GOVERNMENT

OF

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

+ + + + +

PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

TUESDAY

SEPTEMBER 16, 2014

+ + + + +

The Regular Public Hearing convened in the Jerrily R. Kress Memorial Hearing Room, Room 220 South, 441 4th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20001, pursuant to notice at 9:44 a.m., Lloyd J. Jordan, Chairperson, presiding.

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT MEMBERS PRESENT:

LLOYD JORDAN, Chairperson
JEFF HINKLE, Board Member (NCPC)

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBER PRESENT:

MICHAEL TURNBULL, Commissioner

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

CLIFFORD MOY, Secretary JOHN NYARKU, Zoning Specialist

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PRESENT: ALLISON MYERS, ESQ.

NEAL R. GROSS

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

STEPHEN GYOR STEPHEN MORDFIN KAREN THOMAS STEVEN COCHRAN MATT JESICK

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Public Hearing held on September 16, 2014.

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

Public Hearings
WARD TWO Application No. 18817
Application No. 18815
WARD THREE Application No. 18816
WARD FOUR Application No. 18819
WARD SIX Application No. 18794
Public Hearing Concluded 129

1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	(9:44 a.m.)
3	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: 18817. I
4	just need the applicant's representative.
5	Okay, please identify yourself.
6	Please make sure your microphone is on.
7	MR. DeLEON: I'm Joel DeLeon, from
8	Architects Group Practice.
9	MR. SCHIEFER: Andrew Schiefer,
10	Architects Group Practice.
11	MR. ZABIHI: Teymour Zabihi,
12	owner.
13	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Last name
14	again?
15	MR. ZABIHI: Zabihi.
16	MALE PARTICIPANT: Z-A-B-I-H-I.
17	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: I understand
18	there has been no posting in this case, or a late
19	posting?
20	MR. DeLEON: Yes, this is our first
21	time going through the BZA process, and there
22	was an item that was overlooked on our part. I

1 found out late Friday that it was overlooked. And then Monday, as soon as I found 2 out, I did whatever I could to do something for 3 4 So on Monday we did post it and I do have pictures that it was posted. 5 6 In addition I just want to let the 7 Board know that we have gone through the ANC process, met with the Commissioners, talked to 8 all the adjacent owners. 9 10 we've been you know, 11 forthcoming in trying to let everyone know, you know, to present the best project and to let 12 13 everyone add to the process, or if they had 14 comments to try to hear them. So that's where 15 we are right now. 16 CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Got you, and I appreciate you doing the posting. 17 However, I'm very sorry, I don't think I can support 18 19 without the posting. It's just so important 20 for the community. Everybody doesn't attend meetings. 21 22 And the posting is a requirement that we have.

1	And we understand you're learning the process
2	and going through it, but we'd rather err if
3	anything, on the side of letting the community
4	know that there is something going on.
5	And it's just how we operate.
6	Unless the Board has another, further matter,
7	especially in that area. There may be one or
8	two people at least interested in knowing
9	what's going on.
10	So we would just reschedule this to
11	another date. Mr. Moy, if we may?
12	MR. MOY: Yes, sir. To allow the
13	requisite number of days then, which would be
14	required for the posting, we're looking at a
15	date of October, say October 21st would be best
16	for the Board.
17	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes, I mean if
18	that
19	MR. MOY: Well, I could move it to
20	the 7th. There's no hearings during the week
21	of the 14th. We can do the 7th, but you have
22	an appeal case for that day. So if you want to

1	add that to the appeal case on that docket?
2	MEMBER HINKLE: This one was really
3	ready to go, but for the posting. I don't think
4	it's going to take us long to work through that,
5	in my opinion.
6	MR. MOY: Fine. Let's do the 7th.
7	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, so
8	October 7th.
9	MR. DeLEON: Thank you, very much.
10	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes, thank
11	you. And sorry again, but 816 please.
12	MR. MOY: Next application for
13	hearings, Application No. 18816 of Lawrence
14	Hirsh and Joan Melner.
15	This is a request, Mr. Chairman,
16	for a special exception to allow an accessory
17	basement apartment under subsection 202.10 at
18	3307 Cleveland Avenue, N.W., Square 2101, Lot
19	46.
20	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Good morning.
21	We'll let you get settled in, and please make
22	sure your microphones are turned on. And

1	we've, and have you given your witness cards to
2	the court reporter?
3	MS. MELNER: Yes.
4	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: All right, so
5	let's identify yourselves. Yes.
6	MR. HURST: My name is Ralph Hurst,
7	H-U-R-S-T. And I am an architect who provided
8	design services and the permit, construction
9	plans for the project.
10	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, yes.
11	MR. HIRSCH: Lawrence Hirsch, I'm
12	the home owner along with my wife, Joanie, a few
13	seats down.
14	MS. MELNER: I'm Joan Melner.
15	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Good, thank
16	you.
17	
	MR. GRANT: And Aubrey Grant with
18	MR. GRANT: And Aubrey Grant with Emotive Architecture.
18 19	_
	Emotive Architecture.
19	Emotive Architecture. CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Last name

1 All right, this is a matter which the Board has previously reviewed and I think the record 2 clearly supports the relief requested. 3 4 appreciate you getting letters of support. there anybody in the 5 Ιs 6 neighborhood that you didn't get letters of 7 support from? No, it's just a joke, but yes, 45 letters and signatures of support and we 8 really appreciate that. 9 10 We have ANC support, we have OP's support, and I think as I said this is a file 11 that's -- I don't have any questions and I 12 13 believe the filings already supports your request for relief, unless the Board has some 14 questions or anything they need to drill down 15 16 with the applicant on? (No audible response) 17 JORDAN: CHAIRPERSON Then 18 19 typically you have the opportunity to do a 20 presentation to the Board, or you can waive doing your presentation and we can proceed on 21

through the hearing. So, but it's up to you.

22

1	As I always warn people, the only
2	thing you can do is probably talk yourself into
3	trouble, but it's up to you if you think there's
4	something else you need to add or tell us that
5	you really want to make a disclosure about, but
6	right now you're in good shape.
7	MR. HIRSCH: We'll accept your
8	wisdom and waive the presentation.
9	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: There's been
10	a few that haven't. It's only been a couple,
11	but good, thank you. Then we will turn to the
12	Office of Planning and see if there is anything,
13	additions. Mr. Jesick.
14	MR. GYOR: Good morning, Mr.
15	Chairman, Member of the Board. Stephen Gyor,
16	with the Office of Planning. And we support
17	the applicant's request for relief and the rest
18	is on the record.
19	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Good, thank
20	you. Does the Board have any questions of OP?
21	(No audible response)
22	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Does the

1	applicant have any questions of OP?
2	MR. HIRSCH: My only question is
3	for process. I'm not certain from here if we
4	receive some sort of document?
5	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: You're not at
6	that point yet.
7	MR. HIRSCH: Oh, I'm sorry.
8	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: We'll be glad
9	to advise you of that.
10	Is anyone here from the Department
11	of Transportation? Department of
12	Transportation?
12	Transportation? (No audible response)
13	(No audible response)
13 14	(No audible response) COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Do we have
13 14 15	(No audible response) COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Do we have a letter? I don't have a letter from DDOT. Do
13 14 15 16	(No audible response) COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Do we have a letter? I don't have a letter from DDOT. Do you see a letter?
13 14 15 16 17	(No audible response) COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Do we have a letter? I don't have a letter from DDOT. Do you see a letter? MR. MOY: There's none on the
13 14 15 16 17 18	(No audible response) COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Do we have a letter? I don't have a letter from DDOT. Do you see a letter? MR. MOY: There's none on the record either.
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	(No audible response) COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Do we have a letter? I don't have a letter from DDOT. Do you see a letter? MR. MOY: There's none on the record either. CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, well

1	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: We do have a
2	letter of support from ANC 3C which we will
3	certainly give great weight to, and their
4	support of your project as I indicated earlier.
5	Is there anyone not seated at this
6	table who wishes to speak in support of this
7	application?
8	(No audible response)
9	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Anyone who
10	wishes to speak in support?
11	(No audible response)
12	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Anyone who
13	wishing to speak in opposition? Anyone in
14	opposition?
15	(No audible response)
16	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Well we'll
17	turn back to the applicant where we normally
18	have rebuttal et cetera, but it's not really
19	necessary at this point, so we will close the
20	hearing based upon the record. And I would
21	move that we grant the relief requested in
22	18816.

1	MEMBER HINKLE: Second.
2	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: The motion
3	made and seconded. All those in favor of the
4	motion signify by saying, aye.
5	(Chorus of ayes)
6	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Those
7	opposed, nay.
8	(No audible response)
9	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: The motion
10	carries. Mr. Moy.
11	MR. MOY: This our staff would
12	record the vote as 3-0. This on the motion of
13	Chairman Jordan to approve the request for
14	relief, special exception under 202.10,
15	approved plans under Exhibit 5.
16	Seconded the motion, Mr. Turnbull,
17	also in support, Mr. Hinkle. We have two
18	members not present today and motion carries,
19	Mr. Chairman.
20	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Good. And a
21	Summary Order.
22	MR. MOY: Yes, thank you.

1	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: So what
2	we've, we've ordered a Summary Order not a full
3	blown order, so it takes about what? How long
4	would the Summary Order take, like two three
5	weeks?
6	MR. MOY: A few days.
7	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Could, two
8	few weeks or so to do the summaries?
9	MR. MOY: We can do it faster than
10	that.
11	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, well
12	I'm just giving you some, and so you would have
13	the order, pick up the order, transmit it to the
14	DCRA and they'll run with it from there.
15	MR. HIRSCH: Okay, very good.
16	Well, thank you.
17	MR. GRANT: Thank you.
18	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay. Thank
19	you.
20	MR. HURST: Thank you.
21	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Let's do, I
22	think we're okay for 819.

1	MR. MOY: Okay, the next
2	application before the Board is Application No.
3	18819 of Neighborhood Development Company.
4	This is a request for variance
5	relief from off-street parking under
6	subsection 2101.1, a special exception from
7	roof structures under 411.11 and 770.6.
8	And this is what has been
9	advertised, to allow a new 20 unit multifamily
10	residential building, Georgia Avenue, sir.
11	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: I don't think
12	you need to get that comfortable. Please
13	identify yourselves.
14	MR. FREEMAN: Good morning, Chair.
15	And for the record, my name is Kyrus Freeman.
16	I'm a partner with the law firm of Holland &
17	Knight, and I'll just have our witnesses
18	introduce themselves.
19	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes.
20	MR. McKINNEY: Hi, my name is
21	Diarra McKinney. I'm with Neighborhood
22	Development Company.

1	MR. WASHINGTON: Good morning,
2	Adrian Washington. I'm the President and CEO
3	of Neighborhood Development Company.
4	MR. GRANT: Good morning. I'm
5	Aubrey Grant with Emotive Architecture.
6	MS. WHITE: Good morning, Nicole
7	White with Symmetra Design.
8	MR. GIULIONI: Good morning.
9	Michael Giulioni with the Neighborhood
LO	Development Company.
L1	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Good, thank
L2	you and welcome. I don't really, I think the
L3	application well I've got a couple just quick
L4	kind of housekeeping questions about this.
L5	Didn't see it, do we have an ANC
L6	letter? What's the status of ANC?
L7	MR. FREEMAN: We don't have a
L8	letter from the ANC, however we did get a letter
L9	from the Chair of the ANC, who is also our SMD
20	Commissioner, and that was filed yesterday.
21	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, but
22	not, they had not taken a full vote on the ANC?

1	MR. FREEMAN: They have not
2	submitted a letter.
3	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: But okay, all
4	right. And the other question I had was on
5	these conditions. I was kind of, didn't
6	understand. I just want to talk about some of
7	the conditions.
8	And that's, these are just my
9	questions, I don't know if the Board has any
10	other questions but, the applicant shall offer
11	an annual Bikeshare and car share membership
12	for the initial term of lease for new apartment
13	residents for the first five years.
14	The building is open or offered as,
15	or offering, annual Capital Bikeshare or car
16	share membership. Is that your understanding?
17	MR. FREEMAN: Yes, sir.
18	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, and
19	then the second is that the applicant shall
20	provide a minimum of 10 long term bicycle
21	parking spaces.
22	And this is the part I

1	don't quite understand. The applicant shall
2	also be expected to provide at least four short
3	term bicycle spaces during the public space
4	permitting process.
5	MR. FREEMAN: Those would be out,
6	the 10 would be in the building, and the four
7	would be outside the building.
8	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, but
9	they're only needed during the time no one's
10	from DDOT, has
11	MR. FREEMAN: I think what they're
12	saying is that as we go through the public space
13	permit process, we would have to work with DDOT
14	to locate and get their approval for the
15	installation of four bike racks in public
16	space.
17	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, so it's
18	10 in and four out?
19	MR. FREEMAN: Yes.
20	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Regardless.
21	I got it.
22	MR. FREEMAN: Yes.

1	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: I'm, okay
2	that was the issue. I didn't know what they
3	were saying. Okay.
4	MR. FREEMAN: And we've committed
5	to each of those two conditions.
6	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Board do you
7	have any questions that we need to drill down
8	on?
9	MEMBER HINKLE: What's the
10	difference between the number of bicycle spaces
11	that's required versus what's being offered
12	under this condition?
13	MR. FREEMAN: It's all under zoning
14	under the building code it's one for every
15	three. So 20 divided by three is seven.
16	MEMBER HINKLE: Okay.
17	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Mr. Turnbull
18	did you have
19	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes, Mr.
20	Chair, thank you.
21	I guess one of my questions is I'm
22	trying to see how well that this fits in and that

1	I'm looking at a lot of these houses are
2	walk-ups, I mean they have a first floor that
3	you can walk up.
4	And we just wondered, did you look
5	at the possibility of having the three units on
6	Iowa on the first floor, as possible walk-ups?
7	Kind of match the street front, down the street.
8	MR. FREEMAN: We can go to a site
9	plan, but on Iowa there's a large public space
10	
11	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right.
12	MR. FREEMAN: that impacts our
13	site, that, and we have a slope condition. We
14	have a seller condition that, there's a zone on
15	closer to the Iowa
16	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Oh, I saw
17	that but I'm just wondering if you had, in one
18	of your options had tried to go back and tried
19	to at least make it blend in more with the
20	neighborhood that way?
21	MR. GRANT: That's one of the

1	the concept of design phases, but that's one of
2	the options that we are exploring.
3	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: So you
4	would come back then for a modification, or
5	you'd be changing or, what? I'm not sure I
6	understand.
7	MR. FREEMAN: The Iowa Avenue, our
8	building is actually set back from Iowa.
9	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I see
10	that.
11	MR. FREEMAN: So our front is
12	Georgia Avenue.
13	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right.
14	MR. FREEMAN: And the rear along
15	Iowa we have the public space, and then the rear
16	land area which is our rear yard and also is the
17	area that we're using for our green area ratio
18	calculation.
19	So in order to do the walk-ups kind
20	of from Iowa that would we're not
21	anticipating having primary access to any of
22	the residential units from Iowa. The primary

1	access would be from Georgia Avenue.
2	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. On
3	the rooftop, you asked for a variance but OP has
4	not commented on the rooftop variance request,
5	I don't believe, on their report.
6	It's a little ungainly up there.
7	You have, it's not the most attractive rooftop
8	that we're looking at. Did you really try to,
9	an effort to try to make that look a little bit
10	more presentable?
11	MR. FREEMAN: So we asked for a
12	special exception, I had multiple roof
13	structures, on the roof.
14	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right.
15	MR. FREEMAN: And OP did recommend
16	approval of that special exception relief.
17	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Did they?
18	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes.
19	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
20	MR. FREEMAN: So the relief is
21	because we, since we're having a deck, we had
22	multiple structures that are, in order to

1	provide kind of egress for the folks on the
2	roof.
3	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: There is a
4	deck up there?
5	MR. FREEMAN: Yes, sir.
6	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I didn't
7	see anything on the drawings. I just saw a roof
8	plan, showing that you can access the roof by
9	both stairwells?
10	MR. FREEMAN: Yes, on DS-10. I'm
11	not sure if you have the most recent drawings.
12	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I have
13	DS-10 and it's, I don't think there's a date on
14	it.
15	MR. FREEMAN: The hatch
16	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Oh, it's
17	6-10-14.
18	MR. FREEMAN: Our August 22nd
19	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I don't
20	have it.
21	MR. FREEMAN: 8-22-14 drawings
22	that were included B

1	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I don't
2	have that one.
3	MR. FREEMAN: in our pre-hearing
4	submission?
5	We can, if you don't have it, we have
6	copies.
7	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Which exhibit
8	was this?
9	MR. FREEMAN: I don't have it's
10	our September 2nd, 2014 submission.
11	MR. MOY: Mr. Chairman, I believe
12	that's Exhibit 26C, C as in Charlie.
13	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Maybe I've
14	seen it and I just didn't well I have a
15	partial print of it I guess.
16	MR. FREEMAN: We can, let's, we
17	have a copy of the sheet here. We can pull it
18	up on the screen as well. A copy of our roof
19	plan.
20	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Is the
21	rest of the roof, is a white roof, sedum roof
22	or what? What are you, what kind of a roof is

1	up on that for the, beyond the deck?
2	MR. GRANT: It's going to be a white
3	roof.
4	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: White
5	roof. Lighting up there, low level lighting?
6	MR. GRANT: Yes.
7	(Simultaneous speaking)
8	MR. GRANT: exceptions for the
9	deck.
10	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: All down
11	lighting?
12	MR. GRANT: Down lighting, down.
13	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
14	Mr. Chair, those are my questions. Thank you.
15	MEMBER HINKLE: So, I'm sorry, you
16	might have stated this, you're meeting the GAR
17	requirements from the rear yard. Is that
18	correct?
19	MR. FREEMAN: The rear yard, some
20	of the roof area as well as the other storm water
21	management. But we've done the calculation
22	and yes, we are meeting the requirement.

1	MEMBER HINKLE: I don't see in the
2	plans any landscaping for what is the public
3	space along Georgia Avenue. What are the plans
4	for that?
5	MR. FREEMAN: As of now, we don't
6	have a landscaping plan for Georgia Avenue.
7	Georgia Avenue's pretty narrow. What we are
8	doing is setting our building back slightly.
9	And if you look at the first floor plan, which
10	is out of DS-04 or the
11	MEMBER HINKLE: I'm sorry, let me,
12	I'm sorry, I misspoke, Iowa Avenue, and that
13	public space area that's currently concrete.
14	MR. FREEMAN: We're not proposing
15	any changes to that area on Iowa Avenue
16	currently.
17	MEMBER HINKLE: So essentially
18	people would still be able to park there. Is
19	that correct?
20	MR. FREEMAN: Well, I would imagine
21	what would happen, there's a fence around that,
22	so I'd imagine once the fence comes, DDOT would

1	enforce the no parking prohibition in public
2	space.
3	MEMBER HINKLE: So you're asking
4	for parking relief and part of that request is
5	because you can=t access the site.
6	But the existing public space along
7	Iowa Avenue is concrete and is currently being
8	used for parking.
9	MR. FREEMAN: So that parking is,
10	NDC recently purchased the property so that
11	current parking in public space is not legal.
12	So once that use is changed, that parking in
13	public space goes away.
14	MEMBER HINKLE: Okay.
15	MR. FREEMAN: So that's not our
16	legal parking, that's why it's not supposed to
17	be there. If it were there and if we could rely
18	on it, our application would be very different.
19	But that's, parking there is not legal parking,
20	which is why we're here asking for the variance
21	relief.
22	MEMBER HINKLE: But aren't there

driveways that go through public space 1 access lots? 2 MR. FREEMAN: So we've met with 3 4 DDOT and we've kind of outlined in our pre-hearing statement a number of, DDOT is not 5 6 comfortable with allowing us to have a driveway 7 through Iowa Avenue to access the rear of our site, because it would take up such a large 8 9 portion of that public space. 10 MEMBER HINKLE: Okay. But what 11 I'm hearing now is that existing concrete space is just going to remain concrete. 12 13 MR. GIULIONI: Well, through our 14 preliminary conversations with both OP and 15 DDOT, the plan is to return it to like a soft 16 Consistent with DDOT's standards for scape. what is known as public parking. 17 The area between the sidewalk and the actual property 18 19 line. So at this point we haven't actually 20 resolved what that treatment will be, but DDOT 21 22 has clearly indicated to us that they want it

1	brought back in line with the condition that is
2	predominant along the entire street frontage.
3	So sort of to Commissioner
4	Turnbull's point, the intent is to mimic what
5	is to, I guess the northwest of the existing
6	lot. You know, we want to actually have it
7	transition the same way the rowhouses that are
8	next door, how they operate.
9	MEMBER HINKLE: Okay, thank you.
10	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes.
11	MEMBER HINKLE: Well I'm just
12	wondering if that should be a condition?
13	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: That's the
14	whole but then the other issue is DDOT.
15	MEMBER HINKLE: Right.
16	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: I think we
17	could continue to work with DDOT to provide the
18	landscaping requirements or treatment to that
19	spot as DDOT requests.
20	MEMBER HINKLE: Sure. I'm just
21	concerned because we're taking, you know
22	speaking about a parking variance and you know

1	there's still this concrete area.
2	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes, well
3	let's move on and we can have the conversation
4	with planning and also we can decide if there's
5	something else. Any other questions we have
6	for this applicant?
7	(No audible response)
8	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Is there
9	anything that you think you need to present to
10	the Board?
11	MR. FREEMAN: No, Mr. Chairman.
12	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: That was just
13	important that we drill down on those things
14	that the Board members were concerned about.
15	Then let's turn to the Office of Planning for
16	input, please. Thank you.
17	MR. MORDIN: Good morning. I'm
18	Stephen Mordin from the Office of Planning.
19	And Office of Planning continues to support
20	this application. I would like to point out
21	one error in the staff report.
22	And that's on the second page under

1	subtitle IV. It indicates that there's a
2	requirement for a variance for roof structure
3	height, which is in error. There is no
4	requirement for roof structure height.
5	So that second to last item on the
6	chart, is an error.
7	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, that's
8	good to know.
9	Board, any questions for planning?
10	Anyone? Questions for planning?
11	(No audible response)
12	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Does the
12	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Does the applicant have a question for planning?
13	applicant have a question for planning?
13 14	applicant have a question for planning? MR. FREEMAN: No, Mr. Chairman.
13 14 15	applicant have a question for planning? MR. FREEMAN: No, Mr. Chairman. CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, where
13 14 15 16	applicant have a question for planning? MR. FREEMAN: No, Mr. Chairman. CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, where are we? Took my eye off the ball and forgot
13 14 15 16 17	applicant have a question for planning? MR. FREEMAN: No, Mr. Chairman. CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, where are we? Took my eye off the ball and forgot where I was.
13 14 15 16 17 18	applicant have a question for planning? MR. FREEMAN: No, Mr. Chairman. CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, where are we? Took my eye off the ball and forgot where I was. Is there any representative here
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	applicant have a question for planning? MR. FREEMAN: No, Mr. Chairman. CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, where are we? Took my eye off the ball and forgot where I was. Is there any representative here from the Department of Transportation?

1	again, would you encourage Department of
2	Transportation when they have conditions or
3	issues that we would beg that they have someone
4	here. It's just helpful to us to understand
5	where they are on some of these matters,
6	especially when they offer conditions.
7	But they submitted a letter with no
8	objections, and we just went over the
9	conditions which they proposed.
10	We discussed the ANC 4C. Is there
11	a representative here from ANC 4C?
12	Representative from ANC 4C?
13	(No audible response)
14	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: We did
15	discuss the issue of not having the vote for ANC
16	4C, however you have the support of the
17	Chairperson and a single member, single
18	district person for that area.
19	Is there anyone here wishing to
20	speak in support of this application? Anyone
21	wish to speak in support?
22	(No audible response)

1	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: We do have a
2	support letter of Mr. Charles Ford, the
3	neighbor at, and it's Exhibit 24G.
4	Is there anyone wishing to speak in
5	opposition to this application? Anyone
6	wishing to speak in opposition?
7	(No audible response)
8	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Then we'll
9	return back to the applicant and if you, any
10	rebuttal or closing that you feel necessary.
11	MR. FREEMAN: Just one point, I
12	don't want to belabor it. We would be happy to
13	have a condition in our order that says the
14	public space adjacent to this site, on Iowa
15	Avenue, will be designed and meet DDOT
16	landscape and public space requirements.
17	We're more than happy to have that
	We so more ensure there ensure the second
18	as a condition of our order.
18	
	as a condition of our order.
19	as a condition of our order. MEMBER HINKLE: Thank you, I

1	will close this hearing. Is the Board ready to
2	deliberate?
3	(No audible response)
4	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, then I
5	would move that we grant the relief requested
6	with the conditions which have been outlined
7	earlier. And with the added condition, just
8	read the wording again, please? Mr. Freeman.
9	MR. FREEMAN: The public space
10	adjacent to the site on Iowa Avenue, will be
11	designed to meet DDOT landscape and public
12	space requirements.
13	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay. That
14	being the motion, Mr. Hinkle.
15	MEMBER HINKLE: Yes, I'll second
16	that. I appreciate that language simply
17	because it's not in the plans at this point.
18	But there's no sense in delaying this. So I
19	second the motion.
20	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Any further
21	discussions?
22	(No audible response)

1	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Those in
2	support, aye.
3	(Chorus of ayes)
4	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Those
5	opposed, nay.
6	(No audible response)
7	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: The motion
8	carries. Mr. Moy.
9	MR. MOY: The staff would record
LO	the vote as 3-0, this on a motion of, 3-0 to
L1	approve. This on a motion of Chairman Jordan
L2	to approve the application for the relief
L3	requested.
L4	The variance for off-street parking
L5	and special exception for the roof structures,
L6	and therefore 11.11 and 770.6 with conditions.
L7	Two conditions and the conditions just
L8	proffered by the applicant giving three total
L9	conditions.
20	As I said, seconding the motion, Mr.
21	Hinkle. Also in support Mr. Turnbull, and Mr.
22	Chairman, we have two members not present. The

1	motion carries.
2	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Thank you,
3	and Summary Order please.
4	MR. MOY: Thank you, sir.
5	MR. FREEMAN: Thank you.
6	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Thank you.
7	Top of the batting order at 15, 815 please.
8	MR. MOY: The next application
9	before the Board for hearing is Application No.
10	18815 of Amanda Bennett and Donald Graham.
11	Mr. Chairman, this application is
12	in for multiple relief. Variances and, to FAR,
13	lot occupancy rear yard, nonconforming
14	structure. To allow rear deck.
15	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay.
16	Let's, please identify yourself.
17	MR. HAINS: My name is Jeffrey
18	Hains. I'm Hains Architects, I'm the
19	architect for the home owner.
20	MS. BENNETT: And I'm Amanda
21	Bennett, I'm the home owner.
22	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, and

1 thank you for coming. All right, it's for you to go ahead and do a presentation. You have a 2 big lift in trying to prove to the Board or 3 4 showing to the Board as well as Office of Planning that there is a exceptional situation 5 6 or condition in line with this property that 7 will allow you to have relief necessary for zoning reliefs. 8 9 MR. HATNS: Thank you, Mr. 10 Chairman. The site, first of all the owner wishes to maximize the use and enjoyment of the 11 site by building a deck. 12 13 The site is a standard size by 14 zoning. There's no harsh physical characteristics about this site other than the 15 16 main level, the main floor level is seven feet above grade. 17 Currently there is an existing 18 19 deck. It does meet current zoning regulations 20 but only utilizes about maybe twenty percent of So my client, home owner, simply 21 the area.

wishes to maximize the use and enjoyment.

1 There are a number of other, in that same neighborhood and alleyway, there are a 2 number of other decks and structures of similar 3 4 size and configuration. And we're simply being consistent with those structures. 5 6 We further believe that the project 7 does not burden any other neighbor's enjoyment, use of their property, light, air, and so forth. 8 There's no compromise. 9 10 I think it's an impractical, we talk about an exceptional practical difficulty is 11 the wording in the analysis. 12 13 And currently they have to walk down five steps from their main level, from the main 14 kitchen, dining room, living room level to get 15 16 to their current deck. And for elderly parents and young children, that does present an issue 17 for the home owner. 18 19 What we're proposing is to raise the deck to the level of the main floor level, which 20 will allow us to keep our parking space 21

And to create a parameter

22

underneath it.

1	screen, and thereby maintaining their privacy
2	but also privacy of adjoining neighbors.
3	Lastly, I would just point out that
4	Historic Preservation, ANC, and the adjoining
5	neighbors to which the home owner has reviewed
6	the plans with them, have all supported the
7	project.
8	So on the basis of that
9	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Let me ask
10	you, I didn't see any letters of support. And
11	that was one of the questions I was going to ask.
12	Do we have letters of support?
13	MR. HAINS: I do have letters of
14	support here.
15	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Are they on
16	file? Do we, I don't believe we have them in
17	our file. So after our hearing we need, well
18	you have copies, sufficient copies for the
19	Board?
20	MR. HAINS: I can certainly make
21	copies and submit them. I have the originals.
22	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Let's

1	continue and then we will work around that,
2	okay. How many letters of support do you have?
3	MR. HAINS: I have four.
4	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: And from the
5	neighbors on both sides?
6	MR. HAINS: Yes. Sides, front and
7	back.
8	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay,
9	continue please.
10	MR. HAINS: So fundamentally we're
11	asking relief of the stated sections to build
12	this deck and screen.
13	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: But this
14	property is similar to the properties on both
15	sides of it. Isn't that correct?
16	MR. HAINS: It's similar, yes.
17	With the exception on the east side, the
18	structure actually is built back to their,
19	practically to their property line. So they
20	have a larger lot coverage on the east side, or
21	occupancy, excuse me.
22	On the west side, the neighbor's

1	house actually sits back from my client's
2	structure. And they, and it is separated by an
3	existing masonry wall.
4	And I think that's, if we go to
5	pictures on Sheet EX-2 and we look at picture
6	F, which is the lower left. We see my client's
7	structure on the right of that photo. And you
8	can see the setback of the adjacent neighbor's
9	house, is setback probably 10 to 15 feet.
10	And then picture G and J show the
11	relationship of the east neighbor whose house
12	extends beyond the back face of my client's
13	structure.
14	We also see on picture D, and A, B,
15	C, and D that the adjoining neighbor's
16	structure that's currently built, which is at
17	the same height or taller than our structure.
18	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, yours
19	essentially will kind of mirror this to some
20	extent?
21	MR. HAINS: We're going mirror what
22	many of the structures there have already

1	built. If we go to Sheet EX-1 we see several
2	more examples of decks built in the alleyway to
3	the east side of the property.
4	And you can see they're all raised.
5	They have surrounding parameter fences or
6	screens. They have parking underneath. Some
7	are partially enclosed, others are open at the
8	ground level.
9	So we feel that we are simply in
10	keeping with the architecture, alley, and
11	structures that are presently there.
12	And we also feel that this project
13	is in keeping with the intention of the zoning
14	regulations by providing convenience, order,
15	and property value, uplifting property values
16	and maintaining the character, in this case of
17	the alley architecture.
18	MS. BENNETT: Sir, may I speak?
19	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes,
20	certainly.
21	MS. BENNETT: The one thing I would
22	like to point out by looking at it, is that as

1	far as I can see, we're the anomaly in that
2	neighborhood. Everything else is consistent.
3	And the reason the use and enjoyment
4	reason, is the only way you can put a car and
5	have a deck at the same time, is to raise it up
6	to street level.
7	And I don't know if I can swear to
8	this, but I'm pretty sure we're the only
9	structure that's at that lower level in that
10	whole entire alley back there.
11	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: You mean
12	presently?
13	MS. BENNETT: Presently, yes.
14	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Without the
15	variance.
16	
10	MS. BENNETT: Without the
17	MS. BENNETT: Without the variance. So every other structure back there
17	variance. So every other structure back there
17 18	variance. So every other structure back there because of the logic of
17 18 19	variance. So every other structure back there because of the logic of CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Because they

1	that we're looking to do. So we're just
2	looking to do, as far as I can tell, the thing
3	that we're the only ones that aren't doing right
4	now.
5	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Got you, I
6	understand. Okay is there anything else you
7	want to present to the Board any questions
8	we want to ask the applicant?
9	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Aren't
10	most of the homes in this area walk-up and you
11	have to go up half a story, I mean so that's not,
12	I mean you're talking about an exceptional
13	condition but that's standard for most of DC.
14	A lot of these rowhouses are, that's
15	part of what you buy when you buy the house.
16	You have to walk up half a floor. Am I correct?
17	MR. HAINS: You're correct from the
18	street level you do have to walk up half a level.
19	But in terms of a practical difficulty, to have
20	to go down out of your back, back of your house
21	to enjoy your deck, five steps.
22	It's one thing to go up to get into

1 house. You actually do enter, actually enter the foray at the lower level and 2 you actually go up inside the house to get to 3 the main level. 4 But once you're up at the main 5 6 level, I feel that there's a practical hardship 7 in having to carry food and beverage and just to come out your back door and have to descend 8 five steps to the deck level to meet the code 9 10 if we were to build to the code, is a practical 11 difficulty. COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I think 12 13 your definition of a practical difficulty is a little different 14 than what the zoning regulations would call a practical difficulty. 15 16 Ι think you're looking at а convenience for an applicant, for an owner, but 17 that's part of the, as I said, that's part of 18 19 the building stock of DC. 20 So I, it's hard to actually say that it's a practical difficulty when you buy a 21 dwelling unit such as this. 22

1	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Isn't there a
2	sewer right behind?
3	MR. HIRSCH: There actually is a
4	kind of
5	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Kind of a deep
6	sewer there?
7	MR. HIRSCH: It's on the property,
8	yes.
9	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: The other
LO	properties around you, do they have the same
L1	sewer?
L2	MR. HIRSCH: They do not, to my
L3	knowledge.
L4	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay. Board
L5	any other questions?
L6	(No audible response)
L7	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Then if
L8	there's nothing else we'll turn to the Office
L9	of Planning for their input.
20	MR. JESICK: Thank you, Mr.
21	Chairman and members of the Board. My name is
22	Matt Jesick. We feel the applicant has

1	designed a very attractive deck that would
2	certainly make their backyard more useable.
3	It would protect the privacy of
4	neighbors. It would not have undue impacts on
5	light and air, however, where we stumble in our
6	variance analysis is we can't get over that
7	first hurdle of what is unique or exceptional
8	about the property?
9	So while we sympathize with the
10	applicant unfortunately we cannot recommend
11	approval of the variance relief as requested.
12	I'd be happy to take any questions.
13	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: How
14	prominent is the sewer behind the house?
15	MR. JESICK: What do you mean by
16	prominent, I mean?
17	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL:
18	Configurations, impact upon the property?
19	MR. JESICK: It exists now, I
20	MR. HIRSCH: If I may
	i de la companya de
21	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: No, no, no

1	MR. JESICK: It exists now, in the
2	current configuration, I don't know if that
3	would have an impact on
4	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I know,
5	I'm just throwing it out there, just trying to
6	look for some straws. Okay.
7	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Board, any
8	other questions you'd like to ask?
9	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: No, I
10	always like to talk to Mr. Jesick. I think
11	you've hit something. I mean we're all
12	sympathetic to, I mean apparently there's been
13	a lot of other construction in this area, which
14	is probably un-permitted or not by code. I'm
15	not sure.
16	I'm not sure, I mean there's a lot
17	of these other decks that are back there. Do
18	you know much about, I mean
19	MR. JESICK: I don't have a sense of
20	which decks have received Board relief in the
21	past. That's something we can research and
22	find out if you're interested

1	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: That was, I'm
2	glad you, because that was something B
3	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: It's
4	always a difficult question, I mean they're
5	going for 87 percent lot occupancy which to me
6	is a lot in this area too. I mean considering
7	that there's already others that are back here.
8	But I think part of the problem is
9	some of the reasons that I've heard, like you
10	said, don't really make the three prong test.
11	Especially that first prong.
12	Although we're sympathetic to it,
13	we see the issues, and from, being HPRB says
14	okay, but HPRB is not concerned about zoning.
15	They're appeared about appearances. So from
16	that standpoint, yes, from appearances it's an
17	attractive structure.
18	And considering what's there, it
19	probably won't have much of a impact but I'm
20	reluctant to give relief based upon the fact
21	that it's basically a personal request. It's

like a personal need, well we need, it'd be nice

1	to have. It's nice to have this.
2	And unfortunately the zoning
3	regulations aren't based upon nice to have. So
4	I'd like to somehow help but I'm stretching
5	myself to give approval to this.
6	So I wish there was stronger
7	arguments from the applicant's standpoint as to
8	you know, what was really, what is unique about
9	this property that could give us the ability to
10	say, yes we can do this?
11	And I'm looking at that
12	neighborhood, I'm just as I say, a lot of it's
13	probably, might be illegal. I don't think they
14	may have had a building permit. I don't know
15	if any of them did, but it might be worthwhile
16	just to look.
17	I don't know if it's, if the members
18	of the Board want to carry that any further or
19	just
20	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: I think we,
21	well let's kind of wait to deliberations.
22	COMMISSIONER THRNRILL: Yes

1	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Because we
2	can kind of have that, but I don't know if
3	there's any other questions of Mr. Jesick?
4	(No audible response)
5	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Does the
6	applicant have any questions of Office of
7	Planning? For the Office of Planning
8	Representative?
9	(No audible response)
10	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: All right
11	then, let's ANC, we do have a, any
12	representative from ANC 2B? Representative
13	from ANC 2B?
14	(No audible response)
15	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: We do have a
16	letter of approval which we will give great
17	weight to, from ANC 2B.
18	Anyone from the Department of
19	Transportation?
20	(No audible response)
21	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: We do have a
22	

1	certainly doesn't object to the relief.
2	Is anyone here wishing to speak in
3	support? Anyone here wishes to speak in
4	support?
5	(No audible response)
6	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Anyone in
7	opposition?
8	(No audible response)
9	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: I do wish we
10	could have those letters. And while Mr. Moy
11	is, yes, let him take a look at these.
12	MR. MOY: Thanks.
13	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: We can kind of
14	and the book and fourth lived of a form latter
	switch back and forth, kind of a form letter,
15	but at least they provided
15 16	
	but at least they provided
16	but at least they provided (Off the record comments)
16 17	but at least they provided (Off the record comments) CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Let's, sure
16 17 18	but at least they provided (Off the record comments) CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Let's, sure and let the applicant see if there's anything
16 17 18 19	but at least they provided (Off the record comments) CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Let's, sure and let the applicant see if there's anything you want to add in rebuttal or closing on this?

be held to the minimum requirements adopted for the promotion of public health, safety, morals, convenience, order, prosperity, and general welfare" and goes on to say "provide adequate light and air, prevent undue concentration of population and the overcrowding of land" et cetera.

Perhaps this is not a property that doesn't have a physical hardship, but at the same time, we do meet analysis number three which is, we are not inhibiting anybody's enjoyment, light and air. It is contributing to the value of the neighborhood.

And then finally the homeowner's right to enjoy their property. And I would ask the Board to consider those values in their decision making.

MS. BENNETT: And Mr. Jordan, would you consider, I hadn't thought about this until you brought it up, but the fact that it's so low and so close to the sewer that's right underneath it.

1	Is that possibly when you're
2	talking about cooking, about the cooking and
3	people playing out there, that you'd be raising
4	it up higher to make it a greater distance from
5	a current existing sewer?
6	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: I was
7	stretching trying to find something. And I
8	think this, you know, that's why I saw the
9	pictures, talked about the sewer being
10	different. I didn't see that in the other
11	places.
12	But we just have to talk about it and
13	see where we are. Is there anything else that
14	you guys would we appreciate you coming. Is
15	there anything else you have?
16	MR. HAINS: I do not.
17	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay. Then
18	let's close the hearing on the record based upon
19	what we have so far. Is the Board ready to
20	deliberate?
21	Yes, here's one that you know, the
22	issue that you may be, that the applicant may

1 be seeing as Mr. Turnbull has said, there may be illegal decks around you, which we simply 2 just don't have. 3 4 I think there is from the testimony, from the pictures, et cetera, I believe that the 5 6 sewer could lead to a difference in how that 7 back yard is used. Stopping up the sewer, the whole shebang, yes, I'm stretching, may allow 8 for some relief. 9 10 But then we have, Mr. Turnbull, we do have a fail-safe for situations like this. 11 You know, it's like baseball, the pitch is like 12 13 real close and the catcher grabs the ball and he pulls it across the plate just a little bit. 14 And this might be one. 15 And this is I don't know where other 16 just my thought. Board members are, but I think Gilmartin, we 17 certainly look at relief being diminimous to 18 19 some extent. 20 And we have some outs in that regard, to saying that you know, weighing the 21

overall burden, the strict requirements of

1	this, there is a need for the use right off the
2	main floor.
3	A stretch to talk about the sewer,
4	providing an exceptional situation or
5	condition to this property, but I realize it's
6	a stretch, but that's just some of my initial
7	thought for others to weigh in.
8	MEMBER HINKLE: Well there is an
9	existing document and so if you're speaking
10	about the diminimous impact, you know, I do see
11	that.
12	Well what's being proposed is
13	significantly larger than what's there, but
14	it's not as if this is a new deck going in.
15	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: And compared
16	to the others.
17	MEMBER HINKLE: Correct and
18	compared to the others it's certainly, as
19	evidenced in the photographs, it's very similar
20	to what's been occurring in that block.
21	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Mr. Turnbull,
22	what do you want to do?

1 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well, let me play bad cop and maybe a little bit of good 2 cop here. 3 4 First of all I, when we do the three prong test probably the easiest prong to meet 5 6 is number three, I mean that's the easiest prong 7 for most people to meet. One and two, one especially is the 8 9 stickler. That's the one that really, you get 10 by that, you're probably on your way to getting the variance. 11 I don't want to kill this, but I 12 13 think that the applicant, and what I would be open to is having the applicant come back with 14 a little bit stronger case. 15 16 Maybe give us some information on the sewer, give us some more input as to meeting 17 this first prong somehow physically. 18 19 Give us something a little bit more 20 tangible that we can at least say, well you're not quite there but it's enough to put you over 21

maybe most of the hurdle.

1 I think maybe meet with the Office of Planning and talk about this site, talk about 2 some of the fit conditions in here and then come 3 4 back to us with maybe a little bit different presentation, where you really hit home and try 5 6 to get this first prong. 7 I'm a stickler because zoning, the zoning regulations I looked at the Office of 8 Planning and that they have, usually they're 9 10 right on in some of these things. But noticing the situation of the 11 area, it's, we run into this where there are 12 13 existing things that have been built. They're probably unregulated. They've probably been 14 there for years and somebody --15 16 But so anyways, that's why I don't want to get too wordy, but I just think I'd give 17 them the option of coming back, going back 18 19 looking at this again and trying to really hit 20 home with the first prong. CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: 21 Okay, I can

certainly accept that. And for a stronger

1	argument built around the backyard, its
2	difference. How the effect of the sewer
3	affects the property, your ability to expand
4	back there.
5	So let's do this
6	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL:
7	Architecturally we find, we have, I have no
8	issue with it. I mean I think, you know from,
9	you got letters that saying from your
10	neighbors, so that's not the issue. The third
11	prong is not the issue.
12	It's that first prong. We've
13	really got to try to give us, give the Board
14	some, something, some more meat to chew on here.
15	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes, we don't
16	want to kill it. We want to get there but we
17	are bound by what the law requires and so that's
18	what we're trying to give you a lift there.
19	Give you another chance to do that.
20	So Mr. Moy, what would be
21	additionally we need some information, if you
22	can check the land records yourselves to find

1	out whether or not these other decks had proper
2	permission to be there.
3	Mr. Moy, what would be
4	MR. MOY: If the applicant can
5	appear with supplemental information in a
6	week's time, staff would recommend that the
7	Board rehear this in decision or hearing on
8	September 30th.
9	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes, they may
10	not have enough time to really work this.
11	MR. MOY: Okay.
12	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: You can go
12 13	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: You can go another date. They're not pressing for it, they
13	another date. They're not pressing for it, they
13 14	another date. They're not pressing for it, they want to get it done, but we want make sure they
13 14 15	another date. They're not pressing for it, they want to get it done, but we want make sure they have sufficient time to work this.
13 14 15 16	another date. They're not pressing for it, they want to get it done, but we want make sure they have sufficient time to work this. MR. MOY: Okay, let's set a date
13 14 15 16 17	another date. They're not pressing for it, they want to get it done, but we want make sure they have sufficient time to work this. MR. MOY: Okay, let's set a date then for October the, well the, I was going to
13 14 15 16 17 18	another date. They're not pressing for it, they want to get it done, but we want make sure they have sufficient time to work this. MR. MOY: Okay, let's set a date then for October the, well the, I was going to say October the 21st. If you feel that's too
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	another date. They're not pressing for it, they want to get it done, but we want make sure they have sufficient time to work this. MR. MOY: Okay, let's set a date then for October the, well the, I was going to say October the 21st. If you feel that's too long, then

1	us ample time.
2	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, let's
3	do that and so we'll continue this. Let's keep
4	the hearing open, not for decision. Let's keep
5	it open just in case we have questions. Okay?
6	Good. Thank you. We'll try and
7	get you there, but you know, we need some help
8	from you.
9	MR. HAINS: We appreciate it.
10	Thank you.
11	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Thank you
12	all. Oh, we're going take five minutes and
13	then we'll move into our last case on the
14	docket. Am I correct? Or am I ahead of
15	myself?
16	MR. MOY: That's correct, sir.
17	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Then 18794,
18	thanks.
19	(Whereupon, the above-entitled
20	matter went off the record at 10:37 a.m. and
21	resumed at 10:44 a.m.)
22	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: All right,

1	we're back in session. Mr. Moy, you want to
2	call 18794, please?
3	MR. MOY: Yes, sir. Thank you.
4	This is Application No. 18794 of
5	Newton Street, Development Three, LLC. Mr.
6	Chairman, this is a request for multiple
7	variance relief at property 1740 New Jersey
8	Avenue, N.W., and I believe there are revised
9	plans under Exhibit 30A.
10	This was last heard, I believe July
11	15th. No, it was postponed from July 15th,
12	rescheduled to today.
13	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: All right,
14	thank you. Please identify yourselves.
15	MR. MOLDENHAUER: Good morning.
16	My name is Meredith Moldenhauer from the law
17	office of Griffin, Murphy, Moldenhauer &
18	Wiggins. Here with me today are
19	representatives of the applicant. To my right
20	is David Bloom, the architect of the project.
21	
	To my left is Jimmy Edgerton, and to his left

1 I'll just start out with a brief summary of what has changed from the initial 2 application and then I'll turn it over to my 3 4 clients and go through a presentation. The application has been modified 5 6 to reduce the degree of lot area relief 7 requested, reducing the number of We've also handed out a copy of the revised 8 penthouse design which modified the penthouse, 9 10 reducing it in size and visual appearance based on back and forth discussions with the ANC. 11 12 We're also requesting 13 non-conforming structure relief and parking The documents submitted, including 14 relief. the supplemental application, the pre-hearing 15 16 statement, we believe outline and demonstrate in great detail, including financial analysis, 17 as to how the applicant satisfies the three 18 19 prong use variance test, or area variance 20 tests. The applicant has gone to great 21

depths to work with the neighborhood and the

concerns of the ANC. And has, is very excited to be able to report that they have gotten the support of the ANC which is part of the record.

They have, they had originally as Mr. Moy indicated, postponed the case to allow for additional dialog. At which time, they reduced the number of units and provided an extensive degrees of parking mitigation measures which include RPP for the entire building.

And also a first, I believe, time the Board has ever seen this, but a restriction on the VPP as well. Visitor parking permits, which the District has acknowledged will become formally effective as of January. Anybody can obtain a VPP, so the applicant has agreed to restrict those as well for the entire building.

We acknowledge Office of Planning's position but will identify kind of our belief, they kind of lacked response in regards to the financial hardship that we will be able to walk through and ask, answer any questions that the

1	Board may have answers to.
2	At this point in time, I'll turn the
3	presentation over to Jimmy Edgerton to give a
4	brief introduction and then walk through the
5	plans.
6	MR. EDGERTON: Good morning. My
7	name is Jimmy Edgerton. I'll quickly
8	introduce the development team. Both Dave
9	Bloom, the architect with DB Architecture and
10	myself, Newton Street Development, we live in
11	DC.
12	Nick Hodges, all three of us, we all
13	work in the city. We intend to be a part of the
14	community and we're very excited to propose
15	this adaptive reuse project near public
16	transportation.
17	We've only done one project, one
18	project every year or two, and I've done other
19	projects before but I've never come in front of
20	the Board for relief.
21	Dave, you want to say a moment? I'm
22	sorry this is Dave Bloom the architecture, and

Nick Hodges with BJC Contracting. This is a map that shows we're in the R4 zone, which is the reason we're here today. We are across the street from a large C-2A zone.

This picture is looking southwest from the post office and you can see that we're on the edge of a commercial zone and there are two gas stations south of the property.

This slide shows a couple pictures of the existing conditions when we first saw the inside of the property. It had been vacant for five to eight years. It had been neglected for many years. There were problems with vagrants, cleanliness, crime and safety.

There were also numerous title issues surrounding the property. It was a unique situation from the owners. There were communication issues. We worked into the process confirming hairs, heirs, and interest percentage. There were divorces and remarriages involved.

It created an elongated contract

period. There was also a double short sale with lean positions that had been subordinated in conflict, and one bank had been bankrupt and the other had been sold.

Additionally inside the interior, there was roof damage. There was some mold. When I first saw the basement, there was standing water that was up to the redline, if you look at the bottom left slide. It was up to my knee if I had walked into the basement. Overall this has created a base sum to renovate the property as a heavy lift.

MR. BLOOM: Okay, as my partner mentioned, my name is Dave Bloom, I'm a partner and the architect on the project, and I'll quickly go through the plans that we have developed so far.

What you see in front of you now is the site plan and the typical floor plan. The building, it's a very prominent building as you come down Rhode Island, and you get to this part of town, this is the building that's kind of

right in your face.

It fronts on three streets, Rhode Island, New Jersey, and S Street. The orange area is both the building and essentially the lot. It's 100 percent lot occupancy with a small closed court on the west side. And then all the area around it is the public parking space. So it's not technically our property.

The makeup of the building is four one bedroom units, three two bedroom units. We have storage space in the cellar, which will also provide secure bike parking. Seven spots, one for each unit.

There are three existing entrances into the building. We're maintaining all three of those, so each street, Rhode Island, New Jersey, S Street, each had essentially its own entrance into the property.

What you see in front of you are the proposed renderings of the building. It is right now an existing two story structure with a basement. And we are proposing to add a third

story.

Even though this is not a building that's in an historic district, we're very sensitive to the neighborhood. That it is a neighborhood with a lot of old wonderful building stock and our proposed design is very sensitive to that.

We are extending what is the attic mansard roof, extending that along the existing angle to turn that into the third story. And we are essentially just elongating the existing windows, the dormer windows to provide the windows in the, into those units that would be on the third floor.

You can also see in this rendering the revised penthouse. In working with the ANC we've reduced the size of it. There used to be a mechanical room up there as well as a community space. And those have now been essentially removed.

The mechanical room is now in the basement. We have a small closet up there for

1 the use of the community but that's about it. 2 There is a roof deck. We have also extended the mansard 3 4 roof at even a steeper angle to hide the quardrail for that roof deck, so it really does 5 6 look like it's always been there. And that's 7 what our intent has been. This is just a quick map showing its 8 proximity to public transportation. 9 This is a 10 very public transportation oriented That's sort of our niche with 11 development. this one. 12 13 Rhode Island has many bus routes. It's just a few blocks from the Shaw Metro, 14 Bikeshare is a block away. It has a very high 15 16 walkability score. I think it was 96 out of 100. really targeting 17 So we're this development towards people who don't have cars 18 19 or see the need to have a car. There is an existing drive-thru on 20 the space that is located in the public space, 21

or the parking space. In talking with DDOT

1 about that, we're actually going to remove And that creates additional community 2 that. parking spaces on the street on the Rhode Island 3 4 side. removing that drive-thru 5 6 obtain one full parking space. So the diagram 7 on the left, the upper one shows the existing condition with two cars. Of course the cars 8 continue parking down Rhode Island. And then 9 10 the lower diagram shows that added one space. On S Street we don't pick up a full 11 space but we pick up about half a space. 12 13 then given the overall length of parking available until you get to our neighbors curb 14 cut, you can fit three compact cars there. 15 16 Right now, you can only fit two standard cars. Just to quickly go over the rest of 17 our transportation demand mitigation strategy, 18 19 we have reduced the number of units. We started off with eight, we're now in talking 20 with the ANC, we've reduced that down to seven. 21

As Meredith mentioned, this is full

1 restriction on all residential parking passes, I just mentioned the visitor parking passes. 2 additional on street parking that's created by 3 the removal of the drive-thru. 4 We have the secured bicycle parking for the tenants or the 5 6 owners in the basement and the off-street 7 parking. MR. EDGERTON: Developing 8 any project that fully complies with all zoning 9 10 requirements would not be economically feasible. The 11 investment required is substantial due to the existing condition of 12 13 the property. Profit and loss submitted to the 14 infeasibility of 15 Board shows the the 16 alternatives. Compliance with lot, area would result 17 requirement, in a practical difficulty. 18 19 presented to the ANC We subcommittee on zoning on May 29th, June 26th, 20 and August 27th and received a recommendation 21

of support on August 27th. On September 3rd,

the ANC voted to support the application.

David and myself have walked the neighborhood many times talking in depth to neighbors, discussing the plans, receiving feedback.

I had previously have lived in the neighborhood and we walked the streets ourselves, and really went out to meet our neighbors again, and get to know what their concerns were, and what they would like to see in this project. We received 18 letters of support including the only adjacent neighbor.

Repairing the dilapidated existing structure at this prominent corner would be a benefit to the neighborhood. Paying careful attention to historic details is something that we're very sensitive to.

Keeping the structure productive and back to its, existing or original residential use, we believe we do have a transportation demand management plan. And that adding the parking spaces along Rhode

Island up and S Street N.W. do provide a benefit.

MR. MOLDENHAUER: Thank you. As indicated we're looking for three different areas of relief. The lot occupancy relief stems directly from the challenge in regards to the existing condition of the property, the financial and practical difficulty that arises from renovating a property that is, you've heard on the record, has been long vacant and dilapidated.

Any individual buyer you know, if they were looking at purchasing this property would not most likely have gone through what Mr. Edgerton described as an over a year long process to actually close the property and get through all of the title hurdles, and all of the multiple short sales situations that have occurred at the site, which did create a unique history in order to get title.

And the challenge of, and someone pursuing and taking the time and effort that is

required to bring this property back to a more attractive, you know useful aspect.

applicant with The has met neighbors and currently a majority of the community is very eager to see the property no longer be as indicated, a location for vagrants and things of that effect. Would rather have it be restored to attractive а more contributing part of the property.

Parking as indicated because of the 100 percent lot occupancy footprint and not having an existing curb cut on the site, is not obviously possible based on those factors.

And because of the request for the additional number of units, the applicant has identified multiple degrees of traffic demand management that believe address those concerns.

And that was a large discussion point at the ANC, and at the end of the day as indicated, the ANC did vote to support that application.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

The degree of relief that we are requesting, we believe kind of providing some other examples of cases that have been supported and presented to this Board and received approval, is in line with those other cases in regards to the number, the degree of lot occupancy relief, adhere, especially by reducing the number of units. We believe that, that provides more of a inline comparison to other cases that have been supported by the Board and have satisfied the standards, the three prong standard for the Board. I think that at this point I'll open it up to any Board questions and be able to --CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Let's go back

it up to any Board questions and be able to -
CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Let's go back
to the first prong of the test which I think
we're all having difficulties with, and OP has
indicated. Would you elaborate on how you
believe you meet the first prong of the test?

MR. MOLDENHAUER: It's a
complements of factors. It's one, the fact

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 that the property is an existing 100 percent lot occupancy, so there's no, obviously no room for 2 providing parking. 3 4 It's also a question that there's existing three entrances, so the challenge and 5 6 I can have Dave speak just a little bit more of 7 the challenge of obviously laying out and constructing a building or a unit design with 8 three doors that obviously enter onto the 9 10 premises creates a challenge. And if Dave, if you can elaborate a 11 little bit on the existing, how you're trying 12 13 to reduce the degree of renovation and the existing opening stairwell and aspects of that 14 degree about the layout? 15 16 CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: And so I have what you've outlined is the 100 percent lot 17 occupancy, and then the three entryways to the 18 19 building? 20 MR. MOLDENHAUER: Sir, I haven't finished yet, but I was going to have going to 21 have, I'll go through all them. 22

complements of factors of 100 percent lot occupancy, of existing three entryways, the fact that the property does front on three streets, and is on the corner of a commercial zone.

So this is actually on a very large, if you look at our original -- let's see here, I'm going the wrong direction, I'm sorry. If you look at the zoning map, if you look up here, if I can get my cursor -- this is all C-2A.

And it's not on the corner of a kind of a small C-2A zone, it's actually on the corner of a very large C-2A zone. And so in regards to marketability it's a very unique site because it corners on all three.

And you're looking directly across the street to, into two large gas stations which you know are in regards to marketing the property and creating a unique situation for you know, other uses especially in regards to a six unit or six bedroom home. It creates a practical difficulty in regards to marketing

that.

And then the last practical, the last unique circumstance is the physical condition of the property. The property had extenuating and dilapidated conditions.

The roof was falling in, the basement, and we can have both Dave and Nick testify and provide some more background about the base level of construction that was required to remedy the existing condition of the flooded basement, the mold that was incurred. It was created because of the flood since the property had been vacant for so long.

And the roof obviously caving in creating more problems. You can see in these pictures the roof was caving in on multiple areas of the floor. So all of those created a base level of construction cost which would then create the practical difficulty associated with the relief.

That's a summation of the areas for the complements of factors, and I'd like to have

both Dave testify a little more from an architectural perspective on that, and then Nick address some of the construction aspects.

(Off the record comment)

MR. BLOOM: So even though the interior of the building is quite dilapidated, the framing for the floors was actually in remarkably good shape and so we are proposing to keep that framing pretty much 100 percent of it. Maybe we'll have to remove a little bit of it.

But what that means is that the real main entrance to the building is on New Jersey, which is this one right here. And as you go through those doors you come to a very nice set of stairs that take you up to the upper levels.

So we are proposing to maintain the stair opening. We have to replace the stairs for code reasons to bring them up to code to make them code compliant. But that existing stair opening really sort of sets the stage to naturally divide the floor plan into a unit on

the left side and a unit on the right side.

Additionally what that provides us is on the first floor those two units would each have a private entrance which we find would be a marketing bonus. And then the main entrance on New Jersey would take you to the upper levels where there would also be units on either side for a total of six. And then one in the basement makes seven.

MR. MOLDENHAUER: And Nick if you can just talk about the conditions of the property that would then lead to additional costs. That no matter how many or what degree of relief we're requesting, the overall cost that would be associated with bringing this property back to any type of use, habitable use.

MR. HODGES: When we acquired the property, as Jimmy shared with you, there was a large amount of water that had built up in the basement. The building was taking on water from numerous areas. One of the areas was downspouts, gutters, they were all clogged,

1 falling off the building. We were getting a lot of water in from those areas. 2 Another would be a prior garage door 3 4 opening that was in the basement foundation And then the ramp, the concrete ramp 5 wall. 6 that used to go down to that, was still 7 underground and covered up with dirt. We were taking in massive amounts of water in there. 8 The site conditions in regard to the 9 10 grating, you know the grating was pushing up, opposite direction grating into the house, the 11 foundation level. 12 The current slab 13 sitting on top of nothing but just solid 14 clay-type dirt. So it wasn't filtrating in any 15 way. 16 We've gone in and we had to do test pits immediately to help relieve some of that 17 pressure. We've had Geotech take a look at the 18 19 project and determine that we need to do extensive underpinning and filtering systems. 20

portions of the slab or all of it. Completely

Most likely have to remove large

21

1 do drainage systems underneath and within the building, around the outside, and on 2 inside. 3 4 So to date, we've already invested substantial amounts of money. 5 In excess of 6 \$75,000 to just start mitigating the problem. 7 And we know we have more to come to make this successful, to have a properly operating 8 But and structurally support the 9 structure. 10 additional work we're going to do. But to also just simply keep water out of the building. 11 MR. MOLDENHAUER: And would those 12 13 costs be required whether you did four units, or six units, or seven units? 14 Yes, they would be. 15 MR. HODGES: 16 have any type of occupancy into this building, due to the amount of water and 17 humidity that was building up in the basement, 18 19 and potential you know, future mold, and we 20 already mitigated what was there to date. Yes, we would need this regardless 21 of any type of, or quantity of occupancy in the 22

1	building.
2	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Board any
3	questions, additional questions of the
4	applicant? Yes, Mr. Turnbull.
5	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes, thank
6	you Mr. Chair.
7	You've mentioned a lot about
8	talking with the ANC and walking the
9	neighborhood. Have you had any further
10	meetings with OP regarding these changes and
11	talking about it?
12	Because the last OP report is dated
13	August 29th and I'm just wondering have you had
14	any further discussions with Ms. Thomas about
15	any of these changes?
16	MR. MOLDENHAUER: We made a lot of
17	these changes right around the September 3rd
18	ANC meeting which was I believe the same date
19	that our pre-hearing statement was due.
20	And so we provided a copy to Ms.
21	Thomas but we haven't had I actually ran into
22	Ms. Thomas the other day and we had a very short

1	discussion outside of actually this hearing
2	room about two weeks ago.
3	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I guess
4	part of my concern is the OP report is based upon
5	an eight unit dwelling. The stuff we just got
6	over the transom, is for a six unit.
7	MR. MOLDENHAUER: Seven, the
8	pre-hearing
9	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Is it
10	seven?
11	MR. MOLDENHAUER: The pre-hearing
12	statement included seven units. And the ANC
13	voted on a seven unit project.
14	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: So, I got
15	the eight unit
16	MR. MOLDENHAUER: The unit in the
17	basement
18	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
19	Well I guess there has to be further discussion
20	with OP. Did you ever talk about, I mean I
21	guess my biggest why would you buy a property
22	like this knowing the zone and the

1 restrictions? 2 MR. MOLDENHAUER:

MR. MOLDENHAUER: Well, and I believe it, you know reverts to multiple cases

4 | that self-created hardship is not a factor.

In you know, the preservation for a 1700 block of N Street, they determined that it you know, in that case where the YMCA bought a property that they know would have had difficulty putting a swimming pool into the basement along with providing parking, and that for a area variance, self-created hardship cannot be considered a factor. And I think that you know this was something where that should apply here as well.

CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes, but we've also had cases where deteriorating conditions of property where people have tried to use that as a reason basis for uniqueness and support, we've accepted it and we've rejected it.

So I mean, it's the same kind of discussion Mr. Turnbull is having. Not

1	necessarily using the term, its self-imposed
2	hardship, but using the conditions of the
3	building as being what you inherited when you
4	got it, as basis to support among other things,
5	uniqueness. That's kind of where I believe Mr.
6	Turnbull
7	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right
8	MR. MOLDENHAUER: Well, let me
9	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: And I
10	guess part of the other thing is I mean you talk
11	about all these problems with the basement, the
12	water proofing, the leaking. You're in a flood
13	zone as I understand. You're in a FEMA flood
14	zone?
15	MR. MOLDENHAUER: Let me allow Mr.
16	Edgerton to address that question. I think
17	that some of the facts may be helpful, or is it
18	Dave?
19	MR. EDGERTON: I can do it. Mr.
20	Turnbull, I'm sorry, I didn't, can you repeat
21	your question?
22	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well I'm

1	just saying, I mean, as I understand it you had
2	a lot of problems with the water, the basement,
3	the flooding, and as I understand you're in a
4	FEMA flood zone? So, but you're still going to
5	come back with basement dwelling units?
6	MR. EDGERTON: We have reduced the
7	initial, the proposal was for two basement
8	dwellings units, not it's only one. And that
9	reduces the cost of our only really fully
10	mitigating one of the units for habitable
11	space.
12	And if I may speak upon the
13	hardship. There was, we had not been able to
14	get into the property often before purchasing.
15	So we were not aware of some of the interior
16	issues in the basement.
17	None of the test pits or
18	geo-technical study that we, could be
19	accomplished until after that closing. But
20	these, some of these were unknown before we had
21	actually purchased the property.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL:

22

Ι

Well

guess I'm still struggling with the first prong, getting over that hump for the relief requested. And I don't know whether I need more information, or you've got a backup to that.

I guess I need something else that's really going to show me that you're satisfying the first prong. And maybe OP, we can get into that with OP. But I mean OP's original, you know, the 900 square foot -- I don't know what you're at right now.

I mean, you've given us this whole new stuff. I don't know if anything changes, or I mean you've tried to come in and say oh, we've made changes. We've done this, but I don't know what that does for me to help get over that first prong.

MR. EDGERTON: Mr. Turnbull if I may, the exterior of the property has not changed much at all from the eight unit to the seven unit proposal. That OP previously looked at, other than the reduction in the

1 penthouse. COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes, and 2 the, doesn't look that great either still. 3 Ι 4 mean it looks like it's just tacked on, sloped, that excited by 5 and Ι mean I'm not it 6 architecturally. That it's trying to, 7 keeping the character of the house, it just, it looks rather bland and plain and just bumped on. 8 I agree with the 9 MR. EDGERTON: 10 bland and plain. We were trying to take into account comments from the ANC and the community 11 12 about trying to make it go away as best as 13 possible. And have it not be visually seen. I think it 14 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: stands out more, I think it looks worse. 15 16 I don't know, but that's just this one Board member's feelings. 17 MR. EDGERTON: Understood. Tf T 18 19 may I have one more thing about the property. 20 One of the reasons I was drawn to it is I used to, I lived a block away and I would walk down 21

New Jersey Ave., one of the grand avenues and

1 then take a left down Rhode Island Ave., to get 2 to the Metro. And there's not often that is a 3 4 property on the corner of these two grand avenues that is not in a much more denser or 5 6 larger area. And some of the setbacks and the 7 public parking from New Jersey Ave., and also 8 Rhode Island Ave., have created some of the 9 10 difficulties in trying to make this project become feasible and turn it around into a place 11 that can be lived in again. 12 13 But being on the corner of those two 14 grand avenues is something that initially drew me to the property. Not knowing some of these 15 16 further items lurking in the basement and the roof. 17 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: 18 Okay. 19 CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: The square 20 footage of the units here, is it still going to be 240? Is that what I understand, square 21

footage?

1	MR. BLOOM: The square foot per
2	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Per unit?
3	(Off the record comment)
4	MR. BLOOM: Unit size, the one
5	bedrooms are about 550 to 560 square feet. And
6	the two bedrooms are close to 740.
7	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: All right
8	guys, okay, so that's just the relief, this
9	is, okay I see. All right I'm straight. Any
10	other questions of the applicant, Board?
11	(No audible response)
12	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: The applicant
13	have anything else they want to present to the
14	Board before we go to the Office of Planning?
15	MR. MOLDENHAUER: I'd just like to
16	try to address some of the questions about the
17	first prong. And obviously can address those
18	also to the Office of Planning. In Office of
19	Planning's report they do indicate the property
20	does create uniqueness.
21	I think their question was more a

1 relates to the practical difficulty. The uniqueness here, there are not 2 any other properties that are in this square 3 4 that are of this size, so you're dealing, or it's not size, but of this shape. 5 6 It is a very unique shape to try to 7 create and design a mix of units based on that, is an exceptional and a unique condition that 8 directly relates to the practical difficulty. 9 10 You also have then the challenge of 11 having these three separate doors which are prominent from obviously S Street, from New 12 13 Jersey, and from Rhode Island, trying to design a number of units. 14 Obviously and a unit mix without 15 16 having two separate doors or a door to nowhere creates a question of how do you then modify or 17 identify the number of units that would be 18 19 appropriate for that unique type of structure with multiple doors. 20 There also is as we indicated, the 21

front entrance with the existing staircase and

so that naturally divides the units into one on one side, and one on another side. In regards to the type of unit mix again, going towards the lot area requirement.

We also then have as indicated the property is right near two large gas stations and on the corner of a very highly trafficked area.

So you have the unique location of the site, which if you were to create larger units which then go to the lot area requirement, you're talking about units that may end up having more of, larger families or in units that are family sized in some cases.

And Jimmy can attest why, and provide more information on the marketing challenges of that. Given the challenge of the location as we indicated on looking onto, and marketing, and trying to sell a unit that is larger for a larger value that is looking onto two gas stations.

And has the challenge of the safety

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

for potential use in order to marketing that for a larger family or something. So I believe that those all are factors.

And the question of marketability, and practical difficulty and reuse all stem from the Gilmartin case, and also stem from the case for the Downtown Cluster which go to trying to reuse, Downtown Cluster is reusing a shopping center in the downtown area and trying to relocate the lease type of, lease in that building.

This is a situation where this is a home which is on a very challenging corner, very challenging, unique conditions associated with it. And the question here is the practical difficulty in regards to re-utilization of that building, bringing it back to life, also an attempt of adaptive reuse.

As you heard testimony from Mr. Bloom about the attempt to try to reuse the joist and the floors and the opening that already currently exists, dividing the

1	property pretty much into two.
2	At this point, I'll reserve any
3	additional closing for after OP.
4	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes, because
5	you were kind of in a closing mode. I thought
6	I'd just let you go on, but any Office of
7	Planning?
8	MS. THOMAS: Yes, good morning, Mr.
9	Chairman, members of the Board. Karen Thomas
LO	with the Office of Planning.
L1	OP appreciates that this property
L2	would be revitalized and brought back to some
L3	viable use as a residential use, but we have an
L4	issue at 100 percent lot occupancy.
L5	You have an addition that goes on
L6	top, a top floor addition that doesn't meet that
L7	occupancy requirements as well. We see no
L8	need. We can't clear that first part of the
L9	test as to the reason for the addition.
20	Further to that, they're including
21	another unit in a FEMA flood zone as they
2	stated

1	So if one were to look at a case, if
2	you were just bringing the case on, you know
3	you're renovating the building. And the floor
4	pattern, and the shape of the building is,
5	presents a practical difficulty with the three
6	entrances, we could see perhaps where they
7	could have just used the two floors to create
8	the four units.
9	But we cannot clear that, we cannot
10	support the addition, the roof top addition and
11	the additional unit in the basement.
12	We have no issues with the parking,
13	we think that's commendable what they are
14	trying to do. But we couldn't clear that
15	
	hurdle with the first prong with respect to the
16	hurdle with the first prong with respect to the addition at a top floor.
16	addition at a top floor.
16 17	addition at a top floor. I'll be happy to take any questions.
16 17 18	addition at a top floor. I'll be happy to take any questions. CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Board, any
16 17 18 19	addition at a top floor. I'll be happy to take any questions. CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Board, any questions of Office of Planning?

1	MS. THOMAS: If it came to just
2	looking at the floor plate, and they were
3	retaining the, with respect to the three
4	entrances that exist, and you had to, and that
5	was that their claim solely on that basis, we
6	would say that there's a practical difficulty
7	in maintaining those three entrances to the
8	building, to the renovation.
9	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: What about
10	if they added the basement for five units?
11	MS. THOMAS: I cannot support the
12	addition for five units because they already
13	stated that this is in a flood zone. I don't
14	see how that support of a basement unit is
15	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Although
16	if it was habitable in the past, I mean there's
17	a risk I understand, I'm just curious.
18	MS. THOMAS: I didn't think that
19	they said it was habitable in the past. If it
20	was
21	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I'm not
22	sure if, yes.

1	MS. THOMAS: a garage, it was I
2	believe.
3	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay,
4	okay. Could they go for a map amendment change
5	of the property? I don't know what that would,
6	that would be C-2A though?
7	That would be the only, that would
8	be ridiculous.
9	MS. THOMAS: Yes, I couldn't say at
10	this point, how that line would brought in.
11	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes, it's
12	struggling. Okay, I was just curious.
13	MS. THOMAS: Yes.
14	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Thank you.
15	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Let me ask, I
16	thought you said that you do find that the three
17	entranceways are unique to this property?
17 18	
	entranceways are unique to this property?
18	entranceways are unique to this property? MS. THOMAS: As a corner property
18 19	entranceways are unique to this property? MS. THOMAS: As a corner property you had three entrances to the house at that

1	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I think
2	that's how she's getting to four units.
3	MS. THOMAS: Yes.
4	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay.
5	MEMBER HINKLE: Yes, Mr. Chair,
6	thank you.
7	So I'm looking at the zoning map Ms.
8	Thomas, and as the applicant stated, this
9	property is essentially surrounded by C-2A.
LO	Now C-2A would allow significantly greater
L1	density wouldn't it, to some extent?
L2	MS. THOMAS: C-2A would allow up to
L3	50 feet, I believe, matter-of-right, 65 with a
L4	PUD.
L5	MEMBER HINKLE: And there's no
L6	restriction in terms of the number of units
L7	related to the size of the property. Is that
L8	correct? I could be wrong.
L9	MS. THOMAS: No number of units,
20	but height and density, FAR.
21	MEMBER HINKLE: I mean this is a
22	personal gripe of mine, is when you know.

1 zoning, districts actually are split along you know the middle of the roadway. 2 So you get different things on each side. 3 4 But it seems if you were to really hold them to the R-4 zoning, the rest of the 5 6 neighborhood surrounding it could certainly be 7 redeveloped into much denser area. would actually have a bit of a anomaly here in 8 this corner. 9 10 MS. THOMAS: It's certainly that this building is 11 unusual at intersection, I'll give them that. 12 It might be 13 harder to be convinced to do a single family dwelling, but you know, they didn't say why you 14 can do a flat? 15 This is a very, this is a small 16 building regardless of how it may look at the 17 It looks big, but in actuality you 18 corner. 19 have a 1600 square foot lot, at 100 percent lot 1600 square foot is still 1600 20 occupancy. square feet whether it looks big or whatever. 21

They didn't say how they can do a

1	flat?
2	MEMBER HINKLE: Okay, thank you.
3	MS. THOMAS: I'm pushing it out to
4	help them at four.
5	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: And but
6	unique-wise as Mr. Hinkle has indicated, the
7	way this property is situated right at that
8	boundary line there, it's really influenced by
9	the C-2A district. Would that be correct?
10	MS. THOMAS: We have a lot of dwells
11	in the district.
12	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: But not this
13	area?
14	MS. THOMAS: We have a lot of R-4,
15	butting at C-2A. Yes, this area does. And we
16	had one instance where they had to go, get a map
17	amendment to do that.
18	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Got it.
19	MS. THOMAS: Right?
20	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Chair,
21	I can remember we, Office of Planning brought
22	before us on Georgia Avenue, a lot of

1	residential homes were on Georgia Avenue and
2	they were being used for commercial reasons.
3	So we had a map amendment that would change a
4	lot of those point buildings and made it
5	consistent.
6	We had some that were going to be,
7	basically OP came back and rechanged Georgia
8	Avenue in certain areas and made it more
9	consistent, separating residential from the
10	commercial strip, which again, getting back to
11	what Mr. Hinkle was and what I was I don't
12	know if it makes sense to ask for a, that they
13	need a map amendment or not? But that's
14	possibly one option.
15	Otherwise I think Ms. Thomas has
16	made a, you know, a case for saying if, they
17	could easily do a four unit building here.
18	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Board any
19	additional questions for Planning?
20	(No audible response)
21	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Does the
22	applicant have any questions for Planning?

1	MR. MOLDENHAUER: Just a few. So
2	Ms. Thomas you're saying that you could support
3	a four unit?
4	MS. THOMAS: Looking at the floor
5	plan as it exists, and the internal structure,
6	four units could be supported.
7	MR. MOLDENHAUER: But that would be
8	the same use variance standard that would be
9	whether it's four or whether it's seven.
10	MS. THOMAS: We're not using a use
11	variance
12	MR. MOLDENHAUER: Sorry, area
13	variance, I'm sorry, I apologize. I had a
14	brain absentee moment. So it would be the same
15	area variance standard whether it's four or
16	whether it's seven?
17	MS. THOMAS: No. You're adding,
18	we have an issue with that addition to the roof
19	to create an, that structure doesn't go all the
20	way up.
21	MR. MOLDENHAUER: So your concern
22	is with the addition to the existing

1	non-conformity
2	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: She's talking
3	about the, excuse me, the very basic part of the
4	test.
5	MS. THOMAS: Yes.
6	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: She's saying
7	the uniqueness is either going to be there or
8	not. Is that what you're saying?
9	MS. THOMAS: Yes, that's what I'm,
LO	yes. The uniqueness is going to be there.
L1	MR. MOLDENHAUER: And how is the
L2	Office of Planning, because I didn't see in the
L3	report, differentiating, one of your questions
L4	was well it could do a flat or maybe four units.
L5	Are they analyzing the practical
L6	difficulty that's been evidenced by the profit
L7	and loss analysis for economic hardship as to
L8	why four units does not financially work, as
L9	opposed to seven units?
20	MS. THOMAS: No, we're not looking
21	at, we did not look the profit and loss. No.
22	MR. MOLDENHAUER: Thank you.

1	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: But you
2	didn't provide, I have not seen four units.
3	MR. MOLDENHAUER: We provided, I'm
4	sorry, maybe we've had three
5	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Three, five,
6	eight, correct. Three, five, eight.
7	MR. MOLDENHAUER: But and then the
8	three, five, and eight. So the five obviously
9	does not work, and we then provided the three
10	which was without providing and I can have
11	Mr. Edgerton provide more of an analysis on the
12	why four doesn't work in that regard.
13	But we showed I think kind of a
14	mirroring image of below and right above why
15	five doesn't work financially. We can go in a
16	little more description of that if the Board
17	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Well I think I
18	can extrapolate that. One thing that people
19	constantly do, putting back their purchase
20	price and including it at the above line. But
21	you don't really loose the purchase price if
22	you're keeping the property, you're going to

1	get it back, as we look at return on investment
2	and then how we use it.
3	You're showing that even if you had
4	eight units here, that your return on
5	investment is 5.5 percent? What is it with
6	seven?
7	MR. EDGERTON: That is correct.
8	The return on investment with seven units is
9	just under two percent, 1.95 is what the profit
10	loss analysis shows.
11	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: So you would
12	do this deal for seven units with a two percent
13	return?
14	MR. EDGERTON: It is a, not the most
15	comfortable situation but given the practical
16	difficulties and what work must be done to the
17	roof regardless, we feel that this meets the
18	concerns and advice from the community.
19	And also brings a small amount of
20	return incentive to the team to turn this
21	property back into habitable use.
22	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay. Any

1	additional questions from the applicant to
2	Office of Planning, please? You had questions
3	of Planning?
4	MR. MOLDENHAUER: Oh, I'm sorry,
5	no. Those were all my questions for Office of
6	Planning.
7	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: All right, so
8	then let me change screens here. Trying to do
9	this sometimes my finger becomes all thumbs on
10	these devices.
11	Okay, is anyone here from
12	Department of Transportation?
13	(No audible response)
14	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: You've talked
15	to Department of Transportation about your
16	proposed mitigation plan. Correct?
17	MR. MOLDENHAUER: Yes, the
18	applicants have had actually extensive
19	conversations with them. Trying to see if they
20	could preserve the half curb driveway, talking
21	about all the mitigation measures that they
22	would provide.

1	And DDOT is supportive of the
2	project, but obviously was very limited in
3	their ability to provide any curb cuts or
4	provide any balance in regards to addressing
5	the parking issue.
6	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, did you
7	have conversations with DMV?
8	MR. MOLDENHAUER: No.
9	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: I'm still
10	cross, isn't DMV the one that was the force in
11	the RPP and visitor parking and all that stuff?
12	You know, we've learned that there's a
13	disconnect. And you talked to DDOT, doesn't
14	help really with the RPP stuff. And so I didn't
15	know if you've had conversations?
16	MR. MOLDENHAUER: We have not, but
17	we have and we would be willing to accept
18	conditions in regards to providing a lease or
19	condominium by-laws, covenants, and
20	restrictions.
21	Also then requiring that either the
22	landlord or the condominium association

1	obtains authorization to check the DMV records.
2	Similar to other cases that have provided, I
3	think, a wealth of contractual enforcement
4	obligations on the property.
5	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, so we do
6	have a letter of no objection from the
7	Department of Transportation on this.
8	ANC 6E, any representative ANC 6E?
9	(No audible response)
10	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: We do have
11	that letter of support on a 5-2 vote in support.
12	Do we have that in the record now? Did we get
13	that, we got that yesterday?
14	MR. MOY: Well if it's found, I was
15	just looking that because it's
16	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: I think we got
17	it yesterday.
18	MR. MOY: because it's not
19	exhibited in the record if we did receive it
20	yesterday.
21	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: I think we
22	might have. But okay, we can proceed on.

1	Is there anyone here wishing to
2	speak in support, well we do have 20 letters of
3	support from neighbors on this project. Is
4	there anyone here wishing to speak in support
5	of this application? Anyone is support?
6	(No audible response)
7	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Anyone
8	wishing to speak in opposition? Anyone in
9	opposition?
10	(No audible response)
11	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Well let's
12	turn back now to the applicant for any rebuttal.
13	MR. MOLDENHAUER: At this point in
14	time I'd just like to turn it over to Mr.
15	Edgerton to address OP's comments about the
16	fact that you know, they haven't really
17	analyzed or been able to evaluate this on an
18	economic feasibility for the practical
19	difficulty standards since they have conceded
20	that they do satisfy the first prong.
21	So I'd like him to just simply,
22	briefly walk through the hardship for the

1 practical difficulty for the case. CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: 2 Yes, but remember now OP can see and it may not be where 3 4 some other people on the Board are. I'm just going to, so that you don't miss that. 5 Yes, understood. 6 MR. EDGERTON: 7 Looking at the sales comparables, and we can only look at what the market is currently. 8 I've reviewed this with my broker as well and 9 10 he has a letter in support of the comparables 11 for sales comps. And we felt that smaller units may, 12 13 tab the units when going up into the market, get crowded out 14 bу townhomes and make them potentially harder to sell as there'll be more 15 16 townhomes in this area. We feel that with the roof in its 17 current condition, no matter what, there'll be 18 19 significant repairs. Without the additional 20 floor space of that third floor and the units that will be up there, it makes it very 21

difficult when we're below seven units to have

22

1	this become a net zero or a small net profit
2	project.
3	The financial constraints are
4	significant and it leaves a very small margin
5	of error to make sure that we are successful in
6	creating a net neutral or a net positive
7	project.
8	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay. Is
9	there anything else from the applicant in
10	rebuttal?
11	MR. MOLDENHAUER: I just wanted to
12	address some of the comments that were
13	referenced from the Board and talk through the
14	question about a map amendment.
15	And I obviously, we pursued this
16	because we believe that this was the most
17	appropriate way to move forward with a
18	challenging site.
19	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Is this like
20	your closing?
21	MD MOI DENIIAIED. This is
	MR. MOLDENHAUER: This is

1 going to make a quick closing afterwards. CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: 2 Okay. The site would MR. MOLDENHAUER: 3 4 not be conducive to a map amendment in our evaluation. In addition to that, based on the 5 6 comprehensive plan, in addition to that I think 7 the problem would be that you would end up having a matter of right development which 8 9 would be really not in keeping with the 10 community here. Even though we are requesting an addition to the non-conformity for the third 11 floor. 12 13 Three floors is permitted, or three 14 stories are permitted in the R-4 zone and that in keeping with the character of 15 16 community. It would, if it was for a 17 amendment, a map amendment I think would allow 18 19 as a matter of right without the beneficial 20 restrictions that we are presenting to the Board in regard to the transportation demand 21

management studies, in regards to RPP and VPP,

22

and the additional monetary incentives.

Those benefits would not be, rather would be simply a matter of right project in a much higher density, which we don't believe the community and the neighbors would be supportive.

We believe as we indicated, we do have 20 letters of support indicating they are supportive of the number of units here, they are very excited to see this property become the beauty that it once was, obviously many, many years ago.

As the Office of Planning does indicate in their report, the property had been previously used, many years ago as a dentist's office. Because the use of this property was so large, it obviously could not be used simply as an NR, as a residential use, but rather residential and office use for a home office, dental office.

That being said, we believe that the fact that this is the only property even in this

1 area, on this course or strip that actually fronts three different streets. That it had 2 the three existing doors which create a natural 3 division in the site. 4 The desire to try to do an adaptive 5 6 reuse on the site, the fact that OP does see 7 that the property is unique based on its shape, based on its location across from a C-2A zone, 8 9 two large gas stations. 10 We feel that you know, the challenge of being able to satisfy and provide, while 11 obviously in this case a very small margin. 12 13 This is smaller development а group, this is not a group of kind of larger 14 developers that are looking for a higher degree 15 16 of return or acquire that for their equity investors. 17 This is a group that has never come 18 19 before the BZA before but is simply trying to 20 return this property and improve this area by

does require relief

doing what they believe is a very high quality

design,

but

21

22

in

1	instance.
2	And if the Board requires any
3	additional supplemental information, we'd be
4	more than willing to provide that as well.
5	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: So was that
6	rolling into your closing, or have you?
7	MR. MOLDENHAUER: I did, that was
8	my closing. I apologize Chairman Jordan for
9	being long winded, but that was my answer and
10	then my
11	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: No, I just
12	didn't know where the lines were drawn, I was
13	just trying to stay with you. Okay. Then we
14	would close the hearing based upon the record
15	derived.
16	Is the Board ready to deliberate or
17	do you need additional information? Where are
18	we Board?
19	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well we
20	could start deliberation, then if we decide
21	that we need more information we can then ask
22	for it I guess.

1	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: All right,
2	good. You want to lead us off here?
3	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes, I
4	mean, we both want to talk about the map
5	amendment now, and I threw out the map amendment
6	mainly because I wanted to hear the mindset of
7	the applicant.
8	I seriously, and you know that the
9	Zoning Commissioner wouldn't approve it just
10	because of where it is and what it would do. But
11	I just threw that out as a talking point. I
12	wanted to hear what was, get some feedback.
13	I guess I'm a little bit troubled by
14	some of the comments that I heard. I have this
15	feeling that, why have zoning regs? If it
16	isn't profitable for the applicant and it's not
17	marketable, it's not fair.
18	And so it's like I don't want to
19	mention a certain city in the south that has no
20	zoning regs and you can build whatever you want,
21	but that's what my feeling is. That if it's not
22	profitable and you can't our bottom line is

1 this, it's not fair. You ought to let us do it because we're doing such a good job here. 2 I really don't know if they've 3 4 really -- and I think Ms. Moldenhauer's given OP's comments a little bit more than what they 5 6 actually said. I think regardless, I think one of 7 the comments in the OP report regardless of size 8 of the lot and irregular shape, the shape would 9 10 justify for providing four times the permitted number of units on the site. 11 think that's still 12 So Τ the 13 threshold, four, and we still haven't got that, other 14 than we hear profitability, marketability, and that's it. 15 16 And I'm still troubled by what I'm hearing as to the overall building and adding 17 the extra floor and putting this ugly little 18 19 penthouse on top, but it's profitable, it's marketable and people will be able to live on 20 it regardless of the fact that you know, it's 21

only 400 square feet or 700 square feet or

22

whatever up to here, some 40 or 550, 560.

I'm just troubled and I don't want to necessary kill this but I think that the applicant has got to go back and give us more information. I don't know whether they need to meet with the Office of Planning some more and talk about, but I think, you know I think the nugget that's out there and which they don't want to accept is the four units.

I guess I could have my arm bent and go for five. I know Ms. Thomas will look askance at me when I agree to that but going to the seven I think is a stretch.

But I think the applicant needs to really, and then come yet for me to say I can approve this project I'm still struggling with that first prong.

CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: I'm kind of with you on this but let me tell you I mean, I think Ms. Moldenhauer's presentation helped bring me back, because initially after I was doing my review before this, I was not anywhere

near on board.

However, I think that she has shown some realistic uniqueness that directly ties into the relief being requested, especially the 100 percent occupancy. Lot occupancy as it is, for the property the entryway there, its location and proximity to the commercial zone.

And I did hear Office of Planning kind of come back and say yes, regardless of what you have there, this property is unique and is just a little different than what the report said. But it didn't say everything that the applicant expanded on in that regard.

So I'm still really kind of on the fence on this one. That's just my thought and I would agree too. Mr. Hinkle any thoughts on this?

MEMBER HINKLE: Well, I certainly think the property is unique. And the situation in terms of how it's located on three streets, adjacent to commercial property convinces me that larger units would be

1 | difficult.

Now with that said, you know you are talking about an addition to it to increase the number of units. I'm just about there but I'm not sure what I'm looking for.

CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: You know I think this is what we're going to do. We're going to tie this one over, give you opportunity to take in what the Board is saying.

I'm also concerned about the two percent profit, because I don't know if we're just ramping this thing up and not going to really do it. Two percent is a realistic deal to try to do. Are we just ramping this up?

So I think what we do is continue this, give the applicant the opportunity, and OP the opportunity to have some additional conversations and fill in, in light of this conversation that we're having. I don't think you would have the votes anyway to be where you need to be if we moved it vote today.

And there's just three of us hearing

1	this case, so it'd require you to have a 3-0 vote
2	to move forward, period. So no harm, no foul,
3	I think we have information. I think you have
4	information from us about what we're thinking
5	and what the concerns are.
6	Mr. Moy, where can we push this? To
7	October 20, something, would that give you
8	enough time to rework it?
9	Is it October 20th, what was that
10	date we were throwing around earlier?
11	MR. MOY: It was October 21st, sir?
12	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: What's the
13	docket look like?
14	MR. MOY: It's chocked full of
15	nuts, yes.
16	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Dave, can we
17	make it the first of November?
18	MR. MOY: I didn't mean to sound
19	coy, but you know we
20	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Oh, no. You
21	can do that.
22	MR. MOY: it's a pretty full

1	docket, sir. But you know
2	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: So what's the
3	next docket?
4	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: You
5	weren't referring to the applicants involved.
6	MR. MOY: I think the 28th is very
7	doable for the Board, but I don't know
8	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: What 28th?
9	MR. MOY: October 28th.
10	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: October 28th
11	is doable for the Board.
12	MR. MOY: October 28th then.
13	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, make
14	sense? We're good?
15	MR. MOLDENHAUER: And then any
16	documents would be filed by the 21st?
17	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes.
18	MR. MOLDENHAUER: As a line.
19	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes, there's
20	nobody responding to anything. It's just for
21	us to go through it and read everything as you
22	know, and give labor.

1	MEMBER HINKLE: Is there a list of
2	proposed conditions on this?
3	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes, they
4	were in the pre-hearing statement.
5	MEMBER HINKLE: Okay.
6	MR. MOLDENHAUER: We'll make sure
7	that it's in one single page which is easier to
8	grab.
9	MEMBER HINKLE: Or anything
10	updated would be
11	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: And I
12	would recommend very much a meeting or two with
13	OP.
13 14	OP. MR. MOLDENHAUER: Absolutely,
14	MR. MOLDENHAUER: Absolutely,
14 15	MR. MOLDENHAUER: Absolutely, thank you.
14 15 16	MR. MOLDENHAUER: Absolutely, thank you. CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Well we
14 15 16 17	MR. MOLDENHAUER: Absolutely, thank you. CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Well we appreciate it. Thank you. You're still in
14 15 16 17 18	MR. MOLDENHAUER: Absolutely, thank you. CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Well we appreciate it. Thank you. You're still in the ball game but you'll handle it, I'm sure.
14 15 16 17 18	MR. MOLDENHAUER: Absolutely, thank you. CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Well we appreciate it. Thank you. You're still in the ball game but you'll handle it, I'm sure. MR. MOY: This is a continued

1	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Thank you,
2	thank you. Thank you. Mr. Moy, any other
3	business coming before the Board today?
4	MR. MOY: Not from the staff, sir.
5	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, Board
6	anything else?
7	(No audible response)
8	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Then we're
9	adjourned. Thank you, thanks everybody.
10	Thanks Ms. Thomas.
11	(Whereupon, the above-entitled
12	matter went off the record at 11:45 a.m.)