GOVERNMENT

OF

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

TUESDAY

DECEMBER 15, 2009

+ + + + +

The Special Public Decision

Meeting convened in Room 220 South, 441 4th

Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20001,

pursuant to notice at 9:30 a.m., Shane L.

Dettman, Vice-Chairman, presiding.

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT MEMBERS PRESENT:

SHANE L. DETTMAN, Vice Chairman (NCPC) MERIDITH H. MOLDENHAUER, Board Member

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

ANTHONY J. HOOD, Chairman PETER MAY, Commissioner (NPS)

NEAL R. GROSS

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

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

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PRESENT: SHERRY GLAZER, ESQ.

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Public Meeting held on December 15, 2009.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Opening 4
<u>APPLICATION NO. 17988</u>
<u>APPLICATION NO. 17963</u> 9
Commissioner Angel Alston, ANC 5C
Carlynn Fuller, representing the
applicant
Michael Gaus, applicant 32
VOTE: 3-0-2 to approve with conditions 52
APPLICATION NO. 17958 56
VOTE: 3-0-2 to approve

NEAL R. GROSS

1 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 2 10:20 a.m. BZA VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: This 3 meeting will please come to order. 4 Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. 5 This is the December 15, 2009 of the Board of 6 Zoning Adjustment of the District of Columbia. 7 is Shane Dettman, Vice 8 Мγ name Chairperson representing the National Capital 9 Planning Commission 10 is 11 То right Mr. Peter May representing the D.C.Zoning Commission. 12 13 left. is Ms. Meridith Moldenhauer, Mayoral Further left is Mr. Appointee to the BZA. 14 15 Clifford Moy with the Office of Zoning and Ms. 16 Beverley Bailey also with the Office of Zoning. 17 Copies of today's meeting agenda 18 19 are available to you and are located to my left in the wall bin near the door. 20

at our meetings unless the Board asks someone

We do not take any public testimony

21

to come forward.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

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

point, this will And at we entertain any preliminary matters. And Mr. Bailey, does staff Moy, Ms. have any preliminary matters?

SECRETARY MOY: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members of the Board. We do have preliminary matters this morning for the two decision cases. And the staff would suggest that we take that up case-by-case.

BZA VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Perfect.

I think what we'd like to do, the Board has two decision this morning; those decisions are Application 17963 and 17988 and I think what we'd like to do is flip the order

NEAL R. GROSS

and take up 17988 of Koo L. Yuen first. So could we call that case first?

SECRETARY MOY: Yes, sir.

Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, that would be Appeal No. 17988 of Koo L. Yuen. This is a motion for summary judgment, pursuant to 111 DCMR '' 3100 and 3101, from an April 30, 2009, Notice of Intent to Revoke Building Permit No. B85608 by the Zoning Administrator, Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs for a gasoline service station in the C-1 District at premises 5010 Benning Road, Southeast. That's in Square 5340, Lot 68.

On December 1, 2009 the Board completed public testimony on the motion for the Summary Judgment and closed the record to further testimony. The Board scheduled to make its decision on December 15th.

And staff would leave it at that, Mr. Chairman.

BZA VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Thank you,

NEAL R. GROSS

Mr. Moy.

Colleagues, as Mr. Moy stated, the
Board heard the arguments on the Motion for
Summary Judgment on December 1st and set the
decision for that motion for today. However,
at this point in time due to some unexpected
circumstances the Board does not have a quorum
for this particular decision. We don't have
the three members necessary in order for us to
render a decision on the Motion for Summary
Judgment. And that's going to necessitate the
Board to put our decision off on this case
until a later date so that we can get the
three votes. We can have Chairman Loud review
the record and participate in the vote. And I
believe Ms. Moldenhauer is going to be reading
the transcript as well as the record and
participating in that vote as well. So at
that later date we'll have four Board members
participating.

Mr. Moy, is there anything else that I need to state for the record or is it

NEAL R. GROSS

1	just a matter of finding a date?
2	SECRETARY MOY: At this point it
3	would be a matter of rescheduling it to a
4	future date.
5	BZA VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Okay. Why
6	don't we and, Ms. Moldenhauer, if you wanted
7	to weigh in on a date, why we don't we look at
8	the afternoon of January 26th. And I think
9	what we can do is schedule the decision for
10	the Motion for Summary Judgment and depending
11	upon the outcome of that vote, we can also
12	include the hearing, if necessary, on that
13	particular afternoon. Does that work for
14	staff?
15	SECRETARY MOY: Yes, sir. It does.
16	BZA VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Okay. And
17	why don't we do our very best to keep that
18	afternoon reserved solely for this particular
19	case, if that's possible.
20	SECRETARY MOY: So that would be
21	rescheduling to Tuesday, January, 26, 2010 in

Typically we start at 1:00.

22

the afternoon.

BZA VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Great. Thank you, Mr. Moy.

If there's nothing else, I think we can move ahead to the next case.

SECRETARY MOY: And that would be Application No. 17963 of Euclid of Virginia, pursuant to 11 DCMR ' 3104.1 for a special exception to allow a new self-service gasoline station and convenience store under section 706, in the C-1 District at premises 4975 South Dakota Avenue, Northeast. The property is located in Square 3899, Lot 76.

At its decision meeting, if the Board will recall, on November 10, 2009 the Board convened this application and deliberated on two preliminary matters. The Board expressed continued concerns related to the applicability of a study event. event, the Board rescheduled its decision to December 15th with filings from the applicant and respondents.

The applicant filed within the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	deadline, and that filing is in your case
2	folders identified as Exhibit 33.
3	There were no other filings from
4	respondents except for a filing from ANC 5E,
5	which was faxed into the office this morning,
6	December the 15th. So that would be untimely
7	considering that the deadline for filing from
8	parties was Monday, December the 7th.
9	Although for the Board I read on the first
10	page of that ANC 5A letter that it does say
11	that the ANC held an emergency community
12	meeting on December 7th.
13	Anyways, apart from that
14	preliminary matter, the Board is to act on the
15	merits of the requested special exception of
16	zoning relief.
17	And that completes the staff's
18	briefing, Mr. Chairman.
19	BZA VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Thank you,
20	Mr. Moy.
21	Colleagues, I think the first
22	matter that we should take up is the late

filing from ANC 5A. As Mr. Moy stated, we received a last minute fax from the ANC addressing some of the remaining concerns that they had with this case. And that's a resolution from ANC 5A, dated December 11, 2009.

Having had a chance to review the content of that resolution, I see that they do very briefly address the traffic study that was prepared for this report or for application, that's on the first page of the And then furthermore, the ANC raises some issues with respect to EPA regulations and conformance and nonconformance with EPA regulations which fall outside of the BZA zoning purview. It also falls outside the scope of the information that we were looking for on this latest round of filings.

So I think my recommendation on this late filing is that we could allow it into the record simply for limited to the information that is contained on the first

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

page that addresses the ANC's position on the traffic report. But anything outside of that, the information pertaining to the EPA, I think falls outside our purview here and I would not be in support of allowing that information in the record and allowing it to influence the Board's deliberation on this case.

Colleagues?

COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chairman, I don't object to the full document being the record. But I agree with you that anything that does not address the traffic report is not relevant. You know, it's not what we requested. It's not the basis for decision making that we would make according to the requirements for special exception. Because otherwise trying to redact information from a document or something like that, that's I think an unusual step. I think it's enough to say that that's simply not relevant and we'll accept it for what it says about the --

MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: This case, the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

ANC has obviously been putting a lot of effort forward in trying to present their issues. And I think it's frustrating for us to get a document at the last hour containing amendment seven that was created on the 11th, and then we don't get it until the morning of the 15th. trying to review, Ι quess, assessments. You know, they have challenges in the first section about the traffic study. And it also provides us -- it's a detriment to us in order to be able to review this and actually take it into consideration and then to try to compare that to the report.

I think we can allow it in. I don't know how much we're going to be able to give it in regards to assessing it or analyzing it.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chairman, could I also add as I recall, what was discussed at the last meeting since I was not there but I read the transcript, was that the ANC would provide the report with sufficient

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	time for the applicant to provide a response
2	to it. Clearly, we don't have time to be able
3	to get that response. And I think that if
4	were to move forward today, we would want to
5	take into consideration the fact that we don't
6	have from the applicant. And if we were to
7	move to deny the application, I think that we
8	would have to postpone and allow them to
9	respond, based on the prior meeting.
10	BZA VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: That's a
11	very good point, Mr. May.
12	Well, let me ask this: I see the
13	applicant is in the audience. And would Board
14	members entertain bringing the applicant up to
15	ask if they've had a chance to review this
16	filing and whether or not they wish to
17	respond?
18	COMMISSIONER MAY: I don't object
19	to that.
20	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: I'd be fine
21	with that also. Because this letter questions

the validity of the traffic study that we're

relying on considering that that was one of the major issues. And it states here that they're not sure if its numbers are accurate, what the date of its completion was; things to that effect. So I would definitely be willing to allow the applicant to weigh in on whether or not they want to respond.

BZA VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Okay. Why don't we do that then? If the applicant could come up to the table.

And the ANC is in the audience as well, and Ms. Grant, if you wanted to come up to the table. I'm sorry, Ms. Alston. If you wanted to come up to the table, we're not going to have a debate about this. This is really just a matter to find out whether or not the applicant wants to respond to this latest filing.

And keep in mind that the Board has pretty much determined that we are going to allow this in the record. We haven't waived our rules yet, but the scope of the

NEAL R. GROSS

information that the Board's allowing into the record is only that paragraph that pertains to the traffic study. So really there's no need to respond to the information about the EPA.

And just for the record, could you introduce yourself?

MS. FULLER: Yes. Good morning. My name is Carlynn Fuller. I'm the attorney for the applicant.

Well first, if I may, raise an objection. Because we just got this from Mr. Moy. We didn't even get it from the ANC.

The last meeting on November 10th there was a late filing allowed by the ANC at that meeting. I called the office on December the 11th to -- I'm sorry. On December the 8th to find out if the ANC had filed so that we would be able to respond timely. They had not filed. I spoke with Ms. Booth in the Office of Zoning. There was no response from the ANC.

I think it's unfair to the

NEAL R. GROSS

applicant who did spend considerable amount of money on this traffic study, who did meet the deadline to get it to the Board and hand delivered it to the ANC on the 10th to now have to, perhaps, push this case out again not at the fault of the applicant when, again, as you indicate they met on the 7th, this was done on the 11th and its just now getting into our hands today on the 15th.

Can I just consult with my client in terms of whether -- because we really don't want to push this into January to have to review what they are alleging in this report, especially if the Board has had an opportunity to review the traffic study. I mean, I'm not sure if they've consulted with their own expert or if this is just their opinion.

BZA VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Well, let me just say this, and that's fine if you want to consult with your client again, keeping in mind the information in the resolution that the Board is going to accept into the record

NEAL R. GROSS

and incorporate into the deliberation which is 1 2 the last paragraph on the first page. We need to apply the standard that 3 allow this into the 4 in order to record: There's good cause shown for the late filing 5 6 and no prejudice to any party, which the only other party to this case in addition to the 7 ANC is the applicant. 8 MS. FULLER: Yes. 9 10 BZA VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: So while you confer with your client, perhaps you can 11 decide whether or not you feel like you're 12 going to be prejudiced if the Board was to 13 allow this into the record. And then we'll 14 hear from the ANC on what their good cause is. 15 16 MS. FULLER: Okay. Thank you. BZA VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: That sound 17 good? Okay. 18 19 Good morning. COMMISSIONER ALSTON: Good morning. 20 Angel Alston on behalf of the ANC 5A 21 things I definitely want to 22

1	clear up.
2	First one being, she said the
3	filing was late because they met their
4	deadline. At the last hearing, they did not
5	meet their deadlines which is why we had to
6	postpone it. Because we did not get the
7	traffic study in October when we were ordered
8	by the Board. We actually got it after the
9	hearing, which is why our filing was not
10	timely
11	COMMISSIONER MAY: Was that not
12	known at the hearing?
13	COMMISSIONER ALSTON: It was, and
14	that's why we're at this hearing
15	COMMISSIONER MAY: But following
16	the hearing you were supposed to get the
17	report that day. Did you receive it that day?
18	Did you
19	COMMISSIONER ALSTON: We did
20	receive it that day. But
21	COMMISSIONER MAY: I really think

that's the only thing that's relevant at this

1	moment.
2	COMMISSIONER ALSTON: No. She said
3	at the November okay. I'm sorry.
4	COMMISSIONER MAY: You know, what
5	she says about when, who received what really
6	matter.
7	COMMISSIONER ALSTON: Okay. At the
8	last hearing
9	COMMISSIONER MAY: The question is
LO	whether
11	COMMISSIONER ALSTON: Yes, sir. We
L2	received it that day.
L3	COMMISSIONER MAY: you received
L4	what you were supposed to received based or
L5	that.
L6	COMMISSIONER ALSTON: Yes, sir.
L7	That day. But thisokay. This particular
L8	issue, when we sat here at the scheduling at
L9	the last hearing, the record was not supposed
20	to be closed to the ANC on the 7th because we
21	did not hold our emergency meeting until the

night of the 7th. And we were supposed to

have until the end of the week for the record 1 2 to be open to us because we specifically said that our meeting would be held. We would 3 4 first try to call an emergency meeting just to address this issue because we don't meet in 5 6 the month of December. And our meeting was not 7 until the night of the 7th, and that's why it's--8 COMMISSIONER MAY: I think it would 9 10 be more useful to address why the report was dated December 11th and we didn't receive it 11 until this morning. 12 13 COMMISSIONER ALSTON: December 11th was Friday. It was supposed to be faxed out 14 15 of our office on Friday. And then it was -- I 16 think it was faxed over yesterday, not today. COMMISSIONER MAY: 17 Okay. COMMISSIONER ALSTON: Okay. 18 19 BZA VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Well, Ms. I think Mr. May makes a very good 20 point that the Board put together a briefing 21

schedule based on the emergency meeting. So

the November date really, the date that you were supposed to get the original study in November really isn't relevant.

However, what is relevant is the ANC had a filing deadline of December 7th, and that happens to be the day that you held your meeting.

So in terms of the Board's standard that they have to apply in order to waive the rules and allow in the record, and the first part of that standard is for good cause shown, was there a reason why you couldn't hold your emergency meeting prior to the 7th? Was that the only day that you could hold that meeting, discuss it with the community and get your filing in sometime after?

COMMISSIONER ALSTON: Yes, so we actually -- that date was set on the record at last week's -- month's hearing when we looked at the calendar that that was the only date scheduled. And so we let you all know. Because you asked us to let you know when our

meeting was going to be. And I told you that if we were to accommodate a meeting, it would be December 7th. And then you all said that you would allow time for us to file. But it that the 7th was the deadline. never Because we even looked at the calendar with another Commissioner here. That our meeting, if we had one at all, would always be the first Monday of the month, which was the 7th, 7:30 p.m. And that should be on the record.

COMMISSIONER MAY: My recollection, having read the record very recently, was that that's roughly correct. I don't know what the time was that it was allowed for report, but I think there was a deadline that was set for the report. It might have been the 10th, but it certainly was not the 11th or today. The idea was to make sure that there was time to get it the applicant and to get a response from the applicant.

And as I recall, my recollection of

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the testimony was that the ANC would turn the report around the next day, the day after the meeting from what was in the record. But I think that we did actually give them a couple of days.

MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: I have another question. Obviously, the time -- we'll all aware of the issue of the timing. But is there a reason why, I mean if this was either faxed out on Friday or on Monday, why it wasn't sent the applicant as well?

COMMISSIONER ALSTON: We were never asked to send anything to the applicant. We always -- always -- our correspondence always comes to your office. That's just like--

MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: But I mean you knew the time frame and you knew that it was getting kind of tight. And so I'm just wondering why you weren't trying to make sure that they had time to respond and either, you know, contact, Cliff or make sure that either you just send it directly the applicant. And

NEAL R. GROSS

do you have correspondence from the applicant?

COMMISSIONER ALSTON: No, we don't have mailing. We have a telephone number that we use where we do correspond. But it's never been the tradition for us to send anything to them because that's not what we were asked to do. We were just asked to give it to the Board.

MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: All right.

BZA VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Okay. Well, I mean typically in Board proceedings when parties submit information to the Office of Zoning, they serve all the parties in the case too.

But with respect to the good cause shown for the late filing, I think that perhaps maybe there was a little bit of a misunderstanding whether or not the filing deadline was the 7th or the meeting was supposed to be held on the 7th. I think given the tight timeline and the efforts that the ANC made to hold an emergency meeting, I think

NEAL R. GROSS

that that part of the standard has been met.

Now with respect to whether or not allowing the filing into the record would prejudice any party to the case.

I guess it's back the applicant to see whether or not they've been able to determine now.

Okay. Again, we do FULLER: object to the late filing. However, we're reviewing what is -- if you say it's limited to the first paragraph, this is an opinion. It's not citing any expert, anything that would verify that they consulted with their own person. I don't see any grounds that rise to the level of an expert opinion. They're raising several question in this paragraph and re-emphasizing some of the same concerns that they raised prior to even receiving traffic study. So I don't see this as a direct response other than a challenge based on their opinion that they've raised prior to even having the traffic study.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

BZA VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Okay. Well, whether or not reflective of an opinion or an expert opinion, or the decision of a transportation expect, I mean that's for the Board to decide --

MS. FULLER: Yes. I mean I --

BZA VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: -- when it comes into the record. However, I think the question here is do you feel that the information contained inside the resolution prejudices you?

I do believe that if MS. FULLER: its given great weight just on the face of it, then I do believe that the applicant will be prejudiced. Because the applicant has not had an opportunity to really respond to this in great detail. And the fact that if it's going to push the decision of the Board off until another month or two, which is what the point in the deadlines that were set we're trying to do avoid, you know Ι believe that applicant will be prejudiced.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

BZA VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: I think the Board is prepared to go forward with their deliberation today. And I think that given the amount and the content of what's in the resolution, the Board can process that incorporate that particular part of the resolution into their deliberation. It looks like this resolution does meet the great weight standards about holding a meeting. It was duly noticed. It had a

meet the great weight standards about holding a meeting. It was duly noticed. It had a quorum. So that information about the transportation study would be afforded the great weight that its entitled to.

But nonetheless, the Board is prepared to go forward today. And unless you feel that you're prejudiced to the point where you need to respond, that would be the only reason that the Board would put this decision off.

MS. FULLER: Okay. Can you give me one second, please?

We're prepared to go forward.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

BZA VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: You ready to go forward?

MS. FULLER: Yes.

BZA VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Okay. And simply just for the record, you do not wish to respond to that information that pertains to the transportation study?

MS. FULLER: Unless we can respond orally. But if we're not in writing --if we can respond today in the form of testimony, then I can bring my client up and have him But we stand behind the validity of respond. the the traffic study and information contained therein. And so we disagree with what has been said in this resolution from the ANC.

BZA VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Well, to do our best to satisfy the briefing schedule that the Board put together, and I'll ask my colleagues as well, I'm in support of providing you a couple of minutes to provide testimony on what's here in lieu of a response

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 on paper. 2 MS. FULLER: Okay. BZA VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: And then 3 following that couple of minutes, and really 4 we're looking for a brief response. Maybe a 5 6 couple of minutes. And then the Board will move on with their deliberation. 7 MS. FULLER: All right. Thank you. 8 Mr. Chairman? COMMISSIONER MAY: 9 10 BZA VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Yes, sir. COMMISSIONER MAY: Do you need a 11 motion to be able to waive the rules to accept 12 13 the ANC report into the record? BZA VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Thank you, 14 15 I think actually we can do this by Mr. May. 16 consensus of the Board, or by a motion. COMMISSIONER MAY: 17 Yes. BZA VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: We've done 18 19 it both ways. But I can basically say that I'm in support of waiving under section 3100.5 20 our rules and allow the late filing from the 21

22

ANC into the record.

1	COMMISSIONER MAY: I would agree
2	with that.
3	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: I would agree
4	also.
5	BZA VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Okay. It
6	appears we have a consensus. So the ANC
7	resolution will be allowed in the record and
8	afforded the great weight that its entitled
9	to.
10	Now back to the applicant, we'd
11	like to ask you to come up. And again, maybe
12	we're looking at a couple of minutes to
13	respond to the information that pertains to
14	the traffic study in the ANC resolution. And
15	then we'll bring this matter to a close.
16	MS. FULLER: Thank you. We're
17	pulling the actual study up on the computer.
18	We don't have a hard copy with us.
19	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: In regard to a
20	response, I would just like to say, I mean the
21	applicant obviously is not a traffic expert so
22	I don't believe that he should try to testify

in that regard, just simply provide some general responses as to background information on your expert or on the traffic study that was conducted.

MR. GAUS: Okay.

MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: Providing your some guidance on response.

MR. GAUS: Okay. All right. Good morning.

Again, my name is Michael Gaus.

And I'm prepared to move forward toward.

that That paragraph is being submitted into testimony today, it alleges that the traffic study was flawed. It alleges that the numbers grossly were under represented. Let me just state that this study was traffic performed by an is the basis company that this of business. This is a study that was performed, this group spent a couple of days not only at intersections site, but in that went the beyond the scope of what was asked for simply

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

to be thorough and to make sure that there wouldn't be any adverse impact on the surrounding community and the side streets.

And frankly, the Minnesota Avenue Traffic Study that was utilized in the first place shows that the Minnesota Avenue traffic patterns is actually heavier than the South Dakota Avenue traffic pattern, which would further enhance our argument that this would not be a detriment to the surrounding area in terms of traffic is concerned.

I don't see anything on this that would show that someone actually came back with another site study that showed the traffic pattern being something different than what was performed by the group that did the traffic study. And so therefore, you know, I'm prepared to move forward.

BZA VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Thank you very much.

I think at this time it's back to the Board. And we'll go into deliberation on

NEAL R. GROSS

this case.

And I believe I've stated it, but once again for the record with respect to the ANC resolution that was provided to us this morning, the information that will be allowed into the record only pertains to that which addresses the transportation study. And the information that pertains to the EPA regulations and different stories and weblinks that are included in the resolution, that will not be considered by the Board.

So, colleagues, I can start us off here.

This is an application that's been around for some time and it's a request for a special exception relief to establish a gasoline service station at 4975 South Dakota Avenue, Northeast. For the Board to analyze such an application, it's per section 726/706 as well as the provisions of 2302 needs to be met.

Relying upon the Office of

NEAL R. GROSS

Planning's analyzes with respect to the provisions of 706, and I won't read them in their entirety but kind of summarize what those provisions say. 706.3 states that the station shall not be located within 25 feet of a resident's district unless its separated by a street or an alley, and such is the case as this one. The subject property is in the R-2 District and it is appropriately separated by either a street or alley from the surrounding residential district.

706.4 states that the operation of the use shall not create any dangerous or other objectionable traffic conditions. And I think with respect to that provision I'll address it at the end of my comments since that's kind of where the crux of the issues around this application are centered.

So moving on to 706.5 the Board may impose requirements pertaining to design, appearance, screening and lighting and what have you. The Office of Planning as well as

DDOT, both in support of the application, suggested some conditions that be put in place if the Board was so inclined to approve the application. So we can take that up at the time it's appropriate.

706.6 states that the required parking spaces may be arranged so that they're not accessible at all times, however they need to be designed and located in a manner that the maneuvering of such vehicles would not require moving into public space.

The application, the site plan that was provided which is in our file shows that the applicant does meet the minimum required number of parking spaces and they have been arranged in the manner that will be actually accessible at all times. And so the provision of 706.6 has been met.

With respect to consistency with section 2302, 2302.1 pertains to public storage garages, repair garages, mechanical and a gasoline service station established or

NEAL R. GROSS

enlarged in any district except the CM.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

And then moving on to 2302.2 no portion of a structure or premises to be used for those uses shall be located within 25 feet of a residential district. As I stated in articulating the provisions under 706, that provision has been met.

2302.3 related to the location of a vehicular entrance and its proximity to residential district. No closer than 25 feet district, again to residential unless separated bу street or alley. That а provision is met as well as 2302.4 which discusses the relationship of exits and entrances to street intersections. Not only does this application meet the 40 foot requirement on the Regs, but I believe it meets the 60 foot requirement under the DDOT public space provisions.

So it appears to me that the provisions under 2302 have been met, including 2302.5 stating that all grease pits and hoists

NEAL R. GROSS

shall be within the building. This particular use will not have any of those types of facilities.

Moving back to the issues that revolve around traffic and the impact of this particular use on the surrounding neighborhood with respect to traffic and congestion, having reviewed thoroughly the transportation study that was submitted to us, our Exhibit 33, I think that Ι was satisfied in what transportation study kind of came conclusion of.

I disagree with a couple of points in the traffic study in that the traffic study says that it is unlikely that the site's location in the city will result in a reduced number of trips based on the amount of public transportation that services this site. I think that this is a very automobile-oriented use. People are going to be patronizing this facility for purposes of filling up their gas tank. So perhaps maybe to a very, very small

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

degree those that are visiting the convenience store might wish to ride a bike or ride the bus to this facility. But I don't think that the public transportation that's in close proximity to this site is any kind of justification for a reduction in the number trips that this thing is going to be likely to generate.

I do agree that this type of use lends itself more to pass by trips. Meaning that the vehicles that are going to be entering this site are vehicles that are going to be on the road anyways. I could be wrong. But there's not many instances where I've ever been sitting at home and I'm going to jump in the car to go up my gasoline tank. And that would be a new trip.

So, I do agree that there's going to be a high degree of pass by trips, which means that cars are going to be on the road already contributing to traffic and congestion.

NEAL R. GROSS

with Secondly, I disagree the transportation study in that it says because the surrounding neighborhood is well established that it does not lend itself to commuter cut through traffic. I think that whether its an established neighborhood or a new neighborhood, I think that the surrounding transportation network, and if it lends itself to shortcuts to where people are trying to get to or shortcut to a highway, I think that that lends itself more to cut through trips as opposed to whether or not the neighborhood is established or not.

So looking at the map that was included in the transportation study, I think the surrounding transportation network doesn't lend itself to cut through traffic simply because I think that the majority of the traffic on South Dakota Avenue is trying to get to another major arterial, and one being the BW Parkway. And so the neighborhood to the north of the subject traffic, I don't see

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

any kind of easy connection to get to that location. So I don't see that this particular use is going to increase the amount of cut through traffic in the neighborhood.

In terms of the number of trips, I don't see it raising to a level where its going to have a substantial impact on the surrounding neighborhood.

And with respect to the site circulation contemplated, I think that that's going to control for any kind of objectionable traffic conditions on the neighborhood.

So, colleagues, I'll turn it over to you. It was kind of a long-winded way of saying that I do support the application. However, I think that conditions will be required in order to address some of the issues that were raised by the neighborhood.

MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: Thank you, Shane, I believe you did a very thorough job of going through the different factors for both 723 and 2302.

I think one of the major issues that you identified is the traffic conditions under 726. And, you know, that was one of the major discussion points of all the different hearing dates. And the ANC's main concern was issues of cut throughs. We try to address that by really analyze and discussing DDOT's evaluation, obtaining the finer transportation study for this site and not for another site. And I think that based on a company that focuses on transportation studies, they have analyzed and gone through.

I believe that you're correct in assessing and I believe that the transportation study does correctly state these will be pass through trips.

And I think that DDOT has tried to make sure that the traffic goes back onto South Dakota based on the fact that they're going to have a one in and then everyone else will come out onto Emerson, and to take a right back onto South Dakota or to do a left

onto South Dakota.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

And I think that while it is a concern, I think that the requirements for the special exceptions have been met.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your summarizing the basic facts of And I think the matter has become the case. relatively straightforward now that we have a traffic report that's been prepared by somebody with the appropriate expertise and has been endorsed by DDOT. And we have, I think, the right combination of conditions from the Office of Planning and DDOT to mitigate any of the other concerns that we're supposed to mitigate by the terms of Zoning Regulations. So I think at this point it's pretty straightforward.

BZA VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Moldenhauer and Mr. May.

I just wanted to make a couple of points in response to some of the issues that the ANC raised. And I'll just very quickly go

NEAL R. GROSS

through their three reports that we received.

Looking at our Exhibit 26, which is the first report that we received. As to the first two issues, the community does not need or benefit from a low priced gas station and that the proposed location will be directly adjacent to an existing gas station, really those are not issues that are of a Zoning nature that the Board would consider in their deliberation.

The current property does not have adequate square footage to provide a gasoline service station. Again, the Board does look at the size of the property. However, a particular threshold in terms of square footage does not need to be met in order to establish the gas station.

The current location is surrounded by homes and a new gas station was potentially cause environmental problems. I think that any kind of impact to the neighborhood, whether it be traffic, whether it be environmental the

NEAL R. GROSS

Board certainly does take into consideration. However, Ι think that there other are regulations outside of the BZA, outside of the Zoning Regulations that help to control for environmental impacts the of gasoline а service station, some of which were included in the latest ANC resolution with respect to EPA regulations. Although the Board's not considering those here, it's just kind of an example that regulations do exist.

As to whether or not the current owners currently maintain their property. think that property maintenance and cleanliness is an important thing and I think that there are other of the arms D.C. Government that can be engaged in order to make sure that that happens appropriately.

So I think that addresses the issues in Exhibit 26. They're largely the same issues that were included in our Exhibit 32 from the ANC, again raising some issues that don't fall within the Zoning purview;

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

property maintenance, safety in the neighborhood. Certainly these are very legitimate issues, but not before the Board right now.

As to the last resolution that we received from the ANC, the one that we waived in today, colleagues, I think that it is the ANC's opinion that given their hands experience for this particular area and the amount of traffic that they've experienced they raised a very good point that this area does have a lot of traffic. I actually do think that that's reflected in the transportation study.

In looking at the existing conditions, the level of service of the intersections, they're operating at a level of service D, which is the lowest threshold that DDOT will accept as an acceptable level of Anything below a D is considered service. And I would suspect that if the failing. existing, including the background as well as

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the number of trips that this facility is expected to generate, if it was pushing it to a level of service E, DDOT would weigh in on that and say that they would not support this I think that there's application. So minimum number of trips generated by the site. And that incorporating those into existing, the surrounding transportation network we're still operating at an acceptable level based on the expert opinion of DDOT.

So, at this point I think I can entertain a motion.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chairman, I would move approval of Application No. 17963 of Euclid of Virginia, pursuant to 11 DCMR '3104.1 for a special exception to allow a new self-service gasoline station and convenience store under section 706, in the C-1 District at premises 4975 South Dakota Avenue, Northeast.

BZA VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Thank you, Mr. May.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	Is there a second?
2	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: Before I
3	second it, I believe there were some
4	conditions, and as long as its conditioned
5	upon those elements in the DDOT report
6	including things that went to safety;
7	providing lights and no noise that could be
8	heard from, I guess, from the gas stations.
9	So based on those
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
11	BZA VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Yes?
12	COMMISSIONER MAY: I would amend my
13	motion to include the conditions. I meant to
14	include them.
15	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: Okay. And
16	then I would second the motion.
17	BZA VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Okay.
18	Thank you.
19	Let's discuss conditions and then
20	for the record, we have a motion that's been
21	made and seconded as conditions. And let's
22	figure out what those conditions are.

2	Moldenhauer, did you want to address these or
3	I could read them as well?
4	It's Exhibit 23. And looking over
5	those conditions, I'm fine with what OP
6	recommends.
7	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: The conditions
8	are: Just the hours of operations shall be
9	limited from 6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.; the
10	flood lights shall be angled downwards and
11	shuttered in order to avoid light spillage
12	onto the nearby neighborhood properties; the
13	canopy lights shall be recessed, and; there
14	shall be no exterior amplified sound systems.
15	And I believe that those are the conditions
16	that Mr. May included in his motion.
17	COMMISSIONER MAY: I believe there
18	were some additional conditions.
19	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: Oh, were
20	there.
21	COMMISSIONER MAY: I'm sorry.
22	Additional conditions from DDOT that we'd like
	N-11

The OP report, our Exhibit 23, Ms.

1	to address. The limitation to 30 foot long
2	trucks, which the applicant agreed to. Fuel
_	crache, which the applicant agreed to. ruer
3	delivery between 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. And
4	let' see. I believe that was it for the
5	DDOT conditions. Those were the two that were
6	not addressed in OP's report.
7	MS. GLAZER: Excuse me. I think there
8	were conditions regarding the curb cut and the
9	right turn in and exit.
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: Oh, you're
11	right. So the curb cut will be restricted to
12	a right turn in vehicle movement only. And
13	the curb cut will be 20 foot wide, but I think
14	that's a fairly standard thing.
15	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: I just have a
16	question for OAG. I believe that the DDOT
17	report also included a request to have annual
18	updated meetings at the ANC regarding traffic.
19	Is there an opinion on that?
20	MS. GLAZER: I think we discussed that
21	before. I'm not sure if you were present and
22	OAG was recommending against that condition.

1	COMMISSIONER MAY: I would agree
2	with that recommendation.
3	SECRETARY MOY: Okay. With respect
4	to the other DDOT conditions, I'm certainly in
5	favor of the one that requires the South
6	Dakota Avenue entrance be right turn in only.
7	So there's no left turns in and there's no
8	exit coming out. So all exiting traffic will
9	on to Emerson.
10	With respect to the closure of the
11	South Dakota Avenue curb cut that's nearest
12	the intersection of Emerson and South Dakota,
13	I think it shows on the plans that this curb
14	cut is going to be closed so I don't see a
15	need to include that as a condition.
16	So for the Office of Attorney
17	General, does the Board need to articulate the
18	conditions again or have we been clear enough?
19	MS. GLAZER: I think it is
20	sufficient.
21	BZA VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Great.
22	Thank you.

1	Well, the motion has been made and
2	seconded. All those in favor say aye.
3	ALL: Aye.
4	BZA VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Opposed?
5	And there ar no abstentions.
6	Can we call the vote please?
7	SECRETARY MOY: Yes. Staff would
8	record the vote as three-to-zero-two. This is
9	on the motion of Peter May to approve as
LO	conditioned by the Board. Seconded by Ms.
11	Moldenhauer. Also in support of the motion
12	the Chairman, Mr. Dettman. We have two
L3	members not present and not voting.
L4	So, again, that's a vote of three-
15	to-zero-to-two to approve with conditions.
L6	BZA VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Thank you,
L7	Mr. Moy.
18	And that concludes the Board's
L9	morning Public Meeting, correct?
20	SECRETARY MOY: That's correct.
21	(Whereupon, at 10:29 a.m. the
22	A.M. Session of the Public Decision Meeting

complete, was adjourned until the Afternoon Session of the Public Decision Meeting beginning at 1:55 p.m.)

NEAL R. GROSS

1	A-F-T-E-R-N-O-O-N S-E-S-S-I-O-N
2	1:55 p.m.
3	BZA VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: The
4	meeting will please come to order.
5	Good afternoon, ladies and
6	gentlemen. This is the December 15, 2009
7	afternoon Public Meeting of the Board of
8	Zoning Adjustment of the District of Columbia.
9	My name is Shane Dettman, Vice
10	Chairperson representing the National Capital
11	Planning Commission
12	To my right is Mr. Anthony Hood,
13	Chairman of the D.C. Zoning Commission. To my
14	left Ms. Meridith Moldenhauer, representing a
15	Mayoral Appointee on the BZA. To my left is
16	Mr. Clifford Moy and Ms. Beverley Bailey from
17	the Office of Zoning.
18	Copies of today's meeting agenda
19	are available to you and are located to my
20	left in the wall bin near the door.
21	We do not take any public testimony
22	at our meetings unless the Board asks someone

1	to come forward.
2	Please be advised that this
3	proceeding is being recorded by a court
4	reporter and is also webcast live.
5	Accordingly, we must ask you to refrain from
6	any disruptive noises or actions in the
7	hearing room. And at this time please turn
8	off all beepers and cell phones.
9	To the staff, does the staff have
10	any preliminary matters for this afternoon's
11	public meeting?
12	SECRETARY MOY: No, sir.
13	BZA VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Thank you,
14	Mr. Moy.
15	The Board has one decision to
16	deliberate on for this afternoon. And why
17	don't we go ahead and call that case.
18	SECRETARY MOY: Thank you.
19	Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman,
20	members of the Board. This one case as you
21	said for decision is Application No. 17958 of

Community Auto Service Center, pursuant to 11

DCMR ' 3103.2, for a variance from the use provisions under section 701.1, and a variance from the off-street parking requirements under subsection 2010.1, to establish an automobile repair and service establishment in the C-1 District at premises 4408 Arkansas Avenue, Northwest. The subject site is located in Square 2819, Lot 808.

The staff notes for the Board that the application was also amended to provide special exception relief from section 2116 which would permit accessory parking.

As the Board will recall, on December 1, 2009 the Board completed public testimony, closed the record and scheduled this decision on December 15th. The Board did allow the ANC 4C to file its report by December 11, 2009. That document is in your case folder identified as Exhibit 39 from ANC 4C.

With that, the Board is to act on the merits of the use variance under section

NEAL R. GROSS

701.1 and variance from the off-street parking requirements and off site accessory parking.

That completes the staff's briefing, Mr. Chairman.

BZA VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Moy.

Colleagues, if you recall at the close of the hearing on this case the Board set off their decision in order for the ANC further request to analyze this case and weigh in on the matter. And we did receive a resolution from ANC 4C, and that's our Exhibit 39.

And very quickly, the ANC did have an opportunity to meet with the applicant on December 8, 2009. They expressed their unanimous support for the project for the use variance to establish the repair garage, the variance from the off-street parking requirements and they do not the applicant's acquire some off site parking efforts to spaces in the lot next door and the lease that

NEAL R. GROSS

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

had been submitted into the record that attests to that.

So, we did receive the information that we need in order for us to go forward, and I can start us off on our deliberations if Board members don't have anything further? Great.

Very quickly, Mr. Moy recapped the areas of relief that are being request here. We're looking at a use variance under section 701.1 to establish a repair garage in the C-1 District. In addition to having to satisfy the use variance test and meeting the burden of an undue hardship, the applicant needed to demonstrate that they are consistent with the provisions of 2302.

We're also here to deliberate on an area variance request to reduce the required number of parking space which, for this facility is 14 spaces, and that area variance would be from 2101.1.

As Mr. Moy noted, the applicant

NEAL R. GROSS

amended their application to pursue the ability to locate parking space off site by way of a special exception under 2116.6.

A review of the regulations, also just for safety's sake, I think that as I articulate the special exception, I'll also incorporate the provisions under 708.1 and section 510 which deal with accessory parking spaces permitted as a special exception in a C-1 District.

With respect to the two variance requests, the use variance as well as the area variance for parking, I'll rely upon OP's report. This is, if you'll recall, colleagues, this is a very, very narrow, very small property that's surrounded on two sides by a large amount of public space which from the street it looks like it's part of the property, but indeed its not.

The current lot occupancy for the building, which was built well prior to the adoption of the 1958 Zoning Regulations is

NEAL R. GROSS

nearing somewhere between 98 and 100 percent
lot occupancy. It's a one story building that
was, according to the OP report, constructed
for the purpose of an auto related use;
whether it be a repair garage, a service
station. There was a mention that it had been
used for a significant amount of time as a
used car dealership. So the applicant also in
their testimony stated about the difficulty,
the undue hardship that would result if they
were required to convert the existing
structure to a matter-of-right under the C-1,
again given the amount of lot occupancy, there
was the presence about the vehicle related
equipment in terms of a hoist that would be
used for repair garage, there was an oil pit
inside, the longstanding use of the property
for auto related purposes. I think three was
mention of an uneven floor, concrete floor
inside of it.

So in terms of the first prong and on whether or not the property has an

NEAL R. GROSS

exceptional condition or situation, I that the first prong has been met. Now whether or not the first prong gives rise to, in this case, an undue hardship for the use variance I think that I was persuaded as well that there would be an undue hardship on the property owner to require them to put this to a matter-of-right use in the C-1. Whether or not there would be a practical difficulty upon the property owner to provide the requirement number of parking spaces, I think that given that this property was constructed to nearing a 100 percent lot occupancy, it would be practically difficult for the applicant provide all 14 spaces on the property.

But I think what we're looking at here is a parking variance to reduce the required number for parking spaces from 14 to 11. The applicant received authorization from the Public Space Committee to locate three vehicles in the public space along the adjacent street frontage. And I think that

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

given the degree of the variance that we're looking at, only three spaces, I think the test has been met for the area variance.

That leaves 11 spaces that need to be accounted for. And the applicant amended their application to seek a special exception to locate the remaining 11 spaces off site in the adjacent parking lot pursuant to 2116.6.

you'll recall, the applicant testified that they currently have negotiated a lease with their adjacent neighbor. not have an exhibit number with this lease, however it's a leave between the property Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority and the located next door. They have fairly sizeable parking lot next door. And that particular organization has made available 11 spaces to the applicant.

In order to grant the special exception the applicant must meet the requirements under 2116.6 and those provision request that the Board shall determine that it

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

is not practical to locate the spaces in accordance with 2116.2. I think, again, given the lot occupancy of the property, I think it's impractical for them to locate the spaces on site. 2116 gives preference to locating these spaces in adjacent or nearby properties, such as the case in this application.

quickly as final Verv а turning over to the provisions of 510 which regulate the off site location of parking spaces not only in special purpose districts but also it applies to the C-1, the provisions of 510 state that the total number of parking spaces provided for the principal use shall exceed the minimum number of spaces required for the principal case. And in this case the requirement is 14 and we're looking to locate 11 off site.

And finally, 510.4 states that it shall be considered economically impractical or unsafe to locate the parking spaces within the principal building. And, again, given the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

lot occupancy of the property I think it is economically impractical for them to locate parking spaces on site or in the building in a manner that is consistent with all of the regulations of Chapter 21. So that being said, colleagues, I think all of the relevant standards have been met for the three areas of relief that are being requested. And I can turn it over to colleagues for additional comments.

MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: Chairman Dettman, I believe that you've sufficiently summarized everything. I agree with all your analysis.

I think that this property exceptional unique considering, as you said, it's about 99 to 100 percent lot occupancy. They're not looking to build up anything. It's just a matter of getting relief for a use variance to revise the use to be a repair shop and also for the parking. I think we went the parking multiple days over on and

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

discussed that. And the applicant did a very good job of finally coming back with the letter and the lease indicating that they were able to relocate those additional 11 spaces next door. And I think that that was the ANC -- I don't know if you mentioned the ANC. I believe that the ANC in our Exhibit 34 stated that they needed some additional time to get a vote, but then at the same time I believe the last time the applicant before us, he stated that the ANC was in support or had not gotten back specifically to him based on the fact that they were aware that the parking spaces were going to be provided by the fraternity next door.

So based on all the above, I think that we can move forward.

I'm sorry, there's also -- it doesn't have an exhibit number, but we had an ANC 2C letter, dated December 1st, 2009 which states that the ANC 4C supports the application.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

BZA VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Moldenhauer. As you've stated, we have a few reports from the ANC. They appear to meet the great weight requirement and they'll be afforded the weight that they entitled to, and that is Exhibits 34, 39 and a follow-up letter which does not have an exhibit number.

I'm prepared to make a motion in support of the application. I would like to throw out the idea of one condition, and it goes to the special exception for the off site location of parking spaces.

According to our Exhibit 33, which has a letter from the Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, they are entering into an agreement for the provision of 11 spaces that will be available to the applicant Monday through Friday from 7:00 to 5:00. And I guess given the nature of these types of businesses where work might be being done to an automobile, it's not completed at the end of the day so it needs to be moved off site, which would be

NEAL R. GROSS

after 5:00.

I could see it being appropriate to term the special exception for a period of two years, which is consistent with the period of the lease that's being entered into. And a that time the Board will be able to assess whether or not the placement of vehicles in the lot over night as created any kind of objectionable traffic conditions or parking conditions in the neighborhood.

So I would be in favor of that recommendation if, Ms. Moldenhauer, if you are as well.

MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: Yes. I think two years is a sufficient time frame, especially in consideration of the lease time, lease term.

BZA VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Great. So that being said, I'll move for approval of Application No. 17958 of Community Auto Service Center, pursuant to 11 DCMR ' 3103.2 and 3103.4 for a variance from the use

NEAL R. GROSS

1	provisions under section 701.1, and a variance
2	from the off-street parking requirements under
3	subsection 2010.1 and a special exception from
4	the provisions of 2116, 708 as well as in
5	accordance with 510 to establish an automobile
6	repair and service establishment in the C-1
7	District at premises 4408 Arkansas Avenue,
8	Northwest.
9	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: I second.
10	BZA VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Motion's
11	been made and seconded. All those in favor
12	say aye.
13	ALL: Aye.
14	BZA VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Opposed.
15	Abstentions.
16	Mr. Moy, do we have any absentee
17	ballots?
18	SECRETARY MOY: Yes, we do, Mr.
19	Chairman. So before I give a final vote, we
20	do have an absentee ballot from another
21	participating member, Konrad Schlater. And
22	his absentee vote is to approve with such

1	conditions as the Board may impose. And in
2	his comment he specifically mentions a
3	condition of the two year term. So that would
4	be consistent.
5	So again, so the final vote would
6	be recorded as three-to-zero-two on the motion
7	of the Chair, Mr. Dettman, to approve with one
8	condition for the off site for the accessory
9	spaces for a period of two years. Second the
10	motion, Ms. Moldenhauer. And again, in
11	support of the motion Mr. Schlater. Other
12	Board members not present, not voting.
13	So again, three-to-zero-to two.
14	BZA VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Thank you,
15	Mr. Moy.
16	And I think as there is no
17	opposition to this case, we can do a summary
18	motion on that.
19	SECRETARY MOY: Yes, sir. Very
20	good.
21	BZA VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Thank you.
22	And that completes the afternoon
l	II

1	Public Meeting?
2	SECRETARY MOY: Yes, sir.
3	BZA VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Great.
4	Then this meeting stands adjourned.
5	(Whereupon, the Public meeting wad
6	adjourned at 2:11 p.m.)
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	

NEAL R. GROSS