GOVERNMENT

OF

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

+ + + + +

PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

TUESDAY,

JANUARY 13, 2009

+ + + + +

The Public Hearing convened in Room 220 South, 441 4<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001, pursuant to notice at 1:00 p.m., Ruthanne G. Miller, Chairperson, presiding.

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT MEMBERS PRESENT:

RUTHANNE G. MILLER Chairperson
MARC D. LOUD Vice Chairman
MARY OATES WALKER Board Member

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBER PRESENT:

MICHAEL TURNBULL Commissioner

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

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

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PRESENT:

LORI MONROE, ESQ.

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

ARTHUR JACKSON MATT JESICK DAN EMERINE

This transcript constitutes the minutes from the Public Hearing held on January 13, 2009.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<pre>WELCOME: Ruthanne Miller5</pre>
Ruchanne Miller
PRELIMINARY MATTERS (2):
ASSOCIATES FOR IDEAL EDUCATION INC
ASSOCIATES FOR IDEAL EDUCATION, INC. APPLICATION NO. 17866 - ANC-4C:11
REQUEST FOR POSTPONEMENT12
RESCHEDULE HEARING TO JUNE 2, 200919
1400 MD AVE LTD EMPIRE LEASING, INC.
1400 MD AVE LTD EMPIRE LEASING, INC. APPLICATION NO. 17825 - ANC-6A:
REQUEST FOR POSTPONEMENT20
RESCHEDULE HEARING TO JUNE 16, 200935
NDC HOME AGAIN 22A LLC
APPLICATION NO. 17871 - ANC-1B:
WITNESSES:
Kevin Brown43
Jeff Goins46
OFFICE OF PLANNING:
Matt Jesick89
EXHIBIT 22 - ANC-1B REPORT:
COUNCIL MEMBER JIM GRAHAM LETTER:106 MOTION TO APPROVE APPLICATION 17871110
VOTE TO APPROVE APPLICATION 17871121
VOIE TO APPROVE APPLICATION 17071121
BABY LAND DEVELOPMENT CENTER
APPLICATION NO. 17867 - ANC-7E:
WITNESS:
Victoria Manley125
OFFICE OF PLANNING:
Arthur Jackson
CROSS EXAM OF OP BY MS. MANLEY175 ANC-7E:
Rosa Hamlet180
SPECIFICALLY REQUESTED MATERIAL
SET FOR DECISION MARCH 3, 2009199
CHY II MANC
CHY H. YANG ADDITION NO. 17799 - ANC-1A:
APPLICATION NO. 17799 - ANC-1A:

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPLICATION NO. 17799 (CONTINUED):
GRANT PARTY STATUS REQUEST205
WITNESSES:
Chy Yang205/209
Rajat Vajpeyi
CROSS EXAM OF APPLICANT BY MR. GREEN230
OFFICE OF PLANNING:
Dan Emerine
CROSS EXAM OF OP BY MR. GREEN246
PERSONS/PARTIES IN OPPOSITION:
Charles Green
SPECIFICALLY REQUESTED MATERIALS:285
SET DECISION FOR APRIL 7, 2009
ADJOURN:
Ruthanne Miller315

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

1:01 p.m.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: We have next on our agenda the morning's Public Hearing and this case went very long. So what we are going to do is take a 10 minute break and assess what we are going to do. We're definitely, I believe, going to take -- I think there is at least one case on the agenda that is seeking a postponement and that's a preliminary matter and we will probably deal with that first.

And so in any event, I want to let you all know if any of you need to step out for 10 minutes or so, this is a good time. We won't be starting that hearing for at least 10 minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1:01 p.m. a recess until 1:25 p.m.)

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. This is the January 13<sup>th</sup> Public Hearing of the Board of

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

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Zoning Adjustment of the District of Columbia.

As it is now 1:23 in the afternoon, we're going to merge our morning and afternoon cases.

So I'll just be reading one intro which will apply to all the cases that are remaining on the agenda today for the Public Hearing.

My name is Ruthanne Miller. I'm the Chair of the BZA. Joining me today to my right is the Vice Chair, Mr. Marc Loud, and next to him is Mr. Michael Turnbull from the Zoning Commission. To my left is Mary Oates Walker, Board Member. Our other Board Member, Shane Dettman, will not be participating with us today as he is out of the country.

And also joining us is Mr. Clifford Moy from the Office of Zoning and Ms. Lori Monroe from the Office of Attorney General. I believe that Ms. Bailey will be joining us shortly as well.

Copies of today's hearing agenda

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

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

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 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 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.

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

The order of procedure for special exceptions and variances is as follows: One, statement and witnesses of the applicant. Two, Government reports, including Office of Planning, Department of Public Works, DDOT, etcetera. Three, report of the Advisory Neighborhood Commission. Four, parties or persons in support. Five, parties or persons in opposition. Six, closing remarks by the applicant.

to Section 3117.4 and Pursuant 3117.5 of Zoning Regulations, the following time constraints will be maintained: The applicant, persons and parties, except an ANC, in support, including witnesses, 60 minutes collectively. Persons and parties, in opposition, including except an ANC, witnesses, 60 minutes collectively. Individuals 3 minutes.

These time restraints do not include cross examination and/or questions from the Board. Cross examination of

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

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

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 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 evidence to the Office of Zoning. After the record is closed, no other information will be accepted by the Board.

The Sunshine Act requires that the Public Hearing on each case be held in the open before the public. The Board may, consistent with it's Rules of Procedure and the Sunshine Act, enter Executive Session

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

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

during or after the Public Hearing on a case for purposes of reviewing the 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 consider any preliminary matters. Preliminary matters are those which relate to whether a case will or should be heard today, such as requests for postponement, continuance or withdrawal or whether proper and adequate notice of the hearing has been given. If you 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.

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

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MS. BAILEY: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Does the staff have any preliminary matters?

MS. BAILEY: Madam Chair, good afternoon. There are two preliminary matters and I'm not quite sure how the Board would like to deal with this. The first one is in the morning and in the afternoon there is one associated with the afternoon.

The first one there is a request for postponement and that is of the Ideal Education, Inc., Application 17866. This is a private school. Is the applicant here for that case? Okay. And then again, there is another one following this, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Why don't we take the first one first then? Whoops, I need the microphone on. Thank you. You press push, the green light goes on and you'll be on the record.

MR. KOLONGI: Okay. My name is Abdullah Kolongi. I'm with the Associates for

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

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Ideal Education. We were requesting postponement of this particular hearing and we wanted to have an architect and engineer review the plans. And we also wanted to meet with the neighborhood and see if we can't minimize any impact with the application. CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Do you know of any objection? MR. KOLONGI: No, I don't know any objection. CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. I just want to make a couple of comments. That's no problem then, you know, we don't rescheduling you. MR. KOLONGI: Okay. CHAIRPERSON MILLER: After you have all your meetings and submit another filing, a lot of the issues that we look at when we are considering -- this is a private school? MR. KOLONGI: Yes. CHAIRPERSON MILLER: A private

school. We look at, you know, the number of

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

students and staff, what are the ages of the students, are there any traffic concerns, like for instance, with respect to drop-off or pick-up, is your play area going to affect any neighboring property, what's the parking situation, what's your schedule going to be. Those are kind of just basic points. So you may have already addressed some of them in your application, but I just wanted to bring that to your attention. MR. KOLONGI: Okay. CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. So how much time are you thinking that you would like? MR. KOLONGI: A minimum of 90 days. CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Well, what would you ideally like? MR. KOLONGI: 120 days. CHAIRPERSON MILLER: 120? Okay. We'll look at our calendar. Is June 2<sup>nd</sup> too

MR. KOLONGI: No, that's okay.

**NEAL R. GROSS** 

late?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Because
2	we are pretty open in June. Is that okay, Mr.
3	Moy? Okay. And are you raising your hand on
4	this case? Okay. Do you want to come forward
5	then? You are here on this case? Oh, okay.
6	Would you introduce yourselves for the record,
7	please?
8	MS. THOMPSON: Yes. My name is
9	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Is your mike
10	on?
11	MS. THOMPSON: My name is Doreen
12	Thompson and I am President of the Carter
13	Baron East Neighborhood Association. And the
14	Ideal facility, the current facility is
15	located in our community.
16	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Why
17	don't we go through the group and then we will
18	get back to you.
19	MR. WIELAND: I'm Sean Wieland. I
20	live at 1362 Hamilton Street, N.W. I live
21	within the Sabina boundaries.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I'm sorry,

1	what's your name?
2	MR. WIELAND: Sean Wieland.
3	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Is your mike
4	on?
5	MR. WIELAND: Yes.
6	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Sean Wieland.
7	You live within?
8	MR. WIELAND: The Sabina
9	boundaries, 1362 Hamilton Street, N.W.
10	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Yes?
11	MS. MEYERS: I'm Janet Meyers. I
12	am the newly elected ANC-4C02 in which Ideal
13	School is in my Single Member District. And I
14	live at 5005 13 <sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.
15	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. And you
16	are automatically the ANC is automatically
17	a party to all applications. Do you have a
18	position on the
19	MS. MEYERS: Yes.
20	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: request?
21	Yeah.
22	MS. MEYERS: (Speaking off mike) I

have met with the community and our position is that we will not support this.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Now, the only question on the table right now is the request to postpone the hearing until June. Do you have any opposition to that?

MS. MEYERS: Well, I mean, they can postpone certainly and go forward with their application, but the ANC has met with the community and we have met as a Commission as a whole and, you know, whether they go forward with that -- okay, thank you. We have taken the position that we will not support the application.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Now, in granting a postponement, that also gives the applicant an opportunity to change the plans and perhaps meet some of the concerns of the community or attempt to. So you may -- it may result in another vote as well.

MS. MEYERS: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Do you

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

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

all --

okay.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MS. THOMPSON: We just would like to say that, for example, I think I feel -CHAIRPERSON MILLER: No, you --

MS. THOMPSON: -- Ideal is here today saying they want to meet with the community. Ideal could have notified us that they were seeking a postponement or that they wanted to modify. They mentioned that they wanted to bring in an additional -- an expert. Ideal has posted no signs in preparation for this hearing.

is Ιt there is lack а of communication and sensitivity towards us. We have been here all morning as well. Ideal is in close proximity to show people in community and could have communicated to us. And, in fact, we were here this morning to say it should be postponed because that placards, nothing has been done in preparation for the hearing.

And so to be -- to come today when you have the opportunity to talk to the community is really not respecting us as well.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Do you have anything you want to say to that or not?

MR. KOLONGI: I cced the ANC and

MR. KOLONGI: I cced the ANC and the Office of Planning with the letters for postponement.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.

MR. KOLONGI: We also filed here.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. We are scheduling it for June 2<sup>nd</sup> not hearing any opposition to that. But when that comes around, there are regulations that require that you do placard the property. There are posting requirements. You might want to check with the Office of Zoning if you are not familiar with that, but you will need to do that in advance of the hearing.

MR. KOLONGI: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: And obviously, the better the communication with the

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

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

community in advance of the hearing often the smoother the hearing goes.

MR. KOLONGI: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Anything else? All right. Then this hearing is rescheduled. This case is rescheduled for hearing on June  $2^{\rm nd}$ .

MR. KOLONGI: Thank you.

MS. BAILEY: Afternoon session?

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Yes, afternoon session. Okay. Okay. And then I believe we have one of the cases scheduled for supposedly the afternoon session, which this is afternoon already. It's 17825 is going to be requesting postponement. And why don't you introduce yourselves for the record, please.

MR. AGUGLIA: That is correct. My name is Richard Aguglia, counsel for the applicant. With me is Nante Berhane, who is with Dade Petroleum. We have requested a continuance in this case until your May calendar.

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

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Just to give you some brief background, you will recall that the case was originally set for October 14, 2008. The ANC, which is in opposition to our application, requested a continuance, so that the case could go before the Public Space Committee.

We met with the Public Space Committee on December 18<sup>th</sup> and presented our plans, our revised plans. The Public Space Committee rejected those plans. However, they outlined an 8 point, roughly an 8 point, summary of what we needed to do in order to come into compliance.

However, there was no guarantee that they would accept the revised plans. I want to make that clear. We are still waiting for the letter from the PSC and we have also tried to order the transcript and we were told that they were doing that. We still haven't received this. It has been roughly a month, but we do have copious notes.

So our proposal is to continue this

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

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

until May and we're trying to get on a fast track schedule, as I have put forth in my letter. We would file our revised plans, we think, consistent with the Public Space Committee's remarks by the end of this month. We would then go before the Preliminary Design Review Committee to make sure that our plans were consistent with the remarks.

And then there is a two month hiatus before we can get on the Public Space Committee hearing bringing us into April. And then we would ask then, of course, that we be scheduled for May.

I would bring to your attention that I believe there are important public policy aspects in keeping our case on the calendar and, you know, keeping it alive and calendaring it in May. As part of my application -- as part of my request for a continuance, I attached the traffic study that was done by former Mayor Anthony Williams.

And if you can turn to page 16 of

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

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that report, you will see that from 1977 to
2002, the number of gas stations in the
District of Columbia decreased from 270 to
112, that's something else, but I'm going to
refer to that immediately after this
discussion.
Do you want to give them a copy?
MR. LUNA: I thought we were still
introducing ourselves. Is that not happening?
CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Yes, please.
MR. LUNA: Are we arguing?
CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I'm sorry.
Yeah, we're not going to hear too much
argument anyway, because we're just here for
postponement and scheduling. Go ahead.
MR. LUNA: I'm sorry, I'm Richard
Luna. I'm counsel for ANC-6A.
CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Your mikes
need to be on.
MR. LUNA: Richard Luna, counsel
for ANC-6A.

RONNEBERG:

MR.

Drew Ronneberg.

I'm the Chair of the Economic Development and Zoning Committee for ANC-6A. MR. LUNA: I actually just wanted to point out that there is a motion that is chronologically prior to this motion continue the case. On --CHAIRPERSON MILLER: We have a copy of it. It's a motion based on mootness. Right. The January 5<sup>th</sup> MR. LUNA: 10 motion to dismiss. Okay. I don't 11 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: believe though there has necessarily been time 12 13 for the applicant to respond to the motion to dismiss. I mean, were you intending to 14 respond? 15 LUNA: And likewise, there 16 MR. wasn't time for us to -- his motion 17 continue the case was filed after his time for 18 19 filing papers, so we really haven't had a chance to review his -- to answer his --20 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: 21 Are you

opposed to continuing the case?

1	MR. LUNA: I would. We would
2	prefer denial or dismissal. I mean, the case
3	is moot. There is no
4	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Let me just
5	say this. I know that you cited N Street
6	Follies, but I don't that was the Board's
7	decision in N Street Follies. But in a rare
8	occurrence, the Court of Appeals reversed the
9	Board on our determination of mootness in that
10	case.
11	MR. LUNA: Okay. I did not
12	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: So
13	MR. LUNA: I was not made aware of
14	that.
15	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Yeah, that was
16	decided June 5, 2008.
17	MR. LUNA: Okay.
18	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: So
19	MR. LUNA: Thanks for pointing that
20	out.
21	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.
22	MR. LUNA: It did not come up in my

search.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Well, you know, a motion to dismiss though, I mean, I'm not saying we're denying that, but I am saying that that's a very important case that I wanted to bring to your attention.

MR. LUNA: Right, right, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: You know.

MR. LUNA: I appreciate that.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I think we normally with a motion to dismiss do give the applicant an opportunity to file a written response to a written motion to dismiss, because that takes care of their whole case and that goes to the merits. But so what I would propose is that the applicant have an opportunity to respond to that and that we take that up when this is continued, unless the Board is convinced that it should not be continued.

And that's rare that the Board wouldn't continue a case for good cause. And

good cause seems to be what is going on with the Public Space Committee.

MR. LUNA: I guess giving -- ANC-6A would not be opposed to giving the applicant an opportunity to respond to the motion to dismiss. The problem is really that because of the nature of the changes that the Public Space Committee requested and the permission - the extent of the space that the Public Space Committee denied use of.

The application is really going to have to be substantially different. We're going to have to go through notice periods. The ANC still -- the plans are going to be completely different. So really the ANC and the public should be entitled to the full opportunity to review the plans, renew notice, things like that.

So in all fairness and in the interest of fairness, the application is going to be so substantially different that it really should be dismissed and refiled. It's

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

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

going to be completely different from whatever is on file right now.

MR. AGUGLIA: Of course, the basis will still be the same. The PSC said the sign is too high. So we're going to lower the sign. They said you might be queuing on public space, so we're going to go from four stations and eight pumps to two stations and four pumps. They said they wanted more landscaping. We had proposed to landscape roughly 18 percent of the impervious area. We're going to landscape more.

So you still have the same substantial basis.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. And any revised plans would be served on the ANC in time for them to comment, correct?

MR. AGUGLIA: Absolutely. And it will be served upon them as part of the PSC hearing. So they will have it, you know, within the next month or so.

MR. LUNA: That's purely

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

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

speculative though. I mean, the -- they haven't even gone before the Public Space Committee. They haven't -- I mean, there are lots of steps that happen between now and then before they can even claim to have plans that are ready for the Board to review.

MR. RONNEBERG: Madam Chair, the applicant made many requests of the Public Space Committee, all of which were denied and was chastised by the Public Space Committee for not following D.C. Regulations. have a case here where the ANC has put a lot of time and effort and it takes a lot of time and effort to muster people to these hearings. And when these hearings are constantly continued, it's difficult for the community to cope with a case that continues.

You know, for example, I have to take -- I'm on vacation here to come to this hearing for a case that has to be continued.

I have important things to do at my work. So I think given the applicants lack of

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

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

preparation for the prior case and the fact that we have no plans here, I think, functionally it would be better, much better if the application was denied and they were allowed to reapply.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Anything else?

MR. AGUGLIA: Of course, from our perspective, we have a tenant paying a lot of money for a vacant property with no income coming in. We have vacant property which does not bring any revenue into the District of Columbia. And again, I point out very quickly that there is an important policy consideration. I passed out this pamphlet.

There are no gas stations in ANC-6A.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. We don't want to get into the merits though. Really, I think just the postponement. But I think also if you were to -- if it were to be dismissed, then they would have to pay again for an application, I think. Is that not

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

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

true, if it were to come in again? Well, I think so. I think that's one of the --

MR. LUNA: \$200 for a guy that owns 30 gas stations doesn't seem too unfair.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Well, let me ask my Board Members. I think that we often just reschedule cases when they are meeting with other bodies that are deciding information that is going to affect this case. So I don't see -- I know it is, you know, somewhat of a burden when community members have to take time out to come to hearings and then they get continued.

But I think when you weigh that in the whole picture, it doesn't seem like grounds for dismissal and refiling. But also, if there are other grounds for dismissal which you have raised, the applicant can then respond to that. I don't know. We don't usually decide things ahead of time, so I guess if we continue this, we would decide that issue at that hearing. That's the way it

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

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

usually works.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Do others have an opinion about continuing or not continuing?

VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: I agree with you, Madam Chair. I think good cause has been shown for a continuance. I would hope, and we do this anyway, when we do these things, that when we do continue it, it's a real firm date, so we don't have the situation we have today with the ANC-6A Chair of the Economic Development Committee and his counsel coming down and having to just recalendar another date in the future.

On the other hand, our rules are real clear about good cause being shown and having to interact with other agencies of the D.C. Government is good cause. So I'm -- I support the continuance.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.

MR. RONNEBERG: Can I make a request? If we do show up, if the applicant's public space -- next public space application

is denied and we come to another continuing case and they still do not have a public space, I would ask the Board that, at that point, to consider dismissal of the case.

MR. LUNA: I would also if it is continued, I would ask for more time than the applicant is giving. I mean, four months is, I think, optimistic. I have actually communicated with Matthew Marcou, the Chair of the Public Space Committee, and he is not quite as optimistic as the applicants are about the timing.

I mean, he actually hasn't given any firm dates. And so for the applicants to say that they can provide plans by January 22<sup>nd</sup> when the Chair of the Public Space Committee isn't even sure he can pull together the record by then, just seems far more optimistic.

So either -- you know, the Public Space Committee has decided the issue that was -- that they had to decide. The applicants do

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

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

not have -- this Board continued the case previously so the Public Space Committee could review whether the applicant used -- could use public space. That permission was denied already.

So now, we are basically looking at continuing an application that can't legally be built. So that is kind of the essential problem. So now, we have to go through the entire Public Space Committee review process again on a time line that, quite honestly, the applicant has somewhat fabricated.

I have been in communication with Matthew Marcou and he hasn't set any firm dates on anything, because he doesn't even have the record and he doesn't know when he is going to have the record.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.

MR. LUNA: So if --

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Let me just--

MR. LUNA: -- we are going to continue it, it really should be beyond April.

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

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

It should be 9 months to really give, 6 to 9 months, to give the process adequate time to actually work through the notice periods. The ANC is entitled to the Public Space Committee's own review process and allow for scheduling for all these things.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: First of all, is there consensus in postponing the case, continuing it at least once more? Okay. So now we have to find a realistic date. And we don't have any time in May anyway, so I think that the first available would be June, that's where we started with the previous case that was seeking postponement.

So do you want to -- Mr. Aguglia, is June --

MR. AGUGLIA: June is acceptable.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Is Mr. Luna wrong that -- is June going to be enough time?

Because -- so you're not in a position asking for another continuance.

MR. AGUGLIA: That's acceptable.

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

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: June? MR. AGUGLIA: A June date. CHAIRPERSON MILLER: You think is realistic? MR. AGUGLIA: Yes. CHAIRPERSON MILLER: June 16<sup>th</sup> in the afternoon? MR. AGUGLIA: When would you want me to prepare my opposition and file that to 10 the motion to dismiss? CHAIRPERSON MILLER: And will you 11 be filing with the Board, in general? Ι 12 13 couldn't remember. You went through scenario. Are you -- will you only be filing 14 revised plans and a new, you know, reviewed 15 prehearing statement, you know, 14 days ahead 16 of the hearing or are you going to be --17 that's too short for at least giving them 18 19 notice and everything. I mean, I'm just wondering if we 20 should -- you file your opposition with some 21 other papers or you just want to file it ahead

of time? MR. AGUGLIA: I would file it ahead of time. CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Just get that done. Okay. MR. AGUGLIA: Yes. CHAIRPERSON MILLER: When do you think you can get it done by? I mean, the minimum time is usually 10 days in accordance 10 with the Court rules. But we don't have any specific rules. 11 AGUGLIA: I would say March MR. 12 2<sup>nd</sup>, which is a Monday. 13 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. When do 14 you see having revised plans served on the 15 16 ANC? MR. AGUGLIA: When do you think? 17 Hopefully by the end of this month, because we 18 19 intend to file revised plans with the PDRM, you know, with Public Space for the PDRM, 20

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

which is the preliminary meeting, so we can

provide them with the same plans at the same

21

time. So let's say not later than the end of this month. CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Good. And will they change? Might they change as a result of that meeting? MR. AGUGLIA: They could. CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. AGUGLIA: MR. And I guess your 10 question is then will we keep the ANC updated with revisions and the answer is yes. 11 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okav. 12 13 And certainly far enough in advance of the hearing, so that they have an opportunity to 14 have their ANC vote on it. Yes, sir? 15 MR. RONNEBERG: We're still trying 16 to figure out our calendar, if you can give us 17 one brief moment? We can accept that date. 18 19 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. When is your ANC meeting in May or in April, just so 20 that we know --21

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

MR. RONNEBERG: Our ANC meeting is

the second Thursday of the month. So May 14<sup>th</sup>.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: So, Mr.

Aguglia, will they have the final revised plans by May what?

MR. RONNEBERG: We need that -- we

have a committee structure and we need that --

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.

MR. RONNEBERG: -- if it's in May, we're going to need the plans -- we have an Economic Development and Zoning Committee meeting in April and that's the third Wednesday of April. And we need to have plans at least a week ahead of that.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I mean, it sounds like you will, but I just -- if you want to get on the record what the -- the hearing is June 16<sup>th</sup>. And Mr. Aguglia seems to say that, you know, he is going to have stuff, revised plans, in March. But I just wanted to make sure that the final plans are to the ANC in time for the hearing. Yes?

MR. AGUGLIA: Assuming that we get

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

our hearing and we hope to, the PSC hearing, in early April, then they will have the revisions, if there are any further revisions recommended by that board, in time for their-when was your economic development meeting, April what?

MR. RONNEBERG: April 15<sup>th</sup>.

MR. AGUGLIA: April 15<sup>th</sup>.

MR. RONNEBERG: And we need that really a week ahead of time. So we have -- to give our Committee Members time to review the plans and the public. We post all our agendas to the public.

MR. LUNA: So if we can have plans by April  $8^{\rm th}$ , then that would be in time for our April  $15^{\rm th}$  meeting. And then we make our recommendation to the ANC.

MR. AGUGLIA: But the PSC hearing isn't until April  $9^{\rm th}$ , if we get on the calendar.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. You're going to have to be flexible with that

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

schedule. It sounds like though, I just wanted to make sure that the June 16<sup>th</sup> date for the hearing did allow enough time for the ANC to meet and vote on the plans and it sounds like it does certainly. So okay.

MR. LUNA: Now, this is all contingent on the Public Space Committee actually having an opportunity to review the plans and approve the plans.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Yeah. Okay. So June 16<sup>th</sup> is the date for the -- that the hearing is continued to. And let's just get that date. Mr. Aguglia, what did we say the date that your opposition to the motion to dismiss, what date?

MR. AGUGLIA: March 2<sup>nd</sup>.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: March 2<sup>nd</sup>, okay. Okay. And then if there is a revised pre-hearing statement that may need to be done, if there are big changes in the application, you would do that 14 days in advance of the --

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	MR. AGUGLIA: That is correct.
2	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: hearing.
3	Okay. Good. Are we all set?
4	MR. AGUGLIA: Sure.
5	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: All right.
6	MR. AGUGLIA: Thank you, Madam
7	Chair.
8	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Thank you.
9	MR. RONNEBERG: Thank you.
10	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Ms.
11	Bailey, now I believe that completes the
12	preliminary matters, is that correct, for
13	today's hearings?
14	MS. BAILEY: Yes, Madam Chair.
15	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: And everyone
16	who is here who, I don't believe we have done
17	swearing in yet, wishes to testify in support
18	or opposition should rise now for any of the
19	cases and Ms. Bailey will swear you in.
20	MS. BAILEY: Please, stand to take
21	the oath. You look puzzled. What's the
22	problem? Yes. Would you, please, raise your

right hand?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

(Whereupon, the witnesses were sworn.)

MS. BAILEY: Thanks. Madam Chair, the next case is Application 17871. This is the Application of NDC Home Again 22A LLC, pursuant to 11 DCMR 3103.2, for a variance from the lot area requirements under sub section 401.3, to allow the conversion of an existing building from two residential dwelling units to three. The property is Zoned R-4. It is located at 902 T Street, N.W., Square 362, Lot 234.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Whenever you are ready if you would introduce yourselves for the record, please.

MR. BROWN: Good morning. My name is Kevin Brown. I'm with the Neighborhood Development Company. We're located at 4110 Kansas Avenue, N.W.

MR. GOINS: My name is Jeff Goins with PGN Architects. I'm a partner with PGN

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

Architects.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I'm sorry, I missed your last name.

MR. GOINS: Jeff Goins.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Thanks. Okay. You are here for a variance. You know, with respect to the variance test you need to address three prongs. What is unique about your property or your situation that gives rise to a practical difficulty in complying with the regulations. And then why our granting you this relief would not result in a substantial impairment of neighboring properties, the Zone Plan. Okay. So that's our framework.

MR. BROWN: Good morning, Members of the Board or good afternoon, Members of the Board. Before I discuss the actual variance, I just want to give a quick overview of the project.

NDC was awarded 902-904 T Street by DHCD's Home Again Initiative as a part of

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

Bundle 22. After over a year of negotiations, a land disposition agreement was executed with the District in the fall of 2007. The property was in transfer to NDC 22A Home Again LLC in February of 2008.

The agreement with the District requires that the property is developed into three residential for-sale condo units with one affordable unit. Due to the size of the existing structure, these units will be very large. There are two 1,300 square foot units and one 900 square foot unit. Both are two bedroom and two baths.

These buildings are currently vacant and in very bad condition. Therefore, it will be very expensive to restore and renovate them. The major issues driving these costs are the size of the existing structure compared with the number of units.

The existing roof has failed on both buildings. In the smaller building, the floor structures have collapsed. In the

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

larger structure, the floor systems are failing. Lead and asbestos remediation will be required in both buildings. And also, the facade must be restored to historic criteria.

Throughout this lengthy process of negotiating with the District and designing the project, NDC has worked with the District, our architect, the ANC, community groups and HPRB to develop a plan that not only allows the restoration of this vacant building, but meets the concerns of the community, provides affordable housing and is financially viable.

In our application, we have requested approval of a variance, the minimal lot area required for this apartment conversion. We believe this project should be granted relief, because we meet the three part criteria for the variance to be granted.

In addition, their economic hardships due to affordability requirements, the condition of the building and the historic restoration requirements.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I want to address the three part test, because there is some disagreement, I believe, between us and OP.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. First of all, could you just set us up with respect to exactly what regulation you don't meet? Like it requires this and you can only meet this much.

MR. GOINS: The regulation we don't meet is 401.3. It's the land area required for a subdivision to apartment building of 900 square feet per dwelling or flat. The current site is 1,529 square feet, which the requirement would be 2,700 square foot for three dwellings and the site is only 1,529 square feet.

MR. BROWN: The -- I guess the first part of the test is does this property-- is it specific uniqueness with respect to exceptional narrowness, shallowness, shape, topography or other extraordinary or exceptional situations or conditions. And the

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

answer to that is yes.

Jeff Goins of PGN can go into that in further detail.

MR. GOINS: Yeah. I want to kind of address that and then I think Kevin and I will just kind of go backwards and forwards as we present the case here.

The uniqueness of this site is the fact that architecturally if you look at the existing board here, there exists two buildings on site. Not only in architectural terms, but it actually has two separate entrances and there is actually two separate addresses.

And when you look at the drawing, it might show a little bit better than the picture here, you can see the second building, the smaller building is roughly about 15 to 20 feet smaller than the other structure. There is a party wall conditioned that separates the two architecturally.

So there is no communication

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

between the smaller structure and the larger structure architecturally. And I think you can further see from a design standpoint, there is not much communication either, which we actually think that's what makes this building unique.

The building on the corner of 9<sup>th</sup> and T is very ornate in nature and has many ornate details, where the other building --well, you can see from the mansard roof and some of the other details, the historic porch entry. The other building is really a flat front brick facade with its own entrance.

The floor lines don't line up, so there is -- architecturally it's very -- it's not very feasible to actually connect these buildings architecturally nor structurally. So that's kind of what Kevin is talking about the uniqueness in the architecture there.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: So why are they considered one building?

MR. GOINS: Because they are on one

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

lot.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: One lot, okay. MR. GOINS: Yeah, they are on one lot. And the second thing is the two buildings actually occupy 87 percent of lot. They are not in accordance to the 60 percent. So I mean, if you wanted to kind of put that in square foot terms, I mean, in an Zone, this lot, that would be the R-4equivalent of about, approximately, 1,200 square feet of usable space at 87 percent.

And the two structures, we will get into the design and the floor plans in a minute. But that's kind of the overview of the site and the architectural elements that we think make it unique.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Sorry to be a little bit dense here.

MR. GOINS: Oh, that's fine.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.

MR. GOINS: Go ahead.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Which of the

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 two buildings. because it looks like that picture is divided into three parts. Do you see what I'm saying? There is the third part and then this.

MR. GOINS: Yeah, that building on the end, if you can go there and show them where that building actually ends? The building on the end actually ends, yeah, sorry. You can see -- there you go. There is the floor plans of the two structures there.

The building on the end will actually be a three-story single-family home, in essence. It just happens to be on one lot.

And the other taller building that you see, which is quite large, will actually be divided into two units.

Each of those units will be 1,300 square foot, two bedroom, 2.5.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: So that little square one on the right --

MR. GOINS: Will be the affordable unit, 900 square foot, two bedroom unit.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Oh, that's
2	so this is all part of the building?
3	MR. GOINS: Yeah, that's all part
4	of the building.
5	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: All three
6	parts. Okay.
7	MR. GOINS: And that's what we
8	think is unique about this particular property
9	is that the party wall, the architectural and
10	the design elements kind of make this unique
11	what the in respect to the 401.3 and the
12	land area requirement.
13	I mean, the two structures that are
14	on the one lot make up over 4,000 square feet
15	of usable area or gross area, excuse me.
16	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: When you're
17	talking about two structures, I'm sorry, I'm
18	just a little confused which. There seem to
19	be three parts there.
20	MR. GOINS: Kevin is going to show
21	you.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.

1	MR. GOINS: Yeah.
2	MR. BROWN: This is the
3	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: You need to be
4	on a mike.
5	MR. GOINS: There is actually a
6	party wall condition meaning that there
7	MR. BROWN: This is the party wall
8	that Jeff is talking about.
9	MR. GOINS: Yeah.
10	MR. BROWN: So this is one
11	structure. This all of this is the second
12	structure. This is a false line. It's just
13	MR. GOINS: Yeah.
14	MR. BROWN: a shadow line.
15	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. That's
16	not a party wall. The line on the left?
17	MR. BROWN: No. This is the party
18	wall.
19	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.
20	MR. BROWN: And they actually had
21	two, it was 902 and 904 T Street with two
22	separate entrances.

MR. GOINS: Right.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Thank you.

MR. GOINS: We have a section if you would like to see that? That might show it a little better. But I think as mentioned, the larger building, the result and the division of the two units will be two family units at 1,300 square feet, over 1,300 square foot. And then the affordable unit is 900 square foot and also a two bedroom unit. And in essence, it will be like a single-family home, because it will have its own entrance.

There is a section drawing there on the end that might show it a little better there. We have received HPRB approval. We have worked with them for about -- I guess we started this project about a year ago. We have received approval from them.

MR. BROWN: Should I continue?

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I should have this in front of me, but I know, you know, it was recently enacted. Does the regulation

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	call for 900 square feet?
2	MR. GOINS: Yes.
3	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: For what?
4	MR. GOINS: 401.3. The land area
5	required in an R-4 Zone
6	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: For a
7	conversion, right?
8	MR. GOINS: Yes, for a conversion,
9	yes.
10	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: So but you are
11	saying it isn't 900 square feet.
12	MR. GOINS: No.
13	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Oh.
14	MR. GOINS: We only have 1,529 of
15	lot area. We would be required to have 2,700
16	for three units. And I think our argument is,
17	obviously, that what makes this unique is that
18	there is actually two existing structures on
19	the site now. It's not feasible to really
20	connect them into two units.
21	MS. MONROE: Madam Chair, can I ask
22	a quick question, which just dawned on me a

second ago when you said this. Was this three units in the past or was it two? The reason I ask that and I'm -- legally, because if it was already three --MR. BROWN: Right. MS. MONROE: -- is it a conversion? MR. BROWN: It was a rooming house last occupancy for it, for that the building. MS. MONROE: So it would probably considered a conversion then. MR. BROWN: Yeah. MS. MONROE: It wasn't three units and you're going with three units again. Ιt was a different use. MR. GOINS: Right. MR. BROWN: It was a different use. MS. MONROE: Okay. Okay. It has been vacant for MR. GOINS: time. long -- for some I'm not exactly, but it has been vacant for a long

time. As Kevin mentioned, I think the other

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

uniqueness thing that we would argue is that it's a historic building that we are restoring the exterior and renovating the interior. And the current state is in very bad shape.

As Kevin mentioned, the roof and the floor are collapsed. We have a picture of the interior, if you would like to see it, but I mean, one of the bathrooms fell from the second floor to the first floor, so I mean it's a substantial amount of work that is going to be required.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. You know, when we look at exceptional condition or uniqueness, it has got to be tied to the practical difficulty. It's not just oh, all the ways in which this property is like different or whatever.

So the reason you are raising the historic aspect of it that you need to renovate it, does that go to the cost or does that go to physical constraints, you know, related to how you divide it?

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	MR. BROWN: It goes to cost and
2	physical restraints, because we are not
3	modifying the exterior of the building.
4	MR. GOINS: Yeah. Not one square
5	foot is being added to this property. We are
6	working within the envelope of the two
7	structures restoring the exterior and
8	renovating the interior.
9	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I mean, I
10	guess the point would be though then why can't
11	you just have two units instead of three,
12	since you don't have enough space for three?
13	MR. BROWN: Because it's not
14	financially viable and we are required to have
15	one of the it's not financially viable and
16	especially with the requirement that one of
17	the units be affordable. Can you explain the
18	requirement?
19	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Can you
20	explain the requirement?
21	MR. BROWN: Who asked?
22	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I asked

that.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Oh, I'm sorry. MR. BROWN: When this project was awarded to Neighborhood Development via the Home Again Initiative, I believe that initial award, correct me, was in 2006, but we didn't sign a Land Disposition Agreement until late 2007. Part of their goals when they dispose of vacant unimproved land is to also provide ownership opportunities to affordable.

And so part of the covenant that transferred with this property is the affordable requirement.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Did you know at the time that this property would not meet the zoning -- meet the requirements that you -- to develop it as three units?

MR. BROWN: We did not. And I believe that came about.

MR. GOINS: Yeah, that 401.3 was revised last year.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right.
2	MR. GOINS: And we had I think
3	we were completed the HPRB process at that
4	time. So we were not aware of it at the time,
5	so it definitely was a surprise, at that
6	point.
7	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Do you
8	what range of affordability are you looking at
9	here? What income range is this house going
10	to be?
11	MR. GOINS: It is 80 percent, but
12	right now the maximum price per also part
13	of that covenant, the maximum price we can
14	charge for that is \$271.
15	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
16	MR. BROWN: Which is a substantial
17	discount to what is available in that area.
18	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
19	Thank you. Is the smaller structure historic?
20	MR. GOINS: Yes, it is.
21	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: It is
22	considered historic?

1	MR. GOINS: It is.
2	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Or
3	contributing?
4	MR. GOINS: It's contributing, yes.
5	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
6	Thank you.
7	MR. GOINS: Yeah.
8	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: So when you
9	entered the agreement, was 401.3 not revised
10	yet?
11	MR. GOINS: No.
12	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.
13	MR. JESICK: Madam Chair, if I may?
14	While 401.3 was updated, it has always said
15	that there will be 900 square feet per of
16	land area per unit. That's not new.
17	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Do you want to
18	introduce yourself for the record?
19	MR. JESICK: Sorry, my name is Matt
20	Jesick with the Office of Planning.
21	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Thank
22	you.

MR. GOINS: Just to say one thing had met with the Office of that, we Planning on several occasions during the design of this building and Historic Preservation on numerous occasions. At one point we were even encouraged to add an additional unit.

So during this process, it was definitely not on our radar that this wasn't going to be allowed.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: And how long has the property been vacant, that you know?

MR. BROWN: I'll get that. I don't know. I know it has been vacant for many years, because we -- the -- actually, the biggest push we're getting to renovate this project has actually been from the ANC and the community. But I can't tell you how many years it has been vacant. But just judging from the condition, it has been many years.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Would it be that it was vacant for so long because it

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

needs so much work and money put into it and then people haven't wanted to do that? Do you have an idea?

MR. BROWN: I know the District acquired it from the previous owner, who had not renovated it, as part of the Home Again Initiative. And that was brought about by the community put pressure on the District to obtain the property, because it had been sitting vacant.

My guess is that it is a substantial amount of renovation and given current market conditions, even with relief, this is going to be a very difficult project for us to make work. It is absolutely not viable without relief.

Earlier, Martine Combone was here from DHCD, because, basically, without relief, this is at a standstill and we will have to go back to them to either renegotiate or something else, but the project definitely will not be restored or renovated.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: What's next
2	to the smaller structure?
3	MR. GOINS: There is actually a
4	very small alleyway there that I think we
5	might have a you can kind of see right
6	there in that view right there. There is an
7	existing structure next to it and then there
8	is a small alleyway that goes to the units
9	behind. Yeah, there is kind of a site plan.
10	Oh, there is a side yard and then
11	there is a house and then the alleyway there.
12	There is a small side yard.
13	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Who does
14	the side yard belong to? Is that this
15	property?
16	MR. GOINS: Yes, it belongs to this
17	property.
18	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: So that's
19	not a parking pad or anything? That's simply
20	a grassy area?
21	MR. GOINS: Yes.
22	MR. BROWN: Correct.

1	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
2	Thank you.
3	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: This Land
4	Disposition Agreement was set up by whom, Home
5	Again Initiative? What is it?
6	MR. BROWN: Yes, the Home Again
7	Initiative.
8	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. And
9	that's a District of Columbia
10	MR. BROWN: DHCD.
11	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: DHCD, okay.
12	And when they set this up, they set it up for
13	three units?
14	MR. BROWN: That was the original.
15	When we looked at it, we went through various
16	options of what we could do on this site. At
17	one point, there was talk of more units when
18	we initially met with OP. However, in the
19	final agreement with DHCD, it was determined
20	that it would be three units.
21	MR. GOINS: Well, I mean, just to
22	interject something here, because we're the

architect. This was part of a bundle award that included, I think, nine other vacant properties. This was the only one that had an existing building on it that in D.C. was awarded. The rest of the properties that were awarded were vacant properties and this was the one that was existing. And I think that was because of the community support to get this building restored.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Go ahead.

MR. BROWN: I guess the second part of the test, does extraordinary or exceptional situation pose a practical difficulty, which is unnecessarily burdensome to the applicant? And we believe it does. There are architectural, market, practical, financial issues that provide an unnecessary burden to NDC.

First, again, it's just not financially viable without the third unit.

There are the affordability requirements.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Also, if we were forced to develop this as two units, you would end up with one unit over 300. One unit basically will be 3,000 square foot -- feet where you will be forced to somehow connect these two separate buildings that are separated by a party wall and have floors at different levels. And just the overall cost implication, the expense of doing this renovation.

The third part of the test OP is in agreement with us that not only does this not provide substantial detriment to the public good, it, in fact, benefits the community by renovating this long vacant building. And I would like to add it also provides affordable housing opportunity in the neighborhood where there aren't many.

The -- I guess the other thing I would like to point out is that I believe granting the relief to this project does not impair the intent of the Zoning Regulations.

This is a unique nonconforming existing

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

structure that when restored will provide family units.

And so for those reasons, I don't believe it impairs the intent of the Zoning Regulations. And also, as stated earlier, there are economic hardships on this project, based on affordability, the scale of renovation and the historic nature of the facade.

MR. GOINS: Just to kind of echo Kevin's thoughts there on the intent of the zoning, when we looked at this and the Zoning Regulations, we kind of read that as protecting the R-4 Zone. I live in an R-4 Zone, which is a family zone. And we kind of think that we are providing three two bedroom units, two of which will be 2.5 bedrooms. I mean -- yeah, 2.5 bedrooms, because they will have a den, a study in both of those units.

So we feel like that the intent to -- of the R-4 Zone is there. We just don't have the land area, but we have this

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

substantial structure that exists, two structures that exist on the site to provide those uses.

MR. BROWN: I guess the only other thing I would like to add is that we have met with the ANC on numerous occasions and have their support. We have the support of Council Member Graham. In fact, he keeps calling us to let us know when we are going to finish this project. And really that's -- and we also have gone through and met with HPRB on several occasions and they have, in fact, stamped and approved the final version of the plans.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. I certainly get the economic feasibility argument and the affordable housing element and, you know, your agreement. If economics weren't a constraint and it was just -- well, the historic I understand goes to the expense as well, because it requires a big infusion of money to do that, right?

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

As far as the architectural constraints of an historic structure, is there a correlation between that and practical difficulty of complying with the regulation for the 900 square feet per unit?

MR. GOINS: Well, I think then you would end up with two units. And as Kevin said, basically, the house would be one unit.

Unless you try to make a physical connection between the smaller structure on site, which is really not possible, because the floor lines don't line up and I think you would -- it would be very inefficient if you did try to make a connection between the two units.

So you would end up with one very, very large unit. And then the other building would be your affordable requirement, so, you know.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: And what's wrong with that? Is there not a market for that or what?

MR. BROWN: One, there is really

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

not a market for that size of a condominium and also it wouldn't be financially viable. We don't believe we would be able to sell that one unit for the price of two units. Once you get -- once you start going above certain square footage or sizes in a unit, your actual increase in sales price per square foot declines.

MR. GOINS: You would end up with probably about a five bedroom house as well. I mean, it would be a five -- I mean, we have -- yeah, five bedroom condo. We have separated the structure into two units and we are getting two bedrooms and a den in each unit and 2.5 baths in each unit. So if it was one structure, it would be a very large family home.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: And your point though is -- I mean, there are some large family homes, but there is not a market for it in this location for what you would need?

MR. GOINS: Well, I think the

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

71 burden with the restoration costs and renovation cost for the client, I would agree, it would be hard. CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Do you have a copy of the Land Disposition Agreement that requires the affordable housing? I have the declaration MR. BROWN: of covenant here for the property that we signed with the District which has affordable requirements here. CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Is that problem for you to submit in the record? there anything confidential or anything? MR. BROWN: No, I brought copies.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Because that is one of the factors that we would be considering that it's a requirement for affordable housing, correct?

MR. BROWN: Okay. And if needed, I could have -- I could talk to DHCD also about providing a letter confirming those requirements.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Let's see if it's in this covenant, that might be sufficient. MR. BROWN: It's in this covenant. CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. MR. BROWN: Can I --CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Do you have an extra copy now or not? I brought the MR. BROWN: No, 10 appropriate amount of copies. CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay, good. 11 Thank you. Okay. 12 13 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I've got one question from a design standpoint. 14 I'm just curious on the second floor in the tower. 15 Why did you remove so much of the floor 16 space? 17 I think when we were MR. GOINS: 18 looking at the design idea, the market we were 19 looking at designing it as two condos. 20 you talking about the double heighted space 21

22

right there, I assume.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yeah, looks like you have -- you aren't occupying all of that tower on the second floor and the study. It looks like you have got it open down below. MR. GOINS: We do, we do, indeed. You can see from the rendering right there. COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yeah. MR. GOINS: It is open below. 10 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. just curious, you are losing study space. 11 just -- I mean, it's a nice design feature. 12 13 MR. GOINS: Yeah. 14 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: But I'm just curious. 15 MR. GOINS: Okay. 16 BROWN: It's a nice design 17 MR. feature and the unit is already 1,300 square 18 19 feet, which is above norm size unit in that area for two bedrooms. So we just felt that 20 the design feature would be something that

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

sets it apart.

21

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Let me ask you this. I guess there wasn't a possibility of subdividing the lot into two lots with the bigger part on one and the affordable housing on the other?

MR. GOINS: We actually looked into that and we still wouldn't have enough for three units, to do three units.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: And could you do, I don't know, like a flat? No? I don't know. You must have looked into this. This was the only scenario? Nothing else worked?

MR. GOINS: Well, the actual other scenarios were actually more units. This was -- when we were working with Historic Preservation, it was hard to actually get additional units and still maintain the facade and some of the other elements, you know, maintaining the integrity of the facade was very important.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

So when you add additional units, walls don't line up in the right place. And so it -- the actual other scenario we looked at was additional units, not less. Our -- I guess -- I think we did look at, you know, providing one unit on the first floor and then having a unit above as opposed to the design we have, but I think it has always been three or more units.

Because I think the second structure is -- basically, it's a stand alone structure. So we really kind of focused our energy on the house. What do you do with this large house? And how do you make it work, you know, with the requirements of the Home Again and all that.

So we always looked at the smaller structure as one single-family home. And when we looked at the other larger structure, it was always two or three units. And through the process, we have derived the two.

MEMBER WALKER: Now, I'm still sort

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

of struggling with that. I guess, I'm just
curious as to why you didn't subdivide it into
two lots, so then you would have the smaller
unit would be its own separate structure. And
then you would have a flat in the larger
structure.
MR. BROWN: But the I believe if
we subdivided it, then we would be having the
same discussion about the
MR. GOINS: Right. The other
house.
MR. BROWN: large structure,
because that lot would not meet 900 square
foot for two, if we subdivided it.
CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Well, I think
Office of Planning
MR. BROWN: We need
CHAIRPERSON MILLER: is going to
weigh in on this for a second.
MR. GOINS: Yeah, regardless, we
would need 1,800 square feet.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Is that true?

MR. JESICK: Not for a flat. CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I don't think so. MR. JESICK: A flat is a permitted use on any lot size in the R-4. I mean, they would still have to deal with probably some variances in order to obtain the subdivision, because those lots would be -- would not meet the standard lot sizes in R-4. 10 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. just trading one variance for another. Okay. 11 I'm sorry, are there questions? 12 13 VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: Good afternoon. Just off the top of your head, do 14 you know which section of the Declaration of 15 Covenant requires the affordable unit 16 or units? 17 The quickest way MR. BROWN: Yes. 18 19 to -- the quickest is if you go to Exhibit F, which is the second from the last page, which 20 is referenced in the covenant. And if you 21 look at Unit C and it is

22

an asterisk

indicates the property will be sold to individuals whose incomes levels are at or below 80 percent of AMI, which is the third unit in the 902-904 T Street.

And then the references to the requirements of the affordability are contained on -- I'm sorry there is not a page number, would be the first, second, third --

VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: If you don't know, that's fine. I can, you know, review it.

MR. BROWN: The bottom of the third page. I'm sorry. If you look to the middle of the third page, Item C, it speaks to the affordable unit. But then also at the bottom of it in Article 5 it speaks to the occupancy period for the affordable unit and it's also under A and B, Article 4. It's Article 3 and Article 4 where you are going to find it.

VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: Let me just ask a couple of quick follow-up questions. So as I understand it then, you are now under a

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

legal agreement with the District of Columbia where you have to develop three units, one of which is affordable?

MR. BROWN: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: And when they did the solicitation, DHCD, was the requirement for affordable specifically on 902 and/or 904 or was it the bundles, that a certain percentage of the bundle of 9 had to have an affordability component?

MR. BROWN: Originally it was a component of the full bundle. And then it became -- the bundles that we were awarded was reduced. So in its initial package, we were only given 2 of the properties. And so in order to make it financially feasible and find a place where we could -- there was a preference for two bedroom. And so this was the property where that would work.

VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: Okay. I'm not sure I understand it totally, but I think I do understand the argument that this land, to me

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I guess, you know, it would take a legal interpretation to convince me differently, but it's unique because, first of all, you are under a legal obligation with the District of Columbia to develop three units on a 1,500 square foot site.

And it resulted from a solicitation where affordability was a requirement as a part of -- if not this specific site, at least, the bundle that included this site.

But getting from the award to the actual three units and one of which had the affordability requirement, was that a negotiation driven by your team, based on the numbers, or did the District require -- in other words, I guess, you could not have done three units on this site and made them all market rate. There had to be an affordability requirement, right?

MR. BROWN: I don't specifically recall how it was determined, but I do know that during the negotiations there was some

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

give and take on where the affordable units would be located.

VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: And under your agreement with the District, you could do two units and only make one of them affordable and have the other one market rate. I know that for your purposes --

MR. BROWN: Not at this point.

VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: -- it doesn't work. So at this point, you have to do three.

MR. BROWN: Right. Not -- at the point we are now, the location of the affordable unit is dictated by the covenant on the property.

VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: No, but my question is a little bit different. So, okay, so the affordable is physically where it is under the agreement. But could you do the bigger part of the site as a single -- under your agreement, could you just do it as a single-family dwelling? Could you do it as a 2,600 square foot project under your

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

agreement?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. BROWN: Under our agreement, I am not sure, because it specifically tells us, if you look at the -- we would have to go back and -- I'm not sure.

Whole host of reasons that you and your architect went through, the different floors, well, the finances of it, the historic nature of the property and some of the other things that you mentioned, you couldn't do the 2,600 square foot development for the bigger part of the project. You would need to do two 1,300 square foot condos?

MR. BROWN: Yes, because if you make it a single-family structure, the reason the -- they are 1,300 and 1,300, but if you made it a single-family structure, actually, the size of it would go up to, approximately, 3,000, because you would take out -- part of that square footage is used up by a stairway that is serving two units.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

In addition, there would be a -- so you would have 3,000, three levels abovegrade, but as a two unit condo, we're also using the ground floor as storage for the unit owners. So you would end up with, approximately, 3,000 above-grade and then a full basement that would be, and this is rough numbers, almost -- you know, another 7 or so, because -- if you looked at the section.

VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: Thank you,
Madam Chair. I don't have anything further.
It sounds like a great project.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: The separate building has storage in the main building? So they have access to the basement then, too?

MR. BROWN: Yes. It's a common -the main entrance to the larger structure is a
common entrance for both units and the -- in
that building and the person -- because,
frankly, there was just so much square footage
in that building, we couldn't figure out what

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

to do with the basement area, so we decided storage for all three would just be a good use of it.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: What happens if you don't perform in accordance with the covenant?

MR. BROWN: We wouldn't pursue not performing with the covenant.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: No, I know you wouldn't pursue it. But for instance, if we were to deny relief in this case, and then if I understand your argument, it wouldn't be economically feasible for you to produce.

MR. BROWN: We wouldn't proceed with the project. We wouldn't proceed with the project. And then the next steps I guess we would have to confer with counsel on how we could alleviate the matter, talking to DHCD and see if there is some other way we could address it.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. for instance, when you entered this covenant and agreement with DHCD, there was no there doesn't seem to be any acknowledgement that a variance might be required in order to comply with this. Is that right? You said there was never discussion about that. Was it on anybody's radar screen?

MR. GOINS: It was on no one's radar. You know, to mention about the other properties and some of the reason we looked at this property for affordable, a lot of the other properties was very tough and it is very tough to get two bedroom units. And I think DHCD and the city was pushing for affordable units that were two bedroom and family units and not the smaller version.

So some of the other properties and this one with the separate structure that served as a single-family home that exists, kind of seemed a reasonable place to put an

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

affordable unit. I think that was part of the discussions. CHAIRPERSON MILLER: How many bedrooms is going to be in the affordable unit? MR. GOINS: Two. CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Two, okay. MR. GOINS: Yeah. It's a three It's a small footprint, but there is 10 three levels with a basement. A bedroom on the top floor and the basement. 11 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Thank 12 13 you. COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Madam 14 Chair, I just have one more question. 15 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Um-hum. 16 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: And it's 17 not really a zoning issue, it's really a 18 19 building code. You have -- one of your bedrooms is in the basement and there is no 20 How are you achieving that as an windows. 21

occupiable space?

MR. GOINS: There are window wells
in the front. You know, how that all gets
worked out with the building permit, we I
don't know. We will probably call it a study
or add a window. There's not a window on the
back.
MR. BROWN: There is no window
well, but there is a full there is a
COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: You have a
door.
MR. BROWN: A full door and we will
look at possibly adding we can look at the
possibility of adding a window adjacent to
that door.
COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. I
was just curious, because those spaces often
are very difficult to work with. I was just
curious.
MR. BROWN: Yeah, we have dealt
with those issues in the past where we have
had to do window wells with egress ladders and

such.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Any other questions? Is there more that you wanted to say, at this point, or shall we move on to Office of Planning? MR. BROWN: I think we have said everything. CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Well, 10 you will have another opportunity anyway. Unless, is anybody here from the ANC? Okay. 11 So why don't we go to the Office of Planning? 12 13 MR. BROWN: Oh, I'm sorry, but there is -- there should be a letter of 14 support from the ANC as well as from Council 15 16 Member Graham, because we met with the ANC on numerous occasions about this. 17 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. We will 18 19 get back to the ANC. But I just wanted to ask that, at this point, in case they were here. 20 They have the right to cross examine. So but 21

as far as whose turn it is in the course of

the proceedings, that would be Office of Planning then. Okay.

MR. JESICK: Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the Board. Again, my name is Matt Jesick. This was a tough case for the Office of Planning. Obviously, you know, the development would bring a lot of benefit to the neighborhood: The affordable unit, restoring an historic structure, simply bringing people into a property that has been vacant for a long time. Obviously, we support all of those goals.

But like any variance, we looked at this one using the three part variance test. And we didn't see any particular uniqueness or exceptional condition affecting this property that had a nexus to the area of relief being sought. And that's the first part of the test.

And because that part of the test isn't met, neither is the second part which relies on the first part of analysis.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

The relief could be granted without detriment to the public good. There would be no significant impacts to light or air or noise or traffic. Parking, there would probably be maybe some additional demand for something like parking, but not significant for the addition of one extra unit.

We did conclude that relief would impair the intent of the Zoning Regulations, however. The applicant has mentioned the financial hardship aspect and we do feel that if they provided, you know, some substantial documentation about, you know, maybe something like a pro forma with a breakdown of the costs and a breakdown of projected revenue from sale of the property, that that might be some information that the BZA could take into account in its decision.

And they have started, I think, with the Exhibit F of the covenants, which does take a look at some projected revenues for the project. So we do feel that the BZA

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

could take into account that aspect of the project and maybe the, as well, significant deterioration of the interior of the property.

For the rest of my testimony, I would just rest on the record, but I would be happy to take any questions.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Well, it sounds to me, in part, that Office of Planning came to the conclusion because it didn't have enough information to conclude that this was an exceptional condition. but giving rise to practical difficulty, but that you anticipate that perhaps some information is out there, such as a pro forma, that might convince the Office of Planning otherwise? Is that correct?

MR. JESICK: Yes, that's correct. I mean, we -- I think, in general, we are very hesitant to take the financial route through the three part test. You know, that gets to the question of, you know, does the first part of the test ask about property or what does

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the property encompass.

But I think in this case, that might be an argument because of the condition of the property and the requirement for an affordable unit, etcetera.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Yeah, because the exceptional condition has been treated, I think, a little more broadly by the Courts and that we can consider the situation of the property. And that for instance, this covenant, I think, would fall within the situation governing the property.

I guess, what strikes me here and I would like your reaction, we seem to have a covenant that is requiring the applicant to have three units here, but they can't have three units without a variance. So that it's actually the D.C. Government or an arm of the D.C. Government, I think, that is requiring them to have to seek relief. Is that correct?

MR. JESICK: I mean, I don't know how the Land Disposition Agreement or the

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Covenant were derived, whether that was, you know, proposed by the applicant and DHCD agreed to it or whether maybe the disposition of the land is contingent upon getting all appropriate zoning approvals. I don't know if I'm answering your question or not, but --

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Well, it doesn't say it. It just seems like, you know, we have different parts of the D.C. Government doing things. Like on one hand the Land Disposition Agreement does seem to require them to alter the property in a manner that has three units, but that that would be in violation of our regulations and they would need a variance for that.

So to me, that seems like an exceptional condition. Not to say that we have to grant a variance. For instance, if we found that that would result in substantial detriment, we don't have to. But it just seems to me that it goes to an exceptional condition of the property that gives rise to a

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

practical difficulty.

MR. JESICK: Yeah, no, I think you are correct that at the state we are now with the agreement already in place, I think that could create a practical difficulty. I don't think we can exempt any property from going through the proper zoning channels, but certainly they would need relief to fulfill the terms of the agreement.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: And you didn't have this covenant before you when you did your report, right?

MR. JESICK: No, that's correct.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Other questions? Does the applicant have with him any type of pro forma with respect to Office of Planning's concern about accepting a practical difficulty related to the economic feasibility issue?

MR. BROWN: I do not, but I would like to point out that some of the initial resale prices and projected profits that are

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

shown on this attachment are -- were based on a market and economy in the latter part of 2007.

And so a property that was already difficult, I guess, all of us sitting here realize that we're in a completely different real estate market and that I could provide something, but it's something that, I guess could, I would hate to say understood, but something that most people would realize that the financial viability of this project, regardless of the variance or not, is in a much more difficult position than it was.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Well, let me just ask you this. For instance, sometimes we don't want too many numbers, because, you know, we don't really need to get too bogged down in all the financial parts. But we have the numbers that we should be looking at are in Exhibit F, right, or are there other numbers?

MR. BROWN: Those were some of the

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

projections that -- at the time. I mean, to be honest, had we known the conditions of the -- had we known the conditions that the market was going to be in now, we wouldn't have took the project at this number. And frankly, we will, even with the variance, make a profit on this project, but it will be minimal.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Is the Neighborhood Development Company a nonprofit or what?

MR. BROWN: No, we are a LSDB developer in --

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.

MR. BROWN: -- the District located in Ward 4 at Georgia and Taylor, roughly.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. And the reason we would not need more numbers on this is why? What do we have so that we can conclude that it wouldn't be economically feasible without the three units? I know we have some general statements about the cost of historic, the renovation.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. BROWN: Well, I guess if you looked at what you have, if you had to make a conclusion from what you had, you would see according to these initial resale prices, which I'll say are not -- they are going to be reduced some percentage just due to market conditions.

But if -- just using information provided on here, those two units combined are close to \$1.5 million, which is not what they would ge combined, at this point, but we can make the assumption that the market price of the two units has decreased as much as the one unit.

But the ability to sell a single-family house in that neighborhood for \$1.5 or as much as two condos is just not feasible.

I guess the other point we were trying to make and I don't know if we were successful is that in addition to the financial aspect, and maybe we are incorrect, we thought that the extraordinary circumstance

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

or condition was just the nonconforming existing building that was on the site that we were dealing with.

MR. GOINS: Yeah, I think to summarize, I think that we were looking at this as two structures that occupy close to 90 percent of the lot, which make up two very large -- it makes up a very large square footage. And so we were looking at it as just if it was new construction, obviously, it wouldn't be built this way with the current zoning.

It is nonconforming and it has produced, you know, one very large structure and a second structure and the relationship of the two doesn't exist. There is, you know, the language of the architecture on the exterior as well as the structural language doesn't exist between the two structures. And they just happen to be on one lot.

And that's what we were looking at from an architectural standpoint that made

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

this unique as well as the historical aspect of it.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: But then the next step is, okay, they are unique and how does that contribute to your difficulty in complying with the regulations?

MR. BROWN: I guess when we looked at it, we were looking at -- you are looking at the uniqueness because of the economic burden, the uniqueness of the lot, you know, affordability, all combined together not as individual unique items.

MR. GOINS: And you know, architecturally, the building is a beautiful building. They don't get built like that today. And so we were looking at it on the historical side. know, You from an architectural stand -- getting the opportunity to restore this building and the good, the benefit to the city and the neighborhood, you know, that's where we didn't think it was a determinant to the zoning as well.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Well, is it
likely that it wouldn't get restored if it had
to comply with the regulations? I mean, it
has been vacant for a long time.
MR. BROWN: I believe it is going
to be vacant. If relief is not granted, I
don't believe it will be restored any time
soon.
CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Any
other questions? Okay.
COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Actually,
if you tore even if you didn't have the
smaller structure, you couldn't put in two
units. It could be a flat.
MEMBER WALKER: It could be a flat,
Mr. Turnbull.
COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: You're
right, you're right. It could be a flat.
You're right.
MEMBER WALKER: And that
COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: But you
can't tear down the smaller structure, because

it's a contributing.

MEMBER WALKER: Right. When I look at this project, I see a flat and then a single-family. I mean, it was obviously meant to be a separate structure. I mean, you know, the floors don't line up. It's a different building. It's only reasonable that they would develop it as a separate building.

And so that's why I was just kind of toying with the idea of looking at this as if it were two different lots, because they could do the flat, as a matter-of-right, and then if the side yard or I guess what is actually the rear yard, the way you have laid the -- drawn the plans were associated with the smaller structure, it would seem to me that the lot area requirement would be met. And I'm looking to Mr. Jesick over there for a little help here.

MR. JESICK: If the lots existed-if they were two separate lots today, they
could do up to four units as a matter-of-

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

right. However, in order to achieve the
subdivision at the present time, they would
need variances to minimum lot area and
probably some other things, which I can't
think of off the top of my head. And who
knows whether that would be an easier variance
to grant or not. It's hard to say without
knowing exactly what relief would be needed.
MEMBER WALKER: So they would still
need a lot area variance if the rear yard were
associated with the smaller structure?
MR. JESICK: Well, because the R-4
District has a minimum lot size of, I believe,
I want to say, 1,800 square feet, just off the
top of my head.
MR. GOINS: It's 1,800 square feet.
And they have a minimum lot width as well.
MR. JESICK: So I think if you
subdivided those properties, they would not
meet the 1,800 square foot minimum.

meet the width either, the minimum lot area

MR. GOINS: I don't think we would

width. You know, one of the reasons I think I was calling that a side yard, the actual address is on T Street for both properties, you know, as 902 and 904 T Street are the two addresses.

MS. MONROE: Just so you know, the minimum lot size and width of lot for an R-4 row dwelling and flat is 1,800 square feet and 18 feet for width, so that's what Mr. -- that's what it is.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Mr. Jesick, so what was your point about they could have four units as a matter-of-right under what circumstances?

MR. JESICK: If the lots -- if the two structures were separated on two different lots today, then they could put in two flats as a matter-of-right. The problem though is doing a subdivision today.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: So the problem is that they don't have enough width. They don't meet that requirement of the square

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

footage requirement?

MR. JESICK: Apparently both. We would have to take a look at the plans.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Okay.

Any other questions? Does the applicant have any questions for the Office of Planning? Do you have a copy of the Office of Planning's report? Okay. Okay.

I talked about the -- well, I asked if the ANC was here and then I said I would get back with respect to their filing. I see in our record we have an Exhibit No. 22 from Commissioner Phillip Spalding. The last line says, well it says, "Writing to update the Board in the ANC's review of the application." And then the last line says "Should the applicant secure a hearing date prior to our November meeting, ANC-1B will not object to the Board's considering this application."

Oh, there is another one?

MR. BROWN: No, there should be an updated letter, because we went to three

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

meetings and they didn't have a quorum.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Oh, that was October.

MR. BROWN: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Thank you.

Our counsel is just giving me the latest.

Okay. That's December 5<sup>th</sup>. They voted 5-0-1

to support the application for variance relief

from 401.3.

And they say they have heard from both the Westminster Neighborhood Association and the Cardozo-Shaw Neighborhood Association, who also support the plan. And they don't see any detriment to the public good. They see it as consistent with the general intent and purpose of the Zoning Regulations and Map. And they mentioned that it has also been vacant for a long period of time.

Okay. Is there anybody here who wishes to testify in support of the application? Anybody who wishes to testify in opposition? Okay. Any closing remarks? Oh,

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

let me make another mention, we do have a letter from Council Member Jim Graham as well, dated January 8, 2009, expressing strong support for the application.

He said this project is what was envisioned when the property was transferred to the Neighborhood Development Company through the District's Home Again Initiative.

NDC's proposal, let's see, "It was competitively bid and lawfully accepted by DHCD and ODMPED develop and was to the property as a three unit building and all parties concerned, including the District NDC, their design consultants and their financial have been working with this partners understanding for the last two years.

To go back to the drawing board now would destroy all prospects from moving ahead with the project in these difficult economic times."

Then he mentions the importance of the affordable housing. And he says that "The

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Home Again Initiative of Affordable Housing requirement is one of the practical difficulties for NDC in developing this site, since at least one of the units must be affordable. Decreasing the unit count to two would irreparably weaken the economics of the project."

Okay. Okay. Do Board Members see any other documents in the record that they want to highlight? I guess I would, in going through the file, I mean, I would like to reference I guess, since September, the Office of Planning was quite concerned about the condition of the property, noting that the historic existing structure is in very bad condition.

This was actually referencing the applicant's characterization, but "The roof on both buildings has failed, the floor supports at 904 T Street have collapsed and the building condition continues to deteriorate."

MR. GOINS: I think that was an

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	attempt to get an
2	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Expedited
3	hearing.
4	MR. GOINS: hearing, yeah.
5	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I think it
6	just buttresses though your point about the
7	bad condition of the property and the
8	significance of or the urgency in restoring
9	it, because of its historic nature.
10	MR. GOINS: Yeah, to kind of also
11	put on the record, we have gone through the
12	third-party permit process and we have
13	historic sign-offs and I mean, we were I
14	think construction was ready to begin in the
15	fall to start working on this project, so this
16	has here we are.
17	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Do you
18	have any final remarks?
19	MR. GOINS: Thank you for your
20	consideration.
21	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: All right. I
22	think that the Board is ready to deliberate on

this.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: Madam Chair, bear with me as I just pull together some papers. This is a very interesting project and it has, while it is not overly complex, some complexities to it. So as I articulate why I'm going to be supporting it, bear with me if I'm not completely together on every point of the matter.

But I would like to move for approval of Application No. 17871 for variance relief under our section 3103, to allow for the development of a three unit condo at what has been described as 902 T Street, 904 T Street where the project does not meet the requirements of our Rule 401.3 requiring at least 900 square feet of area for each unit on the lot.

And although we have two structures, and there has been some discussion about how that came to be, we are all in agreement that there is a single lot here. So

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

that would be my motion.

Now, in terms of sort of setting out the variance test and why I'm supporting approval of the application, we, essentially, have two different buildings on a single lot. Two buildings that don't articulate with each other at all. They have different floor plans. And the lot itself is 1,529.5 square feet.

Our rules, as I indicated, would require a minimum lot area of 2,700 square feet in order to do three units. And this cannot meet that requirement. So what the applicant would like to do is to create two units on the larger portion of the building of about 1,300 square feet each and then one unit at about 950 square feet, which would be affordable.

In the context of the variance test, the first element requires that there be something unique or exceptional about the property or the circumstances connected to the

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

property that would allow us to grant relief from strict application of our zoning requirements.

And in this case, what I think is unique is that there is actually a legal binding agreement with the District of Columbia Government, the Department of Housing and Community Development that requires this applicant to develop three units on this site, including one that is affordable, and that's evidenced by Exhibit F of an agreement that not itself have exhibit does an because it was just handed to us today, but it is a part of our record.

Now, I think it is alluded to as well in a letter by Council Member Jim Graham.

And certainly was a part of a lot of the testimony that came out today regarding both the existence of this agreement and the evolution of how the applicant got to that agreement with the Department of Housing and Community Development.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

So for one, I think that is unique. I think you -- not every single piece of property that is going to come before us is a property that was under the control of the District of Columbia Government that was then sold by the District of Columbia Government to a developer as part of a competitive process requiring that developer to yield three units from it and make of units one those affordable. I think that's a confluence of unique factors with respect to this property.

did Secondly, hear we conversation about some testimony and conversation about the uniqueness of the property itself in terms of the floor plates being and that necessitating uneven tremendous expense if one were to try create a single structure on this property where there would be articulation between the two separate buildings, because one would have to connect the two buildings with the uneven floor plates.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

In addition to which, we have seen the pictures on the record showing the current condition of the property and the tremendous that would be involved expense trying to marketable restore the property to а condition. So when one adds those factors to the already existing reality of this LDA agreement on the record, these, I think, are a confluence of factors that make it a unique situation.

With respect practical to difficulty, testimony have from the we applicant that this property would in all likelihood remain vacant if relief were not to be granted. And certainly in the case of this applicant, he would have to abandon project. He could not do it without the relief that he is seeking here today.

I think also that for him to -- for us not to give relief would, in effect, require this applicant to breach his agreement with the District of Columbia Government,

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

because again, he is duty bound by this agreement to yield these three units on this site.

With respect to substantial detriment to the public good, I think we have testimony from the Office of Planning in their report which is our Exhibit 25, that there is no substantial detriment to the public good. We also have the ANC report, which is our Exhibit 23, that there is no substantial detriment to the public good.

And with respect to impairment of the Zone Plan and/or Regs and Map, we again have testimony through the regular report of the Office of Planning that there is no substantial impairment to the Zone Plan or Regs.

So for all of those reasons, I am in support of the application. I'll defer to other Members of the Board.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Thank you. I think that was very comprehensive. And I'll

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

just add that as I was saying to the Office of Planning, that the Court cases that have considered exceptional conditions under variance relief have said that the Board can consider the situation, the improvements on the property, not just the topography of the property, and things like zoning history.

And I think that this case, as Mr. Loud said, does involve somewhat of a confluence of factors. You know, the fact that there is this agreement with the District of Columbia, that doesn't necessarily bind the Board, but it is a factor for the Board to consider that the three units is something that was required in the agreement by another arm of the District of Columbia.

And that there is this history that all the parties have been working with us for over two years and very significantly, that it seems to be in the public interest. There doesn't seem to be any other feasible even alternatives.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

We have a property here that has been vacant for a long time. And we have an applicant who is going to be building on it restoring a historic property, which is in the public interest, and providing affordable housing in the public interest.

And even though we don't have a proforma, I am convinced that the information that we do have in the record is sufficient to conclude that if we denied the relief, it wouldn't be economically feasible to restore the property, you know, especially in a way that would provide affordable housing and preserve the historic features.

So I will support this motion as well. Others?

MEMBER WALKER: Madam Chair, I will also be supporting the motion. I am less persuaded by this argument about this agreement with the District of Columbia, only because the agreement sort of contemplates that the covenants may be amended. It is the

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

case that we had testimony about the fact that the prices that are listed in Exhibit F will likely change.

But I do agree that the property is unique because there are two structures on one lot. And while if it were the case that this were two lots, we wouldn't even be here, because they could do a flat as a matter-of-right and there would be a nonconforming single-family row house on the other property.

And as the Office of Planning has pointed out, I mean, there are variance -- there would be variances required for them to subdivide. But just in looking at this the way this -- these two structures were obviously constructed and intended to be used, we are -- the applicant is taking us back to the way that the property was erected in the first place.

And so they could do two units in the larger structure as a matter-of-right as a flat. And so for that reason, I think that

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the public interest here really tips the scale. I mean, they are doing a wonderful project by bringing this blighted property, you know, back into service, back into good use.

And I think that the fact that there will be an affordable unit as a part of the project is tremendous and the applicant should be commended.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Any other comments?

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Madam Chair, I am in an awkward position, since I voted on strengthening the original Zoning Commission Regs for doing -- for exactly -- I'm in the position that the Office of Planning is recommending not approval, which involves strengthening 401.1, 401.3 and 401.11.

So I think in this particular case, I think I am, as Ms. Walker already stated, not so as moved by the agreement. I think the

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

agreement is annoying. That an agency can put something in and kind of steer something a certain way without looking at the Zoning Regs.

But I think that the site does offer some unique aspects: Two structures on it, the fact that the floors will not align, that it is a party wall that is probably 12 inches or more thick, so there is a structural aspect of trying to combine them.

But I would agree with Ms. Walker's analysis of it. I think that the -- there is a uniqueness to this that is perhaps not as evident as when you first look at it, but once you get into it, you can see that there are some aspects to it that we normally don't get into.

So as reluctant as I am, I will vote approval.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Now, I think we have all commented. Mr. Loud, did you actually make a motion or did you just

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	begin the discussion on this?
2	VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: I did make a
3	motion. I would be happy to make it again if
4	it's helpful, but I did move.
5	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. I don't
6	believe you moved approval, correct?
7	VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: Um-hum.
8	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Of the
9	application. I don't believe then it has been
10	seconded yet, so I will second that. Is there
11	further deliberation?
12	All those in favor say aye.
13	ALL: Aye.
14	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: All those
15	opposed? All those abstaining? Would you
16	call the vote, please?
17	MS. BAILEY: The vote is recorded
18	as 4-0-1 to grant the application. Mr. Loud
19	made the motion, Mrs. Miller seconded, Mr.
20	Turnbull and Mrs. Walker support the motion.
21	Mr. Dettman is not present at this time.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. And as

there is no party in opposition in this case, this can be a summary order.

MS. BAILEY: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: So you will be getting your order fairly soon. Okay. Thank you.

Okay. The Board has been going pretty continuously since about 9:30 this morning, so we're going to take about, approximately, a 20 minute break. We have two cases left on the agenda. So that's what we are going to do. So you all feel free to go and come back, whatever you want to do, but it will be 20 minutes or so. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the Public Hearing was recessed at 3:23 p.m. to reconvene at 4:14 p.m. this same day.)

18

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

1

2

4

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

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

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

4:14 p.m.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. We're back on the record. I believe, Ms. Bailey, that we are ready for Case No. 17867, Baby Land Development. Okay.

MS. BAILEY: Yes, Madam Chair. Application 17867 of Baby Land Development Center, pursuant to 11 DCMR 3104.1, for a special exception to establish a child development center, that's 40 children and 6 staff, under section 205 at premises 4628 H Street, S.E. The property is Zone R-2. It is located in Square 5359 on Lot 328.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Good afternoon. Sorry that you have had such a long wait today. It was kind of an unusual day. Why don't we start with your introducing yourself for the record, please?

MS. MANLEY: My name is Victoria Manley. I reside at 4628 H Street, S.E., Washington, D.C.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: And is anybody
2	here from the ANC? Okay. Why don't you come
3	forward for a minute and introduce yourself
4	for the record as the ANC is automatically a
5	party in these applications.
6	MS. HAMLET: Good evening. My name
7	is Rosa Hamlet and I reside at 503 53 <sup>rd</sup> Street,
8	S.E.
9	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Let me just
10	ask you, do we have a report from the ANC in
11	this case? Oh, yes, I see it. I see we do
12	have a report.
13	MS. HAMLET: I didn't hear you,
14	ma'am.
15	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: We have a
16	report from the ANC.
17	MS. HAMLET: Yes.
18	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Dated December
19	22 <sup>nd</sup> .
20	MS. HAMLET: Yes.
21	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. So we
22	will hear from the applicant first and then if

you have any questions of the applicant, you will have an opportunity to ask. Okay. So if you want to sit where you are, that's fine. There is plenty of room at the table or if you want to sit in the audience and come back if you have any questions, whatever works for you is fine. Okay. All right.

Now, you are here for a special exception.

MS. MANLEY: Yes, ma'am. for a special permission to expand my existing infant and toddler child care. The intended use of the property at 4628 H Street is to have an infant and toddler child development The center will provide center. education, supervision and guidance for infant per day, toddlers 10.5 hours and Monday through Friday.

The building will contain necessary use such as office space, classroom, kitchen, recreation activity area and a sick room.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. And you

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

are coming in under section 205 of the Zoning Regulations, correct?

MS. MANLEY: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: So you say you have an existing child development center?

MS. MANLEY: Yes, ma'am. I have a home child development center. I have had it for seven years. We are only allowed to have 5. I have an infant, so I only have 4. I felt a need in my community for infants especially. Also, I have a good friend and she has her center at First Rock, which is not far from my home.

And we have a list, a waiting list for infants, so I decided to ask for special permission to have more than 5.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. It sounds like you didn't exactly have a child development center under 205. You have probably had another type of child center that didn't require special exception under 205.

MS. MANLEY: Right.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: As a child
2	development center.
3	MS. MANLEY: Um-hum.
4	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. So if
5	we look at 205 for the requirements that you
6	need to meet, do you have a copy of that, our
7	Regulations 205?
8	MS. MANLEY: No, I don't think so.
9	No, I don't, ma'am, no.
10	MS. BAILEY: Madam Chair, she has
11	the Office of Planning's report and I think
12	that it should be outlined in OP's report.
13	MR. JACKSON: Madam Chair, I just
14	wanted to highlight too that in her submittal,
15	she actually goes through each one of the
16	provisions. So if you want to just read from
17	your submittal?
18	MS. MANLEY: Okay. Mr. Jackson
19	asked to give further clarification of
20	addendums and one was the anticipated client
21	population.

MR. JACKSON: No, I'm sorry, the

original submittal, your original application. MS. MANLEY: Oh. JACKSON: It actually went MR. through each one of the provisions if you wanted to give that --CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. I don't necessarily need her to re-read it, to read it, but let's pull it and have it before us. Do you have an Exhibit No. on that? 10 MS. MONROE: It's Exhibit No. 4. CHAIRPERSON MILLER: 4, okay. And 11 then you are also saying that you submitted 12 13 further documentation to respond to Office of Planning's concerns? 14 MS. MANLEY: Yes. 15 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I just want to 16 get that all in front of us. 17 MS. MANLEY: There was 18 concern about client population, child drop-off and 19 during peak 20 pick-up hours, playground accessory, in turn playground facility, the 21 collection and 22 refuse other child

facilities in my community.

In reference to the client population, the -- I can't determine a capacity until a feasible survey is done by DCRA.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Now, we do make determinations here with respect to numbers though, as far as -- I understand what you are saying, they are the ones that make the ultimate capacity, but you are here seeking a certain number of students. I mean, not student, I'm sorry, number of children and number of staff. Is that right? Within what you believe the building certain can accommodate?

MS. MANLEY: That's correct. From my measurements and the DCMR 29, it's 38, 35 square feet per child. And from my measurements, it was 38 children. I initially applied for 15, but I was told if I were given 20, I would have to redo the application over again, so that's what I was trying to avoid

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

with the number of 40.

I'm not sure if I'll even get 38 with DCRA, but I just didn't want to go through the application of zoning again. So I don't know how many children I'll be allowed to have.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: But how many children are you seeking to have with respect to getting permission from this Board to have?

Because that is something that we usually set, the number of children.

MS. MANLEY: If I can have 38, I would take 38. I would be appreciative to get 38. That's what I'm asking for.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. So if you are asking for 38, now, can you explain why your building and, you know, your staff can accommodate 38 children? And what ages would they be?

MS. MANLEY: I wanted to do infant and toddler. I have it set up, the program set up for baby languages from 6 weeks to 18

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

months. And then I have Tod-World, which will be from 18 months to about 2.5 to 3. And then in the second floor, I have Kid Zone, which will be 3 and 4 year-olds.

I have to have two staff for each room, which consists of a teacher and assistant. I have in place that staff, one with a degree in Kid Zone and the other two in Baby Land and in the Tod-World, they have their CDA.

I also have in place a Spanish teacher that will come in on Tuesdays and Thursdays and also Ms. Erica, she does sign language. She will come in on Monday and Wednesdays. I will be there all day, Monday through Friday, to make sure it is operated safely.

So I'm not looking to hire someone to do this for me. I want to do it myself. You know, I feel that in being in this seven years, there is a -- you know, toddlers are basically individuals that learn through

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

interaction and I want to create that type of environment for them, a safe environment.

I also want to create a stimulation environment as well, you know, through educational curriculum that is both physically challenging and mentally stimulating in an atmosphere that strives to make learning an enjoyable adventure for them.

I have received everything possible to maintain a good child care center. My CDA, I'll graduate in May with my degree in early childhood education specializing in infant and toddlers. I have accreditation for my home and I'm CPR/First Aid, you name it, I have it. So I'm planning to do this with my center as well.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: How many staff do you anticipate to serve 38 children?

MS. MANLEY: Six staff, six staff, including myself, seven.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: So it's one staff for every six plus?

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	MS. MANLEY: I think infants there
2	is it's two staff for each child care
3	setting room. If I have eight infants, I'll
4	need two staff. Even if I have one and I
5	become a center, I'll still have to have two
6	staff. So there will be two staff in each
7	room. Two staff persons in each room.
8	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Do you have 17
9	rooms?
10	MS. MANLEY: No, ma'am.
11	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.
12	MS. MANLEY: I have one, two,
13	three.
14	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Not 17. 19?
15	MS. MANLEY: 19 rooms?
16	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: You said two
17	staff and 38 kids? Two staff for each room?
18	MS. MANLEY: Well, not for I'm
19	talking about 38 as a whole. I'm not like
20	I said, I'm not sure if they will give me 38.
21	I'm looking at 8 infants. I'll have to have
22	two staff. They are not going to put 38 in

one room. 12 toddlers, two staff. Kid Zone, I'm not sure. I think it's still 35 feet. I want to say I measured 15, two staff.

I'm not sure yet if they are going to let me have that many in one room. And DCRA wouldn't come out without the zoning permit to let me know the information. So whatever the rules and regulations are with the DCMR 29, then that's what I'll go by.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Why don't we look at -- you talked about addressing concerns raised by Office of Planning.

MS. MANLEY: Oh, yes. Office of Planning had questions in regard to the capacity, in which I just stated I don't know the capacity. They had concerns with drop-off and pick-up during peak hours.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Did you address that?

MS. MANLEY: Yes, I did. I had letters from 4618 to 26, those neighbors.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

They --

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: They said that you could use their driveways?

MS. MANLEY: Yeah. I'm not saying to use their driveways, but they have all been really good in working with me and we have letters from them and they don't see it as a problem, because they work. So they are not there during my hours, my drop-off and pick-up hours. So they are not seeing a problem with it.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: What time are your drop-offs and pick-ups?

MS. MANLEY: 7:30 to 9:00 and then from 3:00 to 6:00 is when they normally come in. I've been working for 7 years and they don't come in as early as 3:00, but if they do, they normally are in close to the time we close, 5:30, 6:00.

They have been -- my neighbors have been really generous in offering me their driveways, but I have no intent on

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

inconveniencing them in any way. I have plans to have someone or myself to stand out to make sure that there is no blockage of driveways. And if we do use a driveway, that we will make sure the child is in and out.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: How about your parking?

MS. MANLEY: I have -- we have offparking street and Ι have а three car driveway. The teachers that I have is -- I haven't talked to the Office of Planning. mean, the Office of Aging and Mr. Thomas in reference to hiring some people from his office about their traveling, but there is a bus that runs, a bus stop directly in front of the property, every 12 minutes. So the people that I had planned on hiring are going to use that as transportation, because it's convenient.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: So you have a driveway that can accommodate three cars? Is that what you said?

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	MS. MANLEY: Yes, ma'am.
2	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: And then
3	MS. MANLEY: Yes, ma'am.
4	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: was there
5	any other off-street parking or is that it?
6	MS. MANLEY: Yeah, you have off
7	we have off-street parking.
8	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: What is it?
9	What do you have?
10	MS. MANLEY: Public parking.
11	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Oh, do you
12	mean on-street?
13	MS. MANLEY: Public parking.
14	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: You have on-
15	street parking?
16	MS. MANLEY: There is on-street.
17	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Yeah, I know.
18	It is confusing.
19	MS. MANLEY: Okay.
20	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: But so you're
21	just saying there is spaces on the street
22	MS. MANLEY: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: -- that the public is allowed to use for parking.

MS. MANLEY: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. So you have three on your property.

MS. MANLEY: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: And then, okay. And your testimony is that they are pretty available on the street?

MS. MANLEY: Oh, yeah.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Did
Office of Planning have some other concerns
you were responding to?

MS. MANLEY: Yes, they did. They have concerns with the playground, in which I thought was helpful. I was -- my plans were to, the playground is about a block away, have the kids to walk to the playground at the school, Davis Elementary School. But as they were saying that there is no sidewalk, which there aren't, they will have to cross the street.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

So what I have done and actually we
started today was I asked the Government for
D.C. General's Playground, because it wasn't
in use, but they decided to give me the one
from DC Village, which is very nice. So we
are today we started putting that in place.
So we have a playground right there on the
property.
CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. And is
that going to be next to any residential
property or anything?
MS. MANLEY: Yeah. Well, I'm next
to residential property, but it will be in my
backyard. It won't be in their
CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Do you have
neighbors on each side?
MS. MANLEY: property. Yes, I
do.
CHAIRPERSON MILLER: And do they
know that the playground equipment is going to
be in the backyard?

MS. MANLEY: Oh, yes, um-hum.

I

have playground equipment already in the front
yard, but it is for little kids. So the one
that we are putting in the backyard that they
are donating can accommodate 3 and 4 year-
olds. It's not very big, but they had no
problem in me putting it, actually, they
wanted it there, you know.
CHAIRPERSON MILLER: The neighbors
wanted it there?
MS. MANLEY: Yeah, because I'm not
going to be there on weekends, so they asked
me if they could use it, you know, if they
have events, which is fine with me, as long as
they ask for permission first.
CHAIRPERSON MILLER: And are these
neighbors there during the week?
MS. MANLEY: During the week?
CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Yes.
MS. MANLEY: Yes, they yeah.
CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I mean, they
are there or are they at work?

MS. MANLEY: The one to the right

of me is at work. The one to the left, also has a day care, a home day care. CHAIRPERSON Oh, okay, MILLER: Because sometimes we have situations okay. where child development centers are in homes and they are next to other homes and sometimes in those other homes there are people who work out of their homes and then they find the noise from the children to be disruptive to 10 them. MS. MANLEY: I can understand that. 11 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: So that's kind 12 of why I'm asking, because we look at impacts 13 on neighboring properties. 14 MS. MANLEY: Okay. 15 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: So what you 16 are saying is you don't have that problem in 17 your situation, because one side is working 18 and the other side has day care anyway. 19 20 MS. MANLEY: That's correct, yes. CHAIRPERSON MILLER: 21 Okay. MS. And then there is 22 MANLEY:

letters in my packet that -- my neighbors, all of them work except the one next to me and at the end. All of us do child care. But everybody else is at work.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.

MS. MANLEY: So there is letters stating that they are not home during the hours.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.

MS. MANLEY: During those hours.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I think one of Office of Planning's concerns might have been that there is another child development center within 1,000 feet.

MS. MANLEY: Yes, that's --

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: And that's your friend? Is that right?

MS. MANLEY: Yes. We're graduating this year in May and there should be a letter, Joseph W. King is the name of the building. The center is First Rock. There should be a letter stating that she has an overflow. We

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

talk about it all the time. And you know, recommending that I do open infant/toddler, because there is really need where we are. CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. And were there other points that you responded to or have we covered them? MANLEY: The collection was MS. brought to my attention and I was encouraged 10 by Waste Management --11 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: MS. MANLEY: -- Ms. Russell, to go 12 13 on-line and find -- contact a solid waste hauler in which I did. And it was Ace Trash 14 Removal, which is really conducive with this 15 mom/pop type of waste/trash removal. And I 16 talked to him, so I think that's who I'll go 17 with if I decide to open it. 18 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: And how often 19 will they collect the trash? 20 MS. MANLEY: Twice a week. 21

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

CHAIRPERSON MILLER:

22

Twice, okay.

So you won't be going to an off-site play area any more, right? MS. MANLEY: No, huh-uh. CHAIRPERSON MILLER: All right. I was planning to MS. MANLEY: No. bring you guys pictures of them starting, but on Wednesday and Thursday of last week when he was supposed to start, it rained, so couldn't do the holes in the concrete, but he 10 did send a letter and signed it that they had started today, as far as the playground is 11 concerned. 12 13 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Okay. Are there other Board questions? 14 VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: Good 15 afternoon. 16 MS. MANLEY: Hi, Mr. Loud. 17 VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: Α quick 18 question for you. I'm looking at what is 19 Exhibit No. 6 in our package that is prepared 20 for us. I don't know if you actually have 21 these pictures. 22

1	MS. MANLEY: Yes, I do.
2	VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: Okay. Now,
3	this picture on the top, what is this a
4	picture of?
5	MS. MANLEY: That was the
6	playground area that I was intending to use
7	before they came out
8	VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: Oh, all right.
9	I gotcha. Okay.
10	MS. MANLEY: and encouraged me
11	to do something different.
12	VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: Okay. All
13	right. I just wanted to be clear on that.
14	Okay. Thank you.
15	MS. MANLEY: You're welcome.
16	VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: And one other
17	thing, when you said that you won't be there
18	on weekends, you mean the day care facility
19	MS. MANLEY: Yeah, I
20	VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: won't be
21	open on weekends or that you physically would
22	not be at 4628 on weekends?

1	MS. MANLEY: Both, both. I plan to
2	use it solely as infant and toddler center. I
3	won't be there on weekends, because we won't
4	be open on weekends.
5	VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: So do you live
6	is this your residence?
7	MS. MANLEY: I currently live here
8	now.
9	VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: All right.
10	MS. MANLEY: But we are planning to
11	move.
12	VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: I see.
13	MS. MANLEY: Um-hum.
14	VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: Okay. All
15	right. Thank you.
16	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Actually, I
17	have one other question. The Board, at least,
18	got yesterday a package of letters from
19	neighbors and from community directors. Okay.
20	In one of my letters, there is a hand
21	well, they are email messages. And then at

the bottom it says "I asked DOT to conduct an  $\,$ 

analysis to see how my parents and children can get in my center safely. This was their response to may call."

I don't know if that's what you wrote.

MS. MANLEY: Yes, that's what I wrote.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.

MS. it MANLEY: Because was encouraged that I would have someone, traffic analyst to come out to see how -whether I would use homes or we will put signs that will have you out and I wasn't really successful, because DOT, Ms. Glenda Payne, sent me to James Murphy. James Murphy sent me to Ali Shakur. It was ongoing until I got a message from Mr. A-N-D-A-R-G-H-I, which stated that it wasn't their place to come out and do an analyst. It was up to BZA. Let me see if I can find that for you.

Here it is. He sent an email saying that he spoke to his colleagues and

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Office of Planning. They said BZA ruling is outside OP's jurisdiction. One guy said I needed to pay for someone to come out and see how they could ingress and egress out safely.

So I only have the email from Mr.

A-N-D-A-R-G-H-I and he was saying that whatever BZA requests of the applicant is up

to the applicant to field in this case. He don't believe OP is responsible to conduct a traffic analysis, so I was -- that's where I

was as far as the analyst is concerned.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Yeah, I just wanted to make sure that I wasn't missing something, such as, you know --

MS. MANLEY: Yeah, that --

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: -- a response from DDOT that is saying oh, this is what you should do. So you never got that?

MS. MANLEY: No.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. And is there anything else you want to add, at this point?

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MS. MANLEY: No. I thank you for hearing my case.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Well, you stay right there.

MS. MANLEY: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Now, are there other Board questions?

MEMBER WALKER: Just one, Madam Chair. You have probably given some thought, even though you haven't had someone to come in and do a formal analysis of what your pick-up and drop-off procedure will be. So if you could just walk us through what will happen when a parent comes by car, let's say, to the site.

MS. MANLEY: I plan to be there initially, at least for the first year, to see how it is flowing, to make sure that I'm not inconveniencing my neighbors. And if I should have to because, you know, normally during drop-off and pick-up peak hours, they are gone. There is no -- you know, the parent can

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

bring the child in and I can get the child or they can take it in and I can watch the car if they are in the driveway.

But usually, all 15 is not going to come in at one time. I'm sure of that. But if they come in with a car, I'll be there. I'll be standing there to make sure it's safe to park here, make sure that if the neighbors are home, okay, you can park here and take your child in. You know, so I will definitely not inconvenience them in any kind of way. And I will stand out there personally, at least for the first year, to see how traffic is going in and out and how I can make it safe.

MEMBER WALKER: So currently, your parents pull into your driveway to drop-off?

MS. MANLEY: Yes, ma'am. They pull into the driveway or you should have -- they pull in front of the house, which is offstreet parking. Pull in front of the house, because we have a lot of that, because we have

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

three car driveway, so there is, you know, always parking there.

MEMBER WALKER: And the same is true for pick-up in the afternoon? They pull into the driveway to load the children?

MS. MANLEY: Right, right, they can.

MEMBER WALKER: And then what's the location of these neighbors' driveways that you propose to use?

MS. MANLEY: Well, the neighbor to the right of me doesn't have a car at all, which is Mr. Weil, Leonard. You should have a letter from them. But all of us are next door to each other. There is two conjoining, then — there is two conjoining houses. One driveway is on one side and one is on the other side. So they are right there in a row. There is no driveways on the other side of the street. Everybody is right here in a row to the east of me.

Let me show you a picture. Let me

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	see if I can find a picture.
2	MEMBER WALKER: So in Exhibit 6
3	that shows
4	MS. MANLEY: Here we I don't
5	know if you can see.
6	MEMBER WALKER: Right.
7	MS. MANLEY: This is my driveway.
8	This is the conjoining house and her driveway
9	is on the other side. But the letters I got
10	are from this house all the way down to the
11	middle of the block. I didn't go that way. ]
12	went this way. These neighbors don't have a
13	car, not that they would never get a car, but
14	they have no really have no problem with me
15	bringing the children in from their driveway.
16	MEMBER WALKER: Okay. So we are
17	actually looking at two driveways in this
18	MS. MANLEY: We're looking at
19	no, we're looking at, I think you have, five
20	letters, six letters.
21	MEMBER WALKER: In Exhibit 6, the
22	picture that you just referenced with the red

car.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MS. MANLEY: No, this one driveway where my car is holds three cars. The driveway beside me, which is here, holds three cars. So yeah, we're looking at two which can hold six cars at a time. You are right.

MEMBER WALKER: Thank you.

MS. MANLEY: You're welcome.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I thought you talked about how you didn't expect all 15 to come at one time or something. So what does that 15 represent? Are you talking about 15 children?

MS. MANLEY: Yes. All 15 --

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: You're not talking about --

MS. MANLEY: -- vehicles.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: -- 38 children, I mean?

MS. MANLEY: I'm -- as far as parking and drop-off and pick-up, I'm talking about vehicles. I have four and all -- three

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

of them catch the Metro. There are young moms that catch the Metro, so they get off the Metro and get back on. Only one that is -- she drives and she is older. So I was thinking about 15 vehicles being there at one time. Not 15 children.

MEMBER WALKER: So you anticipate that most of your clients will utilize public transportation and that only 15 are likely to drive?

MS. MANLEY: No. Um, my community, most of them probably will public transportation because of the Actually, since I have convenience. parents have working, used public transportation to my home, because it's really convenient.

I don't know how many will use public transportation. So that's why I said I want to be out there initially for the first year to see how it is -- how traffic is going and coming during my peak hours as far as

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	making sure my kids get in there safely.
2	MEMBER WALKER: Right. We're just
3	trying to figure out how you came up with the
4	number 15 when you are talking about 38
5	children.
6	MS. MANLEY: Oh, well, that's just
7	a roundabout number. I'm just saying I don't
8	think it will be that many vehicles coming
9	into the driveway at one time.
10	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. So
11	you're saying it's not necessarily there
12	might be more than 15 vehicles even, but they
13	are not going to come at the same time. Is
14	that your point?
15	MS. MANLEY: Right, yes.
16	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: You can
17	accommodate 15 at one time?
18	MS. MANLEY: Can I? You said can
19	I?
20	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Yes.
21	MS. MANLEY: I didn't hear your
22	question.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Yes, yes.

MS. MANLEY: Of course, then I'll have to use the driveways, you know, because in front of 246, there can be eight cars parked off-street.

MS. MANLEY: Right.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.

MS. MANLEY: On my side that's eight and then the two driveways, which is my driveway and the next door neighbor driveway, there is six cars. So you know, I can accommodate probably 15 at one time, but I'm not seeing this happening.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. All right. We got it. Thank you. Okay. Any other questions? Does the ANC have any questions for the applicant? Okay. You're not on the record though, do you want to say that on the record? Okay. Yeah, you --

MS. HAMLET: They --

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: And I'm not
2	asking for your testimony, at this point. I
3	just want to know if you have any questions
4	for her?
5	MS. HAMLET: We have no questions.
6	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. So you
7	can
8	MS. HAMLET: Because they asked her
9	a lot of questions.
10	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.
11	MS. HAMLET: And they have been
12	answered.
13	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Good.
14	All right. We will call you when it is your
15	turn to testify.
16	MS. HAMLET: Okay.
17	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: We've got to
18	go to Office of Planning first.
19	MS. HAMLET: Okay.
	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Thanks.
20	CHAIRPERSON WILLIER. Oray. Illains.
20 21	Okay. Mr. Jackson?

Chairman and Members of the Board. My name is Arthur Jackson. I'm a Development Review Specialist with the District of Columbia Office of Planning.

And on this case, you have a report before you and I will be very brief in my presentation.

The applicant -- I met the applicant on the site and she was kind enough to show me around. At that time, the child care -- the building was in the process of being converted to full-time use as a child development center. And the major elements that were missing are the ones that are outlined in my report.

I raised concerns about the -confirming that the play area would be on-site
and be ready for use by the time the child
care center opened because of the distance
between this building and the elementary
school and the fact the children would have to
cross the street two times coming and going.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

The applicant responded to that by initiating the installation of the new facility and we talked about having it ready by the hearing date, but apparently it's moving right along, so that addressed that concern.

There was also the cumulative impact of this proposed center with the existing First Rock Baptist Church Development Center at the Joseph W. King Senior Center. At this point, it appears that that center where all of their functions in a manner children come off the street, that is the pick-up and deliveries are done off-street on the site. But I have no real fact -- no information about that. So that is not fully addressed at this time.

She has made provisions to take care of the cumulative -- accumulated refuse associated with the center and that is being handled twice a week. And she has got -- I assume you will have the correct containers to

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

keep the materials in and all.

But I think the real concern we had, and I guess it's up to you to decide whether or not it has been addressed or not, is that it's just so unclear about what the jump from 5 to 40, what impact that will have on the community. But I will say that I'm very impressed by the fact that the applicant has gone out and talked to all of her neighbors, told them what she plans to do and that so many turned in letters of support.

We were trying to do a little map with dots showing where all the letters were, all responses were, but we didn't have time to get all the dots on before this hearing. But the pattern appeared to be that if you look at the map that is attached to the Office of Planning report, the last map that shows more of an aerial view of the site and highlights the distance between this property and the --it's Exhibit 2.

It highlights the distance between

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

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

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

this property and the child care center at Adelaide Davis Elementary School, of course, this map is north and south. You see the site and based on the pattern of the dots that came in that were positive or for the center, the neighbors to the west of her in every house, virtually every house, indicated that they were supportive.

And the neighbors across on Hannah Place, that's the street just north of the property, there were a number of letters of support from those neighbors. The neighbors who were opposed to the center were on the south side of the street and they were surrounding H -- no, I'm sorry, 16<sup>th</sup> -- 46<sup>th</sup> Place, I believe.

So that there was solid support on the north side of the center -- north side of H Street. Then of course, there was a letter of support from the management of the center at the Joseph W. King Center.

So the pattern was that the folks

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

who had the most experience with the existing center were supportive of the expansion.

But again, our concern still was that we didn't know how the drop-off and pick-up would be managed. And the applicant has done, I guess, all they could do without a consultant coming in and doing an extensive study. We encouraged her to contact the Department of Transportation to see if they would look into the matter.

I didn't -- I don't know -- there have been other applications where the Department of Transportation has sent out representatives who have done analysis of the centers, but those were in -- in retrospect, those were large facilities. Those were large facilities that were already controversial and that were in a much more compact area.

I guess the complications in this situation is that this is a fairly -- this appears to be a fairly busy street with the regular bus line that runs every few minutes.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

There is no sidewalk on the north side of the street. It is manageable, just not a clear plan of how it could be managed.

So that's the only caution we have, because, based on the conversations with the applicant and the effort she puts forth to make this thing work, make this project work, we think there is sincerity here and that she has done about all you can do in terms of contacting her neighbors and letting them know what can be done.

That said, there is still intangibles that may not be able we determine without doing extensive transportation study. So if the Board was to decide to move forward on this project and it may be prudent for a trial period, maybe a short term of approval, because based on the applicant's discussion, our discussions, don't think the intent was to open up a 40 person center initially.

The goal was to get approval such

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that the ultimate capacity that the center could handle, would be allowed to handle could be accommodated on site, so that it would be an incremental increase up to that period. The time period -- since there is a back log of students in the -- of children in the area who need service, that time period could be fairly short.

But we would think that once, as the applicant illustrated, as the -- it opens and it begins to function and it's in -- the cooperation of the neighbors holds up, that this could -- the actual pick off and drop-off mechanisms could be worked out over a period of time.

But again, we're not -- if -- we don't have enough information yet to actually endorse the application, but we're saying if the Board decides that it is good to move forward, that the time frame for the approval be such that there will be a reasonable period for which to -- for which it to function and

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

then you could check back to see whether or not this -- the issue of transportation drop-off, pick-up has worked itself out.

So at any rate, that's -- those are the issues that we saw in the application. Again, the primary ones were the -- just how the vehicular and pedestrian circulation generated by this center would work safely.

That concludes a brief summary of the Office of Planning report and we are available to answer questions.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Thank you. It sounds like what you are saying though is there is a question about the safety of the children in drop-off and pick-up, because this operation is on a busy street.

MR. JACKSON: Well, I don't really know if it's busy. Again, we know that there is a regular bus that comes down here on a regular basis, but the site visit, on my site visit, I didn't see that much traffic. But again, that's not a traffic analysis.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

And we -- our expertise is not in the area of transportation. And so we defer to consultants, of course, the Department of Transportation to do that type of analysis and give us their best recommendations. That has not occurred. And so at this point, we don't have enough information to move forward.

Now, keep in mind that based on the residents, least some of at in letters, recommendations that have come forward from the Civic Association, for instance, think it's a very busy street. I think the issue is more that the number of 40 children really is an unknown and it's so much larger than the number that is current there, that the impacts are just -- it's -envisioning the impacts is somewhat difficult.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. I guess it has been my experience that it's not usually such a big deal for DOT to go out and do an assessment for BZA cases. I mean, I'm not sure that we are talking about some

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

complicated traffic analysis. It sounds like we are talking about just somebody with expertise in traffic going to the site and making some assessment and some suggestions. Is that right?

MR. JACKSON: Well, the -- we have contacted DOT and requested some input and we encouraged the applicant to do the same. And to date, we haven't gotten any response.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Okay. We will see what we want to do with that at the conclusion of this hearing. But it's not uncommon for the Board then to make a request and then get a response, if Board Members think it is necessary.

All right. And the other point you are making is that we might want to consider a phase-in in this case with respect to the number of children, because the impact is not clear from a change from 5 children or infants to 40. Is that right?

MR. JACKSON: That would be one

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

option, yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Is there another one that you want us to consider?

MR. JACKSON: I was thinking more in terms of the term of approval.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Term, okay, term.

MR. JACKSON: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: And other than that, the Office of Planning doesn't have any concerns with the application?

MR. JACKSON: Well, the application

-- the applicant has addressed the concerns we raised about the recreation being on-site, about the -- what the accumulated refuse from the center how that would be handled. The cumulative impact of the child care center is something that could also be -- of this center compared with the other facilities is also something that the Department of Transportation could look at.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

But otherwise, I think the applicant -- and we have -- we accept the realization that although the Department of Education, now I guess, has recommended approval of the center, that the actual number of students won't be determined until after there is a formal review. And that review won't occur until they have the proper zoning approval.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I guess that's my other question. That you know, in these proceedings we normally set, you know, number of children and staff. And yet, we're hearing that that's going to be set by the other department, you know, who licenses child development centers.

Do you think we have enough or do you feel comfortable with the number 40?

MR. JACKSON: Well, the applicant actually --

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Based on the information in our record.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. JACKSON: -- said 38, so I --CHAIRPERSON MILLER: 38, 38. MR. JACKSON: -- would say --CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Sorry. MR. JACKSON: -- we don't have any better information to go on than what presented. Again, that could be reconsidered at the term of if there is a shorter term, we should consider it then. It might even be 10 more, who knows. Okay. CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Thank 11 you. Other questions? 12 13 VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: Just one quick Jackson. question, I believe the 14  ${\tt Mr.}$ applicant testified earlier this morning that 15 there was a play center directly across the, 16 not the alleyway, garage. Not the garage, the 17 parking area that one of her neighbor's has. 18 I believe the testimony was that 19 one of her neighbors works during the day, so 20 wouldn't be impacted by potential noise, but 21 that the other neighbor has a child care 22

center. MS. MANLEY: Yes, she has a home child care. VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: Okay. So in light of that, I just wanted to ask you does that change anything in your report, particularly under 205.8, regarding location of these facilities within 1,000 feet or do you want to just leave your report as 10 written? MR. JACKSON: Well, if they are a child care home --12 13 VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: Um-hum. MR. JACKSON: -- that's different 14 from a child care center. I think the 15 16 regulations specifically talk about child care And there is one at the school. 17 centers. There is one in -- I believe -- no, actually, 18 19 the elementary school doesn't have one, just the elementary school. 20 MS. MANLEY: Just --21

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

JACKSON:

Okay.

11

22

This is the

only one that the Department of Education said was in the vicinity, within 1,500 feet. VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: So basically, your -- other than what you have just shared in the exchange with the Chair, your report stands pretty much as written? MR. JACKSON: Right. VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: Okay. The report from the MR. JACKSON: 10 Department of Education said there were two child care homes there. 11 VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: Um-hum. 12 13 MR. JACKSON: But I didn't make reference them, since that's 14 to not specifically addressed in the regulations. 15 VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: Okay. Thank 16 17 you. (Whereupon, at 5:00 p.m. the Public 18 Hearing continued into the evening session.) 19 20

21

О

. .

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

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

#### E-V-E-N-I-N-G S-E-S-S-I-O-N

5:00 p.m.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. I mean, just for the record, we are dealing with a child/elderly development center or a child development center. And in our definitions section of our regulations at 199, there is a child development center and then there is a child development home. And what the applicant was saying is she currently has a child development home, because she has no more than 5 individuals, 15 years of age or less in her care.

And when you go over that threshold, you get into the child development center.

MS. MANLEY: Right.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. All right. Are there other questions? Do you have questions for the Office of Planning?

MS. MANLEY: Yes, I do.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. And do

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

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

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	you have a copy of their report?
2	MS. MANLEY: From the Office of
3	Planning?
4	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Office of
5	Planning.
6	MS. MANLEY: Yes, I do.
7	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Good.
8	MS. MANLEY: Um-hum, um-hum.
9	CROSS EXAMINATION
10	MS. MANLEY: If I was if DCR
11	came in and said I can only have 15 children,
12	would it make a difference as far as ingress
13	and egress?
14	MR. JACKSON: Well, the potential
15	impacts on the street and on your neighbors
16	would be different, of course, because you
17	would have fewer children coming and going.
18	The this also presents so what we would
19	be looking at is the maximum, assuming the
20	that you had less than 38 children.
21	If the BZA were to move forward

with a number of 38 and the Transportation

Department did -- if the Transportation or somebody else did some analysis, based on the number of 38, then, of course, that would be a good circumstance, because there would be significantly less impacts than would be projected and your Transportation Management Plan could accommodate it easily.

So that it would be to your benefit actually.

MS. MANLEY: Um, see, that's the catch-22 I don't know exactly how many I'm allowed to have, so I can't ask for what I don't know. And I don't want to ask for less than what I can have, because I have to do this all over again and I don't want to do that. So --

MEMBER WALKER: Ms. Manley, earlier in your testimony you started to kind of walk through a calculation based on square footage.

MS. MANLEY: Uh-huh.

MEMBER WALKER: What was that calculation?

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MS. MANLEY: In the facility?

MEMBER WALKER: Yes.

MS. MANLEY: It's 35 square feet per child that's allowed in the facility. In the infant/toddler area, if the infants sleep in the same play area, then it's 45 square feet per child. With the toddlers and the 3 and 4 year-olds, school age kids, it's 35 feet per child. But with infant and toddlers, if they are sleeping and they are playing in the same area, it's 45 square feet per child.

MEMBER WALKER: Okay. And the square footage of your facility is what?

MS. MANLEY: Um, I want to say the square footage is 3 -- of the facility, I'm not sure. I'm not going to give you a number and I'm not sure. But the entire square footage of the facility is 3,000. That's including the back and front yard. I think I have -- I'm sure I have it.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Just to clarify though, your 38 figure, that was based

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	on your calculations of what you believe you
2	will be allowed to have, correct?
3	MS. MANLEY: Well, no. I don't
4	know what I'll be allowed to have, like I
5	said, but that's what I measured in the home
6	is 38 children. So when they come in, they
7	might say well, no, you can have only 20, but
8	I don't know how they do it, because even when
9	I went to the center's meeting, they were
10	telling us you may measure one thing, but when
11	we come in, it could be something different.
12	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Okay.
13	So it sounds like you just don't want to
14	under-sell yourself here.
15	MS. MANLEY: Right, right.
16	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: You can always
17	have less, but
18	MS. MANLEY: Right.
19	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.
20	MS. MANLEY: Right.
21	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. And
22	then I think Office of Planning's point is

when whoever is assessing the impact, you know, they may find that usually fewer may have less impact. But we really don't know.

MS. MANLEY: Right.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I mean, DDOT can go out and -- well, if we decide that we need a report from DDOT, we're not going to decide on the number until we get their report or something or you have a chance to respond to it or something like that. So we could come up with a number, based on the evidence in our record, and then, you know, the licensing agency would come up with a definitive number, based on, you know, their regulations.

So we can just make the best judgment, best guess here, you know.

MS. MANLEY: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: That you would like. Does the ANC have any questions for the applicant? Office of Planning, I mean? No? Okay, fine. Okay. We don't have any other

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

questions for Office of Planning, at this point, I don't believe. Okay.

So now, would the ANC like to testify or just rest on the report that you filed? Oh, wait, come to the table for a minute.

MS. HAMLET: When you say testify, what do you mean to testify to?

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.

MS. HAMLET: As to -- because what I did was I followed everything she surrendered, I mean, turned in and I based all of the information that I put in the letter, I based it on what actually happened. So I mean, it's nothing else to -- that I can say, at this point, because she has been keeping me with copies of everything that she does.

So the only thing I can -- I mean, you know, I don't even want to -- I guess, well, you said --

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: You don't need to testify.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MS. HAMLET: Beg your pardon? CHAIRPERSON MILLER: You don't need to. MS. HAMLET: Oh, okay. CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I mean, the ANC has submitted a report. MS. HAMLET: Yeah, they have, we submitted a report. CHAIRPERSON MILLER: And that's 10 what we give great weight to. Just you are here and if you heard something that you 11 wanted to respond to or explain, you have that 12 13 opportunity. MS. HAMLET: Oh, okay. 14 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Did the -- I'm 15 trying to review, look at the two documents we 16 One is December 12<sup>th</sup> and one is December have. 17 In your December 22<sup>nd</sup>, the ANC talks 18 19 about how she responded, I believe, to information you requested. Did the ANC take a 20

position on support or opposition to the

application?

21

MS. HAMLET: They didn't do
anything until December when I finally asked
for a call on the vote of how what their
position was. And we had a quorum and there
you see which each Commissioner said. Is
that what you are talking about in my letter?
CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Yeah, I'm
looking for if there was a vote. Okay. It
just wasn't all that clear.
MS. HAMLET: I beg your pardon?
CHAIRPERSON MILLER: It wasn't all
that clear to me about the vote. And we're
looking at the letters and, basically, the
second page of the December 22, 2008 has votes
next to each Commissioner, such as no, no, no,
no, abstain, yes. Okay. That represents the
vote on the application?
MS. HAMLET: Yes, that represents
the vote how each Commissioner voted.
CHAIRPERSON MILLER: So the
Commission voted against the application by a

vote of 4-1?

1	MS. HAMLET: I beg your pardon?
2	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: The Commission
3	voted against the application by a vote of 4-
4	1?
5	MS. HAMLET: Yes.
6	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. And
7	there is a December 12 <sup>th</sup> letter from the ANC.
8	MS. HAMLET: Who is it from?
9	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Um, unless
10	there are two different ANCs. Oh, it's
11	another. No, it's ANC-7E from Naomi Robinson.
12	What's your name?
13	MS. HAMLET: She is 7E, Naomi
14	Robinson.
15	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: 7E, right.
16	MS. HAMLET: She must have sent her
17	own comments.
18	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. So they
19	don't reflect the ANC as a whole. They are
20	just her comments?
21	MR. JACKSON: I believe, just a
22	point of clarification, the borderline does

1	the ANC borderline along H Street?
2	MS. HAMLET: No, we are 7E.
3	MR. JACKSON: Oh, okay. So
4	MS. HAMLET: Her SMD is on H Street
5	and mine is on across.
6	MR. JACKSON: So her SMD is south
7	of H Street and yours is north of H Street?
8	MS. HAMLET: Mine is H, where she
9	lives.
10	MR. JACKSON: Right.
11	MS. HAMLET: Ms. Robinson's is up
12	46 <sup>th</sup> Street, I think it is.
13	MR. JACKSON: Okay.
14	MS. HAMLET: She is 46 <sup>th</sup> Street.
15	MR. JACKSON: So she is south of
16	where your's is? And the child care center is
17	north of H Street?
18	MS. HAMLET: Right.
19	MR. JACKSON: So she is in the
20	vicinity, but she is not in the same SMD, but
21	nearby.
22	MS. HAMLET: So I guess she

1	submitted a letter because she said her
2	neighbors were in opposition. So I imagine
3	she sent a letter also.
4	MR. JACKSON: Well, another point
5	of clarification though, the negative
6	responses that I mentioned were all in that
7	south of H Street? So it's in the other SMD.
8	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: So Ms.
9	Robinson represents south of H Street?
10	MR. JACKSON: 64 <sup>th</sup> Street 64 <sup>th</sup>
11	Place is south of H Street, so she represents
12	that area, yes, I believe. Right, okay. So
13	she is south of H Street. And the current
14	representative resident here is north of H
15	Street.
16	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Are you Ms.
17	Hamlet?
18	MS. HAMLET: Yes.
19	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. And do
20	you represent neighbors who are supportive of
21	the application or is it mixed?
22	MS. HAMLET: What I did was sent

out letters and I thought I attached those where I got the information of the 35 people were solicited, they responded and whatever, because this is what she gave me. So I -they are on, I guess, I don't -- I guess they are on my side of the SMD. They are in my SMD. CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Just for clarification, it's the ANC report that we give great weight to, but --MS. HAMLET: I know. CHAIRPERSON MILLER: -- is it -are the response that you got, were they favorable or not favorable? MS. HAMLET: Yes, the --CHAIRPERSON MILLER: They're favorable. MS. HAMLET: -- responses that I got were favorable. But some people, you

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

know, like one person refused to open their

door or whatever to her, but I turned in the

ones, the responses that I had gotten from

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

her.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Okay.

I see. I got it now where you listed it at 20 yes responses.

MS. HAMLET: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.

MS. HAMLET: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I got it now. Okay. Are there other Board questions? Okay. Thank you very much. Is there anybody here who wishes to testify in support of this application? Anyone here who wishes testify in opposition? Okay. Are there any other Board questions of the applicant before she provides any closing remarks? No. Okay. Do you have some closing remarks? No?

MS. MANLEY: No, ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. All right. Thank you. All right. Then I think that we are at the point where the Board just needs to decide whether we have all the information we need to make a decision or

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

whether we want to keep the record open for additional information.

And I think that the main question outstanding here is whether we want to request the Department of Transportation to do an assessment of traffic concerns and recommendations for drop-off and pick-up for this application.

I mean, to me, it sounds like it I think that Office of might be a good idea. Planning was having some difficulty in making a clear recommendation, only with respect to that aspect, but that's an aspect that does affect safety. And so I don't see any harm in asking for that. I think it would probably be helpful the applicant to to get recommendations and maybe peace of mind that, you know, it's fine or that you need to put these cones out.

I mean, I think it could be fairly straightforward. And we have done it in other applications. I don't recall whether they

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

have to be big or not. I don't think so. It sounds to me like they could just go out and take a look.

Like Office of Planning says he can go out and take a look, but that's not his training, so, you know. Is there any objection to doing that? Okay. And the applicant, you would be supportive of that as well?

I think that since we have that question hanging out here, I think it would be good for the community at large to know that. You know, maybe traffic will come out and say, you know, it's fine for 30, but not 38 or it's fine, it doesn't matter as long as you do the cones or sometimes they even put up a sign and they give you a parking area for drop-off. But that's a whole -- you know, I don't know what they would do.

So, Mr. Jackson, how much time do you think that we would need to provide in order to get a response from Department of

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	Transportation?
2	MR. JACKSON: Well, that's hard to
3	predict. But I would say three weeks.
4	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: When does the
5	ANC meet, in the event that this might be
6	something that the ANC might want to comment
7	on?
8	MS. HAMLET: Um, we meet the second
9	Tuesday of every month.
10	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. So is
11	three weeks from now February 3 <sup>rd</sup> ? Okay. When
12	is the ANC meeting after February $3^{\rm rd}$ then, the
13	next like February 10 <sup>th</sup> ?
14	MS. HAMLET: The well, actually,
15	our meeting is tonight at 7:00. Then we will
16	have February the second whatever the
17	second Tuesday is in February.
18	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. I
19	think, according to our schedule, that would
20	be February 10 <sup>th</sup> .
21	MS. HAMLET: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. I'm not

that this report would require much response, but we don't know. MS. HAMLET: We have no idea. CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. MS. HAMLET: Could you --VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: I believe you have to put the mike on. COMMISSIONER JONES: Oh, you know. VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: Okay. MS. HAMLET: What the Commission is 10 going to be asked to --11 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: The Commission 12 13 wouldn't be asked to do anything. It's just a question of whether we leave the record open 14 in the event they wanted to respond to the 15 traffic report. 16 17 MS. HAMLET: Okay. They certainly CHAIRPERSON MILLER: 18 don't have to, but they should be given it. 19 And we could leave the record open just for a 20 very short time and I'm not sure that the 21

applicant would want to respond either.

we could leave the record open for a very short time as well, because we're really looking for just, primarily, their assessment and they are an expert in traffic.

In the event sometimes there is something that some other party, information they have that we should have related to another report, we will leave the record open just for that.

Okay. So we just need to determine then when to set this for decision making. Is there any time urgency? Otherwise, our next decision meeting after the 3<sup>rd</sup> would be March 3<sup>rd</sup>. If there is an urgency, sometimes we can fit in a decision on a non-meeting date. Is there an urgency in the schedule?

MS. MANLEY: No, there is no great urgency. I have a waiting list, so we will have to wait until March 3<sup>rd</sup> for an answer, I guess.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Well, we'll take a look at our schedule and see. Mr.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Jackson, let me just ask you, if we wanted to go for the February  $3^{\rm rd}$  decision meeting, is there any way that you think we would have a-you can't assure us that traffic would be able out? That the Department to qo of Transportation would be able to go out earlier, right? MR. JACKSON: I haven't -- again, I haven't been able to get them -- a response to

date.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Right.

MR. JACKSON: So --

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.

MR. JACKSON: But I would -- if you that date, I would urge them to do something about it before that time.

Okay. CHAIRPERSON MILLER: But this is important and we want to make sure that it gets done.

Right. Madam Chair, MR. JACKSON: I was just reminded that the Department of Transportation might be a little busy next

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	week, so
2	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: That's right.
3	I think we ought to aim for the March 3 <sup>rd</sup>
4	decision date. So in order if we back up
5	from that, is February 3 <sup>rd</sup> still realistic?
6	MR. JACKSON: I can ask them to
7	shoot for that.
8	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: You can ask
9	what?
10	MR. JACKSON: After next week.
11	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Yeah, after
12	the 20 <sup>th</sup> , it should be better.
13	MR. JACKSON: Yes, that's a
14	possibility after the 20 <sup>th</sup> .
15	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.
16	MR. JACKSON: Or actually the
17	following week, the week after the 20 <sup>th</sup> they
18	probably will be back in full swing.
19	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. So the
20	February 3 <sup>rd</sup> date should work. Okay. So
21	that's definite. Okay. So we'll do February
22	3 <sup>rd</sup> date, will be a report from DDOT.

And so they will come out to the
property before February 3 <sup>rd</sup> , obviously, and
hopefully meet with you and assess the
situation and address, you know, how you might
do drop-off and pick-up and how safe the
street is, etcetera.
MR. JACKSON: Right and the
interaction with the other facilities.
CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.
MR. JACKSON: But so when would the
report have to be in to the Office of Zoning
for them to put in your packet?
CHAIRPERSON MILLER: We were
talking about February 3 <sup>rd</sup> , but if that's not
going to work
MR. JACKSON: So it would be the
Friday before would be good or a week before?
CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Oh, no, it
doesn't have to be. The February 3 <sup>rd</sup> date was
so then if the ANC needed to respond to it.
MR. JACKSON: Okay.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: They would

1	have it before their meeting.
2	MR. JACKSON: Okay.
3	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Which is when?
4	MR. JACKSON: Gotcha. All right.
5	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: The 10 <sup>th</sup> ? The
6	ANC meeting is the 10 <sup>th</sup> ? Okay. So do you want
7	more than later than the 3 <sup>rd</sup> ?
8	MR. JACKSON: No, no. So you're
9	saying it needs, the report, to be in the
10	Office of Zoning by February 3 <sup>rd</sup> ?
11	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Right.
12	MR. JACKSON: Okay. That's what I
13	wanted.
14	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: That's okay?
15	Would it get to the ANC on February 3 <sup>rd</sup> ? Would
16	you be giving it to them or they would have to
17	come down to the Office of Zoning to get it?
18	MR. JACKSON: We can do it do
19	you have email?
20	MS. HAMLET: Yes.
21	MR. JACKSON: Well
22	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. You
- 1	

1	could email the ANC. That would be great.
2	MR. JACKSON: I can get that to
3	you.
4	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.
5	MS. HAMLET: Yes.
6	MR. JACKSON: All right.
7	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. All
8	right. So that's February 3 <sup>rd</sup> . Okay. Our
9	meeting is March 3 <sup>rd</sup> , so any response to the
10	DDOT report would be due by when, Ms. Bailey?
11	The Wednesday before at least?
12	MS. BAILEY: Madam Chair, um, did
13	you want an OP supplemental report? I know
14	that's not the question you asked me, but that
15	kind of helped me to frame the response to
16	you. Did you want a supplemental report from
17	OP?
18	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I don't think
19	that's necessary. Do you, Mr. Jackson, I
20	mean?
21	MR. JACKSON: No.
22	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: No.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

MS. BAILEY: Okay. CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Because we are only interested in DDOT. MS. BAILEY: Okay. CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Right. We have -- yeah, okay. MS. BAILEY: And the response of the applicant is that it? CHAIRPERSON MILLER: We're leaving 10 the record open for the response of applicant, if she chooses to respond and same 11 with the ANC, if they choose, it's 12 13 mandatory. MS. BAILEY: Well, there is lots of 14 I'll say the 24<sup>th</sup> of February. 15 16 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Any problem with that? Okay. Good. All right. 17 So February 3<sup>rd</sup> is the date for the DDOT report 18 19 and someone from DDOT would be coming out, obviously, before then. And then February 24<sup>th</sup> 20 would be the date for any responses to that 21

report by the ANC and the applicant. And our

1	decision will be on March 3 <sup>rd</sup> .
2	And we don't take testimony at our
3	decisions. You can, if you wanted to hear it,
4	come down and listen, otherwise, you can watch
5	on the Internet and then, otherwise, there
6	will be a transcript.
7	MS. MANLEY: I can also watch on
8	the Internet?
9	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Yeah, um-hum.
10	MS. MANLEY: Oh.
11	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Um-hum, yeah.
12	Okay. Any questions?
13	MS. MANLEY: And that's March the
14	3 <sup>rd</sup> ?
15	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Right.
16	MS. MANLEY: Is there a particular
17	time?
18	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Morning.
19	MS. MANLEY: Morning?
20	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Morning,
21	morning. No earlier than 9:30.
22	MS. MANLEY: Okay, okay.

1	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: There may be a
2	schedule up as well on the Internet. I'm not
3	sure, but sometimes we may change the order,
4	so any time from 9:30 on.
5	MS. MANLEY: The website for that
6	is?
7	MS. BAILEY: We can give that to
8	you if you just come up.
9	MR. MOY: DCOZ.dc.gov.
10	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Also, if you
11	do have any other questions, feel free to ask
12	Mr. Moy or the Office of Zoning. Okay. Thank
13	you.
14	We have one more case on the
15	agenda. I think we are just going to take a 5
16	minute break. And if you all need to take a 5
17	minute break before we start the hearing on
18	that case, feel free to do so.
19	(Whereupon, at 5:28 p.m. a recess
20	until 5:40 p.m.)
21	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: We're back on
22	the record and ready for you to call the last

case of the day, Ms. Bailey, when you are ready.

MS. BAILEY: Madam Chair, thank you. Application 17799 of Chy H. Yang, pursuant to 11 DCMR 3104.1, for a special exception under section 223, or alternatively pursuant to section 3103.2, for a variance from the open court requirements under section 406, for a rear addition to an existing one-family row dwelling. The property is located at 1121 Lamont Street, N.W. It is Zoned R-4. It is located in Square 2842 on Lot 64.

The hearing is a continuation from the September 16, 2008 scheduled Public Hearing. And lastly, there is a request for party status and that is from Mr. Charles Green.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Thank you. Why don't we start with introducing yourselves for the record, please?

MR. YANG: I'm Chy Yang. I live at 1121 Lamont Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

20010.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. VAJPEYI: Good afternoon, Madam Chairman and Members of Board. I'm Rajat Vajpeyi. I live on the corner of 1121 Lamont, Washington, D.C. 20010.

MR. GREEN: I'm Charles Green, adjoining neighbor of 1119 Lamont Street. Ah, Charles Green, adjoining neighbor at 1121 -- excuse me, 1119 Lamont Street. Just a point of order, friends at the other table were not here during the swearing in section and the oath, just a point of order.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Anybody here who plans to testify who wasn't sworn in earlier, please, rise, unless you are an attorney. You need to take the oath. So have you taken the oath?

MR. YANG: No, we haven't.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Ms. Bailey will administer it.

MS. BAILEY: And the gentleman beside you? Please, raise your right hand.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	(Whereupon, the witnesses were
2	sworn.)
3	MS. BAILEY: Thank you.
4	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. And I'm
5	sorry, I didn't get your name exactly.
6	MR. VAJPEYI: Mine?
7	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Yes.
8	MR. VAJPEYI: My name is Rajat
9	Vajpeyi.
10	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: And what's
11	your relation to the case?
12	MR. VAJPEYI: I'm the co-proponent
13	or, you know
14	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. With
15	Mr. Yang?
16	MR. VAJPEYI: Yes.
17	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Are you
18	an owner, co-owner? Okay, okay. I believe we
19	have a preliminary issue. Mr. Green is
20	seeking party status. Is that correct?
21	MR. GREEN: Yes, Madam Chair, that
22	is correct.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: And you are the next door neighbor?

MR. GREEN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. So therefore, you believe you will be more impacted than the general public by relief granted in this case?

MR. GREEN: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Does the applicant have any objection to granting party status? Do Board Members have any concerns, objections, questions? That's often the case that the next door neighbor is more impacted than the general public and being impacted than more general public is, in essence, the test for party status.

Okay. So not hearing any concerns, the Board is going to give you party status, Mr. Green. Okay. Now, before you get into the heart of your case, I just want to clarify the relief that is being sought. Are you

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

seeking just special exception relief under
223 or are you seeking variance relief as
well?
MR. YANG: Just section 223.
CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Fine,
good. All right. Then I'm going to let you
proceed with your argument. Are you going to
have any witnesses? No? Okay.
MR. YANG: We don't have any
witnesses.
CHAIRPERSON MILLER: So you can
just present your case.
MR. YANG: Yeah. Can I say in the
during the September initial hearing on
September $16^{th}$ , we did have a witness that was
going to show up and he did show up, but, you
know, it was postponed and it was later than
the 1:00 schedule, so he had to leave and he
couldn't be here today though.
CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Is
there anything else you want to

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

MR. YANG: No.

1	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: He didn't
2	submit anything in writing?
3	MR. YANG: No, he didn't. He
4	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.
5	MR. YANG: is our Commissioner
6	for the ANC. The one that is in charge of our
7	area.
8	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Is anybody
9	here from the ANC?
10	MR. YANG: No.
11	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. And
12	that's ANC what is your area?
13	MR. YANG: 1A.
14	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: 1A, okay.
15	Okay. So then that leaves you to see if there
16	is anything you want to add to your filings in
17	argument as to why you qualify for relief
18	under 223. Okay.
19	MR. YANG: Okay.
20	MR. VAJPEYI: Shall I begin? Okay.
21	So just as a background, we had we were
22	scheduled for a hearing back in September.

And at that time, Mr. Green approached us and he said that he would be willing to support our case or drop his opposition if we made certain design changes to our structure. So we requested a postponement for today.

Since then, we have worked very hard and we worked with Mr. Green to modify our design. And we changed the design to incorporate all the requests that Mr. Green had made of us. We can go into the design changes that we have made. We also presented you the drawings.

Some of the changes that Mr. Green wanted to make was that his main opposition was that there was water. Because of how the structure was designed, that there was water, when there was heavy rain there was water, which was going over to his side of the house. And to alleviate that problem, he asked that the pitch of the roof be removed and it be flattened.

He also asked that we move the down

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

-- rain downspout from the -- from his side of the house to the other side of the house from west to the east side. I'm sorry, east to west. Basically, move it to the other side, so that when water flows out, it doesn't flow out near his house, but on the other side, from the other side.

And then he also requested a perimeter wall or perimeter -- a 10 inch high structure be put up on the roof, so that it prevents any water from flowing onto his side of the house. So those were the three changes that he requested, asked for and we incorporated those in our designs in which we have submitted to you.

So we feel that this will address Mr. Green's issues that he has raised. And based on those changes, I'm hoping that he will support our case. That's what I wanted to say.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: You are hoping? You didn't discuss it with him before

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

this hearing?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. VAJPEYI: We did send the designs over to Mr. Green after making those changes and Mr. Green, I think, he didn't say that he didn't disapprove, so I'm not 100 percent sure.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.

MR. YANG: I can address the issues, the answers, the response I have in regards to the requirements of section 223. The first requirement being that "The light and air available to neighboring properties shall not be unduly affected."

And you know, based on -- you know, I don't know much about astrology or anything, but based on what I know, you know, the front of our house faces north and the -- I mean, faces south. And the back of our house faces north.

As a result, the -- so the sun rises in the east. And there is a long narrow, about 4 feet on my side, 4 feet on his

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

side, so total the alley is about 8 feet wide and 25, approximately, feet long. As a result, that -- there's a narrow alley between our house, which, you know, because the sun -- and -- the light that Mr. Green has addressed as not receiving, due to the construction, into the dining room of his house is on the first floor and what I'm saying is that, you know, the sun doesn't -- we don't get direct sunlight into the dining room either.

And not because of the structure or anything, just by the mere fact that, you know, the sun doesn't shine directly into our rooms.

Furthermore, you know, it's a two level structure at one point and then the middle of the house is a three level structure and there are other buildings to the east of us that block light into our -- into that narrow -- it's very difficult. The type of light that we get are, essentially, you know, diffused light on just, you know -- light,

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

just not direct light.

The second issue for the requirements of section 223 relates to "The privacy of use and enjoyment of neighboring properties shall not be unduly compromised." You know, we believe that the addition that we have added, you know, doesn't have any effect in relation to how he uses his property.

Basically, the alley that is in between our house, that we share between our house, he basically just -- you know, it's just an alley. We don't use it as well and he, basically, you know, from what I can see, it's used basically to -- there is a trash bin that collects the water that is emitted from his AC system and to store, you know, any debris or whatever you want to store in the alley. That's what it's used for.

And that's what we use for it as well. We haven't heard any complaint from any of our other neighbors as to, you know, how it affected negatively on their enjoyment of the

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

neighborhood.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

So the next requirement is that "The addition together with the original building as viewed from the street, alley and other public ways shall not substantially or visually intrude upon the character, scale and pattern of the houses along the subject street frontage."

Again, the addition is in the rear, so no one in the front could see it unless they come into the alley of our neighborhood.

And I have -- all I have heard is basically consistent of various design and architecture.

There is -- in our neighborhood.

So in the back of the house, you know, some people have two level decks, some have one. Some have enclosed decks. And there is, you know, also some designs as is true throughout D.C.

Furthermore, I mean, I have provided pictures of, you know, the neighborhood in the front of the house and the

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

diversity of the architecture in front of the house and the back of the house. And you can see from those pictures that, you know, there is -- you know, recently there is a modern condo right just two house away from our block that shares our alley, which doesn't -- you know, it's large, it's a much larger scale than our house.

You know, just to show you that our design is not like it's out of character of the rest of the neighborhood.

The last requirement deals with the lot occupancy, "The development of flat together with the addition shall not exceed 50 percent in the R-1 and R-2 District or 70 percent in the R-3, R-4 and R-5 District."

I have provided calculations which, you know, basically -- two types of calculation. One based off the measurement that is stated in the D.C. Public Record and one based on my own measurement. And if you-- I think, I believe you do have these paperwork

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

as well.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

And that, basically, what I have calculated is that, you know, they are way under the 70 percent occupancy requirement. It's somewhere around 49.362 percent. And the other, the one based on my own measurement is about 49.558 percent occupancy.

So basically, those, you know, responses I do believe that I should be -- but that's it.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Can you tell me what happened with respect to this case originally being advertised as a variance? Did you change your application or did you just realize that you didn't need to seek a variance?

MR. YANG: Well, yeah, I did change it. Initially, upon speaking to Matthew LeGrant, I mean, the only thing that I -- you know, based on his knowledge, that was what he was -- that was what was told to you that I needed to seek a variance. But after meeting

with others, like Mr. Nero, he pointed me to the Office of Planning.

And I spoke with, at that time, a named Travis Parker. gentleman And mentioned that you actually should seek for a special exception, because, you know, you will qualify under that ruling. And that's how I learned of the special exception. And on that same day, I came back to this office and amended the application to special exception.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Well, can you address, for instance, there are documents in the file such as Exhibit 33 it looks like it is a resolution from the ANC opposing the variance.

MR. YANG: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: And I guess I'm wondering, the variance that they thought they were opposing, I mean, were they opposing the plans that are being presented to us today or were they opposing --

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. YANG: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: -- different plans and they just thought it was a variance that you were asking for?

MR. YANG: Okay. This is actually a complicated matter where the ANC is concerned. I wasn't really familiar with the ANC until two days before, two or three days, the hearing. Actually, I was informed on Sunday. And we -- our ANC meets at the first Wednesday or the second Wednesday of every month, I forget which one. But the Wednesday of every month.

And so, you know, I had to travel for work, which I had been planned way back, you know, then, so, obviously, I was not able to attend that particular ANC hearing. And so we weren't going to attend, but I did send an email out. Mr. Green did send me an email giving me the -- you know, so that I would have the email address of the ANC Members, because I didn't know that it existed.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

And so, you know, when I got that email, I did email the, you know, group saying that, you know, unfortunately, I'm not going to be able to attend because of work requirements. But you know, I doubt that you guys are going to reschedule my hearing anyway, based on short notice.

And you know, so I had to travel, but we weren't planning on attending, but then when I was away in Denver, I did phone Rajat and I said you know what, since we have never been to one of these things, why don't you just go and see what it is like?

And so he did appear and I can let you talk about this, because I wasn't there. So he can talk more about the experience. But that's the precursor to what happened. So and then I, you know, interject later.

MR. VAJPEYI: So yes, basically, to answer your question, I attended the meeting.

I didn't -- I wasn't familiar with the process and then when I went to the meeting I

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

realized it was a hearing to approve our variance. The application that Chy had submitted as a variance.

At that time, he hadn't changed it to an exception. And I was at the meeting and I'm not very familiar with the case, even though I'm the co-owner. Chy has been involved with the entire process. So I wanted to explain this and but what happened at the ANC meeting was that they basically decided that they would still vote on the matter.

And the -- at one point, the Commissioners said that I didn't even have to be there in order for them to decide on the matter. So I wasn't really able to present my case, just because I was not very familiar with it and wasn't prepared to do so on that date.

And our ANC, Mr. Commissioner, Mr. Johnson, was out of town, so he wasn't -- and we hadn't spoken to him at all until then.

And now, that's why he was going to be a

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

witness in the last hearing explaining that he was -- their decision was made against the variance, while he was away.

And so what I feel is because it was a decision against a variance and we are seeking exception, that that is not as relevant to the case.

Can I add some more MR. YANG: stuff? Basically, so you know, after that decision was made, I didn't know any decision. This actually -- the copy that I have wasn't actually, you know, given to us until actually just a few weeks before the September 16<sup>th</sup> And you know, so after that I hearing. started communicating with Anne Thiessen, which does all the email correspondence. And I think she is the one that wrote up this ANC decision.

And I told her like, you know, actually you guys made the decision without any input at all from our -- from us. And as a result of that, you know, so I kept emailing

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

her back and forth and that's when she referred me to Mr. Samuel Johnson. He is like -- she was like the hearing that we do on Wednesday is very, very brief. You don't -- we don't give you time to add to -- respond to anything.

It's basically just a brief thing for us to make a decision. And so that's why you should work with Mr. Samuel Johnson. And that's so -- from that point on, I continued to be in communication with Mr. Samuel Johnson and relating the information and showing him the paperwork that I have.

So then they were going to put us on the agenda, because I wanted to find out what's the appeal process for the decision and that's when I was informed that there is no such thing as an appeal process. We make our decision that's the end of it.

But, you know, I wanted to be on the agenda anyway, so he was going to have me put on the next ANC agenda, which was, at that

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

time, June of 2007. But then he -- you know, something happened and he wasn't available to -- he wasn't in town. And so they rescheduled me for July ANC hearing.

And so but, you know, during this time, I was making sure that I was on the agenda. And I was ensured that I was on the agenda for the July ANC hearing. But then on the week of the ANC hearing, Mr. Samuel Johnson just learned that you are actually not on the agenda, but don't worry, I'll talk to Dottie, Madam Chairman Dottie, and she will —have you — give you some, you know, slot, so that you can make your case.

So but that -- it didn't turn out to be the case at all. It was just like their basically opinion was we have made our decision, let's move on. But you know, it was struggle, because Mr. Johnson had to, basically, say give him a chance. Не never had, you know, a chance to say anything.

So then, you know, they gave in and

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

they said okay, you have two minutes to make your case. And of course, you know, two minutes wasn't much. And then in that two minutes, another ANC person would interrupt and say we have made our decision and then looking to Rajat and saying you were here, you made your case and, you know, a decision was made.

And that's when, you know, Rajat was saying at that point in time, like he was there, basically, just to learn the process. He didn't prepare any document. He didn't bring anything with him. So as a result of that, you know, I tried to appear to them and say that actually you guys made your decision based variance request, but the on а application has been amended to section 223 and that, you know, under the circumstances, I wasn't given an opportunity to make my case. No one knows anything about this case and the decision that was made came from one source only.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

But, you know, it failed.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Thank you. I do want to note though that this resolution does not, if I'm looking at it correctly, appear to show the vote on this at all or whether there was a quorum present or whether it was publicly noticed and those are all factors that would lead us to give it great weight.

Is there something else here?

Okay. I was handed another ANC document. I was looking at Exhibit 33.

MR. YANG: Which is what?

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Which is received by the Office of Zoning, September 9<sup>th</sup>, which says "Advisory Neighborhood Commission 1A Resolution on BZA Hearing 17799 regarding 1121 Lamont Street, N.W." and it starts with a whereas clause. And then it resolves that the variance be denied.

But it doesn't show --

MR. YANG: Mine doesn't show that

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	either.
2	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Yes.
3	MR. YANG: I mean, this is all that
4	was given to me, so
5	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: But then we
6	have another one dated April 9.
7	MR. YANG: Yeah.
8	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: 2008. Which
9	says "With due notice, quorum present, ANC-1A
10	voted 5 aye, 2 nay, 2 abstentions.
11	MR. YANG: Right.
12	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: To support
13	denial of the zoning variance for Case 17799.
14	MR. YANG: Yes, I'm familiar with
15	that one.
16	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: All right.
17	MR. YANG: I just saw that like
18	yesterday actually.
19	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. And it
20	is stapled to the resolution that I was
21	reading.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

MR. YANG: Right.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.

MR. YANG: Yeah. But on September  $16^{\rm th}$  it was not there.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Anyway, great weight means that we would address the issues that are raised in it. And if it does qualify for great weight, we can address it to the extent it is relevant. It does go to the variance test as opposed to the special exception test. So it does not make it as relevant.

Ιt does express concerns about water running onto the neighboring property, which is what I hear you saying you have addressed and I'm sure Mr. Green will address whether you have addressed it or not adequately or sufficiently or not.

Okay. Yeah, the others don't seem to really go to the 223 test, unless others think so. Okay. That's it with my questions, I think. Are there other questions?

VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: Good

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

afternoon. Through no fault of yours or actually anybody else's except for mine, I did not review a complete file of your case beforehand and I'm a little confused just trying to sort out what the basic addition was.

I have looked at the application and some of the back and forth. And originally, it was supposed to be a one level

MR. YANG: It is a one level.

VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: But then some of the pictures show two stories. So just why don't you just start with -- and you can do this real briefly, but the original application was what was actually built and where we are today.

MR. YANG: Okay.

VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: You can do it really briefly, I mean.

MR. YANG: Okay.

VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: I can follow

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

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

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

addition.

you.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. YANG: The addition actually is one story. The original -- I mean, what you see up there, the top portion is the existing addition that was already there when we purchased the house. And so what we did was we added an L-shape on the first floor. I don't know if you have this, this should be in the packet.

This picture here shows the actual addition. The dotted line is the existing addition and what we added is this L-shaped thing.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: What is that attached to?

MR. YANG: Um, what do --

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: It's attached to? Is there an exhibit number?

MR. YANG: Attached, um, I -- on my copy it's doesn't have a number, but it is attached to the survey document.

VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: Can you show

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1	me the same thing by reference to Exhibit 25,
2	which you prepared and which includes
3	photographs?
4	MR. YANG: Yeah. I don't know what
5	Exhibit 25 is.
6	VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: All right.
7	MR. YANG: Because oh, yes. In
8	Exhibit 25, the yellow area is the addition.
9	Yeah, okay, so the yellow area is the one
10	level addition that we added, the L-shape
11	area.
12	VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: You can
13	continue.
14	MR. YANG: Oh, I mean, I don't know
15	specifically what you are looking for.
16	Basically, it is just the L-shaped area in the
17	on the first floor that was added.
18	VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: When you were
19	issued the stop order, what's your
20	understanding of the reason why you received
21	the stop order?

MR. YANG: Because I did do the

addition. I started the addition without a permit. VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: And so the difference between the -- the August 2004, is that before you did the project or is that after you completed? The addition -- sorry. MR. YANG: The addition in that photo does include the addition on the first floor. 10 VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: Okay. I think I understand a little bit better 11 now. 12 13 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Any other Board questions? Mr. Green, you are a party 14 in the case. Do you have any questions for 15 the applicant based on the testimony provided? 16 MR. GREEN: I do. 17 CROSS EXAMINATION 18 MR. GREEN: Someone earlier asked 19 if I was an attorney and I said no, I just 20 happen to have a good suit, so I apologize for 21

my way of doing this. But thank you for your

time today.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

A question of testimony regarding - and before I even get to that, we're not
going with the special exception route,
because we don't disagree with anything albeit
special exception. Before I get to the
variance --

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: The variance?

They're not applying for a variance, so we're

not taking testimony or questions with respect

to variance.

MR. GREEN: This case, as I understand, is part of enforcement by DCRA. This case was started in 2004, was stop work ordered, an issue eventually ordered that was started in October of 2006 requesting -- requested by Mr. Matt LeGrant for an order of abatement to --

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: We're not doing enforcement here.

MR. GREEN: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: That is done

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

by DCRA and the Zoning Administrator. All we are hearing is the 223 and the criteria that is set forth under 223.

MR. GREEN: Okay. The reason though that we are here is because Mr. LeGrant in his Notice of Violation and Order of Abatement for a violative condition gave three options to the adjoining neighbors after four years of time.

Those conditions were either tear down the addition, fill in the entire lot, height, width, breadth or seek a variance.

Mr. LeGrant did not ask them after that amount of time to seek a special exception.

Mr. LeGrant says that you did not accomplish any of the things that he had asked for and your conduct demonstrates a lack of good faith and indicates your unwillingness to bring in the conforming -- structure into compliance with the Zoning Regulations voluntarily.

Because of that, Mr. LeGrant gave

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

them one of three options and one of them was a variance.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. And I know, you know, you're not an attorney. Okay. So what I'm saying is this Board is limited by the jurisdiction that it has.

MR. GREEN: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Now, we do have jurisdiction to hear variances as well as special exceptions. However, it's the applicant that seeks relief before the Board. So the applicant is here seeking relief pursuant to 223, which is a special exception, and the applicant has been advised, as I understand it, by the Office of Planning that they don't need to seek a variance, even though maybe Mr. LeGrant said so.

So we don't really look beyond what is before us. Basically, they are seeking a 223. So if there is something in the history that impacts our decision looking at the criteria under 223, that's one thing. But

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

we're not here to argue about whether they need a variance or special exception or hear arguments about it.

They are the applicant. If they need a variance and they don't ask for one, then they take the risk that Mr. LeGrant, when they go to get a permit, will deny the permit, because he will say oh, you need a variance, you didn't get one.

MR. GREEN: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. That's their risk.

MR. GREEN: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: So at this juncture, it's appropriate if you have any questions that go to the 223 for you to ask them. Now, if it's your position that you're not challenging the 223, then that's fine or if you want to -- you will have an opportunity later to make your case as to why they may not be qualified for the 223.

MR. GREEN: Okay.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. So
2	MR. GREEN: I'll ask a question
3	regarding testimony then, if I may?
4	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.
5	MR. GREEN: Okay. Thank you.
6	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Just so you
7	understand the process, yeah.
8	MR. GREEN: I do. I do. During
9	testimony, Rajat, my adjoining neighbor,
10	pleaded or I guess maybe both did, pleaded
11	ignorance of the ANC. But yet, I do want to
12	clarify that Rajat did plead the case.
13	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. You get
14	to do that under your testimony.
15	MR. GREEN: Okay.
16	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: You can
17	testify to that.
18	MR. GREEN: Okay.
19	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Right now,
20	it's do you have a question?
21	MR. GREEN: What would you like
22	from me?

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: What?

MR. GREEN: What would you like for me? I don't want to go out of order.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: No. It's an opportunity if you have a question about anything they testified to.

MR. GREEN: Okay. But I can't ask them a -- okay. So if I -- did you plead your case at the ANC?

MR. VAJPEYI: I presented my case and I told -- before doing that, I told them that I wasn't prepared to do so. I could share information whatever I had with the ANC, but I requested a continuation. And I did that at the beginning of the ANC meeting. And I believe it was Ms. Dottie, Chairman Dottie who said that well, let's see what happens. We could always postpone it to the next meeting.

So I didn't know that I had an option to just be silent. So they had asked questions and I answered to the best of my

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

knowledge, but I maintained throughout that my co-owner was not present there and we got -we came to know about this meeting just Sunday prior to the meeting, so he couldn't get out of something which was scheduled -- had been scheduled for like a month. So he couldn't get out of his travel.

I would like to point out that there were two members or Commissioners of ANC who vehemently said that they didn't see any

there were two members or Commissioners of ANC who vehemently said that they didn't see any point why they needed to take a decision that very day when Chy was not present and when I wasn't -- I made it --

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. We don't -- you testified a lot to this before.

MR. VAJPEYI: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: And actually,
I almost was hesitant -- I mean, I almost was
-- say yes, that he did say that he testified
in a limited way.

MR. VAJPEYI: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Let's not go

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

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

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	into a whole long story.
2	MR. VAJPEYI: Okay. Sorry.
3	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. If we
4	can.
5	MR. VAJPEYI: Okay.
6	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.
7	MR. GREEN: I think I'm done for
8	now.
9	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.
10	MR. GREEN: Thank you
11	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay, good.
12	Okay. Anything else before we go to the
13	Office of Planning then? All right. Let's go
14	to the Office of Planning.
15	MR. EMERINE: Thank you, Madam
16	Chair and Members of the Board. My name is
17	Dan Emerine and I am a Development Review
18	Specialist with the D.C. Office of Planning.
19	This is, as has been mentioned
20	before, a case with some complicating factors.
21	The bottom line from the Office of Planning
22	report, that you have in front of you, is that

the Office of Planning does recommend approval of the requested special exception pursuant to section 223.

I do want to address a couple of points that are mentioned in my report. One of which is an error and the other is a lack of information. The error relates to the question of where the courts are that are -- that the Zoning Administrator deemed to be in nonconformance.

There is no question about the closed court that was formerly an open court and turned into a closed court by the building of the addition. However, our report refers to the -- to an open court at the rear of the property, essentially, where the addition juts out and where the back stairs are.

That is an error or on our part.

That is not a court, because it is -- has a roof over it. The confusion arose because the actual court, the open court created by the addition is per earlier interpretations by the

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Zoning Administrator. The area above the roof of the addition is an open court.

Essentially, you have seen the Lshaped portion on the plans before. portion, the area above the portion of the L that is along the side lot line is, per the Zoning Administrator's interpretation, an open This may be -- if anyone believes that confusing counterintuitive that is а or decision, I won't disagree with that. that is how the Zoning Administrator has ruled previously, so I just wanted to make sure that the Board was aware of that.

As far as --

VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: Can I ask you a quick question to make sure I'm following?

MR. EMERINE: Yes, yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: So that the area that is shaped like an L --

MR. EMERINE: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: -- all of that L-shape is the open court?

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	MR. EMERINE: Absolutely. My
2	reading of it would be that is simply the area
3	along the side lot line is the open court, not
4	that part of the L that is behind the original
5	existing structure.
6	VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: So the area in
7	the rear, which would form the shorter part of
8	the L
9	MR. EMERINE: Uh-huh.
10	VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: is not an
11	open court?
12	MR. EMERINE: Correct.
13	VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: But on the
14	okay.
15	MR. EMERINE: Correct.
16	VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: All right.
17	MR. EMERINE: Okay.
18	VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: Thank you.
19	MR. EMERINE: As far as meeting the
20	tests of the special exception, oh, I'm sorry,
21	the area in which our report was deficient,
22	relates to the community comments. The Board

just heard testimony relating to whether the ANC had weight on this case and we have not seen any submission from the ANC before submitting our report. So I just wanted to acknowledge that.

Related to the applicant's meeting of the 223 test, the test refers to light and air available to neighboring properties. Our analysis does not indicate any unduly -- any undue effect on light and air. There does not appear to be any effect on the privacy of any neighboring properties.

Use and enjoyment of the neighboring properties, the drainage certainly could be a concern. On my site visit to the property, my finding, my assessment of it was inconclusive. I couldn't determine, because it wasn't a rainy day, where the water was draining.

I think it is certainly an issue that should be addressed by the applicant and the applicant has indicated today that they

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

are willing to address that issue.

The addition shall not substantially visually intrude upon the character. As the applicant noted, there is a variety -- there are a variety of additions along the -- this alley along Lamont Street, some of which are much larger in scale than the applicant's addition.

And as the applicant indicated previously, the addition puts the property well within the 70 percent lot occupancy limit for an R-4 District.

That concludes my summary of my report, but I am available to answer any questions that you might have.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Thank you. I just want to make sure I understand what you were saying about the courts.

MR. EMERINE: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: So since you gave your explanation, I'm looking at page 7 of your report.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. EMERINE: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. So do you believe that the relief is needed for both courts that you circled or were you saying that one of those is an error?

MR. EMERINE: I'm saying that the - on page 7 of my report, the area which was indicated as a new nonconforming open court, that is actually not an open court. No relief is required for that. The relief would be required for the area along the top of the addition that abuts the side lot line.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. And do you have an understanding as to why the Zoning Administrator thought that variance relief was necessary with respect to the courts?

MR. EMERINE: My only understanding of this is that the Zoning Administrator indicated to the applicant what the provisions were that the applicant was not in conformance with. In other words, the addition created a nonconforming closed court and a nonconforming

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

open court. And those related to section 406.

So I don't have any knowledge of why the Zoning Administrator's information only covered that as an option as opposed to also listing 223 relief as another possible option.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Yeah, I was looking at Exhibit No. 23, which is a Notice of Violation, in order for abatement of violative condition and that references that the construction created illegal open and closed courtyards requiring a variance.

Okay. But in any event, that was the ZA's characterization, at that point. But since then, when the Office of Planning reviewed the project, you have determined that variance relief is not required, in your opinion, and only relief under special exception 223 is, correct?

MR. EMERINE: That was our analysis upon initial review of the case, that's what we told the applicant. And upon receiving the

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

full information of the case, that would still be our recommendation.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Right, okay.

Because the situation is that, you know, it could be either one. If it's a violation of the court requirements, but if you meet certain requirements under 223, then you can get a special exception as opposed to requiring a variance. And they meet the other requirements, such as lot occupancy and things like that. Is that correct?

MR. EMERINE: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Okay.

Any other questions? Does the applicant have a copy of the Office of Planning report? And do you have any questions for the Office of Planning?

MR. YANG: No.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Mr. Green, do you have a copy of the Office of Planning report? Yes, you do?

MR. GREEN: Yes, I do.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

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

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. And do you have any questions for the Office of Planning, based on that report or the testimony that was just given?

## CROSS EXAMINATION

MR. GREEN: A question, I'll presume -- a question of 223 versus 406. Is 223 available to anyone, are there some restrictions?

MR. EMERINE: Section 223, essentially, within section 223, it outlines the standards that you have to meet to get relief under that section. So anyone who is building an accessory structure that does not comply with all of the requirements of section 401, 403, 404, 405, 406 and 2001.3 can apply for special exception relief under section 223.

MR. GREEN: And does anyone have to be a single-family dwelling?

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Excuse me, let me just interrupt here. Do you have a copy of

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

223?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. GREEN: Um --

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Just to be --

MR. GREEN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. I'm --

MR. GREEN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: -- just going to -- I'm sorry to intercept, but Office of Planning doesn't have it right in front of him.

MR. GREEN: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: And I do and I just want to make this quicker.

MR. GREEN: Okay.

addition to a one-family dwelling or flat in those residence districts where a flat is permitted, that does not comply with all of the applicable area requirements of 401, 403, 404, 405, 406 and 2001.3, shall be permitted as a special exception if approved by the Board of Zoning Adjustment under 3104, subject

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

to the provisions of this section."

And then it goes through the rest of the provisions. It doesn't affect light and air, etcetera.

MR. GREEN: Right. A question, one-family dwelling or flat, does a building with a basement apartment constitute a one-family dwelling or not or flat or not? I mean, I would -- and I'm presuming that a flat is not -- and a one-family dwelling is not an apartment building. So I'm just asking clarifications as to what a flat is and a one-family dwelling. Because it seems to hinge.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. You know, I just jumped in to read you the regulations.

MR. GREEN: I understand.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: But the Board doesn't give interpretations necessarily. You know, so if Office of Planning wants to address that any further, you can. But you're asking in relation to this particular case?

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Is there something about this particular case you want to ask Office of Planning about?

MR. GREEN: I guess because we seem to be going over the -- whether a variance is required or a special exception is allowed. And that it might hinge on whether this property is a single-family dwelling or a flat.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Let me stop you there then.

MR. GREEN: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I'm going to go back to what I said. The applicant is proceeding at its own risk, okay? It is proceeding under the assumption that the Office of Planning is correct, that that's all they need is the 223, not a variance.

If they go before the Zoning Administrator and the Zoning Administrator says you need a variance, then they are back here before the Board for a variance. So --

MR. GREEN: Okay.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: we're not
2	debating whether
3	MR. GREEN: Okay.
4	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: the need a
5	variance or not.
6	MR. GREEN: No, I wasn't debating.
7	I'm asking for clarification, because you
8	there is a lot that one must know.
9	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I mean, unless
10	you want to ask Office of Planning a question
11	that goes to whether they qualify under 223.1
12	as a one-family dwelling, is that your
13	question?
14	MR. GREEN: I guess that would be.
15	So if it is a one-family dwelling or a flat -
16	_
17	MR. EMERINE: Um-hum.
18	MR. GREEN: a house that has a
19	basement apartment and two-family dwelling.
20	And as I have read, this is only for a one-
21	family dwelling, as I have heard, a one-family
22	dwelling or a flat. So if that's

1	MR. EMERINE: No, I'm not sure I
2	understand your question.
3	MR. GREEN: Is a building that has
4	an apartment and another residence above it a
5	one-family dwelling.
6	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Or a flat.
7	MR. GREEN: Or a flat or neither?
8	MR. EMERINE: Right. Generally, it
9	would be considered a flat, unless the
10	apartment was considered an accessory
11	apartment.
12	MR. GREEN: Another question. What
13	is an accessory apartment?
14	MR. EMERINE: There are provisions
15	in the R-1 District that define what an
16	accessory apartment is, but, essentially, it's
17	something that it's an apartment that is no
18	greater than 25 percent of the floor area.
19	There are a few other provisions related to
20	that that limit what it can be.
21	MR. GREEN: Okay. Thank you.
22	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Is

there anybody here from the ANC? I think I asked that before, but just in case someone happened to have strolled in. Not hearing from anyone, Mr. Green, would you like to -wait, you are not -- are you in support or opposition to this application? MR. GREEN: I'm in opposition. CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Is there anybody here who wishes to testify in support of this application? Not hearing from anybody, then it's time for anyone here who wishes to testify in opposition. So that would be you, Mr. Green, I gather. gather you are MR. GREEN: I correct --CHAIRPERSON MILLER: All right. MR. GREEN: -- Madam Chair. CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Then this is your time. MR. GREEN: Okay. Well, I do want to stay within the scope, but I guess I can

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

give history. Is that correct?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: You can, but
all I would say is I encourage you to testify
to what might be relevant to our analysis.
We're going to be analyzing this under 223.
So if there is some history that is related to
our consideration of any of these criteria
that would be relevant. If it's just
MR. GREEN: I will ask is it
relevant that it was built without a permit or
no?
CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I don't know.
I mean, you tell me. You I don't not
per se. Not per se.
MR. GREEN: So no.
CHAIRPERSON MILLER: So
MR. GREEN: Because I don't want to
waste your time
CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Right, or your
time.
MR. GREEN: with the history,
you know. So
CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I mean, what I

say is, you know, to look at the criteria under 223, you know, light and air and privacy or whatever or special treatment that you think the Board should consider for the protection of adjacent and neighboring properties. You are a neighboring property.

Those are criteria that we will be going through in considering this application.

MR. GREEN: Okay. I'll make this brief. The property was obtained by my adjacent neighbors in 2004. My wife and I went away for a three week period. When we came back, they had built this addition. We were not happy with it. We asked them if it was a matter of aesthetics or law.

They told us, at the time, that they did not have a permit to build it. They did not have plans to build it. They did not -- they were surprised by how large it was when they actually saw it.

After that point, we realized that the design of the building or the design of

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the addition caused water, when it does rain heavily, water when it rains to drain over onto our property. It just empties from their house onto ours.

At the time the property, the addition was built over the property line, so it actually extended onto our property, in the air, but it was on our property. We asked them to adjust this. They did not until this year of 2008, recently about two months ago.

The only thing that they have done regarding the property and adjusting the water issue is to cut off, approximately, 4 inches from the structure. The roof is still pitched towards our house and during very large rains, water does flume, approximately, 10 feet across our back deck. And we do have evidence of that.

So the structure causes a problem for us. They have said that they are willing to make adjustments, but this has been a four year process. Many people in Government,

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

including the Attorney General's Office,
Inspector General's Office, the Mayor's Office
have been involved.

They are our next door neighbor. They have not come to us directly, except recently to hand us a few, three exactly, plans, but otherwise there has been conversation. And in one of their emails, we have done a couple back and forth emails, they have said that they are looking into plans and costs for doing the work that would alleviate our problem. But we have not received any of those as of yet.

So the only effort we have seen from them is the removal of 4 inches of the roof and a few plans. That's it.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: What's the evidence that you were alluding to with respect to the water coming?

MR. GREEN: The rain water?

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Yeah.

MR. GREEN: Okay. If you will

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

notice the design, what takes place -- I'm just going to run through this. What takes place is that water comes down. And at any point when it does rain, because the property does go to -- the structure does go to the property line, originally it went over the property line, water does drain onto our property.

This by some set of D.C. standards is illegal. But that is not to be addressed here. During very heavy rains, water does flume down the side of the building, hits that roof and then basically jump skis across a 3 foot area, 3.5 foot area onto our deck and continues across.

The water then falls through the deck and we have a basement well there and well, there is only one place for that water to go once it does go through that deck. These are slides that have to do with the variance, not the 223. So I'm going to go through these to get to the evidence.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

But we were surprised at how far the water went. The evidence is that we did put up a screen between the addition and our property. What would be on the left hand side there in that opening. It was an indoor screen and not meant to be outdoors.

But what took place is water during a heavy rain storm flumed across and we were able to see evidence of the ink from the shade and where it went. So basically, the path of the water, and that's a long pole, a board that is there to show the direction of the water and how it comes across.

It comes across as far as our door, which is across the other side. The evidence, now this is not a pretty picture, but it's better than I thought. That's the ink that was on the shade that was in that opening. And to back up, that one that you saw a moment ago is right below that table, which wasn't there at that time.

So water comes all the way across

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

and there's no way for us to prevent this. You know, we could build an awning, but then we need a variance. We could put up a sign, but then we would need a variance. And there are things we could do, but then we need to go through a permitting process.

We can't do anything to stop this. So that's the evidence.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Is there something you suggest that they could do to stop this?

MR. GREEN: We had talked about -an architect had looked at the structure and
suggested the flattening of the roof.
Creating a flat roof where water would drain
on the other side of the property, putting up
a perimeter wall, as is normally done in a
courtyard situation, as is done on all of our
roofs in that area.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Now, I thought I heard that the did do that. No?

MR. GREEN: No, they have not done

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that. They have submitted some plans. They did not submit -- they said that they would submit quotes for getting this work done. This -- originally, this hearing was originally set for July. They postponed it from July until September. At the September meeting, we met to see if we could work something out.

And it was our expectation that they would be doing some work, starting some physical work before this time, giving them, approximately, four months from September until now, that was the thought. But no work has been done. They did submit -- they have given us three sets of plans, very different plans, but here we are.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I'm not sure how they could do work before we gave them approval. But are there other -- let me ask the applicant. Are there specific plans that respond that are before us or that respond to Mr. Green's concerns or what's your response

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

to that?

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. VAJPEYI: Yes, may I something? To respond directly to what Mr. Green said that in September when we discussed, Mr. Green said that he would be willing to drop his opposition if we made changes to our design. I specifically asked and I discussed -- I was in presence of the Zoning --

MR. YANG: Mr. Nero.

MR. VAJPEYI: -- Mr. Nero. So I was of the understanding that we will not be able to do anything until we get a permission from you. And I did specifically say this in presence of Mr. Green that all we can do from then until now is agree on what changes he would agree to.

As a result of that, and it was clear to all of us, I thought, that we wouldn't be able to do any work. It would be violation -- in violation. So we presented whatever plans we thought to him to make sure

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

that he was in agreement of that. And I'm not sure we could have started any work. So I'm not sure what else we could have done. CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. So no, I don't believe you could have started work, that's why you are here for us to --MR. VAJPEYI: Right. CHAIRPERSON MILLER: -- determine whether to approve your project, since you can't do it as a matter-of-right. 10 question then is did you have the specific 11 plans that are before us, are they responsive 12 13 to Mr. Green's concerns as we have heard today? 14 MR. VAJPEYI: Yeah. 15 MR. YANG: Yes, yes. 16 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: You think they 17 are? Okay. 18 19 MR. YANG: Yeah. CHAIRPERSON MILLER: 20 You want to explain how they are? 21 22 In the packet that you MR. YANG:

have, you should have some drawings that look like these with Mr. Green's comments. These are the suggestions after the September 16<sup>th</sup> hearing he dropped off in our front door, which I took and, you know, basically, from that point on, you know, I would take his suggestions.

We did need to discuss a suggestion because, ultimately speaking, I was thinking that the pitch of the roof, all I would have to do is put up a vertical perimeter to prevent water from flowing downward to his property. You know, that was fine with him.

He wasn't okay with that, so he wanted us to flatten the roof. So then we're like, okay, we'll flatten the roof. And this -- these, like I said, are basically drawings improvements presented by him. And I basically took these drawings and made up some new drawings just to show that the roof -- just, you know, if we were to proceed forward and get the exception, we would try to get a

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

permit to build.

You know, if you have like these three, mine aren't numbered, so I don't know. Like this drawing, this drawing and this drawing, basically, shows you that the roof will be flattened. And if you have it, I can explain to you what the colors mean.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Exhibit 39?

Okay. Wait a minute, we'll get it before us.

Do you have that, Mr. Green?

MR. GREEN: I do not.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: All right. I believe we all have it before us. Does Office of Planning have it? Exhibit 39.

MR. EMERINE: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Okay.

I think we all have it.

MR. YANG: Okay. These aren't the exact drawings that I gave to Mr. Green. I gave him the same drawing, but different views and larger printout to him. I -- so he does have something similar to this, but not this

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

exact one.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Basically, this -- these new drawings basically shows you that, you know, if you look at this one, it shows you that -- okay, this is what it originally looked like on September 16<sup>th</sup>, the hearing date that we requested postponement.

It shows that there is an overhang. After the September 16<sup>th</sup> hearing here, Mr. Inspector Eric Cox, basically, phoned me every week for me to take off the overhang, which is the encroachment that he is referring to that goes into his property. So, you know, after three weeks of phone -- he gave me 90 days.

But the official letter said you have 90 days to take the overhang out. And within three weeks, you know, the fourth week, I think, I -- or one weekend we took it off. We took it out. The middle picture basically shows that it's no longer there. But the roof still has the pitch.

Because -- the reason we were able

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

to take it off is because, you know, Mr. Cox informed me that I did not need a permit to do correction. Because I was, you know, very -- I was very concerned. I'm like do I need a permit? Do I need a permit? I don't want to have this type of issue again. He said I don't think you do need a permit. Just get that -- remove that.

So I removed that. The third drawing, if you look at a larger picture has purple, red and yellow coding to it. I had a drawing you can look at either this or this. The colors are all the same.

But basically, the red portion that you see, that's just represent that the raised roof, it just represents how high it would — it used to be. Since it's removed, the highest point of the raised roof was — the pitched roof was at the highest point of the red portion of this drawing. That's all it is showing is that. That's how tall it used to be before it is going to be flattened.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

267 The yellow portion, as you can see, is just showing you that this is what the roof will look like when it is flattened. And the purpose represents the 10 inch perimeter on three sides of the drawing to prevent any overflow into the other property. So this is the drawing that, you know, it's essentially what was recommended by Mr. Green. MR. VAJPEYI: Downspout. And the downspout also MR. YANG: is the brown portion. It has been moved from

the east side of the house to the west side as he requested.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: So, Mr. Green, is there something wrong with that revision that is not responsive to your concerns?

The only thing is a MR. GREEN: matter of trust, Madam Chair.

Well, let me CHAIRPERSON MILLER: just say this. We don't do really trust here, I mean.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. GREEN: I understand that.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: If this is the plan that we approve, then this is the plan that, the only plan, they can get permitted on.

MR. GREEN: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: So my question to you is does the plan as they have revised it, including the flattening of the roof and the perimeter wall, does that respond to your concerns or is there anything else that the Board should consider? Because we hear your concerns about the drainage and the water.

MR. GREEN: I --

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: And that, you know, they were significant concerns. And then we hear that the applicant has revised the plans since then to respond to that and that the revisions are, in fact, based on your suggestions.

MR. GREEN: Yes, they are.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. GREEN: Yes, they are.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.

MR. GREEN: After several changes, yes, these are. If these can go through, as I understand that you would approve this to be done, then this is acceptable.

MEMBER WALKER: Madam Chair, in looking at the plans, I'm just wondering if they are -- if they have enough specificity. I mean, we have got, you know, some renderings here with a few measurements, but, you know, is this specific enough for the Board to really approve?

I mean, we don't even -- I mean, we have a little testimony in the record now about what these various colors mean, but, you know, these are a long way from being clear.

MR. GREEN: Madam Chair, part of the issue is we do want to make sure this is done professionally. Part of the back and forth between my adjoining neighbor has been about who would do this work to make sure that

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

they -- it is done by a D.C. licensed contractor. Through four years of history, they had much work done, not have by a D.C. licensed contractor nor by permit. We do want to make sure that that this work is done legally with permits and is inspected. CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Most of that is not within our jurisdiction. I mean, 10 our jurisdiction is what their plans are going to look like. 11 MR. GREEN: Okay. 12 13 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Are they in accordance with zoning. 14 So --MR. GREEN: Can we ask for an 15 architect drawn design or no? 16 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Well, I think 17 Ms. Walker raised a point as to whether we 18 need more detailed plans, correct? And so I'm 19 open to suggestion as to what kind of plans 20 that would be. I'm not an architect. 21

lawyer. So I can't, you know, articulate that

myself. And I would be happy to entertain suggestions from, you know, Office of Planning or Office of Zoning, you know, or my Board Members as to what kind of -- if we would like further plans submitted by the applicant.

In accordance with the renderings that we have here, what would we be asking for?

VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: Well, Madam Chair, I just want to go on the record supporting Board Member Walker, that the plans — I don't think the plans are specific enough. And the ones I have seen they call construction documents, architects prepare them and they have detailed measurements that indicate how long something is.

Just spelling out the measurements of the different parts of the project. So to your point, maybe OP can delineate that further. But I know they are called construction documents. And they tell the contractors what they are going to build.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. it looks like we are very close here to your having opposition this not to special exception. But what is being sought something more detailed than these pictures that you would take to permitting that would ensure that the representations that are being represented by these renderings and by your testimony would be in a format that is really enforceable and clearer to the parties and the Board. And so I guess I understand that

And so I guess I understand that that would probably be achieved if you have an architect draw up the plans as to what would be built as opposed to just having these renderings. Do you have any comments to that?

MR. VAJPEYI: I have a question. So these drawings will be submitted to your Board later on --

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Um-hum.

MR. VAJPEYI: -- for your review?

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Um-hum.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. VAJPEYI: Okay.

MR. YANG: I mean, these drawings, the ones that I have submitted does not have the number, but it's -- the software that is being used are used by architects to -- and they can -- I can easily incorporate the number. I just didn't do it here.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Well, let me - are you going to have an architect?

MR. YANG: I mean, we can.

MR. VAJPEYI: We spoke to the Office of Zoning, Mr. Nero, and he said that as long as the plans are professionally drawn and, like you said, enforceable, then anyone can draw them. And I think that's what Chy is saying that he has the software that he can use to draw renderings. But I understand that you want to see something.

You may not have seen in our -someone other than architect do these
drawings, so I think that's why you are asking
for an architect.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Well, what does that mean professionally drawn if it is not drawn by a professional, such as an architect?

MR. VAJPEYI: Basically, there are softwares available in the market which can -- which are used to, you know, accurately draw these construction drawings, from what I understand. And those are the drawings that Chy has used and worked with the various offices in D.C. So that's what I was saying that he could draw drawings with proper specifications, but --

I have worked with the MR. YANG: D.C. Permit Office, though I'm not architect builder licensed or а orа contractor and stuff like that. An individual can submit drawings that the D.C. Board can look at and review whether it meets specification or not. And that's been my experience in the past.

So I have not -- you know, I have

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

been able to provide the required document in order to get a permit. And you know, like I said, going through these drawings that I have given to you doesn't have the measurements and stuff like that, but they are drawn to scale. This is a software that the professionals do use and it is drawn to scale.

It is just not identified in the drawing that I have submitted.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Well, let me ask you though, was it your plan to generate those documents with the software that are more specific that give measurements, take that to permitting and then that's what contractors would use?

MR. YANG: Yes. I mean, the Permit Office would not, you know, approve any document without measurement and specification. So the documents that I submit to the Permit Office would have measurements and would indicate, you know, how thick or tall the perimeter was or would be.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

So you know, it would have all the necessary specification that is required by the DCRA Office.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Does the Office of Planning have any position on this?

MR. EMERINE: I quess I would say that, you know, generally, these drawings are done by an architect. I don't know that it is a requirement. I would say it is good advice that they done by with be someone professional background. But if the applicant is able to submit something that the D.C. Permitting Office can understand, can review and can deem enforceable, then I don't see any legal or regulatory barrier to him submitting them in that form.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: In the first instance, we would have to also draw that same conclusion, find it, you know, understandable and more precise to, you know, address the point Ms. Walker made that these are not

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

sufficient. Whether that will be -- Mr. Green?

MR. GREEN: Madam Chair, this has been a four year process. A part of that process is that the structure was built illegally. After the fact, my adjoining neighbor submitted plans that they drew, and I do have them, in their original seeking of a permit that did not accurately reflect what was actually built.

So the structure was in place for a month or so. Then they submitted plans for the structure for a retroactive permit. They submitted plans that did not accurately reflect what was built. They were false.

With this history of submission of false documents, of false drawings, of drawings which are not accurate, it is not my hope that they can just submit drawings without a professional, without an architect being involved.

And I'm not sure if, you know,

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

using professional software makes one an architect more so than using a will software makes one an attorney.

All CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. I don't want to put words in your right. mouth. I just want to clarify though what I think I hear you saying. Correct me if I'm That if they were to file more wrong. detailed plans that were drawn up by architect or certified by an architect, that you would know -- in accordance with the representations made here with the flat roof and the perimeter wall, that you would no longer be opposed to the special exception relief.

However, if it's not certified by an architect, you might not have that same trust and might still be opposed. Is that correct?

MR. GREEN: That is correct.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.

MR. MOY: Madam Chair?

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Yes.

MR. MOY: Just you had asked whether or not -- for feedback from the staff. In our own requirements for submission, we ask for drawings, elevation drawings, site plans, so that the Board can get a better understanding of the project.

In the past, the Board has received drawings anywhere from a licensed architect with the typical elevation drawings, roof plans, floor plans and so forth to schematics. We have had architects who are licensed architects submit which appear to be by hand drawings, schematics even, that the Board has accepted.

So I think maybe the bottom line is whether, as has already been discussed, all the dimensions be on the drawings, to scale and I guess the ultimate result is whether or not it is acceptable to Permitting Office. That's part of the objective.

So I don't know if that adds to

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

what the Board is looking for or not, but that's where we are. In other words, we don't make it mandatory that an applicant must hire an architect or a licensed architect.

MR. YANG: Madam Chair, can I add something to respond to Mr. Green's comment that we submit a false documents and drawings to DCRA. That is not the case at all. I mean, if you look at the -- what -- the structure that is now and we look at the drawing that has all the necessary DCRA stamps on it, it does look like the drawing.

Maybe it's off by an inch or two, but it does look like the drawings that we have submitted to you.

MR. GREEN: Madam Chair, I cannot let that go, because I have a document that they are referring to in front of me and it has an additional roof area that is -- that was never there and it's, approximately, 20 feet long. So I'm just saying that there is a history, DCRA has this history of false

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

documents being submitted.

And it is because of those false documents that they were able to get an original building permit, which was revoked by DCRA.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. We're not going to be deciding that.

MR. YANG: Madam Chair, again, can I add something?

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Yes.

MR. YANG: That roof that he is referring to is the reason why we have this open courtyard. The roof -- the original drawing that I submitted to the Permit Office did not have the -- I mean, I worked with the Permit Office for three weeks eight hours a day. I had to go back and forth, back and forth and modify the drawings that -- based on their recommendation.

I did not know that -- you know, we never knew about that we had to build a roof all the way up. And the only reason I knew

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that that roof -- even had I built it, we weren't finished with the construction before we got the second stop work order.

And based on that, when we got that \$1,000 fine, I went and spoke to Rochelle, who I -- at that point in time, she worked there.

And I asked her like why do you guys keep giving me the stop work order? And I cannot pay this \$1,000 fine every time you need to speak to me. And she said, oh, it was just a way to force you to come in, so that we can talk to you.

And I'm like -- I mean, that's when she told me that even if you build that roof all the way out according to your plan, it would still not meet DCRA Zoning's Regulation and that was the first I heard of that. I'm like what do you mean? You guys approved this.

And so I told her like so if I build all the way out, I'm going to have to later pay people to demolish it. I have to

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

spend more money to build it out, why would I do that if you're telling me that it still doe snot meet DCRA Regulations?

She is like, right. You know, but we made a mistake. But building it all the way out does not meet. So that -- it was -- we were intending to build it all the way out, but it makes no sense after hearing from her that, you know, this roof, even if you build it -- and the reason it was in the drawing to begin with was because the permit -- people at the Permit Office told me I had to build it out in order to get the permit.

It was not that I know -- I don't know every Zoning Regulation to work with the rules and regulations. These were the things given fact that were to me as and Τ implemented in my drawing to get the necessary permit. And so the reason I didn't build that all the way out is because it would still not have been compliant.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. We

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

don't need to go there really. As I was saying really what is before us is just your application now on 223. I know there has been a long history here and Mr. Green has pointed out that, you know, some of the history may go to trusting what you are submitting.

But in any event, also what I hear is, No. 1, that Ms. Walker has raised the point and other Board Members agree that we need more specificity to show exactly what is going to be built. And what you have represented is acceptable to Mr. Green, but he needs just more specificity, so that those specific plans would be enforceable to a specific degree.

Okay. The question then is, you know, what form that will take. And I guess what I heard from Office of Zoning is that, you know, we don't require that it be prepared by an architect. However, if it is prepared by an architect, then I think that all parties involved have more confidence in those

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

drawings.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

So I guess, and I'll see what my Board Members -- see if they agree. I mean, we can leave the record open for you to submit specific plans that more showing are measurements and those kinds of things. Ιt may be up to you whether or not -- I don't know what the expense is involved with an architect, but it may be worth your while to leave, you know, no stone unturned if you have an architect.

Unless my Board Members feel that we actually want to dictate that you have an architect prepare the documents. I'm not sure that that's in our regulations to require it, so that's kind of why I might encourage it. But what do others think?

VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: I still agree with Board Member Walker and if we can't require it, I want to encourage it as strongly as we can. And I'm looking at whether the applicant can make 223 convincingly, in my

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

mind, in light of the testimony of Mr. Green regarding the deprived -- what's the word?

It's so late I can't even think. Is deprivement a word?

MS. MONROE: Depravation.

VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: Depravation of normal use and enjoyment of his deck. And for me to sort of reach that hurdle in my mind now, I really would like to see plans from a licensed architect. Basically, what we have are two very, very bright lay people agreeing with each other.

Mr. Green, who apparently came up with the concept, and Mr. Yang who refined it with the software program saying that it satisfies their needs. But a licensed architect may look at this and say you are way off base, because they are bringing knowledge to the process and not just the ability to draw.

So I think that that would kind of satisfy me that this four year ordeal is going

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

to be over for everybody and not the two of you sort of going around and around with what, again, is very, very capable, but it's layman's approach to architecture. So and as Mr. Yang testified, he was relying on staff at DCRA to tell him whether permits and drawings were accurate.

And then at the 11<sup>th</sup> hour he found out that despite the software program, despite what he was doing, they happen not to be accurate and he had to start all over again. So let's just nip it at the bud and have professional plans done and submitted, so that we can review it.

In addition to which the three of us are sitting here without the benefit of Mr. Turnbull or others that normally sit with us who bring some of that architectural insight to our deliberations normally when we sit down and review these kind of things. So that's kind of my take on where we are.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I think that's

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

a good point, because, you know, we three actually happen to be lawyers. And sometimes we have an architect with us. And we don't. And so I think, you know, we are saying honestly to you actually if we get something that is not prepared by an architect, we are going to be less sure about our confidence in what it is saying than if we have an architect certifying the plans.

MR. VAJPEYI: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Do you think you can do that?

MR. VAJPEYI: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Why don't we leave it at that then. How soon would you -- how much time would you like to have in order to submit that? Because we will leave the record open for those plans and that's it. And then we will -- maybe we could leave it open if you were to say there is something wrong with those plans.

But basically, we can leave that

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

open for that option, Mr. Green, as a party in this case. But it's not how the plans can be improved or anything like that. It's that these plans depict what has been represented to us today with respect to the flat roof and the perimeter wall and the moving of the downspout and that kind of stuff.

So that's what we would leave it open. If for some reason it doesn't do that, you know, Mr. green could respond. But what I want to do is give you enough time to do that and then set it for a decision.

So you are the ones that, you know, want this sooner than anyone else, I would assume. So what date are you comfortable with giving us as to when you think you can have an architect prepare the plans?

MR. VAJPEYI: I would like to say as soon as possible, but just so that I don't give a date and can't meet it, I would think that if we could have two or three weeks, that will give us enough time to talk to an

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

architect and do the drawings. Hopefully it will be sooner than that.

I was just talking to Chy and he thinks that if -- he things two or three weeks might be reasonable. If he cannot get a drawing within two or three weeks, we basically don't know how long an architect would take. I'm thinking it won't take long, but --

MR. YANG: We don't know their schedules. We don't know -- I mean, I can't get them and say you have two weeks to do this. So it's kind of hard to give you an exact date.

MR. VAJPEYI: Would we be turning those to you or the -- those dates will be so that we can get agreement with Mr. Green as well and then present them to you?

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. We're not going to have another hearing, because we don't think it would be necessary. We just want the plans. And then, you know, we will

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

look at them and make sure that they are in
accordance with the representations that are
made in the rendering and in your testimony
today, you know, with the assistance of the
Office of Zoning, you know, they have
architectural experience.
But that's what we will be looking
at. So we don't need to have another hearing.
What we want to do is set the date to decide
the case on. But we would need that would
be after we get your plans and after enough
time for Mr. Green to respond or the ANC in
the event that a response would be necessary.
MR. VAJPEYI: How many drawing
would you be requiring?
CHAIRPERSON MILLER: How many what?
Drawings?
MR. VAJPEYI: Drawings.
CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Oh, Mr. Moy?
MR. VAJPEYI: And what kind of
drawings?

MR. YANG: Elevation.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: The question is how many copies and what kind of drawings.

I think would not the architect know what kind of drawings or do you believe you can articulate that for him?

MR. MOY: Well, it's in our submission requirements in terms of the drawings. In terms of the copies, I mean, we are -- it's typically 20 copies. But the typical architectural drawings which includes elevation drawings. You show facades of the buildings, the roof top. Considering that drainage is one of the issues here, you know, you might want to be sure that on the drawings site plan indicate and on the how drainage, water drainage is going to flow.

MEMBER WALKER: On that point,
Madam Chair, I'm a little concerned. I
understand that moving the downspout is to the
opposite side is a positive thing for Mr.
Green. But that could be a disaster to the
other neighbor. I just want to make sure that

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the ANC is also going to receive a copy of these plans, because there could be a significant impact to the neighbor on the other side.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Do you want to just address that while we are still in hearing?

MR. YANG: What do you mean?

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Well, did you show your plans to the neighbor on the other side where the downspout is going to be?

MR. YANG: I mean, we are on friendly terms with the other neighbors and they have never -- I mean, we -- I haven't told them that this is what we are going to do. But yeah, I have no problem going and talking with the other neighbors.

I mean, currently, you know, the last time I spoke to him, they seemed fine with it, with the current structure. But like I said, I haven't proposed the new structure based on the new drawings. But you know,

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

yeah, I can consult with them.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Yeah, okay. I think that you need to. They are not a party. Oh, the ANC is a party. But I think that you ought to show the new plans to your neighbors as well.

MR. YANG: Yeah, that's fine.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: And I guess we -- are you suggesting we leave the record open in case they have a concern?

MEMBER WALKER: Absolutely. If you are talking about taking all the water off the roof and down -- through one downspout onto the adjoining neighbor's property, I mean, that could have --

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Let's do that. I mean, I was going to say, I mean, they are not here and they could have come. But what you are saying is you didn't show them that the downspout was moved to that side. Is that right?

MR. YANG: The other neighbor, no.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.
2	MR. VAJPEYI: One of the
3	MR. YANG: And I have no problem
4	putting downspout on both sides.
5	MR. VAJPEYI: No, no.
6	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. We're
7	just saying that because you made a change
8	that might affect your other neighbor, that
9	we're going to leave the record open to give
10	for you to show it to them and in the event
11	they want to file anything.
12	MR. YANG: Yes, yes.
13	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Yes,
14	Mr. Green?
15	MR. GREEN: Madam Chair, we were
16	friends with the our adjoining neighbor
17	until the issue of water came up. So I do not
18	want to have this force onto their adjoining
19	neighbor on the other side.
20	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Well,
21	they will have that opportunity and then the
22	ANC will be notified as well of the change. I

mean, with the new plans. MR. VAJPEYI: So we should notify ANC? CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Yeah. MR. VAJPEYI: And just make sure--CHAIRPERSON MILLER: You didn't notify them of the change that you presented today. Is that right? MR. VAJPEYI: Right. 10 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Yes, you should send them the final drawings. 11 MR. VAJPEYI: Okay. 12 13 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. MR. VAJPEYI: And should --14 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: And whatever 15 filed today actually. They 16 you are automatic party to our cases. You don't have 17 to appear before them. You don't have to, you 18 know, make your case before them again, if you 19 don't want to, but you do need to serve them 20 with any papers that are served on the Board. 21

Okay.

MR. VAJPEYI:

1	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. So
2	basically, we are looking at a schedule, you
3	know, to give you enough time. I mean, we
4	could go to March 3 <sup>rd</sup> for a decision if that's
5	a comfortable amount of time. Okay.
6	MR. VAJPEYI: And within that time
7	we should have gotten the plan reviewed by Mr.
8	Green?
9	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Right. We
10	need to set a schedule, if we can, you know,
11	the date by which you would need to give it to
12	Mr. Green and the ANC, so that they could
13	respond before the decision date, which is
14	March 3 <sup>rd</sup> . So we can try to back up from March
15	3 <sup>rd</sup> .
16	Ms. Bailey or Mr. Moy, whichever,
17	if we need to have a decision March 3 <sup>rd</sup> , then
18	we would need to receive any responses to the
19	additional plans by what date?
20	MS. BAILEY: I would suggest
21	February 24 <sup>th</sup> for the responses, Madam Chair.
22	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.

1	MS. BAILEY: And February 10 <sup>th</sup> for
2	the submission from the applicant.
3	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: You're
4	suggesting two weeks for a response?
5	MS. BAILEY: The 10 <sup>th</sup> . Um, yes,
6	not knowing when the ANC is going to be
7	meeting, I think that's the quandary. So
8	that's if it's agreeable.
9	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Unless you
10	need more time.
11	MR. VAJPEYI: If I followed the
12	time line correctly, we should have our
13	architects drawing to you by February 10 <sup>th</sup> .
14	MS. BAILEY: Yes.
15	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Now, is that
16	enough time or you don't know?
17	MR. VAJPEYI: I don't know.
18	MR. YANG: I just don't think that
19	architect will work that fast.
20	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.
21	MR. YANG: I mean, we have to find
22	one, first of all, so we have to do our
	NEAL R. GROSS

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

research and contact various architects.

about if you have another week, the 17<sup>th</sup>?

Because we are not really changing. What they are doing is not changing anything really.

It's just depicting it in a more professional way. So I'm not sure that this is an issue that the ANC necessarily would change their position on.

I don't see why they would. Do you have a concern? I mean, this is just a better professional picture of what has been represented at this hearing.

MR. GREEN: I do agree.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.

MR. GREEN: And --

MEMBER WALKER: Is it the case that the ANC has seen these three drawings that we have looked at at this hearing today? I mean, it sounded to me like the applicant shared them with Mr. Green, but that is as far as it has gone.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. GREEN: That is correct.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Well, I think that these pictures -- all right. Let's just say this. These renderings, whatever was served here today should be served immediately on the ANC. And if we want to set a date for the ANC to respond to this, if they choose, we could.

I'm just saying that they need time for professional to do the type professional product that we are asking for. But it doesn't change the issues that the ANC would respond to. Whether or not a perimeter sufficient wall in flat for their is а concerns.

And if the neighbor has no concerns and that's what this addresses, I don't really understand what the ANC's concern would be related to the changes that were made. Unless you're saying the other neighbor perhaps, what might be happening on the other side.

MEMBER WALKER: That was my point.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

If you're taking all the water from one side and taking it to --CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. MEMBER WALKER: -- the other side. CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I don't know if that's what is happening, but, to me, that's depicted right here in the pleadings that have been filed today. And Ι MEMBER WALKER: have absolutely no faith in the drawings that have 10 been submitted today. 11 They have not been vetted by any professional at all. So I don't 12 13 have any faith that they are in compliance with building regulations, with the building 14 code. 15 I mean, we have --16 17 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: We have --Office of Planning has weighed in and looked 18 these pictures, these renderings. So 19 that's not why we're getting an architect. 20 I think this has MEMBER WALKER: 21

been an extremely loose process and that's why

we have ended up where we are. We have drawings that have not been viewed by the community. We have had some -- you know, an applicant who has represented that he is not an architect, you know, who has really played, apparently from the record, fast and loose and has been ordered to stop work on a couple of occasions.

And Mr. Green has made some suggestions that are to his liking, but I don't have any faith that these renderings that are before us are really going to withstand scrutiny once they are submitted for — to obtain a building permit.

An architect could look at these drawings and change them completely.

VICE CHAIRMAN LOUD: You know, Madam Chair, as much as I don't want to drag this out, to be honest with you, looking at -- until Board Member, I know I always call her Commissioner, but until Board Member Walker brought it out of the testimony, I really

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

didn't zero in on the fact that the entire downspout is relocated to the opposite side. So it is something that, you know, we ought to make sure that the ANC is aware of. I don't know if it has to be plans or sort of written notification just some something. But to me, it would be prudent to not have us go through all of this and then at the 11<sup>th</sup> hour the ANC jumps in and says wait a 10 minute, you changed the whole drainage system on us and we didn't know anything about it. 11 And we're just going around and 12 around and around all over again. 13 Okay. CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Ι didn't really disagree with that, but I didn't 15 know that they have to have the final, I don't 16 know --17 MEMBER WALKER: I think you have to 18 have --19 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: -- plans. 20

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

I don't think that that would change their

comments that they had of what we have today,

14

21

since the final plans are only supposed to represent what we have today.

However, let me just say this is really a scheduling issue. And so if you know if we can schedule it so that they have it all before they respond, then everybody is happy.

Mr. Moy, don't you have a --

MR. MOY: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: -- schedule?

MR. MOY: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Good. Okay.

MR. MOY: The ANC typically meets the second Wednesday of the month, so their next meeting actually will be tomorrow. I'm looking at January. For February it would be February the 11<sup>th</sup>, which would be their next meeting.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.

MS. BAILEY: Madam Chair, don't forget the ANC can always have a special public meeting if there's something that they really want to take up. They can always have

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

a special meeting.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Right. That's true, too. So I think what I'm hearing from the applicant though is that you really are not sure if you'll have anything from the architect by February 10<sup>th</sup>. You really don't know, right?

MR. YANG: Right.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. And if the ANC, unless they have a special --

(Whereupon, at 7:26 p.m. a recess until 7:29 p.m.)

at the calendar, I mean, it seems to me there are a couple of wrinkles here that Board Members are concerned with, such that we want to give the ANC an opportunity to look at the plans as well as the neighbor on the other side.

And in that you did not submit the documents showing changes to the ANC or to the other neighbor, we want to build in time for

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

them to have an opportunity to look at all the documents. And it may be that when the architect looks at these renderings, the architect may feel that something else needs to be changed, because this isn't prepared by an architect.

Therefore, I would suggest that we schedule this for our April meeting, which is April 7<sup>th</sup>. And that the architect's documents be given to the ANC and the neighbors prior to their March meeting, which is what March 11<sup>th</sup>? Is that what you said?

MR. MOY: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Since we have a little bit of time here, I mean, I would think maybe we could say by March 1<sup>st</sup> or so that they have time to at least digest the architectural drawings and any other changes.

Mr. Green -- okay, let's see. And the ANC meeting would be March 11<sup>th</sup>. And then the ANC would have time to get any -- and Mr. Green and the other neighbor would have time

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

to submit in any comments to the Board prior to April  $7^{\rm th}$ .

So looking at an April 7<sup>th</sup> date, what would be the date, Ms. Bailey, that the ANC and Mr. Green and the other neighbor would need to submit any comments back to the Board on?

MS. BAILEY: Um, March 23<sup>rd</sup>, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Could you -- first of all, I think that since we are going further out now, that that March 1<sup>st</sup> date for providing the documents to the neighbors and the ANC, that's not a problem for you, is it? Mr. Green, does that sound like sufficient amount of time for you?

MR. GREEN: Yes, it does.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. You would have from March 1<sup>st</sup> to March 23<sup>rd</sup>, yeah, to file something. All right. And that gives time for the ANC to consider all the documents at their meeting.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

However, I would suggest that the applicant serve the ANC and your neighbor with the documents that you have served us as soon as possible, because they are entitled to be served, basically, when we are. And then that would just leave the plans prepared by the architect and if there is any other explanatory language, if there are some changes.

For instance, you know, if it just depicts what you have represented here, it can say that, but if the architect looks at is, we're going to leave the record open, I think if the architect were to determine that, for instance, you couldn't have a downspout just on one side, you really should have it on both sides or something, and then the reason for that.

And then Mr. Green and the others would have that information. Okay. Other comments by Board Members?

MR. MOY: Madam Chair, the March

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

 $1^{\text{st}}$  date is a Sunday, so the filing for the applicant should be March  $2^{\text{nd}}$ , Monday.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.

MR. VAJPEYI: I have a question,

Madam Chair. When I present this to ANC, so

am I applying for a hearing or I just present

it to them in reference to this case?

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Right. What I was saying is you're not required, we don't require you to ask for a hearing from the ANC to make a presentation. If you want to and you think it's going to help your case and you want to communicate with the community, that's up to you.

But you are required just to serve the documents on them, because they are, under our rules, a party.

MR. VAJPEYI: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Mr. Green is a party now, too. We gave him party status. So he is entitled, too. We didn't give party status to the neighbor, but we would like you,

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

on the other side, to do the same on the other side, so that there are no questions out there, you know.

MR. VAJPEYI: And how do the rest get back to you? So we explain to them this is the purpose of sharing the documents, but they will have an opportunity to respond to those drawings. How do they get their feedback to you or do I just -- I just want to make sure that I have given them the instructions.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Oh, right. Well, we're just here certainly giving deadlines that we talked about. I think we talked about March 23<sup>rd</sup> would be their deadline. If you want to communicate that to them, you could also have them call the Office of Zoning if they want to find out really specific information.

MR. VAJPEYI: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.

MS. BAILEY: Madam Chair, would it

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

be acceptable to just go over those dates, so everyone is on the same page? The applicant is to file detailed plans, as discussed here today, drawn to scale by a licensed D.C. architect. Those plans are to be filed by March 2, 2009 to the BZA and others.

The responses from Mr. Green, ANC- 1A and the neighbor, the next door neighbor, if appropriate, is March  $23^{\rm rd}$ . The ANC is scheduled to meet on March  $11^{\rm th}$ . And the Board's decision is scheduled for April  $7^{\rm th}$ .

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: What day of the week is March 23<sup>rd</sup>?

MS. BAILEY: March 23<sup>rd</sup> is on a Monday, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. I just wanted to say that, you know, we can leave the record open also if the Office of Planning did want to file something, but we are not necessarily seeking it from the Office of Planning.

And I just was wondering if we

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

wanted to put a date down for that? March 30<sup>th</sup> or something like that? MS. BAILEY: March 30<sup>th</sup>, okay. CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Just in the event that the Office of Planning wants to comment. Okay. Any questions? MR. VAJPEYI: One final question. CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. 10 MR. VAJPEYI: April 7, do we have to come here or this is just for decision? 11 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Right. 12 MR. VAJPEYI: And we will be 13 notified. 14 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Good question. 15 We don't anticipate continuing any more on 16 hearing, that 17 the we just want those documents. So you do not need to come here. 18 If that changes, we could let you know. 19 But don't take testimony normally 20 decision making. We just come out here and we 21

have considered all the evidence in the record

and then the record will be closed after the dates that we talked about. We will deliberate and we are also webcast live, so you could just watch us on the Internet, if you want to. Okay? MR. VAJPEYI: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON MILLER: All right. Thank you very much. MR. VAJPEYI: Thank you. 10 MR. YANG: Thank you, Madam Chair. MS. BAILEY: Mr. Green, we will 11 need a copy of your PowerPoint presentation 12 when you get an opportunity. 13 MR. GREEN: 14 Okay. MS. BAILEY: Thank you. 15 MS. MONROE: It needs to be in the 16 record. That's all, so sending a copy, you 17 know, paper copy. 18 19 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: That probably should be served on the other parties as well 20 then, correct? Can you do that on the --21 okay. Thank you. 22

1	MS. BAILEY: No, we need for you to
2	print it out.
3	MS. MONROE: Yeah, printed.
4	MR. GREEN: Oh, printed out.
5	MS. BAILEY: Yeah.
6	MR. GREEN: Oh, okay.
7	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Ms.
8	Bailey, do we have anything else on the agenda
9	for this evening?
10	MS. BAILEY: No, Madam Chair. And
11	don't forget, we won't be here next week.
12	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: No, we won't.
13	Okay. Happy inauguration, everybody. And
14	this hearing is adjourned.
15	(Whereupon, the Public Hearing was
16	concluded at 7:38 p.m.)
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	