GOVERNMENT

OF

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

SPECIAL PUBLIC MEETING

TUESDAY,

JUNE 23, 2009

+ + + + +

The Special Public Meeting 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, Chairman, presiding.

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT MEMBERS PRESENT:

MARC D. LOUD Chairman
SHANE L. DETTMAN Vice Chairman

(NCPC)

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBER PRESENT:

PETER MAY Commissioner (NPS)

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

CLIFFORD MOY Secretary

BEVERLEY BAILEY Sr. Zoning Spec.
JOHN NYARKU Zoning Specialist

NEAL R. GROSS

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PRESENT: LORI MONROE, ESQ.

This transcript constitutes the minutes from the Special Public Meeting held on June 23, 2009.

NEAL R. GROSS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

WELCOME: Marc Loud4
W STREET, SE, LLC APPLICATION NO. 17562:
Vote to Approve Motion
BABY LAND DEVELOPMENT CENTER APPLICATION NO. 17867:
APPLICATION NO. 17870 - ANC-7A:
APPLICATION NOS. 17927 & 17928:

NEAL R. GROSS

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

9:52 a.m.

CHAIRMAN LOUD: Good morning, this meeting will, please, come to order. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. This is the June 23rd Public Meeting 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 representing the National Capital Planning Commission, Mr. Peter May representing the Zoning Commission.

To my left is Mr. Clifford Moy,
Secretary of the BZA, and to his left Ms.
Beverley Bailey, Zoning Specialist. And
walking into the room is Ms. Lori Monroe from
the Office of the Attorney General.

Copies of today's meeting agenda are available to you and are located to my left in the wall bin near the door. We do not take any public testimony at our meeting, unless the Board asks specifically for someone

NEAL R. GROSS

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

to come forward.

Please, be advised that this proceeding is being recorded by а Court webcast Reporter and is also live. Accordingly, we must ask you to refrain from any disruptive noises or actions in the hearing room. Please, turn off all beepers and cell phones.

Does the staff have any preliminary matters?

MR. MOY: Yes, we do, Mr. Chairman, but staff would suggest that we take those matters up on a case-by-case basis.

CHAIRMAN LOUD: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Moy. Why don't we proceed with the agenda for this morning?

MR. MOY: Okay. That first case for decision by the Board was -- as a matter of fact, good morning, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board.

We have a request for a modification of approved plans and a waiver of

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the six month time requirement to Application No. 17562. This is of W Street, SE, LLC, pursuant to section 3129 of the Zoning Regulations.

The original application, Mr. Chairman, is pursuant to 11 DCMR 3103.2, for a variance from the off-street parking requirements, under section 2116, and pursuant to 11 DCMR 3104.1, for a special exception to construct six three-unit row dwellings, under section 353 in the R-5-A District at premises 1749 - 1759 W Street, S.E. This is in Square 5755, Lots 38 - 43.

Very quickly, Mr. Chairman, on May 29, 2009, the applicant filed a request for minor modification of approved plans and a waiver of the 6 month time requirement pursuant to section 3129. This is identified in your case folders as Exhibit 50.

The applicant also -- let me run down very quickly three actions for the Board on this request, Mr. Chairman.

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

First is a waiver to the 6 month time requirement to file, pursuant to section 3129.3.

No. 2, approval of the minor modification, pursuant to 3129.

And finally, waiver of the 6 month time requirement to commence erection or alteration as approved in a building permit pursuant to section 3130.3.

The staff notes for the Board that there is a new amended section 3129 which went into effective the first week of June 2009, as well as an added 3130.6 in the Zoning Regulations.

The Board is to act on the request and that completes the staff's briefing, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LOUD: Thank you, Mr. Moy.

That was an excellent overview of the case.

In fact, it was so thorough that I can probably be brief with respect to my recommendations on the case and I think we are

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

ready to deliberate on it.

Let me start with the easiest thing first. The applicant's request for waiver of the 6 month deadline of modified plans. I think is now moot, because the new rule is in effect. This is the first decision meeting we are having with the new 3129 in effect.

And under the new rule, 2 years are allowed. The decision was May 29, '07. The request for relief was filed, I believe, May 29, '09, so that takes care of one of the three.

With respect to the second of the three request for relief raised by the movement, the minor modification and you talked, Mr. Moy, about the original relief being 15-units and how with the proposed plans the applicant now wishes to go to 18-units. I think upon reviewing the files, it certainly my position and I'll open it up to other Board Members as well, that it's not a minor modification.

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

And such, it would not 3129. It's covered by not minor modification for a couple of reasons. and foremost, Zoning Commission Order No. 08-November 14,2008, rezones 12 passed the property in question to the R-3, which does not allow multi-family.

So that the request to go up to 18units from the 15 would not only require modification relief, it would require a use variance. And the new 3129 provides that when a proposed modification is not minor, that a hearing shall be conducted. Tt's not It's a mandatory hearing shall be permissive. to determine conducted whether the modification is in order.

So in this case, I don't think that there is any grounds to consider this a minor modification and to rule upon it at this decision meeting without the benefit of the hearing.

That being said, and I don't know

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

if the applicant is present this morning or not, but that being said, in order for the applicant to obtain the relief that the applicant is looking to get, there would need to be (A) a separate hearing, and at that hearing, the relevant standard would be the use variance and the applicant would have to meet the burden of the use variance.

Also, because shifting we're radically from a section 353 special exception it variance, would be to use very appropriate to readvertise the case all over again with the applicant going through our front office process of filing the proposed plans in our office notifying all of persons that get notice when is а case initially filed.

So the second area for relief, namely the modification, I don't think would be appropriate or justified by the record before us. And I'll turn to Board Members for any thoughts you may have.

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

COMMISSIONER MAY: I would just say having reviewed the whole record, I think that I would agree with the Chairman that the appropriate action to take, at this point, would be to require a hearing to consider the proposed changes in the case.

CHAIRMAN LOUD: Okay. Thank you, Mr. May. I think that the third area of relief sought by the movement was a waiver of the 6 month deadline to commence construction after building permit is issued and I think, in this case, the applicant got his building permit on the original 15 in October of 2008. The 6 months has lapsed. Construction has not commenced. And the only way that he could move forward, even on the 15, would be for us to extend that deadline.

We are authorized to do that under our section 3100.5, which allows us to waive a number of our rules if good cause is shown.

And I'll just pull the rule right quick as I walk through my thoughts on this.

NEAL R. GROSS

I think in the underlying pleadings of what the applicant presents before us is the market downturn and the market downturn impacting significantly his ability to (A) get financing place in from the D.C. gap Department of Housing and Community Development and the collapse of the market, I think, for duplex units.

And as a result of which, he is seeking some additional time to complete this project. We have had a number of cases like this in the last 2 or 3 months and this falls in line with those cases. And certainly, the existence of gap funding in the project, which is reflected by a letter in the record from the Department of Housing and Community Development suggests that there was always some financial challenges with the project, such that it needed gap funding in the first place.

And I think it is fairly well-known that funding from the Housing Production Trust

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Fund has abated somewhat and is slowing down projects. So I think he has made a very good cause showing, at least to my way of thinking, that the 6 month deadline for commencing construction is something that we should waive and allow this applicant the opportunity whether the goes for 15 or 18 to at least get the project back on track from that perspective.

Board Members?

COMMISSIONER MAY: Agree.

CHAIRMAN LOUD: Okay. It appears as though there is consensus on the latter of the three issues that we discussed. And I'm going to ask you, Mr. Moy or Ms. Monroe, do we need to vote on each of these three issues? Okay. Do we need to vote on -- which do we need to vote on?

MS. MONROE: I think as far as the 3100.5 waiver, you don't need to vote on that. Really, whether or not you think it is a minor mod and how you want to handle whether

NEAL R. GROSS

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

you want to have a hearing, I would -- that -- that's the substance of would be the question. I would vote on that. Okay. All right. CHAIRMAN LOUD: So let me make the motion just on that issue of I would move that we deny the applicant's motion for a minor modification to his plans to increase from 15-units to 18-units. is Application No. 17562. And I would move 10 that for all the reasons I have already discussed. Is there a second? 11 VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Second. 12 CHAIRMAN LOUD: The motion has been 13 made seconded. there further 14 and Is deliberation? 15 Hearing none, all those in favor 16 17 say aye. ALL: Aye. 18 CHAIRMAN LOUD: All those opposed? 19 Any abstentions? Mr. Moy, can you read back 20 the vote? 21

MR. MOY:

Yes, Mr. Chairman.

22

The

staff would record the vote as 3-0-2. This is the motion of the Chair, Mr. Loud, to deny the request for a modification of approved plans from 15-units to 18-units, seconded by the Vice Chair, Mr. Dettman. Also in support of the motion are Mr. May. Again, that vote is 3-0-2.

Just for the record, Mr. Chairman, staff would record the waiver for the 6 month to file the application was rendered moot, no vote on that. And the request for the waiver of the 6 month to construct after the building permit, staff understands that that was approved by consensus.

CHAIRMAN LOUD: Well, let me just
- I want to be real solid and tight for the
applicant, so that he knows he can go forward
on the 6 month issue. So if it's done
pursuant to my authority as presiding
official, maybe we should say that or if we
need a vote, an actual vote --

MS. MONROE: If you feel more

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

comfortable, vote. CHAIRMAN LOUD: Let's vote on it. MS. MONROE: Okay. CHAIRMAN LOUD: Because I think it's important that since the 6 months have expired, that there is no gray area and this applicant knows he can move forward at least on the 15. I would like to move that we grant 10 the relief to the applicant in 17562 that would extend the 6 month deadline for 11 commencing construction on the original 15 to 12 one year after the date of the order in this 13 14 case. 15 MS. MONROE: Okay. Which order 16 now? CHAIRMAN LOUD: The one that we are 17 going to do right now denying --18 19 MS. MONROE: On the -- okay. CHAIRMAN LOUD: -- the modification 20 and granting the 6 months, yeah. Is there a 21

second?

1	COMMISSIONER MAY: Second.
2	CHAIRMAN LOUD: Further
3	deliberation?
4	Hearing none, all those in favor
5	say aye.
6	ALL: Aye.
7	CHAIRMAN LOUD: All those opposed?
8	All those in abstention? Mr. Moy, can you
9	call back the vote?
10	MR. MOY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, with
11	pleasure. That vote is 3-0-2 on the motion of
12	Mr. Loud, the Chair, seconded by Mr. May.
13	This is to grant the relief to extend the 6
14	months to one year after the date of the
15	instant order. The motion is supported by Mr.
16	Dettman. Again, that vote is 3-0-2.
17	CHAIRMAN LOUD: Thank you, Mr. Moy.
18	Is there anything further in that case?
19	MR. MOY: Not on this case, sir.
20	CHAIRMAN LOUD: Okay. Why don't
21	you call the next case?
22	MR. MOY: The next case for

decision is Application No. 17867 of Baby Land Development Center, pursuant to 11 DCMR 3104.1, for a special exception to establish a child development center, 40 children and 6 staff, under section 205, in the R-2 District at premises 4628 H Street, S.E. This is in Square 5359, Lot 328.

On June 2, 2009, the Board convened this application, deliberated and rescheduled its decision to June 23rd. The Board allowed filings, additional filings from DDOT and OP by June 17, 2009. As of today, Mr. Chairman, there are no filings in the record case.

So what is before the Board is to act on the merits of the special exception request pursuant to the requirements under section 205. And that completes the staff's briefing, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LOUD: Thank you, Mr. Moy.

I believe the Board has reviewed out file on
this case as well. Obviously, we have had
this case a long time and we pushed it out for

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

today hoping to get a report back from DDOT in the matter.

This is a case for section 205, 206 relief and the ANC opposed it. The Benning Ridge Civic Association opposed it. The Office of Planning kind of didn't pick -- take a position waiting on DDOT to respond to traffic studies.

So what I'm going to recommend to colleagues is that we left it open for DDOT to submit a report. They have had the time under the rules to submit their report, but out of an abundance of caution, before we fully deliberate and vote it up or vote it down, that we have an absolutely full record.

And since the whole traffic transportation issue was the issue in the case, I would like to continue this for one week to June 23rd. If DDOT has something in, if OP has something in, fine. If they don't, we will move forward and vote it up or down at that point in time.

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

But out of, again, an abundance of caution and not voting away someone's rights or privileges without a full record or conversely not voting to support it without a full record, I would be in favor of doing that.

MS. BAILEY: Mr. Chairman, did you mean June $30^{\rm th}$ you're going to -- you said June $23^{\rm rd}$.

CHAIRMAN LOUD: Yes, thank you.

Mr. Chairman, I COMMISSIONER MAY: would just want to state for the record that although I didn't participate in the hearing case, in this have read the record I completely and am prepared to participate in any decision making we might do. And I do support the Chairman's recommendation that we defer decision making to allow DDOT to submit its report.

VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Mr. Chairman, like Mr. May, I did not participate in the original hearing, but have reviewed the record

NEAL R. GROSS

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

as well as the transcripts and support the continuance for one week. CHAIRMAN LOUD: Thank you, gentlemen. So in that case, we will continue this to June 30th. Do we need to vote on this? Okay. No vote necessary. And is there anything further in this case? MR. MOY: No, sir. CHAIRMAN LOUD: Thank you, sir. 10 Can we call the next case? 11 MR. MOY: The next case, Chairman, actually, there are two here that 12 13 are of the same genre, but on different properties. And that would be Application No. 14 15 17927 of the Craftsman Group, Inc. And I'll 16 read both readings, Mr. Chairman. CHAIRMAN LOUD: Mr. Moy, let me 17 interrupt you for just 2 seconds. 18 19 MR. MOY: Yes. CHAIRMAN LOUD: Can we do the Koo 20 Yuen matter first? That actually appears 21 before the two Craftsman on my calendar.

MR. MOY: Oh, I'm sorry. Yes, we Yes, we can. can. LOUD: It's CHAIRMAN а reconsideration request. MR. MOY: Sorry I jumped the gun on that one. CHAIRMAN LOUD: That's okay. MR. MOY: That would be the -- as you said a motion for reconsideration. 10 was filed by ANC-7A06 to Application No. 17870 11 of Koo Yuen for Koo Yuen, Euclid of Virginia, Inc., pursuant to section 3126. 12 13 The original application is pursuant to 11 DCMR 3104.1, for a special 14 exception to establish a gasoline service 15 station under section 726 and 706 in the C-2-A 16 District at premises 3710 Minnesota Avenue, 17 N.E., Square 5046, Lot 810. 18 19 There are two filings in this case record, Mr. Chairman. The first is a filing 20 from the -- well, on June 4, 2009, the Board 21

NEAL R. GROSS

request for this reconsideration.

received

This is from ANC Single Member District 7A06.

And that is identified in your case folders as Exhibit 41. This was filed under the name of Edward Rhodes, who is the Commissioner for the Single Member District.

The second filing in your case folder, Mr. Chairman, is a filing in opposition to the motion from the applicant dated June 22, 2009, and that document is identified as Exhibit 42.

Very quickly, there are two preliminary matters, Mr. Chairman. The first is that pursuant to section 3126.3, motions for reconsideration should be served upon all parties. However, this filing from the Single Member District, the record does not show proof of service to other parties.

The second preliminary matter pursuant to section 3126.2, is that any party may file a motion for reconsideration and there is no record in the record file that indicates or designates the Single Member

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

District as representing the full ANC. That's the second preliminary matter.

Depending on the outcome of these two preliminary matters, the Board is to act on the merits of the motion. And that completes the staff's briefing, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LOUD: Thank you, Mr. Moy.

Let's take up the preliminary matter under 3126.2 first, because I think the threshold requirement for a reconsideration is that the movement be a party. The rule says "Any party may file a motion for reconsideration or of a hearing regarding any decision of the Board provided that the motion is filed with the Director within 10 days from the date of the issuance of a final written order by the Board."

So the plain language makes it clear that the rule is addressing itself to parties. And in this matter, I think the movement here of Mr. Rhodes was not a party. The ANC was automatically a party in the

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

underlying case. But the Single Member District Commissioner who has done a yeoman's job of pulling together this pleading paper within that 10 days was nonetheless not a party.

And do the rule was not designed and does not give him the authority to move for reconsideration. So for that reason alone, I would be opposed to entertaining the pleading as a motion for reconsideration.

But even if I were to entertain it, the substance of what he goes into is the fact that members of the community, himself included, did not know about the project and did not have an opportunity to be heard. The residents were concerned about safety and other issues.

And in fact, if you look at the underlying record, this very Commissioner in our Exhibit 22 places something on our record from December 8, 2008. So the Commissioner was well-aware of the proceeding for reasons

NEAL R. GROSS

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that are inexplicable and chose not to or was not able to participate in the proceedings.

But again, those reasons are not articulated in what was submitted as Exhibit 41, so I think we had a full record before us when we deliberated and made the decision. And this particular pleading does not meet the threshold requirement for reconsideration.

Colleagues, I open to you for any further thoughts.

VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Mr. Chairman, having participated in the hearing as well as the deliberation, I would concur with that.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chairman, I did not participate in this case.

CHAIRMAN LOUD: Thank you, Mr. Dettman and thank you, Mr. May. So what we will do now then is dispose of the pleading for reconsideration.

I would like to move that we deny the Exhibit 41 application from Commissioner Edward Rhodes for us to reconsider the Koo

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Yuen case and that is Case No. 17870. Is there a second? VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Second. All right. CHAIRMAN LOUD: The motion has been made and seconded. Any further deliberation? Hearing none, all those in favor say aye. VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Aye. 10 CHAIRMAN LOUD: Aye. All those opposed? Are there any votes in abstention? 11 MR. MOY: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman. 12 We do have an absentee ballot from the third 13 participant on this application, which is Mr. 14 Michael Turnbull, and his absentee vote is to 15 16 dismiss or deny this request for reconsideration. 17 CHAIRMAN LOUD: Okay. 18 MR. MOY: So that would give a 19 resulting vote of 3-0-2. 20 CHAIRMAN LOUD: Thank you, Mr. Moy. 21 This is on the motion of 22 MR. MOY:

Mr. Loud the Chair, seconded by Mr. Dettman.

CHAIRMAN LOUD: Thank you. All right. So we have disposed of that issue. Is there anything further in this case, Mr. Moy?

MR. MOY: No, sir.

CHAIRMAN LOUD: Thank you. Can you call the final two decision cases this morning?

MR. MOY: Yes, sir. The first of the two is Application No. 17927 of The Craftsman Group, Inc., pursuant to 11 DCMR 3103.2, for a variance from the use provisions to allow the establishment of office, artisan studio, metal and glass working shop for historic restoration projects, under subsection 330.5, in the R-4 District. This is at premises the rear of 729 Fairmont Street, N.W., Square 2885, Lot 59.

The second case is Application No. 17928 of The Craftsman Group, Inc., pursuant to 11 DCMR 3103.2, for a variance from the use provisions to allow the establishment of

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

office, artisan studio, metal and glass working shop for historic restoration projects, under subsection 330.5, in the R-4 District at premises rear of 775 Fairmont Street, N.W., Square 2885, Lot 862.

Both of these cases, Mr. Chairman, were heard on June 9, 2009. The Board completed public testimony, closed the record and scheduled its decision at a Special Public Meeting on June 23rd.

The Board did not request any additional information to supplement the record, as the record was full.

So in both these cases, the Board is act on the merits of the use variance pursuant to subsection 330.5. And that completes the staff's briefing.

CHAIRMAN LOUD: Thank you, Mr. Moy.

I think you nailed it right there. That was a perfect segue for us to begin deliberations.

I think we are ready to deliberate on the case and I'll start off the deliberation.

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

You ended by talking about the use variance standard and so that's exactly where I'll pick up and just talk about my reflections upon what was presented before us.

First of all, let me say I think that the applicant put on a good case and appreciated the time that they took to pull together the documentation, some of the history on the matter.

With respect to the use variance standard, in particular, I was persuaded that the applicant met the burden and I'll just walk briefly through each of the elements and then open it up to fellow Board Members for comment.

With respect to the exceptional situation, I believe that there was a confluence of factors which established that element of the test. In particular, that the structure was built prior to 1958 as a commercial building and remains at present a commercial building. And this was both the

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

755 and 735, I think, the addresses are. 729, I'm sorry, and 729 Fairmont and 775 Fairmont.

So both of them were built as commercial buildings. There are no interior stairs. There is concrete flooring on the first floor. The only walls are the external brickwork that was never finished on the inside and that configuration, I think, of the properties make them unique, certainly make it an exceptional situation to be in the R-4 Zone.

There also circumstantial was evidence showing that the property had been used continuously as commercial since at least the 1940s and taxed currently by D.C. commercial. Additionally, there was evidence showing that the property use had been, at least since 1993, about the last 16 years, continuously used for the applicant's woodworking and metalworking purposes.

So I believe again that there is a confluence of factors that point to, as $\underline{\text{Gil}}$

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

<u>Martin</u> would suggest, there being some exceptional situation about this particular structure in the R-4 in the alley.

Also, I think OP's report indicated that the Historic Preservation staff had noted that while this is not an historic area, this property I'm sorry is not in an historic area, that alley properties between Fairmont and Sherman have structures which have historically been used for industrial purposes. So for that reason, I think that the property met the exceptional situation standard.

With respect to causes undue hardship or whether the exceptional situation approximately causes an undue hardship on the applicant, I also came to the conclusion that the applicant met its burden there and I'll suggest the reasons why.

First, denial of its continued use,

I think, would deprive this applicant of use
of the building. For example, it could not be

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

used as a single-family dwelling or flat, which are matter-of-right uses in the R-4, because the conversion cost to the structure would be fairly significant.

I think the applicant testified that there was a quote of about \$60,000 maybe 10 years ago, so that could only have risen significantly since that time. But more so, to operate as a single-family dwelling or a flat, the applicant would still need variance relief from section 2507.3, because the alley lot width and size are two small and too narrow.

The other matter-of-right uses for this property would be as a garage or as an artist studio. It would not work as a garage because of, in my opinion, all of the testimony on the record from neighbors about their concerns about parking and activity in the alley.

And I think that as much as they are concerned about the alley parking and

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

traffic conditions with this particular use, the metalworking and woodworking, it would be even greater were the property to be used as a garage.

With respect to its use as, and I'm talking again about both properties, an artist studio, there was an Exhibit 6 in both cases that showed a picture of the properties and there is almost no light on the ground floor of either property. In fact, one of the buildings just has literally a garage door, modified garage door, but nonetheless a garage door. And so to me it seems like it wouldn't be very amenable to being an artist studio.

But it also suffers from some of the impediments of converting it same residential in that you don't have interior stairs. You don't have any interior finishes to the walls. You have got the concrete flooring, so you have a structure that, I think, is much more suited to its historic commercial use than an artist studio.

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

And with respect to the final element, whether there is substantial detriment to the public good or harm to the Zone Plan, OP testified that there wouldn't be any harm to the Zone Plan, because it has been used in this commercial/industrial type capacity for at least since the '40s with one small interruption of their being some Howard students that were on the second floor of one of the buildings in question.

The neighbors at our Exhibit 19 wrote in support of the project. It has been there for about 16 years without, for the most part, any objection from neighbors. The ANC-1B supports it. They were concerned about the applicant's employees. I believe 7 of them making sure they get visitor parking passes for the street and never park in the alley.

But apart from that caveat, they were in support of the application. There were three witnesses at the hearing in support as well. And there is a neighbor named Irwin

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

who is our Exhibit 22, but who lives directly across the alley from one of the premises who supports it as well.

So I don't think that there was any evidence that there would be substantial detriment to the public good. And the Office of Planning supported it as well. So with that, I'll turn it over to colleagues to weigh in.

VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Mr. Chairman,
I have nothing to add. I think you have done
a great job of going through the evidence in
the record and the oral testimony that was
offered up at the hearing and determined what
evidence supported the use variance and what
evidence did not.

I agree with everything that you said and in support of this application, both applications, especially given the amount of support that it has in the community and by the Office of Planning and by the ANC.

CHAIRMAN LOUD: Mr. Dettman, did

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

you have any take on the ANC's concern about parking and whether or not there should be parking as a condition? The employees of the applicant should obtain parking passes? I know we don't normally condition variances, but just any thoughts you might have on that. And then I'll share mine.

CHAIR DETTMAN: really VICE I wouldn't be in favor of conditioning don't. the order, especially since, as you say, this is a variance and we typically don't do that. If there is an issue with employees of this particular business parking in the alley, I think that there is some avenue that the neighbors could explore remedy to situation. But I don't know if that is our situation to try to resolve.

CHAIRMAN LOUD: Thank you, Mr. Dettman.

Dettman. And I agree with you, Mr. Dettman.

I think there was a lot of testimony in the record that this applicant was not just operating a business in the alley, but that he

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

was a strong member of the community, that he attended community meetings, that he in some cases led community meetings.

So without making it a specific condition, I do hope, Mr. Dettman as suggested, that the applicant will work with the ANC, and has every reason to frankly, to make sure that employees are not parking in the alley and that some way of resolving that conflict, a sustainable way, is put in place out of honor and respect for the ANC supporting this and for continuing to be a good neighbor.

So with that said, I think what we ought to do is entertain a motion for each case separately and then call a vote on each case separately.

I would like to move approval of Application No. 17927 of The Craftsman Group for a use variance for an office workshop at the rear of 729 Fairmont Street, N.W. in the R-4.

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Second. CHAIRMAN LOUD: The motion has been made and seconded. Is there further deliberation? Hearing none, all those in favor say aye. ALL: Aye. CHAIRMAN LOUD: All those opposed? Are there any abstentions? 10 MR. MOY: Yes, Mr. Chairman. is an absentee ballot from a participant on 11 this application who is Mr. Anthony Hood. 12 13 his absentee vote is to approve with such conditions as the Board may impose. 14 So that would give a final resulting vote of 3-0-2. 15 16 This is on the motion of the Chair, Mr. Loud, to approve the application, seconded by Mr. 17 So again, the final vote 3-0-2 to Dettman. 18 approve. 19 CHAIRMAN LOUD: Thank you, Mr. Moy. 20 Now, I would like to move to our calling a 21

vote on the second related case, which is No.

17928. I would like to move approval of Application No. 17928 of The Craftsman Group for a use variance for an office workshop at the rear of 775 Fairmont Street, N.W.

VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Second.

CHAIRMAN LOUD: The motion has been made, seconded. Any deliberation?

Hearing none, all those in favor say aye.

ALL: Aye.

CHAIRMAN LOUD: All those opposed?

Are there any abstentions?

MR. MOY: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Again, we have an absentee ballot from Mr. Hood, who participated, and his absentee vote is to approve the application as -- and any conditions as the Board may impose.

So again, this is on the motion of the Chairman, Mr. Loud, to approve Application No. 17928, seconded by Vice Chair, Mr. Dettman. And obviously, in support of the motion Mr. Hood. The resulting vote 3-0-2.

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

CHAIRMAN LOUD: Thank you, Mr. Moy. Anything further on this case? MS. MONROE: A question? CHAIRMAN LOUD: Yes? MS. MONROE: Do you -- I think you can do a summary order on this. It depends on how you feel about the ANC, whether or not that was really that important. And also, initially been there had somebody opposition, but he switched to support, so I 10 don't think that's an issue. 11 I don't even think the ANC would 12 13 prevent it, but it depends on how you feel about that. I think a summary order is okay 14 15 on this. CHAIRMAN LOUD: Thank you, MS. 16 And my thinking is certainly right 17 Monroe. where yours is on this. I think the ANC 18

CHAIRMAN LOUD: Thank you, MS. Monroe. And my thinking is certainly right where yours is on this. I think the ANC supported it and I think there was a tremendous amount of testimony from the ANC in support or this project.

They had some concerns about

NEAL R. GROSS

19

20

21

parking, but I don't think that that rose to the level of making them an opponent of the application. Mr. Dettman? Okay. So we will do summary decisions in both cases. Thank you, Ms. Monroe.

We don't normally hear from applicants. If it's an urgent, urgent, urgent, urgent, that's four urgents. That's not urgent. That's probably something that you can take up with Ms. Bailey after the hearing. But thank you and thank you for a great job of presenting the case.

Is there anything further on this case, Mr. Moy?

MR. MOY: No, sir, that would complete the Special Public Meeting, unless there was any other action the Board wanted to take.

CHAIRMAN LOUD: No, I don't think there is any other action. I think what we will do is go into the Public Hearing. But let me just say before we leave here, because

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

once we go into the Public Hearing, I have to say all of the stuff before I can say anything and right now I can just say it.

We're going to call the Shirk and Carney cases first. Both of those cases, at least from my personal perspective, I'll open it up to other Board Members, look to be pretty straightforward cases. So if the parties are here, we may ask you to -- give you the opportunity rather to rest on the record with respect to both cases and pull out some of the testimony that makes it 223 from the Office of Planning in their part of the report.

So our goal would be, cause we've got a heavy calendar this morning, to be able to make it through those to cases. Then we are going to take a break before we do the LT Propco case, because we've got a last minute pleading this morning from the ANC, no more than perhaps a 5 minute break or so, because we want to hear that case this morning.

NEAL R. GROSS

And if the parties are here for that case, it would be our hope that you might be open to the possibility of working through the lunch hour, so that we can finish the case as part of the morning's hearings and certainly finish it before 1:00. So something to think about as you are sitting there.

And with that, we will close the morning decision meeting.

(Whereupon, the Special Public Meeting was concluded at 10:31 a.m.)

12

10

11

13

14

15

16