GOVERNMENT OF

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2009

+ + + + +

The Regular Public Meeting convened in Room 220 South, 441 4th 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 Chairman

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBER PRESENT:

GREGORY N. JEFFRIES, Vice Chairman

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

CLIFFORD MOY, Secretary

BEVERLEY BAILEY, Sr. Zoning Specialist

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

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Public Meeting held on May 5, 2009

NEAL R. GROSS

T-A-B-L-E O-F C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

Marc D. Loud
BABY LAND DEVELOPMENT CENTER APPLICATION NO. 17867 - ANC - 7E
PRELIMINARY MATTER: Request for a Continuance
D.C. TEACHER'S CREDIT UNION APPLICATION NO. 17842 - ANC - 6A
PRELIMINARY MATTERS: Request to Waive Filing Requirements
1634 ASSOCIATE, LLC
APPLICATION NO. 17583-B PRELIMINARY MATTER: Request to Waive Filing Requirements 19
Motion for Minor Modification 20
ROBERT HOLLAND, ET AL APPLICATION NO. 17904 - ANC - 3/4G For Decision
VOTE TO APPROVE 17904 (3-0-2)
JBG/14TH & S, LLC APPLICATION NO. 17850
Motion to Reconsider VOTE TO DENY MOTION (4-0-1)

NEAL R. GROSS

1 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 2 11:06 a.m. CHAIRPERSON LOUD: The meeting 3 will please come to order. Good morning, 4 ladies and gentlemen. This is the May 5th 5 6 public meeting of the Board of Zoning 7 Adjustment of the District of Columbia. My name is Marc Loud, Chairperson. 8 Joining me today are Vice-Chair Shane Dettman, 9 representing the National Planning Commission, 10 Greg Jeffries, representing the Zoning 11 Commission. Both are to my right. And to my 12 left, Mr. Clifford Moy, Secretary of the BZA, 13 Ms. Lori Monroe of the Office of the Attorney 14 General and Ms. Beverley Bailey, Office of 15 Zoning Specialist. 16 Copies of today's meeting agenda 17 are available to you and are located to my 18 left in the wall bin near the door. 19 20 We do not take any public testimony at our meetings unless the Board

NEAL R. GROSS

asks someone to come forward.

21

1	Please be advised that this
2	procedure is being recorded by a court
3	reporter and is also web cast live.
4	Accordingly, we must ask you to refrain from
5	any disruptive noises or actions in the
6	hearing room. Please turn off all beepers and
7	cell phones.
8	Does the staff have any
9	preliminary matters?
10	MR. MOY: Yes, we do, Mr.
11	Chairman, but I think it would be prudent to
12	address those preliminary matters on a case-
13	by-case basis.
14	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Mr.
15	Moy. In that case, let's proceed with this
16	morning's agenda.
17	MR. MOY: The first case for
18	decision, Mr. Chairman; good morning, Mr.
19	Chairman and Members of the Board, is
20	Application No. 17867 of Baby Land Development
21	Center. This application is pursuant to 11
22	DCMR 3104.1, for a special exception to

establish a child development center, 40 children and six staff, under section 205, in the R-2 District at premises 4628 H Street, Southeast. This is Square 5359, Lot 328.

At the Board's last decision
meeting on this application, which was March
3rd, 2009, the Board deliberated and granted
the applicant's request for additional time to
file post-hearing documents. And essentially,
if the Board will recall, this would allow the
applicant to retain a transportation
consultant and to prepare a traffic analysis.

So the Board had given the applicant a deadline for filing of April the 7th and responses to that filing by the ANC-7E and an OP supplemental report of April 21st and April 28th, 2009, respectively.

The only filing in the record, Mr.

Chairman, is a letter requesting continuance

of the Board's decision from the applicant.

And this was received by the office on April

the 29th, 2009 and is in your case folders

NEAL R. GROSS

1	identified as Exhibit 28.
2	Again, the applicant is asking the
3	Board to delay its decision.
4	So at this point, the Board is to
5	act on the merits of this request by the
6	applicant and if the Board decides to deny the
7	request, then of course the Board would act on
8	the merits of the special exception request.
9	That completes the staff's
10	briefing, Mr. Chairman.
11	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Mr.
12	Moy.
13	I think we've reviewed the file in
14	the case and are disposed to grant the
15	continuance motion. I wanted to see if Mr.
16	Dettman wanted to add anything to what you've
17	already outlined.
18	Okay. Does the applicant indicate
19	a date in terms of a continuance?
20	MR. MOY: No, sir. But my
21	understanding is that in conversations with
22	the applicant was that she was expecting to

1	receive the traffic analysis from her
2	consultant today, May the 5th. And of course
3	she would need time to serve that report on
4	the parties, which includes DDoT. So staff
5	would guesstimate that at least a month would
6	be desirable.
7	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Mr.
8	Moy. Can you then look at let us say June,
9	and it could be any one of the Tuesdays and we
10	can set it for a decision? That would allow
11	DDoT their 20-day review period.
12	MR. MOY: The first Tuesday in
13	June, Mr. Chairman, is June 2nd. The second
14	day in June would be June 9th.
15	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Let me just
16	take a quick look at what's already scheduled.
17	Why don't we go with June 2nd?
18	MR. MOY: Sounds good.
19	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Looks like we
20	can squeeze that in in the morning without any
21	problems.
22	MR. MOY: I also have in the

1	record, too, Mr. Chairman I don't know
2	whether you were planning to vote on it or
3	this would be by consensus, but I also have in
4	hand an absentee ballot from Ms. Mary Oates
5	Walker who also participated on the
6	application.
7	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. Well,
8	why don't we I think as we have done for
9	these continuance cases, we vote on that,
10	correct?
11	MR. MOY: Yes, you have.
12	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: That's a
13	decision meeting, so
14	MR. MOY: You have.
15	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: I think you've
16	summarized and we've found a date that we can
17	go with. Why don't I call the vote and see
18	where members come out?
19	All those in favor
20	MR. MOY: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman.
21	Is there a motion? I'm assuming you're making
22	a motion. And is there a second.

1	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Yes. Yes,
2	thank you very much, Mr. Moy.
3	I'd like to move for approval of
4	continuing the Babyland case, 17867, to June
5	2nd in the morning session. Is there a
6	second?
7	VICE-CHAIRPERSON DETTMAN: Second.
8	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Mr.
9	Dettman.
10	Any further deliberation?
11	Hearing none, all those in favor
12	of the motion to continue, please say aye.
13	Aye.
14	VICE-CHAIRPERSON DETTMAN: Aye.
15	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: All those
16	opposed?
17	All abstentions?
18	Can you call the vote, Mr. Moy?
19	MR. MOY: Yes, sir. Before I give
20	the final tally, I would say that the absentee
21	ballot from Mary Oates Walker, her vote is to
22	grant the motion for a continuance. And that

1	would give a final vote of 3-0-2 to grant the
2	motion on the motion of Mr. Loud, the Chair,
3	seconded by Mr. Dettman, the Vice-Chair, and
4	two other Board Members not participating. So
5	again, the final vote to grant the motion is
6	3-0-2.
7	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Mr.
8	Moy. Is there anything further in that case?
9	MR. MOY: That's it, Mr. Chair.
10	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. Thank
11	you. Why don't we move to the next case?
12	MR. MOY: Okay. That Application
13	No. is 17842 of D.C. Teacher's Credit Union,
14	pursuant to 11 DCMR 3103.2, for a use
15	variance to allow the continue use of the
16	former Edmonds Public School for general
17	office use under section 330.5, in the R-4
18	District at premises 901-903 D Street,
19	Northeast. This is in Square 938, Lot 809.
20	On January 6th, 2009, the Board
21	completed public testimony, closed the record

and scheduled its decision on May 5th, 2009.

The Board requested additional
information to supplement the record as
follows: Additional information from the
applicant and responses to the filing from the

5 applicant from ANC-6. And left the record

open optional for comments from the Office of

7 | Planning.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

To date, Mr. Chairman, we have two filings in the record. The first is from ANC-6A, their letter dated April 22nd, 2009 and is identified in your case folders as Exhibit 34. The second filing is from the applicant and that letter is dated -- well, it's a letter that was submitted into the record yesterday, May the 4th. Both filings are untimely, Mr. Chairman. The letter from the applicant is requesting that the Board delay its decision. And so the Board is to act on the two filings that the ANC is filing. As well that's untimely, probably because of not receiving the applicant's filing in a timely way. So those two filings were untimely and so the

1 Board should act on that as a preliminary matter as well as the request for the Board to 2 continue its decision to a future date. 3 And that completes the staff's 4 5 briefing, Mr. Chairman. 6 CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Mr. 7 I think as you had indicated, we were originally going to decide this case this 8 morning. And as I recall, the applicant 9 having put on a fairly strong case for a use 10 variance, but there were some additional 11 things we requested by April 1 from the 12 applicant. Applicant did not meet that 13 14 deadline and shortly following thereafter both 15 the ANC and now the applicant request a continuance. 16 I think the initial threshold 17 consideration for us is waiver of our rules so 18 that we can review the continuance request and 19 20 we're authorized under section 3100.5 to waive our rules for good cause shown. And there 21

NEAL R. GROSS

being no prejudice to either party, I think in

this case both the applicant and the ANC are seeking a continuance. The applicant had some homework to do and in the interval between when we heard the case and the time that the homework was due, the applicant was affected by some decisions of the National Credit Union Administration which it an assessment notice of stabilization, which as I understand it essentially a portion of some fees to this applicant based on stabilizing a number of credit unions that came under the jurisdiction of the National Credit Union Administration.

But moreover, this applicant has acted in good faith throughout these proceedings to be able to pull together a time line for when it could address the issues that remained outstanding from the hearing, namely noise from an air-conditioner, fence replacement, security bar replacement, and additional greenery on site.

So I think that they make a good case obviously for us waiving our rules under

NEAL R. GROSS

1	section 3100.5. Why don't I stop now and
2	allow other Board Members to weigh in?
3	Okay. I think it seems to be the
4	consensus here, Mr. Moy, that we should waive
5	our rules to allow admission of both Exhibit
6	35, as well as Exhibit 34. Does that require
7	a vote, Mr. Moy?
8	MR. MOY: No, it does not.
9	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. It does
10	not require a vote. So we'll allow those in
11	as a preliminary consideration.
12	And now moving to the issue of the
13	continuance, I think the parties have
14	continued to work with one another, it sounds
15	like, to be able to address. There's sort of
16	one outstanding prong of the variance test and
17	they are asking, as I understand it, to be
18	continued to June 9, 2009. I think that makes
19	sense and I'm fully supportive of it, but let
20	me open it up to other Board Members.
21	I think by head nod other Board
22	Members are fully supportive as well. So I'd

1	like to move that we continue case No. 17842
2	to June 9 for decision making. Yes, we could
3	easily move it to the morning of June 9 for
4	decision making.
5	And that's a motion. So if
6	there's a second on it?
7	VICE-CHAIRPERSON DETTMAN: Second.
8	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. The
9	motion's been made and seconded. Is there any
10	further deliberation on it?
11	Hearing none, all those in favor
12	say aye. Aye.
13	VICE-CHAIRPERSON DETTMAN: Aye.
14	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: All those
15	opposed?
16	Any abstentions?
17	Is there an absentee, Mr. Moy?
18	MR. MOY: Yes, I was going to add,
19	Mr. Chairman, we have two absentee ballots.
20	One from Mr. Hood who participated on the
21	application, as well as an absentee ballot
22	from Mary Oates Walker who also participated.

1	In both case, their absentee vote is to grant
2	the applicant's motion, their request.
3	So in this way that would give a
4	vote of 4-0-1 with one Board Member not
5	participating in granting the motion to
6	reschedule the Board's decision to June 9th,
7	2009.
8	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. Thank
9	you, Mr. Moy. Is there anything further in
10	this case?
11	MR. MOY: No, sir.
12	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you. Why
13	don't we call the next case?
14	MR. MOY: The next case for
15	decision, Mr. Chairman, the Board has in their
16	case folders a motion for a minor modification
17	of approved plans to Application No. 17583-B
18	of 1634 Associate, LLC, pursuant to section
19	3129 of the waiver of the six-month time
20	requirement, pursuant to section 3129.3 of the
21	Zoning Regulations.

NEAL R. GROSS

If the Board will recall, the

original application is pursuant to 11 DCMR 3103.2, for a variance from the residential recreation space requirements under section 773, variance from the retail use provisions under subsection 1901.1, and a variance from the off-street parking requirements under subsection 2101.1. And this is to construct a 32-unit residential building with ground floor retail in the ARTS/C-3-A District at premises southwest corner of the intersection of 14th and R Streets, N.W., Square 208, Lots 806, 807 and 808.

Staff also reminds the Board that on April the 7th of this year the Board had also approved the applicant's request to extend the validity of the order for two additional years pursuant to section 3100.5 of the Zoning Regulations.

On April 3rd, 2009, the Board received a request from the applicant for a minor modification of plans and a waiver to the time requirements. This letter is

NEAL R. GROSS

1	identified in your case folders as Exhibit 34.
2	There are no other filings in the record, Mr.
3	Chairman. As you know, pursuant to section
4	3129.4 parties are allowed to file comments
5	within a 10-day period.
6	So essentially what's before the
7	Board is to act on two items. One is the
8	request to waive the six-month time
9	requirement and the second is to act on the
10	merits of the minor modification. And both of
11	these are pursuant to 3129.3 and 3129.7,
12	3129.5, respectively.
13	And that completes the staff's
14	briefing, Mr. Chairman.
15	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Mr.
16	Moy.
17	Again, I guess the order would be
18	similar to the last case. There's the
19	preliminary question of waiving our rules to
20	allow for the late filing, and would be our
21	rule 3100.5. And then to the actual

modification itself.

1	With respect to 3100.5, we've
2	talked about the showing required there, good
3	cause shown and no prejudice to the rights of
4	another party and not prohibited by law. I
5	think in this case the applicant talks about
6	in their Exhibit 34 the difficulty the
7	applicant has had getting financing, which has
8	led to project delays, and that the project
9	delays creating, I think, the opportunity;
10	I'm putting words in their mouth here, I'm
11	paraphrasing a bit, to reevaluate the floor
12	plan a little bit and to essentially suggest
13	some minor modifications. But I think we
14	bought into the argument of the good cause
15	when we issued the April 7 order and I think
16	it's just as valid with respect to the
17	immediate request for waiver of our rules as
18	well.
19	So I do think that they make the
20	case there, but let me stop and see how Board

NEAL R. GROSS

All right. Sounds like there's

Members feel about that.

21

total agreement.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

So why don't we allow the Exhibit 34 into our record, notwithstanding the lateness, having waived under 3100.5?

The second issue would be the question of the changes to the plan which are represented by the applicant as minor modifications. We've reviewed the plans that were submitted with the Exhibit 34 and essentially they ask for alteration of floors 2 through 7 on the south-facing side of the mixed-use project. As you indicated, it's a 32-unit mixed-use at the corner of 14th and R, and then on floors 2 through 5 on the westfacing side. And the modification with respect to both the south and the west is to eliminate balconies, recessed balconies that were in the original plans and enclose the indentation with sliding glass doors and a railing which would essentially add some square footage to each of the units in question.

NEAL R. GROSS

1 They further represent that there's no increase to either floor area ratio 2 or GFA, gross floor area, and that no density 3 will be added to the building, or no new 4 relief is required, and no change in the 5 6 extent of the relief originally granted. 7 We've reviewed the plans and from reviewing the plans the modifications do 8 appear to be minor and I think that this is 9 one where relief would be justified and 10 warranted under the rules. 11 They did notice the parties in the 12 The ANC and I believe they noticed the 13 14 Office of Planning as well. The ANC, which 15 supported the underlying case, has not responded and the Office of Planning has not 16 17 responded as well. So again, I think it's one where 18 the modifications appear minor from the record 19 20 before us and would warrant relief under 3129, but let me open it up to other Board Members. 21

NEAL R. GROSS

And hearing no comments, then why

1	don't I make a motion for approval of the
2	motion for modification in Application No.
3	17583 with respect to a minor modification of
4	plans at 14th and R Streets, N.W.?
5	Is there a second?
6	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Second.
7	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Mr.
8	Jeffries.
9	Is there any further deliberation?
10	Hearing none, then let me call for
11	a vote.
12	All those in favor of approval of
13	the motion for modification, say aye? Aye.
14	VICE-CHAIRPERSON DETTMAN: Aye.
15	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Aye.
16	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: All those
17	opposed?
18	All those who abstain?
19	Mr. Moy, is there an absentee in
20	this one? I don't believe so.
21	MR. MOY: No, sir.
22	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: All right.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	MR. MOY: No, you're all here.
2	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: All right. And
3	so can you read back the vote?
4	MR. MOY: Yes, sir. The staff
5	would record the vote as 3-0-2. This is on
6	the motion of the Chair, Mr. Loud, to approve
7	the motion for minor modification and waiver
8	of the six-month time requirement. Seconding
9	the motion is Mr. Jeffries. Also in support
10	of the motion, Mr. Dettman. And we have two
11	Board Members not participating of course. So
12	again, the final vote is 3-0-2.
13	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Mr.
14	Moy. Is there anything further on this case?
15	MR. MOY: No, sir.
16	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. Why
17	don't we call the next case?
18	MR. MOY: The next application,
19	Mr. Chairman, is Application No. 17904 of
20	Robert Holland, et al, pursuant to 11 DCMR
21	I'm going to read to you, Mr. Chairman, the
22	amended application because it was amended at

1	the Board's hearing on April the 7th.
2	Pursuant to 11 DCMR 3104.1 for a special
3	exception to establish an accessory parking
4	lot under section 214 and for location of
5	parking spaces under section 2116.5 in the R-2
6	District at premises 3820-3826 McKinley
7	Street, N.W. The property is in Square 1859,
8	Lots 49, 50, 51 and part of Lot 92.
9	On April 7th, 2009, the Board
10	completed public testimony, closed the record
11	and scheduled its decision on May 5th, 2009.
12	The Board requested additional
13	information to supplement the record as
14	follows: From the applicant and the Board
15	allowed responses to the filing from the
16	applicant from ANC 3/4G, Office of Planning
17	and DDoT.
18	There are three filings in your
19	case folder, Mr. Chairman. The first is from
20	the applicant dated April 13, 2009, and that
21	exhibit is Exhibit 27. Also the second filing

is a supplemental report from the Office of

1	Planning dated April 28, 2009, identified as
2	Exhibit 29. And finally, the third filing is
3	from ANC 3/4G and that letter is dated April
4	15, 2009, received into the office April 17th.
5	And that document is identified as Exhibit 28.
6	The Board is to act on the merits
7	of the special exception relief to sections
8	214 and 2116.4, as well as the proposed
9	conditions.
10	And that completes the staff's
11	briefing, Mr. Chairman.
12	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Mr.
13	Moy. I think we're going to deliberate on
14	this case this morning and appreciate the
15	patience of the parties in this case, some of
16	whom I recognize as being in the audience.
17	I think Mr. Dettman is going to
18	lead us through our deliberation on this, or
19	at least start it off. And so let me turn to
20	Mr. Dettman.
21	VICE-CHAIRPERSON DETTMAN: Thank
22	you, Mr Chairman. And I think this case is

relatively straightforward and we can do this fairly quickly. But before I get into the zoning analysis, what I'd like to do is just provide very quick some background of kind of how the hearing went about.

The Board at the hearing took some time to identify exactly what the proper relief was that we were going to look at. you remember, the applicant originally applied for the continued use of an accessory parking lot under section 213, but as the hearing transpired it turned out that the Board decided to look at this as the establishment of a new accessory parking area, not the continued use. And I think that was because the applicant's previous Board approval had lapsed. And instead of section 213, looking at this as a parking lot, the Board analyzed this case under 214 for accessory parking spaces, as well as 2116 for the off-site location of required parking spaces. So as Mr. Moy noted, the way he read the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

advertisement is how we're going to look at it today.

The Board requested three things at the end of the hearing. It gave the applicant the opportunity to provide an analysis under 214 and 2116, although the applicant also did go through each and every provision at the hearing and indicated to the Board how they comply with those provisions. So we did not receive that in writing, but nonetheless I think that the oral testimony is adequate.

We did receive a landscaping plan; that's Exhibit 27, which indicates the location of the landscaped area which meets the five percent requirement. It states that there's going to be six dogwood trees planted north of the retaining wall at the north end of the site south of McKinley Street and that those trees, pursuant to DCOP's recommendation would be six feet tall once they're planted. Exhibit 27 also stipulates the maintenance

NEAL R. GROSS

contract that the lawn's going to be mowed once a week. The areas will be fertilized and that the parking lot will be maintained, cleaned and sprayed on a regular basis.

So that being said, I think that we can rely upon the applicant's oral testimony for demonstration of compliance with sections 214 and 2116. And by way of 214.5, the applicant had also gone through the provisions of chapter 23. I think that it was made clear during the testimony at the hearing that the applicant complies with all of the necessary provisions. The Office of Planning, in their original report, as well as their supplemental, being Exhibit 29, continues to support the application as conditioned. And in Exhibit 28, the ANC also reiterated their support from their previous filing.

So there's adequate support for the application. The applicant meets their burden. And I think at this time I can turn it back to you, Mr. Chairman. And as I

NEAL R. GROSS

1 stated, there are some conditions that have been proposed by OP as well as the ANC. 2 if there's nothing further I can go through 3 the conditions and identify which ones could 4 5 be appropriate. 6 CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Mr. 7 Dettman. I think that was a great review of the record we have before us. I don't have 8 any questions or anything to add to it. 9 mentioned the ANC support and we give that 10 great weight, as well as the Office of 11 Planning report. 12 13

So if you could highlight the conditions that would be in play, then we can take it from there.

VICE-CHAIRPERSON DETTMAN:

Certainly. Most of the conditions that have been proposed are conditions that were from previous orders, from previous BZA cases. And just looking at OP's report, Exhibit 29, they proposed 13 conditions. Several of them are actually the Zoning Regulations. They're

NEAL R. GROSS

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

almost word-for-word from the Zoning
Regulations, in particular, 2303.1. So
typically what the Board has done is decided
not to incorporate directly into their orders
the Zoning Regulations. And so I would say
that we could go through these, as well as
checking with the ANC's conditions just to
identify which ones are not reflective of what
the Zoning Regulations say. And mainly that
would be the first one, the approval shall be
for a period of five years. The second one,
no trash dumpster shall be located on the
subject property. There's a condition here
that OP is proposing that the landscaping
shall be planted within a six-month period and
prior to the issuance of a C of O. And
there's a couple more. One is that snow and
ice shall be promptly removed from the
accessory parking area. And the final one
they propose is that the applicant shall
establish and maintain a liaison with the ANC
to discuss problems that might arise in

NEAL R. GROSS

1	connection with the operation of the parking
2	area. And I think those conditions are
3	largely consistent with what the ANC has
4	proposed as well.
5	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Mr.
6	Dettman.
7	In terms of the conditions, I
8	agree with you that these were discussed
9	previously. I'm glad to see that some of the
10	discussion about snow and ice removal on the
11	public space has been eliminated from our
12	consideration and I think that all have worked
13	to come to grips with trying to suggest some
14	conditions that are win/win for both parties.
15	So I don't have any further to add.
16	I don't know if you're ready to
17	make a motion or if there are additional items
18	that you want to discuss.
19	VICE-CHAIRPERSON DETTMAN: I'd be
20	happy to make a motion.
21	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay.
22	VICE-CHAIRPERSON DETTMAN: And

1	just one final point with respect to the
2	conditions. In OP's report the conditions
3	that would be included in the order are Nos.
4	1, 2, 5, 10 and 13. I kind of skipped around.
5	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. Yes,
6	just before you make a motion, just for
7	clarity, on my Exhibit 29 there is not 13. I
8	mean, there's a paragraph after 12.
9	VICE-CHAIRPERSON DETTMAN: Yes,
10	the paragraph that starts with the
11	representatives of the property owner
12	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Yes.
13	VICE-CHAIRPERSON DETTMAN: I'm
14	referring to that as 13.
15	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay.
16	VICE-CHAIRPERSON DETTMAN: Yes.
17	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Just want to
18	make that clarification for the record.
19	I think if you're ready to make
20	the motion?
21	VICE-CHAIRPERSON DETTMAN: I would
22	move for approval of Application No. 17904 of

1	Robert Holland, et al, pursuant to 11 DCMR
2	3104.1, for a special exception to establish
3	an accessory parking lot under section 214 and
4	for location of parking spaces under section
5	2116.5 in the R-2 District at premises 3820-26
6	McKinley Street, N.W.
7	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Mr.
8	Dettman. And did you want to include in your
9	motion as conditioned?
10	VICE-CHAIRPERSON DETTMAN: As
11	conditioned.
12	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. Thank
13	you.
14	The motion has been made. I'd
15	like to second the motion.
16	Any further deliberation?
17	Hearing none, the motion's been
18	made and seconded. I'd like to call for a
19	vote now.
20	All those in favor of approval of
21	Application No. 17904, as conditioned, say
22	aye. Aye.

1	VICE-CHAIRPERSON DETTMAN: Aye.
2	All those opposed?
3	Any abstentions?
4	Mr. Moy, do we have any absentee
5	ballots on this?
6	MR. MOY: Yes, we do.
7	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay.
8	MR. MOY: Yes, we do, Mr.
9	Chairman, before I call the final vote.
10	You're clairvoyant of course.
11	We do have an absentee ballot from
12	Mr. Turnbull who participated on this case and
13	his absentee vote is to approve the
14	application with such conditions as the Board
15	may impose. So I think that fits quite
16	nicely.
17	So that would give a final vote of
18	3-0-2. This is on the motion of Mr. Dettman,
19	the Vice-Chair, to approve the application as
20	conditioned. Seconded by Mr. Loud, the Chair.
21	Of course absentee vote of Mr. Turnbull. And
22	we have two other Board Members not

1	participating of course. So again, the final
2	vote is 3-0-2. And that's it.
3	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Mr.
4	Moy. If there's nothing further in this case
5	I'm sorry.
6	MR. MOY: Other than whether or
7	not the Board would want to consider waiving
8	the rules to write a summary order.
9	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Yes. Yes.
10	MR. MOY: Very good.
11	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Can you call
12	what I believe is the final case of the public
13	meeting?
14	MR. MOY: Yes, sir. That would be
15	what's before the Board is a motion for
16	reconsideration by an opposing party to
17	application No. 17850 of JBG/14th and S, LLC,
18	pursuant to section 3126. The original
19	application, the Board will recall, is
20	pursuant to 11 DCMR 3104.1 and 3103.2, for
21	a variance from the lot occupancy requirements

under section 772 and a special exception for

a roof structure with unequal heights under
subsection 411.11, from the restriction on
eating and drinking establishments under
subsection 1901.6, from the ARTS Overlay
height guidelines under subsection 1902.1,
from the parking requirements for an addition
to an historic structure under subsection
2120.6, for the renovation of and addition to
an existing historic structure that will
create a mixed-use residential and retail
development in the ARTS/C-3-A District. This
is at premises 1407 S Street, N.W, and 1802,
1804, 1810, 1816 and 1818 14th Street, N.W.
This is Square 206, Lots 1, 210, 230, 819, 820
and 821.

Very quickly, Mr. Chairman, on

April 8th, 2009 the Board received this

request for reconsideration from Tom Coumaris,

who is the opposition party on this

application. That filing is identified in

your case folders as Exhibit 60.

Also, staff adds that according to

NEAL R. GROSS

1 the regulations Mr. Coumaris also served other parties to the application and that 2 Certificate of Service is also entered into 3 the record and is identified as Exhibit 61. 4 The final filing is from the 5 6 applicant, the property owner, who filed a 7 response to the motion. That was on April 20, In this instance, both filings, the 8 2009. motion and the applicant's response are timely 9 pursuant to sections 3126.2 and 3126.5, 10 respectively. 11 The Board is to act on the merits 12 13 of the motion. And I think with that, the 14 staff is going to complete its briefing, Mr. 15 Chairman. CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Mr. 16 I think we've reviewed the pleadings in 17 Moy. this case and I think most of us remember this 18 case. It wasn't that long ago that we were 19 20 hearing this case and deciding on this case

and I think we're ready to deliberate on the

motion.

21

Let me start us off by reading the requirements of the rule that allows reconsideration in the first place, and that's 3126.4, a motion for reconsideration shall state specifically all respects in which the final decision is claimed to be erroneous, the grounds of the motion and the relief sought. So it's against that rule that we're measuring the motion for reconsideration. And starting us off, let me just observe a couple of things.

First, the motion for reconsideration was one page and it included five one-sentence claims of error. And I'm not going to read it, I'll just point it out as Exhibit 60.

Each of the assertions of error were stated conclusorily. There was no reference to the transcript made with respect to each of the five claims, there was no reference to any exhibits, no reference to any testimony, no argumentation made, no evidence

NEAL R. GROSS

pointed to. These were very minimalist assertions regarding the entire record. that's especially noteworthy in this case because we had such a full record. We had at least 15 witnesses. We had four party opponents, including the movant in this case. We had Mr. Freedman, Mr. Bogden, Mr. Coumaris and Mr. Nap Freeman and Nap later withdrew. But there was a really full record to draw from in this case. And it's somewhat inexplicable to me that the movant has not pulled together any of the record so that we could take a look at our decision and in good faith reconsider any places wherein we may have made an error.

We heard the case December 2nd. I think the transcript from that alone was 300 pages. And we had sort of like a decision hearing on January 6th, where originally we were going to decide the case, but we ended up allowing testimony as well. And then it was decided on February 3rd. But all of which is

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

to say there was a really voluminous record for a movant to draw from for a 3126 motion in this case.

And again, for reasons that are inexplicable none of that appears in our Exhibit 60. It's even more telling for me because in the opposition that was filed to the reconsideration motion, and I understand that the applicant had to do what the applicant had to do, not knowing where the Board would come out on this, so they've really briefed the issue. But interestingly enough, they go into each of these five conclusions and then they go into the record and they pull out places in the record where arguably the movant could have tried to pulled together a case.

So the record was available. The opposition went into the record and found places in the record that arguably addressed some of these grounds, but the movant did not.

And I don't find, and I'll open it up to other

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Board Members, I don't find that what was submitted as our Exhibit 60 meets even the threshold requirement for a section 3126.4 motion and I hope that it's instructive both to the movant and anyone else that might be review these proceedings that there is a threshold requirement that has to be met before when can draw down on the resources of the BZA to scour a record like this and find places in it that might align with the conclusions in a reconsideration motion. So I wasn't persuaded that it met threshold requirement in that regard.

Again, there's no ground stated for the motion at all and much of what is stated was addressed at the various hearings and responded to at the various hearings.

I'll just take point number one in Exhibit 60 which talks about the advertisement being insufficient, both in the public posting and in the advertisement as a special exception instead of variances. With respect to that,

NEAL R. GROSS

that was addressed very specifically at the hearing on December 2nd. But moreover, as I said there were 15 witnesses. There were four party opponents. The ANC gave testimony.

There's no indication that notice about this hearing did not get out in the community.

So, with that being said, I also want to quote some language from previous BZA Order, that's Application No. 17603-A of Johnson, and I'm pronouncing correctly I hope, Kolipi, where we kind of talked about this issue of threshold requirements and on page 2 of that order we say, "The Board was not persuaded that the motion by the party in opposition alleged any grounds to reconsider its decision to grant the special exception requested by the applicant. The motion did not state any respect in which the Board's decision was claimed to be erroneous and the reasons for reconsideration listed in the motion did not present any new argument relevant to the Board's deliberations in the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	case."
2	So following in the spirit of that
3	earlier BZA Order, and again finding this one-
4	page reconsideration request not rising to the
5	level of a 3126 motion, I'm of a mind to deny
6	the motion for reconsideration.
7	Let me open it up to other Board
8	Members.
9	I think there's general agreement
10	here, so I'll make a motion that would allow
11	us to deliberate and move on with the day's
12	calendar.
13	I'd like to move for denial of the
14	motion for reconsideration, Exhibit 60, in
15	Case No. 17850, JBG/14th & S, LLC, of the
16	party status opponent Mr. Tom Coumaris.
17	Is there a second?
18	VICE-CHAIRPERSON DETTMAN: Second.
19	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Mr.
20	Dettman.
21	The motion's been made and
22	seconded. All those in favor, say aye. Aye.

1	VICE-CHAIRPERSON DETTMAN: Aye.
2	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Aye.
3	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: All those
4	opposed?
5	Are there any abstentions?
6	And is there an absentee?
7	MR. MOY: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman.
8	Very good.
9	That absentee ballot is from Mary
10	Oates Walker and her vote is to deny the
11	motion for reconsideration. So that would
12	give a resulting vote of 4-0-1. This is on
13	the motion of the Chair, Mr. Loud. Seconded
14	by Mr. Dettman. Also in support of the
15	motion, Mr. Jeffries. No one other Board
16	Member of course. So again, the final vote is
17	4-0-1 to deny the motion for reconsideration.
18	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Mr.
19	Moy. Is there any further matter on this
20	morning's agenda for us?
21	MR. MOY: Sir, the Board regrouped
22	and it's 11:51 and there's no other matters

1	for the public meeting.
2	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Mr.
3	Moy. Let me again apologize to all those in
4	the audience that waited for us to start the
5	deliberation at the posted time of 9:30. We
6	ran into what I hope will be just sort of one
7	of-a-kind set of circumstances that pushed us
8	a little later than normal. But I do
9	appreciate the patience. I think we all
10	appreciate everyone's patience.
11	Thank you, Mr. Moy. And meeting
12	is adjourned.
13	(Whereupon, the meeting was
14	adjourned at 11:53 a.m.)
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	