GOVERNMENT
OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

+ + + + +

PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

TUESDAY

JUNE 30, 2009

+ + + + +

The Regular Public Hearing convened in Room 220 South, 441 $4^{\rm th}$ Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20001, pursuant to notice at 9:30 a.m., Marc D. Loud, Chairperson, presiding.

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT MEMBERS PRESENT:

MARC D. LOUD, Chairperson SHANE L. DETTMAN, Vice Chairperson (NCPC)

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBER PRESENT:

MICHAEL G. TURNBULL, FAIA, Commissioner (OAC)
PETER G. MAY, Commissioner (NPS)

,

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

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

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PRESENT:

LORI MONROE, ESQ.

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

STEVE COCHRAN PAUL GOLDSTEIN ARLOVA JACKSON

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Public Hearing held on June 30, 2009.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Opening - Chairperson Loud4
Preliminary Matters9 Application Number 1787810
Application Number 17948
Application Number 17941
Opening - Chairperson Loud148
Preliminary Matters
Application Number 17940
Closing - Chairperson Loud172

NEAL R. GROSS

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

9:51 a.m.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Good morning, everyone. Welcome to the June the 30th, thank you, Mr. Dettman, Public Hearing Schedule of the Board of Zoning Adjustment.

We have one preliminary matter. There is on this morning's calendar a public meeting -- Special Public Meeting for the Baby Land Development Case, Number 17867. The Board is going to continue that case to the 1:00 p.m. session this afternoon when we'll be joined by the third voting member on that case. So, this morning, we'll go straight into the hearing calendar.

MR. MOY: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman. Also, I'd like to add to that that the staff has notified parties to that application. So, they are also aware that the Special Public Meeting has been moved to 1:00 p.m.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Mr. Moy.

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

In that case, then officially, this hearing will come to order. This is as I said the June 30 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 right representing the National Capital Planning Commission. Mr. Michael Turnbull representing the Zoning Commission. To my far left, Ms. Beverley Bailey, Zoning Specialist here in the Office of Zoning. Ms. Lori Monroe from the Office of the Attorney General. Mr. Clifford Moy who's Secretary to the BZA and I think to my far right, Ms. Arlova Jackson who's a bit eager to get up here this morning representing the Office of Planning.

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 a court reporter and also webcast live. Accordingly,

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

we must ask you to refrain from any disruptive noises or actions in the 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 speak to the Board please give both cards to the reporter sitting to my right.

The order of procedure for special exceptions and variances is as follows: First, statement and witnesses of the applicant; government reports including the Office of Planning, the Department of Public Works, et cetera; the report of the Advisory

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Neighborhood Commission; parties or persons in support; parties or persons in opposition; and then finally closing remarks by the applicant.

Pursuant to Sections 3117.4 and 3117.5, the following time constraints will be maintained. The applicant, appellant, persons or parties except an ANC in support including witnesses 60 minutes collectively. Appellees, parties persons and except ANC in an opposition including witnesses 60 minutes collectively and individuals three minutes.

These time restraints do not include cross examination and/or questions from the Board. Cross examination of witnesses is permitted by the applicant or parties.

The ANC within which the property is located is automatically a party in a special exception or variance case.

Nothing prohibits the Board from placing reasonable restrictions on cross examination including time limits and

NEAL R. GROSS

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

limitations on the scope of cross examination, relevance, redundancy, et cetera.

The record will be closed at the conclusion of each case except for any material specifically requested by the Board. The Board and the 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 consistent with its rules of procedure and the Sunshine Act enter executive session during or after the public hearing on case purposes of reviewing the record or deliberating on the case.

The decision of the Board in these contested cases must be based exclusively on

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

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 those which relate to whether a case will or should be heard today such as a request for postponement, continuance or withdrawal or whether proper and adequate notice of the hearing has been given.

If you are not prepared to go forward with the case today or if you believe that the Board should not proceed, now is the time to raise such a matter.

Does the staff have any preliminary matters?

MS. BAILEY: Mr. Chairman, good morning. To Members of the Board and to

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

everyone, good morning as well. The preliminary matter, Mr. Chairman, that I have has do with to That's the application of Application 17878. Jeffrey Cohen. That application, ${\tt Mr.}$ Chairman, was withdrawn. Good morning CHAIRPERSON LOUD: again, Ms. Bailey, and thank you. Then let's proceed with the agenda 10 for this morning. Would all individuals wishing to testify this morning please rise to 11 take the oath that Ms. Bailey will administer 12 13 to you? BAILEY: Please raise your 14 MS. right hand? 15 Do you solemnly swear or affirm 16 that the testimony that you'll be giving this 17 morning will be the truth, the whole truth and 18 19 nothing but the truth? Thank you. Ready, Mr. Chairman? 20 CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Yes. 21 MS. BAILEY: The first case of the 22

morning is Application 17948. It's the Application of the Government of the District of Columbia pursuant to 11 DCMR Section 3103.2 for a variance from the off-street parking under Subsection 2101.1 requirements to establish a community youth services center in the former Merritt public school. property -- well, the property is located at premises 5002 Hayes Street, N.E., Square 5178, Lots 800, 805, 27, 28, 49, 48, 50 and 51.

And there are two matters, Mr. Chairman, that I would like to bring to your attention concerning this application.

One of which, it appears as if the property is split zoned. It's zoned R-5-A/R-2 and then secondly, Mr. Chairman, it appears as if relief may be needed from the community service center use and that would be an additional special exception relief in addition to what I read about parking.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Ms. Bailey. Are the parties here? In that case,

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	can you please step forward and take your seat
2	at the table and why don't you introduce
3	yourselves for the record?
4	Also, if the ANC is here, you're
5	automatically a party and you can step forward
6	as well.
7	MR. HARGROVE: Good morning. My
8	name is Agyei Hargrove. I represent the
9	Office of Property Management. I am the
10	project manager for the renovation of the
11	Merritt School Project.
12	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Good morning.
13	MR. COOK: Good morning. I'm
14	Alexander Cook from Bowie-Gridley Architects.
15	We are the architect for the project.
16	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Good morning to
17	both of you.
18	Mr. Hargrove, I'm just curious.
19	Are you an attorney?
20	MR. HARGROVE: No, sir, I'm just
21	the project manager.
22	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Project manager.

MR. HARGROVE: Yes, sir.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: You don't have to say just. That's an important job. If you were a lawyer, you could say I'm just a lawyer.

Are there -- are your clients here?

The government agencies that you represent?

MR. HARGROVE: No, they're not here.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: They're not in the audience this morning.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. I think before we get started a couple of things.

We reviewed the record and it's a fairly full record, but upon our review of the record, and I think Ms. Bailey kind of mentioned some of what we're going to lead into before you get started, is that you filed your application on March 24th of '09 and about three days later on March 27th of '09, a Zoning Commission Order which is 08-18 went into effect and it deals with allowing reuse

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

of former public school buildings in residential zones for uses that are approved by the Zoning Commission and several of the uses that were approved as matter of right uses by Zoning Commission Order 08-18 would include the administrative use by a government agency.

That seems to comport with your application as well as the community service use and they've provided a new definition for community service use which would seem to parallel the, what is it, Life Pieces -- Life Pieces to Masterpieces private nonprofit use that would go into the building.

So, that, I'm sorry, five uses were deemed matter of right and those -- within those five are the uses that you would propose so we thing.

And then there were three categories of special exceptions and we're not certain if one of your uses may fall into that category, but I think we're saying that at the

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

outset because it changes the nature of the relief that you would be seeking from us. Some of what you have proposed as a special exception would actually be matter of right and you would not need that relief from us.

In addition to that, it articulates what the parking requirement would be for both your matter of right uses and potentially your special exception uses. So, that the case you would be making this morning would be a much reduced case where you would essentially be making a case for the parking relief, variance case which your pleadings may -- but also, there would be some -- you know, we need to get some evidence on the record regarding whether one of your proposed uses would be matter of right or would be special exception and that in my mind would be the Department of Youth Rehabilitation Services. Just to get a idea of whether better that's an administrative office or some other category of animal.

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Now, with respect to the parking piece, I'm going to defer to Mr. Dettman so he can try to articulate and explain what we would be looking at.

Because if we're able to get some of that information on the record today, we might be in a position to deliberate today and if you're able to get that to us either through starting to do the calculations now or having an assistant make a phone call for you to try to get some of that information. You may have it already. We want to be able to position you to get to work on that early so that we would not have to delay deliberations.

So, let me defer to Mr. Dettman on the parking piece and then perhaps we can open up and see if you have any questions or Office of Planning or other -- or Mr. Turnbull wants to weigh in.

VICE CHAIRMAN DETTMAN: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman and good morning.

As you say, the Zoning Order that

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

you referred to, Mr. Chairman, Zoning Order 08-18, not only amended the regulations to allow particular uses of former public school buildings as matter of right, but а amended the off-street addition, it also parking requirement schedule which is our Chapter 21 in our Zoning Regulations and so, as you address some of the questions that the Chairman posed to you, if we are able to fit these uses into this new regulation, we're going have apply particular to to calculation that uses the gross floor area of the uses determine your parking to requirement.

And so, specifically what we'll need to know is with respect to the Life Pieces to Masterpieces, what is the gross floor area of the total -- I think it's just over 82,000 of the entire building. Of the 82,000, how much each particular use is taken up so that we can calculate an accurate parking requirement?

NEAL R. GROSS

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. COOK: We actually have that information available with us.

The Life Pieces to Masterpieces, their current allocation is a total of 5,091 square feet.

We had calculated at the time of the application a parking requirement for the building as being 138.

When the order came out that changed it, we did a recalculation. That indicated based on the new requirements that we would fall under Order 8-18 that we ended up with a 134 spaces being our total requirement.

VICE CHAIRMAN DETTMAN: What was the calculation that you used for that?

MR. COOK: All right. For what we -- what we used was for a general office building in a C-1, C-2-A, C-3-A which the requirement for that is in excess of 2,000 square feet one per each additional 600 square feet of gross floor area and some other area.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

So, we came up with -- from that, we came up with 82,528 minus 2,000 comes out to 80,528 which is 134.2, sir.

VICE CHAIRMAN DETTMAN: Okay.

MR. COOK: So, the request for the area variance is that we're providing 15 percent of the required parking as opposed to 14 percent which was noted in the original application.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Let me just piggyback and ask a follow-up question. Well, really I think you answered it, but just so I'm clear that I'm following it.

The zone that you drew your parking requirements for was this -- what did you say?

The C-2. Which zone district?

MR. COOK: Yes, because the way -what we were basing that on is that the
requirements would be based on -- it will be
those that apply in the most restrictive
zoning district in which the use is otherwise
first permitted as a matter of right.

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

So, that's -- it was our interpretation of being first permitted as a matter of right was the C-1. CHAIRPERSON LOUD: I'm going to turn for one moment to Ms. Monroe from the Office of the Attorney General just to put some -- weigh in. That's I think okay. MS. MONROE: In the C-R, it's allowed. An office is 10 allowed. It doesn't say administrative office or anything else, but an office is allowed. 11 technically, Which is Ι quess, 12 13 restrictive zone than C-1, but the parking requirement in C-1 is more restrictive than C-14 R interestingly enough. Because the C-R would 15 16 you give you -- you'd only need like 40 spaces or something like that, but the C-1, you need 17 100. 18 So, depends on how you want to read 19 that. 20 CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Well, 21 the

NEAL R. GROSS

language says the most restrictive zone not

the zone with the most restrictive parking. MS. MONROE: That's right. -- because I think -- you see, it's the last -- offices are allowed in C-R. I don't know if it -- you still need a parking variance one way or the other. CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Need a variance. MS. MONROE: Just depends on how of a variance. So, I don't know if much 10 that --CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Would be 11 difference between -- I think we did some 12 13 preliminary calculations of maybe, what, about 60. We did some preliminary calculations 14 which would have you needing a variance for 15 about a total of 45 and you've got 20. So, 16 you would really need a variance for 25 versus 17 your calculations of 134. So, you'd need a 18 variance for 111. Something like that? 19 MS. MONROE: 20 Fourteen. CHAIRPERSON LOUD: A hundred and 21 fourteen. So, we're just trying to make sure 22

that we apply -- particularly since this is the first case that we're going to be administering the new text revisions invited by 08-18, what to make sure that we have the proper --

MS. MONROE: And that, I guess, depends on the interpretation of that -- the most restrictive zone district in which it was first allowed as a matter of right and that office is allowed as a matter of right in a C-R, but it's also allowed in a C-1. I guess if you consider C-R more restrictive, you take that number.

It's your interpretation, I think, of that reg.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. Okay.

No, I understand that. But, just in terms of your thoughts on that, do you have any thoughts on that? Do you want to put on the record as to which -- and we understand that, you know, we'll make the final decision.

MS. MONROE: Not really. It's what

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

you said. I mean you look at the language and take it from that -- from there.

Either way it's a parking variance. Either way the advertising is fine and the only difference is the amount of variance, the magnitude of the variance and that you just have to look at independently.

No, I don't have any special thoughts which way it should go.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay.

MS. MONROE: I'm not going to.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Then why don't we do this? We've got a couple of further housekeeping sort of matters to get to before we get into your actual case.

One of which is I want to open a dialogue up to Board Members regarding the correct zone district to apply for the parking question and then we need to come back and I believe in order for any of this to apply to the case you're going to present to us this morning, you'd have to amend your application.

NEAL R. GROSS

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I think you can do that right here on the record this morning.

So, once you do that, we can proceed under the revised text.

VICE CHAIRMAN DETTMAN: Mr. Chairman, I think -- the way I read the new language in 08-18 the parking requirement language is it goes to the use and not the more restrictive parking requirement, but it goes to the use.

When I saw that, it took me to 2514 which is a section of the regs that doesn't apply to this case, but just for guidance, 2514.3 says for the purposes of interpreting this section, the zone districts established in this title are listed in the following groups in decreasing use restrictions.

So, I always look to that when I'm looking at -- for more or less restrictions and the waterfront zone is to the most restrictive in our zoning regulations and so, if you were to look at it from that angle

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

being waterfront, the most restrictive use district in the regs, that would take us to the requirement where in excess of 2,000 square feet one parking space for each 1800 square feet of office space.

So, at the end of the day again, you still have the use variance, but it drives down the required number of parking spaces and lessens the magnitude of the variance.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Mr. Turnbull, did you have any additional thoughts on this discussion?

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: No, I think
Mr. Dettman's brought up a good point and I
would concur with it.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: All right. So, then we're going to move forward with the governing legal interpretation for us being that the more restrictive zone district would be the -- we're talking the C-R or waterfront and, therefore, the parking variance that you need will be less.

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

The test is still the same, but the actual number will end up being less and I don't think -- for your purposes, it doesn't change your presentation that you were going to make.

Secondly, we do need you to just formally go on the record and revised your application. Just amend your application so that you're now seeking relief just for the uses that are not matter of right and the parking.

And you can just say some very pro forma type words that you amend your application.

MR. HARGROVE: I'm sorry. We would like to amend our application for the parking variance. Our new calculation will be based off of the C-R zone and we are requesting relief for -- I guess before I request relief for the use that's not a matter of right, can I asked the question or is this an opportunity for me to clarify the DYRS --

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Yes.

MR. HARGROVE: -- use in the

facility?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Exactly.

MR. HARGROVE: As it --

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: It may end up being matter of right.

MR. HARGROVE: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: So.

MR. HARGROVE: As it's DYRS, this presented is to us, administrative function of the agency we're providing a case management organization for the Ward youth. This is 7 additionally, they have the Lead Entity Service Coalition which will have space in the facility as well and my understanding in text amendment 08-18, these reading the administrative services would be allowed.

But, there seems to have been some question regarding their use and I wanted to, I guess, determine what those questions were.

NEAL R. GROSS

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. First of all, I think you did a very good job of doing that. I think as we now get into your case, Board Members may have questions for yo regarding either uses with that specific Youth Rehab Services. That's what you're talking about. Right? Or there may be some questions about some of the other uses that were in the application.

I personally don't have any questions about any of the other uses. It would just be the one Youth Rehab Services piece.

So, as we move forward and you make your case, then we'll open it up to Board Members to let you know where their questions are.

And with respect the parking requirement, we've done some preliminary calculations and it looks like the variance relief would be for 50. The total required spaces would be 50. Correct? So, the

NEAL R. GROSS

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

variance relief would be for 30. Okay.

Board Members, any questions for the Applicant.

Okay. So, why don't we turn back to you officially. Sorry to take you through all of that and then you can go through your case and your test for variance relief -- making the case for variance relief.

And again, since the -- I do believe -- Board Members can weigh in if I'm misstating. I do believe that based on the record before us we think that the Child Family Services Office of Youth Development, the Child Family Services Youth Transition Center, DC DOES Office of Youth Programs and the Life Pieces to Masterpieces uses are matter of right just based on the record before us.

You may want to focus on the Youth
Rehab Services and just give us enough
testimony to establish that that is matter of
right also and then go into your test for how

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

you make the variance test.

MR. HARGROVE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Merritt School as we've discussed will house the CFSA YTC, I'm sorry, Child and Family Services Youth Transition Center, the Child and Family Services Office of Youth Development, the Life Piece to Masterpieces as a nonprofit and the DOES Office of Youth Development.

The DYRS Case Management Division which is currently located on H Street, N.W. is the Ward 7 division. They specifically target youth in Ward 7.

The Lead Entity Service Coalition is a citywide activity with heavy concentration in Ward 7.

The functions of these agencies as it has been presented to us is that they will provide administrative services. They will provide access to GED training, life training, independent living, referrals for health care

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

and general -- I can't think of the word. To insure that the youth that have -- that the youth that are participating in the organization have opportunities and that's how it's been presented to us.

It's our understanding that that falls in line with the 08-18 text amendment.

Additionally, we are requesting a variance for the parking which currently we have 20 spaces on the site. Currently we have requested parking -- I'm going to ask Mr. Cook to help me with some numbers here.

MR. COOK: The total requirement was for 50 parking spaces. Therefore, we will be requesting a variance for 30 spaces.

MS. BAILEY: Excuse me. If you have boards that you want to put on the easel, please feel free to do so.

MR. HARGROVE: In our beginning stages of the program, the effort that we went through for the facility, the agency's requested parking that I think it was -- they

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

have a total FTE count of 85 for full-time employees and of that, I think we providing --MR. COOK: No, the total FTE count was higher. It was 93. MR. HARGROVE: Okay. MR. COOK: The 85 was the number of parking spaces that were -- the total number of parking spaces requested by --MR. HARGROVE: Okay. MR. includes COOK: And that government-owned vehicles. MR. HARGROVE: One of the approaches that we took was that because we have -- Hayes Street currently is not in front of any residential facilities. It really services the school itself and we have more than enough capacity to make -- to park on that street and to serve the 85 uses along with the 20 uses that exist on the site. Mr. Cooks' going to walk through the drawings.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

and this may be a segue for what you were getting ready to do, right now, you're making the variance test. Showing that the property is unique in some way. That there's a practical difficulty caused by its uniqueness. Mr. Hargrove just spoke to whether or not there would be substantial detriment to the public good by talking about these, I think, 65 spaces that are on Hayes Street.

So, because the nature of your relief kind of changed as a result of what we did earlier this morning, you actually have a lesser showing to make and if you find ways to pigeonhole your testimony into the standard for the variance test, you will be meeting all of the requirements that we'll have of you. Then Board Members can ask questions and we can still sort of keep the proceeding flowing in a timely fashion.

So, don't feel obligated to say everything that you may have said if it were

NEAL R. GROSS

going to be the case that we changed it from being earlier.

So, I think you spoke to the third prong of the variance test and leaving the first two prongs of the variance test in need of some testimony.

Now, the Office of Planning will give testimony after yours and they've also pulled together some testimony in their view in support of the variance test as well.

So, but that's what we're looking at right now. Is the variance test. You spoke to the Youth Rehab Services piece and how you think that's a matter of right and I think if Board Members have questions about that, they'll ask you during our opportunity to ask questions.

MR. COOK: Thank you. So, the building is on Hayes Street and it is on a split right of way.

Currently, the area of this that is available for regular on-street parking is not

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

used and it is large enough to accommodate far in excess of the amount of parking that we would be required to have.

We have -- we are providing 20 offstreet parking spaces on the west side of the site.

On the east side of the site, there is a large green space. This space is a recreation space it has been determined to be desirable to the community for their use as an open green space because there are no other parks that are on this side of Nannie Helen Burroughs Boulevard that are within walking distance of this facility. So, it's desired by the community to make that -- to have that space available as a community space.

If we were required to provide the full requirement for off-street parking, that is our only available space to put parking. So, that would be lost to the community because it would have to be paved over.

And an attempt to convert that into

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

a parking area would pose a hardship to the owner because the site from Hayes Street towards Hunt Place changes in elevation close There is currently along the east to 60 feet. side of the property Hayes Street on retaining wall. There is another set of retaining walls along the north side of the Those retaining walls property. are constructed for pedestrian traffic. They are not applicable for vehicular traffic. So, they would have to be completely redone and designed for vehicular traffic which would make putting any type of substantial parking on the site extremely expensive.

And that is the only available area that we could put additional on-street parking on the site because of the location and the size of the existing building.

Currently, there are public transportation facilities there or there are bus stops along Nannie Helen Burroughs Boulevard which is one block to the south of

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the site and it is 600 feet from the nearest bus stop to the front door of the facility.

The bus line that runs along Nannie Helen Burroughs Boulevard also goes to the Minnesota Avenue Metro Station. So, there is ample public transportation available in the area.

The parking that we are -- the allowance for on-street parking that we're requesting can be fulfilled without actually parking in front of any other properties in the neighborhood. So, we would not be in anyway impacting the neighbors in terms of parking additional cars in and around the site. Okay.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Mr. Cook. Thank you, Mr. Hargrove.

Unless you had something further to add, I'll open it up to the Board to see if there are any questions.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Is there only one entrance right now used on the

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	existing parking lot?
2	It looked like on the picture
3	you submitted, it looks like the what was
4	it? An exit or an entrance into the alley is
5	now got Jersey barriers in front of it.
6	MR. HARGROVE: That is correct.
7	Currently, that alley is not used for travel.
8	It's really overgrown. So, there is only the
9	one entrance into the parking lot at this
10	at this moment.
11	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right next
12	to the school. All right. Yes.
13	MR. HARGROVE: Right next to the
14	school.
15	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
16	Thank you.
17	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Mr.
18	Turnbull.
19	Now, we're turn to the Office of
20	Planning. Good morning again, Ms. Jackson.
21	MS. JACKSON: Good morning. Good
22	morning, Chair, Fellow Members of the Board.

For the record, my name is Arlova Jackson and I'm a Development Review Specialist with the D.C. Office of Planning.

The Office of Planning recommends approval of the parking variance to allow the convergence of the former Merritt Middle School building for reuse as a community use and agency offices.

Initially, our report addressed a request for community service use, but based on the testimony provided and additional information about the applicability of the recent text amendment found in Order 08-18, it's apparent that that's not needed anymore. So, I'll just talk about the parking variance.

We find the Applicant meets the standards for the off-street parking variance. The site is a large irregular shaped lot that's currently improved with a school building, parking lot and playing fields. The lot has several grade changes and slops upward

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

to the north and east where the unimproved parts of the site are located at its highest elevation.

Use of this area to provide additional off-street parking would required a significant regrading and paving to allow access for cars and would be financially prohibitive to the Applicant.

Hayes Street in this location is a wide boulevard with ample off-street parking to serve the proposed use. The Applicant has estimated that use given the number of employees would require approximately 85 parking spaces which could be provided via the existing lot and street parking in front of the building.

If the Applicant were required to locate all of the off-street parking on-site, it would result in a significant reduction in green space and play areas available for the proposed use and the community.

Additionally, Metro bus routes

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

service Nannie Helen Burroughs an arterial street one block south of the site and Sheriff Road located two blocks north of the site.

Finally, the use will operate largely during normal business hours which should not conflict with parking needs of the residential areas nearby.

Overall the requested use meets the standards. Let's see. Properties affected by a set of exceptional circumstances that would make the provision of the additional 30 spaces on-site very difficult. The adjacent streets meet the needs of the proposed staff and the proposal will put to use a vacant building bringing youth services to the community and allowing several District youth-focused agencies to work together sharing space and resources.

So, the Office of Planning recommends approval of the requested area variance and we'll take any questions you have at this time.

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Jackson. Board Members, are there any questions for the Office of Planning? COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I just had a question. It's not really a programmatic question, but on the site, there's baseball field. Does that remain as a field -- a baseball field for local youth to play? 10 MR. HARGROVE: The field, it's not a baseball field specifically. 11 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okav. 12 13 MR. HARGROVE: It's an open grass field and two of the agencies have expressed a 14 need for their programs to have use for that 15 as well as we met with the ANC and they have 16 also expressed an interest in using the field 17 as it is. 18 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: 19 see they've got lights on it so you can use it 20 into the evening, too. 21

MR. HARGROVE: Yes, and we plan to

maintain the lighting.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Mr. Turnbull.

Are there any questions from the Applicant for the Office of Planning?

MR. HARGROVE: No.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Then we'll turn now to -- typically, we would turn to the ANC for their testimony.

They are not here. If the ANC is here, if you could step forward and I don't believe they're here, but they did submit a report. It's our Exhibit 21. It's from ANC-7C and it indicates that they did meet and that they voted approval of the application. They had notice and they had a quorum.

They don't specifically -- I recall they don't specifically say what the final vote was, but I do think that they meet our Section 3115 requirements for a great weight

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

report.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

They indicate that this would be in the best interest of the residents that live in the immediate circumference of Merritt Middle School -- what is now the Merritt Middle School.

Go on to say a quorum was established by the commissioners and it names the commissioners and that the residents were provided with ample notice of the meeting.

So, I think that their report is accepted by us and see if the Board Members have any issues or questions regarding that.

Okay. Then moving right along, what we would do now is if there are any persons or parties, really persons, that are in support that are in the audience now would be the time to come up and you would be given three minutes to say what you have to say.

And seeing none, if there are persons in opposition in the audience, now would be the time to come up and you would get

NEAL R. GROSS

an opportunity to speak against the project.

Seeing none, then we would now turn back to the Applicant, Mr. Hargrove, for any closing remarks you have.

MR. HARGROVE: Thank you. I would like to thank you for the opportunity to present our case and I just want to reiterate that this is a project that I believe will bring a great opportunity to the community and thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Mr. Hargrove.

I think what we'll do now is get a sense from the Board if we want to deliberate this morning or if we feel like that there's something outstanding that we need to get back on and schedule it for a decision date.

As for me, I think the record is pretty full and I think I'm prepared to move forward with the deliberation and in fact, could start us off if Board Members would prefer.

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

All right. The Applicant's project is a project that falls under our new revised text rule. I think they're invited to 201.1 and I think part of it is at 222, but nonetheless, it's Zoning Commission Order 08-18.

revised And under the text amendment, former public schools are allowed reused matter of right as а government administrative offices and for what defined in the was text amendment community service Ι believe. use community service use and that's a not-forprofit use established primarily to benefit and serve the population of the community in which it is located and based on the testimony that I heard this morning based on the Office of Planning report, it appeared to me anyway that the several uses identified report, in OP's report, as well as the testimony are all government administrative offices.

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I had one question going into the hearing about whether the Youth Rehab Services use would be administrative offices and Mr. Hargrove's testimony that these are employees who are servicing young people and it's an office set up and these are government employees who are working there, so on and so forth persuaded this me that an administrative office as well. So, that was the only question I had about whether any of these uses would fall outside of the matter of right provisions.

Being persuaded that they come within the rubric of the matter of right uses,

I think the question turned to the variance test and whether they could meet the variance test for the parking that would be needed.

We did some preliminary reviews up here and came up with a number of 50 required parking spaces based on the different uses. The testimony being that the Life Pieces to Masterpieces took up about 5,091 square feet

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

and the balance, I guess, would be the government uses and so, the site yields 20 spaces, already required spaces. So, you really need the variance for 30 spaces.

There was testimony from the Office of Planning that the site is irregularly shaped. Testimony from Mr. Cook that it slopes toward the north. Further testimony from Ms. Jackson that the exceptional circumstances included both the shape and the sloping of the of the lot and that's in her report as well.

In terms of practical difficulty, Mr. Cook testified -- Mr. Cook and Ms. Jackson basically testified that it would be very expensive to regrade the site citing the slope. Mr. Cook saying that it was 60 foot change, I think, in elevation causing the hardship to the Applicant to regrade and the need to completely redesign the retaining wall currently on the site so that it could support vehicular use.

NEAL R. GROSS

With respect to whether there's substantial detriment to the public good, we have the ANC report that's in full support of it. Reference being made by OP and the Applicant to the availability I think 65 offstreet parking spaces on Hayes Street that are under-utilized and then the availability of bus lines adjacent to the site as well as bus lines that connect directly to the Nannie Helen Metro Rail Station close by.

And further testimony from the Office of Planning that there would be no impairment to the Zone Plan, Regs or Map. In fact, it would be a wonderful way to synergize different government uses and restore a usefulness to a currently vacant site.

So, I think they met the test for the variance. I think that I would -- I'll support the application and I'll open it up to colleagues.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Chair,

I would concur with your analysis of this

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

project and I think it's a -- as you said before, I think -- representing the Zoning Commission, I think it's an excellent use that was well intended and I think it works very well with the next regulation.

And especially, I'm just going back and looking -- in looking at Life Pieces which with the new definition given in there community service use or not-for-profit use established primarily to benefit and serve the population of the community in which it is located, I think this fulfills that goal, you know, exceedingly well.

So, I totally back your analysis of it and I would be in favor of the voting on this.

VICE CHAIRMAN DETTMAN: Thank you,
Mr. Turnbull.

In that case, then I'd like to move approval of Application Number 17948 request for special exception and an area variance at 5002 Hayes Street, N.E. as amended by the

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Applicant this morning for relief under the revised text 08-18 for variance relief to the parking requirements.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Second.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you. The motion's been made and seconded. Is there any

Hearing none, all those in favor say aye.

(Ayes.)

further deliberation?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: All those opposed? Are there any abstentions?

Ms. Bailey, can you read back the vote please?

MS. BAILEY: Surely, Mr. Chairman. The vote is recorded as 3-0-2 to grant the application as amended. Mr. Loud made the motion. Mr. Turnbull seconded. Mr. Dettman supported the motion. Two Board Members are not sitting at this time.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: I do believe that this would be a summary order --

NEAL R. GROSS

MS. BAILEY: Summary order. CHAIRPERSON LOUD: -- the ANC was in support. Thank you, sir. MS. BAILEY: CHAIRPERSON LOUD: All right. Sorry for the delay and since it's going to be a summary order and there won't be a lot of elaboration on it, I think it's important to note a couple of things and I'm going to just 10 defer to Mr. Dettman to briefly talk about that. 11 VICE CHAIRMAN DETTMAN: Thank you, 12 13 Mr. Chairman. I was just wondering like you say 14 since this is going to be a summary order 15 whether it be worth having a footnote in the 16 order that kind of explains to the ZA how the 17 Board got to deciding that the proposed uses 18 19 matter of right under the new are text 20 amendment. Just trying to prevent, you know,

them being kicked back for whatever reason to

21

the BZA.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Yes, I like that idea a lot because it is the first case that we've heard under this new revised text and it's just a matter of, you know, maybe adding a paragraph or two to the summary format form sort of -- you know, sort of preset form. So, I think it would make a lot of sense to do that.

Thank you, Mr. Dettman.

If there anything further on this case?

MS. BAILEY: No, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: All right. Thank you and hopefully, you'll have your order within a couple of days or so and we can go to the next case. I guess you can call the next case.

MS. BAILEY: Mr. Chairman, can I just take one second to shift gears here?

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Yes, please.

MS. BAILEY: The next case is

NEAL R. GROSS

Application 17941. It's the application of Partnership and it's 1332 Vermont Avenue to 11 DCMR Section 3103.2 for a pursuant the floor variance from area ratio requirements under Section 402, a variance from the lot occupancy requirements under Section 403, a variance from the rear yard requirements under Section 404, a variance from the court requirements under Section 406 and variance from the nonconforming structure provisions under Subsection 2001.3 allow additions including an enclosed parking structure to an existing five-unit apartment house. The property is zoned R-5-B. It's located at premises 1332 Vermont Avenue, N.W., Square 242, Lot 89.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Ms. Bailey and good morning to the Applicants. I believe the Applicants have taken a seat at the table.

Is the ANC here? Okay. They're not here. If they were here, I would call

NEAL R. GROSS

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

them up. They're automatically a party.

And once you get yourselves situated, why don't you state your names and -- is it name and address or just the name for the record? Why don't you just state your name for the record?

And if anybody's going to be an expert this morning, sort of let us know at the outset so we can get them qualified.

MS. PRINCE: Allison Prince with Pillsbury Winthrop here on behalf of the Applicant Bernie Robinson, the resident of the building that is at issue today.

And we do have as an expert witness proposed expert witness Gil as an Entzminger. He has an extensive résumé that accompanied our prehearing submission at Tab F I believe if you want to take a quick look at it. has many years of experience in for Washington at HOK and working well. Blackburn He resides as now Blacksburg, Virginia where he operates his own

NEAL R. GROSS

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

firm.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you and the other -- did you introduce the other person who's at the table?

MS. PRINCE: No, but I will.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay.

MS. PRINCE: Josh McCullough to my right is with Gil's firm. Then we have Gil Entzminger and Bernie Robinson the Applicant.

I think we're ready to begin if you are.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Good morning.

Good morning again and feel free to get started.

MS. PRINCE: Good morning. As I said earlier, I'm Allison Prince with the law firm of Pillsbury Winthrop and I represent Mr. Bernie Robinson the owner of the property at 1332 Vermont Avenue.

We're here this morning seeking variance relief for an additional to an historic apartment house located in Logan

NEAL R. GROSS

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Circle. Mr. Robinson has been the owner and resident of the property for over 30 years.

As our architect will testify, there are several shortcomings associated with the property from an access, green space and safety perspective.

Mr. Robinson is proposing a one story addition that will address each of these shortcomings while at the same time make way for returning the interior of the building to its original grandeur.

We are seeking relief for a onestory garage addition combined with an enclosed stairway that will provide secure parking access to the property, internal access between the ground and first floors and a rooftop recreation space that will enhance the property and enliven the alley.

The existing building is a nonconforming structure. As such, this project requires FAR, lot occupancy, rear yard and court relief as well as relief from the

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

nonconforming structure provisions of the Zoning Regulations.

As you know, in order to satisfy the area variance burden, we need to demonstrate that the project satisfies three-prong test. First, the properly must be affected by an exceptional or extraordinary situation of condition. Second, the strict application of the Zoning Regulations must result in a practical difficulty Applicant and third, the granting of the variance must not cause substantial detriment to the public good or substantially impair the intent, purpose or integrity of the Zone Plan.

I believe that our submissions as well as our testimony today will demonstrate that this project satisfies the variance standard.

At the outset, I must note that the Board established that the property is unique when Mr. Robinson filed an secured approval of a very similar application 30 years ago for a

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

slightly larger addition to the rear of the house.

Specifically, this lot is located in an unusually shaped square with an unusually shaped alley system. The alley cuts the real lot at an angle creating a uniquely sized lot. This is significant because the existing building extends further into the real yard than the neighboring properties creating a unique relationship between the building and the rear lot line.

Another unique feature is that the building formerly had an even more extensive footprint. It had an internal stairway in a portion of the rear of the building that has been demolished. It also had a garage structure that was demolished.

Mr. Robinson is now attempting to return both of these features to the property.

The building is also interesting in that the only access to the main building from the parking area is through the narrow

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

courtyard or the front door. This presents a number of security concerns for the Applicant who has seen several waves of crime during his 30 years at the site including a murder just last year.

The structure also has internal access issues. The two floors of Mr. Robinson's unit don't have private access. The only access between the two floors is a staircase accessible by all residents of the building.

Mr. Robinson and the architect will elaborate more on how the unique features of the property results in practical difficulties in complying with the regulations.

As for the third prong of the variance test, I think that the ANC support and the abundant number of letters of support from immediately affected property owners speak for themselves. Given the widespread community support for the project, I think you would be hard pressed to argue that this

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

project will result in a detriment to neighboring property owners. Rather, it is a strong positive for the neighboring properties.

disagree with the Office Planning's assessment that the proposal undermines the Zoning Regulations for the R-5-B Zone District. On the contrary, I think this proposal is in keeping with the intent of the regulations. The addition creates two and a half times the amount of green space on the property that currently exists and it does so while respecting the light and air available to neighboring properties.

As you know, preserving the light and air associated with neighboring properties is a hallmark of the Zoning Regulations. The very first objective listed in Section 101 of the regulations is the provision of light and air.

Consistent with this objective, the regulations repeatedly make distinctions among

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

certain types of additions. For example, under the definition of building area, an addition that does not extend above the level of the main floor of the main building does not count against lot occupancy. Similarly, in commercial districts, the rear yard is not required below horizontal plane of 20 feet. The regulations recognize that one-story additions do not have the same effect as taller additions.

As we will show today, this onestory addition which is just a few steps above the main level of the house will not negatively affect neighboring properties, but will bring a multitude of benefits to the property owner as well as the neighbors.

There is a tremendous amount of legal precedent for the unique characteristics and the practical difficulties that plague this property and they were set forth in detail in the prehearing statement.

I would like to bring up one

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

specific case that this Board decided just last year involving a home at 1515 Vermont Avenue. In many respects, that case was almost identical and it involved a property only two blocks away. It was a nonconforming structure and the owner wanted to add a onestory garage and deck connected to the house. The owner needed lot occupancy, FAR and rear yard relief.

The extent of the variances there were much greater than in our case. The deck would increase lot occupancy to 97 percent and the FAR to 2.4. Whereas, our addition increases lot occupancy to only 83 percent and FAR to 2.

Nonetheless, the Board agreed with applicant that there was the а practical difficulty in not having recreation space and that a one-story garage did not detrimentally affect Zoning Regulations the or the neighboring properties. The Board unanimously in favor of the application.

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

We are asking for the same relief here and we believe we have a stronger case in this instance because our property is more unique and there are more clear practical difficulties as the architects will describe.

With that, I would like to introduce the property owner and long-time resident Bernie Robinson.

MR. ROBINSON: Good morning, gentlemen. Little nervous. Oops. Good morning.

I grew up on a farm in upstate New York. So, that thrust will probably come out later when I'm talking about my garden.

We purchased the building in 1978.

We intended to renovate it and occupy part of it and rent other portions of it.

We had a design done by Darrel Rippeteau, an architect who's still active in the District of Columbia and we went through the BZA approval to get the prerequisite approvals to tear down the old garage and to

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

install a new garage.

At that time, the fall of 1978, the prime interest rate was released for financial contract reasons or inflation and the construction loan that we had available at prime plus 2 percent would have been a 23 percent loan. So, we decided not to go ahead with the major renovation of the property.

We did do partial renovation of the upper floors modernizing the kitchens and occupied those units with tenants and I occupy the first-floor level cosmetically refurbished.

We move in. The building was occupied. At that time, Logan Circle was a neighborhood in transition. You could step over syringes at the sidewalk to get to the curb. Elmer Brooks, our next-door neighbor, was charged with shooting a prostitute in the rear end with his son's slingshot and it was exciting times and we -- we went through that.

The area has remarkably improved.

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

In the interim, I've established my own real estate management company. We manage buildings such 2101 Connecticut, 2029 as Connecticut, Valley Vista up on Belmont Road, the Mindowd on 20th Street and in the occasion or the process of working with those buildings, we've done а lot of historic renovation especially the restoration and facades and exteriors to maintain an improve those properties.

I was fortunate enough to meet Gil, an architect who was working with John Blackburn at the time who worked with us on several of those projects.

We also manage the Concord Condominium on New Hampshire Avenue which suffers from storm sewer backups into the basement occasionally because of the overage of rain runoff into the city sewer system.

So, I had gotten much more sensitive to various historic issues. Fortunately, I referred to Gil to Petersburg

NEAL R. GROSS

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

where they were providing houses for historic renovations and he and his wife bought one of those. Ended being featured on the cover of Southern Living Magazine and I still respect his judgment enough to retain him to work on this project with me.

I got married two years ago and that provided additional impetuous to have a better living space.

The new design that Gil has come up with sensitive is immensely more the to historic fabric of the building both exterior and interior. On the exterior, he noted the access-way seeming to turn to the right behind We did a little bit of an the building. architectural dig and discovered, in fact, that the opening or alleyway actually did go behind the building and Gil has restored that footprint of the building with the enclosure of that access-way.

The garage is smaller than it was intended or was designed in 1979 to provide

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

this definition of the back for of building with the addition and instead of a kind heavy structural element which of contained a stairway and enclosed an oil tank, it's now an open space providing air and light into our living space -- proposed living space.

The oil tank has been done away with and a cistern will be installed on the property. I mentioned earlier the storm sewer backups and I'm sensitive to the runoff of the city and the consequences that causes and this will also provide a source of water for the garden that I grow in the backyard.

The neighborhood certainly has immensely improved and progressed in the 30 years that I've lived in the building. We do have the Bethune Council House down the street which is not national historic property. The church is on the end of the street. The restaurants, of course, have come back on 14th Street.

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Unfortunately, that poses a little bit of a difficulty. The fast food restaurants, people tend to want to use the alley for dining functions. Buy the food at Popeyes and then eat in the alley and along the alley. So, we're getting a little bit of a resurgence of kind of transient activity in the alley.

Allison mentioned the murder last summer and that was right behind our house and rather disconcerting.

And the unique aspects of the properties on that block I think are well known. The Barrel House Liquor Store on the corner has been there and been a great citizen for the community. The ANC fully endorsed its renewal of its licenses recently. So, we've had a very nice community developing there.

We have a lot of neighborhood support. Grafton Biglow, our neighbor across the alley, is there this morning to speak in support of a garage. He was a pioneer in that

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

area. Basically built a sweat equity house that he had gotten through the District of Columbia program for restoration of that historic area.

As Allison mentioned, the neighbors are enthusiastically supporting of this. We have letters from all the adjacent neighbors and other neighbors in the area.

Connie Maffin was the original real estate agent that sold us the house 30 years ago and we were fortunate enough that she signed our letter before she passed away earlier this year.

The Logan Circle Historic Committee raised some questions about the proposal as did the CDC. As a consequence, instead of having a screened-in porch on the deck, we've deleted that. I'm a little envious of my neighbors who have their screened-in porches across the way, but we can certainly forego a screened-in porch to have a deck.

They also ask that we modify the

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

parapet of the garage to have interesting architectural feature or appearance so that it wouldn't be a monolithic type of construction there and I think Gil has been very sensitive to the nature of the alley especially on the southern end where it is completely closed in or virtually closed in length of the alley and it the significantly help the aesthetics and improve the appearance of the alley in this area.

We also obtained ANC approval and I can honestly say my recollection of the approval process for the variance 30 years ago was certainly a lot more simple than this process has been, but times change.

That's it for my comments. I'll be happy to answer questions.

Gil will present the technical aspects of the ratios and percentages, et cetera.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Mr. Robinson. Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MS. PRINCE: May we turn the lights down? CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Yes, please. Board Members, do you have any questions so far? Okay. Why don't we qualify your expert before he starts? I saw his profile in our submission. I don't have any questions. 10 don't know if the Board Members had questions. I don't think that there are any. 11 Has he testified before BZA before, 12 Ms. Prince? 13 MR. ENTZMINGER: No, sir. 14 CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. 15 just based on the fact that the Board does not 16 have any questions about your profile and your 17 extensive list and history in your profession, 18 the Board's going to go ahead and qualify you 19 expert and give your testimony the 20 as weight that would be given to an expert. 21

NEAL R. GROSS

MR. ENTZMINGER:

22

Thank you.

Again, my name is Gil Entzminger. My firm is Enteros Design Architects in Petersburg, Virginia and as Bernie, I've work in D.C. over a number of years being licensed here in 1996 and meeting Bernie there shortly afterwards and working with him on several restoration projects in the city including 2029 Connecticut Avenue and Valley Vista Condominiums.

So, I was honored with Bernie and Marge asked me to work with them on the renovation of their home at 1332 Vermont Avenue.

I'd like to walk through our slides if I may and if I could have the wireless mike, I'll walk.

Okay. Thank you.

The first slide that I'd like to present in this presentation shows the overall aerial view and context of the site and the community around Logan Circle and the house.

You can see in the circular area

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

with the star in the middle of it is the house at 1332 Vermont Avenue. The house is located along an alley at the rear of the property which angles in relationship to Vermont Avenue so that the width of the or the depth of the lots as they travel to the north diminish. The lots on the southern end of the alley are much deeper and provide much more open space, much more room for development of those lots.

The lot that we're working on is substantially shallower than the other lots. Yet, the size of the house is actually larger than most of the other houses on the block. So, you can see the depth of this house and the existing original kitchen dependency that's original to the house, it's not an addition, is actually fairly deep and deeper in relationship to many of the other houses.

There is no outward external dependency on the back of the property. Whereas other properties do, this house does not.

NEAL R. GROSS

So, again, the house is located in the R-5-B district. It was built in 1888. It is an historic home. It contributes to the historic district.

The house is four stories plus a cellar. A 2,632 square foot lot area and 4,750 square foot house.

Also, just to mention that the dwelling currently has five dwelling units, five apartments in it. That has been the case since I believe around 1960 perhaps earlier and it will continue to have five apartments, five dwelling units in the house. No increase in occupancy of the building as a result of this proposed project.

To further elaborate on the context that we're working in and to look further into the alley that we propose to put an addition on, these are images and photos showing you similar properties along the alley. As you can see, the mass and density of that alley is fairly great. Many of the properties have

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

zero lot line. Their property walls are on the alley and others have walls or gates that front that alley, but it seems to be a fairly consistent precedent on the alley to have either a rear dependency or a wall abutting along the alley.

Our proposed design I think will be in keeping and complement structures more like this that offer an appealing addition with brick and masonry construction and a more refined look than some of the other properties on the street

Security and visibility is definitely major concern Bernie а as mentioned. Currently, the alley is basically unsupervised and un-monitored. There's visibility for most of the properties on the alley and transient activity does occur there and crime does occur there. So, just by the nature of the alley, we feel like we have to do something for them to address the security concerns for their own safety.

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

This is a direct shot of the rear of the property currently as it exists today. You can see the parking area here is a combination of concrete and gravel. It's currently 100 percent impervious area and we would like to correct that situation to some extent.

You can see the rear of the house.

This opening is actually a window. It is not a door. There was some confusion on that and that is actually a window not a door.

On the back of this house, there is no access from the first floor, from the ground floor, main floor of this building. There is no access to the rear of the property. We also feel like that gives it a unique feature that we need to deal with and it also is a practical difficulty.

To point out the areaway that Bernie mentioned, this is a shot that shows an existing wall that comes out from the rear of the property that was an enclosure around an

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

enclosed space at one point in time that was part of the areaway to the basement of the building. You can see some painted surfaces here that would have been original interior space at some point in time. There's a ledge here that might have supported a roof line and there are wood nailers and construction that would have been interior to the building at some point in time. Those are built into the masonry. So, they're likely to have been possibly original to the building.

You can also see the wood fence here currently that is providing minimal amount of security to the occupants of the building. Inadequate security. That fence is easily scaled and once someone is inside the property, they're hidden and could do whatever they like to whoever might be in there.

It also essentially closes the court. There is a narrow court on the side of the building which I'll have a better photo of in a minute, but that essentially closes that

NEAL R. GROSS

court from the exterior.

Another shot of the rear of the building and what I'd like to point out here is the mass and height of the building in relationship to the alley. What you can't really see in this image is that the fourstory portion of the building along Vermont Avenue is actually taller than the rear portion of the building. The building steps down in mass as it approaches the back of the lot. This is a three-story portion.

configuration of the The facade of this is as I mentioned before in the block with somewhat unique this extension of the original rear dependency on the building. That also steps down to the level of the ground floor, first floor of the house and then our proposed deck would step down again. So, we're kind of stepping the down as we approach the alley in an effort to work with the overall mass of the block and mass of the community and also

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

preserve light and air on the block.

This is a closer image, a closer view of that areaway that we mentioned previously. You can see in the middle image the walkway that leads down currently to the unoccupied basement of the house. That areaway turns the corner around the corner of the house into this area.

You can see this brick wall where the brick at one point in time extended on. We excavated the length of that wall and discovered a foundation wall that continued beyond. You can see the interior where there was interior structure at one point in time that covered -- provided some roof over that enclosure.

Also, to point out, we have the 1957 base map. We did some research on the property. Also, we also have looked into the 1919 base map. Both of those maps show the footprint of the building continuing straight and the width incorporating this original

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

areaway wall. That full width was part of the original footprint of the building when both of those maps were drawn.

This image shows the width of the current court. The court is currently 8 feet 4 inches wide. It's a nonconforming court as it exists today and provides almost no green space for the property. It is shaded by the adjacent properties and gets almost no light, air or gives no opportunity for outdoor enjoyment by the residents. So, we really want to make sure we improve that situation.

Oh, yes, also on the base map is the footprint of an earlier garage that was on the property. You can see. It may be difficult to see from where you are, but at the center of that red dot is an X where there was an earlier garage on the property. That garage exists where we want to build the new garage or existed where we want to build the new garage and also, did close the court when it was built there originally.

NEAL R. GROSS

This image shows the existing first-floor plan or I mean, sorry, cellar plan of the house. The existing FAR for the property is 1.8 with 64 percent lot coverage. The cellar or basement of the property is more or less in its original configuration and existing walls of the original house.

You can see in this image the parking spaces on the rear of the property. Existing as they are today.

In yellow here is the footprint of the house which does include that areaway that we would proposed to enclose.

Red line indicates the red fence or the red line indicates the wood fence which essentially closes that court and we do not really intend to change any of those existing conditions as a part of our proposal.

The courtyard, again, would remain 8 feet 4 inches wide.

This is an image of the existing first floor plan of the house. What I'd like

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

to point out in this image is that the house is a very grand house and the interior of the first floor is also very grand or has the potential to be very grand interior space. We want to restore that and maintain that in the design.

The existing entryway from Vermont Avenue is used by residents of the building as they come home in the evenings or leave for work.

We have the side hall here with the stair leading up to the upstairs tenant apartments and then this floor would be occupied by Bernie and Marge as their primary residence.

We have two parlors on the front of the house, a grand dining room in the middle the building and the original kitchen of dependency which will be updated and modernized for kitchen for а new the occupants.

What I really want to point out

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

here is that this hallway on the front of the house is a significant distance from the rear of the property. To try to attempt to have any connection from here to here would be nearly impossible and would take too much space away from the proposed apartment use and would be impractical to do so.

This plan shows the proposed cellar plan. We would propose to enclose the rear parking area. Keep the footprint of the parking area as it exists today. Not increase or decrease that. Actually, we would decrease it by the depth of this enclosure for the stair, but essentially just enclose that area for security and safety.

As Bernie and Marge come home in the evening, they can enter that and go through this doorway into the stairway that will connect them to their apartment. That would provide access to the rear of the property that they can -- that is practically difficult at this point to achieve.

NEAL R. GROSS

There is no access to the rear of the property from their first floor. So, they could go up the stair to the existing kitchen of the house or down to their master bedroom suite.

As you can see in this plan, the green area, the court remains the same. Ιt does not change. Tenants still have access to That court is not for that court. the exclusive use of Bernie and Marge. can come to that court either by means of passing through the which will garage common space for the apartment. They will still have access through there and, in fact, they will need to maintain a path of egress through that garage for the tenants and would also have tenants access through common part of the basement traveling through to access that court area as well.

This is the first-floor plan of the house. You can see in the footprint of the original house we've preserved and restored

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the character of that home. We feel like that's very important to respect the grand character and preserve the historic nature of this home and to cut up or to chop up the interior with any other type of connections we fill would be potentially an insult to the character of the house and would remove too much space and make the house less usable for the occupants.

We feel that this design approach is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's standards for rehabilitation of historic properties and is appropriate to the building.

We've provided the least impact on the home by enclosing that existing areaway which was circulation and access to the property, had been enclosed at some point in time in the past possibly originally and we condition with would restore that the enclosure of the new stair hall which will bring in much needed natural light

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

ventilation into the kitchen space of the building.

You can see in this image that the parking deck or the parking area is covered by a deck. Bernie is an avid gardener. Has many tomato plants that he's trying to grow currently. The plan would be for that deck to be covered with potted plants and green space, perhaps some flowering trees in planters and to really create an area that would enjoyable. To actually take a space that's currently paved area, impervious area and make it into green space.

We're keeping cars off the street by maintaining that parking area. We're keeping cars off the street of Vermont Avenue and making that space available for other citizens of the city to use.

I believe by covering that parking with the deck and creating a green space, we're actually taking the appropriate and correct environmental approach for the

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

building, too. We're reducing the heat island affect by doing so.

The plan will incorporate a cistern that will collect the water from the court and from the deck and pipe it to a cistern for reuse in irrigation for the property. So, all of the storm water that currently runs off from that parking area will be collected and used on site.

I'm trying to think if I've missed anything.

The other aspects of the deck that we feel is a real benefit to the community is that we'll create social space for the neighbors and for the residents to use. Bernie and Marge are very social people and like to entertain and so, this will give them the opportunity to do so.

It will also promote security and safety of the alley. The parapet wall surrounding the deck is only 3 feet tall. So, if someone sits on that deck or stands on that

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

deck, they will see the alley and the idea is that that will be used very often and would also -- would actually increase safety and security not only for Bernie and Marge, but for the entire community.

This is a shot of the rear of the property, the existing rear of the house and you can see it's in need of repair and we feel like this project will improve the appearance — the overall appearance of the alley with the new addition and the proposed wall.

The construction of this wall will be as I mentioned brick and masonry with a wood in-fill. That brick would be consistent in color and feel and texture with the other facades that are already built on the wall and the line of that wall built out to the property line again is an already established precedent on the alley.

The addition of the new stair enclosure is barely visible from the alley. It would not impede anyone else's fresh air or

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

light that they might have on the alley or neighboring properties.

And again, this is the overall aerial view of the project site where you can see the line of other properties extending down the alley. Our project will extend that line with the construction of the new deck and you can see how it creates a very large open space. So, rather than having existing ongrade parking that is essentially unusable outdoor space, we're actually increasing the outdoor space for the project by 268 percent over what is there and usable currently.

The condition essentially court doesn't change. It has been an enclosed court in the past. It currently has a fence which practically makes it an enclosed court. So, that condition and we're not changing really don't feel that we're diminishing any light natural or air from any other properties.

And this is the last image and this

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

shows a rendering of what the enclosure would look like as one stands in the court. We really feel like we can take this opportunity to create a useful enclosed court that can be used for the residents of the building, make an attractive space, provide light, fresh air and ventilation into the house for Bernie and Marge and provide security and safety.

So, the reasons to approve this project are that we've resolved the practical difficulties of lack of access, security and green space. We have done a project or an addition that has the least impact on the historic structure. We're preserving the historic integrity of properties in the city, in the District of Columbia by doing so.

Meets the intent of zoning to control density, preserve open space, light and air and the project presents no detriment to the residents or neighborhoods of the community and actually, we feel that it is a great benefit to the residents and neighbors

NEAL R. GROSS

of the community because it provides social outdoor spaces. It provides outdoor space that's not currently there. Ιt also provide safety and security for the entire community by providing a space that someone could actually live in and enjoy outdoors and also supervise and monitor activities that occur on the alley. So, I believe that describes the design and I'll end my presentation. Thank you, Mr. CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Entzminger, and I hope I'm pronouncing that correctly and Ms. Bailey's going to cut the light on. Was that your final witness? MS. PRINCE: That is our final witness. CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. MS. PRINCE: Yes. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON LOUD: tell you what why don't we see if Board

Members have any questions for any of your

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

witnesses.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Chair, thank you.

My first question talking about the uniqueness and I don't think you've proved your -- the first prong. Why the angle -- why the angled alley is unique. How does that -- we have angled alleys all over D.C. We have properties exactly like this one. We have properties that have a smaller backyard than the current Applicant's got. How is that unique? How does that make this property unique?

MR. ENTZMINGER: Well, I think that the angle in relationship to the adjacent property and other properties in this area does make it unique in that the diminished lot size in relationship to the overall size of the building and the angle and the configuration of the lot is unique. I don't know that any other particular property has those exact conditions in the city.

NEAL R. GROSS

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well, I think there's some houses right next door that look very similar or even worse. I don't --

MS. PRINCE: May I say something?

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Sure.

MS. PRINCE: We looked at this property very, very thoroughly in connection with this variance application. We spent a tremendous amount of time really examining it and at the end of the day aside from the fact that the Board previously found the property found unique, what Ι particularly compelling was not the angle alone. I agree with you completely. There are angled alleys all over the city.

It was the confluence of factors. The Gilmartin case speaks of the confluence of factors. It was the combination of the angle of the alley and the configuration of the original footprint of the building. That's what created the real pinch condition that impaired our ability to address the

NEAL R. GROSS

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

shortcomings associated with the property.

Had that rear dependency not existed, that piece that comes all the way back, had that not been there, we could have easily accommodated the challenges associated with the property. We could have provided enclosed parking. We could have addressed security.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: But, you're not required to provide parking.

MS. PRINCE: It's not legally required, but it's already provided.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right.

But, it's MS. PRINCE: that condition that exists relative to the footprint of the house as it relates to the alley not the alley alone. Because I agree, there are many other buildings that front on that angled alley and it diminishes the size of the lot, but our footprint extends farther back than any of those other buildings and that Ι believe is the compelling unique

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

factor. One of the compelling unique factors.

Т think also the fact that historically this property had the features that we're seeking to reincorporate make it pretty unusual. The fact that there was a connecting piece associated with the building that we've documented that putting back and the fact that there was a garage enclosure that we're putting back and I don't think -- I don't think it's very common to be able to say that we're putting back a rear connecting stairway piece that was part of the original structure.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: All right.

I'll stop for now. I have some other questions, but I'll let other Board Members feed in on this.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. I have two quick questions. I think sort of unrelated to Mr. Turnbull's line of questioning and it just helps me to get a bigger picture of understanding what's going

NEAL R. GROSS

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

on.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

In terms of the garage that's going to be placed on the alley, is there a reason why the rule that requires a setback from the center line of the alley would not apply in this case?

MS. PRINCE: This is an addition to the existing building. It's not a separate detached garage. There may be confusion over that because there was a reference to a detached garage --

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Um-hum.

MS. PRINCE: -- in the OP report, but this is an actual addition.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. And then with respect to there not being any rear access at all for the units that are on the ground and first floor, are those currently one unit? The ground and first floor. Okay. They're currently separate units, but you want to make it into --

MR. ENTZMINGER: No, sir.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay.
2	MR. ENTZMINGER: The ground floor
3	is a unit. The basement is currently
4	unoccupied.
5	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay.
6	MR. ENTZMINGER: It's not been
7	renovated as an apartment.
8	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: And so
9	MR. ENTZMINGER: But, it will be
10	combined with the first floor to make one
11	unit.
12	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Is there rear
13	access from what you're calling the ground
14	floor?
15	MR. ENTZMINGER: The cellar, there
16	is access to the rear of the property from the
17	cellar.
18	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. Okay.
19	Thank you.
20	Mr. Turnbull, did you reflect
21	further on any questions?
22	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I have a

question about this deck. This deck is not an open deck?

MR. ENTZMINGER: No, sir, the intention would be to waterproof the underside of that deck, collect the water and bring it to a cistern and then create green space on top of the deck through planters.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: It's not a true green space. I mean it's -- you're putting planters on it. There's not like a lawn or a grass area on top of this thing.

MR. ENTZMINGER: No, sir, for maintenance reasons, we would pot and plant in planters and make it easier to maintain not only the roof and the architectural components of the property, but also the planting as well.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I think as the Chair stated that we're talking about the access to the back. There is no access now. I mean you could create access through the basement now for all residents.

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	MR. ENTZMINGER: There is access
2	through the basement now.
3	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I mean you
4	haven't had it for 30-plus years.
5	MR. ENTZMINGER: No, there is
6	access.
7	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: People get
8	to the back by going through the basement.
9	MR. ROBINSON: Right. But, they
10	have to go through a public stair at the front
11	of the building and our purpose is to not go
12	through the public space, but to have it
13	access within our space while maintaining the
14	public access for the other residents.
15	MR. ENTZMINGER: The access relates
16	to not only the intended use for the property
17	as their, you know, primary residence, long-
18	term residents for 30 years, but to make it so
19	that they can actually bring a bag of
20	groceries into their kitchen directly is one
21	issue.

NEAL R. GROSS

But, also the security impact as

well. Currently, entering that garage space brings them into a secure area. They can exit their vehicle and go into a secured enclosed stair and go into their apartment and there is great concern by Bernie and Marge for their safety. A year ago, someone was killed right --

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: But, only three occupants can do that. There are three cars in the garage. So, only two occupants. They got to come in through the front door or --

MR. ROBINSON: Many of the occupants walk or bicycle and use the front of the building for those purposes. We have seven residents in the building presently and we have six bicyclists in the building.

The parking is limited, but it has generally exceeded the needs for the residents in the building.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Then I'm not sure why you go on talking about access

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

bringing groceries in through the back. It doesn't seem like it wants to follow the logic of why you want to do this.

MR. ROBINSON: Right now, if we try to go from our parking area into the living space, we have to go all the way through the

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: You do as

back into our living space.

basement up through a public space and then

MR. ROBINSON: In back of the building. That's right. With this enclosure of the previous footprint, we would just come from the garage in through the stairway to the kitchen area.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I have more questions for the Office of Planning.

VICE CHAIRMAN DETTMAN: Mr. Entzminger, actually, if you just go forward one slide, I'm going to talk to -- it's not the one, but I'll do my best here. That's the one.

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

the owner?

1	I'm just considering, you know,
2	what you would be able to do under a special
3	exception rather than a variance under Section
4	223 regs.
5	MS. PRINCE: Excuse me. This is an
6	apartment house use. So, 223 is not
7	available.
8	VICE CHAIRMAN DETTMAN: That's
9	right. I have no questions. Thank you, Ms.
10	Prince.
11	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Mr.
12	Dettman, Mr. Turnbull. Thank you, Ms. Prince.
13	What we will do now, it makes
14	perfect sense, is to go to the Office of
15	Planning for their testimony based on their
16	report which is our Exhibit 24.
17	Good morning.
18	MR. COCHRAN: Good morning, Mr.
19	Chair, Members of the Board.
20	OP has to recommend that the Board
21	deny the requested variances. The Applicant

has certainly made a good case for why perhaps

the structure should pass muster with the Historic Preservation Review Board, but the BZA and the HPRB are different entities and this is also not a design review panel.

We feel that the Applicant simply does not meet the tests that the Zoning Regulations impose for uniqueness exceptional conditions or practical difficulty and we're even more concerned that while the structure may not cause substantial harm to neighbors, its adjacent it does cause substantial harm to the Zoning Regulations particularly Section 2001.3 which has the aim of bringing buildings into conformance with the Zoning Regulations. Nonconforming structures into conformance with the Zoning Regulations.

This structure is already as the Applicant has demonstrated well in excess of its current allowances on lot occupancy and this property was rezoned in Case 97-1 from R-5-D to R-5-B. Expanding the structure this

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

way goes contrary even to that rezoning which was put in place to help preserve the pattern in Dupont Circle.

The Applicant has also as one of its uniqueness tests stated that the building is larger than the other buildings on the block. To us, this seems to make the very case that we're suggesting. That the building is already larger than the other buildings in the block.

Section 2001.3 would then say, it seems to us, stay at that size. Don't increase it even further. Don't make the unusual size of it even larger.

That's a quick summary, but let me go back into some more details in the report.

The Applicant for uniqueness makes several allegations. That there's the prior BZA history on the case. Well, that case was 30 years ago. Unfortunately, the Applicant did not submit the plans from that previous case and we simply don't have those records

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

readily available.

We do know that the Applicant had a garage at that point. From the information the Applicant presented today, it appears where that X is that the garage was not as wide as what the Applicant is proposing. That may not be the case, but that's what appeared from the Applicant's drawings today. That it would have been only on the south side of what is at this point the rear yard not covering the entire width. Again, that's based on the drawings not necessarily on what I know from 30 years ago.

The Applicant has also talked the archaeological digs and there being a previous addition in the back. If you look at the brick pattern and some of what the Applicant shows and the fact that there was a window not a door there, it appears that that addition would have been only one-story high. What the Applicant is proposing is а two-story addition. So, it does seem that the Applicant

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

is proposing to make the building even larger than it was originally when it was larger than it is now.

As far as the dimensions of the lot, they're not unique. There are at least 20 other lots in the square that are less deep than the Applicant's. They also have a similar angle to the rear.

As a Member of the Board has already stated, the Applicant is not required to provide parking nor are they necessarily entitled to provide parking. This is an historic structure. They don't have to provide it.

As it is, they have three parking spaces now. As you can see, if they're going legal parking spaces, they would have actually be cutting down the numbers parking spaces that they're informally providing now because the lot could accommodate only two legal spaces.

Lack of access, again, the Board

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

has already started to address this. There is access to the backyard. Despite what the application has stated, not all Applicants have to go around the block and through the alley to get to the back yard. There is already access to it from the existing building.

With respect to the proposed redesign of the building, the Applicant hasn't demonstrated that they would not be able to fit a staircase in to the two-floor unit so that they could then have their own private access to the back yard. Perhaps it isn't possible, but the Applicant has not demonstrated that it isn't possible. That's quite a large apartment.

On the lack of security, the Applicant himself, the owner of the building, has testified to how much better Logan Circle has gotten over the last 20 years. There are certainly other properties that have addressed their security concerns by putting up roll-up

NEAL R. GROSS

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

garages that can be -- that are 10-feet high. Certainly not to easy to climb over. The Applicant could also put sidewalls, but that would not increase the Applicant's lot occupancy the way that this does from it's already over lot occupancy of 64 percent to 83 percent.

when it comes to lack of green space, again, the Board has already talked about is this really green space. It's a nice deck. It's one that I would certainly enjoy using, but it has planters. Yes, some of the water would be recirculated to the garden area in the existing areaway, but again, to talk about this as necessarily building -- being green space that would provide more permeable surface, et cetera, no, that's not necessarily the case.

And as far as again, uniqueness, the negative impacts from the mixed-use district, well, this certainly isn't unique.

One of the advantages of living in Logan

NEAL R. GROSS

Circle is that you are in a mixed-use district. Presumably, that's one of the reasons that you chose to be there. It's not particular to this property.

For practical difficulty, well, any addition would require relief. It is very difficult for OP to accept that the Zoning Regulations themselves contribute to their being a practical difficulty.

As far as the Applicant not being able to enjoy the property without relief, well, the Applicant has not demonstrated that all of this addition is necessary to the Applicants being able to enjoy their property. Perhaps they wouldn't be able to enjoy it exactly in the way that they would like to, but they haven't demonstrated that there's going to be -- that it would not be a usable and enjoyable space.

I even notice that in one of the Applicant's -- I think it was the last slide, they showed sunlight appearing in the side

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

court. That same side court that the Applicant has already said -- if you want to flip to your last slide, the Applicant has already said that they can't use it because there is no sunlight there, but there you can see how nicely that plot of ground would be lit. I don't know which is really the case.

There also seems to be another slight difference in interpretation on existing conditions. If you could show the slide that shows the back of the proposed garage. I think you already passed it.

Now, if you look at that, to me at least, maybe there is depth in there. I don't see the shadow line, but it's looking like the building to the south has a three-story addition that comes all the way back to the alley or maybe just a few feet back. You can see a slight change there.

In fact, it doesn't. There's a one-story dependency back there. You don't have that other building coming quite so close

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

to the alley, but again, that may just be a case of the rendering and my mis-perception.

Yes, it does definitely have a rear extension. It just doesn't appear to be quite as close to the alley as that seems at least to me to show.

The Applicant would be faced with increased inconvenience if the relief were not granted. Again, the Applicant hasn't demonstrated that the existing common stairway couldn't be used by the other four apartments in the building nor has the Applicant yet demonstrated that the Applicant wouldn't be able to get back to the parking area.

And the requested relief being relatively minor, the lot coverage would be expanded by 19 percent to 138 percent of what is permitted and the rear yard which is now 2 percent shallower than what is required would actually require 93.3 percent variance. These don't seem like minor variances to OP.

Finally, we look at the substantial

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

detriment to the health, welfare and the Zoning Regulations. OP has no illusion that this property would have a negative impact on the neighbors to the north and to the south.

We are concerned about the impact on the Zoning Regulations of property that was down zoned about ten years ago. A block that was down zoned ten years ago and the whole trend towards expanding the building that Section 2001.3 clearly says shouldn't expanded existing nonconforming as an feel structure. So, do that the we Applicant's that your granting the requested variances would have a substantial harm on the Zoning Regulations.

Given that we do not believe that the Applicant has demonstrated either exceptional conditions or practical difficulty, we feel that it would be very unfortunate if you did grant the requested variances and therefore, we recommend that you deny the request.

NEAL R. GROSS

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Mr.
Cochran.

Board Members, are there any

questions for the Office of Planning?

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes, Mr.

Chair.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Mr. Cochran, once again, an excellent analysis of this -- I guess what I would consider kind of a difficult case in a way. It's kind of a conundrum. There's part of this project that I think are interesting to it, but I think you made a comment about it's almost like look what I could do if I didn't have to worry about the Zoning Regs. Here's what I could make out of this project.

And which is a little troubling because I could apply that to any other lot on this block. They could make the same case and the other situation could basically come back and do the same thing.

And it does trouble me that we're getting to 138 percent. I think that --

NEAL R. GROSS

really built over site. There's -- other than this inside courtyard, there's really no open space. This is getting to be totally built up.

So, I share your concerns that this project has not met the three prongs. That there are -- what we didn't see was some kind of a design or an approach that would show something done within the existing structure proper as a stair -- connecting the stair if they wanted to make a two-story unit for the owner and so, I am troubled.

And I think your analysis -- I concur with your analysis. I think there's a -- it's an interesting project. I think -- I can certainly see some of the aspects which they're trying to do, but I really don't think they've met the three prongs that would justify us doing anything like this and it does concern me that I could see the whole block going this way. Which would, again from the standpoint of the zone, would be something

NEAL R. GROSS

which we tried to stop and preserve when it was changed.

So, I share your concerns on this project. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Mr. Turnbull. Mr. Dettman, did you have any follow-up questions?

Okay. Just sort of a reminder in terms of where we are, it's about -- in this sense, it's about 11:40 and we're set to break at 12:00 noon, but if the parties are so willing and we extend beyond 12:00, I think -- and the Board Members are willing, I see heads shake, that we'd be willing to go into the lunch period to conclude the case this morning.

Secondly, just to remind that OP's report is an excellent report, but it's OP's report and we've not -- there hasn't been a cross of that report yet and I don't know if Ms. Prince is going to do that. She certainly has the opportunity to do that. Which would

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

make the record fuller one way or the other
with respect to the points brought out in Mr.
Cochran's testimony.
I don't have any questions for OP.
So, Ms. Prince, if you have a cross, this
would be the time to do it.
MS. PRINCE: I do have a few
questions for Mr. Cochran.
Steve, can you explain your
determination that this property is not unique
when compared to numerous other variance
applications that have been granted and found
to be unique such as 1515 Vermont Avenue?
MR. COCHRAN: When I'm looking at
uniqueness, I'm looking at uniqueness within
that square, within that triangle, whatever
you want to call it. Uniqueness with respect
to its neighbors.
I don't see its uniqueness. There
are even smaller lots on this square.
MS. PRINCE: You don't find it
unique that this building, the dependency

protrudes farther into the rear yard than any other property nearby?

MR. COCHRAN: If I were to agree that this extended farther, I would be taking your word. I have not gone through and measured everyone. It does seem to extend farther than most.

MS. PRINCE: Are you aware --

MR. COCHRAN: But, let me just finish on that. That's not taking into account the properties that already have garages.

MS. PRINCE: All right. Correct. Are you aware that in numerous instances this essentially determined Board has practical difficulties often amount to inconvenience to the building owner? That that's what a practical difficulty is. inconvenience. It's something that is -- you know, people don't need bigger kitchens, but the Board has often granted variances accommodate larger kitchens or third bedrooms.

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	So, what's your view of what a
2	practical difficulty is?
3	MR. COCHRAN: A practical
4	difficulty first off is something that has to
5	be demonstrated. That you cannot effectively
6	use the property.
7	Certainly, in this instance, I
8	don't think that the that your application
9	has demonstrated that the property can't be
10	used.
11	MS. PRINCE: You think that's the
12	burden of an area variance
13	MR. COCHRAN: Perhaps the property
14	could not be used as the owner most wishes it
15	to be used, but there are many honestly,
16	there are many things that I would like to be
17	able to do to my own house that I can't do
18	because of the Zoning Regulations.
19	MS. PRINCE: So, you don't think
20	that there can be a variance granted if the
21	owner is capable of continuing to live in that
22	house as it is. In that case, when would a

1	variance ever be granted?
2	MR. COCHRAN: But, the owner the
3	owner is the owner is choosing to make a
4	duplex unit.
5	MS. PRINCE: Um-hum.
6	MR. COCHRAN: The owner could
7	choose to make a duplex unit on other floors
8	of the building and have the lower floor be
9	its own separate unit not the owner's unit.
10	MS. PRINCE: But, is that
11	MR. COCHRAN: We don't know that
12	there are any to me, that is absolutely not
13	a burden.
14	MS. PRINCE: That if there are
15	alternative ways of accomplishing a project,
16	that the Board cannot grant a variance for a
17	given project?
18	MR. COCHRAN: Certainly, in
19	something like this, no, I don't see where it
20	would be appropriate for the Board to grant
21	it.

It really begins to lead to asking

for a variance because I want a variance. I want to do it this way. Please give me a variance.

You have certain steps that you have to meet to justify granting a variance. It's not a small thing. The Applicant has to demonstrate that there's something genuinely unique or at least has unusual circumstances about the property. The Applicant has to demonstrate that there's a real practical difficulty not just that the property can't be developed the way that you would like to use it or that might even produce the best looking design.

This is certainly a great looking design. I think if I were living in the unit I would very much enjoy living in that unit, but that's not what the Zoning Regulations are about.

MS. PRINCE: Do you agree that there's value to preserving the interior spaces and not chopping up the historic dining

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

room with an interior stairway?

MR. COCHRAN: That would have to be -- you'd be asking my personal opinion on that and I'd rather not give that.

PRINCE: You stated that we MS. hadn't demonstrated that we couldn't accommodate interior access when, in fact, we showed the historic interior of the building and explained the in which we're manner preserving that and that was our way of explaining why it didn't make sense to put a stairway in the middle of a historic dining room.

MR. COCHRAN: I took so many notes.

I can't find the first one right now, but you

-- I believe that the architect essentially
said that to put in a staircase would
certainly violate the historic integrity of
the building. Well, this building as you've
all pointed out was built as a grand single
family house. It's already been split into
five apartments. It's integrity is already

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

not what it was originally.

You haven't demonstrated, at least to me, that an alternate location for a staircase would substantially change the integrity of the building that's already been changed considerably by going from a single family to an apartment building.

MS. PRINCE: Have you ever supported a variance application involving a row house? Just a regular old row house. Has Office of Planning ever supported such an application?

MR. COCHRAN: I think you know the answer to that is yes.

MS. PRINCE: And how on earth could a row house ever be unique? If this isn't unique, how on earth could a row house be unique? A house with а regularly row configured rear yard. A row house with a footprint that's like reqular just neighbors. That fronts on the same alley. How could that ever be unique? When, in fact,

NEAL R. GROSS

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

your office has routinely found many row houses to be fairly unique because you look at each individual factor affecting the property.

And here with this footprint and this lot. this this with lot on configuration, this historic use and the evidence that we're putting back what there in large part. That's not -- doesn't strike you as unique in anyway?

MR. COCHRAN: Well, I don't want to address the first part of that question because I think that's a hypothetical. You know that we have supported variances in row houses before and there have been conditions where we found them unique.

To engage in a back and forth on whether something that I might answer on that and then you might object is not particularly productive.

The case here is whether this property is unique and whether this application has demonstrated its uniqueness.

NEAL R. GROSS

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

When we're looking at putting back things already there, that were that's something that's subject to the Historic Preservation Review Board. That's not something that is necessarily the purview of the Board of Zoning Adjustments at least taking that into account as part of the uniqueness.

The property did conform even less to the Zoning Regulations by your testimony prior to the demolition of these additions.

The Zoning Regulations were put in to put those -- the same additions back and then it seems another floor on that glass-in addition goes against the whole intention of 2001.3.

I can go back. I've already stated the dimensions of the lot, they're not unique. The parking spaces versus the recreation spaces, that's not unique. That's a choice that people have to make all the time in a row house neighborhood.

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	The lack of access, we've already
2	demonstrated that there isn't a lack of access
3	at this point contrary to what the application
4	seemed to say.
5	MS. PRINCE: There's not a lack of
6	access from the main level of the house to the
7	rear yard?
8	MR. COCHRAN: The main level of the
9	house can go to the common stairway and go out
10	to the rear yard. Yes.
11	There's not a if there's a lack
12	of security, it's it could certainly be
13	rectified by putting up a wall or roll-up
14	garage in the back and why now? Why when the
15	Applicant has already testified that Logan
16	Circle is improving so much.
17	The lack of security seems to be
18	getting lessened rather than greater.
19	MS. PRINCE: Except for the murder
20	last year.
21	MR. COCHRAN: That's true.
22	MS. PRINCE: And so, Office of

1	Planning would be more supportive of a 12-foot
2	tall roll-up metal door at the rear of the
3	property than this proposal?
4	MR. COCHRAN: I can't speak to the
5	exact height. That's up to the building
6	regulations, but as far as a roll-up back
7	there, yes, we would be more supportive of
8	that than a garage with a deck on top and the
9	addition.
10	MS. PRINCE: I have no more
11	questions.
12	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Ms.
13	Prince. Thank you, Mr. Cochran.
14	Board Members, following the cross,
15	are there any additional questions for either
16	Mr. Cochran or the okay.
17	Then what we'll do is move on to
18	the Advisory Neighborhood Commission. In this
19	case, it's ANC-2F and if someone from 2F is
20	here, you can come on up. No one's here.
21	So, ANC-2F did submit a report.
22	It's our Exhibit 25 and in the report, they

indicate that they met, had a quorum. They had notice. One of their committees had a number of zoning related questions that they went through including lot coverage and the uniqueness of the site, types of practical difficulties presented, so on and so forth and the bottom line is that after the committee forwarded back to the full ANC, a vote was taken and at the May 6 meeting, ANC-2F voted to approve, I'm sorry, voted to recommend approval of the application.

So, that's a part of our record.

It will be given appropriate great weight under our rules.

And with that unless there are any comments from the Board about the ANC report, what we'll do then is ask whether there are persons in the audience who are in support of the application and if so, this would be the time to come up here. You'll be given three minutes to give your testimony.

I thought I heard earlier that

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	there was a witness who lived across the alley
2	in the rear.
3	No, you can sit at the table
4	actually. There are two open mikes.
5	MR. BIGLOW: I don't know if I need
6	a mike.
7	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: You do. Well,
8	you're still going to need for the purpose of
9	the court reporter a mike. But, we can get
10	don't we have the portable microphone
11	Ms. Bailey all the way to your
12	right has a microphone that you can use and
12	right has a microphone that you can use and then you can use your pointer.
	then you can use your pointer.
13	then you can use your pointer.
13 14	then you can use your pointer. Now, bear in mind, you got about three minutes.
13 14 15	then you can use your pointer. Now, bear in mind, you got about three minutes.
13 14 15 16	then you can use your pointer. Now, bear in mind, you got about three minutes. MR. BIGLOW: I just lost 30 seconds.
13 14 15 16	then you can use your pointer. Now, bear in mind, you got about three minutes. MR. BIGLOW: I just lost 30
13 14 15 16 17	then you can use your pointer. Now, bear in mind, you got about three minutes. MR. BIGLOW: I just lost 30 seconds. CHAIRPERSON LOUD: No, it won't
13 14 15 16 17 18	then you can use your pointer. Now, bear in mind, you got about three minutes. MR. BIGLOW: I just lost 30 seconds. CHAIRPERSON LOUD: No, it won't start until you're ready.

have two stars on it and I bought also back in '78 when the neighborhood was run down, full of prostitutes and everything, et cetera.

Presently, you talk about the improvement of the neighborhood, we have some improvement due through the renovation, et cetera, but we still have tons of homeless and tons of transients coming in. They shop down here at the end of the alley at Popeyes and 7-Eleven is across the street and they come through the alley and they eat.

Most of the time of the day, these three parking spots are unoccupied. So, they come out here through the alley, parking here and they eat their Popeyes Chicken because it's open parking.

There's no parking on the streets because of two-hour limits and the neighborhood is crowded.

So, even on the weekends when people go to the clubs and the restaurants, if they see an open spot and a unsecure parking

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

space, they will stick their car there with Virginia tags known that you cannot get it towed at 9:00 to 11:00 at night. All right. So, we have a big security problem here.

You talk about security and improvement in the neighborhood.

If you could show that slide with the black wooden fence right across from Bernie's, this -- this is my house. I have a double gate here and I have a single gate for individual passage where you don't have to open the whole thing.

This morning is trash day. So, I get up this morning at 8:00 to take out my trash. Somebody has gone in this gate and taken out my trash can and removed the whole trash can. It's not in the alley. I figure it's probably identity theft. Okay. So, my trash can is gone.

So, you talk about security and improvement in the neighborhood. Even if you have a fence, I mean if you don't double bolt

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

it, they're going to come in. Okay.

Another case, the roll ups. Isn't that ugly? Yes, it gives you security and we have several of them on the -- in the alley and they're about 10/12 feet high and they're noisy. Clank, clank, clank, clank, clank, clank. Clank, clank, clank, clank. Half of the time they break, you know, and there's two or three days where you have no security.

More so, if you have four or five people who don't have a car and they want to - but, anyway, they don't have a car.
Everybody in that building has to have a key to make this thing go up and down. Roll ups doesn't have an individual gate on the side where you can just go out and walk your dog without rolling up the whole gate.

Like I said, I've been in the neighborhood 30-some years and I've watched my neighbors improve and if you can show the alley again with the star, all these -- and -- and he doesn't have the biggest house on the

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

lot. I mean there are houses. I can't get this thing to work. But, anyway, this house here is 10,000 square feet, Confederate Memorial Hall. Only the houses down on that end get smaller. Yes, we over here live in shacks.

But, all of these yards, there are no backyards. No, there is no alley access for these houses. There's a secure gate there, but these people along this alley have very little parking and here again, like I said, there's not much that you can do with that space. Very little.

There's no green space there. It's paved. Everybody paves their back yard. I mean even if you have a deep back yard, it's paved. Okay.

And the carriage houses are not used for garages. They're all occupied. They're all duplexes. The one next door to me is a duplex. There's no parking in there. Yes, everybody lives in these things.

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

So, one other comment. In the last three years, we've had two new neighbors and both of them have come in and for convenience or something, my next-door neighbor, she expanded her kitchen feet out into her parking and she has a smaller backyard than I do with an additional 4-foot metal deck and that was just last year they completed it.

So, you know, I don't know why you want to confine individuals who are trying to improve their living and their house to what they can do when there's nothing you can do in this little backyard anyway. All right.

So, I mean one day I might want to do something on my own. I'm too old. I don't have the money and I don't have the energy, but anyway, I'd like to say that we need some security across that alley. Anything would be an improvement. I hate to see a roll up.

And the back elevation, can you show that again? The one directly. This.

Now, this sure is an improvement and I think

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

this is a much better improvement on the roll
up. All right. And I would imagine this is
not two story. I would imagine at the most
this is 11/12-feet tall. It's not two story.
So, I mean you got a 10-foot roll up or
something that's a whole lot better. Eye
pleasing you know.
So, like I said, I live directly
across. This is what I see everyday when I
open my gate and I support it wholeheartedly.
That's all I can say.
Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Mr
- is pronounced Biglow?
MR. BIGLOW: Biglow.
CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Mr.
Biglow. Thank you.
Are there any questions for Mr.
Biglow? All right. Appearing none.
We'll not see if there are any
nersons who are in the audience who are in

opposition to the application.

If so, this

would be the time to come up and give your testimony and seeing none, then we'll turn back to the Applicant for closing remarks.

MS. PRINCE: Thank you. We appreciate your time this morning and your thorough consideration of this application.

As I mentioned, when I took on this case, I really wanted to -- I don't come to you with cases that I don't think are strong cases. I come to you with cases that I feel meet the burden of proof. Because frankly, they don't get filed by me if I really don't think I'm going to win them.

And in this case, when I took it -and the Board -- because I feel as a Board,
you have an obligation to try to be consistent
in your decision making. I reviewed 26
variance applications. I studied extensively
findings of uniqueness in previous cases,
findings of practical difficulty. I spent a
lot of time with the court cases and at the
end of the day, I was thoroughly convinced

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that this application is fully consistent with past decisions of this Board.

For example, as I've mentioned not once, not twice, but probably three times, just the Board approved year ago, unanimously relief for 1515 Vermont Avenue which is a row house that did not have an unusual rear dependency. It did not have an unusual rear yard. Yet, the Board found in that that the owner really practical difficulty in not being able to have green space in its location in the middle of the city and it felt that the property was unique enough to justify unanimous grant of variance relief.

In this case, we, in fact, has a much more unusual footprint confounded by this rear dependency. That were it not there, we could accomplish all of our objectives. So, I do think that's relevant and that Board on numerous instances has found that building configuration can constitute uniqueness.

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

And practical difficulties, I heard a comment that we had a wish list of everything we wanted and we ignored the regulations. I have to disagree with that. Practical difficulties are about ways in which the regulations create burdens in achieving an owner's wishes for the use of the property. There is no obligation whatsoever that an owner demonstrate that the property simply can't be used absent variance relief.

about the convenience of the owner. They are.

They just are. Who needs a third bedroom?

Go buy a new house. Who needs a bigger kitchen? All these court cases over and over again in the variance area tend to deal with houses because homeowners have changes in their family situation and want to change the manner in which their house works. So, they seek variance relief.

Does the Board say well, you're not entitled to an additional bedroom? Generally

NEAL R. GROSS

not. They say is there something unusual about your property that creates a practical difficulty in meeting the requirements of the regulations.

In our case, we have an historic mansion that yes was chopped up into five apartment houses. However, Bernie is doing his best to restore a fairly significant part of this house to its original footprint.

I believe we introduced into the record extensive plans that show that there is — we are creating — recreating the dining room to its original configuration. We're preserving it. The original hallway into the apartment is preserved. The rear dependency is preserved. We are, in fact, recreating the connection that formerly existed at the rear of the property.

I'm hard pressed to understand how it's not a practical difficulty to put a stairway in the middle of an unusually configured original dining room or in a

NEAL R. GROSS

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

kitchen dependency that is original to the house.

So, I don't understand why this situation involving a 30-year resident who has gone to extraordinary lengths to reach out to his neighbors and find an unbelievable level of support is being held to a different standard than a owner was held to just one year ago, the lot occupancy for 1515 Vermont 97 percent. You didn't have a long discussion about it. You simply said I don't think we should take lightly the opportunity -- their opportunity to gain some green space. I look at this as a practical difficulty.

So, when we come to this Board, when applicants come to this Board, I think we are entitled to consistency and I think you've probably heard that over and over. How valuable that is to us. Because we don't want to waste our time either. That is just not the way we do business.

We want to know that we're

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

presenting a case that meets the burden of proof and I would not have taken this on, I absolutely would not have taken this on if I felt that this factual scenario fell so far short of the burden of proof and I don't think you see me often here on case that doesn't meet the burden of proof.

So, I urge you to consider very carefully our prehearing statement which we spent a lot of time writing, which goes through a lot of your earlier decisions, goes through a lot of court cases and I think explains why we've fully satisfied all three parts of the variance test.

And I thank you for your time today.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Ms. Prince.

We are now at 12:05. We have a couple of different options. We could deliberate the case today if we feel like the record is full and we are prepared to move

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

forward on that record and our understanding of the case and so on and so forth or we can set it for decision making in the future, in the very near future.

And I think for me, I'd like to think it over a little. Some of the testimony this morning sort of amplified what was in the record and I think I would benefit from having some additional time to review and reflect upon the record a little bit better.

So, I'll open it up to other Board Members and get your thinking as well. I see Mr. Dettman shaking his head affirmatively and Mr. Turnbull as well.

So, then what we'll do is we will continue this case -- not continue it. We will set it for decision making.

It looks like the first available date we have is the 14th coming after the holiday and we have space in the morning for - to add another decision. We're already doing a public meeting on the 14th at 9:30

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

So, we could probably squeeze this one in between 9:30 and 10:00. It would give us, you know, a couple of weeks to review everything. So, that would be my suggestion. There's -- yes, sir. I think you have to speak into the microphone. ROBINSON: MR. You seem to be focusing on the interior of the building with 10 the idea of an internal stairwell and that sort of thing. I'd like to point out a couple 11 of things that we --12 13 MS. BAILEY: I'm sorry, sir, but we're -- the Board has finished with the --14 CHAIRPERSON LOUD: No, Ms. Bailey, 15 that's okay. 16 17 MS. BAILEY: Okay. Let's hear him CHAIRPERSON LOUD: 18 19 out and let's hear what he has to say and I'd like to hear from his counsel if -- are you 20 closing your case or are you reopening it 21

or --

1	MS. PRINCE: We just reopened it.
2	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. Well, let
3	me ask the Board. Do you think the record's
4	full enough or do you want to hear additional?
5	
6	How long will this take, Mr.
7	Robinson?
8	MR. ROBINSON: Two minutes.
9	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Two minutes.
10	I'm fine with that. Board Members, are you
11	fine with that? Okay.
12	MR. ROBINSON: This is the proposed
13	plan. Presently this is a blocked off wall.
14	We're restoring that in a faux condition so it
15	appears to be original from the exterior
16	hallway and from the interior living space
17	although it wouldn't be usable.
18	We're going to restore this from a
19	single-leaf door to a double-leaf door.
20	We've already taken out a kitchen
21	that was in this area totally obscuring this
22	part of the dining room.

We had previously considered in the previous plans attempting to put stairways interior to the space and for example, this entryway is very unique. We have the original swinging oak door. Restored this. To try to put a stairway in here, totally obstructs the interior of the building.

So, we have considered the interior. The Mindowd installed reproduction mahogany windows in their building and we would hope to do that with 1332 Vermont instead of aluminum-clad single-pane windows.

So, we have consider, Mr. Cochran, the interior of the building and the accessibility on the interior and we're really trying to put the building back to where it was.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Mr. Robinson.

So, we will then, as I said, set the decision for Tuesday, July 14, the second decision case in the morning. We'll start at

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

	1
1	9:30 and this will be the second one that we
2	get to.
3	Is there anything further on this
4	case?
5	MS. BAILEY: No, Mr. Chairman, the
6	record of this case is closed.
7	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: That's correct.
8	Yes. Thank you very much.
9	Do we have any further cases for
10	the morning calendar?
11	MS. BAILEY: No, sir.
12	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. The
13	morning session is adjourned.
14	(Whereupon, the hearing was
15	recessed at 12:13 p.m. to reconvene this same
16	day.)
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

NEAL R. GROSS

A-F-T-E-R-N-O-O-N S-E-S-S-I-O-N

2:08 p.m.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: We're now going to go directly into the Public Hearing scheduled for June 30 and so, I believe we have two cases on the calendar.

There is a talking point that I have to read from. So, bear with me particularly if you've been in the audience for most of the day and have heard this two or three times before. I'll go through it quickly and once I do that, then we can call the calendar for the afternoon and hopefully make it through the cases with some sense of haste.

Good afternoon. This hearing will please come to order.

Ladies and gentlemen, my name is Marc Loud and this is the June 30 Public Hearing of the Board of Zoning Adjustment of the District of Columbia.

Joining me today are Vice Chair

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Shane Dettman representing the National Capital Planning Commission. Peter May representing the Zoning Commission. To my left is Mr. Clifford Moy, Secretary of BZA; Ms. Lori Monroe, Office of Attorney General; 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 aware that this proceeding is being recorded by a court reporter and is also webcast live.

Accordingly, we must ask you to refrain from any disruptive noises or actions in the 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

NEAL R. GROSS

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

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 of procedure for special exceptions and variances is: statement and witnesses of the applicant; Government reports including the Office of Planning, the Department of Public Works, et cetera; the report the ANC; parties or persons in support; parties or persons in opposition; and finally, closing remarks by the applicant.

Pursuant to Sections 3117.4 and 3117.5, the following time constraints will be maintained. The applicant, appellant, persons and parties except an ANC in support including witnesses 60 minutes collectively. The

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

appellees or persons and parties except an ANC in opposition including witnesses 60 minutes collectively. Individuals are allowed three minutes.

These time restraints do not include cross examination and/or questions from the Board. Cross examination of witnesses is permitted by the applicant or parties only.

The ANC within which the property is located is automatically a party in a special exception or variance case.

Nothing prohibits the Board from placing reasonable restrictions on cross examination including time limits and limitations on the 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 the staff will specify at the end of the hearing exactly what is expected and the date when the persons must submit the

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

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 consistent with its rules of procedure and the Sunshine Act enter executive session during or after the public hearing on case of reviewing the purposes 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 cell phones at this time so as not to disrupt these proceedings.

The Board will make every effort to

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

conclude the public hearing today as near as possible to 5:00 p.m. today. If the afternoon cases are not completed, the Board will assess whether it can complete the pending case or cases remaining on the agenda.

At this time, the Board will consider any preliminary matters. Preliminary matters are those that 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 provided.

If you are not prepared to go forward with a case today or if you believe that the Board should not proceed, now is the time to raise such a matter.

Ms. Bailey, are there any preliminary matters?

MS. BAILEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

One of the cases that was originally scheduled for this afternoon has been withdrawn, Mr. Chairman.

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

It's Appeal Number 17939 of Change Suk Chan. There's no action required by the Board at this time. CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Ms. Bailey. MS. BAILEY: Just to put on the record that it was withdrawn. Thank CHAIRPERSON LOUD: you. Thank you. Go ahead. 10 MS. BAILEY: Secondly, there is a request for a postponement from Mr. Jerome 11 This case is continued from the May 12 13 5th, 2009 Public Hearing, Mr. Chairman. LOUD: Thank 14 CHAIRPERSON you. Okay. Let us do this then. I'm not sure. 15 don't have the printed calendar in front of 16 me, but the Bauman case is not scheduled 17 first, let's take them out of order. It's my 18 19 understanding that all we need to do is get a date, then we can go ahead and take care of 20 that quickly and then move on to our next 21

22

scheduled case.

Is that where we are, Mr. Gell? just need to get a date. MR. GELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, if there's a date --CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. sort of MR. GELL: late September, I think that would give Mr. Bauman a chance to find a potential tenant and thereby be able to narrow down his request. 10 I think the Board was concerned about such an open-ended request that he be 11 permitted to rent to a variety of uses 12 13 advance of knowing exactly what that use would be. 14 In the meantime, Mr. Bauman has --15 16 I can hold off. CHAIRPERSON LOUD: No, I'm sorry. 17 We're just looking at some dates. 18 19 MR. GELL: That's fine. Mr. Bauman has -- and he can testify for himself, but he 20 has had real estate agents up looking for 21 They've had nibbles. He's been told 22 tenants.

that a few of them look like real prospects,
but so far, it's not gone to the point where
we can say yes, this is the use and we would
like the Board to permit that particular use.
We fell that given a few months
that issue could be resolved. So.
CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. We were
looking at some dates actually. We have come
up with a date in early September actually
instead of late September. We don't have
anything in late September. We can go into
October and I think it's the first part of
October.
MR. GELL: That'll be fine.
CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. What was
the date that we had looked at? Was it
October the what was that
MS. BAILEY: October the 6th, Mr.
Chairman.
CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. October
the 6th and in the afternoon

MS. BAILEY: Afternoon.

1	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: we just have
2	that one.
3	MS. BAILEY: First case in the
4	afternoon.
5	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. All
6	right.
7	MR. GELL: What would the September
8	date be?
9	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: September 1st.
10	MR. GELL: September 1st?
11	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Um-hum.
12	MR. GELL: We wish we knew.
13	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: You know what?
14	I would suggest give yourselves some time.
15	Because a lot of people leave in August anyway
16	and so, that would be the first date back
17	after the August break. So.
18	MR. BAUMAN: Could I just interject
19	an opinion? Just I I just don't know
20	which way to go because on the other hand
21	MS. BAILEY: Mr. Bauman, are you on

22

a microphone?

1	MR. BAUMAN: I'm sorry. Thank you.
2	I'm unfamiliar.
3	A tenant may or may not like
4	signing a lease contingent on the zoning. So,
5	maybe it's the only option I have is to do
6	that, but that's the dilemma that I have.
7	MR. GELL: I would suggest that the
8	early date would be preferable because if
9	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay.
10	MR. GELL: the real estate
11	agents are correct that there's interest,
12	again, one never knows how strong the interest
13	is and whether they'd be the acceptable
14	tenants to have the sufficient capacity to
15	rent.
16	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: So, you would be
17	for the September 1st date?
18	MR. GELL: Yes.
19	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay.
20	MR. GELL: And, you know, if it
21	doesn't work out, we may be back asking the
22	Board for another continuance and obviously,

the Board wouldn't indicate in advance what
that answer would be, but we hope that by then
we will know what the use will be and be able
to present that.
CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. Let me
just turn to colleagues. See if they have any
questions or concerns. Okay.
All right. Then so, let's go with
September 1 and Ms. Bailey, if you could just
refresh me if that's the morning or the
afternoon where we could fit that in.
MS. BAILEY: Actually, Mr. Chairman,
I would like your guidance. So, let me just
bring the schedule over.
CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay.
MR. MOY: While she's doing that,
Mr. Chairman, I notice on the schedule Peter
May is scheduled to participate in the morning
of September 1st.
CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. Thank
you, Mr. Moy.

Okay. Ms. Bailey was sharing some

insights about the September 1st date, but it will work and what we'll do is put you as the final case in the morning on September 1st and May will be back on the Mr. 1st in the morning. So. COMMISSIONER MAY: Excellent. Which case would that be right now? How many cases? It'll be the CHAIRPERSON LOUD: third case.

COMMISSIONER MAY: The third case.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Yes, and we're going to try to start the hearings at 9:45 a.m. on that date. So, we hopefully can get through those cases.

We may end up having to work through the lunch hour if you're amenable to it. We're going to put you third. So, if anybody crossed over into the lunch hour, it would be your case.

MR. GELL: Right and since the ANC is behind us and we really put on most of our

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

case, there may be some additional things that
you'll be interested in hearing from us or
discussing, but we don't anticipate that it
should be a long
CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Good. Okay.
All right.
MR. GELL: Thank you so much.
CHAIRPERSON LOUD: That sounds
great. So, if we don't see you before August,
have a great summer and we'll see you in
September.
Ms. Bailey, I think we don't
have anything further with that case.
MS. BAILEY: No, sir.
CHAIRPERSON LOUD: It's gone.
MS. BAILEY: That's it for that
case.
CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. So, I
think we can call the next case.
MS. BAILEY: Application 17940 of
Natural Body Spa and Shoppe. It's pursuant to
11 DCMR Section 3104.1 for a special exception

1	to allow a massage establishment under Section
2	731 at premises 1104 24th Street, N.W., Square
3	25, Lot 22. The property is zoned C-2-C.
4	And could I just give them the oath
5	real quickly, Mr. Chairman?
6	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Please. Thank
7	you. Sure thing.
8	I think we have a fairly full
9	record. So, you may want to give some
10	consideration to how extensive a presentation
11	you put on, but okay.
12	MS. BAILEY: Can I just give you
13	the oath real quickly?
14	Do you solemnly swear or affirm to
15	tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing
16	but the truth? Thank you.
17	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Good morning and
18	please state your name for the record?
19	MR. LABLONSKY: Bart Lablonsky.
20	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay.
21	MR. LABLONSKY: Natural Body.
22	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Say good

morning. I should say good afternoon.

The record is full. We've read the record. The case seems to be a strong case although, you know, you never know what can happen at the hearing.

So, you can feel free to highlight the aspects of your case that you find compelling and want to push forward and then the Office of Planning is going to give testimony after you and in their report, they recommend approval and go through the test warranting the approval.

So, whatever you don't cover specifically, it's in their report and they may lift it up at this hearing. So.

MR. LABLONSKY: I'll be brief then.

Just to give you a quick why we're here,

Natural Body started in Atlanta in 1989.

We're a full-service spa. My wife and I have

been the owners of the locations in this

market for about eight years and we opened the

D.C. location in December of 2007 and we're

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

here today for a special exemption hearing just because of a lot of misunderstanding in the zoning process when we went through the initial build-out of the location and so, we are licensed currently, but were asked to come through to get a special exemption or to renew our certificate of occupancy and we're a full-service spa. Just some pictures of what we do.

And I guess I'll let the record

And I guess I'll let the record stand. If there's questions, you can ask them.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Board Members, do you have any questions for the Applicants?

Okay.

Why don't we then turn to the Office of Planning? Good afternoon.

MR. GOLDSTEIN: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Board.

For the record, my name is Paul Goldstein and I am a Development Review Specialist for the Office of Planning.

NEAL R. GROSS

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

The Office of Planning recommends approval of the Applicant's request for special exception relief under Section 731 and with that, we're willing to rest on the record on our submission and, of course, willing to take any follow-up questions that you may have.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Mr. Goldstein and it was a very outstanding report as all of your reports are and we appreciate it.

Let me see if either Board Members or the Applicant have any questions for you. They appear to be sort of looking things over and reflecting upon it.

Let me ask the Applicant. Do you have any questions for the Office of Planning?

Did you get a copy of their report?

MR. LABLONSKY: I do not have a copy of the report, but I did speak with them.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. All

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	right. Hearing Mr. May.
2	COMMISSIONER MAY: I'm just
3	curious. How is it that this was your
4	current use was actually granted as an
5	oversight or it was they didn't flag that
6	you needed a special exception early on?
7	MR. LABLONSKY: No, that was what
8	the problem was.
9	COMMISSIONER MAY: The oversight
10	was.
11	MR. LABLONSKY: Yes.
12	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay.
13	Otherwise, you would have been here long
14	before you opened up for business.
15	MR. LABLONSKY: Correct. Correct.
16	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. All
17	right.
18	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Mr.
19	May. All right.
20	
	Well, if there are no questions for
21	Well, if there are no questions for the Office of Planning, we would now turn to

the ANC here? No, they're not here. I can see that.

They did submit a report though. It's our Exhibit 22 and it's from the Chair of ANC-2A and they are in support of your application. So, their report which I am retrieving as I speak appears to meet the great weight requirements of Section 3115 and as such, we will be giving their recommendation great weight.

It's also good because if the Board votes to approve, then we can do a summary decision since they're not in opposition to you.

But, again, they note -- this is Exhibit 22. It's dated April 15. They note that they had a quorum present. It was properly noticed. Vote of 4 to 2. They support the application. So, you do get the great weight support of your ANC.

Now, would be the time where we would call forward any persons in the

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

audience, but there are none, both in support and in opposition of the application and they would be given three minutes, but again, since there aren't any, there are no persons to call.

But, there are some letters in our record of support including Exhibit 23 which is from a Neil Conway and I believe a couple of letters that are signed as petitions.

So, there are no letters in opposition.

And now, what we would do is turn back to you for your closing statement.

MR. LABLONSKY: I just appreciate you taking the time to listen and I'll wait for your result.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: All right.

MR. LABLONSKY: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: I think what we'll do is deliberate today. This has been a very full record and when the record is full like this and everything is pulled together

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

professionally like it was in this case, it doesn't take long to get through the proceeding or deliberate. So, we're going to go ahead and deliberate and vote on this today I do believe and I think Mr. Dettman was going to lead us off.

VICE CHAIRMAN DETTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Instead of taking the Board through the relevant provisions of 731 and 3104.1 which is the Board's general special exception criteria, I can just incorporate by referring DCOP's report which took us through those provisions and just stating that the Applicant's been in operation since 2007.

The criteria of 731 essentially deal with making that sure the use compatible with other uses in the area and looking at the proposed use and making sure that it doesn't have any effects with respect to noise, traffic, other conditions as well as making sure that there are no adverse impacts

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	on religious, educational or other
2	institutional facilities.
3	I think it's pretty clear that the
4	Applicant meets the special exception criteria
5	of 731 and 3104.
6	As you stated, the ANC gives its
7	support in Exhibit 22. DCOP supported in our
8	Exhibit 26 and finally, we also have in the
9	record an Exhibit Number 23 from the Neil
10	Conway, from the Applicant's neighbor, from
11	District Hardware as well as a petition that
12	was signed by 118 clients of the Applicant and
13	that's our Exhibit Number 24.
14	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: All right.
15	Thank you, Mr. Dettman. That was an excellent
16	job of pulling together the record before us.
17	Is there a motion?
18	COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chairman
19	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Are there
20	further deliberations? I'm sorry.
21	COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chairman, I
22	would make a motion that we approve

1	Application Number 17940 of Natural Body Spa
2	and Shoppe for a special exception to allow a
3	massage establishment under Section 731 at
4	premises 1104 24th Street, N.W. and ask for a
5	second.
6	VICE CHAIRMAN DETTMAN: Second.
7	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Motion has been
8	made an seconded. Is there further
9	deliberation?
10	Hearing none, all those in favor
11	say aye.
12	(Ayes.)
13	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: All those
14	opposed? Are there any abstentions?
15	Ms. Bailey, can you read back the
16	vote please?
17	MS. BAILEY: Mr. Chairman, the vote
18	is 3-0-2 to grant the application. Mr. May
19	made the motion. Mr. Dettman seconded. Mr.
20	Loud supported the motion. There are two
21	Board Members not sitting at this time.

NEAL R. GROSS

CHAIRPERSON LOUD:

22

Thank you, Ms.

Bailey. Then congratulations. The application has gotten the support of the BZA. I think a summary order is warranted. MR. LABLONSKY: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON LOUD: And is there anything further on this case? MS. BAILEY: Nothing further to discuss, Mr. Chairman. All right. CHAIRPERSON LOUD: 10 Thank you. And unless there is anything for the afternoon session, this further 11 session is adjourned. 12 (Whereupon, the hearing 13 was concluded at 2:30 p.m.) 14 15 16 17 18