs. So for the purposes of this morning, what we're primarily looking at is testimony from the Applicant on each of those three prongs. And again, the Applicant has addressed it significantly in The first prong, exceptional the pleadings. situation is something that the Applicant may want to provide a little more testimony on, as well as the Office of Planning when we get to the Office of Planning in terms of what is it about this application that creates the exceptional situation.

MR. MOY: Mr. Chairman, if I could interrupt for just a moment. You said a lot.

I think the translator needs to translate everything that you just said.

CHAIR LOUD: Yes, sir.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. MOY: So you may go through some pauses.

CHAIR LOUD: Thank you, Mr. Moy.

I'm sitting here looking right at you and just talking, talking, talking.

Let me just state it very, very briefly. We have a very full record. And the standard for granting or denying the relief has three prongs. First, some exceptional situation borne by this Applicant that creates an undue hardship for the Applicant and that does not result in substantial detriment to the public good or the zone plan if the BZA were to approve this application. So -- okay, what we're looking for from the Applicant is testimony and evidence that relates to those three standards. Because the record includes a lot of the history, we don't need that repeated formally on the record again, unless it relates to one of those there standards.

All right, with that I think we can begin and I'll turn it over to you.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

TRANSLATOR SIU CHEUNG: We sat in the back a little bit and she has a letter to read and I think that would address your three issues.

CHAIR LOUD: Okay.

MS. XIAO QING ZHANG: Hi. I, Xiao Quinq Zhanq am the owner of carry-out restaurant Moon Star. Now I want to set up a corporation with my son Moon Star, as Incorporated. We will still keep running this same fast food business. We didn't make any change for it. Our fast food Chinese carryout still has been open in this area for many years. Our food is very popular in this district. The neighborhood workers and the residents like our food because it has effort and it has good food quality and taste. And also the price is acceptable and reasonable. Therefore, the neighborhood workers and the residents hope our business keeps going on as to keep with their lifestyle.

Near our carry-out they are

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

building a convenience store. The continual operation of our fast food carry-out will not be harmful because of the traffic, noise and lighting.

CHAIR LOUD: Let me interrupt you for just one second. I'm looking at something that's tabbed our Exhibit 3 which appears to be the very letter that you're reading into the record. And I just wanted you to know you actually don't have to read it into the record. It's a part of the record already and we've actually reviewed the record before coming out here.

I didn't mean to cut you off. If you wanted to read it, but again for our purposes in evaluating the case, it's already a part of the record.

TRANSLATOR SIU CHEUNG: And just for your record, I've already read the letter in Chinese when we sat in the back and so he does acknowledge that is the letter that he wanted and the information submitted.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 CHAIR LOUD: Okay, thank you very 2 much. the Applicant have 3 Does any additional statements apart from what's in our 4 Exhibit 3? 5 TRANSLATOR SIU CHEUNG: That's all 6 on their side. 7 CHAIR LOUD: Okay. Then why don't 8 we do this? Why don't we move to the Office 9 10 of Planning. I'll pause briefly to see if Board Members have any questions for 11 the Applicant. It doesn't appear that there are 12 13 any at this point, so why don't we move to the Office of Planning. Let's go over your report 14 Exhibit 22 and 15 which is our again, 16 report, excellent report. You can perhaps just highlight. You recommend approval, why 17 you think this Applicant meets the test. 18 19 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Board. 20 I'm Office Maxine Brown-Roberts from the 21

Planning.

We're here today to review the Application 17962 at 508 Benning Road, for a use variance to continue the carry-out, it's a fast food establishment. The property is within the C-1 District that does not allow a fast-food establishment which is why the Applicant is here. In regards to the think the Applicant variance, I that proved that there is an extraordinary exceptional situation. In this case, uniqueness results from pre-existing а nonconforming use. Applicant The is proposing to create any new nonconformity.

of Occupancy, this store has been used as a commercial use and even longer for the -they've called it a number of things, a deli
carry-out, a carry-out deli, a fast-food
restaurant. So it has been called, it has a
number of names, but it's basically the same
operation.

The zoning regulation concerning

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

fast-food establishments has changed over the years, in 1985 and again in 2007. And so this restaurant has been operating as a nonconforming use for some time. The uniqueness that has resulted in an exceptional condition and hardship for the property owner because the property, the physical layout of the building, it has limited seating space. It has a large commercial kitchen. Ιt evident it was intended to be used as a carryfast-food restaurant establishment. out And so converting the space to a use permitted in C-1 District would, the to unreasonable and would pose an undue hardship on the property owner.

The granting of the variance would not cause any substantial detriment to the public good as there is no immediate adjacent residential district to the building. To the rear of the building is again, there's a private drive and then there is also another commercial building.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

The property currently does not provide parking on site. It's impossible to provide parking because there's no curb cut off Benning Road or off of H Street. But the Applicant says that they serve mainly the adjacent community and so many people walk from their homes to the store or if they drive it's just to pick up the food and go.

On my visit there, I did not see any parking in front, actually, there were no customers at the time when I visited. But then again, it was in the middle of day and not the time when maybe in the afternoon when they're busiest. But we haven't received any complaints about any parking issues.

And therefore, based on these factors, the Office of Planning believes that the use variance can be granted for this application.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIR LOUD: Thank you. And that was an excellent report. Let me see if the

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	Board has any questions for you. There are
2	none.
3	Does the Applicant have any
4	questions for the Office of Planning?
5	TRANSLATOR SIU CHEUNG: He shook
6	his head and he also said no.
7	CHAIR LOUD: Just one quick
8	question for the Office of Planning in terms
9	of the undue hardship, your testimony was that
10	it would be unreasonable because of the
11	physical limitations of the current layout
12	used in conformity with permissible C-1 uses.
13	Is that correct?
14	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Yes.
15	CHAIR LOUD: And you stand by that?
16	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Yes, I do.
17	CHAIR LOUD: Okay. I don't have
18	any additional questions, so why don't we now
19	move on to the ANC report. And again, I'll
20	ask if the ANC is present. And it doesn't
21	appear that they're present, but as indicated,
22	they did submit a report. It's our Exhibit

We'll talk about it a little this morning 23. and in essence in the report, the ANC Chair of 7E, Ms, Mary Jackson indicates that a meeting was held on September 9th. There was proper notice and a quorum and the recommendation of the ANC was five Commissioners voted to approve the variance and one voted against it. The final vote obviously was five to one. as the ANC in this matter, that report will be given great weight by the BZA deliberations on the case.

Are there any questions about the ANC's report? Then what we'll do now is call for any persons that are in support of this application. If you're in the audience and you're in support of the application now will be the time to come forward and give your testimony.

Seeing none, if there are any persons in opposition to the application, good morning, sir. Now would be the time to come forward and give your testimony.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 Good morning. You're going to have 2 to turn your microphone on. On the base of the microphone, there's a button that you can 3 push and a green light will pop on. 4 MR. THOMAS: I got it. 5 CHAIR LOUD: Good morning. 6 7 MR. THOMAS: Good morning. My name is Benjamin Thomas. I'm an ANC Commissioner 8 and I have submitted an opposition letter as a 9 My address 10 citizen of the ward. is 1135 Chaplin Street, S.E., Washington, D.C. 11 I have lived in the area for 51 12 13 years and I'm very familiar with the situation establishment. of that letter 14 In my opposition I stated and I didn't bring a copy 15 16 with me, but you have a copy of it. CHAIR LOUD: Yes, sir. We do. 17 In talking to MR. THOMAS: 18 19 community and the ANC report is not a fact. It's not a true vote. The vote was opposite 20 of what the ANC indicated. I made a motion to 21

reject the application and four people voted

in favor of my objection and they listed me as being opposed to it. I made the motion myself in the ANC meeting as an ANC Commissioner. So that's a false report that the ANC sent in, a false vote count, that they sent in.

But my opposition to it is because of condition of the business. business, when I first moved in 51 years was a liquor store and ever since then it's been a carry-out. And it is filthy inside. all of you have a picture of the inside and The outside appearance is filthy, outside. dirty. You can't see in or out. And the inside, tiles are missing and it is really a filthy situation. I have copies, pictures of the photos that were sent to me by the Zoning Commission as an ANC Commissioner. It is a detriment to the community because 99 percent of the clientele are the young people that hang out on the corner. And they go in and buy their fast food. As soon as they come out of the door, the container is dropped in front

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

of the business and as soon as they consume the food, the rest of it is thrown out in the community.

Now there's no place inside for a container. But this building trash adequate space for at least four to six table size, like a card table size establishment that could be established, put inside for people to be seated. There's no place inside for the people to sit. They come outside and sit on the wall and wait for their food to be prepared. And it's really a detriment to the community and the condition that that place is As far as I'm concerned, it's unhealthy. in. The bullet-proof glass is nothing but dust and grease on everything that's up there. The front windows are the same way. And I have pictures over here. Graffiti on the door when the door is left wide open during the There's graffiti marked on the door. day.

When cars dome down, when they

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

And it's an unsightly condition.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	bring the product in, they drove over the
2	sidewalk because there's no cutout and park in
3	front of the establishment right at the door
4	so they can unload and you can see the
5	condition of the concrete because of those
6	trucks being parked in front of it.
7	CHAIR LOUD: Thank you,
8	Commissioner Thomas. We really appreciate
9	your testimony this morning. And I'm going to
10	ask the Applicant if they have any questions
11	for you and then we'll see if Board Members
12	have any questions.
13	TRANSLATOR SIU CHEUNG: They don't
14	have any questions for him and he made a
15	statement which I'm just translating is that
16	they do their best to try to clean up in the
17	establishment.
18	CHAIR LOUD: Okay, thank you.
19	Board Members, are there any questions for
20	Commissioner Thomas?
21	Commissioner Thomas, I have one
22	question regarding the graffiti. Your

1	testimony was that there's graffiti on the
2	door?
3	MR. THOMAS: There's two doors. If
4	you would look at the picture. When they open
5	up in the morning, they leave the two doors
6	wide open. And right on the inside of this
7	left door is the graffiti that's been there
8	for years, marked on the door, the white part
9	of the inside of the door. You can't see it
10	from the outside.
11	CHAIR LOUD: Right, you can't see
12	it from the picture.
13	MR. THOMAS: You can see it when
14	the doors are opened during business time.
15	CHAIR LOUD: Hold on, one at a
16	time. Is there any other graffiti on the
17	building?
18	MR. THOMAS: Not on the building
19	itself.
20	CHAIR LOUD: Okay.
21	MR. THOMAS: But inside, it is
22	horrible.

CHAIR LOUD: Thank you. I don't have any additional questions. Thank you for your time and your patience this morning, and thank you for appearing to give your testimony.

We will now turn to the Applicant, back to you for closing remarks, if you have any closing remarks that you'd like to make.

Applicant on the right said that he does do his best to keep it clean and sometimes the neighborhood is a little rough and they -- it gets a little dirty, but they come out and they clean it as much as they can. Sometimes the younger people come and they might do something there, but they do clean it. She had mentioned while he was talking that even the graffiti, they tried to clean that at least once a week as best as they can.

The Applicant on the right said that he does provide trash can and he does ask the customers to pick up their trash and put

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

it in the trash can and when they don't, they 1 2 do come out and they do clean it. She says that they sweep and they 3 clean daily, every morning, when they open up 4 the store. 5 CHAIR LOUD: Thank you very much. 6 7 Is there anything additional you'd like to add? I think we're going to decide as a Board 8 I'm sorry, you have some questions, Mr. 9 10 May? COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, just 11 wanted to follow up on the statement regarding 12 13 loading in front of the building. Do trucks come and unload on the sidewalk in front of 14 15 the establishment? Delivery trucks, yes. 16 TRANSLATOR SIU CHEUNG: He said delivery twice, when it's a 17 once or new person, they bring the delivery in through the 18 19 front and he will tell them not to do that and then that doesn't persist. They don't do that 20 the second time. 21

COMMISSIONER MAY:

22

And then

Okay.

I have a follow-up question for the Office of Planning which I guess I'd like them the statements about the comment on cleanliness and the appearance of the establishment and what you witnessed there.

MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: When Ι went there on that day, the business was operation, but there were no customers. wouldn't -- it can be improved. The outside -- it's really the inside. I think it could maybe just do with a good cleaning, you know. It's not anything that I think would even need paint. It's just cleaning. As gentleman said, there may be some grease and that sort of thing. That could help.

The outside was clean. I didn't see on that day, because I looked specifically around, walked around to see if there was any trash and I didn't see any trash. But then that was just one day. That was just my observation.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Thank you.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

CHAIR LOUD: Thank you, Mr. May.

Any additional questions for either the

Applicant or the Office of Planning? Okay.

Then I think we have a couple of options at this point. We can deliberate your case this morning, try to reach a decision on it or we can schedule it out into the future and try to reach a decision on that date.

Personally, I think the record is full. I think we have enough information in it to deliberate this morning and I'm prepared to both move forward with it and to start us off.

of the Okay, to sort recap evidence, this is an application for fast-food establishment, that has been called variously a delicatessen, a carry-out over the years. It's operating at this site with a proper C of O since at least 1991. This particular Applicant has had a C of O on the site since 2003. And that C of O has been stamped, demarcated, however you want call to

#### NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

carry-out, delicatessen, delicatessen carry-out, etcetera. And that's our Exhibit 7 for the 2003 C of O.

The business prepares food on site exhibits accordance with of the some submitted for our record. Ιt sells to customers for consumption off-site There's no seating and we heard that from the Commissioner as well as some of the evidence in the record. According to the Office of Planning, the evidence it has submitted, food is served in disposable table ware and there are no receptacles in the public area.

There some testimony in the is record regarding and these are my words, not necessarily what's in the record, but accumulation of trash that comes from -- I think that evidence is pretty consistent from both the Applicant and from the Commissioner. The Applicant suggests that the accumulation comes from the clientele and they being young The Commissioner people, as I understood it.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

saying the same thing, that there's an accumulation of trash there, but not necessarily attributing it to young people or anything like that, although he does mention loitering.

There's also some testimony about graffiti being on the interior door, having been there for a number of years, never been removed, according to Commissioner Thomas. That's disputed by the Applicant in the sense that the Applicant, I think mentioned there has been graffiti, but the Applicant says it's cleaned weekly and that the trash accumulation is swept every day.

In terms of the use variance test, the Office of Planning, both in their submission, our Exhibit 22 and in their oral testimony today has indicated that exceptional situation prong of the test is It's met by the fact that the preexisting, nonconforming use at the site that dates back at least 18 years for a deli,

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

grocery, grocery/deli, fast-food establishment and then dates back a total of 43 years for retail years, but for our purposes in terms of it being a fast-food establishment, it dates back at least 18 years and significantly, the 2003 C of O issued by the Zoning Administrator authorizes a deli carry-out use as of 2003. And presumably since it was issued by the DCRA, they greenlighted that use in 2003 and this Applicant has been operating specifically since 2003, but the use back, as I said to 1981.

In terms of there being an undue hardship, the Office of Planning testified that converting the space to a use permitted in C-1 would be unreasonable and an undue hardship because the physical layout of the space would be cost prohibitive for other uses in the C-1 and really kind of limits what this Applicant can do.

In terms of there being substantial detriments to the public good of the zone

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

plan, the Office of Planning testified that there isn't. There's no parking, but most of the patrons either walk there or live very close by and do not push out any demand for parking. The site also does not abut any residential, according to the Office of Planning's testimony.

And so from my perspective, I think this Applicant has for made а case use variance and I'11 be supporting the In terms of if we get to that application. point, conditions to mitigate some of testimony that we heard here this morning, I would be in favor of at least two conditions, based on the testimony. The first condition would require the Applicant to sweet sidewalk adjacent to the storefront and the curbside adjacent to that sidewalk, at least once daily to mitigate against the accumulation of trash. The testimony from the Applicant is that they're already doing it, so it would not be a burden on the Applicant to

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

continue doing that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

The difference with the condition is that it becomes an enforceable matter for the community and if the community is able to substantiate that it's not being done, that could affect the continued use of the restaurant.

Secondly, the issue of graffiti graffiti on the interior of the door and there being some testimony that there has graffiti over the years and it's not been removed and there's been other testimony that there has been graffiti, but it's removed weekly. With respect to that, I would recommend a condition that would require the Applicant, in accordance with its testimony, to make every effort, to use its best efforts to remove any graffiti on the building, the interior, as well as the exterior, within a week of it appearing on the property.

So that's how I'm viewing the evidence and those are the conditions I'd like

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

to suggest to Board Members.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

COMMISSIONER MAY: I think I'm comfortable with those conditions. I wouldn't want to make it a condition, but I would also urge the Applicant to clean up the place. If the Office of Planning suggests that it could use a good cleaning, I think that is well worth the effort. And I think the Applicant would be smart to do that. It makes good business sense.

CHAIR LOUD: Sorry, is there anything further from Board Members? why don't we do this and hopefully the translation is being made in terms of some of the very good suggestions that are coming from the Board regarding continued use, particularly Mr. May's concern and that of some of, at least one of the witnesses here, regarding the interior cleanliness issue.

That being said, I would like to move approval of Application No. 17962, Moon Star, for a use variance for a fast-food

### NEAL R. GROSS

1	establishment under Section 701.1 in the C-1,
2	as conditioned.
3	VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Second.
4	CHAIR LOUD: A motion has been made
5	and seconded. Is there further deliberation?
6	Hearing none, all those in favor say aye.
7	(Chorus of ayes.)
8	CHAIR LOUD: All those opposed.
9	(No response.)
10	CHAIR LOUD: Are there any
11	abstentions?
12	Ms. Bailey, can you read back the
13	vote, please?
14	MS. BAILEY: Certainly, Mr.
15	Chairman. The vote is recorded as 4-0-1 to
16	grant the application. Mr. Loud made the
17	motion. Mr. Dettman seconded. Ms.
18	Moldenhauer and Mr. May supported the motion.
19	The third appointee position is vacant.
20	Are we doing a summary order on
21	this one, Mr. Chairman?
22	CHAIR LOUD: Let me just ask for a

1	point of clarification. I'd like to do a
2	summary order because there were no parties in
3	opposition. The ANC supported, but there are
4	the conditions that we talked about, so I mean
5	is there a way to do a summary and have those
6	conditions?
7	MS. BAILEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.
8	CHAIR LOUD: Okay, so why don't we
9	do a summary, but have those conditions
10	indicated in the order.
11	MS. BAILEY: Thank you.
12	CHAIR LOUD: Thank you, Ms. Bailey.
13	
14	Thank you for your participation
15	this morning and your patience. We're going
16	to call the next case.
17	(Pause.)
18	CHAIR LOUD: Ms. Bailey, when you
19	are ready, you can call our next case.
20	MS. BAILEY: Mr. Chairman,
21	Application 17963 of Euclid of Virginia is
22	pursuant to 11 DCMR Section 3104.1, for a

1	special exception to allow a new self-service
2	gasoline station and convenience store under
3	section 706, at premises 4975 South Dakota
4	Avenue, N.W. The property is also known as
5	Square 3899, Lot 76. And it is zoned C-1.
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: Good morning to
7	everyone at the table. I assume everyone has
8	been sworn in at the table if you're going to
9	give testimony.
10	Okay, why don't you stand and Ms.
11	Bailey will administer the oath to you.
12	MS. BAILEY: Please raise your
13	right hand. Do you solemnly swear or affirm
14	that the testimony that you'll be giving today
15	will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing
16	but the truth?
17	MR. G. GOSS: I do.
18	MS. BAILEY: Thank you.
19	CHAIR LOUD: Good morning. Why
20	don't we have everyone at the table just
21	introduce yourselves for our record.
22	MS. FULLER: Good morning, Mr.

1	Chairman and Members of the Board. My name is
2	Carlynn Fuller. I'm the attorney in this
3	case. My address is 1127 Abbey Place, N.E.,
4	Washington, D.C. 20002.
5	CHAIR LOUD: Good morning. You're
6	the attorney for the Applicant?
7	MS. FULLER: That's correct.
8	CHAIR LOUD: Is the Applicant here?
9	MS. FULLER: Mr. Goss is here.
10	CHAIR LOUD: Okay. Good morning.
11	MR. M. GOSS: Good morning. My
12	name is Michael Goss is 1325 Trinidad Avenue,
13	N.E. Contrary to the submission, that's
14	actually a business address of mine that's
15	listed in the testimony. But my residential
16	is 1325 Trinidad Avenue, N.E.
17	CHAIR LOUD: And Mr. Goss, you are
18	the owner or the representative for the owner?
19	MR. M. GOSS: I'm the
20	representative and the owner.
21	CHAIR LOUD: Thank you.
22	MR. G. GOSS: Good morning, Mr.

Chairman. My name is Gary Goss. I'm also a partner. My address is 2204 14th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 2009.

CHAIR LOUD: Good morning to each of you. Is the ANC present this morning, ANC-5A? Good morning. My don't you come to the table. You're automatically a party in the case.

And as I recall, this is a case where we had about six witnesses that wanted to testify, I believe, or four witnesses that wanted to testify in opposition and we have two witnesses in favor at the table.

Let me start us off, if I can. We've reviewed the file and you pulled together a very good file, counsel. case for a special exception under Section 7262301 believe 706 and Т and there are certain standard requirements that have to be met for the special exception and I don't want to speak for all of the Members of the Board here, but I know in my personal review and in

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

some discussion, some limited discussions with Board Members, we were of the impression that there are really two issues in the case, one of which -- and they pertain to the standards that we're talking about under 706. related to objectionable traffic conditions if there were going to be any and that's an issue that's raised by the nature of the project, the size of the lot, the allegations regarding interior circulation, some of what's in the Office of Planning's report, some raised by the ANC in their report which is our Exhibit 26, and also by a report submitted by the Civic Association, Exhibit 24. So there were some issues around traffic conditions.

There were also some issues around 706.5 which is a provision that sort of has a catch-all phrase in it that allows the BZA to take into consideration protections to adjacent or nearby property owners. And again, there were some issues raised in Civic Association's letter, as well the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

ANC's regarding those two things. And again, mostly around traffic-type issues.

Normally, in a situation like this, what we would want to do is look to the report of the Department of Transportation to get their weigh in and their opinion as experts on traffic, pedestrian safety, transportationrelated issues, etcetera. And in this case, we don't have a report by the Department of Transportation. What we have is a report by the Office of Planning that references some with conversations the Department of Transportation and that also indicates that there would be a Department of Transportation report subsequently filed. But as of the time that we came out here, that had not been filed it kind of both and places us at disadvantage, but also places the application itself on a footing that might not be fully ripe for complete review.

It's my understanding that the Department of Transportation is here this

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

morning in the audience. I don't know if they're -- they're at the table this morning.

Did Transportation submit a written report?

Good morning, Mr. Jennings.

MR. JENNINGS: Good morning, Chairman Loud and fellow Commissioners. Му name is Jeff Jennings. I work for the District Department of Transportation. We did submit written report for this not а particular case. I am vaguely familiar with reviewed some this and have of the case associated materials. We've spoken at length with the Applicant on another case and we feel the Office of Planning's report and the conversations we've had with Mr. Jackson who is here from OP do support the case for the Applicant has most part. The made concessions with respect to turning movements into particular curb cuts. The tanker that will be delivering the fuel --

CHAIR LOUD: Mr. Jennings, hold on for two seconds. I think we can get into the

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 merits, but you've testified that vaguely familiar with the case. You have 2 spoken with the Applicant at length on another 3 4 case, but not necessarily this case. Is your testimony today going to be the testimony of 5 the DDOT on this application? 6 7 MR. JENNINGS: Yes, sir. CHAIR LOUD: Okay, and were you the 8 DDOT person who worked with the Applicant on 9 10 this case? MR. JENNINGS: Yes, sir. 11 CHAIR LOUD: And you're prepared to 12 13 answer questions that the ANC or the Board may with 14 have respect to any transportation-15 related issues? MR. JENNINGS: That's correct. 16 All right. Well, in 17 CHAIR LOUD: light of that I'm comfortable moving forward 18 19 on the merits of the case this morning, if Board Members are comfortable. I think we 20 have a representative from DDOT that can speak 21

to some of the interior circulation and curb

cut and other issues raised by the pleadings.

So unless there's an objection from the Board

Members, I think we should proceed forward on
the merits.

Okay, then why don't we do that and as I've indicated when I first called the hearing calendar this morning, we start with the Applicant's presentation of its case and we go from there to the Office of Planning, assuming there are no questions from the ANC or from the Board.

So I turn it back to you, Ms. Fuller, and you can start us off.

MS. FULLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Again, my name is Carlynn Fuller and I'm the attorney appearing on behalf of the Applicant, Mr. Michael Goss, who at the time of the filing was the agent but has since entered into a partnership agreement with Mr. Yueng and Euclid of Virginia. And Euclid of Virginia is the developer proposing to develop a new self-service gasoline station and to

raise the existing convenience store at the site and build a new convenience store at 4975 South Dakota Avenue, N.E. in Ward 5. The site is currently zoned C-1 commercial. And there has been a convenience store at this site for several years. It started out years ago as a 7-11 and then it was sold to Mr. Yueng and the name was changed to Best Four Seasons Mart.

The convenience store is permitted as a matter of right in a C-1 zone and so we are requesting here today a special exception under 3104 and 706 as required for all new self-service gasoline stations established or enlarged after May 12, 1958.

Mr. Michael Goss is here to present testimony on the merits of the case and why we believe that the proposed construction of this gasoline station and retail store consistent with the intent of the neighborhood shopping district and will have a minimum impact upon the surrounding residential development.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	We have submitted a narrative and a
2	supplemental narrative in this case as part of
3	the application. And so I'm going to turn it
4	over to Ms. Goss to testify as to the specific
5	requirements for the special exception and to
6	answer any technical questions related to the
7	case.
8	CHAIR LOUD: Thank you, Ms. Fuller.
9	Does the ANC have a copy of what you just
10	gave us, this document here?
11	MS. FULLER: No. We can provide
12	her with it.
13	CHAIR LOUD: Why don't we hold off
14	a few minutes while she gets her copy of it.
15	And she should have everything that we have a
16	copy of.
17	MS. FULLER: Okay. It's just the
18	shorter version of the same document.
19	CHAIR LOUD: All right.
20	MS. FULLER: Smaller version.
21	CHAIR LOUD: Very good. Let me
22	just double check and make sure for the ANC

1	rep, do you have copies of the testimony and
2	the diagram?
3	MS. ALSTON: I do, sir. Thank you.
4	CHAIR LOUD: Excellent. So why
5	don't we turn to you, Mr. Goss.
6	MR. M. GOSS: Before I actually get
7	into my testimony as it's written, would be
8	inappropriate for me to paraphrase this since
9	you all have that in the record or would it be
10	more beneficial for me to just go through it
11	in its entirety?
12	CHAIR LOUD: I think it's
13	beneficial, for my standpoint, for you to
14	paraphrase, hit the highlights of it,
15	summarize the points that are going to hit the
16	Section 706 requirements.
17	MR. M. GOSS: Okay, all right.
18	Well, again, good morning. My name is Michael
19	Goss and as I said I'm a member of Ward 5. I
20	have residence in Ward 5 and I also have two
21	
	businesses in Ward 5. So I'm also a native

one that is very important to me in terms of my upbringing and what I would like to see happen with this area.

I grew up in Ward 7 in Marshall Heights. And what we were accustomed to in terms of services provided and offered, I didn't realize how limited that was until I had the opportunity to travel as an adult, go off to college, get into my profession. And what I've noticed is basically a lack of services in these communities, so much so that the communities themselves oftentimes don't realize just how mishandled they've been over the years.

So what decided to do, we brother and I, is to come into the city regardless of the type of business we have, is it with a different into approach, service-oriented approach, a customer-first And with that said, the project approach. here that you see before you is -- was borne from that basis.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I'll give you a brief description on the site. It is on South Dakota Avenue. And we're proposing to raise the existing store and replace retail it with a constructed retail store and а new selfservice gas station. The site does abut a branded 24-hour self-service gasoline station owned and operated by BP Oil. The question I know that we're probably going to be faced with today, outside the transportation issues is why another gas station? There's one already there existing.

What we would like to demonstrate today is that we're comparing and apple and an orange when we're talking about the two sites.

Our site is far more extensive in terms of the services it provides, the convenience it provides, and the thoroughness of its merchandise and that's what we're hoping to start as an igniter for that whole entire community.

Other businesses are eyeballing

### NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Other development opportunities area. are on the table. They are being talked about. We're trying to be first. We're trying to set a standard here. And what we would like to do is would be to raise the bar in terms of what is commonly offered, what is existing there is a junk food store. And I'm just being very frank with you when I speak. chips, and junk food sodas, is generally what's being offered not only at the current convenience store, but at the gas station next door.

And what we're trying to do is go away from that. Turn towards a movement of being, not only environmentally conscious, but being conscious of humanity and what's right.

And what's right is your children should have opportunities to have options, not run into the store and the only thing you can buy is sodas and candy. I've operated convenience stores before and I do sell soda and candy, don't get me wrong. But we also offer the

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

alternatives. We offer fresh food. We offer fruits, vegetables, salads ready to go. And we keep them fresh and we turn every day.

The other thing that we do not do is we do not sell rolling papers. We do not intend to file for liquor licenses. We plan to keep the store dry in terms of alcohol. And the hours of operations that we want to open will be from 6 a.m. to 10 p.m. and that largely from just being out of community and listening the to some concerns of the residents around the area.

To jump back into some of the key points that you brought out with regard to some of the zoning issues, the 706 requirement states that we need to be 25 feet from the closest residents and we've met. that. also  $\circ f$ exception. We've met some concerns with regard to traffic.

Today, there are three curb cuts on that site. What we're doing is we're actually proposing to close one of those three curb

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

The one that's actually closest to the corner of South Dakota and Emerson and you can refer to the document that I gave you on the rear site, page two. The corner at South Dakota and Emerson, you see now that curb cut is closed. There is a traffic light there so that curb could actually today, it does cause a bit of an issue with traffic flow at that By closing that curb cut, we've made site not only less intrusive traffic standpoint, but it also gives the site a couple more amenities and it also allows for a better flow, more turning radius for the vehicles traveling through the site.

Let me go also to the first curb cut on South Dakota. We are proposing to have that be a one-way curb cut into the site. That will eliminate the eastbound traffic from South Dakota Avenue coming into the site in that direction, so our flow really comes South Dakota westbound into the site. Our fuel truck also comes in that direction and flows

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

in and out of the Emerson Street curb cut.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Also, the curb cut being closed at that corner, it allows us to put in some additional amenities to the site with regard to the future. We are planning to work with Pepco. We've had some preliminary discussions with regard to the future of E-Car charging stations. And this site will have the ability to upgrade to E-Car charging and at that point where the curb cut is closed is where we intend to have that take place down the line. Obviously, that's something that's coming to the future, but we are, like I said, discussions with Pepco That is now. an initiative that is very important to them and we may find ourselves in alliance with Pepco on that project.

With regard to the new station, are going to be installing a we The canopy will be 14 feet high, so canopy. also compliance with that is in stipulations in 706. The canopy will

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

finished in a very beautiful Alucobond finish. It almost appears to be sort of like an auto body silver metallic finish. If you've seen like a brand new silver car. That's what the canopy finish will be like. Ιt will be highlighted by recessed lighting which is not going to be too intrusive to the surrounding neighborhood and also features some LED lighting.

From that canopy, we may also be able generate solar to some energy supplement the site in terms of its energy use. The site itself is being built with a very environmentally-conscious and responsible The contractors that will approach. assigned to building this project will be LEED certified and there are a number of LEED credit points that we obviously already have in the proposal that are there for your review.

In particular, we plan to beautify the site with native species of plants and

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

trees, more than what's currently there today.
Even the store itself will have a vegetated
roof for the purposes of not only storm water
management, but it makes for a much more
energy efficiency space on the interior. So
that said, we're looking to raise and enhance
what's currently sitting at that site. We're
investing very heavily in making sure that we
do that and my involvement in this project
before Mr. Yeung and I decided to go into a
partnership agreement, I had certain criteria
that I made sure that we were going to be able
to implement. That was part of our agreement.
And I feel very confident before you today to
say that I know once we have an opportunity to
take this and establish this site, we're going
to be able to build others like it throughout
the city and change the bar, change the whole
standard for how fuel and convenience store
businesses are operated within the city

One other thing I'm going to address is the parking. Today, the

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

requirement is that we have six spaces. We have eight proposed, two of which are handicap accessible. So I think the parking requirement we've more than satisfied that as well.

One thing I will point to is I have with had conversations members of this community. Gone kind of door to door some days and passed out information and answered questions, passed out business cards and those things. And have reached out. We've attended And as a matter of fact, the last meetings. meeting we attended was the North Michigan Association had Park Civic and Ι an opportunity to speak there. So we are coming to the table today with a very collaborative mindset. We do want to compromise.

We do want to make this something that the community can be proud of eventually and be involved in the process from day one from the time the first hammer starts swinging over there, we really want to involve

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

ourselves with the community and we have a history and reputation for doing that on our other projects.

also been in communication I've with Office of Planning on several meetings, three of which were face to face, that we've exchanged the email banter, or course, also with Department of Transportation. Mr. Jennings alluded to, we did meet several weeks back and discussed two issues. This was one of them. And then in a subsequent meeting that Mr. Jennings did not attend, some of his colleagues from Transportation did weigh in with some of their concerns. And I feel as though those concerns without met we exception, without compromise, we made some that made from traffic changes sense а We took their wise advice and standpoint. made it happen.

So I think you'll find a site that flows very nice. The turning radiuses are appropriate. The parking is sufficient. The

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

matriculation of vehicles and pedestrians is taken into consideration. And the entire site is compliant, not only from an environmental standpoint, but from an ADA standpoint and also from a transportation and planning standpoint.

The delivery trucks is another issue that is raised. We have an ability --38 stations. And with those 38 have stations, we have a lot of tanks to fill. we have a pretty broad fleet of vehicles that we deal with. This site would be appropriate for us to deal with a straight truck. straight truck allows us to put a vehicle on that site that's 30 feet long as opposed to a traditional tanker truck which is well over 50 feet long. The straight truck was proposed to both Transportation and Planning for their review and that allowed for the truck to come into South Dakota Avenue, fill the tanks, and turn out of the Emerson Street curb cut and back South Dakota from the on to Avenue

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

traffic light. So we've met that concern by using the appropriate vehicle.

Now the other thing with regard to fuel delivery, it's not in our best interest as a fuel company to try to fuel stations during rush hour and high traffic times. We learned that this wastes a lot of time for us. It's inefficient. So most of our deliveries do occur in the wee hours of the morning. However, at this site because of how we intend to operate it, this site will be fueled some time between the hours of 7 p.m. and 10 p.m. is when we intend to fuel this site.

So that said, I don't see the tanker truck becoming an issue in terms of rush hour in high peak times. As I said, from a business standpoint it's not good for us, nor is it good for the traffic flow to have trucks in and out of that site during those times.

Give me one second to organize myself.

(Pause.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

One other thing I just want to mention is with regard to the lot occupancy and what we're asking for with that. We're not asking for any type of special exception there. We're within the floor area ratio that's prescribed in the code. Also, the height of the structure, both the C Store, the convenience store and the canopy is within the requirements.

And lastly, just to close this up, I want to speak to the design aesthetic. Ιt is very modern approach to how the convenience store and the gas station is put What you'll find is some very nice together. finishes that go along with sort of the ecoenvironmentally friendly theme. The finishes will include the Alucobond finish, wood, and also, we're going to be using recycled materials from the building that we raise in construction backfill to make it more sustainable site.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

interior of the store The will feature wood merchandise displays, recessed lighting, very contemporary furnishings be placed accessories will inside. And another that we've discovered in terms of the way we do business and what's effective in these stores is to eliminate the bullet-proof glass. That's a very popular application in a lot of these types of stores throughout the city and we don't do it. We don't believe in it.

We basically -- we operate our stores hands on and what we found is that good communication is the best security that any store could have, being able to effectively talk to your customers, treat them with respect, field their complaints respectfully, and not only field the complaints, but actually take action on them when they do arise.

So what that provides for is just a whole different atmosphere. When you're

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

trying to do business through three or inches of qlass, both parties are automatically on the defense because of situation you've put yourself in. What we have found is not only does that enhance the appearance of the store, but it enhances the customer's attitude in terms of doing business with you. And we feel as though once people get accustomed to this style of business, sort of this old throw back, general store way of doing business, getting to know your customers on a first name basis, they tend to take up for you and be your advocates around the corner when something may be getting plotted or schemed.

We haven't had any major incidents at our other locations that my brother and I personally operate and this would be a location that my brother and I personally operate and I'm speaking to 14th and W, 1400 W Street location. I'm speaking to our 1803 West Virginia Avenue location. So that said

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

	I'm going to conclude my testimony and allow
2	the proceedings to continue.
3	CHAIR LOUD: Thank you, Mr. Goss.
4	Let's see first if Board Members have any
5	questions for you and then we'll turn to the
6	ANC to see if there are any questions from the
7	ANC and then we can move forward to the next
8	witness. And when we do, I'd like to ask if
9	your brother has covered certain aspects of
10	the testimony adequately, you don't have to go
11	over those same points again, so to speak, as
12	to reinforce those points. I think the record
13	is full on those points that he's covered.
14	So why don't we turn to the Board?
15	Mr. May, do you have any questions?
16	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. You
17	mentioned LEED points the building or the
18	project would score. Have you actually
19	tabulated a score?
20	MR. M. GOSS: Not in its entirety,
21	sire, because we still are in the embryonic
22	stages of the development. The contract

when we put out the bid for this building, part of that bid request for proposal will have a requirement that the contractor be LEED certified. Once we have an opportunity to identify that contractor, we'll get into some more of the finer points of how we not only can take what we've proposed as LEED credits, but we found in past projects that contractors also have some additional LEED ideas that would be considered LEED credits to enhance the project even further.

COMMISSIONER MAY: I think that's very smart. Do you have an objective in terms of an eventual LEED score, LEED certified, LEED silver, LEED gold? The building itself.

MR. M. GOSS: Obviously, we want to LEED gold and that's just because that's the way we believe the industry is turning and we want to be out front on that particular issue.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay, you mentioned other stations, fuel stations that you operate.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	MR. M. GOSS: Yes, sir.
2	COMMISSIONER MAY: Is it the same -
3	- are they the same model in essence?
4	MR. M. GOSS: No, sir. This is
5	going to be the first model this is the
6	prototype for our future stations.
7	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.
8	MR. M. GOSS: My relationship with
9	the fuel company is a brand new partnership.
10	It's only months old. And what we've done is
11	we've, up to this point, is we took the 1400 W
12	location and made some very basic cosmetic
13	changes and policy changes. But as far as
14	doing a new structure in this manner, South
15	Dakota Avenue will be the prototype.
16	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. And in
17	those other locations, you also operate the
18	convenience store aspect of it as well?
19	MR. M. GOSS: Yes, sir.
20	COMMISSIONER MAY: And do you have
21	the same sort of product line? You've moved
22	toward more fresh foods and things like that?

1	MR. M. GOSS: Yes, sir.
2	COMMISSIONER MAY: Is that all
3	doing very well?
4	MR. M. GOSS: Absolutely. We can't
5	keep fruit in.
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: Really. Okay.
7	And then the last question is the straight
8	truck solution?
9	MR. M. GOSS: Yes, sir.
LO	COMMISSIONER MAY: For fueling. Is
11	there any will there be any difficulty in
L2	being able to only receive fuel on those
L3	trucks or are they very commonly used? Is it
L4	an easy thing for the supplier to be able to
L5	come only in straight trucks as opposed to the
L6	articulated trucks?
L7	MR. M. GOSS: For us, it is. As I
18	mentioned, the partnership has over 30
L9	stations. So as far as how we purchase fuel,
20	we do have a bit of an advantage over some of
21	the other smaller independents that have maybe

the onesie-twosie types of locations. Unless

1	you're one of the big major brands, we find
2	ourselves somewhere in the middle.
3	That said, we have a dedicated
4	fleet that just services our stations. Now
5	not all of our stations require the straight
6	truck. Some of them do, just because of the
7	nature of where they're located and how the
8	site is situated. So we wouldn't have a
9	problem keeping up with the demand of the
10	station with a straight truck.
11	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. That's it
12	for me.
13	CHAIR LOUD: Thank you, Mr. May.
14	Are there any additional questions?
15	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: You mentioned
16	that you were not going to be installing
17	bullet-proof glass, but can you elaborate or
18	provide any information on what other security
19	measures that you would be taking?
20	MR. M. GOSS: Well, currently what
21	we do is we obviously have surveillance. And
22	then the other thing that we do is meet with

whoever the local police commander is for that particular area and we kind of discuss security plan with him or her. And that's just been our way. I have to say that being present in a business as the owner, customers recognize that. And they understand that this is more than just dollars and nickels and pennies to the owner, if they know they're heavily invested in it, not just from financial standpoint, but from standpoint.

level of passion for business shines through to goes \_\_\_ And because of that I have a lot customers. of people who are advocates for me. knuckleheads in the neighborhood that would otherwise be an issue or have historically been issues for some of my neighbors others, tend to leave me alone quite frankly. And I think it's because of our presence, but aside from that, we do have adequate lighting that we propose, proposing to have the facade

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

with windows not only on the front, but going around the side, the Emerson Street side, we're going to have windows there. So the store will be in a fishbowl. It will be well lit. So any type of plot or scheme would be very easily detected.

MR. G. GOSS: Not only that, let me just add, we also, one of the key things that we do do when we go into a community, we employ local staffing as far as within the community itself. We try to kind of give back and mentor some of the local residents and it's just changed the business ten-fold, really, the impact, because a lot of quote unquote troublemakers you have seen in the past or business owners had, pretty much everybody knows everybody in the community. And when they see you giving back and reaching into community it's a different approach.

Also, without the bulletproof being there, there's never been a business that I've ever walked into where you can up sell for

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

bullet proof or get to know your customer.

And we're out on the floor with our customers at two, three o'clock in the morning. Knock on wood, but to this day we have not had a serious incident whatsoever. And the businesses have tripled in the communities.

And again, we bring in a fresh product. And if there's something that the

And again, we bring in a fresh product. And if there's something that the local residents need or there's a requirement, somebody is living in a community and has a special need for foods, whatever, we bring those foods in for that person. Almost like your one-stop shopping with customer service.

MR. M. GOSS: The surveillance is video surveillance, not just personal eye surveillance?

MR. M. GOSS: No, it's videos.

MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: And you're talking also about the food and the delivery, can you talk about -- we talked about the gas delivery systems, but can you also talk a little bit about the delivery of all the

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

different products and the fresh foods, since obviously that's going to need more frequent delivery than a regular store.

MR. M. GOSS: If you refer to page two again, the proposed site plan has a loading area designated. That loading area is 15 feet wide. Any truck that we get as far as food delivery certainly can very easily fit into that space, be out of the flow of traffic, be out of the flow of the flow of the gotiated the site for our customers. And load up and be on its way.

We typically take delivery twice a it week for just about everything. So wouldn't be an everyday occurrence, those two days a week, typically Mondays and Thursdays, the loading area is already marked and it does not impact the number of parking spaces that we've also provided to our customers.

MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: What's the time, do you know the deliveries will be

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

occurring?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. M. GOSS: Those deliveries tend to occur in the morning.

MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: How early?

MR. M. GOSS: Starting at about 8 in the morning and flow through the early part of the afternoon. Again, some of suppliers are not directly controlled by us, like for instance, Coca Cola or Pepsi bringing in those types of product. We do, however, have a four-hour window and we generally have our window of opportunity to get a delivery started at about 8 o'clock. So the other ones, my brother and I control, but something like the major soda brands or some of our potato chip vendors, they give us a window for delivery.

MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: Thank you.

CHAIR LOUD: Just have a couple really quick questions follow up on your testimony and then a couple of the submissions.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

In terms of the testimony, I get it in terms of the eliminating the curb cut on South Dakota than doing one-way for the traffic to enter into, onto the lot from South Dakota. But, how is that going to be made known as a practical matter for that eastbound traffic? Is there going to be a big "Do Not Enter" sign?

MR. M. GOSS: But we do intend to tackle that with signage and then also the nature of the curb cut, we plan to design that in such a way that it just encourages the traffic to come in from the westbound side on that side. So, in order to negotiate it from the eastbound, I'm not going to suggest to you that it would be impossible for them to do it, but the way it is designed it would discourage it.

CHAIR LOUD: Okay. So if I'm going eastbound, I'm going to, first of all, I'm going to see some signage that is unique to me going eastbound that says "Do Not Enter" or

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

something like that.

MR. M. GOSS: Yes, sir.

CHAIR LOUD: And it will be designed in a way that it will be hard for me to actually make that left turn.

MR. M. GOSS: Yes, sir.

CHAIR LOUD: Okay. In terms of the 30-foot straight trucks, those were not a concession mentioned in the OP report as something that had been negotiated out of the original or into the application? Is that something that you're open to as a condition?

MR. M. GOSS: Absolutely.

CHAIR LOUD: Okay. In terms of some of the other evidence in the record, and I'm going to just briefly go through the ANC's report, Exhibit 26, and the North Michigan Park's Exhibit 24, because they kind of mirror each other and you mentioned that you're working collaboratively, which I think is great, and they're behind you listening to some of this. They raise some concerns that

are not zoning related and I'm going to skip 1 2 right over those, but they do raise some that are zoning related. And let just 3 me qo through it. 4 5 The, let me see, one concern is that the site is so small that tankers, that 6 7 there would be no place for these tankers to refill. And I notice that you have, with what 8 you gave us, you have sort of the loading area 9 10 demarcated --MR. M. GOSS: Yes. 11 CHAIR LOUD: -- I quess for 12 13 convenience store deliveries, but where would I put the refueling, where would I draw a 14 15 circle to indicate where that's going happen on the site? 16 MR. M. GOSS: If you, if you refer 17 to the site plan --18 19 CHAIR LOUD: Okay. MR. M. GOSS: -- where the yellow 20 vehicle sits on pump three, that area is where 21

we intend to fill the tankers. So, during the

1	few minutes it takes to load those tankers up,
2	that side of pump three will not be available
3	for use to our customers.
4	CHAIR LOUD: Thank you. And then,
5	there was some confusion, I guess, in the
6	community about the hours of operation?
7	MR. M. GOSS: Yes, sir.
8	CHAIR LOUD: And when I look at the
9	record, I'm a little uncertain as to whether
10	the gas station will have the same hours as
11	the convenience store or if they'll be
12	separated out. So just to address that
13	concern raised by the members of the
14	community, what are the hours going to be for
15	the gasoline station?
16	MR. M. GOSS: Through conversation
17	with the community, we have agreed to have the
18	hours be from 6 a.m. to 10 p.m. for the entire
19	site.
20	CHAIR LOUD: And that's Monday
21	through Sunday?
22	MR. M. GOSS: That's every day.

1	Yes, sir.
2	CHAIR LOUD: So that then would
3	include the convenience store?
4	MR. M. GOSS: Yes, sir. It would.
5	CHAIR LOUD: In the Civic
6	Association's letter, there's a reference to
7	the property not being maintained by way of
8	loitering and trash, and I think that would
9	come under our 706.5, which is sort of a wide-
10	open avenue for the BZA to weigh in on
11	something.
12	MR. M. GOSS: Yes.
13	CHAIR LOUD: But what's your, can
14	you respond to that?
15	MR. M. GOSS: They're absolutely
16	correct in that statement. The current tenant
17	has some flaws with regard to that. He's on
18	month-to-month and that situation is going to
19	come to an abrupt and immediate halt. That is
20	totally opposite to the way we maintain our
21	facilities. Cleanliness is something that
1	

we're very, very particular about. And we

1	have restaurants, we have convenience stores,
2	I mean, we cover a range of different types of
3	retail establishments that we operate. And we
4	are very much sticklers for that end.
5	What we found is, and I'll refer to
6	the case that was kind of before us, Mr. May
7	made a very, very wise statement when he said
8	it just makes business sense. When you keep
9	your business facilities clean and free of
10	clutter and free of loitering it just invites
11	more traffic, people feel more comfortable,
12	they're more willing to shop with you. And as
13	a matter of fact some of our customers, you
14	know, kind of go out of their way past a few
15	other suppliers to shop with us because of
16	that.
17	CHAIR LOUD: Okay. So the
18	testimony's sort of there's a new sheriff in
19	town
20	MR. M. GOSS: Absolutely.
21	CHAIR LOUD: and we're going to

handle our business differently. What about

the loitering? You talked about the trash.

MR. M. GOSS: It's the same, it's the same thing. We do notice that that is a problem there. And at our other locations we do not allow it. We don't allow, even if you quote unquote came in as a customer and you left and you're standing outside of our establishment, unless there's some business you're handling or just a brief conversation, we don't allow people to linger in front of our stores.

MR. G. GOSS: One of the issues too Mike that we address is the panhandling that's really, really strong in this city. It's like all the cities we've gone in as well. And we try to, we have a zero-tolerance for loitering because that's the first stage, the first thing you think about as a customer when you're driving into an establishment, who's hanging out around you, what are you going to have to go through to get services? And one of the things we understand as consumers is

1	that we don't want to see that. And it's by
2	us being on-hand owners, we're able to address
3	it right away along with our management. So
4	it just cuts out on a lot of, some of the
5	theft that could go on and also the security
6	state. It helps out when you address it right
7	away.
8	CHAIR LOUD: Okay. Thank you. I
9	don't have any additional questions. If Board
10	Members don't have any further we can turn to
11	the ANC.
12	MS. ALSTON: Do you want my direct
13	questions or my statement?
14	CHAIR LOUD: No, at this point it
15	would just be your questions and then later on
16	you can present your case and it would be more
17	your statement.
18	MS. ALSTON: I do have a couple of
19	questions for you. I'm Angel Austin, I'm the
20	chair of the ANC at 5A. More importantly, I
21	am the representative for Single Member

District 5803. So this proposed location is

in my Single Member District.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

I'm being joined at the podium with Commissioner Timothy Thomas, who is the ANC Commissioner for an abutting SMD. So this proposed location services both of the Single Member Districts at the table.

CHAIR LOUD: Okay. Before your proceed forward, let me just clarify. The ANC is automatically a party to the case, so the ANC has the opportunity to do what we're doing now, which is cross examination. And you can ask, you know, any, you know, pretty wide parameters. You can ask the questions based on the testimony that you want to ask.

MS. ALSTON: Okay.

CHAIR LOUD: The ANC that's single-member Commissioner and has some interest in the case, you can come back later and testify at the point in time where we have witnesses give their testimony, when you'll be given three minutes for that. But this would only be for the ANC person that's representing

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 the full Commission with respect 2 September 17th report. That's our Exhibit 26. Okay? 3 Thank you. MS. ALSTON: 4 CHAIR LOUD: The questions would 5 stem from that authority. 6 MS. ALSTON: With the documentation 7 me 8 that he presented copy, that а you presented me a copy with Mr. Goss, can you 9 10 clarify your actual relationship? Are you, this says that you are the agent from Mr. 11 12 Yeung. Are you the agent, are you an owner? 13 MR. M. GOSS: I am actually both. When the application was originally submitted, 14 15 that time in preliminary at were we 16 discussions the partnership agreement. on However, it was imminent, it was just a matter 17 of some internal negotiations that occurred 18 19 between Mr. Yeung and myself, and my brother, so G2 Design and Euclid LLC will be developing 20 this site. 21

**NEAL R. GROSS** 

MS. ALSTON:

22

Okay. So then, that

1	way, do you have something that shows that you
2	all are in agreement so that you'll be
3	responsible and actually controlling what goes
4	on at this property from beginning to end?
5	MR. M. GOSS: I can provide you
6	with that, absolutely.
7	MS. ALSTON: Okay. Does the LP in
8	this design that you showed me, does this mean
9	lowest price?
10	MR. M. GOSS: It is lowest price,
11	however, the lowest price brand is being
12	revamped. Lowest price is known for having
13	tired, dilapidated facilities. Part of why
14	Mr. Yeung sought us out was to change that
15	whole impression, change the brand, change the
16	way business has been done in the past to this
17	new era we're trying to usher in.
18	So the lowest price brand,
19	everything, the logo, everything will be
20	different, but yes, it is the lowest price,
21	which means we will be able to still offer the

but

competitively priced gas,

22

in a new

facility.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MS. ALSTON: Also, in this design, if I'm looking at the bottom that you just gave me, you said that you're going to take out one of the curb cuts which will create two. The one-way entrance off of South Dakota Avenue which would then push all of the traffic on Emerson Street which is to So since this will be the residential area. only -- since the one off South Dakota Avenue is one way, you can't exit there, you can only enter there, since it's one way and it's right turn only. What other way do you have to exit at this facility besides on Emerson? Because once you leave Emerson that's all residential.

MR. M. GOSS: That part of Emerson Street that's right there, there are -- I think there's one house that sits on that other side of the street and it is more than 25 feet away. The traffic that's going to flow back onto to South Dakota Avenue will basically come out and make a left turn onto

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

Emerson Street. The whole notion was to eliminate what could potentially be a big problem traffic-wise.

The other curb cut was right on top of that traffic light. Actually, it's still there today. It's an existing curb cut that we're proposing to eliminate. And being on top of that traffic light, people coming out of there trying to head eastbound from that light can cause some issues.

MS. ALSTON: I'm very familiar with this site. I've lived there all my life.

MR. M. GOSS: Okay.

ALSTON: So again, when you MS. come out of this Emerson Street which is your only exit, you're at a light. If there are five cars in line and the light is red, they're not going to wait in line. They're going to flood my community which is all residential. You are correct that directly across the street from that site, there is one house, forget that corner but let's not

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	there's ten houses on that block. And then
2	there are three streets, along with an alley
3	that sits at the back of at least 20 streets
4	on a block
5	CHAIR LOUD: Commissioner,
6	Commissioner, I just want to remind you that
7	where we are at this point is for your
8	questions. And then later on you can say all
9	of those things that you just said in terms of
10	some of these problems.
11	MS. ALSTON: No problem. Thank you
12	very much.
13	Tell me how many meetings you've
14	attended in the community?
15	MR. M. GOSS: I've attended one
16	formal meeting.
17	MS. ALSTON: Okay.
18	MR. M. GOSS: But my approach with
19	dealing with the community, I like to kind of
20	talk one on one with people. It's just my
21	style.
22	MS. ALSTON: Okay.

1	MR. M. GOSS: I've walked the
2	neighborhood. I've passed out flyers and
3	that's just the way that I like to do
4	business. It's more personal.
5	MS. ALSTON: So what community did
6	you walk out and pass out flyers and pass out
7	cards in?
8	MR. M. GOSS: The community
9	basically right around the station itself,
10	because I thought that would be more of an
11	effective community to touch because it's
12	MS. ALSTON: Do you know what
13	streets?
14	MR. M. GOSS: Tenth Street. If you
15	exit from our exit onto Emerson Street, turn
16	right and then make that immediately left on
17	10th Street, we've been on that block passing
18	out flyers and talking to community people.
19	And then if you were to go that same way
20	behind the store on to Emerson Street and
21	those streets that are kind of the next

block down and the next block over from it,

1 we've walked and canvassed the neighborhood as 2 well. MS. ALSTON: I also noticed that on 3 4 this curb cut out, on the curb cut that you 5 proposing to take are away, you emphasizing amenities. What other amenities 6 are being offered than four bushes? 7 MR. M. GOSS: Well, the landscaping 8 here is graphic, but I can assure you that it 9 10 will a vast improvement over what's there. Those are actually trees in combination with 11 some other native species of plants that we 12 13 intend to plant there. Some of the other amenities as it 14 15 relates to what's going on in the site is from 16 that area. We will be able to upgrade to the electronic car charging in that particular 17 location with that curb cut being eliminated. 18 19 MS. ALSTON: Now this entire design that you have, is this within the property 20 lines or does this include some of the -- some 21 of the property behind it? Is this within 22

1	your property line, this entire development?
2	MR. M. GOSS: All of it is within
3	the property line and also within the
4	prescribed easement lines.
5	MS. ALSTON: Only because at the
6	meeting, I guess some of the residents were
7	under the impression that you all were working
8	to acquire some additional space behind. Is
9	that correct or incorrect?
10	MR. M. GOSS: No, ma'am.
11	MS. ALSTON: Okay. As far as you
12	saying you were working with MPD and the 4th
13	District Police Precinct to see what their
14	feel was for this location, what contacts have
15	you had so far and what has been their
16	recommendation.
17	MR. M. GOSS: Primarily we've been
18	dealing with 5D. That's where all their
19	businesses are. When I made that statement, I
20	made it out of historically that's our
21	approach, once we go into the community is to
	I control of the cont

form that type of alliance.

MS. ALSTON: This particular location is in the 4th District. So question is what conversation have you had the regarding this District because this requires location particular lot of а attention from PSA 45 already.

MR. M. GOSS: And that's something do. We haven't intend to we conversation with 4th District, but want to make it aware, put it on the record do business that is how and that's we something that is going to be one of our first things. Not only do we just have casual conversation, but we actually go into a fullon discussion with regard to security plans and have them weigh in on how we develop that.

MS. ALSTON: Okay, and then you said that in your testimony, you said that this location will provide daily, they will bring in fresh fruit on a daily basis, but then you went back and said that you would only have deliveries two times a week, on

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	Mondays and Wednesdays. So is it daily or is
2	it twice a week?
3	MR. M. GOSS: The fruit that comes
4	in, my brother and I pick that fruit
5	ourselves.
6	MS. ALSTON: So you bring it in
7	your vehicle?
8	MR. M. GOSS: In our personal
9	vehicles, yes, ma'am
LO	MS. ALSTON: Okay, and so when this
11	tanker at pump number three on the opposite
12	side is coming to pump, and it already takes
L3	away one of the pumping stations, so it leaves
L4	how many other pumps available?
L5	MR. M. GOSS: Five.
L6	MS. ALSTON: And in the community
L7	where there's seniors, how do we regulate
L8	time? You say 8 o'clock in the morning for
19	loading. But you're not really sure. So how
20	do we go gauge that when you have a community
21	all based on seniors. And then you say your

trucks will come at night. What's the noise

1	level as far as like the idling with the
2	trucks as they're loading? They will then
3	enter through the same entry and exit points
4	which is this one-way exit on Emerson Street?
5	Which way will they then go?
6	MR. M. GOSS: Okay, let me you
7	kind of said two things that I want to
8	clarify.
9	MS. ALSTON: Timing and loading.
10	MR. M. GOSS: Also, the type of
11	delivery. Let me distinguish the food
12	product, the convenience store delivery from
13	the actual fuel tank deliveries.
14	The fuel tank deliveries will not
15	occur in the morning. Those occur after peak
16	hours.
17	MS. ALSTON: After 7 p.m.
18	MR. M. GOSS: After 7 p.m. The
19	other deliveries are the ones that occur in
20	the morning for the store, bringing in the
21	food and merchandise. The truck being that it
22	is a 30-foot truck does not have the same

decibel levels of noise that a tanker would have. So from that standpoint, it's not going to be intrusive and then the other thing that we're going to commit to the neighborhood is that we won't do that after 10 p.m., even though if we did, probably no one would notice because it's not such a noisy type of thing.

But our whole approach is to meld in and become a part of this community, not be the outsider kind of coming in trying to run roughshod over the neighborhood. We want to have a very collaborative type of interaction between because we're there, us once consider ourselves to be members of that community. Although we may not reside there, we do have business there and therefore we are part of it.

MS. ALSTON: The type of lighting that you'll use, will it be faced towards the gas station or how will you ensure that the lights won't be directed to the houses and impact the residents?

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	MR. M. GOSS: The type of lighting
2	that we have is going to be more of a downward
3	light. It's going to be recessed light and
4	with regard to the canopy, that will be lit
5	mainly from a recessed light and then we'll
6	also have LED lighting which is a little
7	softer. It's more of an ambient light and
8	that really is like a big flood light that
9	will be directed in the direction of the
10	homes.
11	MS. ALSTON: So if that lighting
12	becomes an issue because that flood light is
13	directed toward the direction of the homes,
14	how would you address it and how would it be
15	fixed?
16	MR. M. GOSS: We wouldn't install
17	them from Day 1. Yes, ma'am.
18	MS. ALSTON: What's been your
19	police report rates filed at your other
20	locations?
21	MR. M. GOSS: I can count on one
22	hand the incidents that have happened on our

other locations, one of which was an internal theft. We had four employees at a station on 14th and W. The money that should have been in the safe wasn't in the safe. So that was handled through --

MR. G. GOSS: Pretty much. We pretty much filed a report on that just for insurance purposes. But we handle pretty much everything internally, situations like that. Very rarely do we have problems because we kind of head the problems off. We kind of see the smoke before the fire at a lot of our stations because we have a tremendous amount of money and time invested and also we're there personally a lot of the times. much our day starts at 4 in the morning and when we talk about bringing fresh product in, fresh produce in, we get to interact with our customers.

We also are very conscious about who is in that area or what's going on. Like you living in that community, we'll get to

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

know you on a one-on-one basis, hopefully. And if there are any concerns going on, maybe two blocks prior to the station, what's happening, if there's too much drug activity going on, if it's loitering going on, we try to address that with you and work with you. Not only that, but work with the local police.

I'm sure you're familiar with Ward

1, that 14th Street corridor how notorious it
was back in the day.

CHAIR LOUD: Let me interrupt for just one quick second. It's around 12 noon now or very close to 12 noon and we are going to -- normally we break at 12, but we're going to work through the lunch hour. Board Members have agreed to do that. We're going to try to make it through the four witnesses that are opposed to the case and may end up taking them out of order before Office of Planning, just so we can get through those witnesses. Those are three minutes allotted for each witnesses.

This questioning, I think is

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	generally relevant to 706.5, generally, but
2	it's starting to a little bit beyond the
3	standards 1400 W Street and you know.
4	MR. G. GOSS: We're passionate
5	about what we do.
6	CHAIR LOUD: I understand. I
7	understand. And we want to make sure that we
8	don't unfairly limit what you want to say, but
9	we also want we have a full calendar today
10	and we want to make sure that we give everyone
11	an opportunity to have their case heard. so
12	if we could again, with the cross, keep it
13	focused on the requirements of Section 706 and
14	the testimony that came out on direct,
15	Commissioner Alston, that would be very
16	helpful.
17	MS. ALSTON: That question only
18	came up because he kept making reference to
19	his other locations and the crime and how they
20	work with the community. So that's what that
21	question was directed from.

CHAIR LOUD: Thank you. How much

1	longer do you think you're going to need for
2	cross of this witness?
3	MS. ALSTON: Like two or three
4	minutes.
5	CHAIR LOUD: Okay.
6	MS. ALSTON: So, does he can you
7	clarify for me, the owner still owns the
8	property and he doesn't plan on selling it.
9	You all are just in partnership, or how is
10	that?
11	MR. M. GOSS: No. We plan to
12	develop it, we don't plan to sell it.
13	MS. ALSTON: One clarification.
14	Can I ask you a question?
15	MR. M. Goss: Definitely.
16	MS. ALSTON: Is it possible to see
17	if the other ANC Commissioner has a question
18	to be asked on behalf the ANC since we're in
19	cross examination? Then this portion will
20	close.
21	CHAIR LOUD: Well, typically, the
22	ANC designates one person as its
	NEAL D. CDOCC

representative and that one person would confer with whomever they would need to confer with outside of this and come, you know, prepared to answer, ask those questions.

MS. ALSTON: Could I have 30 seconds to speak?

CHAIR LOUD: Thirty seconds.

Thank you. Thank you MS. ALSTON: very much sir. only question, other МУ question, would be, well, two other questions, would be have you, have you reached out to any of the other civic associations in the area that this proposed location services? And then, have you been on South Dakota Avenue at any point in time of day to assess the traffic, its speed, or along with DDOT and how are you all working together since you're closing off one of these curb cuts and it will just be one-way in and one-way out?

MR. M. GOSS: The answer to the first question is I've only had interaction with the North Michigan Park Civic

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	Association. With regard to my conversations
2	and meetings with the Department of
3	Transportation and also the Office of Planning
4	as well, the first meeting that I had was with
5	Mr. Jennings who's on the panel and we've
6	discussed this as a sort of secondary matter
7	to a more pressing issue at that time. And,
8	in that conversation, Mr. Jennings raised
9	several points of concern that he had with,
10	with the site.
11	From that we went back and made
12	some modifications to the site and made some
13	changes and then had another meeting that Mr.
14	Jennings wasn't a party to but members of his
15	office were party to and acknowledged that we
16	had addressed most of those issues and we
17	still had a little more homework to do.
18	MS. ALSTON: Okay, so when you met
19	with the Civic Association, were they for or
20	against the project?
21	MR. M. GOSS: The Civic

Association, when we met with them, we had a

1	very brief opportunity to state our case, to
2	be quite honest with you. And the vote was
3	pretty much in motion. However, some of the
4	commentary that came out once I had an
5	opportunity to speak was the impressions of
6	some of the community members, was different
7	in terms of what I presented from what was
8	presented to them by the, the ANC when they
9	first had an opportunity to hear about what
10	was going on there. And, I think that just
11	comes from just the notion of this being a gas
12	station. And that really here in the
13	background on what it is that we're trying to
14	do. That is different in that it is an
15	enhancement. So the vote that came out was in
16	opposition. However, there was, it was not
17	unanimous, I will say that.
18	MS. ALSTON: Okay. So at this
19	point do you, do you think that the community,

point do you, do you think that the community, do you strongly feel that the community is against support of this?

MR. M. GOSS: When I walk that

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

20

21

1	street and I pass out my flyers and my
2	business card and talk to people, for the most
3	part I feel as though the community is in
4	support of it, yes, I do. And by the way, the
5	curb cut closure was borne out of those
6	conversations with Department of
7	Transportation, so we sought their counsel in
8	terms of what would be best in terms of the
9	site.
10	MS. ALSTON: Okay. And who did you
11	do that survey with in DDOT?
12	MR. M. GOSS: Again, Mr. Jennings
13	on the panel here was party to the preliminary
14	conversation. Mr. Jackson, that's on the
15	panel, was there with some other members of
16	Planning and some other members. It was a
17	MS. ALSTON: I guess your
18	recommendation is because Mr. Jennings has
19	already said he's not really familiar with the
20	site, so he can't
21	CHAIR LOUD: Again, Commissioner,
22	this will be the point.

MS. ALSTON: I was asking a
question
CHAIR LOUD: To ask, to ask
questions. Also, the record is pretty full in
terms of where the community stands on the
case. I mean, you could continue to ask him
questions about it but, you look at the ANC's
reports, you look at the Civic Association's
report, it gives you a sense of
MS. ALSTON: No problem.
CHAIR LOUD: at least what the
evidence is regarding community, the
community's position on it, so
MS. ALSTON: Well, if that's the
case, then I'm done.
CHAIR LOUD: Okay. Thank you. And
I think now we will turn to the second Mr.
Goss, if the Applicant still intends to
present him as a witness and this will be your
opportunity to give your testimony.
MR. G. GOSS: I think basically
we've covered everything.

1	CHAIR LOUD: Okay.
2	MR. G. GOSS: Yes.
3	CHAIR LOUD: Let's not drag it out,
4	if it's been adequately covered, it's been
5	adequately covered.
6	We would normally now turn to the
7	Office of Planning, but I think we have a
8	number of witnesses here that were sworn in
9	earlier and I'd like to, with the Board's
10	support turn to those witnesses for their
11	testimony, a bit out of order, but before I do
12	that I don't know if you're going to have
13	to move or not. Let me just check and see
14	what the ANC are you going to be presenting
15	any witnesses this afternoon for your case
16	where you actually call up the persons as
17	witnesses and then you ask them questions and
18	so on and so forth?
19	MS. ALSTON: No, sir. Just the
20	constituents out of the community.
21	CHAIR LOUD: But are you going to
22	call them as your witnesses for the ANC's

1	case? I know that they have testimony that
2	they want to give. We're going to give them
3	an opportunity to do that.
4	MS. LEWIS: May I speak? I'm the
5	President of the North Michigan Park Civic
6	Association.
7	CHAIR LOUD: Yes, ma'am.
8	MS. LEWIS: And we've been working
9	in conjunction with the ANC, so the Civic
10	Association witnesses are ANC witnesses.
11	CHAIR LOUD: Yes.
12	MS. ALSTON: I won't have to call
13	them specifically.
14	CHAIR LOUD: Okay, all right. That
15	kind of clarifies how we want to proceed in
16	terms of our next steps. So what we'd like to
17	do then is go a bit out of order and allow the
18	four witnesses that were sworn in earlier who
19	wanted to testify in opposition to the project
20	to come on up to the table and then you can
21	offer your testimony now and upon conclusion

of that we will proceed with the Office of

1	Planning's report. Okay?
2	MR. JACKSON: Mr. Chairman?
3	CHAIR LOUD: Yes.
4	MR. JACKSON: Just a suggestion in
5	terms of order. Now we're available to make
6	our testimony, but we wanted to make sure that
7	the Department of Transportation had an
8	opportunity to speak. They are on a more
9	restricted schedule, so we would defer to
10	Department of Transportation to answer any
11	questions before our presentation.
12	CHAIR LOUD: Before your
13	presentation?
14	MR. JACKSON: Yes.
15	CHAIR LOUD: I think that's fine.
16	Obviously, we look to get these reports in
17	from the Department of Transportation. We
18	look to have the opportunity to review them as
19	part of our preparation for the case, and when
20	we're not able to, we try to show as much
21	grace and consideration as we can and we just

hope on the other end the Department of

Transportation should it in any way is able to stay today, similarly kind of show us that sort of consideration in terms of timing.

I don't know what Mr. Jenkins' timing is today, but if there's any way that we can take these witnesses and get through these witnesses, we're more than happy to work with Mr. Jenkins around his timing. Thank you, sir.

Okay, why don't we have then all of the witnesses that were sworn in earlier that were going to testify in opposition to the application. If you could come forward now and take a seat at the table. And once you are all present and accounted for, we'll have you introduce yourselves for the record, your address for the record and then we can begin with your testimony.

Each of you will be given three minutes to provide your testimony. Now there were four witnesses, I believe, who stood up earlier and were sworn in to give testimony

and we have only two at the table. So this would be your time to step forward if you're going to give testimony. This would be the time to step forward and give that testimony if you've been sworn in. We're not going to have another opportunity for these witnesses to present testimony.

Okay, so we have two witnesses that are here. Good afternoon. Thank you for your patience, and you're going to have to cut on your microphone. And why don't you introduce yourself for the record and -- why don't both you introduce yourself for the record, and then we'll go back to you and then you can start your three-minute testimony.

MS. LEWIS: My name is Grace J. Lewis. I'm the president of the North Michigan Park Civic Association and I reside at 4945 Sargent Road, N.E. which is about three blocks from this establishment.

CHAIR LOUD: Good afternoon, Ms. Jenkins.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	MS. LEWIS: Lewis.
2	CHAIR LOUD: I'm sorry. Good
3	afternoon, Ms. Lewis. I stand corrected.
4	MS. SMITH: Good afternoon, Mr.
5	Chairman and Board Members. My name is
6	Rosalie A. Smith. And I reside at 5006 12th
7	Street, N.E., 12th and Emerson.
8	CHAIR LOUD: Good afternoon to you
9	as well, and thank you for your patience.
10	Ms. Lewis, we can turn to you now
11	for your testimony.
12	MS. LEWIS: Well, thank you so very
13	much. In regard to security, you cannot
14	depend on PSA 405 and the 4th District to
15	provide security because you will be deleting
16	the services that are in force for the entire
17	PSA, so if security is a problem that is
18	something that the establishment and the
19	owners would have to take care of for an on-
20	going basis.
21	I would like to say for the last
22	nine to ten years the owner of this property

has been trying to put a cheap gasoline station there and a carry-out, etcetera, etcetera and in each instance the community has voted it down because of the congestion and the size of that property.

Those of you who do not realize it, the speed limit on South Dakota Avenue is 45, 50, 60 and 70 miles per hour, you know? People speed on South Dakota because it's a main thoroughfare. People are going east and west. So that is an issue and to change the curb cuts there and to have traffic going one way and another way is going to create more congestion there and you have to take into consideration the businesses that are across the street. This place is directly across the street from McDonald's. Okay? You all know how busy McDonald's is.

There's a beauty salon there.

There's a Chinese carryout there. There used to be a fish market there. There's a sign in the window "for lease." So that's there.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

Next door is a BP station that has been there ever since I've been in the community. We have a heavy volume of traffic right next door to this proposed establishment. So that's another issue and a problem.

And my concern is mainly the proposal is beautiful, but the location is wrong. There are many under served areas in Ward 5 and the City and I think this group of people should take their business to a place where it's needed.

As Commissioner Alston said, this is a retired community. Many of the residents in the community do not work. They're retired federal, professionals, etcetera, etcetera. They do not have a need for what this group is trying to bring in like fresh produce, etcetera, etcetera. They go to the main chains to get their groceries.

Also, the Riggs Plaza Apartments are located just up the street. There is a proposed art center that's going to financed

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

by the Cafritz Foundation. When the Cafritz folks found out about this cheap gasoline station, they had grave concerns because we are trying to upgrade the community with arts and whatever. We have a new development, the Emerson Estates. Those houses cost \$500,000 plus three blocks from this place. When you have a cheap gasoline station, people come from far and near just to say two or three pennies on a gallon. We do not need this extra traffic in the community because we are accident prone because of the heavy traffic on South Dakota Avenue.

The other thing that I'm concerned about, when I listen to the plans I say are they talking about the place I've been seeing for the last 40 years? Is that the same location? There is not enough space there. All of us know the size of a Pepsi delivery truck. All of us know the size of a Coca Cola truck, a potato chip truck. I mean where are those people going to go?

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Now there will be people working there, okay? Where are they going to park? You know, you talk about very good food. The food may be very good, but six parking spaces, eight parking spaces, come on, where are these people going to park? They'll be all through the community. We have youth who walk the streets. And where are they going to eat their food? It's a carryout. They have to get the food and walk the streets and drop the paper on the street. I mean McDonald's does have a place for them to sit. So we have to take all of these things into consideration. And every time I hear about this development, I hear a different story.

I did not go to the ANC meeting, but there were some people at the meeting who heard the first testimony. They could not believe what they were hearing at Michigan Park. I heard it at North Okay? I'm hearing Michigan Park, okay? Now So what is the real deal? today. At North

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Michigan Park, they said deliveries would be from 10 p.m. to 1 a.m. when the residents were no longer on the street. Today, that part has changed.

As to what is the real deal? We've got misinformation on the real use of the building and the facility. Now there's a lottery exchange place, people go there and buy their lotteries. Will lotteries continue to be sold there? It's a very good site. It's got a lot of money and lotteries there. So will you be selling lotteries there? We don't know. Every time you hear from the owners, the developers, we have a different story. So what is the real deal?

CHAIR LOUD: Thank you, Ms. Lewis. We appreciate your testimony. That sound denotes that three minutes is up. I think it's very instructive and helpful that you've given your testimony, particularly before the Department of Transportation has left and/or is given an opportunity to weigh in, because

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

some of what you raise are transportation, traffic issues that we can ask them about when it comes time for them to give their testimony. So again, thank you.

What I'd like to do is turn to Ms. Smith for her testimony and then I'll ask the ANC and the Applicant if they would have any cross for the witnesses.

MS. SMITH: Thank you very much. As I said I'm Rosalie A. Smith and I live at 12th and Emerson. I've been there since '64 and I'm an activist here in D.C. as well as a fourth generation native.

against it for the I'm simple reason that is close to my home. That's the 4900 block of South Dakota. I'm right at the 5000 block and our neighborhood, we have long We have problems with the traffic. blocks. Since they put the salt dome up on Totten, we've had a lot of problems with those salt trucks in the winter time or when we have What has happened, because of all the snow.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

traffic, our property has shifted. We have cracks in our walls. And as you can see by the people that's here today, we are retirees and government workers, federal government workers, District government workers. We paid our dues. We do not need anything else in our community that's going to cause a hazard to us.

Like I said, we lived on a fixed income. Those of us are still here in our community. We do not have young children. basically have grandchildren, grandchildren and they're not living most of them in our homes. like So Ι say, it's hardship for us to have something else come there. It might be nice. We have a gas station right next to Mr. Young's store which has eight pumps. Now they're going to bring six more pumps. This is going to be a hazard We had the same incident happen right on Eastern Avenue and Riggs Road, several We lost a lot of community people years ago.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

because of oil spills and some of them died from cancer. My daughter's father-in-law was one of those. So like I said, we cannot have this. We want to live -- we want to live now to be comfortable. Okay?

This is why I'm actually against, no personal problems, nothing against you all.

But like I say with us, we do not need this

CHAIR LOUD: Thank you, Ms. Smith as well. And again, we appreciate your patience.

MS. SMITH: That's quite all right.

CHAIR LOUD: Waiting for your opportunity to give testimony. Oftentimes, I wish at these proceedings we had DCRA sort of as a mandatory person in the audience and/or environment as a mandatory person so that they can hear some of the enforcement concerns or licensing concerns outside of BZA, like the gas seepage issue that you referenced on Eastern Avenue. Those issues are outside of

in our community.

1	the BZA's jurisdiction and don't factor into
2	our review, necessarily of this kind of
3	application, but your community should remain
4	engaged. There are avenues where those kinds
5	of things will be addressed, issues you
6	testified about cracks in the housing and that
7	kind of thing. Those things are addressed by
8	other areas of the D.C. government and I hope
9	that your community stays engaged throughout
10	the process, wherever the process leads, to
11	make sure that those are taken up seriously.
12	In terms of our jurisdiction
13	though, it's just limited to zoning issues and
14	the criteria under Section 706.
15	At this point, I'd like to turn to
16	the Applicant and then to the ANC to see if
17	there are any questions for the witnesses.
18	MR. M. GOSS: I don't have
19	questions. I could answer the questions
20	raised, but I don't have any questions to
21	them, no.

CHAIR LOUD: And they didn't raise

1	any questions necessarily for you to raise, so
2	what you can do is you can include those
3	concerns you have as part of your closing.
4	MR. M. GOSS: Okay.
5	CHAIR LOUD: A statement that
6	you'll get a chance to do and/or Board Members
7	may have some questions for you later,
8	stemming from some of that.
9	Does the ANC have any questions for
10	the witnesses?
11	MS. ALSTON: I do have some
12	question.
13	CHAIR LOUD: You have to get back
14	on the microphone.
15	MS. ALSTON: I do have one question
16	for Ms. Rose. Ms. Rose, you were present at
17	both the ANC meeting and the North Michigan
18	Park Civic Association meeting, correct?
19	MS. SMITH: Yes, I was.
20	MS. ALSTON: What was the feel of
21	the community about this project at both of
22	those meetings?

1	MS. SMITH: Well, a lot of people
2	was very upset and they was against it. And I
3	do want to say to you that I did mention that
4	no one from the store didn't come in my
5	neighborhood which I am a block away from the
6	store. And the fourth house from the corner
7	of 12th and Emerson. So like I say, I hadn't
8	seen anyone in my community and I'm in and out
9	every day and none of the people in my block
10	has mentioned anything about anybody coming,
11	asking questions pertaining to the new store
12	that's coming.
13	MS. ALSTON: Also, Ms. Rose, at our

MS. ALSTON: Also, Ms. Rose, at our July Single Member District meeting, is it, in fact, that the owner of the establishment sent you to our community asking us to consider allowing him to sell beer and wine and he would withdraw his application for a gas station?

MS. SMITH: Mr. Yeung, who is the renter, had asked that a lot of the people that be in the store a lot, if they could get

## NEAL R. GROSS

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	six packs and that he would withdraw, but he's
2	the renter and not the owner.
3	MS. ALSTON: I just wanted to make
4	sure. No other questions.
5	CHAIR LOUD: Thank you. And thank
6	you again to you, Ms. Lewis and Ms. Smith.
7	I think now we're at the point
8	where the Applicant was closing up this case.
9	Your first witnessed testified. Your second
10	witness indicated that there's probably no
11	need to testify. And so normally what we do
12	is turn to the Office of Planning for its
13	report. So why don't we do that and the
14	witnesses that are the table, you can be
15	excused now. Thank you again.
16	As we prepare for the Office of
17	Planning, do Board Members have any questions?
18	Okay. So we'll turn to OP. Good afternoon.
19	MR. JACKSON: Good afternoon, Mr.
20	Chairman and Members of the Board. As I
21	mentioned, in order that the Department of
22	Transportation's responses were included in

the record, I would defer to the Department of Transportation if they're available to answer any questions that you have and I'll wait until you finish with them before you turn to me.

CHAIR LOUD: Sounds like you don't want any of this heat from the Department of Transportation this afternoon.

What's the best way to proceed? Did you want to just go through your report so we can get that behind us? We're going to break after this case and work straight through the lunch. I know part of your report references some transportation issues.

MR. JACKSON: I guess because you have it before you and the Board is usually very good about reading it, I didn't know if you wanted me to stand on record and just make myself available to answer questions or if you wanted me just to highlight, hit the highlights. Whatever is the preference of the Board.

CHAIR LOUD: I think from our standpoint, standing on the record would be adequate. If there's anything -- yes, most of my questions would be transportation-related questions.

MR. JACKSON: We just would like to highlight that we were aware that there were concerns out in the community and we do note that the MPD, the Municipal Police Department email, did submit an an email indicating what their issues were and that the Police Municipal Department concerned was about extending the hours of operation for a period of time and the impact that might have on their need to provide manpower in this area.

The Applicant's response did limit their hours or clearly state that their hours were limited. So in light of those changes and other changes that are made to the plans in response to comments from the Office of Planning, we did list four conditions that we

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

thought would be appropriate for the site. Those conditions being that the hours of operation would be limited to 6 a.m. to 10 p.m., daily; that the floodlights would be angled down and shuttered in order to avoid light spillage onto nearby residences; that the canopy lighting would be recessed. Of course, when you recess lighting into a box, the light is also contained on site; and that there be no exterior amplified sound system.

Now we understand that most service stations have sound systems on their pumps, so if you have problems they can receive service from inside the building, but we're just saying it should not be amplified since it may bother the neighboring residences.

With that concludes our brief summary of the Office of Planning's report. But overall, we think that the Applicant's application and the changes they've made have been consistent with the standard under the zoning regulations with regard to Section

1	726706 and 2302.
2	CHAIR LOUD: Thank you. Let's see
3	if Board Members have any questions for you.
4	VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Good
5	afternoon, Mr. Jackson. Two questions. One
6	is that I'm looking at your report, starting
7	at the bottom of page four and it might be a
8	typographical error, but 2302.4, speaking
9	specifically to the distance of any driveway
10	from an intersection?
11	MR. JACKSON: Yes.
12	VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: At the top of
13	page five you note that it doesn't meet the
14	criteria. Is that, in fact, true?
15	MR. JACKSON: That's incorrect. It
16	does meet the criteria.
17	VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: It does meet
18	the criteria.
19	MR. JACKSON: The change, by
20	closing the driveway entrance on the first
21	the closest driveway to the intersection of
22	Emerson and South Dakota, they eliminated the

driveway that was within the 40-foot dimension. Both the other driveways would be outside of that dimension.

VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: And secondly, know that in that involve other cases gasoline service station, the Office Planning relies heavily on input from DDOT. And in fact, in a very recent has withheld making a recommendation until DDOT has weighed Such is not the case here. So is your the result of recommendation close coordination with DDOT?

MR. JACKSON: DDOT was very closely coordinated with us on this case. That is to say that the Applicant has been working on other sites with DDOT and this site had been discussed than with more once DDOT in conjunction with these other sites. had a joint meeting with DDOT present where we I met the Applicant on site and discussed it. we walked around and discussed some of the issues and they had further discussions with

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	DDO'I after our joint meeting.
2	So I was in communication with DDOT
3	and we anticipated that there would be a
4	report, but in discussions with emails back
5	and forth, they did not they thought that
6	the issues that they had raised with the
7	Applicant had been properly addressed. And
8	the changes that were made on the plan and on
9	that basis we wrote the report expecting that
10	there would be some sort of statement formally
11	made by DDOT with that same sentiment.
12	VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Okay, thank
13	you.
14	CHAIR LOUD: Thank you, Mr.
15	Jackson. I don't have any questions for you.
16	Mr. Jenkins, do you have testimony, just a
17	quick summary, recap before opening up for
18	questions?
19	MR. JENNINGS: I don't, sir. I do
20	just want to clarify my name, its
21	pronunciations. It's Jennings.
22	CHAIR LOUD: I'm sorry, Mr.

1	Jennings.
2	MR. JENNINGS: That's perfectly
3	fine.
4	CHAIR LOUD: Before we go to you, I
5	just wanted to see if you had some testimony
6	that you wanted to give. I think we need to
7	turn to both the ANC to give the opportunity
8	to ask Planning questions as well as the
9	Applicant.
LO	First of all, do you have a copy of
11	the Office of Planning's report? They
12	submitted a report. It's in support of the
13	application with some conditions and as a
L4	party, of course, you have an opportunity to
15	ask Planning questions.
L6	MS. ALSTON: I do. I do have a
L7	copy of it. I pulled a copy from the file as
L8	we were in here. I don't have any questions
L9	for OP. I have questions more so for DDOT.
20	CHAIR LOUD: Okay, thank you. To
21	the Applicant, Ms. Fuller, did you have any
22	questions for Planning?

MS. FULLER: No questions.

CHAIR LOUD: All right, so why don't we turn to Mr. Jennings and you can give us just a quick summary of the position you take on the application and then we'll open it up for questions.

MR. JENNINGS: Sure. And again, for the record, my name is Jeff Jennings. I work for the District Department of Transportation, Policy and Planning Administration.

The Applicant has stated that we did meet with them earlier this year. That is correct. We did meet also with, I believe it's a business partner. His name is Ku Yueng. He did submit this particular plan at that time. Some of the specifics did not meet our standards as far as the additional curb cut that has since been removed.

The traffic circulation, that's been improved. The delivery of the fuel, the truck being used to deliver the fuel. Those are really some of the more significant

#### NEAL R. GROSS

improvements that we saw at the site. Based upon our initial review of it, going back to I believe February and March of this year.

I worked closely with the Ward 5 transportation planner to understand some of the outstanding concerns. The ANC Commissioner has referenced what are some of the other amenities received out of closing that additional curb cut closest to the intersection of Emerson and South Dakota. DDOT is very, very interested as the Board is aware in understanding how we can improve our multi-modal transportation facilities.

The improvement that we saw, including that curb cut, clearly doesn't meet design and engineering standards. It was a safety hazard. The sidewalk gets significantly improved for pedestrian access, for bicycle access, along South Dakota Avenue. So that was one of the major improvements that we saw at this location.

I won't go much further. I think

#### NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

there are plenty of questions out there, so I'm happy to take them at this time.

CHAIR LOUD: Thank you, Mr. Jennings, let me open it up to the Board for any questions.

VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Good afternoon, Mr. Jennings. One question. How does DDOT in the absence of a traffic impact study, how does DDOT analyze existing level of service on intersections and then additional trips that will be generated by the use? How is that analyzed without a study?

MR. JENNINGS: We used the study that the Applicant provided to us for the 3710 Minnesota Avenue location which in many ways wasn't exactly the same, but had very similar characteristics to it and viewing that and additionally realizing that this particular location would generate some additional trips through the particular intersection that we're seeing here. These are things that we talked over with our traffic engineers internally and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	they felt comfortable enough to go forward
2	without some sort of transportation or traffic
3	impacts.
4	VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Relying upon a
5	study that's been done for a completely
6	different site, not really in relatively close
7	proximity to the site.
8	MR. JENNINGS: That's correct.
9	VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Is that
10	something that's done commonly?
11	MR. JENNINGS: Not commonly, but we
12	felt for this particular case, it worked.
13	VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: So in terms of
14	the number of trips that this particular gas
15	station will generate is in DDOT's mind
16	similar to what that Minnesota Avenue gas
17	station would generate as well?
18	MR. JENNINGS: That's correct. We
19	took a very hard look at it with respect to
20	improving as much of the safety as possible at
21	the site, knowing that the site, as you've
22	stated all too well, that the site would

generate some trips. We're not looking at a site that's going to necessarily max out the Emerson-South Dakota intersection, but we did take into consideration how the Emerson signal time at that particular intersection would perhaps have to undergo some additional review at a later time.

One of the other items based upon the conversation I've been hearing here today, I would probably ask, as -- if this case does go forward with the Board's approval, the Applicant should be responsible to perhaps present to DDOT or the ANC any potential conflicts it sees on a semi-annual basis, if that's at all possible too.

VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Okay, so just one last question in terms of what we did is you looked at the Minnesota Avenue location in terms of the number of trips that were in that study and then applied those additional trips to what was perceived as the existing traffic conditions at Della Field and South Dakota?

1	MR. JENNINGS: Emerson and South
2	Dakota.
3	VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Emerson and
4	South Dakota, okay.
5	MR. JENNINGS: That's correct.
6	VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: What is the
7	existing conditions at the intersections that
8	kind of surround the subject property?
9	MR. JENNINGS: I couldn't take it
10	off the top of my head for you. I apologize
11	for that.
12	VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: So how can we
13	take the trips from that other study, how can
14	we apply it to the existing conditions when we
15	don't even really know what the existing
16	conditions are?
17	MR. JENNINGS: I think the way the
18	traffic engineers explained it to me was when
19	you see the volume at South Dakota Avenue and
20	this is just kind of the explanation I
21	received and you see the volume along
22	Minnesota Avenue, it's substantial. And what

1	you have here is merely, probably a fraction
2	of a percentage of additional trips being
3	produced at this particular intersection.
4	I think we took that into serious
5	consideration, especially with the amount of
6	time that you have at this particular
7	intersection for vehicular travel, the in and
8	out motion as far as which direction the
9	vehicles will be traveling once they perhaps
10	visited the location and then moved on to
11	wherever the next destination was.
12	VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Okay, thank
13	you.
14	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: I'm just a
15	little confused about the recommendation to
16	have the South Dakota entrance. I understand
17	you're not going to be able to enter the South
18	Dakota curb cut if you're coming eastbound,
19	but would you be permitted to exit going
20	westbound?
21	MR. JENNINGS: Any direction on
22	South Dakota is only inbound to the site.

MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: Only inbound to the site.

MR. JENNINGS: Only inbound to the site. We actually let me know that we would not approve or provide any comments in a positive manner if they did not change that from the initial. So initially, the Applicant had it, I believe, in a two-way direction, so you could leave and enter the site via South Dakota. And we let them know that that was not acceptable.

MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: I quess what would be your response from the comments made earlier from of the ANC witnesses some regarding potential congestion on Emerson, having all traffic flowing out of that one exit and then also potential traffic flowing down either Emerson or through 10th Street and to residential streets? How would you respond to that?

MR. JENNINGS: I would say with a great deal of confidence that the cut-through

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

trips through this neighborhood will not be I think you'll see patrons visiting the station and then understanding that exiting Emerson is the best bet. Using South Dakota is going to be the best bet. It's quickest traveling. As the ANC Commissioner stated here, as well as some of individuals from the community, oftentimes it is very fast traveling.

We're doing our best at DDOT to try and understand how major arteries like this could receive some kind of traffic calming. It's not an easy equation to put together. But as far as the cut-through traffic, people will understand that cutting through the neighborhood will substantially slow them down as is most the case of Washington, D.C. Staying on the main arteries throughout the city gets to your destination faster.

MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: Thank you. That's helpful.

One last question is there was

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	testimony from the Applicant about a no
2	entrance sign coming eastbound on South Dakota
3	to enter that curb cut. Is that something
4	that DDOT will work with the Applicant to make
5	sure that there's adequate signage?
6	MR. JENNINGS: We're happy to work
7	with them on all signage, not just that
8	particular signage. If there's signage to be
9	posted up at Emerson at that particular point
10	of access, then we're happy to work with them
11	on that, too.
12	One of the conditions we've had in
13	previous cases and I think it might be helpful
14	here too that the signs should meet DDOT
15	standards or be reviewed with DDOT traffic
16	engineering staff. Once they are designed and
17	made even to a point where they would bring
18	them in to see our traffic engineers and it
19	meets their approval.
20	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: Thank you. No
21	further questions.
22	CHAIR LOUD: A couple of quick

follow-up questions. Is there a reason why DDOT did not submit a written report that goes into some of what you testified to evaluating the 3710 Minnesota Avenue traffic study, traffic engineers, drawing some conclusions about comparable congestion levels, levels of service, etcetera, and then having that signed by the appropriate official made a part of the record so that the Applicant could review it. The ANC could review it. And indeed, the BZA review it prior to coming into the our hearing?

MR. JENNINGS: We felt. the Applicant had met all of the expectations that we had put on them at our earlier meeting, knowing that the previous design did not meet any of what we had sought to see from them. And when we saw the final, I believe in the first week in September, felt very we comfortable with it. It was not a report that could be signed by an individual or anything to that effect.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

CHAIR LOUD: Well, both from the standpoint of having the transportation study, having opinion that's based an on transportation study that's not for the particular site which we normally have recommendation based on the you guys, а transportation for the site and then having a written report that comes under your own Agency's letterhead, it just -- do you see how that can create some challenges in terms of completing the record for our review?

MR. JENNINGS: We do, yes.

CHAIR LOUD: Okay. Let me ask this question in terms of an issue raised by the Civic Association. It has to do with their being congestion at the intersection because of the McDonald's, another gasoline station right across the street. I think that's to the north. Is it the opinion of DDOT that notwithstanding the concern about congestion, the conclusion is that it doesn't rise to a level that would present any objectionable

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

traffic conditions?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. JENNINGS: That's correct. It doesn't meet any kind of adverse impacts or feelings that this particular site would cause those impacts and I think again, one of the conditions that the Applicant is willing to work with us on is that entrance on South Dakota. I think that perhaps was one of the most important items that we reach with them and then realizing that the outbound had to exit off of the Emerson Street side and go through that traffic signal.

CHAIR LOUD: Very quickly, if you I'm layman can, because а on lot of transportation-related subtleties, but I'm going to take you through the Office Planning report, the aspects that relate to transportation and you just tell me how this negotiated concession mitigates traffic conditions, okay, just put that on the record.

MR. JENNINGS: Sure.

CHAIR LOUD: Eliminating one curb

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	cut on South Dakota and then allow only
2	westbound traffic to enter South Dakota, just
3	very briefly, how does that mitigate?
4	MR. JENNINGS: Access points along
5	the main corridor like at South Dakota should
6	be minimized as much as possible and that
7	perhaps is something I think the ANC alludes
8	to and their testimony is that we have a
9	substantial amount of access points along
10	South Dakota, so deleting that access point
11	actually improves the conditions since you
12	don't have a competing traffic access point
13	there.
14	CHAIR LOUD: Okay. So it reduces
15	the queue?
16	MR. JENNINGS: That's correct.
17	Furthermore, we've never if it makes any
18	sense, the design and engineering guidelines
19	within DDOT state that the curb cuts have to
20	be 60 feet away from an intersection. I know
21	the Office of Planning may have used a 40 feet

and I think that's relevant towards the BZA,

1	but we look at these curb cuts with that much
2	more of a careful eye.
3	CHAIR LOUD: Okay, the next several
4	concessions do not appear necessarily to be
5	related to transportation except for the ADA-
6	compliance sidewalks, pedestrian safety and
7	then the bicycle park and ride.
8	MR. JENNINGS: Yes, sir.
9	CHAIR LOUD: And then when we talk
10	about trash enclosures, that has nothing to do
11	with transportation or does it?
12	MR. JENNINGS: We were concerned.
13	I think we mentioned this at our initial
14	meeting with the Applicant. Trash pickup, how
15	that would occur. Perhaps that could be a
16	part of the order, if the case is approved, as
17	far as when those times may occur.
18	CHAIR LOUD: So but does extending
19	the trash enclosure help to mitigate against
20	any transportation okay.
21	MR. JENNINGS: No, sir.
22	CHAIR LOUD: All right. Adding

windows	along	Emerson?
---------	-------	----------

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. JENNINGS: There's this idea in the transportation world that having good shy space and that's the concept of when walking along a structure, how the structure presents itself against the pedestrian environment. So adding glass windows or windows period on the shy space for a pedestrian that actually improves the pedestrian right of way. there's any glass windows along the sidewalk, pedestrian it actually does improve the facilities.

CHAIR LOUD: And just really, really, really, priefly, just explain that to me again.

MR. JENNINGS: Sure.

CHAIR LOUD: Is that for the pedestrian walking on the sidewalk?

MR. JENNINGS: That's right. If I'm walking potentially along a building and the building may have a glass facade to it, there's the -- there have been studies

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

performed that the pedestrian feels more comfortable having the opportunity to see inside the building or the illumination from the building actually helping with the sidewalk facility.

CHAIR LOUD: Okay. Were there any other transportation traffic-related concessions negotiated?

MR. JENNINGS: I think you heard today about the fuel truck, the 30-foot fuel truck. We let the Applicant know that we prefer to see that. That would be something that they would have to agree to do. Clearly, the 8-foot sidewalks in front of the address would be very important to us. We look for the most space possible for all users of the right of way. I think you mentioned the bike parking which was an improvement over having nothing there originally.

We didn't necessarily hammer out how the staff or employees for this particular location would actually arrive to it. As

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

you're aware, we sometimes ask for Applicants to provide some sort of transit benefit to their employees. This is a major transit corridor. So I know that we're dealing with a gas station here and maybe the idea is to drive, all employees should be driving to this location. I mean we would prefer to see all employees that work here, 8, 10 hour shifts, whatever they may be, they should be provided some sort of transit benefit.

CHAIR LOUD: Thank you, Mr. Jennings. I don't have any further questions. If Board Members don't, we can turn to -- Mr. Dettman?

VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: I just need one clarification on one thing. I know that the site plan just shows a right turn arrow coming off of South Dakota Avenue into the site, but I guess reviewing the record, I thought what that meant was right turn in and right turn out. And what we've heard today was just it's an enter only and that's it.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	MR. JENNINGS: That's correct.
2	VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: That's
3	correct?
4	MR. JENNINGS: We would not want
5	you see the size of the proposed curb cut on
6	the rendering here. It's 20 feet wide and
7	that would allow, if you had a wide vehicle,
8	clearly they could get in there easily. If
9	it's two-way, it's probably going to be a
10	minimum of 24 feet.
11	VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Was the 20-
12	foot width of that curb cut, was that a DDOT
13	directive?
14	MR. JENNINGS: We let them know
15	that that was going to be our preference.
16	VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: I see. Is
17	that a maximum DDOT standard? I know the
18	regs stay 25.
19	MR. JENNINGS: Typically, on one
20	way, we would like to see the least amount of
21	public space being used for curb cuts.
22	VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Okay.

1	MR. JENNINGS: We could even go a
2	little further and say it's going to be
3	minimized more. We do realize that there are
4	vehicles wider out there and clearly their
5	fuel truck needs to get into that site too.
6	VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: If you did
7	widen that to match the other one, 25 feet,
8	and you did allow right turn only out of on to
9	South Dakota Avenue, would that have a
10	detrimental effect on South Dakota and would
11	that alleviate some of the traffic along
12	Emerson?
13	MR. JENNINGS: We don't believe so.
14	VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Okay.
15	MR. JENNINGS: Having that right
16	turn out onto South Dakota presents many
17	difficult conflicts, potential conflicts.
18	CHAIR LOUD: Thank you, Mr.
19	Dettman. Let's turn now to the AJN first, and
20	then let's turn to the Applicant in terms of
21	any questions for Transportation.
22	MS. ALSTON: Questions only,

1	correct?
2	CHAIR LOUD: Questions only.
3	MS. ALSTON: Do you have a copy of
4	the report you used for 3710 Minnesota Avenue?
5	MR. JENNINGS: Back in my office, I
6	do. That's right.
7	MS. ALSTON: Can I get a copy of
8	that, please?
9	MR. JENNINGS: I'd be happy to
10	email it to you.
11	MS. ALSTON: Let me ask you a
12	question. Since you're with DDOT, can you
13	tell me how many speed bumps and speed hump
14	partitions we have and would DDOT just around
15	this particular site and that includes the
16	alleys, the one-way sign request, the no-
17	through trucks on the street, because of the
18	high traffic volume?
19	MR. JENNINGS: I don't know how
20	many speed hump partitions you have. They are
21	actually being held I shouldn't say being
22	held, I hope they're not. They're handled by

a different administration at this point in time. So doing most of my work within the Policy and Planning Administration and when I coordinate a review like I did for this site with our traffic engineers, we don't get to the point of where -- we're kind of in a conversation with them, how does this site have potential adverse impacts. We walk through that. We don't walk through how many various partitions there may or anything that you're citing here.

MS. ALSTON: How do you judge it, when you don't do a traffic study and then when the cars exit out of the only exit it can, which is Emerson Street, the only place for them to go is into residential. So if you don't think they'll go into residential, how do you think they would maneuver at that light on Emerson? And then can you tell me the timing at that light on Emerson and South Dakota?

MR. JENNINGS: I can't tell you off

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	the top of my head. I'm
2	MS. ALSTON: I'm listening to you.
3	You said that's something that you considered
4	the timing at that light, what did you
5	consider? What's the timing?
6	MR. JENNINGS: I think I answered
7	your question.
8	MS. ALSTON: Okay. With regards to
9	this particular location, the ANC has been
10	requesting for the last five years to have its
11	own individual traffic study done. Can you
12	tell me why that wasn't done and another
13	traffic study was used for this particular
14	location?
15	MR. JENNINGS: DDOT doesn't set out
16	to provide land use transportation impact
17	analyses. We rely on what the Applicant
18	provides to us and in this case we felt that
19	this particular site matched in many ways to
20	what they proposed previously for another
21	site.
	1

 $\label{eq:ms.alston: Can you tell me how} \text{MS. ALSTON:} \quad \text{Can you tell me how}$ 

1	many tickets has been written or how many
2	complaints you've had about this speed on
3	South Dakota Avenue through DDOT, from DDOT?
4	MR. JENNINGS: DDOT is not an
5	enforcement agency, as far as traffic speed
6	violations.
7	MS. ALSTON: So when you were at
8	the property, did you pay attention as to how
9	busy South Dakota Avenue was when you were
LO	doing your
11	MR. JENNINGS: We're fully aware
12	how busy South Dakota is, absolutely.
13	MS. ALSTON: So how busy do you
L4	think that South Dakota is compatible to
L5	Minnesota Avenue?
L6	MR. JENNINGS: It's comparable.
L7	MS. ALSTON: In what ways?
L8	MR. JENNINGS: Functional
L9	classification. On the functional
20	classification scale, the way we look at major
21	arterials such as South Dakota, travel, as
22	you've stated all too well, in many off-peak

1	hours, vehicles will travel at a higher rate
2	of speed. Oftentimes, these are things that
3	have gone in far before the DDOT staff that
4	works there at the current time. so the
5	design of the roadway actually is towards the
6	driver's advantage. You've stated that too
7	well. You've lived here for all your life.
8	You know how fast some of these vehicles
9	travel on South Dakota. When we were out
10	there at the site, you're absolutely right.
11	Some of the off-peak travel velocity or
12	vehicles traveling at high velocity, it's more
13	than obvious.
14	MS. ALSTON: So at this particular

MS. ALSTON: So at this particular location with being very clear, because even the Board has some questions, with a one-way entry and a one-way exit, this space is comparable -- is feasible to accommodate every kind of truck, delivery, car and everything that will come to this site?

MR. JENNINGS: We believe so.

MS. ALSTON: Without any drawings

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	or anything to prove to us that it is?
2	MR. JENNINGS: I want to reference
3	here. I hope you have this drawing too. This
4	is the drawing that we've worked off of, as
5	far as trying to understand what they provided
6	to DDOT through our conversations with them.
7	MS. ALSTON: That they provided to
8	DDOT?
9	MR. JENNINGS: As in G2 Design
10	Collective, that's correct, Euclid of
11	Virginia, LLC is down here in the lower right-
12	hand corner.
13	MS. ALSTON: But there's nothing
14	from DDOT that can do you have a list of
15	concerns that were DDOT's and that they
16	rectified since then?
17	MR. JENNINGS: I think we went
18	through those with the Chairman.
19	MS. ALSTON: I'm asking do you a
20	list of them to show what they were prior to
21	and what's been fixed now? Because the only
22	thing you've addressed was the curb cut.

1	MR. JENNINGS: I can probably pull
2	my notes from our conversation we had with
3	them earlier this year. I believe it happened
4	in February or March, and I'll email that to
5	you, too.
6	MS. ALSTON: And since you said in
7	the beginning that you're not really familiar
8	with the site, can you tell me who else in
9	your office was working on this project or
LO	plan?
L1	MR. JENNINGS: I don't think I
L2	necessarily said, and I'll be happy to go back
L3	to the record, but I don't think I necessarily
L4	said I wasn't familiar with the site. I think
L5	
L6	MS. ALSTON: Vaguely familiar.
L7	MR. JENNINGS: Vaguely familiar.
L8	So that doesn't mean I' not familiar with the
L9	site.
20	MS. ALSTON: Okay, so my question
21	then is who was the person that was really
22	instrumental in approving this plan besides

1	yourself?
2	MR. JENNINGS: I can provide you a
3	list of names, if that helps.
4	MS. ALSTON: Thanks. I don't have
5	any other questions at this time.
6	CHAIR LOUD: Thank you. Does the
7	Applicant have any questions for the
8	Department of Transportation?
9	MR. M. GOSS: I don't have any
10	questions.
11	CHAIR LOUD: Thank you. And thank
12	you, Mr. Jennings. So the Board Members have
13	no additional questions. I think where we are
14	in the proceeding now is that we would turn to
15	the ANC for presentation of your case, you're
16	a party. I think you testified earlier that
17	you don't have any witnesses to call. It
18	would just be your testimony and the report,
19	of course, of the ANC.
20	MS. ALSTON: Just give me one
21	second.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

(Pause.)

MS. ALSTON: You have in your possession a copy of the report, the letter from the Advisory Neighborhood Commission 5A asking that you support the community in its opposition to this development. Because it's on the record, I won't read it to you unless you feel that there's a need to. I'll just go and make some other minor points on why my community does not want it.

First and foremost, we don't the personal benefit need or any my another self-service community to have station and/or convenience store. The presentation that was made was wonderful at the beginning. None of the need of a gas station was addressed, so we don't see With regards to the need of a gas station. comments that were made about the management, if they own the property, then they can go in just re-manage what's already all of the Because concerns that addressed prior to can deal with management.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Safety is an issue in our community. A lot of our seniors, a majority of our seniors, our residents are seniors. They're retirees. The intersection at Emerson and South Dakota is a traffic disaster. very disrespectful that a development of this magnitude that will come and bring trucks, tankers, cars, deliveries, did not deserve individual traffic that of its own and/or direct attention from DDOT as to why or why not they approve this particular project.

With the speed on South Dakota Avenue, the number of tickets, we've had deaths in our community from children as young as five years old because of traffic. At this particular location, there are there entry and exit points. If you close off one and make one an entry and one an exit, it will create a traffic disaster.

There are more than 15 individual block and alley and streetway partitions trying to calm some of the traffic issues now.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

It's so bad without this added traffic that during the daytime, non-rush hour and rush hour, pedestrians from this site is right on the Maryland-D.C. line, just blocks away. Pedestrians entering and exiting the area cut through the alleys, through the residential communities of this community which makes it very, very, very dangerous. That's one of our biggest concerns is the traffic.

If something were to happen with everybody in the parking lot of this facility, with a one exit, imagine what it could do. It's ridiculous. Mentally think about it. Eight parking spaces, six pumps, a delivery truck and a tanker all trying to get out at one time. It just so happens deliveries are made all at the same time. How would they exit? At the corner, it's a traffic light. We don't know the timing of that traffic light. Who is to say that only three cars can't exit that traffic light at one time which would back up the traffic more in the

community which is not industrial, which is not commercial, that community is residential.

As far as the owner, it's blatantly disrespectful to the community that numerous occasions, even today, he himself did not show. He has not come to the community at any invited invitation, he has not accepted. And so because we take pride in our community and we are one of a community-base, that people have a vested interest community, not just buy, sell, and develop, and then when you go home, you leave, we're stuck with the aftermath that comes along with the development. That's why we're not in favor of the development.

The 4th District Commander himself has already submitted testimony to say that he is in opposition because he knows the time and attention that this particular location deserves just with traffic himself. The 4th District has to send an individual car to sit that because children at corner we have

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

crossing the streets coming from schools. We have everything coming out of the residential. We have so much development going on. It's draining the PSA 4 or 5 resources because we have to have a police officer writing tickets at that light every single day. Not just from 3 to 7. This is from in the morning to the evening.

would ask that before We any recommendation is made that would go against that of our community's request that DDOT be this location required to give its personal attention, that of a traffic study, and not just give us the generics of oh, I think this is like Minnesota Avenue, because it's not. The residents are different. The community is different and the aspects of this different development is than that of Minnesota Avenue.

As for OPM's report, we don't really have anything too much against OPM's report. Again, there's no need for a gas

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

station in our community, especially if the hours are going to be from 6 a.m. to 10 p.m. And if you're doing your loading at 7, there's no need when there's a gas station right next door, and then another gas station three blocks away. We don't have the type of vehicular traffic in our community that requires that of another gas station.

There was a comment made that the community has been mishandled for so long. community isn't one that has been mishandled. We're not against development. We're cautious about the development and development brings. The development is perfect, just not for our community and this particular location.

When we look at the amenities and things to come, all of that's wonderful, but were not clearly defined in the plans of the development at this particular phase. We can't guarantee that those things will come along the lines.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Taking out this driveway or this entryway into this development was not done for -- we don't think was done for the sake of our community because it would have allowed another exit. It was only done to meet the guidelines of what was required by DDOT.

Meeting dates, meetings with an S, there's only been representation at one meeting and it was clearly defined at meeting that the community was against this particular development and you talk about community involved being and community concerned, then you would know that this is not a development that's embraced by community. We're adamantly against it for different reasons, for safety reasons, for environmental reasons, some of which are not zoning issues, so I only stick to the ones related to the zoning issues, but it's clearly defined that the community is against it.

The biasness in the DDOT report,

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	because we don't have facts, you can't show me
2	that this is safe for our community. And that
3	draws a definite concern for the residents of
4	my Single Member District as well as the ones
5	that have taken the time to come and speak on
6	today.
7	Again, I would just ask that the
8	Board of Zoning Adjustment support the
9	community as well as the ANC in their
10	unanimous vote to support the community in
11	opposition of this particular project.
12	CHAIR LOUD: Thank you,
13	Commissioner. We appreciate your patience as
14	well as your testimony and that of the ANC and
15	it will be accorded great weight.
16	Let me turn to the Applicant and
17	then to the Board in terms of any questions
18	for the ANC.
19	MR. M. GOSS: I don't have any
20	questions for the ANC.
21	CHAIR LOUD: Board Members?
22	COMMISSIONER MAY: I'm looking at

1	the report that we received. It's dated
2	September 17th and what I'm looking for is the
3	I guess the numbers here. It doesn't say
4	on here that it was a unanimous vote of the
5	Commissioners present. It doesn't say how
6	many Commissioners were actually present.
7	MS. ALSTON: That may have been
8	left out, but you need the minutes it was a
9	unanimous vote from the Commission.
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: I think we need
11	a piece of paper that says this is what I
12	think it needs to be in the record. This is
13	the number of Commissioners needed for a
14	quorum and this was the vote.
15	MS. ALSTON: Okay.
16	COMMISSIONER MAY: I think that's
17	actually a requirement for great weight.
18	You say that there was only one
19	presentation to the community by the
20	Applicant. Was that the North Michigan Park
21	meeting or was it an ANC meeting?
22	MS. ALSTON: No, when this

particular group came out to the community, it
was at the North Michigan Park Civic
Association meeting.
COMMISSIONER MAY: They didn't
present to the ANC?
MS. ALSTON: No.
COMMISSIONER MAY: What information
did the ANC base its
MS. ALSTON: We were present at the
North Michigan Park Civic Association.
COMMISSIONER MAY: All of the
Commissioners who voted?
MS. ALSTON: No, we have the
documents that were submitted to the ANC and
four of the ANC Commissioners whose area is in
who it directly impacts, was present at the
North Michigan Park Civic Association, and at
our Committee of a Whole meeting we sat down
and reviewed seven of the ANC Commissioners
were present at the Single Member District
meeting and the way in which it's been on our

agenda, it is listed. We've been discussing

1	this issue amongst the ANC since April.
2	COMMISSIONER MAY: Did the
3	Applicant have an opportunity to present their
4	case to the ANC? Were they afforded the
5	opportunity and they didn't show? Were they
6	not given a spot on the agenda?
7	MS. ALSTON: They've never
8	presented directly to the ANC.
9	COMMISSIONER MAY: And why?
10	MS. ALSTON: They did not express
11	interest to present to the ANC.
12	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay, thank you.
13	MS. ALSTON: Yes, sir.
14	CHAIR LOUD: Are there any
15	additional questions for the Commissioner?
16	Okay, then what we're going to do
17	is we went out of order somewhat and have
18	already gotten the testimony of the persons
19	who were in opposition. So if there are
20	persons in the audience who are in support of
21	the application now would be the time to come
22	up and you would be allowed three minutes to

1	give your testimony. And seeing none, we then
2	turn to the Applicant for closing.
3	MR. M. GOSS: Thank you. I think
4	we've very clearly stated our position here.
5	I'm not going to belabor that and go back over
6	the whole thing again, but basically I want to
7	make sure that the community is aware of our
8	desire to participate with them. We do want
9	to collaborate.
10	Some of the banter that has been
11	going back and forth is some misunderstandings
12	and that's my honest belief in terms of the
13	community meetings and who spoke to who and so
14	forth. But our approach has always been and
15	will continue to be to be a part of the
16	community in which we operate our businesses.
17	We are a responsible company and in
18	time, I believe we'll make you proud. Thank
19	you.
20	CHAIR LOUD: Thank you. A couple
21	of thoughts here. This is the point in which
22	we could deliberate, render a decision today.

1	We could deliberate and not render a decision
2	today and continue to a day in the future for
3	decision making.
4	Before we move down that path, I
5	have one question for either the I guess
6	it's the Office of Planning because it appears
7	that Mr. Jennings has left and that is the
8	Applicant met with respect to two projects, I
9	think, with DDOT.
10	MR. JACKSON: Yes, they were
11	meeting on a first project and during that
12	discussion they make reference to this other
13	proposal that was going to be going forward.
14	CHAIR LOUD: And what was the
15	address of the first project?
16	MR. JACKSON: I'm not aware of
17	that. The Applicant may be aware of that.
18	MR. M. GOSS: I can answer that.
19	CHAIR LOUD: Yes, sir.
20	MR. M. GOSS: 3710 Minnesota
21	Avenue.
22	CHAIR LOUD: So it's 3710?

1	MR. M. GOSS: Yes.
2	CHAIR LOUD: And the context of it
3	being 3710, the report, the traffic study for
4	3710 was also reference for the South Dakota
5	project as well?
6	MR. M. GOSS: Apparently so. Let
7	me be clear. That was our initial discussion
8	about this project, but it wasn't our only
9	discussion about this project. It just so
LO	happened that our initial discussion about
11	this project occurred while 3710 Minnesota
L2	Avenue was a little further down the track.
L3	So after that conversation, we've had at least
L4	three other conversations and meetings with
L5	regard to specifically South Dakota Avenue.
L6	CHAIR LOUD: Okay.
L7	MR. M. GOSS: With DDOT, yes.
18	CHAIR LOUD: Okay. thank you for
L9	that clarification.
20	Well, this is a point at which we
21	would normally either enter into deliberations
22	or decide the direction to move regarding

deliberations.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Personally, I think this is a very strong application. Ι think it's an application by an Applicant that is desirous bringing some positive change of in neighborhood and has a design that would tend to corroborate my personal opinion. I think that they want to move in the right direction.

On the other hand, Section 706.4 is a requirement that they have to walk through in order to get to an approval from the BZA and I'm kind of disturbed that there's transportation study in this case, that the transportation relied another expert on location's transportation study which happened to be the address that the Applicant Transportation Department went to see the place about in the first and it was conveniently available for this case.

I'm also concerned that there's no DDOT report written into the record that both the ANC would have had an opportunity to

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

review ahead of time, the BZA would have had an opportunity to review ahead of time and that would have fixed for everybody's evaluation what the points were that DDOT was making and would have referenced the fact that it relied on the 3710.

So I'm not prepared to vote on this case today, at least and I'll certainly listen to what Board Members think. I'd like a little more information from DDOT conforms to how we normally get information from DDOT, addressing some of the that the ANC has raised and that the evidence regarding what the has suggested transportation impacts will be and if the DDOT report is in writing is that they've relied exclusively 3710 Minnesota Avenue, that ought to be a part of our record too. supposed to make decisions exclusively on the 3710 Minnesota Avenue is not even in our record.

So those are some of the concerns I

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

have regarding the application as presented.

COMMISSIONER MAY: If I could talk, I would concur that we do need more on the transportation side of things. Whether we actually need a transportation study, I don't know. But I would rely on DDOT's judgment on whether something like that is necessary and we don't have a written DDOT report. think at the very least we need to have that written DDOT report and if they rely on whatever science they rely on to make their judgment I think that we should -- that should be in the record. And I think that's really the major piece.

I have to say frankly, the project itself I think is an admirable project in many, many ways. I think that the absence of the traffic information makes it hard for us to evaluate whether they've met the test for this special exception, but I think as I said it's an admirable project and it's not something you often say about gas stations,

## NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

frankly. So I think it's got a lot going for it.

The community has some legitimate I also think that frankly concerns about it. I'm not sure there's been the right conversation between the Applicant and community and if between now and whenever the get transportation information from DDOT, if there's an opportunity for the Applicant to make a case directly to the ANC, I think it would be well worth it because it doesn't seem that case has been made for whatever And I do think that that sort of reason. It seems like direct discussion is necessary. there's a lot of -- that there have been gaps in the information that's been presented to the community and when there are gaps, people jump to conclusions about them. We don't know how correct they are, Ι think it's so Applicant important for the to have that direct conversation with the ANC, in particular.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

CHAIR LOUD: Thank you, Mr. May Others?

VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'm in full agreement with your comments as well as the comments of Mr. May, especially with respect to the level of involvement and input that the ANC and the community has had with this. I do think that we need additional information with respect the traffic to impacts of the proposed use and I only maybe suggest that if we do decide to put this off and ask for additional information that ANC and the community be given substantial time, adequate time to weigh in on whatever is done, whether it be a traffic study, a new traffic study, whether it be a reliance on the Minnesota Avenue one. I think this is community that's very involved and is very knowledgeable about what's going on in the neighborhood and around this site.

I think that they can provide some very valuable information to the Applicant

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

with respect to traffic. So I just want to make sure that we give them enough time to weigh in.

CHAIR LOUD: Thank you, Mr. Dettman.

MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: I'm in agreement with the rest of the Members of the Board about providing sufficient time to get a solid report from DDOT to address some of the different issues and provide us the background and analysis that they use to come to their conclusion as we have now incorporated in OP's report which was very thorough and in Mr. Jennings' testimony.

Same as the other Members, I would definitely encourage the Applicant and the ANC to get together. There were comments made by both of mutual efforts to work together and by the ANC that this was a positive project, but I would focus that there were some concerns. on those concerns and how they may be resolved it because like there seems were some

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

potential long-term concerns about through traffic and may not be specifically related to this project, but they may be able to address.

CHAIR LOUD: Thank you. It seems like we're pretty much in consensus in terms of a direction to move. It may take a little wordsmithing to get there and let me try to see if I can move us on in that regard.

We'd like to see a report from DDOT. It's too bad that they're not still here, but a report from DDOT that addresses the section 706 requirements and the 2303, the grounds for relief, particularly as relates to the traffic transportation elements of those requirements.

I think we'd also like to see and articulation in the DDOT report of the basis of their utilizing 3710 Minnesota Avenue study. There was testimony to that regard by Mr. Jennings today, but I think a written articulation of the basis for why they did that and then I'd like to see the 3710 report

as appended to the DDOT report and made a part of our record.

Board Members, is that generally where you are with respect to these issues?

All right. So there's consensus on that and I think all we need to do is select the date now for some of these reports to come in to both the BZA as well as the ANC and the Applicant.

And then select a decision date.

I'm looking down at both of you -
MR. MOY: That's fine, Mr.

Chairman. I just -- just for factors in of

it, staff would suggest at least a month, but

I think the key driving force is how long DDOT

would need. I'm looking at Mr. Jackson, and

how long DDOT would need to prepare a report.

I see Mr. Jennings has already left.

The second consideration is when the ANC meets because I believe they meet the last week of the month, because if I go, let's say for scenario approach, if we give let's say a minimum of a month for DDOT to prepare

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

all the additional information the Board is requesting, that would put the Board up to October -- today is the 22nd, so that would put us up to October 20th, a Tuesday.

Let me just play with this approach and let's say if the Board gave a deadline of October 20th, the ANC would meet the following week, I believe, which would be October 28th or the 29th?

MS. ALSTON: The 28th.

MR. MOY: The 28th and without the Board to request any responses or allow the Applicant to respond at least another week or two, so that would put a decision point for the Board either November 3rd, the first week of November or November 10th which would be the second week of November.

CHAIR LOUD: I'm following you generally and that would give both the ANC and the Applicant an opportunity to respond to what was submitted by DDOT, made a part of our record and when we came on November 3rd, let's

1	say if we did that for decision, we'd have a
2	full record.
3	MR. MOY: I'd probably just give
4	just caution for additional time perhaps
5	November 10th.
6	MR. JACKSON: So a point of
7	clarification. For the DDOT submittal, you'd
8	want that by when?
9	CHAIR LOUD: Looks like October
10	20th. Is that the date we're working with?
11	Roughly 30 days from today, so we're looking
12	at October 20th.
13	MR. JACKSON: And that assumes that
14	DDOT, you just want DDOT to report how they
15	came to the conclusion they've come to based
16	on the previous report?
17	CHAIR LOUD: That's another way of
18	saying it. We want them to walk through a
19	section 706, 2302 analysis.
20	MR. JACKSON: Right.
21	CHAIR LOUD: Touching on the
22	transportation-related components of it.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	MR. JACKSON: Okay.
2	CHAIR LOUD: As well as an we
3	said on the record, an articulation of the
4	decision to utilize the 3710 Minnesota study,
5	why it was done and how it meets their
6	standards for this kind of thing and ther
7	append the 3710 study to it. So that's
8	October 20th. Then there would be a copy to
9	Planning. A copy to the ANC. A copy to the
10	Applicant and we'd be looking for the
11	Applicant to submit a response to that by
12	when, Mr. Moy?
13	MR. MOY: Well, if I understand the
14	ANC meeting, the 28th or the 29th of October,
15	the 28th being Wednesday.
16	MS. ALSTON: Yes, sir.
17	MR. MOY: Is it possible for the
18	ANC to submit a resolution or a report by the
19	end of the week?
20	MS. ALSTON: No sir, because if we
21	don't get the report, if the report isn't due

to you all until the 20th, we may not get it

1	until the 23rd or the 26th. That would give
2	us two days to review it and make a decision
3	on the 28th and have a meeting. That's not
4	feasible.
5	MR. MOY: No, my understanding is
6	they would serve, also service the ANC with a
7	copy of their the same date as they would
8	serve or submit to the Office of Zoning.
9	MS. ALSTON: Now in order for the
10	ANC to entertain it as a collective body,
11	there has to be a Single Member District
12	meeting where they would have to come to the
13	Single Member District and then based on the
14	community, it would go before the full body,
15	because the full body only supports that of
16	the community. So we're looking at having two
17	meetings, the ANC would have to have two
18	meetings before we could come up with input.
19	CHAIR LOUD: Is there a way you
20	could do both meetings on the same evening?
21	MS. ALSTON: No, sir. Our bylaws

state that you have to have a Single Member

District meeting first and once the Single Member District meeting is held, it then comes before the Committee of the Whole, which our Committee of the Whole meeting is the 28th.

Now I have to give 7-day notice to the immediate affected community, so if we don't get the reports back until the 20th, we can schedule a meeting for like the 27th or the 28th, but it would have to be the monthly meeting on the 28th. Would that allow enough time or could we like make the date the 16th which would be that Friday that they submit their report to instead of the 20th? That would give us like an extra three days to play with.

CHAIR LOUD: I'm fine with that.

As long as we can bring this to closure. The hard part is getting to where we are.

Most of what DDOT testified to has already taken place. It just sounds like they need to commit it to writing and append a copy of the report, so October 16th sounds fine.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	October 16th is the drop dead date. We're not
2	going to
3	I don't think we're going to be offering
4	any extensions beyond that. So if we can get
5	that report done the 16th, then we can move in
6	a fashion that meets the needs of the ANC and
7	the calendar for November
8	MR. JACKSON: Again, just for
9	clarification, so you want DDOT's report by
10	the 16th?
11	CHAIR LOUD: That's correct.
12	MR. JACKSON: They normally like 30
13	days, but I'll forward the request.
14	CHAIR LOUD: If you can tell them
15	in this case we've requested the 16th. I
16	think our rules allow them less than 30 days.
17	COMMISSIONER MAY: We normally like
18	to have the reports when we have the hearings.
19	
20	CHAIR LOUD: I don't know if you
21	want to go on record saying they normally like
22	30 days when the rules give them a lot less

1	time than that. But in any event, we're
2	looking at October 16th for DDOT. The ANC
3	will have a copy of that and your report
4	should be submitted to us, if you have any
5	response to it, by what date did we say,
6	October 28th? So a few days after the 28th.
7	Okay, which
8	MR. MOY: Would you prefer the end
9	of the week on that Friday or the following
10	Monday?
11	CHAIR LOUD: Excellent.
12	MR. MOY: Which would be the 2nd of
13	November which is a Monday.
14	CHAIR LOUD: Excellent. Then we'll
15	be looking for a decision on the case,
16	November 10th, if we can set it for that
17	morning. And the record is closed with
18	respect to any other submissions. No other
19	submissions will be entertained by I think the
20	Office of Zoning if they receive under our
21	rules.

MS. BAILEY: Mr. Chairman, Mr. May

asked for, I don't know if he still wants it, but he did ask for the minutes or some statement of the vote of the ANC was unanimous on this disapproval. I don't know if he still wants that or not.

CHAIR LOUD: Thank you, Ms. Bailey.

I think that's an important point. Mr. May

I think that's an important point. Mr. May had requested, just confirmation that the ANC had voted in accordance with the testimony here today and if you could just submit that, that should take you a couple of days maximum. Thank you, Ms. Bailey.

Okay, is there anything further in this case? All right. Thank you. We appreciate your time and your patience.

(Pause.)

CHAIR LOUD: Okay, Ms. Bailey, we'd like to call the next case on the morning calendar. And for those of you who are in the audience who are part of the afternoon calendar, we are running a little behind today and we're going to try our level best to make

up for some of the lost time, but we are running behind. We are running significantly behind. If it appears as though we're not going to be able to make it through all of the afternoon cases, then we'll let you know so that we can expeditiously reschedule some of them.

I know that we continue the Digital Imaging from last week it's case and understanding that it's а really straight forward case and it was a really straight it's last week. Ιf forward case still a really straight forward case, we might be able to call that case and hear it, address it, dispose of it and then go back into the case that we're going to call now. But we'll make that decision as we proceed further. We are mindful of your patience last week.

MS. BAILEY: Application 17964.

This is the application of Emory United Methodist Church and it's pursuant to 11 DCMR Section 3104.1 and 3103.2, for a variance from

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the height requirements under section 770, a variance from the floor area ratio requirements under subsection 771.2, variance from the lot occupancy requirements under section 772, a variance from the loading facility requirements under section 2201, and special exception for multiple setbacks required structures and subsections 7701.6(a), 777 and 411.11. these reliefs are to allow the construction of new building containing church, office, retail, residential and recreation uses. property is zoned C-2-A. It's located at 6100-6120 Georgia Avenue, N.W., Square 2940, Lots 801, 802, 808 and 813.

And just to clear up the record, Mr. Chairman, this project is located in ANC-4A. The ANC has responded, but there is documentation otherwise in the file, but it should be very clear that this project is located in ANC-4A. And finally, the Applicant asks that the pre-hearing statement be

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

accepted in the record. It was filed 14 days - it was not filed 14 days prior to the
hearing as required.

CHAIR LOUD: Thank you, Ms. Bailey.

good afternoon, Applicants. I know some of
the Applicants. And I just want to say good
afternoon to you, thank you for your patience.
All right.

This is a case in which I have an interest that could be deemed to be -- where impartiality might be reasonably my There are no specific rules for questioned. recusal for administrative law, officials in quasi-judicial proceedings, but the BZA looks to the rules that apply in D.C. Superior Court and they look to the ABA's Code of Judicial Conduct. The relevant section provides that a judge, in this case, BZA Commissioner shall disqualify himself or herself in a proceeding impartiality might reasonably be in which questioned and then they go on to name several different circumstances where that may happen.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

In this case, my wife is a member of the Board of Directors of the Emory Beacon of Life which is affiliated with the application in addition to which I serve as one of two persons that chair the Capital Campaign for the Instant Project and have personally invested or donated funds toward the outcome of this project. So for those reasons I am unable to remain a part of this project and I'm going to have to myself.

In my stead, Vice Chair Shane Dettman is going to chair this proceeding and this proceeding is in very capable hands.

VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think what we'd like to do now and I conferred with my colleagues is given that we're at about 20 after 1 and the Board has been at it since 9 o'clock, we are going to take a break for I think 30 minutes, colleagues? To grab a bite to eat and discuss this case a little bit and we will return, as

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	I said in 30 minutes and we can take up any
2	kind of preliminary matters, introductions and
3	party status issues that we might have.
4	Sound good? Okay. We'll see you
5	in 30 minutes.
6	(Whereupon, the above-entitled
7	matter went off the record at 1:24 p.m. and
8	resumed at 2:00 p.m.)
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	

AFTERNOON SESSION

2:02 P.M.

VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: While we're waiting for Mr. Moy to join us, I think what we can do is we can go through introductions and address some of the preliminary issues that we have. I believe there's a late filing and hopefully Mr. Moy and Ms. Bailey -- there she is, join us.

So that being said, I think we have the Applicant at the table and why don't you introduce yourself for the record.

MR. KEYS: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman. My name is George Keys. I'm counsel for the Emory United Methodist Church, the Applicant in this variance and special exception application.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	And I will be offering three
2	witnesses for the Board's consideration,
3	Reverend Joseph Daniels, pastor of Emory
4	United Methodist Church; Sean Pichon, our
5	architect; and Edward Papazian, our traffic
6	engineer.
7	As far as well, I think we
8	should probably address the preliminary matter
9	as to the late filing, because that would be
10	the next thing that I would address.
11	VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: And just
12	before we take that up, do you intend on
13	offering any of your three witnesses, your
14	architect and your traffic engineer up as
15	experts?
16	MR. KEYS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. In
17	fact, that was the contents of the
18	supplemental filing were the professional
19	resumes of both the architect and the traffic
20	engineer, who have testified before the Board
21	as experts in the past.

DETTMAN:

CHAIR

VICE

22

Okay,

1	certainly. Well, I think the late filing
2	is our Exhibit 25. As Mr. Keys has indicated,
3	there were some supplemental information.
4	There are two resumes, as well as a letter
5	from the Brightwood Community Association. Is
6	that correct, Mr. Keys?
7	MR. KEYS: That's correct, Mr.
8	Chairman.
9	VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: And then the
10	traffic impact study?
11	MR. KEYS: And the traffic study.
12	As well as information that the Office of
13	Planning suggested that the Applicant put
14	forward to facilitate the Board's
15	consideration of the case.
16	VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: And that's the
17	determination of Measuring Point and the other
18	stuff?
19	MR. KEYS: Correct.
20	VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Well, unless
21	there's anything that you have to add, other
22	than what's on your cover letter, I think that

1	we can address the preliminary matter right
2	now. You had mentioned that yourself were
3	unexpectedly hospitalized?
4	MR. KEYS: That's correct.
5	VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Following a
6	conference call on September 2, 2009. Counsel
7	was not released from the hospital until the
8	evening of September 9th. Anything other than
9	that?
10	MR. KEYS: That's all. I mean it
11	just backed up my workload and made it
12	difficult for me to meet deadlines. In fact,
13	by the time I was released, I had already
14	missed a deadline for filing the supplemental
15	information.
16	VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Okay.
17	Colleagues, any questions for the Applicant
18	with respect to this matter? No.
19	Well, we can do this by consensus
20	of the Board. I think our rule 3100.5 allows
21	us to waive the prehearing submission
22	requirement, which I believe is 14 days. I

1	think that good cause has been shown. I don't
2	see that there's any prejudice to any party to
3	the case. So I'm inclined to waiving our
4	rules and allowing it into the record. Okay.
5	Let the record show that we're allowing
6	Exhibit 25 which is the supplemental
7	information and the traffic study into the
8	record.
9	So that being said, we now have
10	their resumes of your expert witnesses.
11	And colleagues, if we could just
12	take a moment and look at the resumes for Mr.
13	Sean Pichon and Edward Papazian, is that
14	correct?
15	MR. KEYS: That's correct.
16	VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Colleagues,
17	any issues with allowing them, qualifying them
18	as expert witnesses to this proceeding? No.
19	Mr. Pichon and Mr. Papazian, have
20	you testified before the Board of the Zoning
21	Commission in prior cases before?

MR. PICHON: Yes.

1	VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Okay, why
2	don't you come up here and join us? I think
3	they can be allowed as expert witnesses.
4	Ms. Bailey or Mr. Moy, does that
5	take care of any of the other preliminary
6	matters that we have before the Board?
7	MS. BAILEY: It does, Mr. Chairman.
8	MR. KEYS: Mr. Chairman, there are
9	two additional matters. One, just a minor
10	housekeeping matter. When the witnesses were
11	sworn at the beginning of today's hearing, Mr.
12	Pichon was not present and he would need to be
13	sworn before his testimony.
14	VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Okay, why
15	don't we do that right now then?
16	MS. BAILEY: Would you please stand
17	and raise your right hand? Do you solemnly
18	swear or affirm that the testimony that you
19	will be giving today will be the truth, the
20	whole truth, and nothing but the truth? Thank
21	you.

VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Mr. Keys, you

had a second?

MR. KEYS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. With the Board's indulgence, you were probably aware that at 8:05 this morning there was a fax received by the Board in this case from the National Park Service, specifically from Adrian Coleman, the superintendent of Rock Creek Park. This is a new definition of last minute.

And because of that, I think it's incumbent on me to ensure that my client has an impartial and fair hearing to ask the Board permission to ask questions of Mr. May, who is an employee of the National Park Service, concerning his personal knowledge of this communication or matters relating to it.

VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Okay, and so what you're requesting of us is for you to just perhaps ask Mr. May a couple of question with respect to his knowledge?

MR. KEYS: A brief voir dire as to what his knowledge may be.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: I don't see
2	any harm in that.
3	MR. KEYS: Thank you. Mr. May,
4	were you aware of this letter dated, September
5	3rd, 2009 prior to its being filed in the
6	record this morning?
7	COMMISSIONER MAY: I was aware that
8	there was a letter as of yesterday. When I
9	asked the question of the within the
10	regional office whether anyone had was
11	aware that this case was happening, whether
12	anyone was testifying. And I was told there
13	was a letter. And I was told it would be
14	faxed in today. Prior to that time, I was not
15	aware of the existence of the letter or any
16	discussions of the case.
17	MR. KEYS: Then certainly you did
18	not assist in its preparation?
19	COMMISSIONER MAY: Absolutely not.
20	MR. KEYS: Have you engaged in any
21	discussion with employees of the National Park
22	Service concerning the Emory United Methodist

2	COMMISSIONER MAY: Just to the
3	extent that I just mentioned, whether the Park
4	had been involved in this case. I asked the
5	question whether they had been involved, what
6	they had done, and they said there was a
7	letter and they said they would fax it.
8	MR. KEYS: You did not know the
9	contents of the letter?
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: No, I did not.
11	MR. KEYS: You didn't know whether
12	the letter was favorable or unfavorable?
13	COMMISSIONER MAY: I did not know
14	what the letter said at all.
15	MR. KEYS: Have you spoken with
16	Adrian Coleman or do you know Adrian
17	Coleman?
18	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
19	MR. KEYS: Have you spoken with
20	Adrian Coleman concerning the Emory United
21	Methodist Church application?
22	COMMISSIONER MAY: I asked her

Church application?

1	she was the one I asked whether the Park had
2	been engaged and that was yesterday at the
3	regional office.
4	MR. KEYS: Did she say anything to
5	you regarding the contents of her letter?
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: No.
7	MR. KEYS: Thank you, Mr. May.
8	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay.
9	VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Mr. Keys, do
LO	you have any other questions for Mr. May? I
L1	don't believe you do. Or any other matters
L2	that we need to take up as a preliminary
L3	matter?
L4	MR. KEYS: Mr. Chairman, could I
L5	ask for a minute to speak with my client?
L6	VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Certainly.
L7	MR. KEYS: Thank you.
L8	(Pause.)
L9	VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Mr. Keys?
20	MR. KEYS: Mr. Chairman, I would
21	respectfully like to move that we postpone
22	this hearing and postpone it until we can have

1	a member of the Zoning Commission join the
2	panel that's not connected with the National
3	Park Service. And my concern is the last
4	minute nature of this document being filed and
5	the timing of Mr. May's conversation with
6	Adrian Coleman who wrote the letter which was
7	yesterday.
8	VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: So am I
9	interpreting you correctly that you are
10	actually making a formal motion?
11	MR. KEYS: Yes, I am.
12	VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: For recusal of
13	Mr. May?
14	MR. KEYS: Mr. Chairman, yes.
15	VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: And your
16	request was to actually postpone this simply
17	just to have a different Zoning Commissioner
18	sit on this case?
19	MR. KEYS: That's correct, Mr.
20	Chairman.
21	VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Well, let me
22	just ask a couple of questions. I know that
	NEAL D. CDOSS

essentially to allege a bias in a particular proceeding, you have to facts and just based on the question and answer that you had with Mr. May, Mr. May has indicated that he had no prior knowledge to the content of the letter. He only spoke with Ms. Coleman yesterday, to inquire whether or not the National Service weigh was going to in on particular case as an adjacent property owner.

What other facts go towards support, the fact that your belief that Mr.
May cannot be unbiased in this proceeding?

MR. KEYS: I don't have evidence of personal bias. And I'm not sure that's necessary standard. May has knowledge Mr. before this document was part of the record. if T'm not even sure Mr. May's inquiry prompted the inclusion of this document in the record. I am just concerned having a member National Service judge of the Park application when the National Park Service has written the letter opposing the application,

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

especially in the circumstances where the Board has only three Members considering it.

VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Let me ask you this then, I know you have requested for a continuance until we get a different Zoning Commission Member on the case. I'm not certain that the Board Members participating in this hearing can just require or request the Zoning Commission to send a different Member. He's here by way of his position on the Zoning Commission and they sign up for a particular date.

So we can either what you've told us so far and the Board can deliberate and decide your motion for recusal right now or as I think you've suggested put off the hearing, allow you to file a formal motion on paper, documenting the facts that you think support the reasons why Mr. May cannot be unbiased in this proceeding and then we can schedule this at a later date and decide the motion then.

And let me just refer, as you're

# NEAL R. GROSS

1	conferring with your client, let me ask OAG to
2	weigh in if that's an appropriate way to
3	handle this motion.
4	MS. GLAZER: I think it would be a
5	good idea for the Board to perhaps recess and
6	discuss it and for the Applicant to make a
7	formal motion for recusal and the Board would
8	take it up at a later date?
9	VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Okay, well,
10	let's take a five-minute recess and discuss
11	this and we'll come back.
12	(Whereupon, the above-entitled
13	matter went off the record at 2:17 p.m. and
14	resumed at 2:26 p.m.)
15	VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Back on the
16	record and the Board has discussed this matter
17	and I think Mr. May you wanted to make a
18	statement?
19	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, thank you
20	very much, Mr. Chairman.
21	First of all, let me say I have
22	absolutely no doubt that I'm in a position

representing the Zoning Commission and representing the Park Service on the Zoning Commission. I have no doubt that I can look at this case and evaluate it and make a decision on it based solely on the record in an unbiased fashion.

However, I will also say that in

the interest of moving things along in as uncomplicated a manner as possible, I'm also happy enough to step aside and let someone else from the Zoning Commission take my seat on this case and then decide it for the Board.

With that, I'm happy to recuse myself and help things move along.

VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Thank you, Mr. May. So I guess that being said and that leaves two of us, we need to find another date. And I think we looked at the calendar.

Is the ANC here actually? ANC is not. I think we've looked at the calendar and we identified a date of December 15th which is the earliest date that we have. If that works

1	for you, we can put you in there or if you
2	need a little bit more time.
3	MR. KEYS: Mr. Chairman, December
4	15th would be fine with us. Morning or
5	afternoon, do you know?
6	VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Mr. Moy?
7	MR. MOY: Afternoon would be
8	preferable at 1 o'clock.
9	MR. KEYS: Is that first in the
10	afternoon?
11	MR. MOY: First in the afternoon,
12	sir.
13	VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: And Mr. Keys,
14	I know that just to kind of keep the record
15	very clean, you had made a formal motion of
16	recusal. Mr. May has recused himself at this
17	time. We can say that the motion is now moot
18	or you can formally withdraw your motion?
19	MR. KEYS: I will under the
20	circumstances withdraw the motion.
21	VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Okay. Mr.
22	Moy, any other matters that we need to address

1	before we move on for the day?
2	MR. MOY: This Board's action would
3	conclude the morning session of the 22nd.
4	VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Very well.
5	We'll see you on December 15th.
6	MR. KEYS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
7	(Pause.)
8	VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: I think we're
9	going to just break for five minutes. We're
10	going to enter the afternoon session. We're
11	going to go find the Chairman, wherever he may
12	have wandered off to and I think the first
13	case, Mr. Moy, is the Digital Imaging case?
14	MR. MOY: That's correct, sir.
15	VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Great. So
16	we'll adjourn until then.
17	(Whereupon, the above-entitled
18	matter went off the record at 2:29 p.m. and
19	resumed at 2:46 p.m.)
20	CHAIR LOUD: This hearing will
21	please come to order.
22	Good afternoon, ladies and

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

gentlemen. This is the September 22nd public
hearing of the Board of Zoning Adjustment of
the District of Columbia. My name is Marc
Loud, Chairperson. Joining me today are Vice
Chair Shane Dettman to my left; to my right,
representing the National Capital Planning
Commission, Mr. Conrad Slater; to his right,
representing the Zoning Commission, to my
left, Ms. Meridith Moldenhauer representing a
Mayoral appointee for the Board; Mr. Clifford
Moy, Secretary of BZA; Sherry Glazer, from the
Office of Attorney General; and on my far
left, Ms. Beverley Bailey, Zoning Specialist
in the Office of Zoning.

Copies of today's hearing agenda are available to you and located to my left in the wall bin near the door.

Please be that this aware proceeding is being recorded by a court webcast live. reporter and is also Accordingly, we must ask you to refrain from disruptive actions in the any noises or

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

hearing room. When presenting information to the Board, please turn on and speak into the microphone, first stating your name and home address. When you are finished speaking, please turn your microphone off so that your microphone is no longer picking up sound or background noise.

All persons planning to testify, either in favor or in opposition are to fill out two witness cards. These cards are located to my left on the table near the door and on the witness tables. Upon coming forward to the Board, please give both cards to the reporter sitting to my right.

The order for procedure for special exceptions and variances is statement and witnesses of the Applicant; Government reports Office including the of Planning, the Department of Public Works, etcetera; the the ANC; parties or report of persons support; parties or persons in opposition; and finally, closing remarks only the bу

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Applicant.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Pursuant to Sections 3117.4 and 3117.5, the following time constraints will be maintained: the Applicant, Appellant, persons and parties except in ANC in support including witnesses, 60 minutes collectively; Appellees, persons and parties except in ANC in opposition, including witnesses, 60 minutes collectively; individuals, three minutes.

These time restraints do not cross examination and/or questions include the Board. examination from Cross witnesses is permitted by the Applicant or The ANC within which the parties only. property is located is automatically a party in a special exception or variance case. Nothing prevents from the Board placing reasonable restrictions on cross examination, including time limits and limits on the scope of cross examination.

The record will be closed at the conclusion of each case, except for any

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

material specifically requested by the Board.

The Board and staff will specify at the end of the hearing exactly what is expected and the date when the persons must submit the evidence to the Office of Zoning.

After the record is closed, no other information will be accepted by the Board. The Sunshine Act requires that the public hearing on each case be held in the open before the public.

The Board may, consistent with the rules and procedure and the Act, enter executive session during or after the public hearing on a case for purposes of reviewing a record or deliberating on the case.

The decision of the Board in these contested cases must be based exclusively on the public record. To avoid any appearance to the contrary the Board requests that persons present not engage the Members of the Board in conversation.

Please turn off all beepers and

## NEAL R. GROSS

cell phones at this time so as not to disrupt these proceedings.

The Board will make every effort to public conclude the hearing near as possible to 6 p.m. today. If the afternoon cases are not completed by 6 p.m., the Board will assess whether it can complete pending case or cases remaining on the agenda and more than likely we will continue whatever cases are being heard at that time to the first available date after today.

The Board will now consider any preliminary matters. Preliminary matters are those which relate to whether a case will or should be heard today, such as requests for postponement, continuance, or withdrawal or whether proper and adequate notice of the hearing has been given.

If you're not prepared to go forward with a case this afternoon, or if you believe the Board should not proceed, now is the time to raise such a matter.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	Does the staff have any preliminary
2	matters?
3	MS. BAILEY: Mr. Chairman, good
4	afternoon.
5	CHAIR LOUD: Good afternoon.
6	MS. BAILEY: Yes. Application
7	17932, M. Sikder, that application was
8	withdrawn, Mr. Chairman.
9	CHAIR LOUD: Thank you, Ms. Bailey.
LO	I appreciate that. And if there are no
L1	additional preliminary matters, we can proceed
L2	with the individuals wishing to testify.
L3	Please rise to take the oath and
L4	Ms. Bailey would administer that oath to you.
L5	And that would include witnesses for any
L6	cases this afternoon, not just this first
L7	case.
L8	MS. BAILEY: Please raise your
L9	right hand. Do you solemnly swear or affirm
20	that the testimony that you will be giving
21	today will be the truth, the whole truth, and
22	nothing but the truth?

(The witnesses were sworn.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MS. BAILEY: Thank you.

CHAIR LOUD: Let me just see before you call the first case. I think there were five witnesses who stood total and I wanted to get a sense of how many of these witnesses are going to be for the first case which is Imaging? Okay, Digital and the that stood, how witnesses many of witnesses, just raise your hand if you are for the D.C. Library case. And if you are for the Central Union case?

Thank you.

Okay, Ms. Bailey, would you like to call the first case?

MS. BAILEY: Mr. Chairman, it's Application 17961, Center for Digital Imaging Arts at Boston University. It's pursuant to 11 DCMR Section 3104.1 and 3013.2, for a variance from the off-street parking requirements under subsection 2101.1, and a special exception for a private trade school

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	under section 912, at premises 1055 Thomas
2	Jefferson Street, N.W. The property is zoned
3	W-3. It's also known as Square 1191, Lot 71.
4	Members of the Board, I place
5	before you a document that was filed today.
6	The title is "Existing Conditions." So
7	everyone should have a copy of that.
8	CHAIR LOUD: Thank you, Ms. Bailey.
9	Is the ANC in this case present? Okay.
10	Why don't we turn to you, Mr.
11	Aguglia, to introduce yourself and the members
12	of your team?
13	MR. AGUGLIA: Thank you, Chairman
14	Loud and fellow Board Members. My name is
15	Richard Aguglia. I'm with the law firm of
16	Hunton & Williams, 1900 K Street, N.W. in
17	Washington. My home address is 15400
18	Carrollton Road, Rockville, Maryland.
19	I will do my best to try to keep
20	our
21	case to 30 minutes.
22	With me today is Robert Frazier.

He is the vice president of the school and assisting me is Nicole Selemno from Hunton & Williams.

Today, we're here before you to ask for a special exception for a school under Section 912, as well as a special exception for parking under Section 2108 where we meet the minimum 75 percent threshold.

In the event there's some issues there, I'll hold in abeyance my request for a variance, but I don't think we're going to have to get there.

I'm going to give you some very quick background through our Power Point presentation and then I'm going to say how we meet the various tests and then conclude.

All right, as you'll see from the screen, this is a slightly unusual case. Applicant has already had this teaching facility in Georgetown for the last year and a half. When the Applicant applied additional administrative offices for

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

teaching facility, the Zoning Administrator said what school? I did not know there was a school here. And it turned out that the school had a Certificate of Occupancy for a business use. I was then engaged as counsel and I wanted just to show you the background here.

If you see the screen, this is the first page of their building plans. see that the school clearly was identified as a university, that the middle part that's mezzanine level, it circled, the clearly showed numerous lecture rooms with one administrative office space. building For code purposes, I don't know why, but for building code purposes, all universities are listed as a business use under the building code. So the school used an outside expediter who obtained for them а Certificate Occupancy as a business use which is matter of right.

Of course, for zoning purposes,

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that was not correct. It should have been issued a Certificate of Occupancy as a teaching facility which requires this Board's approval. So that's why we're here today.

If you would go to the first picture, the property is in Georgetown at 1055 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W. If you look north, it would be M Street. If you come down south, that would be K Street.

Here's a picture known as the Foundry Building. There's a picture of the entrance to the building. The building was built in the late '70s. There's another unique situation in that it's not asking to build the facility. It is in the basement of an existing facility.

So as you walk down to the mezzanine level, across this path, next picture, you will walk through some doors and then you'll walk through another set of doors. That is the entrance to the school and you may recognize this if you were a movie fan.

This used to be the Foundry Movie Theater.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

If you go to the next picture, you'll see here are -- there's one of nine You'll see the students there at classrooms. their desk with their computers. This another sample classroom. There are nine classrooms and one studio. Here is studio. So one of the classrooms is always empty when they go into the studio, so there's never more than nine active rooms classrooms in the space.

Here is the backside of the building on 30th Street and that's the parking entrance, so if you were coming down K Street, you would turn right on 30th Street to access the parking in the rear of the building. If you went one more street, you'd come up Thomas Jefferson and turn right if you wanted to drop something off in front of the school.

Here is another picture of the 30th Street entrance to the parking. And if you notice, in the middle back of the picture,

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

that is a bridge that is under construction and as a result, there's very little traffic on that street, other than traffic accessing the various buildings on that street, because it's not a through street. I think it's going to be out of commission for a few years until the bridge is finally constructed.

There is the bridge construction.

I'm sorry the picture is so dark, but I was trying to get a closer picture of it, but the bridge is closed off and it is not a through street.

Here's the underground parking for the facility. Here is a picture of Thomas Jefferson Street facing north towards M Street. You can see the various parking signs.

Go back to that one picture for a minute. So you can see that there's no parking along the Tow Path. And there's one hour parking as you're looking from the school going north towards M Street.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

Here is the same street, Thomas

Jefferson Street looking south towards K

Street. And you can see that there is metered

parking, but it is definitely filled.

Here is Thomas Jefferson Street again on the opposite side of the street facing M Street with various metered parking.

And then the same side of the street looking down towards K Street with metered parking.

There's also a parking facility right across the street from the Foundry Building. That's in the building opposite on Thomas Jefferson Street.

Also, as part of our presentation today, I wanted to indicate that there is tremendous public transportation to this site. The Circulator bus which I take, I think it's District a tremendous resource to the Columbia for a dollar from downtown through Georgetown, so there's а picture of Circulator bus. This bus stop is right at M and Thomas Jefferson Street. Street It's

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

right at the top of the hill. It's less than a half a block walk from the school and the Circulator bus stops there.

Also, the Metro bus -- you can see, the blue, white, and red sign at the top of the pole is for the WMATA buses and below it is also a stop for the Georgetown Connection subway. You can access -- that bus services from three different subway stops, Rosslyn, Dupont Circle, and Foggy Bottom. So if you're taking the subway, you can take the Georgetown Connection bus and easily make it into the school and that's one of the routes that the students' takes.

Again, that's just another picture of the same bus stop right at the top of M Street and Thomas Jefferson.

So that concludes our Power Point presentation.

I also wanted to make one other observation that when Mr. LeGrant, when I was engaged and approached Mr. LeGrant about

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

getting a temporary Certificate of Occupancy for a year within which we had to come to you and get your approval, Mr. LeGrant was very in that the building had to be meticulous totally -- their facility in the building had to be totally reinspected. So it was reinspected for fire, mechanical, electrical, and structural. So that was all redone at great cost to the owner and the tenant because of the issue that was involved that they had an improper Certificate of Occupancy.

And in fact, the occupancy load for that space, remember, it was a movie theater, it was 556 and that was on the first page of the Power Point presentation. And we're at about 20 percent of that. So we're well under that. So of course, it was a movie theater in a brick building. It's soundproof which is another one of the issues that we need to meet for our special exception approval.

Now Mr. Frazier is going to talk very briefly about the curriculum of the

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

school and its practicum		school	and	its	practicum
--------------------------	--	--------	-----	-----	-----------

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Mr. Frazier, would you turn on your microphone and please identify yourself?

MR. FRAZIER: Yes. My name is Robert Frazier, and I reside at 59 Oak Hill Road in Southborough, Massachusetts. Thank you for having us here today.

teach We at our center different programs. teach digital We photography, digital filmmaking, animation, graphic and web design and And the programs run anywhere development. from 9 to approximately 18 months. Our fulltime students are in school from 8:30 to 4:30 five days a week, Monday through Friday. that takes them approximately just under nine And our evening students go months. nights a week, 6:30 to 9:30, and every other Saturday from 8:30 to 4:30 and that takes them about 18 to 20 months.

At the end of the program, the students also do a practicum with a local or

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

national nonprofit where they actually work
with the nonprofit as a client and through
that produce either a portfolio, they'll
redesign websites. We've done work here
locally for the D.C. Public Schools, the
National Housing Trust. We've done work for
Project Smith and we did a film for I believe
it was Habitat for Humanity. That's a few of
them. So that's a key part of the school as
well.

MR. AGUGLIA: All right, Mr. Frazier, I'm going to point out to you that the ANC has written a letter in support of our application with three conditions and I wanted you to address them very briefly before the Board.

One was ANC-2E endorsed the application with a parking cap of seven onstreet cars. I'll step outside of that letter for a minute and say that they were talking about metered parking.

Could you please advise the Board

# NEAL R. GROSS

what steps you are taking to try to limit the number of metered parking used by students?

MR. FRAZIER: Well, first of all, we tell our students at orientation that there is no street parking with meters. That they should be using public transportation parking in our parking garage. We're arranging with our landlord a discounted rate for our students as well.

The day students, it's logistically impossible for them to even park on the street because they are in school for eight hours. They'd have to be running out every hour to two hours and moving their car and it would probably cost them about the same as if they parked in the garage. And our evening students, it's the same thing. They'd have to be outside doing that and we have a discounted rate that we have with our landlord for the students so it makes more sense for them to park in the garage.

MR. AGUGLIA: Mr. Frazier, a second

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	condition that the ANC was seeking was to
2	encourage the use of Smart Benefits for
3	employees. I'll step outside of that again
4	and what they're looking for is pre-taxed
5	deductions for employees who use public
6	transportation. Would the school make that
7	available to its employees?
8	MR. FRAZIER: Yes, we're in the
9	process of doing that now.
10	MR. AGUGLIA: And the third and
11	last condition was the ANC wanted to review
12	"the plans again in the fall of 2010." Does
13	the school have any objection to meeting with
14	the ANC on an annual basis to ensure that the
15	parking requirements of the zoning regulations
16	are met?
17	MR. FRAZIER: No, we don't.
18	MR. AGUGLIA: All right, so I would
19	like then to read briefly the test under
20	Section 912 for private schools and trade
21	school as a special exception in the W-3 Zone.
22	The facility shall be designed to

visual enhance the and recreational opportunities offered by the waterfront. course, as I've explained, this is a unique situation where the building has already been We're in the lower mezzanine of the built. building, so our answer to this is somewhat But I would say that the building was built in the '70s and the brick architectural style of Georgetown and would meet that definition if it had to.

The next point is the use shall be designed and located so that it is not likely to become objectionable because of noise, traffic, number of students other or conditions. The school has been in operation now for two years, a year and a half before a Certificate of the issue came up about Occupancy. There's been no complaints that we know of of noise. Again, it's in an old movie theater in the basement of a brick building and sound proof. There is sufficient parking the basement of the building accessed in

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

through 30th Street as I showed which is now not a through street.

It has a limited number of students. Right number the maximum number of

students who can be in the school at any one

12 students is 108, far below what would be

time is 108. So that's nine classrooms times

8 there in a commercial office setting which

would be an occupancy load of 556.

1

2

3

4

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

So I believe that we meet the special exception test for the use of this facility for a private school.

I then wanted to turn, with your permission, please, to the special exception for the parking. And Ms. Bailey has passed out something I filed with her this morning called "Existing Conditions."

If you have a copy of that, the student test is one for each ten classroom seats. There are no stadium or auditorium seats. So there are nine classroom times 12 seats per classroom, 108 seats divided by 10,

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

I'm come up with 11 parking spots for the students.

I've attached the regulations in the St. Patrick's case that Mr. Dettman alluded to at our last hearing. Two for each three teachers employed at any one period during the day or night. Now the test for universities revolves around students and teachers. It does not revolve around employees.

If you will note from Section 20101 the very page after my analysis, is after synopsis, while there my are requirements for other employees for parking for elementary, junior high, high school, preelementary, there is none for colleges other institutions, including a business trade school. Ιt goes to teachers students, but not other employees.

So under that test, I've got nine teachers maximum at any one time, one per classroom and I come up with six. I come up

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

with a total of 17; total students, 11; total teachers, 6, 17 total times 75 percent is 13 parking spaces. And I'm relying on Section 2118.3 which is the third page of my analysis for the proposition that you count just the number of people who would be there at any one period during the day or night. So whether or not that person teaching is a full-time or a part-time teacher, I counted that as one. But again the test is how many are there at any one time?

So we have leased 12 parking spaces. Twelve parking spaces came with their lease of the facility in order to meet the 75 percent test, we would lease one other space and then ask you for approval under Section 2108 for the 75 percent minimum threshold.

Section 2108 basically focuses on the proximity to public transportation including rail stations Metro and the availability of other public transportation in And I think we've shown that. the area. We

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

have significant public transportation. And I've also provided a transportation study that we did among the students. Only 28 percent of the students drive. Sixty-one percent take public transportation. Others arrive at other methods, for instance, they might be dropped off in a car pool by a parent, but don't drive themselves or park there.

There's no congestion to access the parking facility from 30th Street. There's obviously a lot of parking on Thomas Jefferson itself, metered parking, Street but the I think the purpose of this purpose -particular special exception is met because no one is in favor of more traffic in Georgetown. The public transportation make more we available and the less cars on the street, I think is what -- certainly what we feel is appropriate for the students given limited budget.

Certainly, the ANC would like to see less traffic in Georgetown and I think we

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

meet the parameters of the special exception for the 75 percent threshold.

The last point I wanted to make is you'll see on the bottom half of the first page of the analysis, future conditions. The school would like to lease two or three more classrooms under which, of course, our 75 percent threshold would increase and it would increase under the scenario that I put forth there to 17 parking spaces, again at the 75 percent threshold.

So I thought that -- we think that the ANC's idea that they monitor our situation next year is a good one. And if the Board wanted to monitor situation and have a report back, we would also do that, just to ensure that we were always at the 75 percent threshold.

So it's a good checks and balance for the Board for the ANC and the school wants to be a good neighbor. But at the same time the school wants to afford as much public

1	transportation to its student with as limited
2	a budget as possible.
3	So that's our basic presentation.
4	And we're available for questions.
5	CHAIR LOUD: Thank you, Mr.
6	Aguglia. Let me turn to Board Members now and
7	see if there are questions for you and/or your
8	witnesses.
9	MEMBER SCHLATER: I have a quick
10	question. Those parking spaces that are
11	currently leased, the 12 parking spaces, how
12	are they used or apportioned right now?
13	MR. FRAZIER: With staff right now.
14	CHAIR LOUD: Thank you, Mr.
15	Schlater. Follow up?
16	MEMBER SCHLATER: I just want to
17	clarify one other thing. In the pre-hearing
18	statement it said there were 140 students at
19	any given time and in your testimony, you said
20	108 students at any given time, maximum. I
21	just wanted to clarify which one it was.
22	MR. AGUGLIA: A point well taken.

1	Currently, with all the classrooms filled 12
2	times 9, 108, with teachers and staff, it
3	might reach as much as 120, 125. I wanted to
4	make it broad. Plus the school wants to
5	expand. So I would say under present
6	conditions, a maximum 140, if you took
7	everybody, whether or not they were full or
8	part-time, there or not. And then I think it
9	would be closer to 160 if they leased two or
10	three more classrooms and brought in a couple
11	more teachers.
12	MEMBER SCHLATER: So if you did
13	lease these additional classrooms, you would
14	then lease four more spaces on top of that and
15	you would go from 13 to 17, is that the idea?
16	MR. AGUGLIA: Correct. We would
17	never fall below the 75 percent threshold.
18	MEMBER SCHLATER: I have no further
19	questions.
20	CHAIR LOUD: Thank you, Mr.
21	Schlater. Any additional questions from the
22	Board? There appear not be any, at least at

this time. So why don't we turn now to the Office of Planning for its report. And if Board Members have some questions of you or your witnesses later, we can return back to you.

Good afternoon.

Good afternoon, Mr. MR. MORDFIN: Chair, and Members of the Board. I'm Stephen Mordfin with the Office of Planning. The subject application is in conformance with the criteria for the granting of special exception to permit a trade school because more than 140 students would be one, no expected to be on site at any one time and the school is located within а brick office building in a space originally constructed as a movie theater.

Two, almost two-thirds of the students and ten percent of the faculty do not drive to the site and the building has extensive parking available. And three, the hours of operation are typically of what would

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

otherwise be expected of an office or business within the building or surrounding area.

Therefore, the use is not likely to become objectionable and the Office of Planning recommends approval of the request to permit a trade school.

The subject application is also in conformance with the criteria for the granting of a special exception to reduce off-street parking by 24 percent because the subject building has a surplus of approximately 200 off-street parking spaces. The maximum number of students and faculty expected to be on site at any one time is 140. A maximum of 38 percent of the students are expected to drive to the site. The building was designed to accommodate a movie theater that no longer exists and the requested parking reduction is for four spaces only. And the site is located within close proximity to eight bus lines.

Therefore, the Office of Planning recommends approval of the special exception

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	request to reduce the amount of required off-
2	street parking by 24 percent. Thank you.
3	CHAIR LOUD: Thank you, Mr.
4	Mordfin. Does the Applicant have any
5	questions for the Office of Planning?
6	MR. AGUGLIA: No.
7	CHAIR LOUD: You've seen that
8	report?
9	MR. AGUGLIA: Yes.
10	CHAIR LOUD: Board Members, are
11	there any questions? Okay.
12	Just in terms of your interaction
12 13	Just in terms of your interaction with the community, was there any feedback
13	with the community, was there any feedback
13	with the community, was there any feedback from the community, any issues that you
13 14 15	with the community, was there any feedback from the community, any issues that you learned of in your outreach?
13 14 15 16	with the community, was there any feedback from the community, any issues that you learned of in your outreach?  MR. MORDFIN: I did contact the
13 14 15 16	with the community, was there any feedback from the community, any issues that you learned of in your outreach?  MR. MORDFIN: I did contact the ANC, however, they never did respond to me.
13 14 15 16 17	with the community, was there any feedback from the community, any issues that you learned of in your outreach?  MR. MORDFIN: I did contact the ANC, however, they never did respond to me.  CHAIR LOUD: But subsequent to that
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	with the community, was there any feedback from the community, any issues that you learned of in your outreach?  MR. MORDFIN: I did contact the ANC, however, they never did respond to me.  CHAIR LOUD: But subsequent to that there's been an ANC report that's been made a

spoke to that earlier. Okay. If there are no Board questions for OP, we would now turn to the ANC which is not here, but as Mr. Aguglia indicated had submitted had ANC-2E had submitted a report, late, but they did submit a report. And the report was in favor of the application with the conditions that earlier, the Aquqlia spoke to conditions. And Ι believe the Applicant testified to being in support of all three of those conditions. Is that correct?

MR. FRAZIER: Yes.

CHAIR LOUD: Okay. All right, so why don't we now move on to parties or persons that would be in support of the application. If you're in the audience, now would be the time to come up. Seeing none, parties or persons that would be in opposition to the application, if you're in the audience now would be the time to come up. And you will be given three minutes. Seeing none, as well, we turn now back to the Applicant for closing

## NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

remarks.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. AGUGLIA: I believe we met the special exception test for both the school as well as parking and I would ask the Board to approve both.

CHAIR LOUD: thank you, Mr. Aguglia. I thank your witnesses as well. think where we are now is that we probably full record have а and we can probably deliberate on your application today.

MR. AGUGLIA: Thank you.

CHAIR LOUD: And so why don't we start with the deliberation and I'll turn to Mr. Dettman to get us started.

VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd be happy to take the Board through the relevant provisions. And I don't even think -- I mean the case is relatively straight forward and I don't think we actually line through need to qo line bу provision. application for It's an location of a trade school or private school

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

pursuant to Section 912, located in a waterfront zone, a W-3 zone to be exact, as well as parking reduction, to reduce the required number of parking by as much as 25 percent.

I think given the information that's in the record and the testimony that was provided today, I think the Applicant does meet the relevant provisions of 912 as well as what is it, the special exception criteria for the parking reduction, Section 2108.

Quickly, with respect to 912, the Applicant testified to, the school has been in operation for one and a half to two It's located in a mezzanine, kind of a basement level of an existing building which so therefore the built in the 1970s, facility is not going to have any kind of detrimental effect on the visual qualities of the waterfront area and the Georgetown area and it would comply with 912.2 which would recreational enhance the visual and

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

opportunities in the area.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Given the relative small size of the school, and that the site is well served by public transportation, it does not appear that the facility will have any kind of objectionable impact with respect to noise, traffic, number of students, and any other conditions as required by 912.3.

And let me quickly just check in with Chapter 21, Section 2108 to make sure that we cover all of our bases here.

In order for the Board to grant a parking reduction of up to 25 percent, pursuant to 2108, the Board needs to give consideration to number of things а articulated in 2108.3 and I think I'll rely upon the Office of Planning's report with respect to those provisions and say that the provisions of 2108 are met.

And with that, Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to make a motion in favor of the application.

CHAIR LOUD: Thank you, Mr. Dettman, that was an excellent recap of the evidence. I think all I would add, nothing necessarily different than what you said, but to incorporate the ANC support of the project, their great weight report which was submitted to us, based on the meeting they held on August 31 and their articulation of three conditions for their support, all of which the Applicant has agreed to. So I think when you do state your motion to the extent it's a conditioned by the ANC's as concerns, that would capture everything.

VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: I'll move approval of Application No. 17961 pursuant to 11 DCMR 3104.1. I have the old advertised language, so let me muddle through it here, Mr. Chairman.

Pursuant to 11 DCMR 3104.1 for a special exception for a trade school under Section 912, as well as a parking reduction pursuant to Section 2108, located in a W-3 District, at

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	premises 1055 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W.
2	as conditioned.
3	CHAIR LOUD: Thank you, Mr.
4	Dettman. I second the motion. The motion has
5	been made and seconded. Is there further
6	deliberation?
7	Hearing none, all those in favor say aye.
8	(Chorus of ayes.)
9	CHAIR LOUD: All those who are
10	opposed? Are there any abstentions?
11	Ms. Bailey, can you read back the
12	vote for us, please?
13	MS. BAILEY: Sure, Mr. Chairman.
14	The Board has voted 4-0-1, granting special
15	exception relief from Sections 2108 and 912.
16	The motion was made by Mr. Dettman, seconded
17	by Mr. Loud. Ms. Moldenhauer and Commissioner
18	Schlater supports the motion.
19	CHAIR LOUD: Thank you, Ms. Bailey.
20	Thank you, Applicants, appreciate your
21	patience this afternoon and indeed for it
22	being continued an extra week.

1	I believe this one we can do a
2	summary decision on?
3	MS. BAILEY: Yes, it is, Mr.
4	Chairman.
5	CHAIR LOUD: And how would that
6	work with respect to the conditions that were
7	agreed to?
8	MS. BAILEY: We will include them
9	as a part of the order, list them as part of
LO	the order.
L1	CHAIR LOUD: Okay, so we'll have a
L2	summary decision on it.
L3	MR. AGUGLIA: Thank you. Let the
L4	record reflect that my Power Point did not go
15	over time, Ms. Loud.
L6	CHAIR LOUD: But you promised
L7	exactly 30 minutes.
L8	Is there anything further, Ms.
L9	Bailey, on this case?
20	MS. BAILEY: No, Mr. Chairman, not
21	for this case.
22	CHAIR LOUD: Thank you. And again,

1 thank you. And you can call the next case 2 when you're ready, Ms. Bailey. MS. BAILEY: Application 17993 of 3 D.C. Public Library. It's pursuant to 11 DCMR 4 Section 3103.2, for a variance from the off-5 street parking requirements under subsection 6 7 2101.1, to allow the construction of a new full-service Tenley-Friendship neighborhood 8 library at premises 4450 Wisconsin Avenue, 9 10 N.W., Square 1729, Part of Lot 808. property is zoned C-3-A. 11 CHAIR LOUD: Good afternoon. 12 13 don't you introduce yourself, although you're well known to most of us, but for our record, 14 as well as your client or witness at the 15 table. 16 MS. BRAY: Good afternoon, Mr. Loud 17 and Members of the Board. My name is Kinley 18 19 Bray with the law firm of Arent Fox. And with me today are Dedric Boyd of the D.C. Public 20 Library, Ronnie McGhee with Ronnie McGhee and 21

Associates, Architects, the Architect

1	Record on the project; and Ellen McCarthy,
2	also with Arent Fox is in the room.
3	CHAIR LOUD: Good afternoon.
4	MS. BRAY: On behalf of the
5	District of Columbia Public Library. Good
6	afternoon again.
7	And to your right?
8	MR. BOYD: Good afternoon, Dedric
9	Boyd, D.C. Public Library.
10	CHAIR LOUD: Good afternoon, Mr.
11	Boyd, is it B-O-Y-D?
12	MR. BOYD: Yes.
13	CHAIR LOUD: Okay. And finally to
14	your right?
15	MR. McGHEE: I'm trying to set up
16	the presentation. Ronnie McGhee, Ronnie
17	McGhee and Associates, Architects. Thank you.
18	CHAIR LOUD: All right. And the
19	final, finally to your left, again we know,
20	but for the record.
21	MS. McCARTHY: Ellen McCarthy of
22	the law firm of Arent Fox.

CHAIR LOUD: Good afternoon. Is the ANC present this afternoon, ANC-3E? They are not present, but they did submit a report, Exhibit 25, which I'm sure you've seen which was a vote to support with conditions which we can talk about later.

I think at the outset what we'd like to do is clarify the relief being sought. A couple of things. There was an amendment from the initial filing of the application and discussion then there regarding was some whether the special exception was available under 2514 versus whether a variance would be necessary regarding the split zone and being allowed to use the zoning standards for the least restrictive district. I think where the Board comes out, we'd just like you to weigh in on this a little bit just so we can have it for our record is that the special exception under 2514 would be available and that you your case and your could process evidence forward under the special exception.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

would be helpful for us if you could very briefly just articulate your interpretation of the regulation that would limit density using that special exception to point four.

MS. BRAY: I'd be happy to do, Chairman Loud.

CHAIR LOUD: Thank you.

MS. BRAY: For the record again, Kinley Bray with the law firm of Arent Fox on behalf of the District of Columbia Public Library.

To answer your question directly, we do disagree with the Office of Planning's analysis that perhaps an additional variance is necessary, although we are prepared to request that relief. I hear the Board saying, however, that you would like us to articulate precisely why we would respectfully disagree with the Office of Planning who I note did an excellent job in reviewing this application and produced an excellent staff report. want to thank them Jesick, and Mr.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

particular.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

I read Section 2514.2B which requires the Board to require compliance with 2514.1D as a limitation on the FAR of the area outside the 35-foot boundary in which lesser restrictive zone is being applied so that in this case we are only requesting 11 feet in width in property which is classified within the R-1-B zone. And the proposed property line would separate the library property from the Janney School property.

asking for a width of We're feet, approximately 1,006 square feet of land area that the Board grant a special exception so that the standards of the C-3-A zone are applied to that land area. If our property were to contain Lot 808 as it exists today, which includes all of Janney School as well, I would read 2514.1D through 2514.2B as restricting the land area outside of that 1000 square foot area that remains in the R-1-B. know that's a very difficult way of walking

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

you through that analysis. It's a difficult provision of the zoning regulations to deal with.

The 2514.1 allows, as a matter of right, a lesser restrictive zone to be applied to area which is split zone that carries more restrictions such as the R-1-B in this case. But restricts totally the amount of development that can occur in the R-1-B portion.

2514.2 on the other hand, allows the Board to grant a special exception to extend the bulk, use, and height restrictions of the lesser restrictive zone, in this case, the C-3-A to up to 35 feet in width across the property which is classified in the more restrictive zone. In our case, that's 1,006 square feet, approximately 11 feet in width. We are well below the 35 foot requirement.

2514.2B says the Board shall require compliance with 2514.1D which says .4 FAR is the bulk limitation allowed on the

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

remaining portion of the R-1 property and so if we were extending -- if we had a much larger piece of property and the 35 feet would not cover all of the area within the R-1-B portion of the property that we wanted to develop, it would be the area outside that 35-foot portion to which the .4 restriction would apply.

Going back to the Lewis Plan, which introduced the concept of FAR restrictions and bulk restrictions simultaneously in the District of Columbia, Lewis equated FAR with bulk. And in the most recent case that we could find which dealt with this question of how 2514.2 is to be interpreted, which was 17399 which is mentioned in the Office of Planning report, the Applicants seemed argue that the calculation should -- of .4 FAR restriction, the calculation of the .4 FAR restriction should be limited to areas outside the 35-foot boundary.

As best we can tell from the record

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

which is limited to the transcript in that case because it was a summary order, that is the interpretation that the Board accepted and it was not the Office of Planning's suggested interpretation which was that in that 35-foot area the building was limited to .4 FAR.

So we believe 2514.2B does not apply in this case because we are not asking for -- asking to develop portions of the property outside of that 35-foot boundary. However, we believe that if the Board were to determine a variance were necessary, we have met those requirements and the Office of Planning has walked through their analysis and we adopt that analysis as our own.

CHAIR LOUD: Good. I think that's a threshold question. I think where we're ending up on the question is that the special exception is available to you. I just wanted you to articulate the basis for it as you saw it. Part of your articulation, I think, is precedent by the BZA and the case that you

MS. BRAY: Unfortunately, that's the only case that we've found where there is any significant discussion on the record of that question and the Board, despite the fact that the application was opposed and this issue was briefed in detail, discussed in detail, the Board issued a summary order. So it's not something where there's actually a finding that we can rely on. It was only the deliberation between the members of the Board at that time.

CHAIR LOUD: And that may happen yet again in this case.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR LOUD: Out of a sense of fairness, let me turn to the Office of Planning and just very briefly, obviously not a long, extended discussion, but just for the other side of the discussion.

MR. JESICK: Good afternoon,
Members of the Board. My name is Matt Jesick.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

The Office of Planning reviewed that case that was mentioned, 17399, I believe is the number. In that case, the Board did determine that variance relief to 2514.2B was not required because they were only extending the zoning regulations, I believe it's 34 feet, not surpassing the 35-foot limit.

The Office of Planning in reviewing these sections of the regulations did not see I guess where that interpretation came from. So out of an abundance of caution, I guess, we kind of recommended or went through the analysis in our report for an FAR variance which we support. We have no objection to the form of the library, but we did not see where the interpretation that the Applicant has put forth was really derived from.

I can go through the language in more specifics if you'd like.

CHAIR LOUD: I think the language - well, it is helpful to the Board, certainly,
but I think the regulation is kind of out

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	there and speaks for itself. I don't know if
2	Board Members had any questions for you or
3	just wanted to weigh in on the issue
4	separately from my asking questions, because I
5	know it was something that a number of Board
6	Members sort of took a look at as well.
7	So let me turn now to other Board
8	Members and see if they have any comments or
9	feedback. Everyone is being shy, except for
10	Mr. Schlater.
11	MEMBER SCHLATER: So is it your
12	interpretation that in the R-1-B zone that on
13	that portion of the lot there can be no more
14	than .4 FAR built?
15	MR. JESICK: That's the way we read
16	the regulations, yes.
17	MEMBER SCHLATER: Is that in your -
18	- in other examples where you have split
19	zoning, is that how the calculation is
20	typically made? My personal opinion is that
21	the language is a little ambiguous.
22	MR. JESICK: Yes, it's definitely

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

ambiquous, that's true. I have not encountered this situation previously, so I can't say in other examples. The only example that I know of is the one that was mentioned in our report, the case from five or six years ago where the Office of Planning put forth the same argument that I am today. But again, like you say, it is ambiguous. We did seek an interpretation from the Zoning Administrator, but I have not received one to date. open to other interpretations if the Board so chooses.

CHAIR LOUD: Well, again, I think we're comfortable proceeding forward with the understanding that the -- when the regulation talks about -- when the regulation's language speaks to the portion of the lot that's in the R-1, in this case, that we're talking about the portion that's part of the project in terms of the density. And I think that's the manner under which we're going to proceed for purposes of today. I think it's consistent

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

with the previous position the Board has taken on it and it would just seem to make a lot more sense in terms of -- especially a project like this.

And then also, the part of the regulation that talks about 35 feet, because this only goes 10 feet into -- I think something like 10 or 11 feet into the R zone.

With that in mind, unless there are any considerations or questions by the Board, we'll move forward and allow the Applicant to present its case.

MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: I just wanted to ask a question that you brought up the issue to Mr. Jesick about. It seems like your opinion in the OP report focuses just on Section D, but I guess have you looked at the issue of the 35 feet? Because that seems to be something that Ms. Bray is kind of focusing on more in regards to the fact that they are within the 35-foot requirement.

MR. JESICK: I guess our reading of

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

is that even within that 35 feet, the previous section, 2514.1D would still apply.

2514.2B is very direct in referring to that other section and it says authorizing extension, the Board shall require an compliance with the previous, the other paragraph . It doesn't say beyond the 35-foot boundary, the Board shall require compliance with the previous paragraph or beyond the limits of the structure, the Board require compliance with the previous It just says in authorizing the paragraph. entire extension itself, the Board shall require compliance with those FAR limits.

That's where we're getting our reading from . Again, like Commissioner Schlater said, it is somewhat ambiguous, so you know, we're open to hearing other interpretations as well.

MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: And let me just clarify then, your response to be that would be and I just want to make sure that I

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

understand, would be that whether or not it's in the 35 feet, the interpretation of Section 2514D is that it's overall computation and just to kind of set out а mathematical computation as I see it, it would be the total your C-1-A or C-3-A lot size times FAR calculations plus the portion of the lot size times your .4 FAR calculation, creating a total for the entire lot that is now -- that is split between the two zones.

MS. BRAY: That's absolutely correct and that's why the provision itself begins with "for computation purposes the FAR shall be limited."

Our reading is that to interpret Section 2514.1D as being a restriction on the amount of building FAR that can be built in the R-1-B portion of the property would be inconsistent with 2514.2 which says that you - by special exception extend the bulk area and use provisions of the lesser restrictive zone, in this case the C-3-A to the more

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

restrictive zoned portion of the property.

And Lewis Plan supports that.

There's a lot of discussion in Case 17399 about if not -- if FAR is not bulk, what is it? And the counsel in that case referred the Board to page 106 of the final report for a new zoning plan for the District of Columbia by Harold Lewis which is dated November 9, 1956. It's Exhibit No. 37 in 17399. I have a copy I'd be happy to enter into the record here.

But Mr. Lewis said the most promising of the direct bulk controls and the one recommended here is Floor Area Ratio and clearly Floor Area Ratio was was meant to control bulk. And when we say in 2514.2 that we extend the use high-end bulk regulations, we mean FAR.

MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: Thank you. I would appreciate if you could introduce that into evidence just for our reference. Thank you.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 I have no further questions on this 2 issue. CHAIR LOUD: Thank 3 you, Ms. Moldenhauer. think unless there's 4 Ι questions from Mr. Dettman or Mr. Schlater, we 5 will turn to the Applicant for its case. 6 7 Why don't we begin your case and I think if there are questions in the course of 8 the presentation, we can ask those. 9 10 MS. BRAY: Well, Mr. Loud, we had the hearing today planning to 11 prepared to stand on the record in this case 12 13 because we believe that the record was quite We had the support of the Office of full. 14 15 Planning. We have the support of the Advisory 16 Neighborhood Commission. I'm going to suggest that what we 17 do in lieu of simply standing on the record, 18 19 just to orient the Board to the project is have Mr. McGhee walk through the boards that 20 he has set up to show the project and then 21

we'll have Mr. Boyd give a brief presentation

about the library's programming needs and we'll finish up with Ms. McCarthy and her brief testimony about how we comply with all of the requirements. And we estimate we should need no more than 20 minutes to do that.

CHAIR LOUD: That sounds great. Again, if you find an opportunity to truncate. I think the Board has read everything in the record and may have some very specific kinds questions, Ι think the way you've so outlined it is a good way to proceed. assuming Ms. McCarthy is not going to read this frightening long statement into the record -- okay, because it we have and reviewed it and all that.

Are there witnesses that you need to qualify as experts?

MS. BRAY: Yes, we have submitted the resume of Mr. McGhee and Ms. McCarthy as experts in architecture and zoning and planning, respectively, and both have

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

testified extensively before this body as well as the Zoning Commission and we would ask that you qualify them as experts.

CHAIR LOUD: Thank you. I'm familiar with both of your proffered experts and the submission is in our record. Let's see if Board Members have any questions or concerns? There being none, consider that both witnesses have been accepted as experts.

MR. McGHEE: Good afternoon,

Members of the Board and staff. Thank you

very much for this opportunity to present. I

will try to be as brief as possible. I know

you've spent time reviewing this project.

Basically, we are offering up a new design for a library on the same site as the original library. It's about a 20,000 square foot, 21,000 square foot library on the site of the original library itself. It's a very unique site. Ιt exists in a very active neighborhood, very multi-modal transportation neighborhood, pedestrian, rapid transit,

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

vehicular environment. If you walk around that site, you notice a very active site and we are very excited to put a new library back in place in that situation.

But the site presents some unique problems. It is a very polygonal site. It's basically a site that responds to the street grid that was created back in the days when Tenleytown was first designed. Wisconsin and Albemarle cut right across the front of our site. It creates some unique problems for us.

Albemarle is a very active street. It was designed by DOT. It presents a turn lane so there's really no place for cars to stack. It's basically a place for cars to stack. No place for cars to park right in front. No place to access any parking from that street.

Wisconsin is a very active street, very high-density street and we're right on the corner, so DOT has opted against allowing us to have any access to parking from the

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

corner, but as far away as possible. So access to parking is at the farthest edge of our site.

That puts us in a severe limitation to provide parking on the site, in addition to having a robust program. This is the smallest in the library system, one of the smallest sites in the library system, only 15,000 square feet. So in that environment, we're trying to put that 21,000 square feet of program.

So with an eye towards cost and other issues, we've looked at a two-story, two and a half story site that puts most of the public programming on the first floor, children's program, which we've gone through many, many community meetings, NCPC, Fine Arts, to view the project and met the test for all those folks, public and private. And if you want me to walk through details of the design, we can do that. I don't know if you said you — okay.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

I can do it from here. Basically, the building is polygonal. We've taken a motif, the site motif as a design-generating element for the building. The back is the actual design element -- what we're mimicking is a book, like a library book. The back of the book is against the retaining wall of the site, which is the Janney site. The open fin area on the east and

-- west and south sides is sort of the pages of the book opening up to the public. The fins, the vertical fins provide shading. It's a LEED Silver Project, which also provides some limitations on what we can do on the site.

And the idea is to have public access. We've been to many, many community meetings that the community wanted to have the children's area as large as possible which takes up a lot of the first floor. The idea - that sort of pushed us in the position of having to require less parking and we'll get

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

into the details of how much parking we 1 2 provide. But the design of the building is -3 - let's see, can I use this microphone? 4 CHAIR LOUD: As you transition, Mr. 5 McGhee, I just wanted to share that I'm going 6 7 to step outside for two seconds. I don't want to adjourn the hearing, but I think we should 8 continue with the hearing. As I step outside, 9 watch the monitor 10 going to conference room and then I'll return in about 11 three minutes. Mr. Dettman will preside over 12 13 the hearing as I step outside. MR. McGHEE: All right, as you can 14 15 the design of the building -- these 16 copper fins are really one of the prominent elements of the building. They provide 17 control of sunlight in the building while 18 19 providing almost the open-book effect to the public sides of the building. 20 We are engaged on the property line 21

on the back side of the site, so that is

basically no fenestration on that side. And again, if you look at the project, there's a fairly robust program, not much is wasted. This site is probably one of the most highly used, the book turnover over here is one of the highest in the library system. So the idea of providing as many -- all libraries have a competitive number of books. They're basically all equal in size, but the book turnover here is very great, so the idea of how to process and how to have people to come to the site is very important.

enter the So you on corner, basically, through a very robust glass area. in to the area where the system controlled. We have a very active public access to the building, so in the evening we are able to close the building off and have people come in and have meetings and have readings and things like that. That was one of the highly sought after elements of original library that wanted to be repeated.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

So we've done that.

Some of the interior elements here, very open system, very strong, what we call a power wall system. You walk in the front door. It directs you down a line of the stacks, shows you what's new in the library, what's upcoming and kind of controls the access of the library and that's -- you can see these.

Some of the other boards show, we have a LEED Silver. We hope potentially to make gold. There's a third floor which houses the mechanical system and the green roof up there. And we've actually been fighting with DOT to make sure the ground level plain is unique also. They'd like to have concrete. We like to have something else. But we're working with them on that.

There's a second through the building. As you see the copper scheme is brought into the building. Some metal panels. It's a steel building. Lot of glass, lot of

1	openness. Light is brought through the roof
2	of the system to bring down deep into the
3	building so you have natural light throughout.
4	It's basically an attempt to access the high-
5	performing building status that we would
6	that you like to see in a building that's
7	going to have a lot of children in it. Low
8	VOCs, high light, high access to the outside,
9	so that's really the target of this library.
10	I don't know if we need to get into
11	details of the program which Mr. Boyd will do.
12	MS. BRAY: Mr. McGhee, will you
13	show the Board where the parking is to be
14	located on the site view? If you would point
15	that out? And then also if you would point
16	out the area on the site that remains in the
17	R-1-B zone in which we're asking the C-3-A
18	zone to be applied?
19	MR. McGHEE: The parking on the
20	site is accessed here from Wisconsin. Let's
21	see if I could show it to you right away.

to an alley

It's accessed

22

the back.

in

There's only seven spaces and one handicap space. We actually had an ANC meeting that requested additional handicap spaces, although they won't be legal handicap spaces, they'll be designed handicap spaces.

We have a small area for handicap here and a driveway. All of our loading will be done after hours so we've utilized the space very tightly back there. But we are reduced in parking because of the robust program on the first floor.

And again, as you see, we're close to the corner, so we pushed the parking as far down as possible as required by DOT and other agencies so that our access would not block traffic.

Now the board that shows you the little sliver -- this is actually the drawing showing the area of the site we're talking about that exists as R-1-B. So this is in the back part of the site. And the Janney site is back here.

1	Let's see. I think that's all
2	unless there are questions. Again, we wanted
3	to make sure you understand the difficulties
4	it would take to add another floor or do
5	excavation and provide parking and that's part
6	of why we're here today. Thank you.
7	CHAIR LOUD: Board Members, are
8	there any questions for Mr. McGhee? Okay,
9	you're going to go to your next witness?
10	MS. BRAY: Yes. I'd like to
11	introduce Dedric Boyd who is sitting in Jeff
12	Bonvechio's stead, I believe. Mr. Bonvechio
13	is identified as the library's witness.
14	And Mr. Boyd, I'd just like to
15	point out that the specific program
16	requirements of the library are in the record.
17	It was submitted as part of the pre-hearing
18	statement, but if you could just introduce
19	yourself and give the Board a brief overview
20	of the specific programming issues we face
21	with planning the Tenley Library.

MR. BOYD: Thank you. I'm Dedric

Boyd with the Office of D.C. Public Libraries.

Currently, the library is in the midst of a major transformation with either six new or renovated libraries that will open in 2010 with another six opening in 2011. All of the new libraries share a common building program that is adjusted to meet the unique demands of each community the library services.

What I'd like to do to share some of the program requirements for the new facilities, first, all of our new libraries need to provide natural light which we plan to do here at the Tenley site. We'll also accommodate every changing technology and provide overall flexibility to change as library services and as communities change.

Secondly, DCL desires to build an environmentally-friendly facility and the D.C. Green Building Acts requires us to meet the requirements of the U.S. Green Building Council LEED Silver rating.

Finally, with respect to

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

architectural design, as Mr. McGhee indicated, new neighborhood libraries much reflect the program and goals of the library and the needs of the District of Columbia residents served by each particular facility incorporating forward-thinking approaches to urban design, architecture, engineering, environmental technologies in the public realm.

Each new facility must be an urban library, a destination that can attract and support hundreds of users a day and promote a neighborhood vibrant mixed-use and street environment. The new library must have architectural presence befitting an its location in each community, yet be reflected of the city's modern growth and new innovations in building design and technology.

It should not be a duplication of other recently-built libraries in the District or in the U.S., but should take the most successful elements of these new facilities and create architecture for Washington that is

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

distinctive and of this time. The design must be unique in the nation's capital and representative of 21st century architectural ideals.

Now speaking specifically regarding the Tenley Library, the Tenley Library was closed at the end of December 2004 as part of the original capital improvement plan. In 2005, this original plan was stopped for various reasons, mainly because a smaller, inadequate facility was being proposed. The library the interim facility in December of 2009 and the Tenley Friendship community has been without a full-service library for going on five years.

Starting with the new design team, the library design, the building you'll see in front of you this afternoon that Mr. McGhee just presented, this building meets all of the programmatic requirements for the library. However, during the design phase considerable time was spent with the Deputy Mayor's Office

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	for planning economic development as the idea
2	of a mixed use facility was explored.
3	Due to this exercise, Tenley
4	Library was delayed as compared to the other
5	three libraries that were closed in December
6	2004.
7	In conclusion, the D.C. Library is
8	pleased and excited that this project is
9	moving forward to provide enhanced and
10	expanded library services to the Tenley
11	Friendship community.
12	We're also excited that the library
13	will be an iconic building in the neighborhood
14	and a gathering place for all.
15	That concludes my testimony.
16	CHAIR LOUD: Thank you, Mr. Boyd.
17	Are there any questions for the witness?
18	We can go to your next witness.
19	MS. BRAY: With that we turn to Ms.
20	McCarthy to go over the specific special
21	exception criteria and variance criteria that
22	we have already enumerated in our application.

Ms. McCarthy will briefly go over those for the record.

MS. McCARTHY: Very briefly for the record. The site is uniquely, severely constrained due to an inability to add ground area because the other occupant of the lot, Janney School, is also in need of expansion and has no surplus land; steep slopes, the location of the retaining walls and the odd shape of the lot which is pentagon and I think there's only two right angles in the entire lot.

are directly linked with the inability to provide a full complement of parking spaces required by the zoning regulations, but relief from that requirement can be granted without adverse impact because it's a neighborhoodserving library. There's a relatively low demand for parking as is evidenced by the fact that there were only four parking spaces there previously, and there are no parking spaces

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

attached to the interim library.

There's the presence of two other libraries within five to ten minutes' drive, Chevy Chase and Cleveland Park and Chevy Chase has a relatively large parking lot. There's a presence within walking distance of three elementary schools, two middle schools, and three high schools, plus another set of schools accessible by bus a short distance down Wisconsin Avenue.

The integrity of the zone plan isn't impaired by reducing the number of parking spaces, because the regulations for libraries which were adopted in 2003 already contemplated providing relief for the number of spaces required when circumstances such as a nearby Metro Station and in this case, it's directly across the street, when the presence of Metro Station reduces the need for parking.

With regard to the special exception under 2514.2, the library meets the requirements for that special exception as the

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

proposed density is substantially less than the calculations that would be done under 2514.2B. We're only proposing 22,000 square feet and doing the calculations, assigning .4 to the R-1-B section would give us 60,000 square feet of density that is permitted just on the library site.

In addition, there's no harm to -no adverse impact on the neighboring property
because there's no intrusion on the privacy,
light, and air of any residences since there
aren't any residences that adjoin that portion
of the lot where we'll be moving the zoning
boundary. And the perceived bulk of the
building that will actually be in the R-1-B
zone is substantially minimized by the fact
that there's a huge retaining wall behind it
and a much higher piece of ground behind that.

So in short, the plans for the library meet all the tests established in the zoning regulations for granting relief for this innovative, well-designed project which

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	will greatly increase the quality of library
2	services to the community and provide them in
3	a comfortable and inviting setting.
4	Thank you, Mr. Chair.
5	CHAIR LOUD: Thank you, Ms.
6	McCarthy. Are there any questions for Ms.
7	McCarthy?
8	Let's turn back to the Applicant to
9	see if that's the close of your case?
LO	MS. BRAY: That is indeed the close
L1	of our case. I have a couple of comments in
L2	summary.
L3	CHAIR LOUD: Okay. And you'll do
L4	those in closing? Okay.
L5	Then let's turn to the Office of
L6	Planning.
L7	MR. JESICK: Thank you, Mr.
L8	Chairman, and Members of the Board. My name
L9	is Matt Jesick.
20	I think we've already discussed to
21	some degree a lot of what I was going to say,
22	so I'll just try to be very brief in my

analysis.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

I'll go through the areas of relief that we're discussing today and examine the criteria that the Office of Planning used to reach its conclusions. For the special exception, I think we did talk about the 35foot limit and certainly the application is within that. We also discussed at length the next criteria which is the FAR. The third criteria is the extension shall have effect the of adverse on character the neighborhood and we found that this library would indeed not have any adverse impact on the neighborhood. Wisconsin Avenue is a major commercial corridor and that is a place where you would expect to see important civic buildings such as libraries.

On the other side of the building are institutional uses like the Janney Elementary School, Academy St. Anne's Church and those, in effect, act as a buffer between the library and the residential

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

neighborhood beyond.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

The last criteria is that the Board may impose conditions on the approval of the library and the Office of Planning recommends none. So we find that the special exception criteria have been met.

In regards to the parking variance, site find that the is uniquely constrained. The size of the library property is somewhat smaller than other similar libraries in the District. It's about 15,000 square feet, where other libraries are upwards of 25,000 or almost 30,000 for their property size.

Also, the library property as has been noted today is land locked, so to speak. It cannot expand to the south or to the west as the Janney play field is located in that spot.

So we feel that that unique condition leads to the extraordinary -- sorry, the practical difficulty on the Applicant that

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

it would be unnecessarily burdensome to either expand the property which I've already described as very limited in possibility or to construct underground parking which would be very expensive, or to somehow replace or remove the retaining walls which would also be very expensive.

We found that the relief to parking would not be detrimental to the public good. The library again has been noted as directly across from the Tenleytown Metro and there's also public parking available in the neighborhood in parking garages.

That being said, we don't feel that there would be many drivers coming to the site in any event as it would be mostly used by members of the immediate community.

So that concludes our testimony. We're happy to recommend approval of the application and I'd be happy to take any questions.

CHAIR LOUD: Thank you. That was

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	an excellent report, both submitted as part of
2	our record, Exhibit 24 and then your testimony
3	as well.
4	Do Board Members have any
5	questions?
6	MEMBER SCHLATER: I just have a
7	quick question. What is the status of the
8	city's plans to redevelopment the adjacent
9	site and potentially this site over the
10	library?
11	MR. JESICK: What I understand is
12	that the plants for redevelopment of the
13	Janney site are kind of just off the table at
14	the moment. However, I do understand that the
15	library will be built structurally to
16	accommodate development on top of it should at
17	some point in the future development be
18	contemplated for the Janney School site or
19	this site.
20	CHAIR LOUD: Thank you, Mr.
21	Schlater. Any follow up?
22	Just to sort of briefly follow up

-	Mr. Galalatania anastian in that abot the
1	Mr. Schlater's question, is that what the
2	discussion alluded to earlier about the delay
3	in the project and the conversations with the
4	Deputy Mayor regarding the mixed use project.
5	They are going to try to figure out a way to
6	do some housing on the site?
7	MR. JESICK: Yes. I don't know how
8	long the process lasted exactly. I think an
9	RP went out from the Deputy Mayor's Office to
10	solicit proposals for what could be
11	accomplished on the site. Both the library
11	accomplished on the site. Both the library site specifically and extending into the
12	site specifically and extending into the
12	site specifically and extending into the  Janney property. But again, that process is I
12 13 14	site specifically and extending into the Janney property. But again, that process is I think gone away and I don't think there are
12 13 14 15	site specifically and extending into the Janney property. But again, that process is I think gone away and I don't think there are any proposals out there right now.
12 13 14 15	site specifically and extending into the Janney property. But again, that process is I think gone away and I don't think there are any proposals out there right now.  CHAIR LOUD: Okay. With that then,
12 13 14 15 16	site specifically and extending into the Janney property. But again, that process is I think gone away and I don't think there are any proposals out there right now.  CHAIR LOUD: Okay. With that then, let me see if the Applicant has any questions

of

Department

submit a report into the record.

and

the

21

22

It's our

did

Transportation

1	Exhibit 26. Does the Applicant have a copy of
2	that? Okay.
3	MS. BRAY: We do.
4	CHAIR LOUD: Good afternoon, Mr.
5	Jennings.
6	MR. JENNINGS: Good afternoon.
7	CHAIR LOUD: Your timing is
8	impeccable. Why don't you just go through
9	your report and summarize your conclusions and
10	then how you got to that.
11	MR. JENNINGS: Sure. For the
12	record, my name is Jeff Jennings. I work for
13	the District Department of Transportation. We
14	didn't really have much in the way to go on as
15	far as the application is concerned, and what
16	I mean by that is there was no formal
17	transportation report or study as we stated in
18	some of the initial comments.
19	I think one of the biggest problems
20	that we had with the application is trying to
21	understand how a site so close to a
22	substantial amount of mass transit the

1	additional parking or the parking that is
2	being proposed for the site. I think we have
3	a total of seven parking spaces, two of those
4	are ADA which we completely understand, but
5	the five parking spaces and the way that they
6	are positioned or according to the plans, the
7	way that they are proposed off of Wisconsin,
8	it doesn't leave us feeling too comfortable as
9	far as how those parking spaces are situated
10	up against the building. A single drive aisle
11	is the way we understood it and much of that
12	is reflected in our comments.
13	I'd be happy to answer any
14	questions.
15	CHAIR LOUD: Let me turn first to
16	the Applicant to see if the Applicant has any
17	questions and then we'll turn to Board
18	Members.
19	MS. BRAY: I do. Good afternoon,
20	Mr. Jennings.
21	MR. JENNINGS: Good afternoon, Ms.
22	Bray.

1	MS. BRAY: Mr. Jennings, in
2	reviewing this application and preparing your
3	report, did you consult the zoning regulations
4	in Chapter 21 thereof?
5	MR. JENNINGS: We did.
6	MS. BRAY: And are you aware that
7	the parking requirement for this type of
8	facility, this size of facility in the C-3-A
9	is at least 18 spaces?
10	MR. JENNINGS: We did see that and
11	you referenced that in your July 20 Statement
12	of Reasons.
13	MS. BRAY: Can you elaborate what -
14	- which plan you were reviewing when you
15	commented that you were concerned about the
16	access to the property? I believe there was
17	something in your report referring to a curb
18	cut on Albemarle, just to clarify for the
19	record.
20	MR. JENNINGS: Yes, the curb cut on
21	Albemarle, we took that from the diagrams as
22	part of the I believe it's July 20, the

1	application. And there's no page numbers and
2	I apologize for kind of it's a Freelon
3	rendering, architect rendering.
4	MS. BRAY: Can I direct your
5	attention to the site plan prepared by Freelon
6	which is identified as Sheet C4, dated March
7	20, 2009. It appears on the second page of
8	Tab B in the application documents.
9	MR. JENNINGS: I believe I have
10	that. I have Sheet C1 which is the one I
11	think we used to look at an Albemarle curb
12	cut.
13	MS. BRAY: Can you read the caption
14	on drawing C1?
15	MR. JENNINGS: One hundred percent
16	construction documents, existing conditions
17	MS. BRAY: And that's an existing
18	conditions plan, is it not?
19	MR. JENNINGS: I would assume so.
20	MS. BRAY: With respect to the
21	Department of Transportation's concern over
22	the access to the parking, were you reviewing

1	the access to the parking as if it were on
2	Albemarle or as if it were coming from
3	Wisconsin Avenue? That's not clear to me.
4	MR. JENNINGS: Wisconsin.
5	MS. BRAY: Okay, just to clarify
6	for the record, the Albemarle curb cut, isn't
7	that being closed?
8	MR. JENNINGS: Okay. How is that
9	relevant to the discussion or the comments we
10	had?
11	MS. BRAY: The DDOT report actually
12	specifically points out the fact that there is
13	a concerning curb cut on Albemarle which is
14	being maintained, which is incorrect.
15	MR. JENNINGS: I think the gist of
16	my comments from earlier when Chairman Loud
17	pointed out how he'd like to kind of put
18	together a brief synopsis of the comments, the
19	parking is positioned off of Wisconsin, the
20	curb cut on Wisconsin, as I understand it has
21	already been approved, and therefore those

parking spaces are being proposed here today.

1	MS. BRAY: Are you agreeing then
2	there is no adverse impact in the reduction of
3	parking on the site?
4	MR. JENNINGS: I don't think we're
5	taking that position.
6	MS. BRAY: You're advocating for
7	further reduction of parking?
8	MR. JENNINGS: That's correct.
9	MS. BRAY: Acknowledging that the
10	zoning regulations require significantly more
11	parking than what is being proposed?
12	MR. JENNINGS: We completely
13	understand.
14	MS. BRAY: I have nothing further
15	for DDOT.
16	CHAIR LOUD: Thank you. Board
17	Members, are there questions for DDOT?
18	I have a couple of questions. In
19	your report, you indicate that providing
20	additional public parking at the library, I
21	guess additional to the handicapped spaces
22	would encourage driving and induced demand for

even more parking. Is that a problem? Is there an adverse impact to having five additional cars have the opportunity to park at the site?

MR. JENNINGS: We stated our position the way we did because we're not clear how if you're pulling into that drive aisle off of Wisconsin, how do you know those parking spaces are open? In the instance that none of them are open, all seven or so parking spaces are taken, what's the action that you would, as a driver of an automobile, what do you do from there? It's a single drive aisle, as we understood it, the way that we looked at the various plans.

And as I think we tried to describe to the best of our ability, you would then have to back up on southbound Wisconsin Avenue which is never, never an idea that we would want to introduce for parking of any type, especially along business Wisconsin Avenue which has I believe has ADT, the last ADT,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

average daily traffic counts that we have for Wisconsin, southbound I want to say it's in the ballpark of like 23,000 vehicles.

CHAIR LOUD: So it's not that it's really over-parked or they're offering too many spaces. That would be true if they had three spaces or even two spaces. It's the potential for traffic conflicts, traffic congestion around the uncertainty of what's inside of that parking lot.

That's the first MR. JENNINGS: I think the second point is did the point. Applicant explore all potential options advance of saying seven is the right number to put here on this spot. And one of the ideas that we pitched in the comments, when you look at the area, you've got an underground parking garage that's under utilized at the Tenleytown Metro Station, where there's retail, including a hardware store. last I Buy, The checked I think those numbers are somewhere in the area like 300 or so parking spaces.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

sure there might be the opportunity to do some type of parking provision there.

about St. Anne's Catholic What Church right next door where there's substantial amount of parking on site at that location as well? I guess where I'm going with this is is there a parking inventory that may provide those parking spaces that the Applicant seems to -- I guess, right choice of words, to want. Is there a want here or is there a need? I guess the way we saw it, it's very much a want.

CHAIR LOUD: Well, it might be considered a legal requirement, according to certain analyses. But let me ask this question, given the layout of the lot, and your experience, your considerable experience in transportation, do you see some ways to mitigate against some of the concerns you just raised without necessarily going to the extent of utilizing say the St. Anne's lot or the underground nearby garage that you're talking

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

about? Just from your experience, are there other mitigating strategies that can be used?

JENNINGS: I think when you MR. view who may be using this library, will folks Probably. be walking? Ts there the opportunity for people to be using other modes of transportation, as opposed to offering the parking that the Applicant wants? There are other choices that can be made in advance of this five parking space provision that being talked about. I mean we can go probably into much greater detail. If you were to send me back and talk about how you get people out of their cars and avoid this potential hazard this single drive aisle circumstances of that's being proposed.

CHAIR LOUD: I see a couple of Board Members itching to ask some questions. Let me just ask the Applicant for a response to what DDOT has sort of drawn out as a potential adverse impact with respect to queuing on the busy street and not being able

### NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

to with the single drive out, not being able to predict --

MS. BRAY: I'd actually like to ask Ms. McCarthy to address that as an expert in planning.

MS. McCARTHY: I think our response would be two-fold. One, that the relief that we're requesting is to reduce the legally-required number of spaces and what DDOT has said is that not only do they feel there's no adverse impact from reducing them to the level that we've asked for, but they wouldn't see an adverse impact from reducing it even further. So I would say to the extent that our burden is to meet the task, the DDOT report supports that.

But secondly, with regard to the safety issues, I think we're a little perplexed. If you go to the site plan which is labeled as C-4, I think it's the second page under Tab B in the application, the notion -- it's on the board, okay.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

(Pause.)

CHAIR LOUD: As Mr. Schlater indicated, I don't think your microphone is on.

MS. McCARTHY: Right, I think the essence of DDOT's concern, as I understand it, is that first of all, you wouldn't be able to see whether there are parking spaces available or not and that seems hard to imagine since if you're coming southbound on Wisconsin Avenue, you see where the curb cut is. By that point, the point in time in which you'd be turning right, there's only six parking spaces to see, whether they are occupied or not here and the additional handicapped parking space is here.

So number one, they'd be visible if you were going south, and certainly if you were coming north and turning left, it would be very apparent, whether they are filled or not. There is a small space to do a three-point turn to turn around in the event that there's a big van or something that's one of

the -- in one of the spaces parked closest to the street and you can't, indeed, not see all the way. It is possible to turn around. You'll be fronting out onto Wisconsin and you see the width of the sidewalk here which would mean that as you pull up to the curb cut itself, you will have very ample opportunity to see cars which are coming over the hill and down toward you, as well, if you are turning right as well as then looking further down the hill toward the cathedral.

So I don't think -- and I think that if you think about typical library patrons, there are a small number of toddlers that come for story hour and there a small number of frail, elderly which may not be formally handicapped and therefore able to use a handicapped space, but for whom at least a minimal amount of parking would be a major convenience and may or may not be reasonable to think that they would all be using public transportation.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

So I think we can accommodate them with reasonable sight lines in actually a much safer location than had been the case for the four parking spaces that were there off of Albemarle and the most important thing is, I think that we had the burden of proof to show there wouldn't be an adverse impact from reducing the parking and that has been shown by us, I believe, and further reinforced by DDOT.

If I may add, the van MR. McGHEE: used for actual deliveries, that's because of the maintenance schedule, supply schedule the library has will be unoccupied during the day. So you can actually pull into that space to make your Y-out turn to come So you're really not dead-ended into the out. So if you were to arrive at the lot that was full, you could pull into that space and make your Y-out and come out of the lot. So we don't feel like you're trapped in there if you do arrive and they are full.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	MS. BRAY: Mr. McGhee, following up
2	on that point, have you prepared any turning
3	diagrams that you might be able to share with
4	the Board?
5	MR. McGHEE: Yes, we have a turning
6	diagram for the truck or large van that might
7	arrive, showing how it would work. It assumes
8	that spaces are unoccupied in the evening, but
9	it does show you that space if you'd like to
LO	see that. I don't know if you've entered that
L1	into the record or not.
L2	MS. BRAY: I would like to enter
L3	that into the record, yes.
L4	MEMBER SCHLATER: I guess first
L5	question for the Applicant, are any of these
L6	spaces going to be reserved for staff
L7	employees?
L8	MS. BRAY: None will be reserved
L9	for staff and employees and that's something
20	that actually the ANC asked us to address
21	before ANC-3E to explore off-site parking for
22	employees as it is done at the interim library

1	which has no parking.
2	MEMBER SCHLATER: Okay. Second
3	question for Mr. Jennings of DDOT. I think
4	some of the questions you raise are certainly
5	legitimate just in terms of safety and turning
6	radiuses. We may not have all we don't
7	have a transportation report in front of us,
8	nor do we have a lot of transportation
9	expertise up here to analyze the sight lines
10	are right or whether the turning radiuses are
11	proper.
12	Is there a process the Applicant is
13	going to go through to get the curb cut off of
14	Wisconsin Avenue for the library?
15	MR. JENNINGS: To the best of my
16	knowledge, it's already been approved.
17	MEMBER SCHLATER: And was DDOT
18	involved in that process?
19	MR. JENNINGS: We were.
20	MEMBER SCHLATER: Do they take into
21	consideration what those curb cuts are used
22	for?

MR. JENNINGS: I'm not entirely clear since the process happened away from my particular work.

MEMBER SCHLATER: Is it a public space process or how does it work?

MR. JENNINGS: That's correct.

MEMBER SCHLATER: Okay.

I would also point MR. JENNINGS: Commissioner, that adjacent out, to this particular curb cut, you do have another curb cut for St. Anne's and I think you are someone who may be familiar with how wide a curb cut can get. so in this particular instance, you have the curb cut for the DCPL site and then you have a one-way outbound curb cut which I presume gets heavily utilized on Sundays when leaving parishioners are the St. Anne's I don't know if the Catholic Church site. Applicant took a look at that. I can honestly say I know I did arrive here a little bit Is there a transportation study that's been submitted into the record?

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 MEMBER SCHLATER: Not that I know 2 of. Are libraries open on Sunday? MR. BOYD: Yes, they are open on 3 Sunday, but they have very abbreviated hours, 4 so they will not be there generally after 5 5 I believe they're generally 1 p.m. to 5 6 p.m. p.m. on Sundays. 7 Maybe MEMBER SCHLATER: the 8 Applicant public 9 can speak to the space 10 approvals process and where you've gone thus You've got before DDOT and gotten this far. 11 approval? Did you have to provide any sort of 12 13 transportation plan, traffic plan? MR. BOYD: Yes, we did meet with 14 15 DDOT and one of the questions that was raised regards to Mr. Jennings' question. 16 was in However, I think one of the proposals that was 17 made to DCPL was in essence to us to contact 18 19 St. Anne's and in essence ask them could we sort of move their property line over which I 20 think we felt was a bit much to ask them to 21

give us space on their property just for the

curb cut. So that was one of the questions raised in our review with DDOT.

MR. McGHEE: If I can add, one of the questions came up before DDOT was the width of that access point where if you're at St. Anne's, it's a double wide; and ours, which we originally had as a double-wide, DDOT requested that we narrow it down so that pedestrians would have less travel from one side to the other in case traffic was on it.

St. Anne's has a pulse of traffic occurs with school obviously, library is sort of more constant. But the idea there reduce the was to amount of jeopardy that a pedestrian might be in. So there's one side of DDOT while the other side has another opinion. We think we've satisfied both that we give you a way in and out, narrow the access, reduce the parking. So we tried to satisfy all concerned in that regard.

MS. McCARTHY: And it's probably important to note that the peak of the

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

activity at St. Anne's Church is Sunday mornings when the library is not open and during the weekday at the school in the early morning when the library is not open and then at 3 o'clock which is not a peak time of use for the library.

So the opportunity for conflict is small, but because the St. Anne's alley abuts our curb cut and entrance, it means that there is quite a wide distance of sight line if you're coming northbound on Wisconsin Avenue to be able to see into the parking lot and to be able to see out as you're turning either left or right. There's no building, in other words, that's right up to the curb that's precluding your ability to see traffic as you pull out.

MR. JENNINGS: Chairman Loud, I would venture to -- on Sundays, is there something that prohibits a St. Anne's parishioner from parking in the DCPL parking lot? Nothing. So I mean the way that it

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

could be viewed is it's just another access point to gain close parking to the entrance to St. Anne's. So it's an extension on Sundays of their parking lot.

CHAIR LOUD: Thank you, Mr. Jennings. I believe Board Member Moldenhauer had some follow-up.

MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: Question for Mr. Boyd. Do you know currently how many of your current clients are users of a public library, park or park around or how many actually use different forms of public transportation or walk?

MR. BOYD: No, I don't have that, although when we met with the ANC, they were very vocal with having that ability to park, not only for themselves, but for the more mature citizens of that area as well as some of the family members that still have small children that would definitely use the parking, but I don't have the exact number of patrons that would request parking.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: Then it was a
2	concern of the neighborhood?
3	MR. BOYD: Yes, it was.
4	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: Thank you.
5	MR. BOYD: You're welcome.
6	MS. BRAY: Mr. Boyd, are there any
7	parking spaces provided at the interim library
8	currently?
9	MR. BOYD: Currently, there are no
10	parking spaces provided at the Tenley interim
11	located at 4200 Wisconsin.
12	MS. BRAY: And are you aware of any
13	library patron complaints regarding the lack
14	of parking at that location?
15	MR. BOYD: No, I'm not aware of any
16	at the time.
17	CHAIR LOUD: I think we're probably
18	sufficiently briefed on this point and ready
19	to move forward. I just wanted to share an
20	observation. It's not necessarily evidence
21	although I think there is some evidence in the
22	record regarding our reduced parking and

making it available and reducing the demand, etcetera, but it's my experience with these neighborhood libraries that have really minimal parking that the surrounding community knows that there's very minimal parking and that they're largely frequented by the surrounding neighborhoods and because the communities realize that there's very limited parking, members of the community don't necessarily choose to drive as the way to get there, or if they do, they drive with the understanding that they're probably not going to get parking or they're going to be very lucky to get parking. And either use another means of transportation to get there, walk, bike, or simply trying to find some temporary parking off-site.

So I'm having a hard time, unless there's some data behind it, I'm having a hard time really finding it compelling that you're going to find a lot of neighbors in that community who are familiar with this library

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

and have been familiar with this process and followed it, that are going to be really struggling to get to these five, six parking spaces on a consistent basis, where it would result in any kind of safety or congestion issues.

It's just a personal observation.

If you're in touch with some information or some data that suggests differently, I think it would be important to put that on the record.

MR. JENNINGS: And I guess I would respond to that with all very good points. What's the hazard in reducing the parking even further? I mean you make a very good point with folks may know that there is a very limited inventory, limited opportunity. Therefore, I may not drive there or I may park in the Whole Foods parking spaces and walk across the street with my children for story hour, while I can drop them off, do the shopping and then head on over.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

I think your points are ones that we certainly took into consideration while we wrote these comments too. Can this space be perhaps used for something else? Sure. Do you need parking? Does it invite the opportunity for folks to want to try and pull in?

Each curb cut, the way we see it, know that this curb cut has and we approved, but that additional trip generation through there, it's just additional one corridor like intersection along main а Wisconsin Avenue where on Saturdays and Sundays it's teeming with pedestrians. It's bustling with cyclists and vehicles, whether there's a three-point turn opportunity to pull back out, the sidewalk is not incredibly wide. So it's not an equal surface for everybody, for all users of the right of way presenting potential hazards for drivers as well pedestrians and cyclists. Thanks.

CHAIR LOUD: I think we'll perhaps

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

agree to disagree on some aspects of it. Are there additional questions for the Department of Transportation? Okay.

I think where we are in the case is that -- and thank you, Mr. Jennings. I appreciate your time and your report and your presence here today.

The ANC, the ANC is not here, but they did submit a report. It is our Exhibit 25 and they did submit a resolution supporting the application with three conditions, one of which is that an additional parking space for use solely by a handicapped individual be designated, so that there would be two set spaces designated, apparently one had already been designated. Secondly, that the five remaining spaces for use would be by non-DCPL visitors to the library and I think Schlater had asked the question regarding And the third is that the portion of the library built in a residential zone shall not project further than 11 feet, plus or

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

minus a few inches, into the residential zone 1 and I think that the evidence on the record is 2 that it's ten feet into the residential. 3 Did the Applicant agree to all of 4 these conditions? 5 MS. BRAY: It did. 6 7 CHAIR LOUD: And this resolution for ANC-3E that indicates that it 8 was properly noticed and had a quorum present 9 10 and by vote of 5-0, the ANC supported the application. 11 Are there any concerns, questions, 12 13 comments regarding the ANC's report? Hearing none, then we would go to any parties 14 15 in the audience that might be persons 16 opposition, I'm sorry, in support the of seeing none, if 17 application and there parties or persons in the audience who are 18 19 opposed to the application? 20 Also seeing none, we turn back to

you, counsel, for closing remarks

Applicant.

21

22

of

MS. BRAY: Thank you, Chairman I'll be very brief. You heard from Mr. Loud. McGhee and Ms. McCarthy that the Applicant has demonstrated that its proposed design meets the programmatic requirements of the District of Columbia Library on a constrained site and that the parking which is provided is the most parking that could be provided to satisfy the requirement of 18 spaces that the regulations require on this site for a library of this size.

You heard Ms. McCarthy state, as well as the Office of Planning, that the extension of the C-3-A zone use, height, and bulk regulations into approximately ten feet of the R-1-B portion of the site would have no adverse impact on the surrounding community and meets the requirements of Section 2514.2 of the zoning regulations.

The Office of Planning articulated quite well the analysis under 2514.2 and the District Department of Transportation itself

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

sees no adverse impact in producing, in
providing less parking spaces than are
required under Section 2101.1 of the zoning
regulations. In fact, they would like us to
reduce the parking further. But we have a
legal requirement to meet and the District of
Columbia Public Library believes that its
patrons will use these parking spaces, that
the neighborhood, as demonstrated by the ANC
resolution requests that as much parking be
provided on the site as possible, particularly
to address the needs of handicapped patrons of
the library, and that the reconstruction of
this library to meet the programmation
requirements for the Tenley Friendship branch
is long overdue.

With that, we respectfully request that the Board grant the requested relief under 2514.2 and under 2101.1 from the offstreet parking regulations.

CHAIR LOUD: Thank you, counsel, and thank you, all of your witnesses as well

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

for your presentation. Thank you, Mr. Jennings, and thank you to the Office of Planning as well for excellent reports. I think we are ready to deliberate the case today. I think it's a full record and I'd be happy to start us off.

Before I do that though, I think, counsel, there was a question of the relief being requested having changed from the initial filing and it's in your pre-hearing statement, Exhibit 23, I guess. But I guess you should go on the record and formally amend the --

MS. BRAY: Indeed, we respectfully request that the Board allow us to amend the application to include relief under Section 2514.2 of zoning regulations that would be a special exception to extend the zone C-3-A, zoning requirements into the R-1-B portion of the property as we discovered after filing the application that the property is split zoned.

CHAIR LOUD: Thank you. And as you

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

enter deliberations indicated, we can This is a request for variance relief for parking requirements from Section 2101.1. think 18 spaces are required and the Applicant is offering seven spaces. As well as special exception relief under 2514 to apply the zoning standard for the least restrictive zone in a property that's split zoned between the C-3-A and R-1-B.

With respect to the variance test, we heard evidence during the course of the hearing from the Office of Planning, as well as from the Applicant's witnesses that exceptional because of its property is pentagon-shaped size. I think Ms. McCarthy testified to that. It's also a small lot that's relatively speaking inconsistent with the size lot that the library is seeking to build these, I think there's 20,000 square foot facilities on as a part of their master facilities plan.

There was also testimony regarding

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the retaining walls that are currently on the site and how they constrain the site and that in order to get the full use of the site, it would require removing these retaining walls at extraordinary expense and so I think that evidence supports a finding that there would be an exceptional situation, a uniqueness to the lot with respect to the variance test.

In terms of there being a practical difficulty, there was testimony qo underground to satisfy the parking requirement might cost anywhere from \$25,000 to \$40,000 per space. That was in the exhibits, and the testimony on the record here today that it would be cost prohibitive to seek to do that. The lot itself is not subject to being expanded because it's boarded by the Janney Elementary School and there's certainly a lot of discussion about their need for the land and potential projects that they have in the pipeline for the lot. So there's no opportunity to expand.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

And again, we talked about the practical difficulty of trying to remove the retaining walls.

With respect to there being substantial detriment to the public good and the zone plan, the Office of Planning testified that the Applicant met this requirement. Most patrons, according to the Office of Planning's evidence will probably walk. I think that was consistent with the Applicant's testimony as well, and that even those not walking have available to tremendous amount of mass transit in t.he immediately surrounding area.

We also have the report from the ANC which is our Exhibit 25 which to the extent that they weigh in on public detriment standards have indicated that they support the application, as long as the Applicant is willing to live with their conditions and there's testimony that the Applicant is willing to live with those conditions.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

There was testimony from the Department of Transportation that reached the opposite conclusion and their perspective is that there is substantial detriment to the public good, particularly from having the five spaces that are going to be available to the public and there not being a clear line of sight for would-be patrons to the library to recognize early enough that the lot might be full and then the inconvenience difficulty and/or downright danger of entering on to the lot and not being able to turn around and get back out safely.

But equally in our record was testimony from the Applicant that there is room on the lot for a three-point turn that would allow persons that enter onto the small lot an opportunity to get back out safely.

There was also I think an admission on the part of the Department of Transportation that many of the persons who would use this lot are going to be familiar

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

with the limited parking and as perhaps that would tend to reduce the demand for the lot. I think if I understood the testimony, the Department of Transportation went on to testify that if you had even fewer spaces there would be even fewer demands, so I think that's sort of a tasked acknowledgement that the demand for these parking spaces might b limited to the extent that you really might have an actual congestion problem.

special With respect to the exception under 2514, I don't think I could say it any better than the Office of Planning has indicated in their report and so rather than go through each of the elements through my verbal articulation, I'll just adopt by reference the report of the Office of Planning with respect to each element of Section 2514 own articulation in support of mУ application.

So I support the application. I

## NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

support it as conditioned by the ANC's negotiated agreement with the Applicant that the Applicant has consented to, and with that I'll open it up to Board Members.

MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: I would just like to note that even though we are going to accept the OP's report that we did vary from the report in regards to the parking analysis under the special exception that we applied, that the special exception did not jump to the variance test based on our interpretation of 2514D.

CHAIR LOUD: Thank you, Board Member Moldenhauer. That's an excellent point, distinction to make.

With that being said, I'm prepared to submit a motion for the application. I'd like to move for approval of Application No. 17993 for variance relief from Section 2101 of our regulations, as well as special exception relief under Section 2514 of our regulations, as conditioned. Is there a second?

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	MEMBER SCHLATER: Second.
2	CHAIR LOUD: Motion has been made
3	and seconded. Any further deliberation?
4	Hearing none, all those in favor of the
5	application say aye.
6	(Chorus of ayes.)
7	All those opposed?
8	(No response.)
9	Are there any abstentions?
10	(No response.)
11	Ms. Bailey, could you read back the
12	vote for us, please?
13	MS. BAILEY: Sure, Mr. Chairman.
14	Mr. Schlater, you seconded the motion?
15	MEMBER SCHLATER: Yes.
16	MS. BAILEY: Thank you. The vote
17	is recorded as 4-0-1, to grant the
18	application, as amended. Mr. Loud made the
19	motion. Mr. Schlater seconded. Mr. Dettman
20	and Ms. Moldenhauer support the motion.
21	CHAIR LOUD: Thank you, Ms. Bailey.
22	Is there anything further in this case?

**NEAL R. GROSS** 

1	MS. BAILEY: Summary order, Mr.
2	Chairman?
3	CHAIR LOUD: There's no opposition.
4	The ANC supported it, conditioned, but they
5	supported it, so if we can do a summary order,
6	we'd like to go ahead and do that.
7	MS. BAILEY: And then finally,
8	there were some graphics that are on the
9	easel. Are all of those graphics in the
LO	record?
L1	MS. BRAY: I don't believe that
L2	they are, but I have a hard copy that I can
L3	submit into the record now.
L4	MS. BAILEY: Yes, please.
L5	(Pause.)
L6	MS. BRAY: I'm sorry. I misspoke,
L7	but I'd be happy to submit those into the
L8	record within the next 24 hours.
L9	CHAIR LOUD: Thank you. And with
20	that I think that this case is through. We
21	appreciate your patience this afternoon, the
22	patience of your witnesses, and I think we can

call, this is our final case of the day.

(Pause.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIR LOUD: Let me ask as the parties approach and are preparing exhibits, how many witnesses are there for this case, if you could just raise your hand if you are from Central Union, and as to these witnesses are there any witnesses opposition to the case that are here today? Okay, is the ANC present. Okay, and the ANC application, is in support of the conditions, okay. I believe I did see the report. You can come on up to the table too, because you're automatically a party. I think I read one of the conditions regarding an assurance that it would not revert to community-based residential facility, if Ι understood correctly.

Okay, so it appears as though you've worked with the community and gotten a lot of the earlier opposition out of the way and this appears to be a case that will move

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	fairly rapidly? You think so. Okay, because
2	we're at 4:45 and normally
3	MS. BRAY: I certainly hope so.
4	We'll try and stick to the areas which are not
5	adequately addressed in the record and be as
6	brief as possible in our presentation.
7	CHAIR LOUD: Okay. I tell you
8	what, let's take a five-minute break. You can
9	get all of your exhibits together. It's
10	mostly a bathroom break and then in five
11	minutes exactly we'll go get people out of the
12	bathroom, bring them back here and we'll
13	resume with the case.
14	(Whereupon, the above-entitled
15	matter went off the record at 4:52 p.m. and
16	resumed at 4:57 p.m.)
17	CHAIR LOUD: Good afternoon. We're
18	back on the record and I think we are ready to
19	begin with your case, Ms. Bray.
20	There was a transportation report
21	that came in on this case too. Did you get a
22	copy? Okay, excellent.

Why don't we go ahead and Ms. Bailey, you have called this case or have you actually called the case?

MS. BAILEY: No, Mr. Chairman, I haven't called it as yet. Very quickly, Application 17717 of Central Union Mission, Mr. Chairman, as you know the application was I'll be calling the revised revised. so version. It's for special а exception pursuant to 11 DCMR Section 3104.1, to permit the development of a property in excess of 12,000 square feet within the Georgia Avenue commercial overlay district.

This would be a mixed-use building with 37 residential units, office, and retail uses. The property is zoned GA/C-3-A. It's located in Square 2895, Lots 825, 826, 830 and 831.

And Mr. Chairman, as you had ascertained earlier, there is no one here in opposition to the application, but we do have in the record four requests for party status

# NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	in opposition to the application and those
2	matters have not been taken up by the Board
3	previously.
4	CHAIR LOUD: Thank you, Ms. Bailey.
5	That's an excellent introduction. Why don't
6	we begin with taking up those party status
7	applications. They are in our record and I'm
8	going to recite what I have, Ms. Bailey, and
9	if you have something different, let me know.
10	Exhibit 42, Exhibit 48, Exhibit 36,
11	and Exhibit 30, is that correct?
12	MS. BAILEY: Those are the exhibits
13	that I have, sir.
14	CHAIR LOUD: Let me just very
15	briefly for our record, I don't see the party
16	status applicant for Exhibit 42 in our
17	audience. Is Darren Jones present today in
18	our audience? Is Clarence Moore present today
19	in our audience? And is Habitra Mohanran
20	present today in our audience?
21	Okay, what I would suggest,
22	colleagues, is that there are four party

status applications. These applications date to a period of time I think before the application changed away from being a community-based residential facility application to a mixed-use housing retail. I do believe that's a correct statement.

And none of those parties are here today, so in order to participate as a party, you really have to be present. You have to be engaged in the application and be available to ask witnesses questions and put on your case. So it would be my suggestion that each of those party status applications be denied and that we move to the merits of the case.

And seeing heads nod in consensus, then I think formally for our record, each of those exhibits I just mentioned will be denied and we'll move forward on the merits of the case.

Why don't we turn to you, counsel, you can get us started with respect to presentation of the case.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

MS. BRAY: Thank you, Mr. Good evening, again, Members once of the My name is Kinley Bray with the law Board. firm of Arent, Fox on behalf of the Applicant in this case, the Central Union Mission. me today to my right, the Board's left is David Treadwell, the Executive Director of the Central Union Mission. his To right Christopher Graae, the architect of record on

the project. To my left is Ellen McCarthy, also with the firm of Arent, Fox, all representing the Applicant in this case.

Just brief introduction, the Mission began this process in 2006 and 2007 when it began assembling the parcels which are the subject of this application. The Georgia Avenue overlay was proposed and set down for hearing in late 2006 in the midst of this assemblage. We filed this application in the fall of 2007. As you know, the Mission had property control. And at that point overlay had not yet been approved the Zoning

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Commission.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

So you'll see in our application documents that reference certain may we sections of the Georgia Avenue overlay which are -- were not codified in that particular manner. We've tried to correct all of those in our pre-hearing statement which you'll note we request to amend the application so that the use is reflective of 37 affordable housing units, along with first floor retail, approximately 2500 square feet of retail along frontage; approximately Georgia Avenue 3700 square feet of office uses which may be reserved for Mission administrative functions; and 27 parking spaces in a below-grade garage. That is the description of the use.

The Applicant has agreed to not place a homeless shelter or a community-based residential facility of any kind on this site and it is for that reason that we believe that the Advisory Neighborhood Commission, the Office of Planning, and numerous community

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

members are in support and we do not have the throngs of community members in opposition as we did when this case has been called previously and postponed.

The Mission is the record owner of the subject property and has tried unsuccessfully to sell the property or to find a development partner which would realize the District's goal of affordable housing on this This site was subject to a proposed transaction with the Mission to the move Mission's homeless shelter to the Gale School District of Columbia and the would have acquired this site and developed affordable housing on the subject property.

The Mission is moving forward with its plans for development of this property as it is the record owner and consistent with its tax-exempt purposes and the furtherance of the Georgia Avenue corridor plan recommendations and the requirements of the Georgia Avenue zone, it's proposing a mixed-use facility with

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

retail on the ground floor and residential above.

The Office of Planning and ANC have reviewed and filed their support of the amended application of record in this case.

would like to point out one error in our application, as amended. We stated in our pre-hearing statement that the building designed all of as meets the requirements of the overlay in terms of design and specifically that the building had been designed so that 75 percent of the street wall at the street level is constructed to the line in accordance with 11 **DCMR** property Section 1328.2. That is not correct.

You'll hear from the architect that the building has, in fact, been designed to address the street, but that the building as designed does not meet the 75 percent street wall requirement. We realized this in the last couple of days as we were preparing our case for this evening.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

We submit the compliance with 11 DCMR 1328.2 would actually have a detrimental effect on the surrounding neighborhood and that the building as designed is consistent with the purposes and intent of the overlay and the Georgia Avenue-Petworth Metro corridor plan upon which the overlay is based. In fact, the intent of this provision is to prevent auto-oriented uses from being placed along Georgia Avenue and the other areas in which the overlay is mapped. No such use is proposed.

Ιf Applicant in the Georgia an Avenue overlay desires relief from any design requirement, it would be in the form of a special exception granted pursuant to 11 DCMR 1330.2. We submit that we meet the general criteria and specific for granting relief. Ms. McCarthy will address her testimony, in an we therefore request that the Board allow us to amend the application further to request the additional

## NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

and that the Board waive the requirement of 1328.2 that buildings shall be designed and built so that not less than 75 percent of the street wall at the street level be constructed to the property line abutting the street right of way. Buildings on the corner lot shall be constructed to all building lines abutting public streets. That's the text of Section 1328.2.

Given the late date on which we realized this error, we would also and having discussed this with Mr. Valenti who is here representing the ANC, also we have no objection to leaving the record open so that the ANC or others could address this specific But we respectfully request that the relief. Board allow us to amend the application and request the additional relief.

CHAIR LOUD: Thank you. I don't have any problems with the amended request for relief. I'll open it up to my colleagues here

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

on the Board. I just wanted to ask, once they do, I wanted to ask OP if they agreed with your argument that 1330.2 allows through a special exception process a waiver of 1328, but I don't have any challenges with the amendment itself.

Okay, so the Board is fine with the amendment. I just wanted to turn to OP briefly for your reaction to special exception as an appropriate means to get to allow the Applicant to address 1328?

Yes, the requirement MR. MORDFIN: that 75 percent of the street wall at the street level be constructed to the property line is under the design requirements of 1328. And 1330.2 states that exceptions from the design requirements to the Georgia Avenue commercial overlay district as set forth in 1328, shall be permitted special as а exception as approved by the BZA. So yes, it is appropriate that it be considered as special exception.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	CHAIR LOUD: Thank you, sir. So I
2	think if you're ready, we can move into
3	presentation of your case for the overlay,
4	meaning the overlay as well as the
5	requirements for the waiver from the design
6	part.
7	MS. BRAY: Thank you. With that,
8	I'd like to introduce first, as a
9	preliminary matter, I would like to I've
10	submitted Mr. Graae's resume for the Board's
11	review. And Mr. Graae is an architect and
12	expert in architecture. We'd like to have him
13	qualified as such. And Ms. McCarthy, who
14	testified in the last case, and who has
15	testified numerous times before this Board, we
16	would also like to have her qualified as an
17	expert in planning and zoning.
18	CHAIR LOUD: Thank you. Did you
19	submit that to Mr. Valenti? Do you have an
20	extra copy?
21	As Mr. Valenti looks it over, do

have any questions for the

22

Board Members

1	proffered expert witnesses?
2	I don't think the Board has any
3	concerns. Let's see if
4	MEMBER SCHLATER: I just have one
5	question for Mr. Graae. Just looking over the
6	resume that's been provided to the Board, most
7	of the project experience listed seems to be
8	institutional use. Does the firm have
9	extensive background in residential design as
LO	well?
11	MR. GRAAE: Yes, yes, we do. I
L2	haven't adjusted my I don't put every
L3	project on it. I've been working on it for 35
L4	years, so it was probably tailored to an RFP
L5	at that point, but yes, we have quite a bit of
L6	residential experience.
L7	MEMBER SCHLATER: No further
L8	questions. Thank you.
L9	CHAIR LOUD: We're just waiting for
20	Mr. Valenti to have an opportunity to review
21	it. I think he just got it and see if he has
2	any questions?

(Pause.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. VALENTI: I'm fine with it.

CHAIR LOUD: Okay, then I think by consensus of the Board and there being no issues raised by the ANC, we're fine with both Ms. McCarthy and Mr. Graae being accepted as expert witnesses in their fields of expertise.

MS. BRAY: Thank you very much. With that, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to turn over to David Treadwell to give a very, very brief description of the Central Union Mission and what the Central Union Mission does in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Chairman, for MR. TREADWELL: 125 years, the Mission has been serving the homeless, the hurting, the needy of Washington, D.C. And for about ten years, we've been looking for a new facility to do that in. We've been driven by zoning. We tried to cooperate. We've been looking for C-3-A which is, of course, the place that a community-based residential facility should be

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

located. And that's how we came upon the property on Georgia Avenue.

certainly encountered strong We community opposition and in doing that, we worked with Mr. Valenti and the ANC and Mr. Graae, the Ward 1 Council Member to try and find -- okay, if this isn't going to work, we can't just have a vacant lot there. building up taxes. Interest rates are going. We've got to use the property. What is the next best use for this property? And we believe, largely influenced by Mr. Graae, that the best use that we can find for this property is the retail on the first floor and to have mixed use up stairs to make affordable housing available for people here in Washington which has such a shortage today. And we think the Mission can continue to meet needs of people in Washington in that manner.

MS. BRAY: Mr. Treadwell, are you proposing a homeless shelter or community-based residential facility of any kind on the

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	property?
2	MR. TREADWELL: We are not. We are
3	clearly not going to put our shelter on this
4	facility. We are looking downtown, Gale
5	School looks better to us. We're not sure if
6	that's going to work out, but we've been
7	looking at other alternatives, but we will not
8	put a CBRF on Georgia Avenue.
9	MS. BRAY: Unless, the Board has
10	any questions, I'd like to then turn to our
11	next witness, Mr. Graae.
12	CHAIR LOUD: Well, let's see if the
13	Board or Mr. Valenti have any questions.
14	Board Members? Okay, and Mr. Valenti?
15	MR. VALENTI: Is approval of this
16	development contingent upon that the CBRF be
17	part of the terms of approval? So we want to
18	make sure that they're willing to submit that
19	as part of the terms of approval, that there
20	be no CBRF?
21	CHAIR LOUD: Okay, I think perhaps

when we get to conditions we can discuss that,

but I think the clear testimony was that not only in this section of Georgia Avenue, but I heard him say that they're not going to put any CBRF or homeless shelter on Georgia Avenue at all. So I think that is responsive to your question, but when we get to conditions, we can make sure if it's appropriate that it's written in as a condition.

MR. VALENTI: Okay.

MEMBER SCHLATER: Mr. Treadwell, I'm new to this case and I haven't followed all the history, but you gave a good, brief synopsis of the arc of this and you said that affordable housing over retail was considered particularly by the local community as the next best option. Was consideration given to just selling the land and moving on from the project?

MR. TREADWELL: We have considered that and are willing to do that, but it's not a very good market for finding buyers.

MEMBER SCHLATER: I understand

## NEAL R. GROSS

that. And you're giving consideration to using a portion of this space as office space for Central Union? Is that still under consideration?

TREADWELL: MR. There are two options there. One is if we found the right partner or we did it ourselves, we might want put some of our such our to as administration, finance, our development our people up there. That would be them. location for Or sell the as we property, then we think that's another good use for it, because it's not as good retail. If you see the way it's centrally located in the building, it would be good for office space, but not real good for retail.

MEMBER SCHLATER: Are you pitching this project as an affordable housing project and would you be comfortable with that being one of the conditions of the project? Because clearly that limits the value of your property, if we approve it as an affordable

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

, ,	
housing	project

MR. TREADWELL: We need to be in the affordable housing business. We're not in the profit-making business.

MEMBER SCHLATER: I was just wondering if you're trying to get -- you did spend quite a bit of money, I'm sure, to acquire the property?

MR. TREADWELL: Yes.

MEMBER SCHLATER: And have cash needs. With respect to the affordable housing that's going to be a part of this project, do you have a targeted population for the affordable housing?

MR. TREADWELL: Well, the rates that work out, I mean I have worked with both Montgomery County and the District to try and find housing for people like policemen and firemen and mid-level people like that that there's just such a shortage of. We can't specifically target that, but we know that there are people in that range that need

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	housing and we're very open for that type of
2	use.
3	MEMBER SCHLATER: Will there be a
4	formal tie between the units and the Central
5	Union Mission and the population served by the
6	Central Union Mission?
7	MR. TREADWELL: We're not that
8	developed in our plans at this point.
9	MEMBER SCHLATER: Okay. No further
10	questions. Thank you very much, Mr.
11	Treadwell.
12	CHAIR LOUD: Any questions from
12 13	CHAIR LOUD: Any questions from Board Members? Just a follow-up question to
13	Board Members? Just a follow-up question to
13	Board Members? Just a follow-up question to Mr. Schlater's question in terms of the
13 14 15	Board Members? Just a follow-up question to Mr. Schlater's question in terms of the formula for affordable housing. Is there a
13 14 15 16	Board Members? Just a follow-up question to Mr. Schlater's question in terms of the formula for affordable housing. Is there a formula that would incorporate a range like
13 14 15 16	Board Members? Just a follow-up question to Mr. Schlater's question in terms of the formula for affordable housing. Is there a formula that would incorporate a range like say 30 percent AMI all the way up to 80
13 14 15 16 17	Board Members? Just a follow-up question to Mr. Schlater's question in terms of the formula for affordable housing. Is there a formula that would incorporate a range like say 30 percent AMI all the way up to 80 percent?
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Board Members? Just a follow-up question to Mr. Schlater's question in terms of the formula for affordable housing. Is there a formula that would incorporate a range like say 30 percent AMI all the way up to 80 percent?  MR. TREADWELL: Yes, there is and

1	does it start and where does it end in terms
2	of percentage of AMI?
3	MS. BRAY: The application states
4	that we're targeting a range from 50 percent
5	upward to 80 percent AMI. So we're talking
6	about moderate income housing as that's
7	defined by the zoning regulations.
8	CHAIR LOUD: Thank you. I didn't
9	have any further questions. It sounded as if
10	the Board did not as well. I believe Mr.
11	Valenti, had you exhausted your questions for
12	Mr. Treadwell? Okay.
13	So I believe we can move to your
14	next witness.
15	MS. BRAY: Thank you. Mr. Graae is
16	going to walk through the features of the
17	property and will address the street wall
18	requirement.
19	Mr. Graae, I think the record is
20	quite full in this case with respect to
21	design, so if you can focus your testimony on
22	the 75 percent street wall requirement and how

that has changed in its application, I would appreciate it.

MR. GRAAE: Good afternoon, should I say good evening, after five, Board My name is Chris Graae. Members. principal with Cox, Graae and Spack, Architects. And we've been working with the Mission on this site for I guess I've lost track, a couple of years now.

I think the thing that is probably quite relevant is it was a series of lots that were assembled, and there was a car wash here and it had an inlet and an outlet and there was a parking lot here that had a curb cut onto Newton. All three of those curb cuts are going away, happy to say. And our basic building, access will be off of the public alley which is a good public alley in that three ways in and out. So it's good for circulation.

The other things I'd point out, it may be a little hard to see in this small

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Google satellite photo, but basically Newton is composed of townhouses. You can see that we have a pocket of C-3-A here and it sort of cuts into the R-4 zone a bit. But basically this is all townhouses except for an apartment building here that's roughly the scale of our proposed building and then townhouses that go all the way down Newton.

And as sort of a preview to why we carved our building envelope the way we did, this is a small townhouse residential context with buildings set back from the property lines with little front yard and porches and stoops. And it's that kind of context and of course, Georgia Avenue is primarily right now one, two, perhaps a few three-story buildings. So our challenge was to develop a project that was quite a bit bigger than what was there before, of course, in a way that would commercial retail address the context Avenue, but also respect the small Georgia context of residential neighborhood the

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

immediately on its door step in the R-4 zone.

And again, that can be illustrated somewhat probably by these — these are the two most relevant photographs. This is that parking lot in between the two buildings. Our site is the corner here, back to there. And you can see the row houses on either side immediately adjacent to our property in that context and how they're generally pulled back from the property line. There are other context photos that we can draw back on, if we need to.

And probably I'll start with really the first floor. It's probably the most important one to understand. Newton here, Georgia there, townhouses pretty much starting about here and heading that way and this being all townhouses, all of them fronting on Newton.

Since our approach was to take the basic building that had been developed earlier, the basic envelop that had sort of

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

planning principles behind sound it, essentially departed this reincarnation with the previous design and building envelop and 3D configuration and basically filled the box with a different user. And the essence of it is the retail is located on Georgia. The lobby -- this is again the basic design had been there originally. This is a corneroriented building with the main lobby entrance off of the corner and then a community room that supporting the occupants of the building. And then there's the office component.

One change we made from the last design was we pulled back this facade to get light and air into this office because originally there was program in there that didn't need it and we thought that this was a good potential location and use for the office component.

And then on this one floor, we have four apartments that get the best of the light and air as typically would be the topology of

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the townhouses adjacent to it. And we set back this line here which is one of these issues of the 75 percent street frontage on the lot line. We pulled back basically there to defer and reference the setbacks that start here and go all the way down Newton and to lower the scale and modulate the building and add more stimulation and interest to the structures so that it's not imposing.

And then we made a fairly strong corner treatment with the corner entrance and sort of flanking wings that come out to the property line and then we indented it again at this point where some of the retail is, again, to tend to foster that ability for a retail tenant to perhaps put a nice café seating area out there. And there's some generous space to bring some life and interest to the street without being kind of being right on Georgia Avenue.

So this kind of modulation was our way of kind of carving the larger scale of the

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

building and bringing it down, giving it life and interest and shades and shadows.

And as I said, the curb cuts that are here and here are gone. Our garage will be accessed via this alley, down a ramp and into the garage which we have increased the parking capacity for. We're at 29 spaces, 27. And then there are building support functions here for storage and mechanical and electrical space and then skipping from the first, well, I should probably -- I thought I'd throw in the current 3D model of what the building looks like as viewed from that corner to help describe how this carving of the building, we think, significantly helps the volume and the context -- relate to the context that's here. indentation that mentioned That's that Т earlier. And the same thing happens here. This is pushed in at the apartments that are on this first floor and then it's set back yet the top two, three, and aqain on floors.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

So all of the above first floor are all apartment layouts and you are -- you enter the building at this corner point and there will be a retail, active retail tenant there and then there will be green backyards or possibly yards to use for the apartments if we so choose to do that.

And then your typical floor, once you get to the second floor extrudes to the -up through the rest of the building, course, so we can stack efficiently. And our mix are basically primarily roughly a 60/40 split between one and two bedrooms within the ranges of what that market type wants provide and they are arrayed around on the corridor here and then there's a corridor with laundry room each floor on and some additional support and mechanical space, the two elevators and tower and the stairs And that basically, like I say either end. extrudes through.

On this second floor, we do have

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the ability to come out onto a terrace from apartments and again, we're studying those options and then at the there's top penthouse that will obviously have the rooftop equipment in it. Some of the elevations that we've studied, again, this is quite similar to the more or less the feel of the previous project, but with obviously fenestration and orientation for the predominant set up apartment use.

This is that community room that's the entrance point that you're sort of looking at obliquely. That's the first set back for the first floor apartments and then the rest of the building sets back from that.

This is looking at the rear of the property. The garage will be entered from a ramp that will come down here. There's a loading dock, even though the zoning code requirement — there were no requirements for loading and platform. We're providing that. And then the other elevation is the street

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

front along Georgia Avenue. This is the retail. It's, of course, that 50 percent, we're trying to keep the openness, the visibility, the ability to see through into that retail tenant space. It could be one. It could be several retails. It's quite flexible there. And then the rest of the building, as I mentioned, of course, are the apartments.

The basic materials are brick facade which is going to give that us durability that we need down at street level with a stone base and then a stucco system above and it's meant to be kind of contextual with the kind of scale and feel of the smaller to medium-sized buildings that are in the area.

And that's the site plan. That's actually the old site plan. We have an updated, but it's very similar to this. So you can see the three lots that were assembled to make the one property and that garage is

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

accessed from this back alley and that's the loading dock area, all of which is pushed off behind the building away out of sight.

MS. BRAY: Mr. Graae, the Georgia requires Section Avenue overlay 1328.5, requires that each building fronting on Georgia Avenue shall devote not less than 50 percent of the surface area of the street wall at the ground level to entrances to commercial uses or to the building's main lobby and to having display windows clear clear or emissivity glass, decorative or architectural accents do not count towards the 50 percent Has the building been designed requirement. to comply with this requirement?

MR. GRAAE: Yes, this area this zone that you see here along Georgia Avenue, basically it's three quarters of that facade is designed to be that kind of context with 14-foot ceilings and lots of openness and plenty of opportunity for entrances.

MS. BRAY: Can you point out where

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2	MR. GRAAE: For the retail?
3	MS. BRAY: For the retail, right.
4	MR. GRAAE: That's one entrance
5	there and an alternative of course, it
6	could be divided into even smaller spaces if I
7	go back to that floor plan. This is the area
8	we're talking about which takes more than
9	three quarters of the building's frontage on
10	Georgia. This could be one tenant. This
11	could be another tenant. They're configured
12	in a way that probably would foster smaller
13	retail in a good way as well.
14	MS. BRAY: And finally, what's the
15	clear, floor to ceiling height of the first
16	floor?
17	MR. GRAAE: It's 14-foot
18	requirement in the overlay.
19	MS. BRAY: Thank you very much.
20	CHAIR LOUD: Thank you. Are there
21	any questions for the witness?
22	MEMBER SCHLATER: I have a quick

the entrances the commercial uses?

1	question, two quick questions on the design.
2	The first is on the retail space. I don't
3	have a scale on your drawings, so can you just
4	tell me generally what is the depth of the
5	retail space from the frontage to the back
6	there?
7	MR. GRAAE: In the shallower one?
8	MEMBER SCHLATER: Yes.
9	MR. GRAAE: The one you're
10	wondering about?
11	MEMBER SCHLATER: Yes.
12	MR. GRAAE: Hang on one second. I
13	would say that's about 25 feet, on the shallow
14	one, 25 to 30 feet. On the deep one, yes,
15	that's probably 45 to 50 on the deep one.
16	This one is about 23, 24, something like that.
17	MEMBER SCHLATER: Do you think
18	that's sufficient depth to acquire a retail
19	tenant? I'm just curious, from what I've
20	heard many retailers require more depth in
21	their space in order to lay out a store.

MR. GRAAE: Well, again, if it was

a single tenant, they would have the benefit of this deeper support space. I think it really depends on the kind of -- at one point we were proposing a café in this zone, a very small kind of a café.

MEMBER SCHLATER: The only reason why I mention that is the -- I believe one of the overriding purposes of the recently approved Georgia Avenue plan was to create retail spaces that were retail spaces. And I think that's partly addressed by having sufficient retail space, but also the layout of that space would be important too.

MR. GRAAE: If that were an issue from a marketing point of view, I think we could adjust things in here and add depth to it. I really think that could be accomplished pretty easily.

MEMBER SCHLATER: And the other question I had was on the facade and the materials chosen for the facade. I noticed you're using masonry on the base, is that

1	right?
2	MR. GRAAE: Yes, brick masonry, the
3	tanner brick, darker material that you see
4	there is a brick facade with perhaps a stone
5	base.
6	MEMBER SCHLATER: Okay.
7	MR. GRAAE: And then precast
8	details like the coursing and window jack
9	arches and sills and things like that. And
10	once you get above the second floor, it's a
11	stucco system, a very durable, easily
12	maintained stucco.
13	MEMBER SCHLATER: That's EIFS?
14	MR. GRAAE: That is known
15	generically as EIFS, yes.
16	MEMBER SCHLATER: In the city we
17	don't like EIFS. It's stuff you see
18	oftentimes out in the suburbs. I just wonder
19	if you had thought about potentially other
20	materials up there. I'm not a huge fan
21	personally of that. I'm concerned I just

don't want -- this is Georgia Avenue. It's an

area where there's been under investment for many, many years and understanding that this is affordable housing project and there's a socialness to this project, so it doesn't have unlimited budget. I also know we've seen plenty of cases of affordable housing projects that have come through with inventive uses of cheaper materials, but that have -- I don't know, a better presence than EIFS maybe.

I would just respond MR. GRAAE: see very substantial durable you can materials are being used at the lower parts of the buildings which get the most wear and And I would also add that EIFS has tear. matured dramatically in the last five or so It did have a bad rep. It did have years. performance issues. The product is substantially better and we're comfortable using it again. There were years for our it banished until firm where was issues were addressed which we feel they have not done so.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	MEMBER SCHLATER: No further
2	questions, thank you.
3	CHAIR LOUD: Any additional
4	questions from the Board Members?
5	Just a couple of quick follow-up
6	questions from me, Mr. Graae. In terms of the
7	75 percent threshold requirement regarding the
8	street wall, and you may have said this and I
9	just didn't zero in on it, but what is the
LO	percentage now? It's less than 75 percent.
L1	MR. GRAAE: Yes.
L2	CHAIR LOUD: If you have that
L3	number available.
L4	MR. GRAAE: I should have that at
L5	my fingertips. It is probably about 30
L6	percent, 25 to 30 percent on Georgia Avenue.
L7	Because as you see in terms of the plan, let
L8	me go back to that, the building, we chose to
L9	do a corner treatment here which obviously
20	means that you're cutting a corner off, which
21	is a fairly standard architectural planning

situation on Georgia Avenue. Many of the

buildings that you'll see there do have corner -- in fact, right across the street at Newton is the smaller version of the same thing. So we were kind of responding to some of context there bу that approach. So immediately once you decide to use that device, we're pulling away from the lot line. And then we did choose to indent this area in order to sort of make this a corner entrance, almost a shallow tower, if you will, be a strong presence and to allow more to happen on the street front in terms of perhaps a café wanting more depth to arrange umbrellas and chairs.

So on that side, we are probably, like I say, a third, 30 to 35 percent, let's say. And I can come back and give you actual dimensions. Unfortunately, I didn't bring a scale with me.

On Newton, which frankly I'm mystified why that would be a benefit, frankly, on a residential street like that,

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

but on that frontage we're probably less, we're in the range of 25 percent.

But it's the net benefits, in our view that we get by providing more outdoor space, more places to landscape and green and there's no way people are going to park on this because they're going to be prevented from doing that. We don't have curb cuts any more and it allowed us to carve the building and make what would otherwise be a pretty intimidating facade, to bring this thing right up to the property lines for 75 percent of those two lengths of the building would be a pretty unrelenting, heavy-duty, commercial feeling building. And we thought it wouldn't have that context, with respect to the context and it would have kind of that residential feel that we were trying to achieve there by kind of breaking the box.

CHAIR LOUD: Thank you, and this is sort of an academic question for counsel, but do you think when they did the overlay that

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

they intended, that they contemplated wraparound buildings like this, corner buildings that would end up not -- where a substantial part of the building would not be on Georgia Avenue?

MS. BRAY: I think that's probably a question better addressed to Ms. McCarthy and her testimony. However, I will say that the Office of Planning's set down report in Zoning Commission Case No. 06-48 which is the proposal for the Georgia Avenue overlay, noted that auto-oriented uses, particularly where parking is proposed between building Georgia should frontage and Avenue be discouraged and they cite to specific portions of the comprehensive plan and the Georgia Avenue-Petworth Metro corridor plan for that statement.

The second sentence of that section which says that for corner lots, the property should abut both street frontages. I think it was clearly intended that the property not be

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

set back significantly from one portion of the property to the other.

Here, we have a building that is addressing both street frontages, although not abutting it for the entirety and even for the majority of the property line.

I also note that for purpose of interpreting the language of that requirement, 1328, there's no possible way to actually make the street frontage, 75 percent of the street frontage on Georgia Avenue abut the property line, because there is a significant building restriction line along Georgia Avenue which requires that the building be set back. I believe it's nine feet along Georgia Avenue. So we're going right up to the building restriction line where we can and carving out in that small area where the retail entrance is proposed.

CHAIR LOUD: Thank you. Does the ANC have any questions?

MR. VALENTI: No.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	CHAIR LOUD: All right. Your next
2	witness?
3	MS. BRAY: With that I'd like to
4	turn it over to Ms. McCarthy.
5	MS. McCARTHY: Good evening,
6	Chairman Loud, Members of the Board. I'd like
7	to start today with just a little bit of
8	context about Georgia Avenue which may be
9	unnecessary in the case of Mr. Loud who I know
10	is very familiar with Georgia Avenue, at least
11	the upper part, but we are talking about an
12	avenue that people have been talking about the
13	revitalization of for way more than 30 years.
14	Probably many of us can remember one of Bill
15	Clinton's first gestures to the city, walking
16	on Georgia Avenue with former Council Member
17	Jarvis to show the commitment of the Federal
18	Government. It's been a series of
19	disappointments and not much in the way of
20	reinvestment, especially not in the lower part

In 2000, Mayor Williams thought

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

21

22

of Georgia Avenue.

that an important action to help revitalize Georgia Avenue would be to put the Department of Motor Vehicles at the Petworth Metro Unfortunately, there are people who Station. lived in the neighborhood didn't think that was such a hot idea and after a couple -almost two years of controversy and discussion The Office of that proposal was withdrawn. Planning did а SNAP plan, а Strategic Neighborhood Action Plan. One of recommendations of which was the need for a small area plan to look at the revitalization of the area.

So starting in 2003, and concluding in 2004, the Georgia Avenue-Petworth Metro Station Area and Corridor Plan which addressed this area was done and one of the recommendations that came from that plan was having an overlay which would address some of the land use related issues that developed.

I was not in charge of neighborhood planning when that planning study began, but

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

some point along the lines I became Deputy Director Neighborhood Planning, for addition Historic Preservation to and Development Review, and it was staggering the amount of reinvestment in this area and for those businesses that were extant the amount of redundancy, braiding shops, nail salons, liquor stores, check cashing, the amount of made auto-oriented uses which it almost impossible to attract other kinds So the discussion that took place retailers. the actions the study and were translated into the overlay were very much geared around trying to eliminate that kind of blight.

And I think it's important to have that as the context when we look then at the provisions of the overlay and see how this project measures up against them. First, to realize that in terms of understanding the site, it was the home of a former car wash, apartment house, and convenience store, with

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

vacant parcels. There's a mixture in the area there of immediately around commercial buildings and fronts vacant store along Georgia Avenue with predominantly low-scale row houses on either side of Georgia Avenue, some of which are also vacant and one of the only new investments in that stretch other than the new Donnatella and Klein project at Petworth Metro is a charter school, the design of which is probably -- well, I'll just say the design of which predates the overlay, unfortunately.

Office When the of Planning published its revitalization strategy report, the plan concluded in the beginning is in need of revival. With avenue distinctive residential building stock and a housing market, the strong area experiences pockets of crime, vacant deteriorating residential and commercial properties, a steady increase in automobileoriented business, and declining

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

infrastructure and public realm."

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

while the plan predominantly So addressed opportunities for redevelopment there were large amounts of property, it did recommend the creation of an overlay zone " to stabilize existing desired businesses and encourage redevelopment and to implement design standards to improve quality of the public realm."

The Comprehensive Plan then came along in 2006, designated this a main street mixed-use corridor in the generalized land use map and designated it as mixed use, medium density residential and moderate density commercial in the future land use map. Rock Creek East element of the plan, the area element, recognized the importance of creating additional affordable housing to deal with what then rapidly increasing housing were retain the diverse prices in order to character of the area. It also reinforced the redevelopment the need to encourage of

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

commercial areas and to encourage more pedestrian-oriented retail.

The overlay was adopted by the Zoning Commission in 2007 with the aim of furthering these goals.

So let's look specifically at the special exception criteria. The main ones that you're familiar with from 3104, that the use is in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the zone regulations and zone maps, and that the use is not likely to adversely affect neighboring property. And then the specific conditions that are specified in the neighborhood commercial overlay broadly and with regard to the Georgia Avenue plan.

As we've discussed before and I think you've seen in the record and I don't think we need to go into in detail, in terms of the design criteria that are in the overlay we're in conformance. I just wanted to put the issues that Mr. Graae was dealing with in a design sense with regard to the 75 percent

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

requirement in a little bit of planning context for you.

The -- let's see, the Newton Place is an extraordinarily narrow street. It is 50 feet wide. You can't say that about very many streets in this city. And when you look, if I could direct your attention to the application -- to the pre-hearing statement on the plan section which is number two, there is a photo in the middle of page two, the bottom row, right in the middle that says Newton Place view west with site on left. It makes Newton Place look a little bit wider than it actually is, because it's a foreshortened view of Newton Place. But what I wanted to direct your attention to is that not only is Newton Place only 50 feet wide, but you can see from the townhouses that are on the right how close they are to the street. I haven't measured the sidewalk there, but it's quite narrow and putting a taller building immediately across the street from that would have been not only

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

-- would have itself had an adverse impact had we followed the requirement of putting the building closer to the street wall.

That's one rationale for why we don't meet the 75 percent and the other reason we don't meet it is the chamfered corner at Georgia and Newton. But it's important again to pull back in a broader context and realize one of the things that -- one of the rallying points for the plan and for hopes for revitalization of Georgia the Avenue was opening of the Petworth Metro. We expect it to have the same kind of impact that opening the Metro in Columbia Heights had on an area that had been decimated in the civil disturbances in '68 and had seen virtually no for the 40 after that, reinvestment years until the Metro Station opened and began to gel.

So orienting the corner of that building north toward the Petworth Metro Station is an important gesture

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

architecturally, I think, to orient the building toward Metro to the pedestrian traffic that's coming and going from the Metro Station and to penalize the building having made that gesture, I think would be a mistake, particularly because as we've already stated, really the requirements in the overlay to get to Georgia Avenue and the property line was so we weren't having parking lots with a building set behind them. It wasn't so we couldn't put a gesture at which we could put café tables or allow people the opportunity to gather outside the front door of the building and meet and greet their neighbors or step back a building to have the opportunity to give a little more light and air to the people who live across Newton.

And I would note with regard to that, Ms. Bray has indicated that we'd be willing to amend the application for a special exception, but I would also direct your attention both in Section 1304, the broad

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

section of the neighborhood commercial overlay and then 1330.3, the specific section that deals with the Georgia Avenue overlay. Both of them permit the Board to impose requirements with regard to design and massing to protect neighboring property and the proposed setbacks would certainly be acceptable to the Applicant if the Board would like to impose them and we just happened to be prescient enough to have drawn them into the plans that were submitted to you in advance.

last thing that I wanted to The direct your attention to and another important reason why that gesture to step back on Newton Place is important is to look again at the first set of plans where in the pre-hearing statement where you see in yellow the boundary that the C-3-A zone takes. As you'll see, it takes this funny jump in, а substantial distance for this property, so that you could have had commercial development qoinq substantially far into that block which would

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

have put it then directly across from this whole narrow set of townhouses. And I think (a) the fact that the land use choice has been to put residential there and then secondly to step it back is just an important recognition of the fact that the odd placement of the C-3-A boundary makes it even more important to develop design and gestures in the building that will respect that neighboring property that is across the street.

important thing that you the find with regard to the requested special exception for properties of 12,000 feet and above is that the proposed use is not likely affect adversely the to use of neighboring property. We've already addressed a number of those and just to run down the reasons for the record, the retail use along Georgia Avenue is consistent with the requirement to provide retail along Georgia and the existing development in the corridor certainly be consistent with the and will

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

future development of the vacant parcels to the south of the property which will also have to abide by the same overlay requirements.

And I guess I would say with regard to Commissioner Schlater's concerns, while it is true that there's a certain amount of depth that is required for retail, one of the things that we noted was a problem for retail on Georgia Avenue was so many of these spaces obsoletely deep, so that you especially those that have kind of the little boot on the front, but they tend to be space that is so deep that a retailer, especially one that needs to relate to street with shop windows can't really use the depth of the property behind it. So I think having a shallower based, which is still 25 feet or 28 feet, with the opportunity to then expand in the back with the right set of tenants, I think is not a recipe, it is a recipe for retail success of the kind of retail that I think we need to encourage here.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

So the commercial side of the property along Georgia Avenue would not have impacting neighboring adverse on the an property along Georgia, and then as you turn the corner onto Newton Place and would become residential in character, we've got sufficient parking, the entrance of the parking is off The design of the project is the alley. residential and echoes the materials of the other residential uses on that block. All of those reasons Ι think taken together reasons why we can safely conclude that there is no adverse impact on neighboring uses.

Skipping ahead, well, it also has to be consistent with the OP plan and the Great Streets plan and those -- the purpose for those included: encouraging additional residential encouraging uses, approved commercial uses, encouraging vertically mixed uses with ground floor commercial residential above from Park Road to Shepherd Street and the proposed project is clearly

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

consistent with those purposes. We've addressed the design criteria.

So quess in the end I would Ι conclude if you look at the recommendations in the Office of Planning's Georgia Avenue plan, specifically when it came to doing the overlay, the recommendation said apply transit-oriented development principles dynamic place with generate а increased variety and intensity of land uses activities within walking distance of the Metro Station that draws the community visitors alike to socialize, shop, live and The 3500 block of Georgia Avenue interact. has been waiting a long time to see investment in a new building that will achieve these Not only will the proposed project not ends. have adverse impact on its neighbors, it is hard to imagine a project that could be more in tune with the goals the community set in 2004.

Thanks.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

CHAIR LOUD: Thank you, Ms. McCarthy. Are there any questions for the witness?

Mr. Valenti?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. VALENTI: I just want to make a comment about some of the stuff that was said. One is on the orientation of the building. think that the building it is replacing is also oriented kind of in the same way with the entrance facing toward the Metro. So I think that would be a good thing. But in terms of when zoning on Georgia Avenue changed from C-2-A to C-3-A back in I think it was 2004, the neighborhood was opposed to it and one of the Georgia Avenue corridor plan and the overlay and some of the other things that we've been involved in since then, the overwhelming thing that I hear is that you want to massing of buildings to go down as you move south from the Metro Station.

One of the concerns that we did raise was the building is probably a little

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

larger than what we would like to see. The use of the stucco is supposed to help blend that in some. So I'd just like you to consider that.

CHAIR LOUD: Okay, thank you. I think in terms of how we proceed that we allow -- it might be better if we allow the Applicant to finish out its case. Then we'll go to Office of Planning and then we'll come back to you and to the ANC's report and then you can delve into it a little more fully without being concerned that we're going out of order here.

So I think the Applicant can sort of chew over what you just said and we'll come back to you for that kind of testimony. But if you have any specific questions for any of the three witnesses that the Applicant has presented this will be a good time to follow up.

MR. VALENTI: So the Georgia Avenue
Overlay District does state which desired

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	types of commercial uses or retail uses would
2	be listed. What are your ideas specifically
3	for the kinds of retail uses that would be in
4	the building?
5	MR. TREADWELL: The idea that we
6	had originally was café and bookstore.
7	However, we have to be honest. There's going
8	to be retail interest there. We're going to
9	find out who is going to make money and be a
10	good tenant and so you don't want to do
11	anything without studying the neighborhood,
12	finding out what needs are, what are people
13	looking for there. But the two ideas that we
14	had in mind initially were a café and a
15	bookstore.
16	MR. VALENTI: That's all.
17	CHAIR LOUD: Thank you, Mr.
18	Valenti, and if you have some additional
19	questions come to mind, we can see if we can
20	get those questions in and to the witnesses

**NEAL R. GROSS** 

Applicant, are you through with

for you.

21

your case?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MS. BRAY: I have a couple of very brief questions on redirect for Ms. McCarthy and Mr. Graae.

CHAIR LOUD: Okay.

MS. BRAY: Mr. Graae, were you able to find a scale?

MR. GRAAE: I was. I did use my graphic scale and the depth is 28 feet on the shallow part and it's about 64 on the deep.

MS. BRAY: Okay. And Ms. McCarthy, with respect to the design requirements and the special exception criteria for waiver of the design requirements under 1330.2 should the Board find that that special exception relief is necessary, is there any, from a planning perspective, is there in your review or in your experience as a planner, is there any reason to believe that the parking traffic associated with project the or noise with would associated the project objectionable or have a significant impact on

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

the neighboring property?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MS. McCARTHY: Yes, I'm glad you reminded me, because it was in my testimony, but I didn't mention it. But those are the two other conditions and yes, I believe that the number of parking spaces, there are only 27 and the entry and exit is off of the alley, so the likelihood of having an adverse impact on the residential neighbors that are behind that is extremely small and the way that the building is constructed with the major retail use being on the front and with it stepping down to the residential uses behind it, I think would minimize any noise or disruption to the residential uses that are behind it.

MS. BRAY: Thank you. Chairman Loud, that concludes the Applicant's presentation.

CHAIR LOUD: Thank you and unless we have questions for these witnesses, we'll turn to the Office of Planning. Are there any questions?

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

Okay, so we'll turn to the Office of Planning. Good early evening.

MR. MORDFIN: Good early evening, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Board. Stephen Mordfin with the Office of Planning. And the subject application conforms to the criteria for the granting of special exception because the property is in excess of 12,000 square feet of land area and with the exception of the 75 percent street wall built at the street level, built to the property line, the building is designed in conformance with the design requirements of the Georgia Overlay District with modern retail Avenue ground floor and residences space the on above.

The application will advance the recommendations of the Great Streets framework plane for 7th Street/Georgia Avenue through the elimination of parking lots on Georgia Avenue and will contribute to the transformation of Georgia Avenue to an

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

attractive residential and retail core.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

All vehicular access would be from the alley and all existing curb cuts along Georgia and Newton would be eliminated and the design of the building steps back after the first floor along Newton Street toward the row houses west of the alley.

reference the additional to special exception requested by the Applicant having to do with the 75 percent of the street wall, the building, even though it doesn't come all the way up for 75 percent, one of the design requirements was that you wanted to bring the buildings to the street and make it so that people could walk easily into the buildings and also to create a street wall, not parking lots along the side. And what this building does as you see, as it goes around from Georgia from the south property line around the corner, it goes up sidewalk, whether that sidewalk be a part of the public space or part of the private space.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

So it is achieving that goal of bringing the building to the street because it would be imperceptible to anyone walking down the street where the public and private line would be. And so you would be able to walk into all of those buildings.

So I think in reference to that, I think the requested special exception to reduce that 75 percent is justified. And therefore the Office of Planning recommends approval of the application.

Thank you.

MS. McCARTHY: And Mr. Chair, I should note this as a point of privilege that I had some involvement in the Georgia Avenue plan. Mr. Mordfin was there at all of the planning meetings and is the author of the overlay. So if he says we comply, you can take it from a good authority that we comply.

CHAIR LOUD: Thank you. And that's your unbiased, totally objective opinion on it.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	Are there any questions for the
2	Office of Planning?
3	Mr. Valenti, do you have any
4	questions?
5	MR. VALENTI: I would just like
6	clarification on 1327.3(e) and 1330.2(a) which
7	state that the strategy would incorporate
8	uniform building design and enhance urban
9	design features in the immediate vicinity in
LO	which it's located.
L1	What buildings within the immediate
L2	vicinity were used to make the judgment that
L3	it is actually conforming?
L4	MR. MORDFIN: I'm sorry, you said
L5	1327.3(e) which is the uniform building design
L6	standards and I'm sorry
L7	MR. VALENTI: And the 1330.2(a)
L8	which says enhance urban design features in
L9	the immediate vicinity in which it's located.
20	MR. MORDFIN: Correct, to enhance
21	the urban design features, when we looked at
22	what was on Georgia Avenue and we surveyed it

up and down Georgia, what we noticed was that
there were a lot of buildings there that did
not exhibit modern features. Many of them
were built originally as residential row
houses that had been converted to commercial
store fronts. And these, and of them also we
had a lot of automobile-oriented uses there.
Like the car wash that's on this site. And
what we wanted to do was change those. And we
wanted to enhance the urban design features by
allowing for or encouraging buildings that
would be built up to the street line to the
extent possible that would eliminate all of
the parking lots on Georgia Avenue and
eliminate the curb cuts and provide modern
retail store, modern retail spaces that had
the minimum 14-foot height for the interior of
the store to attract modern retailers to the
area.

I don't -- did I address the other one? Well, the uniform building design standards they -- the design includes things

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

like the 14-foot minimum height by also
requiring the clear, what is the word, the
glass, not wanting the windows to be blocked
up. Some of the stores along Georgia Avenue
had cinder blocks that had blocked up all the
windows. You couldn't see in. You couldn't
see out. You didn't know what was being sold
there. We wanted to encourage them to have
windows there that you could see into.
Encourage maybe street shopping, which might
then encourage people to actually purchase
things on Georgia Avenue. So that's what we
meant by the uniform building design standards
and that's what we also meant by encouraging,
by improving the urban design features.

CHAIR LOUD: Thank you Mr. Valenti.

And again, if some additional questions surface for you, we can always take the opportunity to ask the Office of Planning those questions.

Ms. Bray, did you have any questions for the Office of Planning?

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	MS. BRAY: I do not, thank you.
2	CHAIR LOUD: Okay.
3	MS. BRAY: Other than to say I
4	think it was an excellent report.
5	CHAIR LOUD: Okay. Thank you. And
6	I do believe also that there is a report that
7	was filed by the Department of Transportation.
8	I do see Mr. Jennings. Good early evening to
9	you again and thanks for the long day you've
10	had. Also, thanks for getting in the report
11	that the Department has submitted for us. I
12	believe the report is not a timely report, so
13	I think the first order of business for us
14	would be to waive in to our record, barring
15	some concerns, that I'm going to give the
16	Applicant an opportunity to raise if there are
17	such or Board Members, or ANC.
18	MS. BRAY: The Applicant has seen
19	the report and is prepared to question DDOT
20	and/or address it in closing remarks or
21	rebuttal testimony if necessary.

CHAIR LOUD: Okay. And I don't

believe I hear any concerns from the Board necessarily. So we'll waive our requirements with respect to the timeliness issue and make this a part of our records and then allow the Applicant to address some of the things that you raise in it. So why don't we then turn to you,

Mr. Jennings, for the essence of your report.

MR. evening, JENNINGS: Good Chairman Loud, and Members of the Board. for name is Jeff Jennings. I work the District Department of Transportation. not really sure as to where to begin because we don't have an updated transportation impact study for the amended application. So we provided comments what the original on proposed plan for this site.

I'd be happy to take any questions. I think we'd prefer to have an updated or supplemental transportation impact representing the residential building with 37 apartments and ground floor retail.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	CHAIR LOUD: Thank you. I'm going
2	to let the Applicant weigh in on the
3	transportation study and it's propriety or
4	lack thereof, and of course, if Board Members
5	have questions for you, but based on the
6	testimony that you have heard, and I don't
7	know if you had an opportunity to read the
8	Applicant's pre-hearing statement, which I
9	believe sort of corrected the earlier
10	project's presentation, 14 CBR facility, but
11	again, looking at those two parts of the
12	record, the Applicant's written submission and
13	then the testimony you've heard today, do you
14	feel like DDOT has an opinion with respect to
15	the application?
16	MR. JENNINGS: I haven't had the
17	opportunity to read the pre-hearing statement
18	and I honestly cannot say, sir. I don't know.
19	CHAIR LOUD: Okay. Board Members,
20	are there any questions for Department of
21	Transportation? Why don't we turn to Ms.

Bray, to see if you have any questions?

1	MS. BRAY: I'm not sure I have any
2	questions based on Mr. Jennings' assertion
3	that he hasn't reviewed the pre-hearing
4	statement. I would like to note for the
5	record that the traffic impact study that was
6	submitted with the original application
7	reviewed a proposed 60,000 square foot
8	structure as noted in DDOT's report which was
9	essentially the maximum allowed on the site
10	and at this point we are proposing a project
11	that is significantly below 60,000 square feet
12	and not of the same scale and scope as the
13	project that was reviewed.
14	We provided the nonetheless, we
15	provided the pre-hearing statement and the
16	traffic analysis which the Mission
17	commissioned back in 2007 to DDOT to aid in
18	its review of this project last week upon
19	DDOT's request.
20	MEMBER SCHLATER: Have you
21	considered getting an updated traffic study?

MS.

BRAY: We have not at this

1	point because as a matter of course when an
2	Applicant is proposing a use which is
3	significantly less than what would be
4	permitted as a matter of right, and is
5	complying with the parking requirements and
6	layout requirements, we typically don't advise
7	our clients, particularly nonprofit clients to
8	go to the extra expense of a traffic impact
9	analysis. If this were a PUD, absolutely, we
10	would have submitted an updated traffic
11	analysis or if we were proposing more square
12	footage than would be permitted as a matter of
13	right.
14	MEMBER SCHLATER: I guess I would
15	say if the program has changed, was there
16	retail in the previous program?
17	MS. BRAY: There was approximately
18	1500 square feet of retail that would have
19	been operated by the Mission.
20	MEMBER SCHLATER: And how is that
21	proposed to be loaded and serviced?
22	MS. BRAY: There's actually no

loading requirements for the -- under the zoning regulations for the amount of retail that is being proposed, but Mr. Graae can point out on the site plan where proposed loading facility is located.

MR. GRAAE: Yes, both the retail and the office tenants can gain access from the loading dock through this corridor to service the retail and the office sites.

MS. BRAY: What size loading berth and loading platform are proposed?

MR. GRAAE: Let's see. We iust talked about it as a loading area. Since there wasn't specific criteria required, it's about -- there's a loading platform of at least 200 square feet, I would say, 150 square feet, let's call it. And then a loading berth that would certainly accommodate a 30-food truck quite easily. Because not only are we setting back for our rear yard, you can see there's a further setback here to get a truck in there and a loading dock. So it's pretty

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	generous considering we were under the
2	minimums anyway.
3	MEMBER SCHLATER: Are the parking
4	spaces, the number of parking spaces the same
5	as in the previous proposal?
6	MS. BRAY: No, there are additional
7	parking spaces that are required which is tied
8	to the change in use from a proposed
9	community-based residential facility which
10	requires only one parking space per ten beds,
11	I believe. And we had proposed 19 parking
12	spaces to one parking space per three dwelling
13	units in the C-3-A, as well as the retail and
14	office use was providing some parking for
15	those, although the zoning regulations do not
16	require provision of parking for those uses
17	unless they meet a minimum square footage
18	threshold of which we have not met.
19	MEMBER SCHLATER: Thank you. No
20	further questions.
21	CHAIR LOUD: Just a quick question
22	I guess for your expert, Ms. McCarthy.

1	In terms of the overlay, what are
2	the transportation-related elements that you
3	think the evidence would be relevant to?
4	MS. McCARTHY: I'm sorry, that the
5	evidence would be relevant to?
6	CHAIR LOUD: That the DDOT evidence
7	would align with essentially you're before
8	us to establish that you meet the conditions
9	of the overlay and the general special
10	exception requirements. And now the special
11	exception for the waiver related to the 75
12	percent threshold. And so with respect to the
13	standards that we're looking at, where do you
14	see the DDOT testimony connecting?
15	MS. McCARTHY: Well, the Great
16	Streets report which was a DDOT and Deputy
17	Mayor for Planning Economic Development
18	Initiative was particularly focused on
19	reinforcing the pedestrian character of
20	Georgia Avenue, and encouraging transit use.
21	So to that extent having, in effect, a wider

better

providing

sidewalk

and

22

streetscape

because the opportunity to put café tables and to reach out to the street along with, as Mr. Mordfin pointed out, perception on the part of the pedestrian that it suggests a wider and a more pleasant pedestrian environment, I think that that's what bears more on what DDOT established as goals for the Great Street for Georgia Avenue to be a great street.

And Ms. Bray is right, that there is a presumption, generally, in the zoning standards that the parking spaces and loads that are prescribed in the zoning regs under a matter of right development are compatible with the infrastructure of -- and the configuration of the streets around there.

Typically, when at least when I was at the Office of Planning, we only looked for traffic impacts when people were proposing to go beyond the matter of right zoning and intensity. So since we are substantially below the matter of right zoning, since we are talking about a clientele that probably will

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

have relatively low rates of auto ownership talking about affordable because we are housing units, and because it's 2000 square feet of retail, we're not talking a big retail kind of major box or activity generators. If you look at the list of retail that's prescribed in the overlay, those are low impact, very neighborhood-oriented uses and we would expect that the retail would largely serve the residents the neighborhood and probably would be largely by pedestrian trips.

CHAIR LOUD: And that would kind of relate to the general special exception standard regarding the potential adverse impacts to neighboring properties. Your expert opinion is will there be an adverse impact?

MS. McCARTHY: I don't see an adverse impact at all. I think as has been stated, going beyond the requirements to include a loading zone that wasn't required,

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

to include the access off of the alley to the parking to set it back from the street somewhat, to reinforce pedestrian activity, I think those are all actions which the Mission has taken that go above and beyond to make sure that there isn't an adverse impact from the project.

CHAIR LOUD: And do you think your reaching that conclusion is in any way affected by not having an updated transportation study?

MS. McCARTHY: I do not.

CHAIR LOUD: And why not?

MS. McCARTHY: Because, as I said, the C-3-A zone was set with an assumption that the density under the matter of right under a C-3-A zone is compatible with the neighborhood and we are talking about a project that could go up to 60,000 square feet and is at 46,800 or something along those lines. So I don't see that as requiring 27 parking spaces. I don't see that as requiring it.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

Even if every one of those parkers
deciding to leave at the same time, that would
be my brain was on a great glide path there
to doing that math in my head, but somehow
with the hour, it just fractured, but it would
be one per even if they only left at the
rate of one per minute, that would be a half
hour's worth of traffic on the neighboring
street. And you know they're not all leaving
at the same time. And you know, even if some
of them were leaving at the same time, it
would be a few seconds apart. we're not
talking about streets that are over saturated
in terms of their ability to access Georgia
Avenue.

CHAIR LOUD: Thank you. Board Members, are there any additional questions? Okay.

Thank you, Mr. Jennings. I don't believe there any additional questions for you right now. And I don't believe necessarily that there are questions for the other

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

witnesses.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

We will now turn to the ANC for its report and I believe it's our Exhibit 67. Thank you, Mr. Dettman. And it's dated, I believe, September 17. But in any event, it's a part of our record and thank you for your patience and we now turn to you for the ANC's report.

MR. VALENTI: Sure. And maybe instead of just reading the report, I'll just give you kind of the broad points and kind of let you know how we arrived at that decision.

The first thing is the retail space reserved along Georgia Avenue. We definitely this а plus for Georgia as Currently, there are retail uses on Georgia Avenue, but I don't know what they're used for, honestly, because they are businesses that I don't think anybody in the neighborhood And they seem like they're closed half the time, though they're viable, even legitimate businesses apparently.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

So I think the addition of 27,000
square feet of retail on Georgia Avenue that
will be for true, viable neighborhood-serving
business, an essential element that we really

5 need to support.

A point of controversy was a lot of people were concerned about the fact that every project that's approved for Georgia Avenue currently is 100 percent affordable and we need to start mixing up, getting some market rate development on Georgia Avenue as well. But that issue was addressed -- we decided as an ANC, we're going to take that up separately and not target any one project. And that this could help start, get some construction going on Georgia Avenue, get some more residential and then we could move from there toward building up more of a mix of uses and stuff.

Another point of contention at the meet was a lot about the architectural elements. I think everybody views The Sidney

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

on Georgia Avenue which was -- it opened last year. It's a new building. That would be a totally conforming of what we pictured Georgia Avenue to be like with the overlay and everything. And then you have the EL Haynes on the other extreme which would be the exact opposite.

think our conclusion was this project is somewhere in the middle. And you know, ultimately, we decided that residential aspects and retail aspects would be good and that we were wiling to waive that concern with the guarantee that there will be no CBRF because the overwhelming element of the meetings that we've had on this was that everybody is afraid that this is some trick to get a community-based residential facility of 150 homeless men into the neighborhood and that would definitely be detrimental commerce in the area and you know, the area already has an abundance of shelters and we just want to make sure that that is spread

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	throughout the city so that it's not all
2	available in one specific neighborhood.
3	So those were all the concerns that
4	we raised and I think I really want to thank
5	the BZA for extending this meeting three times
6	because it allowed us the opportunity to come
7	up with something that was mutually
8	beneficial. And I also want to thank the
9	Mission for being willing to step back and
10	reevaluate their plans and provide us with the
11	guarantees that the neighborhood to feel like
12	we're on a successful path. And that's all I
13	really have to say.
14	CHAIR LOUD: Thank you, Mr.
15	Valenti.
16	Does the Applicant have any
17	questions for the ANC?
18	MS. BRAY: I do not. Thank you.
19	CHAIR LOUD: Board Members have any
20	questions? Okay.
21	Then we will now see if there are
22	any persons in the audience who are in support

1	of the application, now would be the time to
2	come up. You'll be given three minutes. And
3	seeing none, if there are any persons in the
4	audience who are in opposition, seeing none,
5	we turn to the Applicant for closing.
6	MS. BRAY: Thank you very much, Mr.
7	Chairman, and Members of the Board.
8	I, too, on behalf of the Mission
9	would like to thank the ANC for its
10	involvement following this application, their
11	patience and our requests for postponement as
12	the Mission has wrestled with what to do on
13	this property for nearly two years.
14	I'd also like to thank the Office
15	of Planning and DDOT for their review of the
16	proposal and their excellent reports.
17	The proposed use is a matter of
18	right in the C-3-A zone district in the
19	Georgia Avenue Overlay District. The proposed
20	building proposes significantly less FAR in
21	height than would be permitted as a matter of

right in the C-3-A. The building has been

designed to conform to the requirements of the the recommendations of overlay and the planning tools upon which the overlay is based as Ms. McCarthy testified. And also, as Ms. McCarthy and Mr. Graae testified, the application meets the general and specific criteria for special exceptions of over 1200 square feet in land area in the Georgia Avenue overlay.

The use is in harmony with general purpose and intent of the regulations and zoning maps. Again, the uses are permitted as a matter of right. The use will not tend to adversely impact the use of neighboring property. You've heard the building has actually designed been specifically to address the architecture and the low-scale development along Newton, particular. The use, building or feature at intensity in location size and substantially advance the stated purpose of the Georgia Avenue overlay, nor be detrimental

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

to the health, safety, convenience, or general welfare or persons residing or working in the vicinity.

submit that by changing from community-based proposed use а residential facility proposing 170 beds in a homeless shelter environment, from that to a medium-density residential facility commercial the ground floor uses on meeting the need for affordable housing in neighborhood, this have satisfied the we requirements of 1304.1(a).

You heard Ms. McCarthy testify that vehicular access and egress are located so that they minimize conflict with the principal pedestrian ways as required by 1304.1(c). The design of the project enhances the urban design features of the immediate vicinity in which it is located as required by 1330.2(a). You heard Mr. Gray testified that the entrance has been oriented toward the Metro, that the property has been designed in such a

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

way that it allows for seating or a café space on the sidewalk in front of the retail along Georgia Avenue, and it mirrors the lower-scale development residential along Newton which is a very narrow street and warrants special treatment, that there are no parking traffic conditions associated with operation of the proposed use which would significantly adjacent impact or nearby residences. In fact, the traffic submitted with analysis which the was application when it was proposed initially as a CBRF at 60,000 square feet proposed less than ten spaces less than what is proposed now and found no significant impact associated therewith.

We submit we meet all the specific and general criteria required for approval of the special exception in the Georgia Avenue overlay and appreciate the Board's time and patience in reviewing this application. We request that the Board approve the relief

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

requested.

CHAIR LOUD: Thank you. I do believe the record is full. I believe it's probably something that we can deliberate on today, but I do want to check with my colleagues here before we get too far into that.

Okay, I'd be more than happy to start us off. This is an application, as amended, for Section 3401 relief, obviously, general special exception requirement as well as Section 1328 compliance with the Georgia Avenue overlay and as further amended for a waiver of Section 1328.2 under the provisions of Section 1330 which allow waiver of that provision which addresses the 75 percent threshold.

With respect to the general special exception requirements under 3104, we did hear testimony from the Office of Planning as well as the Applicant's expert regarding the project being in harmony with the general

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

purpose and intent of the zone regs and Additional testimony from zone map. the Office of Planning and the Applicant's expert regarding the proposed use not being likely to affect of neighboring adversely the use property. There were some potential questions raised by the Department of Transportation in its report and in its oral testimony regarding potentially adverse uses, but they were open ended and they were qualified by the fact that there wasn't a transportation report that they could review and that they did not have the opportunity review the to most recent submission from Applicant's counsel regarding the change, nature of the project from a CBRF facility to 37 units residential and ground floor retail.

So the evidence there with respect to their being some adverse, potentially adverse impact was inconclusive. On the other hand, we had strong testimony from the Office of Planning and Applicant's expert regarding

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

there not being any adverse impacts to neighboring properties.

With respect to the Georgia Avenue overlay provisions, rather than just regurgitate everything that both Ms. Bray has just said and that's also in the Office of Planning's report and that was testified to by Ms. McCarthy as well, I would just like to adopt reference and incorporate by by reference the way that that -- those overlay requirements are laid out in the report of the Office Planning of and suggest that Ι incorporate that in both -- find that evidence persuasive.

With respect to the waiver 1328.5 regarding the street wall of the project not meeting the 75 percent threshold, we did hear testimony from the Office of Planning that notwithstanding that the building achieves the goal of bringing property to the street level by bringing it as close to I guess the setback sidewalk as it

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

could and that that would be imperceptible to members of the public, that they were not meeting the 75 percent threshold, in addition to which there was testimony by the Applicant of Newton regarding the narrowness Street being 50 feet, regarding the design direction set back the corner of the property, regarding the desire to landscape, particular, the new site which had the ground floor residential. And so there was testimony -- not that the waiver requires that kind of evidence, but nonetheless there was some testimony offering reasons why the 75 percent threshold was not met.

There was also the report of the ANC that was fully supportive of the special exception as conditioned by a permanent statement that there would never be any CBRF or homeless shelter facilities on the project and the ANC's report was properly noticed, had a quorum and the vote, I think, was eight to zero in support of the project.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	And so for all of those reasons the
2	full record before us, I'm in support of the
3	application and I'll open it up to Board
4	Members.
5	VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Mr. Chairman,
6	I think you've done a great job taking us
7	through the relevant provisions. I think the
8	provisions have been met. The special
9	exception burden has been met and I'm with you
10	in your support for the application.
11	CHAIR LOUD: Thank you, Mr.
12	Dettman. Is there anything further?
13	Okay, then I would like to let
14	me see if I can get this straight. I would
15	like to move approval of Application No. 17717
16	for special exception relief under 3104.1 and
17	1330.2(b) and 1328, as amended, and as
18	conditioned by the ANC. I just want to make
19	sure I have all the amended relief as well.
20	I would like to move approval of
21	said application as I just described it. Is

there a second?

1 VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Second. CHAIR LOUD: Further discussion? 2 MEMBER SCHLATER: Just one point of 3 clarification. I just wanted to make sure 4 that one of the conditions of the order is 5 that there be affordable housing as part of 6 7 the project? I don't know if that comes naturally as an outgrowth of the application, 8 just 9 but Ι want to make sure that's 10 formalized. Thank you. No harm. CHAIR LOUD: 11 I think the Applicant has testified that that 12 13 would be the case, 50 percent to 80 percent AMI and I think it's part of their mission, 14 but Ι think we can write that in 15 condition. 16 There was some testimony from the 17 ANC regarding the whole affordability issue, 18 19 but I think it ended up cresting was that they would take that up in another forum. 20 So I think that's an excellent condition. 21 Board Members? Okay, I don't hear

any objections from the Board on that.

And again, by affordable, we're talking 50 to 80 percent of the AMI range.

MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: Would that be a continual requirement or would we put a limit on that? I don't like seeing -- if this isn't currently required, but just having a look, I guess, affordable housing until -- I can see the ANC -- one of their goals is to try to encourage marketable housing. If for some reason the Mission ended up deciding that you know they wanted to sell that property and seek other areas, maybe that were more need in the District.

MEMBER SCHLATER: I guess how I would put it is that I think there are certain qualities of the design that are necessitated by the social mission of the building and if it were a market-rate building might not be -- we might not grant the special exception were it not an affordable building. So that's why I'm pushing that.

1	I think it's always reasonable to
2	put a term on the affordable housing mandate.
3	Sometimes it's 15 years. Sometimes it's 30
4	years. And I'd be open to discussion on that
5	point, but it's I think it comes with the
6	approval.
7	What I wouldn't like to see is the
8	property sold with the zoning approval and
9	then there not be affordable housing on it. I
10	guess that's what I'm trying to guard against.
11	MS. BRAY: Mr. Chairman, if I may?
12	CHAIR LOUD: Yes, please.
13	MS. BRAY: Board's indulgence. The
14	inclusionary zoning requirements, which have
15	recently gone into effect will require that a
16	portion of the units which are proposed in the
17	proposed development be maintained as
18	affordable in perpetuity.
19	The remaining units will be
20	constructed as affordable units, but we have
21	not proposed, because we have not gotten into

development

in

that stage

22

frankly an

affordable housing covenant other than what we know will be required as a part inclusionary zoning requirements, but Ι believe it's the desire of the Mission to -if it sells this property or partners with another entity, that it be developed affordable housing and we would address that in the transactional documents related to that.

But at this time, we can proffer that the units which must satisfy the inclusionary zoning requirements would remain so in perpetuity as required by the zoning regulations and the DHCD requirements.

MEMBER SCHLATER: Just with all due respect to Ms. Bray, I'm not asking for what's already required in the zoning regulations. I'm asking for something above and beyond that.

MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: I believe right now we're actually in the discussion section.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

CHAIR LOUD: We are.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: So I would definitely be willing, as long as there were some limited period of time, even the 15 years, I probably -- but 10 years, to that extent a portion beyond, whatever, the IZ requirements are.

CHAIR LOUD: Mr. Schlater, I'm going to weigh in after the exchange between the two of you. I've got some concerns, questions.

I'11 bring a MEMBER SCHLATER: little bit of my limited Zoning Commission experience into the discussion. When we get affordable housing as an amenity in a PUD, the affordability period that we typically see is maybe the useful life of the unit which -units do require after a period of time reinvestment and recapitalization. So at least on a Commission level we acknowledge there's -- it's okay to have a limited period, but usually that period is somewhere between

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

15 and 35 years.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

So I would be comfortable somewhere within that range.

MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: I would throw this back out to the other two Board Members to see -- if I'm the sole Member in dissent, let's just go forward. That's fine.

VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Ι think typically when the Board conditions or places conditions on an application, it serves to mitigate something. And I think -- I'm not heard Mr. Schlater's quite certain I comment about his comment about maybe he wouldn't support the application if it wasn't affordable building given some of architectural details of the building.

I kind of differ in that respect. The basis for my support for the application is not because it's being proffered as an affordable project. I basically see before us an apartment building that they intend to build as an affordable project, but that

certainly did not factor into my support for the project.

So to put a condition that requires them to do all affordable housing, either in perpetuity or for a certain amount of time, I'm just not quite certain what that goes to mitigate. We occasionally will do a condition that mitigates for impacts to traffic or impacts to the pedestrian realm or the public realm, but here I'm not seeing it.

CHAIR LOUD: Mr. Schlater, did you want to respond?

MEMBER SCHLATER: I think quality over design is the key aspect of the review criteria in front of us with respect to the recently approved plans that were approved by Council and part of high-quality urban design is immaterial to the architecture. I think we have testimony from the ANC saying that while the building is not objectionable from a design standard, it is certainly not what they would consider superior architecture and

design which is something that we are striving for in the Georgia Avenue corridor and the use of the highest quality materials.

We're trying to step it up and pushing it in that direction, but I also understand it's an affordable housing project, so we can only push so far in this respect. If this were a market-rate developer coming before us and proposing this building and saying without the affordable housing being proffered, I personally would not support the building.

CHAIR LOUD: I think I understand Mr. Schlater's concern and direction. I kind of see it in terms of mitigating, Mr. Schlater saying that this tends to mitigate toward the overlay design issues. Because a lot of the overlay just deals with design and complying with the design intent, etcetera. His very clear statement that if this project were before us with this design and he were looking at it as measured against the overlay, and

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

what the overlay was designed to help us get to on Georgia Avenue which actually includes a lot of the testimony that Applicant's expert, Ms. McCarthy, addressed in her testimony regarding the direction for Georgia Avenue, its development. I can both understand and emphasize with Mr. Schlater's condition.

I don't see any harm in doing it particularly since the Applicant has testified that it's part of its mission to so do that and that any resale of the property would include some covenant regarding affordability as part of the transactional documents. Tt. didn't say what percentage, but I mean clearly some provision there with a sunset could be ten years. I don't know what appropriate period would be. But I'm clearly seeing what the harm would be to the Applicant based on the testimony that's a part of the record already and I can clearly see Schlater's mind what in Mr. it mitigates against in terms of the overlay.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MS. GLAZER: Mr. Chair, I just want to caution the Board. I'm sorry to interject, but I don't know that a condition standing alone would be enforceable without covenants. So I just wanted to interject that. I think it may be an academic discussion unless there's a covenant.

MEMBER SCHLATER: I would hope you would enforce it with a covenant I guess would be my point.

CHAIR LOUD: Let me suggest we go a little bit out of order because we're sort of raising the issue of the condition in deliberation and now having gone over it significantly during the evidentiary part of the hearing, so I think it's appropriate for counsel for the Applicant to weigh in as we proceed further in our discussion and then we'll close down the evidence part of it and go back to pure deliberations with the Board Members.

MS. BRAY: I appreciate that, Mr.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Chairman.

While I certainly understand Mr. Schlater's reasoning and his analysis, there are a couple of reasons why proposing such a condition could have potential adverse impact on the Applicant.

First of all, any such condition may have a chilling effect on the Applicant's ability to find a development partner and/or market the property for development of affordable housing. While we are proposing an affordable housing project, most developers which are in the market, including some of those that the Mission has spoken to, are using low-income tax credit financing to do so, which is only available for a period of ten years.

So once that period has run, the developer could not continue to claim the credit against -- I see you shaking your head, Mr. Schlater.

MEMBER SCHLATER: If you're using

affordable housing tax credit financing, there's going to be an affordability period of at least 30 years.

There's definitely going MS. BRAY: to be an affordability period associated with the project. The problem is that the Mission doesn't yet know what the financing vehicle will be for this development. Nor does it know whether it's going to be developing it on its own or with a development partner perhaps the District of Columbia. The Mission is trying to keep all those options open and it would be premature to set a period now other than to say that the units will be constructed as affordable units and perhaps the Applicant will condition or covenant in transaction any real estate t.hat. the affordable units be maintained as such. don't think the Mission is at this point in a position to agree to a term because financing vehicle hasn't been determined.

I'm probably not, in terms of the

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Mission's advisor, probably not the best person to speak to financing of this project. But Mr. Treadwell or Kevin Keagan who is with us today from the Brailsford and Dunley, the Mission's consultants with respect to facility planning and who have advised on several of the proposals to join with the developer on this project may be able to add something to the discussion there.

MR. TREADWELL: Ιf I might there's irony The some great here. neighborhood wants bring in us to affluent occupants and having some of units available for the more affluent may be appealing to someone who would partner with And so maybe even make a little different us. brick on the front that the ANC would like. So the more flexibility in doing that, the neighborhood's concern was that we were going to lower the threshold and now we're looking at something that's going to be put a ceiling on it and look at increasing of the threshold.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

So I'm caught in an irony here that's hard to address at this point.

MS. BRAY: And I'll also add that when the Mission, when we last appeared before this Board and we sought postponement, we did so in April of 2009 after meeting with Council Member Graham who requested that the Mission consider very seriously developing a project of mixed income which would include some market rate units.

While the Mission, as developer of this project, is absolutely committed to development of affordable housing because it is consistent with its tax-exempt purposes, I'm concerned about the chilling effect that such a condition may have on the Mission's ability to finance the project and to join with the developer. Of course, anybody can come back and modify the condition, but it's the chilling effect of having that type of condition prematurely applied to a project that has not been financed at this point that

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

I'm concerned about.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MS. McCARTHY: I think it might also be relevant to observe with regard to Mr. Schlater's analogy to the Zoning Commission that affordability requirements in the Zoning Commission tend to be very long term for a PUD because you are asking for а substantial will in density which last increase perpetuity for the building. So asking for extra density and balancing that with public benefit is a very different kind of situation than actually providing less than what matter of right and aiming to do affordable, but not having things gelled at this point.

I suppose one way out of the box would be to say if the desire to require affordable housing is linked to the use of EIFS, then do we put in a condition that says okay, if it's semititious siding then we can go to mixed income and if we go up to all masonry, then we can be luxury? It's a -- we should note the EIFS is not at the lower

levels where people will see it. It is only at the upper levels of the building.

Okay, I think the CHAIR LOUD: record is full. I really do and I think a sense of where the votes is probably not going to change. So I think what we'll do now is go back into deliberation, address this issue of the proposed condition for affordable housing. three votes to get approval on It takes something, so we'll address that. Then motion the table there's still а on for conditioned the application as approval of only with the ANC's recommended condition and then I think we're in a position to vote on this case and close it out.

So what's on the table now I think is the affordable housing requirement that will be 100 percent affordable. The suggestion from Board Member Moldenhauer is that there be some sort of sunset provision put to it. And are you willing to consider the sunset provision and what period of time

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

would you be willing -- okay, 15 years.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Okay, so the proposed condition is that affordable housing, 100 percent affordable housing be made a condition of the application for our vote in deliberation. All those who are in favor of that condition indicate by saying aye. All those opposed indicate by the appropriate saying and then we'll check for abstentions.

I have upon listening to further evidence from the Applicant, although I'm not totally on board with the inclusionary zoning piece. I don't know if it's ten percent. don't know what the percentage is and we don't have to go into the record to go into it, but I'm a little more persuaded that having the zoning piece, giving inclusionary the Applicant some flexibility moving into the future in terms of its financing and ultimate mix at the site is probably not a bad thing to do. It's probably not a bad thing to do.

1	Earlier I supported it. Mr.
2	Schlater, but listening to the evidence coming
3	in, I think where I am not is that I would not
4	want to saddle the project for the requirement
5	for 100 percent affordability. So that being
6	said, all those in favor of the proposed
7	condition, please indicate by saying aye.
8	All those who are opposed to it,
9	please indicate by saying opposed. There's
10	one in favor, one opposition, and all those
11	who abstain?
12	So it looks like there's one in
13	favor. There is one opposition. There's two
14	abstentions. The proposed condition does not
15	carry, so we can go back now to the original
16	motion for approval of the application as
17	conditioned by the ANC.
18	Is there further deliberation on
19	that motion?
20	Okay, so it's been moved that the
21	application be approved as conditioned by the

ANC. Is there a second?

1	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: Second.
2	CHAIR LOUD: It's been moved and
3	seconded. Is there further deliberation?
4	Okay, hearing none, all those in favor of the
5	application indicate by saying aye.
6	(Chorus of ayes.)
7	All those opposed? And are there
8	any abstentions? And Ms. Bailey, can you read
9	back the vote, please?
10	MS. BAILEY: Who seconded the
11	motion, please?
12	CHAIR LOUD: Ms. Moldenhauer.
13	MS. BAILEY: Thank you. It's a
14	little difficult to hear on this end, but I
15	believe was vote was 3-1-1. The motion was
16	made by Mr. Loud, seconded by Ms. Moldenhauer,
17	supported by Mr. Dettman. Mr. Schlater is
18	opposed to the motion. Thank you. The Board
19	has approved the application, as amended, and
20	as conditioned and the condition is that there
21	would not be a CBRF developed at the site.
22	CHAIR LOUD: Thank you. And I

1	believe there's no opposition in our record to
2	it, so I believe that we can do a summary
3	order that incorporates a condition I think
4	that we've agreed and voted upon.
5	MS. BAILEY: Thank you, sir.
6	CHAIR LOUD: Is there anything
7	further with this case?
8	MS. BAILEY: No, Mr. Chairman.
9	CHAIR LOUD: And is there anything
10	addition for today's calendar?
11	MS. BAILEY: That's it, Mr.
12	Chairman.
13	CHAIR LOUD: Thank you very much.
14	Thank you. We appreciate your time and your
15	patience. And on that note, this hearing is
16	adjourned.
17	(Whereupon, at 6:53 p.m., the
18	hearing was concluded.)
19	
20	
21	
22	