GOVERNMENT

OF

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

TUESDAY JULY 29, 2014

+ + + + +

The Regular Public Meeting convened in the Jerrily R. Kress Memorial Hearing Room, Room 220 South, 441 4<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20001, pursuant to notice at 9:30 a.m., Lloyd Jordan, Chairperson, presiding.

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT MEMBERS PRESENT:

LLOYD JORDAN, Chairperson
MARNIQUE Y. HEATH, Board Member
JEFF HINKLE, Board Member (NCPC)

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBER PRESENT:

ROBERT MILLER, Member

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

CLIFFORD MOY, Secretary
TRACEY W. ROSE, Sr. Zoning Specialist
JOHN NYARKU, Zoning Specialist

NEAL R. GROSS

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

## D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PRESENT:

ALLISON MYERS, ESQ. MARY NAGELHOUT, ESQ.

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Public Meeting held on July 29, 2014.

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

AGEND	DA ITEM	PAGE
CALL	TO ORDER, Lloyd L. Jordan	4
BOARD	ACTIONS/MOTIONS	
	Application No. 18738 Siamak Aryanpour Kashani pursuant to 11 DCMR 3104.1, special exception to construct a new five unit apartment house under Section 353	8
	Reschedule the Board's decision to October 21st, 2014	8
	Application No. 18804 of FBL Holdings, LLC	8
	Rescheduled to October 7th	8
	Application Number 18784 of Observatory Land Trust pursuant to 11 DCMR 3104.1 and 3103.2 for variance from lot occupancy requirements under Section 403 and special exception under Section 353	
	Application No. 18765 of Fulton Land Trust pursuant to 11 DCMR 3104.1 and 3013.2 for special exception under Section 353 and variance from lot occupancy requirements under Section 403	9

## 1 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S (9:18 a.m.) 2 CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: 3 Good morning. Would this hearing and meeting of the Board of 4 Zoning Adjustment please come to order. 5 6 located at the Jerrily R. Kress Memorial 7 Hearing Room at 441 4th Street, N.W. Today's date is July 29th, 2014. 8 Lloyd 9 is Jordan, My name 10 Chairperson. To my right is Jeffrey Hinkle, 11 Member of the Board, to my left is Marnique Heath, a Member of the Board, to her left is 12 Robert Miller, Member of the Zoning Commission 13 sitting in as a Member of the Board of Zoning 14 15 Adjustment today. be advised that 16 Please these 17 proceedings are being webcast live and also being recorded by a court reporter, who is 18 19 seated to my right. Therefore, I'm going to

ask you to refrain from any disruptive noises

here in the hearing room today.

20

That's the signal now, to take a look at your cell phones and other things that ring and buzz and make sure that they're in a mode, a silent mode.

The Board hearing procedures are contained in a document to the door, to the back to my left. If you're not familiar how we process applications, or other matters here at the Board, feel free to get the document and to read it.

If you're going to provide any statements or testimony to the Board today, if you're going to make any statement to the Board, read any letter, or anything other thing addressed to Board, I'm going to need you to do two things.

The first of which, I'm going to need you to complete two witness cards per person. That's two witness cards per person and prior to testifying, prior to testifying, give those two cards to the court reporter, who

б

1 is seated to my right. And the second thing I'm going to 2 need you to do, if you're going to provide any 3 statement, or address the Board in any manner, 4 I'm going to need you to now stand and take the 5 oath, which will be given by Mr. Moy, the Board 6 7 Secretary. MR. MOY: Good morning. 8 9 (Parties sworn.) 10 MR. MOY: Ladies and gentlemen, you may consider yourself under oath. 11 CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay. 12 13 Let's do this, can we have you. representative of the applicant on 18784 and 14 15 those who are seeking party status in 18787, so the applicant representative in 18787 and those 16 17 who are seeking party status in that case, 18 please come forward. 19 Do we have anyone that's Okay. 20 seeking party status in 18787? Going once, going twice, going for third time.

21

Mr.

1	Collins, do we know if there's been withdrawal
2	of their party status request, is that
3	MR. COLLINS: No, I do not. I'm
4	not aware of any withdrawal of party status.
5	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, then.
6	All right, they're not here, Mr.
7	Collins, and you know how we normally proceed
8	and ask to get together beforehand. So we will
9	call this on the docket, if they're not here,
10	then we will not accept their party status.
11	Thank you.
12	Okay, Mr. Moy, we'll go ahead and
13	call our meeting. I think that's all our party
14	status for today?
15	MR. MOY: That's correct, sir.
16	But I would like to make a quick announcement
17	for the record, if I may?
18	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes, please.
19	MR. MOY: For two cases on the
20	docket.
21	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes.

1 MR. MOY: The first application, which is actually application for 2 an 18738, that been 3 decision. has on applicant's request and granted by the Board to 4 reschedule the Board's decision to October 5 21st, 2014. б 7 My second announcement is to Application Number 18804, of FBL Holdings, 8 LLC., and this application has been rescheduled 9 10 to October 7th. CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: All right, 11 12 thank you. So with that, the two 13 MR. MOY: 14 applications for Board decision, the first is 15 Application Number 18784, Observatory Land The second is Application Number 18765 16 17 of Fulton Land Trust. Both of these cases were 18 heard together on June the 24th, 2014, where the 19 testimony was completed, record closed, the 20 Board requested additional information from

information

the,

21

supplemental

the

from

1	Applicant. That's in your case folders, Mr.
2	Chairman, under Exhibits 39.
3	There is a preliminary matter in
4	that there are a dozen letters that followed the
5	Applicant's filing. And that completes the
6	staff's proofing, Mr. Chairman.
7	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Well, those
8	letters weren't placed in the trash, at first,
9	weren't they, didn't we save those?
10	MR. MOY: Yes, sir.
11	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: It's out of
12	the ordinary to receive those without request
13	for leave, but I believe we probably already
14	reviewed those, so we accept them in the record.
15	But make sure before we do that in the future
16	that we get a ruling on it.
17	MR. MOY: Understood.
18	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Is the Board
19	ready to deliberate on 18784 and 18765? This
20	one has me puzzled and a little perplexed, in
21	regards to really what to do with it

1	So is anyone else on the Board want
2	to take a lead and provide their discussion
3	about this matter, their thoughts? Mr.
4	Hinkle.
5	MEMBER HINKLE: Yes, thank you, Mr.
6	Chair. I appreciate allowing the additional
7	letters, I will say, from the public.
8	I know there's been a lot of
9	involvement, it appears, between the public and
10	the developer, regarding the design of the
11	building and it appears from the
12	pre-submission, I mean, the additional
13	submission from the developer that there are
14	some conditions being proffered.
15	And it appears that most of those
16	conditions would be acceptable to the public,
17	at least in terms of how I read the letters that
18	we've received. So I'm comfortable with the
19	application, as it stands now, as long as those
20	conditions are in place.

CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Anyone else?

This is one where our review is under, by Regulation Section 353. There are a lot of people in the community that sought party status, they were consolidated, it's been a lot of activity.

It's one in which I had certainly encouraged that the applicant would work in good faith with the neighbor. And that's one of the things that we require, especially as a policy, since I've been Chair, that we try to have the applicants, at least, address the neighbors at being good neighbors beforehand.

This is one where I don't know where the thing was missing up front, but subsequently, we asked them to meet on this matter.

This is before us on a special exception under 353, so our hands are kind of tied, regarding special exception, we don't have the same level of discretion and 353, basically, just requires a referral to the

various government agencies to put their two cent in, regarding application, and all the government agencies supported this, if I'm not incorrect, this application.

However, there is a reference that you're required, under 353, to do a drive-by of 3104, as special exception conditions, and our only aspect of that, from a board, where we have some discretions is whether or not the application's in harmony with the neighborhood and the intent of the zoning regulations and the zoning map and et cetera.

As I said, I'm still kind of bothered by this. I had initial concern about this design and project. I just thought that it was over the top for this neighborhood and it was not the best thing for this neighborhood.

During the hearing we had evidence for and against the property and, you know, it was so different between what had been there, what has not been there, between what people,

1 who have lived there for a while, talked about, plus the new folks. 2 reference the Russian 3 The to Embassy and the other surrounding properties 4 helped move me toward getting closer 5 accepting this application, although 6 7 property sits on the side of the street, which is kind of different than the other side of the 8 street and then around the corner. 9 10 The required yards and a number of parking spaces and building heights 11 conforming with the R-5-A Zone, so that helped. 12 13 But as I said, the properties on the 14 North, South and West were Zone R-5-A, and you 15 did have apartment houses in that same general area and you had some detached dwellings and row 16 houses, it's just a mix of type of properties. 17 I believe the neighbors' concerns 18 19 were very valid, as I indicated. I hope that 20 the applicant would have worked closely with

21

the neighbors.

And I understand there was a split even in the neighborhood group afterwards. There was some that worked with the neighbors and now the applicant made some changes in designs, which I think are for the positive.

But then there's another group of

neighbors still out there that's not accepting the design, but I think the common denominator, as you said, Mr. Hinkle, was that they all agree, to some extent, even those who were still in opposition, on the conditions.

an aspect of flushing out the ability to mitigate any question about the property. I think that was the common denominator, both from the applicant standpoint and those who still oppose it, was that the conditions, everybody wanted those conditions in place.

And we've been in this situation before. You can't make everybody happy. I mean, it's just, and that's why we encourage

1 people to get together and have these discussions. 2 Actually, I'm tempted to put this 3 back on for a hearing to flush out those other 4 Because, if what was reported by the 5 issues. neighbors and the community is true that the 6 7 applicant came in with a hammer and was not working very friendly with the neighborhood, I 8 don't know if that's true or not, then that 9 10 gives me some concerns. And I hope we wouldn't have that and 11 12 I'm not accepting that to be true or not, but 13 it just gives me another pause. But we do have 14 a more acceptable design and the conditions, I think, help. 15 importantly, Office 16 More of 17 Planning has recommended the approval of this 18 application, which we're required to give great 19 weight. 20 On the contrary to that, we'd had no input, officially, from the ANC, who is a party 21

to these proceedings and also to which we're to give great weight, so we have to take that opinion out, because they didn't express an opinion, I guess, they're also maybe torn, as we are, in regards to that neighborhood.

I think that the building actually should have been brick, or have a color that's more blended for brick to bring it in to more conformity to the immediate neighborhood, but if you look at the broader picture in that neighborhood, the building's color could blend in with it.

Since this is, as I said before, this is a 353 Special Exception, the law requires us to just look at the four corners of the application and does it fit, and so we lose a lot of our discretion.

So I would reluctantly support the modified application with the conditions. And those conditions would be imposed to, that the building would be subject to a condominium

regime under the District of Columbia Condominium Act, that that's required to be filed, prior to getting a C of O on this.

That the Declaration of Condominium Covenant will include language that no more than three of the six units in each building shall be rented at any one time, no more than 50 percent requirement be part of the declaration and also to be recorded to run with the land.

The applicant will replace all the trees that are being removed, those being at least ten feet high, I cannot, the Board cannot put in place the requirements that they show a proof of funds, that does not go towards zoning requirements, so I'm going to reject, I would recommend that the Board reject that one.

That the Declaration of Condominium and also that there's a proper recording to run with the land and to place notice with the Department of Transportation and with the DMV

1	that there can only be one residential parking
2	permit per unit on this property, to help
3	mitigate the issues of parking on this block.
4	And that the applicant's required
5	to regularly contact the Office of Department
6	of Transportation and DMV to do the periodic
7	checks to find out if additional RPP has been
8	issued on this property.
9	That's the way I see it and I would
10	move the Board to approve the application, with
11	those conditions.
12	MEMBER HEATH: I would second the
13	motion.
14	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Motion made
15	and seconded. Additional discussion? All
16	those in favor of the motion signify by saying
17	aye.
18	(Chorus of ayes.)
19	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Those oppose,
20	nay? Mr. Moy, do we have an absentee?
21	MR. MOY: Yes we do, Mr. Chairman.

1	We have an absentee ballot from participating
2	member, Marcie Cohen, and her ballot vote
3	signed on the two applications are to approve
4	with such conditions as the Board may impose,
5	so that's her votes on both applications. So
6	that would give a resulting vote, well, of four,
7	one, two, three, yes, four to zero.
8	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: All right.
9	MR. MOY: And the Zone motion of the
10	Chairman Jordan to approve the request for a
11	special exception under 353, seconded the
12	motion, Ms. Heath. Also in support, Mr.
13	Hinkle. And, of course, Ms. Cohen, the Board
14	Member not participating. So the motion
15	carries four to zero.
16	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: A full order,
17	please.
18	MR. MOY: A full order, yes, sir.
19	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay. We can
20	move into our hearing cases.
21	(Whereupon, the above-entitled

matter went of the record at 10:00 a.m.)