GOVERNMENT

OF

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

+ + + + +

PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

TUESDAY

DECEMBER 2, 2014

+ + + + +

The Regular Public Hearing convened in the Jerrily R. Kress Memorial Hearing Room, Room 220 South, 441 4<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20001, pursuant to notice at 10:00 a.m., Lloyd J. Jordan, Chairperson, presiding.

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Public Hearing held on December 2, 2014.

#### BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT MEMBERS PRESENT:

LLOYD JORDAN, Chairperson S. KATHRYN ALLEN, Vice-Chairperson JEFF HINKLE, Board Member (NCPC)

### ZONING COMMISSION MEMBER PRESENT:

PETER MAY, Commissioner (NPS)

## OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

CLIFFORD MOY, Secretary
JOHN NYARKU, Zoning Specialist

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

MARY NAGELHOUT, ESQ.

#### OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

BRANDICE ELLIOTT
KAREN THOMAS
STEVEN COCHRAN
MATT JESICK
ELISE VITALE

# DISTRICT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION STAFF PRESENT:

JONATHAN ROGERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

ITEM PAGE	1
WARD 3	
Application of Jennifer Keller 4 18870 ANC-3C	Ė
Application of Eli & Margaret Joseph 8 18868 ANC-3D	}
WARD 7	
Application of Roslyn Taylor	)
WARD 2	
Application of Planned Parenthood Assoc 31 18866 ANC-2B	-
WARD 6	
Application of Growth Spurts	)
WARD 2	
Application of SB Urban LLC	)
Application of SB Urban LLC 18853 ANC-2F	
WARD 6	
Application of Robert J. Searle	}

1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	10:00 a.m.
3	MR. MOY: That would be Application No.
4	18870 of Jennifer Keller.
5	Mr. Chairman, this is a request for a
6	special exception to allow and accessory
7	apartment, under Sub-Section 202.10, as
8	advertised.
9	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: All right, please
10	identify yourself. Just make sure your microphone
11	is on. Is it push the say something. I don't
12	think your microphone is on.
13	MR. SEARLE: Sorry, yes.
14	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: There you go.
15	MR. SEARLE: Jennifer Keller.
16	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: You also have a
17	request for the Board to waive the requirement for
18	proper certification, self-certification
19	requirement that attorney and/or an architect
20	certify your request for relief or a Zoning
21	Administrator letter.
22	MR. SEARLE: Yes.

1	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: What does the
2	Board feel about that, anyone?
3	For this particular relief, I could be
4	supportive of this, in this instance, because
5	you're already the property you're just
6	trying to basically, clean up something that's
7	already been happening, and it's already been cited
8	by DCRA I believe, is that right?
9	MR. SEARLE: I was when I purchased
0	the property in 2009, I was told it had a
1	certificate of occupancy, and I re-applied for it
_2	by mail.
13	In the process of having the apartment
_4	rent though, I determined that it was not a
L5	certificate of occupancy. It was a business
L6	license, and so, the apartment had not been zoned.
L7	I continued the lease and when my
8	dweller left the apartment, I've started the
_9	process with the Board of Zoning.
20	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, Board ready
21	to deliberate on this? I mean, well, first it's

1	I really don't have any other further
2	questions, that I need to ask. Board, any
3	questions we need to drill down and hear anything
4	from this particular Applicant?
5	All right, it's up to you, to add
6	anything if you want to, but I don't believe it's
7	necessary. We can go on and proceed with the
8	hearing, if that's your wish.
9	MR. SEARLE: Yes.
10	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, then let's
11	turn to the Office of Planning, and see if there
12	is anything in addition to what's already in the
13	record.
14	MS. ELLIOTT: Good morning, Mr.
15	Chairman, members of the Board.
16	For the record, I'm Brandice Elliott
17	with the Office of Planning.
18	We have nothing additional to add to the
19	report. We're recommending approval of the
20	request.
21	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Thank you.
22	Anyone here from Department of Transportation? We

1	do have a letter of no objection to the requested
2	relief.
3	Anyone here from ANC-3C for this
4	matter? ANC-3C?
5	We do have a letter of support from
6	ANC-3C, which we certainly give great weight to.
7	Anyone here wishing to speak in
8	support? Anyone wishing to speak in support?
9	Anyone wishing to speak in opposition? Anyone in
10	opposition?
11	Then we'll close the record on this
12	matter, and I would move that we grant the relief
13	requested in 18870.
14	VICE CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Second.
15	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Motion made and
16	seconded. Additional discussion?
17	All those in favor signify by saying
18	aye.
19	(Chorus of ayes)
20	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Those opposed,
21	nay. The motion carries. Mr. Moy?
22	MR. MOY: Staff would record the vote

1	as 4-0. This on the motion of Chairman Jordan to
2	approve the application for the relief requested,
3	seconded the motion, Vice Chair Allen. Also in
4	support, Mr. May and Mr. Hinkle. We have a member
5	not present. The motion carries 4-0, Mr.
6	Chairman.
7	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Summary, please.
8	MR. MOY: Thank you.
9	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: As well as the
10	other case, summary order in that.
11	MR. MOY: I was going to ask. You knew
12	that.
13	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Thank you.
14	Appreciate it. I guess we're at 868.
15	MR. MOY: Application No. 18868 of Eli
16	and Margaret Joseph.
17	Mr. Chairman, this is a request for a
18	variance related to allow additions to a one-family
19	detached dwelling. This is the property at 4547
20	Lowell Street, Northwest.
21	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, all right.
22	Just one second.

1 All right, please identify yourself for the record. 2 Patrick Cooke, acting as an MR. COOKE: 3 4 agent for the owner's behalf from Thompson & Cooke Architects. 5 6 CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, we were 7 just looking at the request for relief because it speaks of special exception and is asking for a 8 variance and then I think the variance is being 9 10 asked for -- from the front yard relief, but we believe that's sufficient to do the special 11 exception, extension of the non-conforming use 12 13 under 2001.3. So, that's kind of what our discussion 14 was about here. 15 16 All right, does the Board have any issues or questions with this application, since 17 we've kind of talked through that. 18 19 Mr. Cooke, as you may have heard, the Board believes there is sufficient information 20 here already in the record to grant the relief for 21 22 special exception, the and it's also your

1	opportunity, if you want to make a statement, you
2	can, but otherwise, you know, it's probably heavily
3	suggested that you want to move on.
4	MR. COOKE: We'll stand on the support
5	of OP.
6	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, then
7	turning to the Office of Planning, is there
8	anything additional that we have?
9	MS. VITALE: Good morning, Mr.
LO	Chairman, members of the Board. Elisa Vitale.
L1	Office of Planning supports the
L2	requested relief. We'll rest on the record and can
L3	answer any questions. Thank you.
L4	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Board, any
L5	questions of Planning?
L6	We also have a letter from Department
L7	of Transportation, with no objection to the
L8	requested relief.
L9	Is there anyone here from ANC-3D? We
20	do have a letter from ANC-3D, who stands in support
21	of application.
22	Is there anyone here wishing to testify

1	I mean, anyone in support? Anyone wishing to
2	speak in support?
3	We do have a letter from I've got to
4	think. We have a couple letters from neighbors who
5	have written in and supported their application.
6	Anyone here wishing to testify in
7	opposition? Anyone in opposition?
8	Then we would close the record on this
9	matter, and I would grant the I would move we
10	grant the relief requested for the special
11	exception.
12	COMMISSIONER MAY: I would second it,
13	and I would also add the comment that I think that
14	the addition is very well designed to fit with the
15	building and fit with the context, and modest in
16	
10	scale and I appreciate that.
17	scale and I appreciate that.  CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Any further
17	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Any further
17 18	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Any further discussion, Board? All those in favor of the
17 18 19	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Any further discussion, Board? All those in favor of the motion, signify by saying aye.

1	MR. MOY: Staff would record the vote
2	as 4-0. This on the motion of Chairman Jordan to
3	approve the amended relief for a special exception
4	under Section 223 in 2001.3. Second the motion,
5	Mr. May. Also in support Vice Chair Allen and Mr.
6	Hinkle. Member not present. Motion carries.
7	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, summary,
8	please.
9	MR. MOY: Thank you.
10	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Thank you. Next
11	case?
12	MR. MOY: Next application before the
13	Board is 18864/18403.
14	This is the application of Roslyn
15	Taylor.
16	As advertised, Mr. Chairman,
17	advertised as request for a modification of a
18	previously approved special exception order under
19	Section 205, to allow expansion of a child
20	development center for 27 children and eight to
21	nine teachers at in the R-1-B District at
22	premises 4428 Ord Street, Northeast, Square 5117,

1	Lot 838.
2	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, let's see
3	how helpful our Monday morning advice from Counsel
4	was. I'll have to do it here, because I missed the
5	meeting yesterday.
6	Would you please identify yourself?
7	MR. HUGHES: Good morning, Mr. Chair.
8	For the record, my name is Dennis Hughes with the
9	firm of Holland & Knight, and joined with joining
10	me today is Ms. Jessica Bloomfield, also of Holland
11	& Knight, and to my right is Ms. Roslyn Taylor on
12	behalf of the Applicant Lia's Rainbow Center.
13	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, Mr. Hughes,
14	there's a couple of issues here.
15	One, you're outside the filing for
16	the modification was outside the time frame for
17	receiving the modification.
18	So, we need you to file an application
19	for this, and pay the appropriate fees for the
20	relief. The time period had expired, when you
21	filed for the modification.
22	So, therefore, the application is still

1	not alive. It requires you can't modify that
2	which went out of existence. So, we need you to
3	do a new application.
4	We also need a new self-certification
5	form, in regards to this relief.
6	MR. HUGHES: Mr. Chair, I'm not
7	following the time limit concern.
8	With respect to the
9	self-certification, we can provide correspondence
LO	from the Ms. Taylor was actually directed here
L1	by the Office of the Zoning Administrator, so we
L2	can provide that documentation in their.
L3	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, I'm going
L4	to ask OIG to respond to timeliness.
L5	MS. NAGELHOUT: The issue is that the
L6	when the application was filed, the prior order
L7	was still in effect, but has since expired, and you
L8	know, there was no
L9	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay.
20	MS. NAGELHOUT: request for an
21	extension. So, that order the validity period
22	of that order has expired.

1	So, that's why you would need a new ZA
2	referral or self-certification, in effect, a new
3	application.
4	MR. HUGHES: Well, is it appropriate to
5	dialogue with this?
6	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes, go ahead,
7	that's fine.
8	MR. HUGHES: I'm not following why the
9	current order 18403 is expired. We're operating
LO	under that order, which I didn't understand had a
L1	time limit.
L2	MS. NAGELHOUT: Well, the order itself
L3	has a time two-year time limit, which ended, I think
L4	in September.
L5	MR. HUGHES: Why does it have a
L6	two-year time limit?
L7	MS. NAGELHOUT: Because if you read the
L8	stuff at the very end, it says, "This order is valid
L9	for a period of two years."
20	MR. HUGHES: Unless within such
21	period.
22	MS NACELHOUT: But it would you'd

1	never ask for an extension, is the point.
2	MR. HUGHES: But this is for special
3	exception of a child care center. It didn't have
4	a lapse to it. We weren't
5	MS. NAGELHOUT: Use to the lapse, just
6	the order, the validity of the order. So, this
7	would be considered a new application to expand an
8	existing child development center.
9	MR. HUGHES: Okay.
10	MS. NAGELHOUT: Rather than to modify
11	a prior order.
12	MR. HUGHES: I'm not sure I agree with
13	that, but we're at the Board's you know, we're
14	just following staff's direction, and we'll
15	certainly continue to do so, but there is
16	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: This is what
17	we're doing to do. I am going to move that we waive
18	any alleged untimeliness here and that we take this
19	as a modification, as requested.
20	MR. HUGHES: Thank you.
21	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Does that
22	consensus with the Board?

1	Yes, so, we'll make that by consensus.
2	Now, that we've taken care of
3	procedural issues here, I just have I guess there
4	is really so, you're going from you're going
5	to have 27 children and nine teachers, is that
6	correct?
7	MR. HUGHES: That's correct.
8	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, so, it's an
9	increase of like 15 and so, it's an increase of
10	15 children and was it another two?
11	MR. HUGHES: Two to three staff.
12	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Two to three
13	staff persons, and the you've seen the
14	conditions recommended by the Office of Planning?
15	MR. HUGHES: Yes, sir.
16	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Any issues with
17	
	that?
18	that?  MR. HUGHES: I'm sorry, could you
18 19	
	MR. HUGHES: I'm sorry, could you
19	MR. HUGHES: I'm sorry, could you repeat that?

1	them. So, one is that the hours of operation shall
2	be from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.
3	MR. HUGHES: Seven a.m. to 6:00 a.m.
4	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Six a.m.?
5	MR. HUGHES: Twenty-three hours.
6	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: This is
7	overnight, okay. Yes, I'm sorry, a.m.
8	That the number of enrolled children
9	shall not exceed 27. The number of staff,
LO	including two onsite residents shall not exceed
L1	nine.
L2	Outdoor activities shall be supervised
L3	and concluded by 8:00 p.m. Trash shall be kept
L4	onsite, collected three times a week and the
L5	property shall be kept free of debris.
L6	Staff shall monitor the dropping off
L7	and picking up of the children.
L8	MR. HUGHES: Mr. Chair, the Applicant
L9	is agreeable to all these conditions, with a couple
20	of clarifications.
21	One Item 3, the number of staff,

1 Taylor. She is one of the two residents -- she is one of the residents of the house. Her husband is 2 not part of -- does not participate in the 3 4 operations of the child care center. So, it would be -- we're requesting 5 6 number of staff shall not exceed nine, including 7 one of the residents, as opposed to including two onsite residents. 8 9 CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, that's 10 interesting. We'll make that 'shall not exceed 11 10'. It's easier that way. Okay, thank you. 12 MR. HUGHES: Then 13 to condition -- the condition with respect regarding trash, property shall certainly be kept 14 free of debris, and Ms. Taylor has entered into a 15 16 contract with a private trash service. It's a single-time a week, but it is a dedicated large 17 haul-off container. 18 19 We can certainly submit this to the 20 record, but as opposed to three times a week, given the commercial nature, this is what she was 21

directed to pursue by the District.

1	includes a recycling, once weekly recycling.
2	So, we'd just like to submit this and
3	
4	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: So, that's two
5	times a week?
6	MR. HUGHES: The recycling occurs at
7	the same time as the trash removal.
8	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: All right, then I
9	would need to have input on the from the Office of
10	Planning, who suggested three times for this.
11	Board, any other questions of the
12	Applicant? Yes, please.
13	VICE CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Is the daycare
14	now 23 hours?
15	MS. TAYLOR: Yes, ma'am.
16	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: It's 23 hours.
17	VICE CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Okay, thank you.
18	MS. TAYLOR: You're welcome.
19	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes, please.
20	COMMISSIONER MAY: So, what happened
21	between the last application and this one? I mean,
22	why are you going so much larger now?

1	MS. TAYLOR: Because of the needs of
2	infant and toddler slots in the District of
3	Columbia.
4	D.C. bought out this grant earlier this
5	year, for infant and toddlers, and Lia's
6	Rainbow/Roslyn Taylor happened to be one of the
7	recipients, who won that grant to do an addition
8	and increase the child care slots in the District.
9	COMMISSIONER MAY: So, you weren't
10	going to do an addition before?
11	MS. TAYLOR: No, sir.
12	COMMISSIONER MAY: That was just
13	MS. TAYLOR: No, sir.
14	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right, you were
15	just going to expand the capacity to 12, and that
16	was what was approved, and now, you've gotten a
17	grant that allows you to go even bigger?
18	MS. TAYLOR: Yes, sir.
19	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay, thank you.
20	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes, it requires
21	response to the D.C. grant, wasn't that it?
22	MS. TAYLOR: Yes, sir.

1	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: That's what I
2	thought, okay. Ms. Allen?
3	VICE CHAIRMAN ALLEN: I just have one
4	other question.
5	How many of the children are infants?
6	Toddlers? Are they all?
7	MS. TAYLOR: No, we have six infants
8	and six toddlers currently.
9	VICE CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Okay, because I
10	was concerned and I guess we'll hear from OP, but
11	I was concerned that trash pick-up of sort of dirty
12	soiled diapers, once a week, might not be very
13	healthy. Are you concerned about that? I would be
14	concerned about that.
15	MS. TAYLOR: Well, we did have concerns
16	and we got a visit from an inspector from the
17	District. He suggested that seeing that we had a
18	business in the District, we needed a commercial
19	trash can, instead of a regular the regular green
20	trash cans, which did adhere to, and we have that
21	big huge trash can.
22	It has a cover on it, and we also have

1	the recycling bin.
2	VICE CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Thank you.
3	MS. TAYLOR: They also pick up once a
4	week, every Wednesday at 6:00 a.m., during closing
5	hours.
6	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, anything
7	else you want to say to the Board, before we go to
8	the Office of Planning?
9	Let me do this. Mr. Cochran, would you
10	go ahead and give us your view on this, in regards
11	to the number of trash pick ups?
12	MR. COCHRAN: Assuming that there
13	would be something akin to the residential storage,
14	which is why in the previous, we had recommended
15	that it be picked up three times a week, for all
16	the reasons you've already brought up.
17	OP is not necessarily an agency with
18	expertise in sanitation.
19	So, I'm sure that there is some sort of
20	commercial container there, that can be
21	appropriately sealed, etcetera, and picked up by
22	a commercial service. I just would not know what

1	would have to be specified in the order, to ensure
2	that that's adequate.
3	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: I'm thinking it
4	should be kept odor-free.
5	Okay, well, let's we can get around
6	to that. We can ponder it.
7	Is there anything that you need to
8	offer to the Board? I think we kind of understand
9	the issue on where you are. This is the trash?
10	Tell me, what kind of trash receptacle
11	is it? Is it odor-free? You need to speak on the
12	record, please.
13	MS. TAYLOR: Yes, sorry. Yes, it is,
14	sir.
15	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Why don't you
16	describe it and tell me what kind it is?
17	MS. TAYLOR: It's a huge commercial
18	bin. Like I said, it has covers. The lids on it.
19	So, it's closed, and like I said, Bates, which is
20	the commercial company, they normally come out and
21	clean and remove trash everywhere in this area.
22	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: And you know that

1	it's suppose to be odor-free, or is it just a
2	regular commercial and you're just saying it's
3	odor-free? I mean, how do you know it's odor-free?
4	MS. TAYLOR: Well, before we sign the
5	contract, these are questions that we ask.
6	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: It's sealed?
7	MS. TAYLOR: Yes, sir.
8	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Do you have a
9	picture of it?
10	MS. TAYLOR: No, I don't.
11	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, that was my
12	concern, yes, okay.
12 13	concern, yes, okay.  All right, good. Yes, go ahead.
13	All right, good. Yes, go ahead.
13	All right, good. Yes, go ahead.  COMMISSIONER MAY: So, when you take
13 14 15	All right, good. Yes, go ahead.  COMMISSIONER MAY: So, when you take the trash out, is it all going to be bagged, as it
13 14 15 16	All right, good. Yes, go ahead.  COMMISSIONER MAY: So, when you take the trash out, is it all going to be bagged, as it goes into the dumpster, when it goes into the
13 14 15 16 17	All right, good. Yes, go ahead.  COMMISSIONER MAY: So, when you take the trash out, is it all going to be bagged, as it goes into the dumpster, when it goes into the dumpster? You need to be on the microphone.
13 14 15 16 17 18	All right, good. Yes, go ahead.  COMMISSIONER MAY: So, when you take the trash out, is it all going to be bagged, as it goes into the dumpster, when it goes into the dumpster? You need to be on the microphone.  MS. TAYLOR: I'm sorry. The regular
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	All right, good. Yes, go ahead.  COMMISSIONER MAY: So, when you take the trash out, is it all going to be bagged, as it goes into the dumpster, when it goes into the dumpster? You need to be on the microphone.  MS. TAYLOR: I'm sorry. The regular trash is bagged and the diapers, we normally put

1	bottle?
2	MS. TAYLOR: It's like it's like a
3	diaper pail, refill bags and we put them in this
4	
5	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay.
6	MS. TAYLOR: so, it's seal-able.
7	COMMISSIONER MAY: Got it, okay.
8	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay.
9	COMMISSIONER MAY: So, it's sealed?
10	MS. TAYLOR: Yes, sir.
11	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Well, come on
12	now. Anyway, got it, okay.
13	COMMISSIONER MAY: Plenty of diaper
14	time on my side.
15	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, good. So,
16	I don't think there is anything else we need to hear
17	from you, Mr. Hughes, unless you something else
18	you want to say.
19	Then we would modify this to one time
20	for trash pick up.
21	Board, any additional questions of the
22	Applicant? Mr. Cochran, anything additional you

1	wanted to say?
2	MR. COCHRAN: Just to be safe, you may
3	want to say something like in a sealed odor-free
4	commercial container, picked up by a professional
5	service once a week.
6	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: We kind of hummed
7	that around, until we learned about the Genie bag.
8	MR. COCHRAN: You never know when
9	they'll go out of business.
LO	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: All right, so,
L1	give me that wording again.
L2	MR. COCHRAN: A sealed odor-free
L3	commercial container, to be picked up once a week
L4	by a commercial service.
L5	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Mr. Hughes, you
L6	understand what that request is? I think it's very
L7	reasonable.
L8	MR. HUGHES: We agree, yes. Thank
L9	you, Mr. Chair.
20	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, so, that is
21	what we'll change number five to.
22	Is there anyone here from Department of

1	Transportation for this matter?
2	We do have a letter of no objection from
3	Department of Transportation. Did we get a letter
4	from ANC-7D?
5	MR. HUGHES: Yes, Mr. Chair. It's
6	included in the Applicant's pre-hearing statement
7	at let's see, it's Exhibit-F.
8	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, all right.
9	MR. HUGHES: I'm not sure if it was
10	independently submitted.
11	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes, that's why
12	we missed it, and it's not part of the record. Can
13	you make sure it's properly pulled out and filed,
14	so it's part of the record?
15	We can accept it in your report, but I'd
16	rather for it to be pulled out, and I know OP did
17	make reference to it, and that gave us some comfort.
18	Is there anyone here wishing to speak
19	in support of the application? Anyone in support?
20	We do have letters from neighbors and
21	others in the area who support the application,
22	which is good, especially for something like this.

1	Anyone wishing to speak in opposition?
2	Anyone in opposition?
3	All right, I don't know if there is any
4	need for any rebuttal or closing, Mr. Hughes.
5	So, I would close the hearing, based
6	upon the record that we have, Board, any other
7	discussion?
8	Then I would move that we grant the
9	relief for 29 children and nine teachers, 10
LO	teachers, and that the conditions as read, with the
L1	modification to number five, that required trash
L2	should be kept onsite and collected in a sealed,
L3	odor-free commercial container and picked up once
L4	a week by a commercial operation.
L5	Okay, so, that would be my motion.
L6	VICE CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Second.
L7	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Motion made and
L8	seconded. All those in favor, aye.
L9	(Chorus of ayes)
20	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Those opposed,
21	nay. The motion carries. Mr. Moy?
22	MR. MOY: Staff would record the vote

1	as 4-0. This on the motion of Chairman Jordan to
2	approve the request for modification with the
3	conditions as cited by the Board, be amended - as
4	amended.
5	Second the motion, Vice Chair Allen.
6	Also in support, Mr. May and Mr. Hinkle. We have
7	member not present. Motion carries, sir.
8	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Summary, please.
9	MR. MOY: Thank you.
10	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: All right, very
11	good. Thank you very much.
12	MS. TAYLOR: Thank you.
13	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: On 866.
14	MR. MOY: All right, next up is
15	Application No. 18866. This is Planned Parenthood
16	Association of D.C., as advertised for variances
17	from the Court under Section 536 and parking
18	requirements under Section 2101 and 2120, and a
19	special exception for office use under Section 508.
20	This is property in the SP-2 District
21	at 1108 16th Street, Northwest.
22	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, please

1 identify yourself. MR. COCHRAN: Good morning. 2 My name is Christine Roddy and I am the attorney with 3 4 Goulston & Storrs, and with us today we have representatives of the Applicant. We have both 5 6 Lynn Hackney and Mr. Loren with us this Ms. 7 afternoon, and to my left, I have Erwin Andres, who is our transportation consultant, and to my right, 8 I have Jane Nelson, who is our project architect. 9 10 CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, a couple of First, we'll grant the motion -- the 11 request of the Office of Planning and accept the 12 13 report out of time. it's anybody else but you, 14 Thomas, no. We'll accept that report out of time. 15 16 All right, I think we're going to need a presentation from you. I don't think -- well, 17 I don't have any issue with the Court. Here is the 18 19 issue. The parking relief is a lift, and in 20 your presentation, I think you need to drill into 21

that, especially effect upon the surrounding

1	community and etcetera.
2	So, when you go through your
3	presentation, you want to do that.
4	Board, any other thing specifically you
5	want to hear? What about anything about this
6	the dimensions of the Court? No? Okay.
7	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, I just wanted
8	to information on the trellises on the roof,
9	because they're not described, but they seem to be
10	there in the plans, and don't have anything about
11	heights and set-back and so on, and if there is
12	relief associated with them.
13	MS. RODDY: Absolutely. Would you
14	like us to speak about the addition to the office
15	use, since we are seeking a special exception for
16	that, as well?
17	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes, please.
18	MS. RODDY: Okay, as I mentioned, there
19	are three areas of the relief. We are seeking
20	special exception for the office.
21	The parking is actually a special
22	exception, since this is considered a contributing

1 building to the 16th Street Historic District. So, it's not a variance, and we are 2 filing -- we are also seeking a variance for the 3 4 courtyard. The courtyard would otherwise have to be 24 to -- 25 to 34 feet wide, and we're providing 5 6 a courtyard that is 14 feet wide. 7 Just to back up, the property is currently approved as a four-story office building 8 that's owned and operated by Planned Parenthood. 9 10 The first two floor facade, we will be 11 retaining. That is what has been deemed contributing to the Historic District. 12 13 will be retaining the first two floor facades. Planned Parenthood is relocating and we 14 will be redeveloping the site with an eight-story 15 16 mixed office and residential building. The office will consist of about 18,000 square feet and will 17 have up to 17 residential units. 18 19 project has simultaneously The undergone review by the Historic Preservation 20 Review Board, which has granted concept approval. 21 22 We have gone to the ANC. The ANC has noted that

1	it has no objections to the project and we have the
2	support of the Office of Planning, as well as DDOT.
3	DDOT did have two recommendations in
4	their report, that we provide additional parking,
5	and we have agreed to do that.
6	We are working with DDOT on the exact
7	dimensions of what that bike parking will be, but
8	we will be able to accommodate the request.
9	So, with that, I will turn to Ms. Jane
10	Nelson first, and she can walk through the roof
11	trellises, as well as the court and the parking.
12	MS. NELSON: Good morning. Jane
13	Nelson with Nelson Architects.
14	I'll just quickly show you the
15	location.
16	So, as Christine mentioned, it is
17	within the 16th Street Historic District, which
18	terminates at the south from at the White House.
19	We are a few blocks north of that, south of Scott
20	Circle.
21	It is a mid-block site. It is
22	surrounded by primarily commercial office

1 buildings. There is one apartment building to the -- on the block to the south, and a representative 2 of that apartment building did attend the ANC 3 4 Committee meeting, and they are in support of the 5 project. 6 This is the context of the middle row 7 of pictures, it's our site. I guess you really can't see with the lights on, but that is our site, right 8 there. 9 10 Christine mentioned, it an existing four-story building, originally 1880, it 11 was three row houses, three-story row houses, 1920, 12 13 there was a new facade put on, and then in 1954, a facade was added two stories to the top. 14 The site plan shows, you can just see 15 16 the remnants of the row houses at the back, and there is a two-story addition and a four-story at 17 the front. 18 19 is the current facade. The Historic Preservation Office has concurred that 20 floors of that facade 21 the top two are

non-contributing and we are retaining the lower two

floors of that historic facade. Everything behind 1 it will be removed. 2 The top row shows our new eight-story 3 4 building within that street scape. As Christine mentioned, it is a mix-use 5 6 project. The existing two-story facade 7 basically, acts as the organizer of the new building with a three-bay division. 8 In keeping with 16th Street historic 9 10 apartment buildings, the organization vertically is base, shaft and capital. 11 We are -- this view shows to the side, 12 13 the courtyard and then we have a step-back out at the top floor. 14 The site plan here, this is the proposed 15 16 site plan. So, you see the -- to the north top of the page is a nine-story office building. To the 17 left, the west across the alley, is a 13-story 18 19 office building, and then to the bottom, the south is a five-story contributing historic building. 20 The site is only 50-feet wide by 114 21

feet deep, which did create a parking challenge.

1 As you can see from the first floor, so with -- you know, to do a below grade parking, the 2 ramp is roughly 20 feet. The drive aisle is 20 3 4 That leaves roughly less than 10 feet for -- we could have parallel parking on that lower 5 6 level. 7 If we didn't do the ramp and you just parked surface on the site, essentially, we would 8 be pulling up to the front of the building, behind 9 10 the historic facade. We certainly wouldn't want to see a garage, parking garage behind the facade. 11 In addition to the fact again, at the 12 So, the entry to the building with the core 13 width. and the elevator, by the time you provide those 14 elements, there is virtually nothing left for the 15 16 parking. The existing office building does have 17 parking at the rear of the building, and that is 18 19 essentially where we are providing parking. 20 are providing -- the existing building has five spaces. We are providing three, 21

partly because we have to require -- we need to

1 provide a van space, which has a much wider requirement than the standard space. 2 We are -- there is -- just a note that 3 4 one of the spaces does allow for a smart-car size parking space. 5 6 I will jump to the trellis, and we are 7 not asking for relief on those. They would be, you know, open trellises. 8 This is the roof plan. They would be 9 10 eight-feet tall, set back eight feet, minimum of eight feet. So, it would be the one-to-one set 11 back. 12 13 The penthouse, we are not asking for relief on that, as well. 14 So, they would be -- basically, the 15 16 architectural embellishments for terraces -- roof terraces on the project. 17 The trellis that you see in the -- this 18 19 corner right here is actually the walk-out terrace 20 at the eighth floor. So, it does two things. it provides a very nice for that unit, but also it 21 22 cuts away that top element for the court and brings

1	additional eastern light into that court, and
2	that's if you have any questions on that, I'm
3	happy to answer.
4	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes, Ms. Allen?
5	VICE CHAIRMAN ALLEN: I have a couple
6	of questions. You said that you had to you were
7	required to have a van? Could you explain that a
8	little more?
9	MS. NELSON: Sure.
LO	VICE CHAIRMAN ALLEN: I'm sorry, you
L1	said that you were required to have a van?
L2	MS. NELSON: Accessible space, yes,
L3	has to be you have to provide a van parking space.
L4	VICE CHAIRMAN ALLEN: So, it's for
L5	I mean, it's ADA accessible, okay.
L6	MS. NELSON: And in this case, it also
L7	you know, it helps for any short-term drop-off
L8	loading/unloading.
L9	VICE CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Okay, and then
20	you said I think you said a smart-car? You had
21	space for it? Is that in addition to the three
22	spaces that you were

1	MS. NELSON: That's in addition, yes,
2	it's just a note.
3	VICE CHAIRMAN ALLEN: All right.
4	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes, Mr. May?
5	COMMISSIONER MAY: So, why isn't a
6	trellis considered a roof structure?
7	MS. NELSON: It is 51 percent open and
8	it's an architectural
9	COMMISSIONER MAY: That means it's not
10	it's not a floor. It's the roof on it, but I
11	don't understand why it wouldn't be a structure.
12	I mean, we see roof trellises all the
13	time that are attached to penthouses and if they're
13 14	time that are attached to penthouses and if they're not at the same height as the penthouse, they
14	not at the same height as the penthouse, they
14 15	not at the same height as the penthouse, they require relief.
14 15 16	not at the same height as the penthouse, they require relief.  So, I don't understand why it wouldn't
14 15 16 17	not at the same height as the penthouse, they require relief.  So, I don't understand why it wouldn't be a roof the roof structure why it would not
14 15 16 17	not at the same height as the penthouse, they require relief.  So, I don't understand why it wouldn't be a roof the roof structure why it would not be considered a roof structure.
14 15 16 17 18	not at the same height as the penthouse, they require relief.  So, I don't understand why it wouldn't be a roof the roof structure why it would not be considered a roof structure.  MS. NELSON: The penthouse is 18.6.

1	Preservation standpoint.
2	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.
3	MS. NELSON: Views from across the
4	street.
5	COMMISSIONER MAY: Well, I mean, I
6	understand why you wouldn't want to have them at
7	18.6, and guess I wouldn't have any problem with
8	them being I don't know.
9	I mean, I think that there has to be some
10	sort of explicit form of relief, in order to have
11	the trellises up there, if they're not going to be,
12	you know, at a uniform height, and set back
13	one-to-one.
14	MS. RODDY: Right, and we would be
15	comfortable requesting that relief if the Board
16	would consider it.
17	We can review the roof plan, but as we
18	said, the roof structures would be set back from
19	a one-to-one structure, and a one-to-one set back.
20	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay.
21	MS. RODDY: And they would be at a 51
22	percent open to the sky.

1	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay.
2	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes.
3	COMMISSIONER MAY: I'm not sure what
4	how we'd want to handle it, but I'm interested in
5	hearing, maybe what the Office of Planning has to
6	say about it.
7	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Mr. Hinkle?
8	MEMBER HINKLE: Yes, thank you. I
9	want to get to the the requested relief for the
10	parking.
11	I'm a little bit concerned about this.
12	It's a contributing structure, is what I am
13	hearing, to the Historic District, but you're only
14	preserving just the first two floors of the facade,
15	is that correct?
16	MS. RODDY: That is correct, and for
17	the width of the lot along 16 Street, yes.
18	MEMBER HINKLE: And everything behind
19	that facade is demolished?
20	MS. RODDY: Correct.
21	MEMBER HINKLE: And you're asking for
22	special exception relief for the parking, under

1 2120.6. So, just reading that, so, the Board can 2 grant relief from the parking requirements, as a 3 4 result -- and I'm going to guote this, "As a result of the location of the historic resource, providing 5 6 that the required parking will result in 7 significant architectural or structural difficulty in maintaining the historic integrity 8 or appearance of the historic resource." 9 10 So, how would providing the required parking result in some significant architectural 11 or structural difficulty in maintaining those 12 13 first two floors of the facade? MS. NELSON: Well, it's a combination 14 of the site width of the -- and the length of the 15 16 lot, as well as the facade. So, to do a below grade, as I discussed 17 earlier, the width, the math basically doesn't work 18 19 with the ramp width, the drive aisle, and then a 20 19-foot depth parking space.

are basically 20 feet long. You'd still only get

If you could do parallel spaces, those

21

1 a couple of spaces down there. So, a ramp below grade structure is 2 impractical. 3 If we just -- if we got rid of the ramp 4 and basically surface-parked under the building, 5 6 again, two negative and impractical things. 7 One, we still have to have the core and the corridor to get to that core. So, that 8 basically adds up to about 15 feet of that 48 feet 9 10 inside clear. So, that doesn't leave enough for the surface parking on that first floor. 11 The negative to that is, we'd have to 12 13 provide a certain depth behind that facade, of actual occupied space, so the facade doesn't --14 behind that beautiful, classical facade, does not 15 16 -- you don't see a parking garage. But essentially the 17 MEMBER HINKLE: I just heard from you are for a variance 18 arguments 19 and not necessarily a special exception, related to preservation of this historic facade. 20 I mean, for me, the special exception 21 22 the point of preserving a historic

1 resource, and right, I am just not getting the relationship between the parking 2 relief and preserving the facade itself without additional 3 4 structure behind it. Well, I think part of it MS. RODDY: 5 6 goes to the point that below grade parking could 7 compromise the facade, when you do the excavation below the building, as well as what she had said, 8 it's a combination of preserving some space behind 9 10 the existing facade. So, it maintains that appearance along 11 16th Street and the providing the core. 12 13 I think though from what she had said, and we also have Mr. Andres here to discuss the 14 impacts, which is part of the requirement as well, 15 16 that this case also would fit the variance and satisfy the variance requirement. 17 It's unique in that it is only 50 feet 18 19 wide and it also has those two -- first two floors 20 that must be preserved, and we get the practical difficulty for all the reasons that Ms. Nelson just 21

explained, as to why we would not be able to provide

additional parking and provide a court to access
the building.
So, then again, we'll have Mister we
haven't gotten to Mr. Andres at this point, but we
he can testify to the impacts that the lack of
parking would have on the community, and that we
are mitigating that and that this really is a
community that isn't driving to this site.
They're in downtown. Most people who live there
would use public transportation and everyone who
worked there would likely use public
transportation, as well.
CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: At some point,
we're going to keep hearing that argument. It's
going to blow up.
MEMBER HINKLE: Yes, I mean, we hear
this all the time, right.
CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Everybody uses
the same argument
MEMBER HINKLE: Right.
CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: up and down the
block, throughout the District, and everybody is

1	saying that no one is going to park, but there's
2	an awful lot of cars around, and anyway, we'll get
3	to that, under Mr. Andres.
4	But let me ask you. So, you could keep
5	the five spaces, but could you because you're
6	eliminating two of the spaces you already have, I
7	mean, without impacting the historical nature of
8	the property.
9	MS. NELSON: We would not be able to get
10	five. The very most we could get would be four,
11	because we are still required the van space. So,
12	again, it's a math. It's a
13	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: That's your
14	election though, right?
15	MS. NELSON: No, no, it's a
16	requirement.
17	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: The van spaces.
18	MS. NELSON: The accessible van space.
19	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay.
20	MS. NELSON: And it's an 11-foot wide
21	space with a five-foot access aisle to that.
22	In addition, that access aisle acts are

1	the rear the entrance, the pedestrian entrance
2	and the removal of trash and loading from that rear.
3	So, they have five now. They just have
4	five nine-foot wide spaces. They do not have an
5	accessible van space.
6	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Anybody else,
7	questions? You can proceed on.
8	MS. NELSON: Yes, the van isn't an
9	ANSI, and ADA requirement.
10	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, got you.
11	That's what I was it was like, wait a minute.
12	Okay. So, it's an ADA requirement. Okay, yes, I
13	just knew it wasn't an and the zoning was going
14	my brain is going zoning, zoning, van
15	requirement? Okay, all right.
16	MS. RODDY: And we'll have Mr. Andres
17	now testify.
18	MR. ANDRES: Good morning, Chairman
19	Jordan, members of the Board.
20	For the record, Erwin Andres with
21	Gorove/Slade Associates.
22	We've worked with the development team

to support the application. 1 With respect to the relief requested, 2 it's important to know, you know, basically where 3 4 and what characteristics contribute to the parking demand. 5 With respect to the site location 6 7 itself, as shown on the screen, it's -- the site is located west of 16th Street, just north of L, 8 and if you notice the -- there are three accessible 9 10 metro-rail stations within three blocks, that include two to three different lines with Farragut 11 North on the red line, and Farragut West and 12 13 McPherson Square on the blue and orange. 14 It's important that we are providing access to three spaces behind the garage with an 15 16 alley, a public alley that extends from L Street and dead-ends mid-block behind the property. 17 With respect to the relief, next slide, 18 19 the relief that is being sought consists of 13 20 spaces. Currently, we're providing three, so the relief we're requesting is 10 spaces. 21

I understand, as we've spoke about

before, Chairman Jordan, if this -- under the new zoning rewrite regulations, and I understand that it's not final yet, but under the draft zoning rewrite regulations, this project would have no parking requirement associated with the residential.

As part of the loading requirements, there is no loading requirement either.

With respect to the justification itself, and I think this goes to the heart of the issue, we believe that the -- the parking that's provided and the amenities that are in and around the site, as well as the demographics associated with residents in and around the subject property, lends itself to the amount of parking that we're providing.

With respect to the actual demographics from the census tract, 60 percent of the two census tracts that this site is located in and near, do not owe cars. So, there is 60 percent non-vehicle ownership.

The District average is in the 50

1	percent range. So, it's a higher non-auto
2	ownership, as compared to the overall District.
3	With respect to destination of journey
4	to work information, which is information related
5	to how people get to and from work, 78 percent of
6	the residents in the households in these two census
7	tracts where the site is located do not drive to
8	work.
9	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Seventy?
10	MR. ANDRES: Seventy-eight percent.
11	So, only 22 percent either drive or car-pool to
12	work, of the residents that live in this within
13	the census tracts.
14	So, it's important to note that even if
15	they do own a car, there is a portion that don't
16	use their car to go to work.
17	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: So, what's 78
18	percent of the number residents for this
19	building?
20	MR. ANDRES: Seventy-eight percent of
21	residents?
22	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Are projected for

1	this building.
2	MR. ANDRES: If there are 17 units, you
3	know, I guess if you assume a couple at most, it's
4	you know, 70 80 percent 78 percent of 34
5	residents is I would say it's in the range of
6	about 24.
7	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Right, 24.
8	MR. ANDRES: Yes.
9	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Twenty-one to 24.
10	MR. ANDRES: About 24.
11	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: So, there is 10
12	people who are going to be driving?
13	MR. ANDRES: If those if those
14	people do not decide that, you know, their almost
15	there in the because that 78 percent is an
16	average. So, there is
17	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Using your
18	numbers.
19	MR. ANDRES: Absolutely.
20	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: How else do we
21	verify the numbers? We're using your average,
22	right?

1	MR. ANDRES: Absolutely.
2	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Can't have both
3	sides.
4	MR. ANDRES: No, I understand that, but
5	you know, certain residential developments attract
6	certain types of residents.
7	There are some residents that are not
8	close to the metro and have no real proximity to
9	some of the amenities that drive non-auto
LO	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: But I thought you
L1	said in your hypothesis that you included the
L2	people in the type of area that this building is,
L3	with this same type of situation, that's 78
L4	percent.
L5	MR. ANDRES: Yes, that's correct. So,
L6	with respect to that 78
L7	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: So, that would
L8	include the same issue with being near mass
L9	transportation, etcetera.
20	MR. ANDRES: Yes, that's correct, but
21	this also includes some other residential
22	buildings within the area that have parking.

1	So, in this instance, we have a limited
2	number of parking, so, the way that the marketing
3	for this development, as well as other developments
4	like this, are looking to attract people who either
5	are currently not reliant on their personal vehicle
6	or choose to live near where they work.
7	I wouldn't be surprised if some of the
8	residents live within the Golden Triangle downtown
9	bid area. So, that they choose that you know,
10	they'd rather spend their money not on
11	transportation, but obviously higher housing
12	costs.
13	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Where in your
14	presentation, I didn't see it, maybe I missed it,
15	where you've offered some type of mitigation or
16	deterrent for people to park, to have cars, who want
17	to park in this building?
18	MR. ANDRES: Well, with respect to the
19	mitigation, I am going through that.
20	So, the first is obviously, the
21	demographic cuts out a whole bunch of people
22	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: I'm asking for

this building, what are you -- what is being placed for this building, that's going to discourage people from owning cars?

MR. ANDRES: Well, with respect to the TDM plan, the Transportation Demand Management plan provides opportunities to disseminate information, so that those who are non -- who are not inclined to drive or own a car, to get the information they need to be able to access bike-share, car-share, metro-rail, future street car line and there is 20 bus lines within three blocks of this site.

In addition to that, we're providing each residential unit, car-share membership or capital bike-share memberships, so it helps stimulate that environment of providing non-auto modes to commute, and then we're providing onsite bicycling, which we've committed to as part of our response to DDOT comments.

In addition to that, in our report, we've identified a graphic that shows 34 offsite parking garages.

CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Now, let me ask you. Does your TDM include that which has been offered from Department of Transportation? Did it consolidate, because I --

MR. ANDRES: No, it did not. Our TDM includes a commitment to provide bicycle parking. DDOT's comments identifies what that commitment should be, and we're committed to meet DDOT's requirements.

CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay.

MR. ANDRES: And then in response to, I guess your question about mitigation, we've identified all the different reasons why people don't have to drive, but in the event that they do, there are 34 parking garages in and around this subject property, 12 of which provide overnight parking.

So, there are 22 public garages in and around within -- if you look at our graphic up on the screen, the -- what looks like blue are actually facilities that are overnight -- that are daily parking.

1	So, if there are residents that come
2	that if they're visitors for the residents
3	during the day that don't have parking, they can
4	park in those facilities, but the residents
5	themselves have access to the green facilities,
6	which provide overnight parking.
7	So, those green facilities, and there
8	are 12 of then within three blocks of the site, that
9	provide the necessary sort of overflow relief, with
10	respect to parking supply, in the event that
11	despite all of the recommendations that we're
12	identifying, in the event that somebody still wants
13	to drive, there is an opportunity for them to use
14	one of these offsite parking garages that do
15	provide overnight parking.
16	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Has the Applicant
17	made any arrangements with one of the parking
18	garages?
19	MS. RODDY: Yes, we have made
20	arrangements for overflow parking in a garage next
21	to the building.
22	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay.

1	MS. RODDY: And just to clarify, I know
2	that we were anticipating in the math that we did
3	before, that there would be 34 residents. We would
4	anticipate there would actually be 24 residents.
5	We don't expect to have two residents in the
6	one-bedroom units.
7	So, with 24 residents in the building,
8	that would really be five spaces. The 22 percent
9	comes out to five spaces.
10	So, just wanted to clarify that.
11	That's a two-space overflow from what we're
12	providing in that, we've made arrangements, like
13	I said, for overflow parking in a neighboring
14	garage.
15	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: So, what kind of
16	arrangements have you made?
17	MS. RODDY: We have Ms. Hackney, who is
18	a representative of the Applicant, coming to
19	testify.
20	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay.
21	MS. HACKNEY: Good morning, Chairman
22	and the Board.

1	I actually spoke with the parking
2	garage directly behind, which is not a 24-hour, it
3	closes every day daily at 9:00 p.m., closed on
4	Sunday, and they have currently have spaces.
5	They expect to have space availability when we need
6	them.
7	I also talked to a parking garage
8	Desales, which is a 24-hour garage with some block
9	it's about halfway, and they have spaces,
10	anticipate they'll have spaces when we need them.
11	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: You don't have a
12	contract with them, is that correct?
12 13	contract with them, is that correct?  MS. HACKNEY: We can get a contract
13	MS. HACKNEY: We can get a contract
13 14	MS. HACKNEY: We can get a contract anytime, you know, that we need it. It's just at
13 14 15	MS. HACKNEY: We can get a contract anytime, you know, that we need it. It's just at this point, we would need we would have to start
13 14 15 16	MS. HACKNEY: We can get a contract anytime, you know, that we need it. It's just at this point, we would need we would have to start paying for the spaces, and we're far enough out,
13 14 15 16 17	MS. HACKNEY: We can get a contract anytime, you know, that we need it. It's just at this point, we would need we would have to start paying for the spaces, and we're far enough out, that that obviously would be a financial impact,
13 14 15 16 17	MS. HACKNEY: We can get a contract anytime, you know, that we need it. It's just at this point, we would need we would have to start paying for the spaces, and we're far enough out, that that obviously would be a financial impact, but the spaces are available.
13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. HACKNEY: We can get a contract anytime, you know, that we need it. It's just at this point, we would need we would have to start paying for the spaces, and we're far enough out, that that obviously would be a financial impact, but the spaces are available.  CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: You wouldn't have

1	secure space with the contract. You have to start
2	paying a monthly fee, that's the only way to secure
3	them.
4	I'm happy to get that in writing from
5	them, if you'd like.
6	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, go ahead,
7	please, go ahead.
8	VICE CHAIRMAN ALLEN: So, when you
9	I'm just trying to understand what it is that
LO	when you talk to these, what did you envision or
L1	what is your as you get closer to it, what would
L2	be the contract that you would be seeking?
L3	I guess I'm just trying to understand
L4	what is it that you actually would are thinking
L5	about providing?
L6	MS. HACKNEY: Sure, and
L7	coincidentally, my office was directly across from
L8	both these garages for 11 years. We just moved to
L9	14th Street a few months ago.
20	So, I personally used both of these
21	garages for 11 years for my staff. So, I'm very
22	familiar with the people and how they run and how

1 it works. So, you lease each month, it's a 30-day 2 renewable and they charge anywhere from \$215 3 4 currently, to \$250 a month for these spaces, and there is no -- they will not offer you a long-term 5 6 contract, but in 11 years, I never had an issue 7 renewing as many spaces as I needed for my staff. We would have as few as 10 a month or 8 as many as 20, depending on who needed parking at 9 10 any given time. So, then with --VICE CHAIRMAN ALLEN: 11 are you talking about your former staff or the 12 current staff, because then that would indicate 13 that you have anywhere from 10 to 20 people that 14 are going to need parking spaces on any given month. 15 16 MS. HACKNEY: Well, we moved to 14th I'm just referencing that, because I've 17 Street. used these exact two parking garages for a number 18 of years. 19 20 VICE CHAIRMAN ALLEN: That's what I was asking. So, the folks who you -- yes, right. 21

Planned Parenthood moved, but the people who are

1	going to be in this building are the ones that
2	you're referencing, the five spaces or whatever the
3	10 people, the 24, I got you.
4	MS. HACKNEY: Okay.
5	VICE CHAIRMAN ALLEN: All right.
6	MS. HACKNEY: Thank you.
7	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, anything
8	else?
9	COMMISSIONER MAY: No, Chairman.
10	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: All right,
11	anything else, Ms. Roddy?
12	MS. RODDY: That's our presentation.
13	I would just add that, you know, we have advertised
14	for a variance relief for the courtyard, so if you'd
15	be more comfortable in proceeding with a variance
16	for the parking, which as we walked through the
17	this impractical difficulty, I do believe we can
18	satisfy parking.
19	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Well, if we're
20	going to I was going to take a break, but let
21	me ask you, because that just raised another issue,
22	that I remember I had in my notes.

1	What do you claim is unique about this
2	building?
3	MS. RODDY: This lot is only 50-feet
4	wide, so
5	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Are there other
6	buildings on that other buildings on that in
7	that block 50 feet wide?
8	MS. RODDY: While we're looking for the
9	
10	MS. NELSON: Is your question are there
11	50-foot wide lots that provide parking? Is that
12	the question?
13	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: I didn't ask all
14	of that. I'm just talking about the uniqueness for
15	the building, that you're your argument is for
16	uniqueness, why you claim the building is unique
17	for the variance relief?
18	MS. NELSON: The 50-foot wide goes to
19	the difficulty and the impracticality of providing
20	the parking.
21	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: I'm talking about
22	step one, not step two.

1	MS. RODDY: Right, it's a conflict of
2	the width of the lot, as well as the fact that we
3	have to preserve the first two floors, the first
4	two-floor facade, and that together, since the
5	facade runs from north to south for the entirety
6	of the lot, creates the practical difficulty and
7	the uniqueness of the site.
8	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: So, there is no
9	other building that has this historic significance
10	on that block? Is that what you're saying?
11	MS. RODDY: No, I'm not saying that
12	there are no other buildings. I am saying that the
13	create the width of this lot, coupled with the
14	historic and the requirement to provide parking.
15	The other properties on this site, I
16	don't know what their situation with parking is.
17	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: All right, so,
18	but you're making the argument that this building
19	is unique compared to other buildings and other
20	situations, and I'm saying you're talking about
21	your building.
22	MS. RODDY: Yes, and our's is a facade.

1	I don't know what the other historic attributes
2	would be. They may not be have to preserve the
3	building, which would create a different
4	uniqueness.
5	Our's would be the
6	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: But that's
7	something you just pulled out the air, without
8	doing the research to find out.
9	You know the standard better than I do,
10	and the fact that almost every building has
11	something that they consider themselves unique
12	about it, but actually, we look at it as required
13	within the realm of the immediate universe, it may
14	not be.
15	So, we're going to give you a change to
16	deal with that, and let's take a break for five.
17	Five minutes.
18	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
19	went off the record at 10:56 a.m. and resumed at
20	11:03 a.m.)
21	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, sorry, we
22	can proceed, back in session. Thank you. Do you

1 want to proceed? You had asked us --2 MS. RODDY: Well, wait. CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: 3 Do 4 we have seats? Do you need seats? Yes, let's -please, let's take seats and -- thank you. 5 6 MS. RODDY: You had asked us what was 7 unique about this property and if there were any other properties that were similarly wide, and if 8 you look at the plot for Square 183, and I'm looking 9 10 at one that was in Exhibit-C of our initial submission. 11 You'll note that the property to the 12 similarly wide, whereas 13 south of us is the properties to the north, directly to the north is 14 considerably wider, as well as the property north 15 16 of that. Property north of that is narrow, 17 well. The difference though with our property is 18 19 that we have no access to L Street, as the practice 20 -- property to our south does, and we have no access to an alley along the east-wide width of our lot, 21

as the property to the north.

1	We are the only one who has the limited
2	access along the 30-feet of the rear of our
3	property, and that limits the flexibility that we
4	have and how to access and locate the parking.
5	So, it is a confluence of the width of
6	the property, the fact that we can't access it off
7	of 16th and we can only access it from the alley
8	in the rear along the 30-foot width of our property.
9	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Mr. May?
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: Can I ask a
11	question? What is the I'm sorry, can you give
12	me the exhibit number again?
13	MS. RODDY: It's C in the initial
14	submission, the very first one.
15	COMMISSIONER MAY: Tab C, yes, okay,
16	it's
17	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Can you pop it up?
18	MS. RODDY: I'm sorry, I don't have
19	that on our in our PowerPoint.
20	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, Tab C in
21	your pre-hearing?
22	MS. RODDY: No, in our initial

1	submission.
2	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Tab 3?
3	MS. RODDY: C as in Christine.
4	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Your initial
5	submission?
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, I mean, it's
7	not syncing up with what the
8	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes, right.
9	COMMISSIONER MAY: The way our
10	documents are listed.
11	MS. RODDY: I'm sorry.
12	COMMISSIONER MAY: It's in the tab.
13	MS. RODDY: I am looking, essentially,
14	we have a plot, as well as a zoning map. The zoning
15	map is it can easily be used, as well.
16	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Let's proceed on
17	it. You might have to submit that, and more,
18	that's not off the hip, so that we can verify it,
19	because I'm not going to hold up the hearing for
20	this, and because that's something that should have
21	been pointed out to us, and before. So, let's
22	proceed on it.

1	I don't think we're going to make a
2	decision on this, because there is some additional
3	information that we're going to need. That is one.
4	Any other questions of the Applicant at
5	this particular point?
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, I'm by the
7	way, I think we have the zoning map on Exhibit-11,
8	right, which does show it.
9	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Exhibit-11?
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: So, explain again,
11	now that we have this exhibit in front of us.
12	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Eleven?
13	COMMISSIONER MAY: Eleven, yes. If you
14	might, exactly what the your argument about the
15	the wide why it's different compared to the
16	neighbors.
17	MS. RODDY: Yes. So, we're Lot 111,
18	and you'll note that we are similarly wide as Lot
19	106 to our south, Lot 98 and 91 to our north is
20	narrower.
21	Lots 881 and Lot 105 are considerably
22	wider, and then Lot 884 also in our square, is much

1	wider.
2	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: One-zero-six,
3	what did you say about 106?
4	MS. RODDY: It's similarly wide as our
5	lot. So, yes.
6	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: They're the same?
7	MS. RODDY: Yes.
8	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
9	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Got you, all
10	right, that's all right.
11	MS. RODDY: So, I would say out of those
12	six lots, one lot is narrower and one is the same
13	as our's. The others are much wider.
14	Of the two lots that one is narrow or
15	similarly wide, Lot 91 has access all along the
16	length of it, along the alley.
17	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Lot 91?
18	MS. RODDY: Yes, at the north to the
19	north.
20	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Give me one
21	second. I'm going to have to enlarge this.
22	Ninety-one, over here, okay, is that

1	91? It's upside down. Okay, I got you, 91 is what
2	now?
3	MS. RODDY: It has access. You have
4	the 16th Street frontage as well as the frontage
5	all on the east-west length of that lot from the
6	alley.
7	Similarly, Lot 106, which is similarly
8	wide, has 16th Street access, as well as L Street
9	and again, that's all the entire length of that
LO	east-west length of that lot.
L1	Our lot only has access from the alley
L2	in the rear, for the 30-foot length of that lot.
L3	So, we have less flexibility in how to access or
L4	position the parking on our lot. It can only
L5	we'll never get approval to access parking from
L6	16th Street. I mean, well, even if we didn't have
L7	the facades.
L8	But so, we can only look at the alley
L9	and the the access is from that point, whereas
20	the others would have more flexibility.
21	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: But the same Lot
22	105 has the same issue.

1	MS. RODDY: They have a much wider lot.
2	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: They have access
3	to the but I
4	COMMISSIONER MAY: Does 105 have
5	parking in the building?
6	MR. ANDRES: If you look actually,
7	one of our graphics show where the existing garages
8	are.
9	None of the garages none of the
10	buildings on that square have garages, on that
11	on our side of the alley.
12	All of the buildings that Ms. Roddy
13	referenced do not have parking.
14	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: They have no
15	parking?
16	MR. ANDRES: Yes.
17	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: On that block?
18	MR. ANDRES: Well, there is no
19	structured parking in the building. So, they
20	might have
21	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: In the building,
22	they have it on the property?

1	MR. ANDRES: If they do, it might be one
2	or two spaces in the alley, but not you know,
3	nothing of significance.
4	COMMISSIONER MAY: And 105 is a taller
5	building, is it not? That's the one to the north.
6	MS. RODDY: Yes, that is the taller
7	building.
8	COMMISSIONER MAY: That is the taller
9	building, and 106 is the historic building on the
LO	corner that was just redone, and they took off all
L1	the stucco or faux stucco, and that doesn't have
L2	any parking in it, as I recall. That's a historic
L3	building, right?
L4	MS. RODDY: Correct.
L5	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. So, we've
L6	seen many cases where parking is extremely
L7	difficult because of the width of or because of
L8	a dimension of the property, because you know, you
L9	have a certain floor plate that is really
20	necessary, in order to have efficient structured
21	parking.
22	Can you tell us what that might be? I

1	mean, is it does it become efficient at 60 feet?
2	Eighty feet? One-hundred feet?
3	MS. RODDY: Yes.
4	COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Andres is going
5	to answer, so, I'm interested in both, you know,
6	whoever wants to go first, but what you both have
7	to say.
8	MS. NELSON: Yes, a 60-foot wide
9	actually, so, you have a 20-foot aisle, a 19-foot
10	space on either side, that allows for the two
11	two feet for the exterior walls.
12	So, 60 feet was the magic number, where
13	you could provide a ramp down. That ramp then
14	turns into a drive aisle. You have parking on one
15	side of that, and a few parking spaces that could
16	fit under the top of the ramp.
17	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay, and remind me
18	again, the width of the property.
19	MS. NELSON: Fifty feet.
20	COMMISSIONER MAY: Fifty feet,
21	exactly, okay, and but even at 60 feet, you've got
22	room for two sets of spaces on either side, and then

1	one drive aisle, right? You don't necessarily get
2	a turnaround necessary for a ramp.
3	MR. ANDRES: Well, in that instance,
4	you're actually only have one side
5	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.
6	MR. ANDRES: and you can park on a
7	few spaces, underneath the ramp that's coming down.
8	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.
9	MR. ANDRES: So, depending what that
10	clearance is, you might squeeze some under the
11	ramp, but other than that, yes, that's all you're
12	limited to.
13	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right, right. So,
14	more or less, everything that's I mean, that's
15	not a I don't know, probably 80 or 100 feet wide,
16	it's not going to be very efficient parking?
17	MR. ANDRES: In addition to that, there
18	is a depth issue, because if you start the ramp from
19	the alley
20	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.
21	MR. ANDRES: and drop down, you
22	know, depending on what the depth of that lot is,

1	there is also some constraints, unless that ramp
2	is, you know, upwards of 15 to 16 percent.
3	COMMISSIONER MAY: So, did you look at
4	doing the steepest possible ramp and getting down
5	to a single parking level, instead of having those
6	cellar apartments, and what kind of numbers did you
7	get out of that?
8	MS. NELSON: Yes, we did look at that
9	and again, the only parking that we we couldn't
10	fit the perpendicular parking. We could only fit
11	a row of parallel parking, and those spaces
12	actually take like 21 to 22 feet in length because
13	of the
14	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.
15	MS. NELSON: maneuvering ability,
16	and so, if you use the full lot of 114 feet, you
17	basically get four you know, five spaces.
18	COMMISSIONER MAY: And you get three,
19	maybe four outside, and I mean, the current design
20	shows three and you could get a fourth, possibly.
21	MS. NELSON: Possibly. Well, you
22	would have to the 20 you need to subtract the

1	20 feet for the drive aisle, plus another five feet
2	for pedestrian access. So, that is
3	COMMISSIONER MAY: No, I'm not talking
4	about additive. I'm talking about what you
5	know, having a garage versus having the surface
6	parking. The surface parking gets your current
7	scheme is three spaces, and then if you but if
8	instead, you had a ramp down into the building, you
9	would get four or five spaces, you say.
10	MS. NELSON: On the surface or below?
11	COMMISSIONER MAY: Below.
12	MS. RODDY: Correct, and again, our
13	current scheme, it's three zoning compliance
14	spaces, a fourth that does not meet the zoning
15	requirements.
16	COMMISSIONER MAY: Got it, okay. So,
17	Ms. Roddy, lots of this size are fairly frequently
18	developed for office or apartments, and the
19	argument is typically made that a variance is
20	needed for parking in a because of these sorts
21	of circumstances.
22	In those kinds of cases, are they

1 typically, you know, truly unique properties, where you know, everything else on the block is 100 2 feet wide and this one only happens to be 50 feet, 3 4 and so, therefore, it can't fit, or is it often in places where there are other properties on the 5 6 block that are the same width or narrower? 7 MS. RODDY: Well, I think again, we are -- the difference here is that we're in the 16th 8 Street historic district. So, our frontage along 9 10 16th Street doesn't help us with our access, and we have to preserve those first two floors. 11 So, I think that this situation is 12 I know that there are other situations where the 13 14 lots aren't wide enough to accommodate the parking, but this is the situation of both of those issues. 15 16 As we -- we wouldn't be able to provide -- I mean, assuming we were located elsewhere in 17 the District, we could come off of the front, 18 19 provide some parking from the front, and then provide additional parking, surface parking from 20 the alley. 21

But given that the fact that we have to

Τ	preserve the lacade along the front, we can't do
2	that. We're limited only to the alley access, and
3	I think that it's those factors that create the
4	uniqueness.
5	COMMISSIONER MAY: What I was trying to
6	do was get a baseline for how just how unique
7	a 50-foot wide property can be, because it seems
8	to me that when it comes to building a building of
9	any size on a 50-foot wide lot, that it's going to
10	be a challenge to provide parking, no matter what,
11	and somehow in those cases, a case is made that the
12	property is unique, even though there might be
13	other 50-foot wide properties on the block. Would
14	you agree with that?
15	MS. RODDY: I guess it's hard to say.
16	Out of without the context, but there could be
17	a uniqueness about that building, even if there are
18	other 50-foot wide lots that are on the same
19	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.
20	MS. RODDY: square.
21	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay, all right.
22	Thank you.

1 CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: All right, couple of questions. 2 One, looking at your TDM, really not 3 4 excited about the fact that you're saying for only the first new tenants, the first occupants of the 5 6 building will be granted the bike-share membership 7 and etcetera. If it's something -- I would want to see this to have for every first -- every new 8 9 tenant. 10 Additionally, is there anything that you're proposing for your lease, that says that 11 tenants can't have a car? 12 13 MS. HACKNEY: Mr. Chairman, the units 14 in this building are going to be for-sale condominiums, and not rental, in which case, the 15 16 condominium documents would obviously be handled by the residents and what they want to do, going 17 forward. 18 19 CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Now it gives us a 20 little bit more 'umph' that we can use. We would need -- that does not stop the 21 condo documents that have a covenant that they 22

1 cannot -- owners in this building cannot have cars. Additionally, then we're talking about 2 -- and going further about additional sales of the 3 4 building and the condo docs, that the association makes sure that they are provided the bike-share 5 member, etcetera and car-share membership. 6 7 I don't see that in your TDM kind of offering here. 8 Here is the problem. You know, it's 9 10 not just that you get passed us today and that, these things go away, once you walk out this room. 11 These buildings have a history and a 12 whole life, and as you know, parking is a major, 13 major issue in the District, and we see it all the 14 time, and some of these reports from -- some other 15 16 or some transportation experts, I can just take it, change the name of the Applicant and just put a new 17 name on it, because they all read the same. 18 19 They're all guessing about what is going to happen. 20 We put in these measures and what -- and parking is the issue, even places where there has 21 been granted relief, based upon some of the same

1	arguments that people aren't going to have parking
2	in the District, and nobody is going to drive, and
3	sure enough, those aspects of this, those buildings
4	are up for a little bit, we find out people have
5	cars, have parking, because they decide one, not
6	just they have to go to work, but how are they going
7	to get groceries on the weekend, and we're not
8	taking the groceries on the metro, all of those kind
9	of things.
10	So, we take it real serious, and I'm
11	just saying to you, it's not the convenience of the
12	Applicant. It's the convenience of the citizens
13	of the District of Columbia, okay. That's really
14	what we're looking at.
15	So, I raise these issues with you to see
16	if you're looking at the alternatives. I looked
17	at your TDM, and I'm like, "Oh my God, come on.
18	This is drive-by TDM."
19	This Board has been more restrictive,
20	have we not, regarding TDM's and you know, you know
21	first hand, Mr. Andres, how we have been with TDM.
22	So, I just put I put forth to you,

1	is it Ms. Hackney?
2	MS. HACKNEY: That's correct.
3	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Ms. Hackney, that
4	the fact that they're condos versus apartments,
5	that doesn't get you any points with us, per se.
6	MS. HACKNEY: Fair enough.
7	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Because they have
8	to be real issues here and
9	MS. HACKNEY: Well, I mean, is the
10	request that you want to require in perpetuity?
11	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Well, I was just
12	asking you, have you considered what are those type
13	of things, because we have if you kind of follow
14	and track how this Board has operated, we're asking
15	for those things.
16	We're asking, and I don't think this
17	is kind of RPP block, because it's a commercial
18	street, so you can't do RPP anyway, but if had it
19	been a residential area, we would have requested
20	that, in addition.
21	MS. HACKNEY: I think that what we run
22	into is with the Condominium Board. We can put

1	requirements and condo docs from the initial public
2	offering statement, but if the Board subsequently
3	votes to do something differently, we have to
4	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: No, that doesn't
5	that's recorded with this property, that will
6	go through that will stay with this land, and
7	everybody will be required to follow. That's not
8	the
9	MS. HACKNEY: Okay, I won't argue the
10	legality piece of it, but that's just based on
11	experience, so, okay.
12	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, I'm just
13	trying to get you there, because I'm telling you,
14	you've got a lift, and I know you got a lift with
15	this Board and as you can see, we take these things
16	really, really serious.
17	Okay, so, Board, any other questions?
18	Applicant, anything else you want to say before we
19	go to the Office of Planning?
20	Anybody? No? Please, then Ms.
21	Thomas.
22	MS. THOMAS: Good morning, Mr. Chair.

1 Karen Thomas with the Office of Planning, for the 2 record. We are going to stand on the record of 3 4 our report. We've reviewed the application of a special exception, including the parking issue 5 6 that you're focusing on. I'd just like to highlight one issue 7 with respect to the condition. 8 You were asking whether the property 9 10 was unique and to what extent, but when you -- the 11 variance test requires that there is an exceptional narrowness, and I would position -- position that 12 13 with respect to parking, it is exceptionally narrow to provide parking on that site, because as Miss 14 -- as the Applicant Ms. Roddy stated, there is a 15 16 magic number to -- and width, to be able to provide that situation below grade. 17 I'd be 18 happy to take any other 19 questions. 20 CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes, please. COMMISSIONER MAY: So, did you, either 21 22 initially or since I raised the issue, look into

1	the question of the trellises of the roof?
2	MS. THOMAS: Well, since you raised the
3	question with the trellises, having discussed it
4	with other staff members, this did not raise a red
5	flag for us, because it was open.
6	We looked at it as an embellishment, and
7	as in the past, we have not had any issues with it,
8	and based on DCRA's interpretation in the past,
9	this is
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: They wouldn't
11	consider it a roof structure, just because it
12	doesn't have a roof over it.
13	MS. THOMAS: No, because it was 51
14	percent open, because it was an open structure.
15	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay, but
16	penthouses frequently don't have roofs at all.
17	They're open to the sky and they just have enclosing
18	walls.
19	So, those aren't roof structures,
20	either?
21	MS. THOMAS: That would that is
22	classified as a roof a penthouse is classified

as a roof structure, but a trellis has not been in the past. So, we did not --

COMMISSIONER MAY: But I mean, usually they're attached to the -- the penthouses are often -- they're attached to the penthouse, in fact, part of this one is attached to the penthouse.

You know, the openness has never been a subject of debate in my experience. I mean, that didn't -- that suddenly didn't -- that did not suddenly get you a free pass.

I mean, my -- you know, unless somebody can show me in the regulations, why I'm wrong, my conclusion is that those trellises are roof that structures and means roof structures, possibly separate roof structures, and structures requiring relief due to unequal heights, and potentially even set-back issues, because of where they are placed relative to the courtyard, because often, we wind up having to grant explicit relief for set-back from courtyards.

In fact, we have that for the stairway

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 exit from the rear top floor unit, where it's not set back from the courtyard. 2 I think all these things need to be 3 4 addressed explicitly and somebody needs to demonstrate why relief is not needed or you need 5 6 to request the relief, and I'd be very interested 7 in seeing what the Office of Planning has to say about that, because I mean, you know, I'm just doing 8 9 it based on my recollection of past cases, when 10 these sorts of issues have come up and how we've 11 addressed trellises in the past, and what I'm 12 seeing here is not consistent with what 13 happened in the past. My memory could be faulty. It could be 14 that you're -- you know, you're absolutely right, 15 16 and everybody -- and I'm the one in the wrong, and somebody just needs to show me why I'm wrong. 17 Okay, we'll be happy to 18 MS. THOMAS: 19 look at it further. 20 COMMISSIONER MAY: Thank you. 21 MS. THOMAS: Thank you. Anybody else, 22 CHAIRPERSON JORDAN:

1	questions for Office of Planning?
2	Applicant, questions for Office of
3	Planning?
4	Okay, anyone here from Department of
5	Transportation? Yes, there he is. I'm sorry, I'm
6	looking right at you. Go ahead, please. Thank
7	you for coming.
8	20: Happy to be here. I will largely
9	stand on the record
10	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Please identify
11	yourself.
12	MR. ROGERS: Sure, Jonathan Rogers
13	with the District Department of Transportation,
14	and happy to stand on the record that the site,
15	given its location and its excellent access to
16	transportation alternatives, will the parking
17	relief that is requested is will not have an
18	adverse impact on the transportation network.
19	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, let me ask,
20	Mr. Rogers, where does DDOT have the analysis
21	based upon these past projects for the TDM's that
22	are similarly in place, the success of it?

1	I know there was going to be a study
2	done. Do you have has that been produced?
3	MR. ROGERS: You're talking about
4	Transportation Data Management effectiveness,
5	essentially?
6	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes.
7	MR. ROGERS: We do not have a study on
8	that, and but what we've found are more anecdotally
9	is that TDM elements, they work together.
10	So, it's not it's difficult to
11	attribute a certain performance to one particular
12	element, but it's, how does the entire plan work,
13	given the other elements that are in place, given
14	context, given the demographics of the residents
15	and so on.
16	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: And I don't know
17	if you had the chance well, just reviewing the
18	ones that is done by Arlington and Fairfax County
19	and some other places, and we're we have a more
20	intense use, I believe than those areas, I mean,
21	still some concerns.
22	Okay, Board, any other questions of Mr.

1	Rogers?
2	Applicant, again, any questions of Mr.
3	Rogers? What ANC is this? Is anyone here from
4	ANC, is it two? Which ANC is it? ANC-2B?
5	Anyone here from ANC-2B? We do have a
6	letter of no objection from ANC-2B, in fact, I did
7	just read that.
8	Is anyone here wishing to speak in
9	support? Anyone wishing to speak in support?
10	Anyone wishing to speak in opposition?
11	Anyone wishing to speak in opposition?
12	We will turn back to the Applicant for
13	any rebuttal and closing, please.
14	MS. RODDY: Well, in thinking about
15	what you had proposed, with respect to a covenant
16	of property, to give some assurance that there
17	wouldn't be a parking impact, and I think one of
18	the things that we can look at doing is providing
19	the covenant that for the residents who will come,
20	that there be evidence of a monthly lease, so that
21	they'd be parking in the neighborhood, and not

onsite.

1	Another possibility might be that we
2	would maintain a minimum number of spaces at an
3	offsite location.
4	I think there is a couple ways that we
5	can do this, to get to your concern, through the
6	use of the covenant.
7	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: So, you said the
8	owners would be required to produce a monthly
9	lease? Was that the first one?
10	MS. RODDY: Yes, if they have a car,
11	that they would have to provide evidence that they
12	were not parking it onsite, that they had a monthly
13	lease with I'm sorry, with the garage.
14	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: And the second
15	thing that you said?
16	MS. RODDY: Well, I think an
17	alternative option would be that we would maintain
18	a minimum number of spaces at an offsite garage.
19	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, is there
20	anything else you want to say in rebuttal?
21	MS. RODDY: Well, I would just I
22	would continue just to, you know, evidence that

1 DDOT believes that this will not have an impact. Our analysis shows the same. 2 We are providing the TDM. The ANC, 3 4 which is usually very strong in letting their voice be heard, if they do have concerns about the 5 6 parking, has no objection to this application, and 7 again, Office of Planning is supportive. provide those 8 We are happy to 9 assurances as we just went through, if that makes 10 your more comfortable with our request for the parking variance. 11 think that our submission 12 13 evidence the courtyard, the variance standard has been met for the courtyard. I also believe that 14 the office space, the evidence is in there, that 15 16 we meet the special exception standard for the additional office space. 17 CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: All right, thank 18 19 Then we will close the record. you. Any 20 additional -- yes, but I was just -- we're going to do deliberation or you want to just --21 22 Okay, so, let's close the record with

1 what we have before use, and I note the Board is ready to deliberate, or if there is additional 2 information that we're going to need. Mr. May? 3 COMMISSIONER MAY: 4 Well, I think there probably there additional 5 is is some 6 information, I certainly requested some. 7 But I would very much like to start talking about what issues are here, so that the 8 Applicant knows best, what to be submitting. 9 10 I think that the -- the Applicant has made the case here, for relief from the parking. 11 I mean, that seems to be the big issue here. 12 have, you know, what I think are minor concerns 13 about the trellis, but I think they need to be 14 addressed, and they will be. 15 16 But the parking here -- parking relief here really makes sense. 17 There are certainly circumstances when parking relief for additional 18 19 housing in certain neighborhoods is problematic because of the tendency for spill-over parking, for 20 people to go ahead and, you know, have a car, even 21

though their building doesn't have parking for

1 them, and then they just go park in the neighborhood. 2 Well, the immediate vicinity here is 3 4 not a residential neighborhood. You have to go a couple blocks to get to anyplace where there is --5 6 where there even are residential parking spaces. 7 The building is not eligible for RPP. The people who are moving into this building are 8 going to be buying condos, so they know that they 9 10 will have to acquire a parking space, if they have to park a car there. 11 I mean, this is, I think fairly typical, 12 13 you know, very urban living, to not have the parking associated or directly under the building where you 14 If you live in New York City, if you live 15 16 in Manhattan, you're going to have -- you know, it's not uncommon to have your building -- another 17 building where you have your apartment and then 18

I don't think that there's any problem with it. So, I think that it meets the uniqueness

you've got to walk a couple blocks to put your car

in the garage, if you have a car.

19

20

21

test, because of the narrowness and the difficulty
of putting parking under the building. It's a
historic property. The practical difficulty has
to do with the inefficiency of putting parking
under the building, and there is so little, I think
potential impact from this, because again, it's not
RPP eligible, and because the people who purchase
the units are going to know what they're in for.
You know, we can't think of properties
like this as if, you know, "What would I do if I
lived there?" That's not what this is about.
This is you know, this is what people
who buy properties like this know what they're in
for and know that they if they're going to have
a car, they're going to have to pay for a garage
somewhere, and I don't have any problem in granting
this relief.
CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Anybody else?
CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Anybody else?
CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Anybody else? Mr. Hinkle?

case on the uniqueness test.

Now, I agree with Mr. May, in terms of the impact, but it's how do we get there, and what I would propose is to have the Applicant come back with a solid argument, in terms of the variance on the parking relief, because I would like to see that spelled out by the Applicant, in terms of how it meets the first prong, how this property is unique, and how that uniqueness actually fits into the practical difficulty to provide the parking.

That practical difficulty discussion can include sketches or what have you, that shows that you can't fit the parking on the site, but I think we need more in the record to show that.

So, my suggestion is to have the Applicant supplement the record.

CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: I agree with that. I believe the record is very light, in regards to showing the uniqueness, showing how there is an issue with parking, the inability to park -- to create parking spaces underneath, the financial issue that may hit, trying to do it, even

1	for the four or five that you can put there. I
2	mean, that is I would agree with that. Ms.
3	Allen?
4	VICE CHAIRMAN ALLEN: I totally agree,
5	and I just it always bothers me when I hear,
6	"Well, we could do it this way," and that would give
7	us maybe four or five or six more spaces, or four,
8	five or six versus two or three.
9	I mean, the idea here is to not go
10	against the zoning regulations that are in place,
11	and so, I would prefer a presentation that shows,
12	"Here is what we can do that can give the maximum
13	amount of spaces."
14	You know, I mean, that would be helpful
15	for me, assuming you can get beyond the uniqueness
16	test.
17	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, let's do
18	this. Let's keep the record open. Let's just
19	what we need to see, something from the Applicant
20	regarding the issue of trellis versus roof
21	structure.
22	We need a stronger argument for you,

is this building smaller, narrower or whatever, on 2 uniqueness, regarding this property. 3 4 Need a stronger TDM plan, in light of what we talked about. The projected make up of 5 6 what these residents are going to be, you know, you 7 say where one-bedroom, then there's only going to be one person in a one-bedroom. People do two 8 people in two-bedrooms -- one-bedrooms all the 9 10 time, you know, that kind of stuff. I don't know what you're marketing is centering trying to do. 11 The letter for some type of intent or 12 13 letter of interest from some parking garage that they believe that -- I don't know when this building 14 is suppose to come online, but potentially, they 15 16 think it might be still in existence, that -- the location of the parking. 17 Let me look at my notes here. 18 Anything 19 else, Board, you see that is needed? Mr. Hinkle? 20 MEMBER HINKLE: Do we need а supplemental from the Office of Planning? 21 22 CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: I think Planning

with not just us sitting here looking at guessing,

1	is very clear.
2	MEMBER HINKLE: In terms of reviewing
3	these documents. On the trellis issue, they I
4	did ask them to respond.
5	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes, I asked them
6	already. I asked them, for the trellis issue.
7	Yes, you asked for OP to respond to
8	that?
9	MEMBER HINKLE: Yes.
10	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, all right.
11	So, let's if you'll supplement the record with
12	that.
13	Let's put this on for a continued
14	hearing, limited hearing. That means that
15	everyone has had a chance to already have their
16	comments, regarding opposition and support and all
17	of that is already here.
18	We'll just do a limited, based upon the
19	submission. Mr. Moy, a date? Where are we?
20	MR. MOY: Well, Mr. Chairman,
21	depending on the labor of the Applicant
22	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: So, we were

1	January or February?
2	MR. MOY: Yes, because there is as
3	I said earlier, the last hearing for this month is
4	the 16th, which may or may not be too soon.
5	Otherwise, we're into January.
6	Given the size of the docket, when are
7	you back?
8	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Twenty-seventh
9	of December?
10	MR. MOY: The 27th of January, Mr. May,
11	I'm told will be here.
12	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay.
13	MR. MOY: So, that would be the 27th of
14	January.
15	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: All right, the
16	27th of January and so, when we
17	MR. MOY: Yes, may need filings a week
18	before the 27th.
19	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes.
20	MS. RODDY: We were just wondering if
21	there's any possibility that we could go with the
22	December 16th date?

1	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Mr. May won't be
2	here.
3	MS. RODDY: Okay.
4	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: And it's
5	important, I think, that he's here for whatever
6	addition that we're doing.
7	Okay, so, the submittal?
8	MR. MOY: Submittals, a week or eight
9	days before the 27th, perhaps Monday, January 19th.
LO	So, the Board will have ample time to review.
L1	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, all right.
L2	So, that is where we are, and we'll continue until
L3	that date, with the supplemental information to be
L4	placed into the file.
L5	All right, thank you. Thank you, all.
L6	Eight-six-seven, Mr. Moy?
L7	MR. MOY: The next application is
L8	Application 18867 of Growth Spurts. If the
L9	Applicant is here, this a request for a variance
20	from the off-street parking requirements under
21	Section 2101.1 for a child development center at
22	1802 D Street, Northeast.

1	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: All right, very
2	good. Did you give your cards to the Court
3	Reporter? Okay, and were you here to get sworn in?
4	I didn't think so.
5	Okay, so, would you stand? Mr. Moy, we
6	need to give them the oath, please.
7	MR. MOY: Do you solemnly swear or
8	affirm that the testimony you're about to present
9	in this proceeding is the truth, the whole truth
LO	and nothing but the truth?
L1	Thank you. You may be seated.
L2	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: All right, please
L3	identify yourselves. Make sure your microphone is
L4	on. There should be a bright, glowing green light.
L5	MR. SMITH: Calvin Smith.
L6	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay.
L7	MS. SMITH: Good morning. I'm Camilla
L8	Smith.
L9	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Before we begin,
20	I need to know, was this property posted with the
21	zoning sign, the placards?
22	MS SMITH: NO

1	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay.
2	MS. SMITH: You mean something on the
3	wall or the door?
4	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes.
5	MS. SMITH: No.
6	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, so, we've
7	had we've got to end this hearing, and I thought
8	the office had conversations with one of you about
9	that.
10	MS. SMITH: They had conversation with
11	me on Friday, but I was out of town, and
12	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: All right, so,
13	we're going to have to continue this for another
14	time. You have to post the property.
15	You have to get the placards from across the
16	hall, and you have to put it on your property for
17	15 days, so that everybody knows what you're doing,
18	and give them the opportunity to comment on the
19	relief that is requested. All right, mandatory,
20	okay?
21	Then you have to file with the Board,
22	an affidavit swearing that these things happened,

1	okay?
2	MR. SMITH: Okay, got you. No one told
3	us about that.
4	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Mr. Moy?
5	MR. MOY: Yes, sir, given the time
6	requirements for posting, that would take bring
7	us into January, again.
8	Given the number of hearing dates we
9	have in December, so, the earliest, the Board has
10	eight or nine cases for January 6th, which I would
11	have preferred, and January 13th is also similarly.
12	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: And be sure to
13	stop with the Office of Zoning across the hall, to
14	make sure you know everything that you're suppose
15	to have for these things.
16	There is also a plaque, a document in
17	that back that tells you what needs to go on it,
18	and online there is a whole kind of step-through
19	kind of tutorial, so be sure you look at those
20	things, or seek advice for some you know, another
21	person professional, to do so.

MR. MOY: But given the nature of this

	application, I would suggest bandary ben, sil.
2	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, so, January
3	6th. We'll put this on the docket for January 6th,
4	okay?
5	So, I would go over across the hall now,
6	to get the signage and etcetera, get that all worked
7	out, so when you get home or wherever you're going,
8	get back to the property, put it up, so you at least
9	get that out the way. Okay, thank you.
10	Let's go ahead and line up. Get 18852
11	and 18853.
12	MR. MOY: Yes, sir. Again, this would
13	be Applications 18852 and 18853, both are
14	applications of SB Urban LLC, multiple variance
15	relief and special exceptions relief.
16	Both at premises 90 Blagden Alley
17	Northwest, the other property at 91 Blagden Alley
18	Northwest.
19	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: As soon as Mr. May
20	comes back, we'll continue to introductions,
21	please. We'll take five minutes.
22	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter

1	went off the record at 11:43 a.m. and resumed at
2	11:46 a.m.)
3	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, are we
4	ready, Mr. Moy?
5	MR. MOY: Whenever you are, sir. I
6	think they're all at the table.
7	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, please
8	identify yourselves.
9	MR. KADLECEK: Good morning, members
10	of the Board. My name is Cary Kadlecek from the
11	law firm of Goulston & Storrs, on behalf of the
12	Applicant, and I'll let the rest of the team
13	introduce themselves.
14	MR. KATZEN: My name is Brook Katzen
15	with the SB Urban, the Applicant.
16	MR. BALABAN: I'm Mike Balaban with the
17	SB Urban.
18	MR. PERKINS: I'm Devon Perkins with
19	Hickok Cole Architects.
20	MS. MILANOVICH: Good morning. Jami
21	Milanovich with Wells & Associates, transportation
22	consultant for the project.

1	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Thank you.
2	Okay, of course, we've got to drill down in the
3	parking, right?
4	I think let me see, the relief you're
5	requesting, sometimes I look at these things so far
6	in advance, I have to go back and read my notes on
7	them. I can't read them.
8	For me, it's drilling down on the
9	parking relief, I think. I am good on moston
10	all the other requests and I think your application
11	is supported.
12	Board, anything you want to drill down
13	on?
14	MEMBER HINKLE: Yes, thank you, Mr.
15	Chair. I think most everybody at the table was
16	here for the last application. I have the same
17	issues with this application, as I had with the
18	last.
19	I'm not sure if the special relief
20	I mean, the special exception for the parking
21	relief is appropriate in this case, and then
22	secondly, on both lots, I need to hear more about

1	the uniqueness, and why that uniqueness would
2	create a practical difficulty in providing
3	parking. So, that's where I stand.
4	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, all right.
5	MR. KADLECEK: Okay, we're happy to
6	provide that information.
7	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Board,
8	additional? We're good, okay, all right.
9	MR. KADLECEK: I also wanted to preface
10	it with the fact that we've reviewed the DDOT
11	report. They asked for us to agree to four
12	additional conditions, which we do agree do, and
13	with that, I'll let Devon and Jami discuss the
14	parking.
15	First, I think we'll focus on the
16	special exception for the M Street lot, and then
17	we'll talk about the variance relief for the 9th
18	Street lot.
19	MR. PERKINS: So, there are a couple of
20	key issues with the M Street lot, and looking at
21	the screen, M Street is on the south
22	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Is that one of

1	your exhibits?
2	MR. PERKINS: Yes, we submitted a set.
3	Should we hand out the package?
4	MR. KADLECEK: It's in the pre-hand.
5	MR. PERKINS: Okay, if you note on the
6	north end of the property, there is a historic
7	structure. It's a historic garage structure that
8	we have to maintain.
9	So, putting any type of parking on the
10	
11	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Excuse me, Mr.
12	Moy, can we have the lights, please? Can you just
13	turn them on?
14	MR. PERKINS: Okay, so, talking about
15	the M Street building, located here.
16	At the north end of the property is a
17	historic structure that we have to maintain in
18	whole. So, providing any sort of access into the
19	building through this historic structure would not
20	be acceptable to HPO, and we are also not allowed
21	to have curb cuts along M Street at South, and we

have a very narrow alley to the west side of the

1 site. The alley is only 15 feet wide. extraordinarily 2 So, it's actually difficult to find an appropriate place into the 3 4 building. I'm going to go to another diagram, as 5 6 well. The site itself is 68 feet wide, but the 7 building portion is only 50 feet wide. We have FAR 8 limitations that control the size of the building 9 10 that we can build, and in this particular diagram, it's oriented 90 degrees differently. 11 The historic structure is at the back. 12 13 which we cannot go under, and so, that leaves us 14 this portion of the building. Aside from the fact that we can't 15 16 in at the front and it's very difficult to come in the side, and we can't come in at the back, just 17 extraordinarily the building is 18 accessing 19 difficult, and also, the 50 foot width, when you 20 look at this diagram, you know, by the time you have a drive aisle and a ramp you're left with about nine 21

feet in the center, which would be enough just to

1	get a couple of parking spaces and we could get one
2	row at the end.
3	What this results in is more than 1,000
4	square feet of space.
5	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Where did you say
6	you could get one row in?
7	MR. PERKINS: On the end here. If we
8	could figure out how to get access off of the alley
9	and into a ramp, we can get approximately five
LO	spaces on the end of the building.
L1	However, when you look at the overall
L2	configuration of the plan, more than 78 percent of
L3	the plan is required just for circulation of the
L4	vehicles, and so, you end up providing over 1,000
L5	square feet of space for each vehicle, simply
L6	because of the practical of the practical issues
L7	of the building of that width.
L8	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes, so, you
L9	can't get another row in without because you
20	don't have access. You wouldn't have access to that
21	row.
22	MR DERKING: Veg if we can get the

1	turns to work, to get in
2	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Got you.
3	MR. PERKINS: So, we can get about
4	eight spaces or nine spaces per floor at the max,
5	and practically speaking
6	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: But you couldn't
7	get
8	MR. PERKINS: it's just really
9	inefficient.
LO	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: You couldn't get
L1	to it.
L2	MR. PERKINS: It would be very, very
L3	difficult. It would be an extraordinarily
L4	difficult entrance.
L5	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay.
L6	MR. PERKINS: I would say that it's not
L7	feasible.
L8	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay,
L9	structurally not feasible or financially not
20	feasible?
21	MR. PERKINS: The amount of opening and
22	ramp that you would have to have, and the turns that

1	you would have to make to get onto that ramp are
2	practically infeasible.
3	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay.
4	MEMBER HINKLE: So, the historic
5	structure, that's contributing or not?
6	MR. PERKINS: Yes.
7	MEMBER HINKLE: That is, and it was an
8	auto garage, is that correct?
9	MR. PERKINS: Yes.
10	MEMBER HINKLE: So, they were able to
11	get automobiles to the alley at some point in time,
12	but you're telling us now, you can't access it?
13	MR. PERKINS: No, cars come through the
14	alley, but we cannot put a ramp through the middle
15	of this historic structure.
16	MEMBER HINKLE: Okay.
17	MR. PERKINS: And in this particular
18	design, we are using that historic structure as all
19	of the amenity uses for the project.
20	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Ms. Allen?
21	VICE CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Can you go back
22	a slide or two?

1	MR. PERKINS: To the ground floor plan?
2	VICE CHAIRMAN ALLEN: I don't know.
3	I'll tell you when you get there. There.
4	So, you talked about the north, the
5	south and the west, but I'm sorry, the north, the
6	south and the west, on this east side, what is that?
7	Yes.
8	MR. PERKINS: So, car-only, this is the
9	main entrance to the project, and once you come into
10	the project, all the amenity spaces are on this side
11	and all the residential units are on this side.
12	We are also not allowed to building our
13	building overtop of the historic structure, to the
14	greatest extent possible.
15	So, the building actually only extends
16	a little bit on top of the historic structure.
17	VICE CHAIRMAN ALLEN: What is the space
18	in between the buildings? Is that a street?
19	MR. PERKINS: This is an alley. It's
20	part of the Blagden Alley network and it's a 30 foot
21	side alley.
22	The difficulty that we have is that if

we have to put a 20 foot opening here and pull in, and immediately turn down, it's just a -- it really effectively destroys the ground floor plan and the connectedness of the amenities with the residential units, and it's also just a very, very impractical ramp solution.

CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, proceed.

MR. PERKINS: Okay, so, 9th Street has similar issues. The 9th Street property is even smaller. It is only 57 feet across in the width, and about 130 feet in length, and again, if we provide a ramp coming off of the alley at the back, a ramp coming down, the ramp takes up more than two-thirds of the length of the property, and we can again, in an 8,000 square foot area, at the very max, get eight spaces.

It also has, you know, just detrimental impacts on what we would like to actually accomplish on the alley, which is keeping the activity and the pedestrian quality of the alley itself.

So, again, it's just an extreme

1	challenge and an extreme inefficiency on a building
2	of this size.
3	MR. KADLECEK: Devon, would you say
4	it's an unusual condition to have a property
5	flanked on two sides by an active pedestrian alley?
6	MR. PERKINS: Yes, extremely unusual.
7	This particular alley has numerous restaurants,
8	shops, exercise centers, coffee shops, and it's
9	very, very, heavily active by pedestrians, so,
10	keeping cars out of this alley is very desirable,
11	because as you know, alleys don't have sidewalks,
12	so that are a lot of people that use this alley.
13	So, minimizing the impact of vehicles on this alley
14	is critical to the design.
15	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Why did you say
16	that on the 9th go back to the 9th Street.
17	The first thing you said about the
18	what was the width of the alley portion?
19	MR. PERKINS: The maximum width is 68
20	feet across here. The property then steps in a
21	little bit and the building about, our residential
22	building is a 50 foot wide building.

1	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay.
2	MR. PERKINS: Which allows us to have
3	a residential unit on either side and a corridor
4	down the center.
5	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: All right,
6	continue.
7	MS. MILANOVICH: So, as you know, the
8	parking required by code for the 9th Street
9	building would be 44 units. For the M Street
10	building would be 79 units, and we are seeking
11	relief from those requirements, as we will be
12	providing no parking.
13	The site is ideally situated with a
14	multitude of transportation options. The site is
15	a five-minute walk to the metro station. There are
16	six metro bus lines and a D.C. circulator line that
17	serve the project with bus stops in immediate
18	proximity to the site.
19	There are 19 car-sharing vehicles that
20	are within a quarter-mile of the project, and there
21	are two Capital bike-share stations within two
22	blocks of the site.

In addition, there are an abundance of nearby amenities, such -- and services, such as grocery stores, restaurants, pharmacies, banks, hardware stores, barber shops, salons, all making it unnecessary to have a vehicle to run your typical daily errands.

Importantly, the project -- both buildings will have Blagden Alley addresses, because Blagden Alley is not eligible for the RPP database, that means that none of the residents of the building will be eligible for residential parking permits, and residents will be notified that they will not be eligible for RPP permits when they signed our lease.

To take advantage of the transportation options that are available and to encourage people to use those transportation options, the Applicant will implement a transportation demand management plan, and again, this is one of the most, if not the most comprehensive transportation management plans that I've seen for a project of this type.

There will be a transportation

1 coordinator for the buildings. Again, that coordinator will notify potential residents that 2 they won't be eligible for residential parking 3 4 permits, and that they will be prohibited from obtaining residential parking or temporary parking 5 6 permits. 7 They will direct residents to the property's website, where they'll find various 8 information on all of the transportation options 9 10 available to them. 11 The transportation management coordinator will also maintain a current list of 12 neighborhood retail and service uses that are 13 available within walking distance. 14 There will be transit screens provided 15 16 in both residential buildings. Car-share memberships will be provided for all residents of 17 the buildings, for the initial term of their lease, 18 19 and that will be done in perpetuity. 20 Capital bike-share memberships will also be provided, however, instead of being 21

provided for residents who do not own bikes, at

1	DDOT's request, we will providing them for all
2	residents of the buildings for the initial term of
3	their lease, and again, that will be done in
4	perpetuity.
5	There will be bike parking inside the
6	building for residents. There will be a bicycle
7	repair facility inside.
8	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes, we have the
9	TDM's. You're reading the list of TDM's that you're
10	submitting right?
11	MS. MILANOVICH: Correct.
12	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: We can do that.
13	MS. MILANOVICH: Okay.
14	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, but
15	questions, Board? Yes? Mr. Moy, may we have the
16	lights on, please?
17	VICE CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Thank you. I
18	just want to make sure I understand the nature of
19	this building.
20	It's a 100 unit building. Is it some
21	kind of a temporary housing or whatever? So, I
22	just

1	MR. BALABAN: Yes, I can offer
2	VICE CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Let me just
3	let me finish my question.
4	So, we're talking 100 units. We're at
5	you're suggesting absolutely zero parking, and
6	I didn't hear any discussion about even loading,
7	like how this 100 unit parking, where people are
8	going to you know, they have to have something,
9	I guess, some kind of a car or truck to load whatever
10	they're bringing to the building.
11	So, I mean, I have to tell you, I'm very
12	concerned about this, and would really like you to
13	discuss that a little more.
14	MR. BALABAN: We appreciate the
15	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: And because there
16	are 69 60 more spaces required, isn't that
17	correct?
18	You're required to have 61 parking
19	spaces? Am I right or wrong?
20	MR. KADLECEK: You're correct, 62.
21	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: And you're asking
22	for zero?

1 MR. KADLECEK: That's correct. CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: That's a lift. 2 MR. BALABAN: So, we appreciate the 3 4 question. We should describe a couple things about the project and the community and our model that 5 6 may be helpful. First of all, of the 123 units, they 7 will be 100 percent studio apartments. We formed 8 our company specifically to develop and operate for 9 10 the long-term, small household, small unit rental 11 apartments. Number two, they will all be furnished. 12 13 So, there will be no move-in or move-out deliveries of a conventional kind. 14 Number three, Jami referred to the 15 16 parking restrictions, and our leases will not only point out that one cannot have a residential 17 parking permit, but the leases will preclude in 18 19 such a way that it would be a breach of the lease, 20 any tenant from seeking by any means, any parking arrangements for any automobile that they may have, 21

by any means other than renting a space in a parking

garage.

So, we're obligating ourselves to
impose on our tenants, the restriction that they
not park cars, other than in a commercial parking
garage, and the reason that we're so comfortable
doing that is that because the units are all small,
because they're all furnished and because they're
specifically targeted to a profile of tenant who
will appreciate our community which has
significant socially interactive shared living
spaces, our tenant is by definition, going to be,
because otherwise there would be no reason to live
in this community, that it's going to be a persor
who does not have a lot of things, including does
not have car.

So, it is not an ordinary apartment building. It is not an ordinary apartment community. It won't have ordinary apartment renters.

There are no one-bedrooms. There are no two-bedrooms. There are no families. The units average 380 square feet. We do not expect

1 even many couples and the couples that we will have from time to time, will be people who are urban and 2 share the perspective of all of the members of our 3 4 community, that they want to be immediately proximate to transportation. 5 They want to be 6 immediately proximate to pedestrian-accessible 7 urban amenities, and they want to have immediate access to the workplace. 8 So, I hope that's helpful in describing 9 10 why it is that we're convinced that we won't have cars, and what we're doing affirmatively by choice 11 to make sure that our tenants don't have cars, and 12 it's because of that, that we chose to change the 13 14 address of these buildings to Blagden Alley addresses, which are not eligible for parking 15 16 permits. It's completely consistent with our 17 model, and I hope that's helpful. 18 19 MR. KADLECEK: Mr. Balaban, can you 20 also explain the extent to which the units are furnished and the nature by which you anticipate 21

residents arriving to the building, i.e., moving

1 in? MR. BALABAN: Yes, the units, as I 2 said, are 100 percent furnished. So, we expect 3 4 that most of our tenants will arrive by taxi or by metro or by being dropped off. 5 6 They'll have a suitcase and a little bit 7 of stuff, if they have anything more, if they have any china or they have any furniture from grandma, 8 they won't choose to live here, because there is 9 10 no room for it in the unit. 11 With regard to the loading plan, actually we'd be pleased to describe briefly and 12 13 I think others can address it more extensively. We have discussed with the ANC at 14 length, a loading and trash operations plan, which 15 16 does everything that we can to preclude in a way that's consistent with this profile of tenant and 17 community that I've described to you, that we will 18 19 not have vehicular traffic contributed to the

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

loading plan is that the tenant would be required

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

CHAIRPERSON JORDAN:

alley.

20

21

22

Basically, your

1	to provide notice to you, couple weeks or so in
2	advance, and they are doing on-street loading and
3	unloading, correct?
4	MR. BALABAN: There is a designated
5	loading area on 9th Street, and our staff is
6	obligated by the conditions to advise all persons
7	and parties who may do loading that there is parking
8	on 9th Street, that parking is not permitted in the
9	alley, and we expect there will be very few people
LO	who will actually arrive with anything that
L1	requires a loading stop of any kind.
L2	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: When you say
L3	parking on 9th Street, what do you mean?
L4	MR. KADLECEK: It's commercial
L5	loading.
L6	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay.
L7	MR. KADLECEK: It's a commercial
L8	loading.
L9	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: That's what you
20	mean?
21	MR. KADLECEK: Yes, it's commercial
22	loading space.

1	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes.
2	VICE CHAIRMAN ALLEN: And let me just
3	ask about the building itself.
4	Is there any storage for each of the
5	units?
6	MR. BALABAN: Yes, there is storage in
7	the building. The units themselves are designed
8	to include as much storage within that square
9	footage, as can be arranged, and there is storage
10	in the building available to the tenants.
11	VICE CHAIRMAN ALLEN: So, then they
12	could arrive with grandma's china, but just I
13	wondered, okay. Thanks.
14	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Anything else?
15	MR. KADLECEK: We have nothing
16	additional.
17	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Board, anything
18	additional from the Applicant?
19	Office of Planning, please.
20	MR. JESICK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman
21	and members of the Board. My name is Matt Jesick.
22	For most of my testimony, I will rest

1 record, just to address the parking question. 2 We felt that the application adequately 3 4 addressed the special exception test for parking relief on the M Street property, as well as the 5 6 variance test for the 9th Street property. 7 We had requested that the Applicant produce diagrams showing what a potential parking 8 layout would look like, if one were to somehow be 9 10 provided, and you can find that in the pre-hearing 11 submission, and they were shown in the Applicant's PowerPoint. 12 13 comfortable with So, the are 14 requested relief and recommend approval of We are also comfortable with 15 project. the 16 proposed TDM plan, which is similar to other TDM plans approved by the Board in the past, including 17 at 15 Dupont Circle, which was BZA case from last 18 19 year and had a very similar TDM package. 20 That concludes my testimony. I'd be happy to take any questions. 21 This is a hard 22 CHAIRPERSON JORDAN:

1	something to swallow with 62 parking spaces gone
2	in kind of a residential neighborhood, and what is
3	your opinion about that? You don't find there is
4	any it won't have an impact on this neighborhood?
5	MR. JESICK: I believe the conclusions
6	both of the Applicant's transportation study, as
7	well as Department of Transportation, who was here
8	to testify, is that there wouldn't be an impact.
9	The residents would not be permitted to
10	park on the street. There are numerous transit
11	options available. I think as was alluded to in
12	the previous case this morning, the people who
13	choose to live in this location would and in the
14	specifically, the type of units that are being
15	provided, would likely not even have vehicles.
16	So, yes, we are comfortable with
17	granting the relief.
18	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Any other
19	questions for Planning, Board?
20	Applicant, any questions for Planning?
21	Mr. Rogers, transportation?
22	MR. ROGERS: Good afternoon. I'm

1	Jonathan Rogers with the District Department of
2	Transportation.
3	Again, largely rest on the record and
4	only say that between the transportation options
5	that are plentiful and available on the vicinity,
6	the transportation demand management plan and the
7	parking restrictions and plans included in the
8	application, DDOT finds that there will be no
9	significant negative impact to the transportation
10	network, and also, DDOT acknowledges and
11	appreciates the Applicant's inclusion of the four
12	addition TDM measures in their application. I'll
13	be happy to answer any questions.
14	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: So, no impact for
15	not having 62 parking spaces in a building that has
16	at least 175, is it? What is the number?
17	MR. KADLECEK:
18	One-hundred-twenty-three in it.
19	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN:
20	One-hundred-twenty-three units.
21	MR. ROGERS: That's correct. So,
22	looking I guess I'll focus on the parking

1 management plan that the Applicant has proposed. They've changed the address, so that 2 the properties aren't RPP eligible. The parking 3 4 spaces in the vicinity, the curbside parking spaces are either RPP or they're metered spaces. 5 6 Without RPP permit, there are no viable 7 long-term curbside parking options for the residents. 8 So, even if they were theoretically to 9 10 own a car, they wouldn't be able to park on the street as a long-term parking option. 11 They'd either have to move their car every two hours, in 12 13 keeping with RPP restrictions, or they'd have to adhere to the metered restrictions. 14 The target audience that the Applicant 15 16 is looking at are unlikely to own cars, however if they should bring cars with them, the Applicant's 17 analysis identified sufficient parking in private 18 19 parking garages in the nearby vicinity, and that 20 would really be the only long-term parking option that would be available to the residents. 21

CHAIRPERSON JORDAN:

22

What do we do

1	after two years from now, these buildings are up
2	and running, and we've got a parking problem? How
3	do we go back and say undo? Is there a way?
4	No, that was rhetorical. That's okay.
5	So, and this is a residential neighborhood, which
6	is even different than that on 16th Street,
7	although there is a lot more teeth here, with this
8	application.
9	Anyway, any other questions for
LO	transportation? Anybody? All right.
L1	Is there anyone here from ANC-2F?
L2	ANC-2F? Please. Whoever is the representative,
L3	please come forward. Who is the designated
L4	representative?
L5	MR. CAIN: That would be myself and
L6	Greg.
L7	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, we usually
L8	have one designated representative by the ANC, but
L9	okay, that's fine. Would you please come up?
20	MR. CAIN: My name is Walt Cain.
21	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Just make sure
22	that the microphone is on, please.

1	MR. CAIN: My name is Walk Cain. I'm
2	the Vice Chair for ANC-2F, and the reason that we
3	felt it important to have both myself and Greg here,
4	is that in my capacity as Vice Chair, I also Chair
5	our community development committee, which is the
6	formal first impression for the ANC, for BZA
7	matters, HPRP matters, those types of things.
8	Greg sits on that committee and it's
9	also
10	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: And Greg's last
11	name is?
12	MR. CAIN: My name is Walt Cain. This
13	is Greg Melcher.
14	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Greg Melcher.
15	MR. CAIN: And Greg sits on that
16	committee, and also is the Commissioner who
17	represents the single-member district, where the
18	project would be located.
19	He is also very involved with the
20	Blagden Alley and Naylor Court Community
21	Association, so, I thought that he had a very
22	unique perspective that would be valuable to

1 CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay. MR. CAIN: -- to the Board. 2 CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: But just make 3 4 sure we have our five minute on our timer, please, 5 Mr. Moy. All right, very good. Thank you, and 6 7 welcome, please. MR. CAIN: Thank you. I'll keep this 8 9 brief, but I wanted to say that your initial 10 reaction was the same as mine. The ANC has been working with SB Urban on this project for several 11 months, trying to arrive at a conclusion that we 12 thought was beneficial for the neighborhood. 13 Then they first came, I looked at the 14 application and again, said exactly what you said, 15 16 "Are you telling me zero parking places," and but since then, and over the course of the past several 17 months, we've come to a place where I think that 18 19 this is -- it's in the best interest of the 20 community, and I think it will really be a benefit to the community, and the things that specifically 21

led the ANC to that conclusion was the changing of

the address to Blagden Alley, thus making the residents ineligible for RPP.

The transportation demand plan, which includes -- the Applicant has also agreed to install an additional Capital bike-share station within the immediate vicinity of the project.

The loading and unloading, actually the kind of -- the concern of the community was around not necessarily folks moving and moving out, but if these are people who are coming in with very few things, they're going to be ordering a lot of things that need to be delivered. So, FedEx, UPS, those types of things.

Those were concerns that we raised and that they suitably addressed, in putting together the delivery plan that they noted in their transportation demand management plan. We feel as though they have addressed those concerns.

Then also, the nature of the development being short-term leases, very small units, it's just not hospitable to folks who are going to come with a lot of baggage and are going

1 to need parking. I'll wrap up my portion, just by saying 2 that we work with a lot of developers on a lot of 3 4 different projects, and these folks have really been our example of the way the process should work. 5 6 They've been very collaborative, very 7 responsive. They've taken the feedback of the ANC and responded positively and substantively to 8 that, and made changes that really addressed the 9 10 concerns of the ANC. Mr. Melcher. CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: 11 12 MR. MELCHER: Okay, thank you. Yes, I'm 13 the President of the Blagden Alley/Naylor Court Association, as well as a single-member district 14 from ANC-2F06. 15 16 By the way, as a matter of record, I testified here in opposition to a BZA proposal in 17 1994 to change this alley to commercial, which was 18

I'm glad to see that at least now 2014, I do welcome

our commercial neighbors coming into the alley, the

shops, the restaurants, and the other things going

I just thought I'd note that, although

approved.

19

20

21

1 on there. But I'm also very glad to see that these 2 two large lots are going to be residential for the 3 4 most part. In considering the proposal, I was 5 6 looking very carefully at the interior of Blagden 7 Alley and all the other development activity currently underway. 8 9 I'm looking at it more as a system that 10 we have to work together, not as individual 11 properties. What I've concluded is that the ideal 12 13 solution for future development is one that does not add any additional vehicle traffic to the 14 interior of the alley. 15 16 We believe it's very important that Blagden Alley become a living alley full of 17 pedestrians either walking in or between their 18 19 places of residence and the restaurants and bars 20 that are here or soon to come. We should also be capital that there's 21

a metro stop that is a short two blocks away, and

1 by the way, if you walk out of that metro, you walk under the underpass. So, you're literally only 2 100 feet before you're in this going about 3 4 building, or actually outside, exposed to the elements. 5 6 In any event, for that reason, I've 7 reached the conclusion that I don't really want to see any additional parking or parking garage 8 9 entrances in the alley. 10 At present, we have one restaurant, 11 Roque 24, one bar the Lost and Found, a doggie 12 daycare place, a yoqa studio, a supper club, a 13 couple art galleries, all that are co-existing in there, and we're expecting to have additional 14 restaurants and bars that will open in the near 15 16 future. All this again, is leading to the desire 17 of Blagden Alley to become a walk-in paradise and 18 19 any additional uses should be ones that do not add additional vehicle traffic. 20 You just need to go there a few minutes 21

on a Saturday around the coffee bar and see what

goes on, the people walking around, and see how that's impeded by the traffic now. It's only going to get worse if we put something in there that brings more cars and vehicles into it.

In addition, I've been working with some of the business developers around there and want to work more with DDOT to ensure that we do have the proper loading zones along 9th Street and ensure that we can remove the additional truck traffic that might ordinarily be required to service these properties.

The Douglas development properties agreed to this. The American restaurant that's coming, their settlement agreement includes the provision that they will hand-truck their stuff from the loading zones on the street, into the interior of the alley.

As Walt has mentioned, we've worked closely with the developer over the last six months to get this project forward, and you've seen all the provisions.

So, bottom line is, this is really our

1	fifth try at this location in 20 years, to get
2	something to happen. It's fortunate we found a
3	project that's both residential and fits with our
4	downtown close to metro location, and just keep in
5	mind that something could come back, if this
6	project doesn't go through, it could be C-2-A, it
7	could be fast food restaurants, who knows what
8	would go in those lots.
9	I think this is one that's worked, and
10	I ask you to approve it. Thank you.
11	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Board, any
12	questions of the ANC representatives?
13	I take it when you say this is in the
14	best interest of the community, it's because there
15	have been vacant properties? Is that and that
16	you think it's better for
17	MR. MELCHER: They're basically
18	have been used for parking of the the old
19	warehouse, the historic building has had storage
20	in it and the rest of the two lots are just parking
21	lots, at this point.
22	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: And so, you don't

1	perceive there is any impact of not having thus
2	having zero to 62 less parking spaces?
3	MR. MELCHER: Well, clearly, there is
4	going to be impact when you build a new building,
5	you know. Clearly, there will be more people.
6	There will be more density. That's going to
7	happen, whatever you put there.
8	I just think in this case, they built
9	the case to justify minimizing it, and further, if
10	you look at the entire alley and think of the
11	historic alley, what you want it to be, I envision
12	it full of people walking around, going to the
13	restaurants, the bars, using the shops that are
14	back there, and if you add additional garage door
15	entrances and more cars and more trucks going in
16	there, then you're never going to achieve that
17	vision.
18	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: All right, any
19	other questions, Board?
20	Then is there any one here thank you
21	for coming.
22	Anyone here wishing to speak in

1 We do have a letter from the Coalition of Smarter Growth and letters of another neighbor. 2 Anyone else want to speak in support? 3 4 Please come forward, and you have three Okay, please. 5 minutes. MS. CORT: Thank you, Chairman. 6 Му 7 name is Cheryl Cort. I'm with the Coalition for Smarter Growth. I did submit written testimony in 8 advance. 9 10 We are a non-profit in the Washington, D.C. region, where we're based in D.C., making the 11 case for smart growth. Our mission is to promote 12 inclusive transit-oriented 13 walk-able, and communities, and the land-use and transportation 14 policies and investments needed to make those 15 16 communities flourish. We wish to express our strong support 17 for this residential housing project and the 18 19 variances needed to make it feasible and 20 appropriate to its unique context, which I note is a treasured pedestrian oriented historic alley, 21

and I really recommend that everybody, if you

haven't been there, you really need to go there.

It's a wonderful -- it's a wonderful place.

Given the continued strong demand to live in this growing neighborhood and in the city in general, the site's walking and bicycling proximity to hundreds of thousands of jobs and the neighborhood's low car ownership rate, this project is a helpful contribution to making the city's -- meeting the city's need for housing.

The project is especially welcome with its addition of 11 inclusionary zoning units, half of 50 percent AMI and half at 80 percent AMI.

The building has -- could require a level of parking that's actually even inappropriate, in terms of what we were seeing, in of a typical market development would terms typically do, sort of dig down like one level, about the .3 parking ratio. This is that higher .5, which developers consistently tell me is just too hiqh for these great transit-oriented neighborhoods.

But no-vehicle parking is appropriate

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

for this location for the following reasons.

Parking would be a costly and unneeded expense, especially given the numerous transit alternatives readily available in the neighborhood. The project is only intended to -- for residents who do not own or need a car.

The project's management will amplify residents already significant transportation options through substantial transportation demand management program and other services, and the historic character of Blagden Alley would be significantly degraded by adding parking facilities.

We note actually, if you look at the commute pattern for the census tract that most commuters are walking to their jobs. Thirty-seven percent of people going to work every day are walking to their jobs, and that is followed by riding transit at 31 percent.

The area already enjoys 41 percent car-free renters, and that's before trying to attract and -- attract car-less households.

1 That's just passively, not actively seeking out those who don't need cars and those who are seeking 2 to live in a place where it is very easy not to own 3 4 a car. I think what's important about this 5 6 project is that it offers a sound alternative to 7 unworkable parking requirements and demonstrates the fallacy of the notion that there is a fixed 8 amount of parking demand per housing unit. 9 10 This is specific to a context, to the type of person that is being attracted to a 11 particular housing project, and we welcome this 12 13 added housing, taking advantage and -- taking advantage of this location and really building on 14 the strength of the transit accessability, but even 15 16 more so actually, the walk -- this incredibly high walk to work rate. 17 So, it's not even we're talking about 18 19 transit here. We're actually just talking about 20 people walking to their jobs. 21 We agree with ANC-2F, that the

demonstrated

developer

has

22

compelling

а

alternative model for providing housing that does not generate demand for vehicle parking and we applaud the robust transportation demand management program, and I especially want to call out the new Capital bike-share station with the additional bikes and docks, and along with the other things, including bicycle storage room and a bicycle repair room.

So, in summary, I just want to say that very enthusiastic about this we are intentional project, that does not need to and is intentionally seeking to serve people who don't own cars, who don't want to own cars and who want to live in a great place where they can probably walk to work, and we also, with our publicizing this, we have 41 people who have joined with us in signing a petition, saying that this is a really great project, that we hope that the BZA will advance. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Board, any questions? Applicant, any questions? Our next witness, please. You've got three minutes. Make

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 sure the microphone is on. Thank you. MR. LEFEBVRE: Hello. 2 My name is Alexis Lefebvre. I'm a resident on the 1400 block 3 4 of Church Street. I used to live at 16th and R, so I'm well aware of how difficult parking is in 5 6 neighborhoods around Logan Circle. 7 know there was another controversial parking variance case on my block 8 recently, and I supported the approval of that one, 9 10 as well. I think sort of -- we've touched on the 11 issue here that for most people like me, and I'm 12 just speaking anecdotally for me and my friends in 13 the neighborhood, it's a very conscious choice to 14 live a denser metro-accessible area. 15 It's a lot 16 of people that don't have cars, don't want cars, that like the walk-ability. 17 That's really an appeal of the neighborhood. 18 19 Again, just speaking from either me and my friends of the five households that I am friends 20 with in this area, three of those have cars. 21

all have garage parking. I have a friend who moved

1	there with a car, after two weeks, he couldn't take
2	the parking. He sold it, didn't need it.
3	People's attitudes towards driving and
4	parking are changing, particular in this
5	neighborhood. So, I would urge BZA to approve this
6	and other projects like it, particularly where the
7	developer, I think is really gone to great lengths
8	to address the concerns.
9	I wasn't even aware of the Blagden Alley
10	address change. I think that's, you know, a great
11	addition to this project, so, thank you.
12	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Board, any
12 13	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Board, any questions? Applicant, any questions?
13	questions? Applicant, any questions?
13 14	questions? Applicant, any questions?  Thank you very much. Thank you, two,
13 14 15	questions? Applicant, any questions?  Thank you very much. Thank you, two, for coming.
13 14 15 16	questions? Applicant, any questions?  Thank you very much. Thank you, two, for coming.  Anyone here wishing to speak in
13 14 15 16 17	questions? Applicant, any questions?  Thank you very much. Thank you, two, for coming.  Anyone here wishing to speak in opposition? Yes, please come forward.
13 14 15 16 17	questions? Applicant, any questions?  Thank you very much. Thank you, two, for coming.  Anyone here wishing to speak in opposition? Yes, please come forward.  I'm going to limit the number, because
13 14 15 16 17 18	questions? Applicant, any questions?  Thank you very much. Thank you, two, for coming.  Anyone here wishing to speak in opposition? Yes, please come forward.  I'm going to limit the number, because I'm sure it's all on the parking issue and if it

1	team back up, if necessary.
2	All right, let's see. How many do we
3	have? One, two, three, four, five, six, okay.
4	Is someone going to talk about anything
5	other than parking? Who is speaking, other than
6	parking?
7	MR. MIKHAILOV: Hi, Mr. Chairman. I'm
8	Sergei Mikhailov, and I'm the Petitioner
9	organizer. In addition to the witnesses here, we
10	have petition with 75 signatures in opposition to
11	the project.
12	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, that wasn't
13	what I asked.
14	So, we're going to do two minutes a
15	witness, because we understand that issue, but we
16	just simply want you to so, let's begin please.
17	Yes, but still, we're going to go ahead, please.
18	Just make sure, you've got to identify
19	yourselves, and let me first ask, have all of you
20	been sworn? Have you been sworn in?
21	Mr. Moy, let's make sure if you have
22	not been sworn, please stand and take the oath with

1 Mr. Moy. (Witnesses sworn) 2 Please identify CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: 3 4 yourself. MR. NELSEN: My name is Craig Nelsen. 5 6 I live in Blagden Alley, and what it seems like this 7 project is, is just an attempt to take -- to jam as many apartments and as many people as possible 8 into a small area, regardless of the impact it might 9 10 have on the people who already live there. As I understand it, this project is 11 planning to widen the alley and turn -- co-op the 12 13 alley, usurp it basically, to provide a common area for the residents of this project, and this is --14 this is something that they're selling as a way to 15 16 keep people from going crazy, living in apartments the size of two parking spaces. 17 This is -- if anything is going to 18 19 the character of Blagden Alley and its historical 20 nature, it's seems to me, this would be it. It's not even close to keeping it within the character 21

of the alley, as it is today.

1	So, I think you know, I just hope that
2	the I think what some of the objections I've
3	heard from the Chair has been have been right
4	on, and I think that the people the greed that
5	sort of is the engine behind this project should
6	be if left unchecked, is just going to destroy
7	what is there, and that would be a shame, because
8	as you said, if that happens, there is no going
9	back. Once this is done, you know, it's over and
10	the whole city will have lost something that's kind
11	of a treasure.
12	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Thank you very
13	much. Board, questions? Applicant, questions?
14	Our next witness, please.
15	MS. BEEBE: Good morning. My name is
16	Carolyn Beebe, and I have lived on M Street, three
17	doors down from this proposed development since
18	1980. I raised my daughter in this house and my
19	daughter and her husband are now raising their
20	three children in this house.
21	We are clearly committed to this
22	residential neighborhood and to the city, and this

neighborhood, as we've already discussed, It's the first residential block north of unique. the downtown development and in 1996, the Board of Zoning signed this case that changed the alley zoning to C-2-A, and this was a movement by people in the neighborhood to try to decrease the terrible crime that was going on in the 1990's in Blagden Alley, and the document, which we have here, it states quite clearly that this was -- the purpose of this was to protect the character of neighborhood, the residential character of the neighborhood, and it was requesting that there small scale commercial would be uses and residential uses to revitalize the interior of the square.

This development that is being proposed, these 130 or 125 units, these tiny 300 square feet units, are essentially residential hotels, and this is going to be a hotel on a residential block.

They say they have a kitchen. It's two burners and a little fridge, which is what you get

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 in a hotel room. So, this is not appropriate for this 2 residential block, apart from parking, which is 3 4 another issue, but it's a very dense development that is going to detract from the residential 5 6 character of M Street. 7 CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Thank you, Ms. Beebe. Board, any questions? Applicant, 8 9 questions? Our next witness, please? 10 MS. SCHAUER: Good morning. My name I am -- my building is at 937 11 is Barbara Schauer. I've been in the area since 1988, and 12 M Street. as Carolyn said, Zoning Commission Order No. 782, 13 dated February 12, 1996 re-zoned the interior of 14 the alley form R-4 to C-2-A, with 10 pages of 15 16 discussion as to what the limits would be on this It was C-2-A with many limits, in 17 development. terms of the density of the commercial development 18 19 was allowed. 20 Back in 1996, and I was there, so I remember, nothing of this sort would have ever been 21

agreed to, and this is not just an apartment

1 building. It's like a dormitory -- it's a short residents hotel, three to six months per person. 2 Yes, people will find ways of finding 3 4 parking. They can go down to the local police station and get a card to stick in their window 5 6 for a month. So, this notion that that's going to 7 be prevented it not true. Number two, the third prong of the 8 variance proof is that you have to show substantial 9 10 detriment to the public good or impairment of the 11 intent purpose or integrity of the zoned plan does 12 not occur. 13 They have not made an argument that this development does not do all of those things. 14 Historic Blagden Alley is unique. It's 15 16 unique in the east coast. It's unique in It is not a pedestrian alley. 17 Washington. about every street that leads into it has a garage 18 19 behind the house, including myself, Carolyn and 20 many of these people. People drive through the alley. 21

The notion that it's going to become

1 some kind of a Venetian piazza is a fantasy. a drive-able alley with lots of garages in back, 2 building and in fact, the that 3 they're 4 incorporating into the development is a garage. It's not a beautiful house. It's not a store. 5 Ιt 6 is not a pedestrian alley. 7 If you come in there, you'll see there are not many cafes. There is one coffee and there 8 is one tiny, little restaurant that is only open 9 10 three days a week for special evening events and a bar that just opened last week. 11 So, it is not a busy commercial zone. 12 13 That's absolutely not true, and finally, there were 14 many people who would have come here today. I have signatures here for 74 people who are adamantly 15 16 opposed to this, for a variety of reasons. We want protection of our precious 17 It's a resource for us, for our future 18 alley. 19 generations, for the entire city, for the country. 20 It's on the National Register. It's also in a D.C. historic zone. 21

Secondly, the issue of this loading and

1	unloading of trash. How does 100 how does trash
2	for 125 people get removed from a building and put
3	on the sidewalk? This is their proposal. There's
4	no loading dock, and this notion that people are
5	going to be biking up with their little satchel to
6	go into an apartment is absurd.
7	They're short-term rentals, three to
8	six months. People are going to be coming and
9	going in droves, like a hotel.
10	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, I
11	appreciate
12	MS. SCHAUER: And that's the end of my
13	statement. Thank you.
14	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: No, no, I think it
15	was impactful. Thank you.
16	MS. SCHAUER: But I would like to put
17	some things into the record, that I brought.
18	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: No, we've used
19	the time, but if you could submit your
20	MS. SCHAUER: Yes, I put my paper in,
21	yes.
22	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay. Board?

1 Applicant? Next, please. MR. MIKHAILOV: Mr. Chairman, I was 2 wondering if in light of the fact that we do have 3 4 75 signatures from the neighbors, if you can allow 5 us --6 CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: No, two minutes. 7 Go ahead. MR. MIKHAILOV: All right. So, I do 8 agree with the second Zoning Commission ANC 9 10 Commission that re-zoning back in 1996 to create C-2-A zone did create a problem, and I guess my 11 recommendation for this, I think that to really 12 correct this issue, it should not be done at the 13 Should go back to Zoning Commission and 14 BZA level. 15 actually get re-zoned back. 16 Now, addressing the various variances requests, I do -- I'm encouraged by the fact that 17 in the previous case, for the Church Street 18 19 development project, that the Board voted 3-2, just 20 barely in favor of the project, and I feel that the increased magnitude of this project and even 21

a more brazen request for, you know, zero parking

1	spaces, it's provided six, convinces some members
2	to vote in opposition.
3	Now, I did some I will submit a
4	I guess a 15 page report, which I hope you will read
5	a little bit. I tried to make arguments for all
6	the prongs, the variances tests.
7	I am not at all convinced that either
8	property is exceptional. Generally, the
9	Applicant essentially lists several factors,
10	majority of them are in fact, favorable, and then
11	they declare that there is a combination of factors
12	as to how it constitutes exceptional condition.
13	You know, and I have a long list, which
14	I don't have time to review right now, but just from
15	a review of those.
16	So, I do not believe that the
17	exceptional condition has been met.
18	Going addressing the issue of
19	practical difficult for parking, again, their
20	argument is that the general garage will be
21	inefficient. As far as I know, inefficiency by
22	itself is not doesn't have any bearing in BZA

1	deliberations.
2	There is a long sort of gap between
3	inefficiency and practical difficulty. So far,
4	this has not been proven.
5	Now, there are other ways to achieve
6	efficiency. I have several appendices that are
7	attached, that suggest that one can use a car
8	elevator or an automated parking system to achieve
9	greater efficiency.
10	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: You're over your
11	time. So, and we've seen what you submitted.
12	MR. MIKHAILOV: Well, I do request that
13	you read the report.
14	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: I know you have
15	submitted information before, and we've already
16	looked at that. So, just to let you know that.
17	But we appreciate your concern and
18	certainly, the depth of your concern and research
19	and work here on this particular because I do
20	know we've had that, and that these things are very
21	important.

Next witness, please.

1 MR. LIPINSKI: My name is Don Lipinski. I live at 937 M Street. I'm just not in favor of 2 this project. 3 4 Even if the variances weren't needed, the project is just too large and too dense for 5 6 Blagden Alley Historic District, and the 7 surrounding residential area. Protection of this area was promised in 8 the re-zoning of 1996 and it was intended to offer 9 10 some commercial development, to stabilize the neighborhood alley. 11 Now, we're faced with a situation where 12 13 the excessive development threatens to overtake the alley, and this shouldn't be allowed. 14 What is proposed is far beyond thinking 15 16 of behind the re-zoning. I have lived there since 1989 and this type of development was never 17 envisioned. 18 19 The alley is a rare historic area, and 20 the intention was for protection, not for The area is on commercial development. 21 22 national historic registry for historic places,

1	and development must be modest, scaled to preserve
2	the history.
3	The surrounding Victorian row houses
4	must also be protected from the encroachment of
5	commercial development.
6	It's quite obvious that any hardship
7	the developers feel they may have is one of their
8	own making. The site is develop-able, but at
9	reasonable scale, and that concludes my
LO	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Thank you for
L1	your comments. We understand the impact, yes, but
L2	it's kind of caught all in.
L3	Board, any questions? Thank you. Our
L4	next witness.
L5	MS. CORRIGAN: My name is Colleen
L6	Corrigan and I live right on the alley. I'll show
L7	you where.
L8	I live right here, and this this
L9	community development is really going to affect me.
20	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: I have to have you
21	on the microphone.
22	MS. CORRIGAN: Okay, no problem.

1 Right behind my house. I have a unique house. have 10 unit -- a small 10 unit apartment building. 2 So, I am aware of what apartments are. 3 4 Out of my 10 units, four of my tenants have cars. I have two studios and -- I have two 5 6 studios and eight one-bedrooms, and to say that 7 they will not get cars is a fluke. They will get People do want to drive places. They want 8 cars. to go see mom and dad. They want to drive. 9 10 They also rent cars. Enterprise is right down the street, and they rent a car and 11 they'll bring their rental car right back, and my 12 13 tenants do rent their cars -- rent cars, and they 14 have to find parking on the street. It's very hard to find parking on the 15 16 street now, and it's going to be absolutely insane to find parking on the street with this property 17 122 units coming. 18 19 My husband is also handicapped. Have 20 to get him out the back door of my -- I have a ramp built in the back of my house, to try to get him 21

out my back -- out my back door, and I need access,

1	and it's been very hard right now, to get access
2	back and forth. I need access to 9th Street and
3	in the alley.
4	If this becomes pedestrian only, I will
5	not be able to get him out the door. Thank you very
6	much.
7	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Thank you. Our
8	next witness, please.
9	MR. HORVATH: Yes, my name is Ed
10	Horvath. I live at 929
11	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Last name?
12	MR. HORVATH: Horvath, H-O-R-V-A-T-H.
13	I live at 929 M Street. It's three lots away from
14	this development.
15	This is a very unique situation,
16	special situation. One thing which hasn't been
17	raised and which is not in the OP's report is this
18	property is the 9th Street property is
19	immediately adjacent to the D.C. Convention
20	Center.
21	Both of the the D.C. Convention
22	Center is within 200 feet of both of these

1 properties. At the D.C. Convention Center, that was plopped in the middle of our neighborhood. 2 have at times 45,000 people there for events, with 3 4 zero public parking. This just adds too that burden. 5 Even 6 the parking that we have, when we have special 7 events, special national emergency events, the President is there, our streets are blocked off. 8 We have 10 foot fences in front of our 9 10 We need to, you know, be able to get in and out. 11 So, this is not a normal street in a 12 normal neighborhood. Blagden Alley is 30 feet 13 The idea of mechanical parking is 14 wide there. something which again, could alleviate the -- and 15 16 allow for denser parking within parking 17 structures. While 62 spaces may be a lot, I think 18 19 that at least two-thirds of that number would be 20 a reasonable way to go. Don't have to have everything, but I have friends who are major bike 21

riders, and they say, you know, they can't envision

1	123 units of people, even who were serious bikers,
2	not having vehicles.
3	One of the other things that was brought
4	in the prior case was, there is no provision for
5	ADA parking either. Zero parking, and you know,
6	I think this is just such a burden on the
7	neighborhood.
8	We had other buildings, right on the
9	same square where zero parking was proposed. They
10	went back and re-did their designs, put in two
11	levels of parking, and across the street from this,
12	immediately across the street, the Whitman condo,
13	that was built and we had influence on the architect
14	there. They have more than a one-to-one ratio of
15	parking per unit.
16	Parking is off-street parking in
17	garages is needed in this neighborhood. Thank
18	you.
19	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Thank you.
20	Appreciate your concern and comment.
21	I think we have one other person that
22	came in. No? Yes?

1	MS. BAKKER: Yes, I did.
2	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: All right, you
3	have two minutes, please.
4	MS. BAKKER: Sorry?
5	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Two minutes,
б	please.
7	MS. BAKKER: My name is Sara Bakker.
8	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Just make sure
9	your microphone is on.
10	MS. BAKKER: My name is Sara Bakker.
11	I'm at 1235 4th Street, and I have similar concerns
12	as other neighbors have stated.
13	But specifically, the biggest concern
14	is with the transportation analysis, and that the
15	Applicant was allowed to reduce the trip generation
16	number by 90 percent.
17	This yielded number is below a
18	threshold of a required full traffic impact study,
19	and when my husband, Sergi Mikhailov spoke with
20	Jonathan Rogers, the development reviewer for
21	DDOT, he was asked, why the 90 percent reduction
22	was how it was rationalized and why 90 percent

and not 75 percent?

He stated, Mr. Rogers stated that the DDOT felt that the 90 percent was reasonable, without citing any concrete study. In fact, there was no study to back the generous 90 percent reduction.

Essentially, he had allowed the Applicant to make assertions without any factual basis, and we find this to be arbitrary and capricious.

In other matters, the domino effect, because we don't live directly in that neighborhood, but the domino effect of parking due to events in the Convention Center, and otherwise, we have a family and we find it very difficult to find parking, especially on weekends. So, we foresee that increasing.

The speaker mentioned earlier that he foresees -- because it is fully rented or fully furnished, that there will be no -- nobody will be driving, and that's incorrect because it's similar to dorm living, and if anyone has children in dorms,

1	you bring a lot of stuff for them. You drive.
2	They have families. They will buy stuff. The
3	premise is that they will have cheaper living, so
4	they will probably spend more money.
5	You have Uber, which is a new form of
6	transportation and it is prevalent in our
7	neighborhood. They come, they go to the
8	alleyways, the find parking on the street. They
9	double-park, and that he mentioned, there will
10	be other forms of transportation, including being
11	picked up, and that is a very frequent and
12	encouraged way now.
13	So, it impacts many people. Excuse me.
14	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Well, your time
15	is up.
16	MS. BAKKER: Two minutes? Okay.
17	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Thank you. We
18	appreciate all the comments. Board, questions?
19	Applicant, questions?
20	We thank you all for coming down. Your
21	input is very important. We know generally, the
22	gist of where you are, and other comments were the

1	same, you know, kind of boxed in. That's why we're
2	able to kind of convince it.
3	We understand the issue, and we're
4	taking a good, hard look at this. So, thank you
5	all for coming down.
6	Mr. Kadlecek, rebuttal? Let me ask one
7	question. Is the property you said the property
8	is going to be furnished. Is it optional? Can I
9	take the furniture out?
10	MR. KADLECEK: I'll let Mr. Balaban
11	speak to that, but my understanding is no, and I
12	also want to emphasize, not only are they
13	furnished, by the provide everything from linens,
14	dishes, utensils. It's not like a dorm. People
15	don't have to bring anything.
16	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Like a hotel?
17	MR. KADLECEK: Except you have to have
18	a lease.
19	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: How long is the
20	lease?
21	MR. BALABAN: There will be no leases
22	shorter than 90 days.

1	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: It's
2	extended-stay hotel.
3	MR. BALABAN: We certainly wouldn't
4	call it that. There will be residential leases and
5	we expect to have many 12 month leases and if it's
6	convenient for a specific tenant to make shorter
7	arrangements, because it is so easy to move in and
8	move out, because as Mr. Kadlecek said, everything
9	is provided, we expect there will be some
10	short-term tenants.
11	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Rebuttal, Mr.
12	Kadlecek?
13	MR. KADLECEK: Yes, Mr. Milanovich is
14	going to speak a little bit about TDM.
15	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: What about them?
16	We've got the TDM plan.
17	MR. KADLECEK: Effectiveness of TDM.
18	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: It's not
19	rebuttal, right?
20	MR. KADLECEK: Well, the I believe
21	that the neighbors testified that they think there
22	is going to be a significant impact on the

neighborhood.

CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Go ahead.

MS. MILANOVICH: I just thought it might be helpful to cite a few case studies, that show that the TDM plan is actually -- they do work. They are effective in reducing vehicular trips, and the case studies that I'm going to cite are actually -- the TDM plans aren't nearly as robust as what we're proposing.

So, we've done annual studies at a number of developments. I'm going to talk about one in the District that's near the Foggy Bottom metro station, and then the other three are actually in Fairfax County, and the reason I've selected those is because those are not near metro, and it's sometimes hard to understand if you're looking at a site near metro, how much of the reduction in vehicular trips is simply just because you're adjacent to metro versus how much is from the effectiveness of the TDM plan.

So, the Square 54 development, which is adjacent to the Foggy Bottom metro station, has --

it's where the Whole Foods is at 22nd and I. There is residential and office components there, as well.

When we did the study for that several years ago, the estimated trip reduction for that project was 60 percent, and that's 60 percent reduction in a.m. and p.m. peak hour vehicle trips.

We've gone out and monitored that, most recently in September of this year, and what we found was that the site is actually achieving a 70 percent reduction in the a.m. peak hour and an 82 percent reduction in the p.m. peak hour. So, significantly exceeding the anticipated reduction.

I also looked at three sites, and as I said, in Fairfax County. Two of those sites are more than one mile from metro. One of those is Ridgewood, which the goal of that TDM plan was to achieve a 20 percent trip reduction during the p.m. peak hour, and when we monitored that and did a survey of that last year, in November of 2013, we found that they're actually achieving a 46 percent

reduction. So, more than doubling the reduction that was specified in their goal.

The other that's more than one mile from metro is the Mosaic District in the Merrifield area of Fairfax County. Their goal was 30 percent non-single occupant vehicles, and in December of 2013, a year ago, we did a survey of that site and found that they are actually achieving a 42 percent non-single occupant vehicle rate.

Then the final case that I'll cite is the Reserve at Tysons. It's about a mile from the Dunn-Loring metro station. This was done pre-silver line.

Their goal again, was a 20 percent non-single occupant vehicle and in November of 2013, they were actually achieving 30 percent non-single occupant vehicle, and I just do want to note that none of those projects included Capital bike-share memberships for residents or car-share memberships for residents, not at initial occupancy and certainly, not in perpetuity of the project.

1	As I said, three of the four are nowhere
2	near metro. In our case, we're near metro, so we're
3	having the benefit not only of the TDM plan, but
4	also the proximity to metro.
5	So, I thought that might just help put
6	it in context and show that TDM plans really do
7	work.
8	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Certainly, and I
9	would want you to submit those studies and your
10	analysis on that, so we can see the actual
11	comparable's of TDM's that were in place, what the
12	initial goal was within the reduction and the time
13	period. That would be good. Thank you.
14	All right, anything else?
15	MR. KADLECEK: Yes, I just have a short
16	closing.
17	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes, please.
18	MR. KADLECEK: Three main points I want
19	to make in closing.
20	The first is, I want to re-emphasize Mr.
21	Balaban's testimony about the nature of the
22	residents in this building.

They're not the kind of people who are going to be bringing a lot of stuff. They are choosing to live in this neighborhood and in this type of project precisely because they want to be near transit. They want to be near amenities. They want to be near restaurants. They want to be near jobs. They want to be near gyms. They want to be near everything that they can get to within a short walk, with metro, with bus.

If they want to have a car, there are plenty of other options in the District, even in this neighborhood, there are other options for people to have cars where they can park in their building.

That's not the type of marketing that this project is oriented towards. These are not the types of people that are going to live in this building.

Secondly, when you're talking -- when people are making comparisons about people parking on the street, we have to remember that this is an atypical type of apartment. It's not a standard

one-bedroom. It's also not eligible for RPP, which in think differentiates it from a lot of the other buildings in the neighborhood that some of the neighbors have testified to.

My second main point is, there was some discussion about -- concern about preserving the Blagden Alley, and I want to say that we are in complete agreement with preserving Blagden Alley. In fact, as Commissioner Melcher testified, we believe this project actually helps preserve Blagden Alley by eliminating additional car traffic in it.

For those people who do have garages that back onto the alley, this will make their lives a lot easier than if a matter-of-right building with parking were to go in and have parking, or cars driving through the alley.

There is no part of the alley that's being deeded to this project. I think there was a misunderstanding about that. We're actually preserving part of our property that will be towards and which will, in effect, widen the alley.

Then finally, I want to emphasize again, the ANC support. We went to the ANC for just the BZA case, four times, not to mention the times that we went to the ANC for the HPRB case.

felt, The ANC as you heard, strongly that we went above and beyond to meet the concerns of the community that were expressed at those meetings of the ANC Commissioners. why we've committed to such a robust TDM plan, and that's why we're, you know, willing to do as much as we can to minimize the fact that there would be any negative impact, but never the less, we believe that the types of residents that will live here are not likely to bring cars, despite the number of parking spaces that we're asking for relief from. So, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: All right, thank you. We'll close the record on this, unless the Board needs something additional.

I do want the study that you recited, so we can take a look at that. I would like to have that. Mr. May?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	COMMISSIONER MAY: I just have one
2	question. Reading back over the ANC report, and
3	I'm not seeing the actual vote, what the vote was.
4	Was it unanimous or was it a split vote?
5	MR. KADLECEK: It was a split vote.
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: And I'm sorry, I'm
7	asking him.
8	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Folks that
9	participated as witnesses with in the in
10	opposition, it's no discussion. Your guys time is
11	done. It's now conversation with the Applicant,
12	okay.
13	COMMISSIONER MAY: So, I'm sorry, can
14	you tell me what it was? It was a split vote?
15	MR. KADLECEK: Four to three.
16	COMMISSIONER MAY: Four to three?
17	Okay, so, technically, we need to have that
18	reflected in the in the report, and I'm just not
19	sure I we have it on a in a written form in
20	the record. Yes, I mean, it's I'm not seeing
21	it in the letter that was written.
22	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: So, I'd like to

1 see that in the -- the letter amended in the record. Board, anything else you want to see? 2 I don't think we're ready for a decision on this, 3 4 are you? Okay, so, Mr. Moy, I want to put this 5 6 over for -- on the hearing docket, just in case 7 there is some additional questions, but hearing/decision date. 8 I'm telling you, that study is going to 9 10 be very key, because it's a -- you know, I've looked at the Arlington and Fairfax County studies myself. 11 I've been always waiting for the District to do its 12 -- you know, because you're right. 13 I mean, your Arlington is still -- and Fairfax is still not the 14 District, and we keep hearing, it's coming, it's 15 16 coming and coming and coming, and these -- you know, this project is going from a required 61 or 62 17 residential 18 parking spaces to zero in 19 neighborhood. Yes, that alley is zoned commercial. 20 Then that's another aspect this Board has got to 21 22 look at, the impact of what went on in the Zoning

1	Commission hearing when it was designated as
2	commercial. I think that's a fair consideration
3	also.
4	So, and now, we hear that the ANC vote
5	was actually 4-3 and it wasn't a slam dunk there,
6	as I was kind of getting the impression, it was a
7	slam dunk.
8	So, I want to put this on for another
9	date, Mr. Moy. That's fair.
10	So, I think as soon as December 27th?
11	No, I'm sorry.
12	MR. MOY: January 27th.
13	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: January 27th is
14	fine. No, no, January 27th is fine with me.
15	You know, we you know, we've got to
16	do these things with you know, certainly with
17	some speed, but it's got to be deliberate speed.
18	These things are not like, you know
19	because these decisions are going to impact people
20	for a long time. Mr. Moy?
21	MR. MOY: Okay, as I heard Mr.
22	Chairman, that was continued hearing, as opposed

1	to a decision meeting for January Tuesday,
2	January 27th. Any filings as the Board requests,
3	by January 20th, because I believe the 19th is a
4	holiday. I believe that's a Monday, I think, but
5	I could be second-guesses on that.
6	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: So, the 27th?
7	MR. MOY: Yes, sir.
8	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: And in on the
9	19th?
10	MR. MOY: Twenty.
11	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: They've got to
12	get it in by the 20th? What's the docket look like?
13	We've been stacking some stuff up for the 27th.
14	MR. MOY: Yes, but I have high
15	confidence in this Board.
16	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: What the heck
17	does that mean? Twenty-seventh, please, okay, and
18	with the submission beforehand.
19	Thank you, all. Thanks, everybody.
20	Thank you all for coming down and being diligent
21	on this. I know this is it's one of those
22	issues. It's one of those life impactful issues

1 and we understand that. All right, a brief three minutes and 2 then we're up and running. We'll take the last 3 4 case for the day, and that's got expediently. 5 6 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter 7 went off the record at 1:00 p.m. and resumed at 1:06 p.m.) 8 This is Case No. 9 CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: 10 18841, the continuation hearing of Robert Searle for the variance for addition to row-dwelling in 11 the R-4 District at 1522 8th Street, Northwest. 12 13 This case was previously heard in 14 October 28th -- was it October 28th, that long ago? October 28th, it seemed like just yesterday. 15 16 October 28th, 2014. The case was kept open for the Applicant 17 to present to the Board, issues that were raised 18 19 during the hearing, including explanation of other 20 alternatives and options and why it's not feasible -- why those things are not feasible, and to further 21

clarify the structural reasons for the third floor

expansion.

Anyway, okay, good. So, the Board has reviewed the record on the matter. I think we see what's going on. Let me find out.

Board, was there any other questions we want to ask this Applicant about the supplemental filing?

I kind of -- if we can do -- if you bear with me a minute, let me go and ask a question of OP on their report, because it's my understanding, Ms. Vitale, you still are not in support of the relief for the third floor, correct?

MS. VITALE: That is correct.

CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: And let me ask you, because you wrote in your report, some potential alternative ways to do the -- how to handle the structural issue with the building, that the Applicant could refrain -- re-frame the existing third floor roof and distribute the roof load to the parting wall and dog-leg the wall, or the Applicant could restructure and stabilize the under-pinning.

1	If doing it your way, would they not
2	need any zoning relief to do this project?
3	MS. VITALE: I actually did speak with
4	the Office of the Zoning Administrator in DCRA, to
5	confirm that if the Applicant were to pull permits
6	to, you know, renovate and stabilize the existing
7	structure without the addition, if that could be
8	done, without the need for relief, and they
9	indicated that was in fact, the case.
10	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: All right. So,
11	back to the Applicant, to respond to that and/or
12	yes, I got you.
13	No, I didn't do it. That's my fault.
14	You weren't on. There you go. Now, you can do it.
15	MS. MOLDENHAUER: At this point, can I
16	cross-examine Office of Planning based on that
17	statement or are we jumping around?
18	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes, because
19	we're already in the hearing. So, let's I think
20	unless there is something else you think you need
21	to present to the Board, that you haven't presented
22	to us.

1	MS. MOLDENHAUER: Well, one, I'd like
2	to cross-examine Office of Planning.
3	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Go ahead.
4	MS. MOLDENHAUER: And then I can
5	provide additional supplemental.
6	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Certainly, that
7	would be good. Go ahead.
8	MS. MOLDENHAUER: So, my question
9	would be, based on your proposed options, is it your
10	understanding that structurally, you would have to
11	underpin and thus, demolish the existing basement
12	structure?
13	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Say that again.
14	Could you rephrase that?
15	MS. MOLDENHAUER: Based on your
16	recommendations to just simply re-stabilize the
17	existing wall, do you understand or is it your
18	understanding that you would have in order to
19	do that, you would have to then demolish a portion
20	of the existing basement or cellar unit?
21	MS. VITALE: I'm
22	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: You're missing

1	the question?
2	MS. VITALE: No, I understand what
3	she's saying, and I'm not certain that I know, you
4	know, the relevance of that.
5	You could underpin that existing wall
6	that now runs from the basement to the third floor,
7	to the existing third floor, that half-story, you
8	know, as I discussed with staff in the Office of
9	the Zoning Administrator.
10	That underpinning work could be done
11	without the need for additional relief. The
12	extent of renovation interior work to underpin, I
13	don't I can't speak specifically
14	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: I think her
15	MS. VITALE: to that.
16	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: I think her
17	question is saying doing it the way that you
18	suggest, would you then either take away the use
19	or is there a need to substantially change the
20	cellar level in doing that? Is that your question?
21	MS. MOLDENHAUER: I think the Office of

Planning had answered the question, that they

1	haven't evaluated the need to
2	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Well, first let
3	me was that the question, as I rephrased it?
4	MS. MOLDENHAUER: Not exactly.
5	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: All right, so,
6	let's make sure we're clear on the question,
7	because I
8	MS. MOLDENHAUER: The question was, in
9	your proposed alternatives, did you consider the
10	fact that those proposed alternatives would
11	require waste and demolition of a portion of the
12	cellar unit that has been renovated?
13	MS. VITALE: Yes, I did. I know it
14	at the last hearing, you did indicate that the
15	basement unit had been renovated recently.
16	I did check permit records, didn't see
17	any permit records for extensive renovation work
18	for the basement.
19	So, I did. I understood that
20	certainly, that's finished space and to underpin
21	in a finished space, would require some disruption,
22	certainly of that space.

1	MS. MOLDENHAUER: And that does not
2	evaluate in regards to wasteful renovation or
3	something that would be practically difficult? In
4	other words, to wasting an existing structure
5	that's been renovated already?
6	MS. VITALE: I'm not certain how that's
7	relevant to the case before us and the need for the
8	third floor.
9	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Let me say this.
10	Ms. Vitale, relevance, don't worry about that.
11	Let's just answer the question. We'll handle the
12	relevance, okay? I understand. Just answer the
13	question.
14	I understand where you're coming from,
15	but just answer the question. I think I
16	understand what she's asking
17	MS. VITALE: As I stated, yes, I
18	understand that you would certainly need to disrupt
19	some existing finished space, in order to underpin
20	that wall.
21	MS. MOLDENHAUER: Then no other
22	questions at this point for OP.

1	We'll then just simply we have
2	obviously, we can elaborate on the information that
3	was provided in regards to the civil engineer, and
4	we also, in part of the revised plans, have shown
5	that the roof top access has been removed from the
6	structure, and I believe that the Applicant would
7	like to provide a brief statement, as well, to the
8	Board.
9	MR. SEARLE: Good afternoon, Chairman
10	Jordan and the Board.
11	I'll try to be quick and brief on this.
12	I just want to give, from my
13	perspective, you know, the difficulty that is, you
14	know, on the decision of how to remedy this wall
15	in my unique situation, as we talked about. There
16	is an internal wall. It's got a lot of cracks.
17	It's even buckling in a spot, and it's causing a
18	lot of problems and something has to be done to
19	remedy, and this was done through previous owners,
20	through modifications and failure to keep upkeep
21	of the property.

consulting initially

In

22

with

my

architect, she gave me a couple options. You know, one we discussed, which was to carry the load of the roof back to the rear well, which has a better footing and better structural integrity to carry the load.

The other, which was to tear apart—the basement, which you know, to build up that wall to put in footing, which obviously was going to be difficult, because we'd have to tear apart—and wasteful, because we'd have to tear apart—the basement that was already finished, or demolishing the garage, which again, was wasteful to a structure that was already there, and it would also require a variance and permission from the Historic Board.

So, because of the risk and the difficulty, it seemed that, you know, carrying the load to the back wall was the best option that we could do.

She told me that this would require a variance and that this can be costly and laborious, but I felt because of the other options and the

alternatives and this old house, that this was what we would go for.

So, before we even started, I reached out to the neighbors, and I got support from all the neighbors that I asked. We brought this to ANC-6E and Alex Padro, that actually lives across the street, and he was very emphatically in support of it, and he — because he is — lives across the street, he also is concerned about how far it's reaching.

I also got very emotional support from Mary Sutherland, who was community activist at the meeting, who happens to be my next door neighbor, who was very vocal during the meeting in support for it.

So, following the last meeting from the Zoning Committee, or from the Board, we did get the structural engineer to look at it, and he in deed, backed what we had said in the last meeting through the architect, that that wall is basically -- he condemned it, which he said -- he was actually concerned about it falling apart unless we did some

serious construction to it, which involves the -putting -- finishing or taking -- putting the
footing in and increasing the footing on the
foundation.

So, if there still is a question, I just want to make it clear that from -- you know, from my perspective, or at least -- and I hope it's the Board's perspective, that I mean, deliberation is good, but I think in this case, I rest on the experts of the architect and the structural engineer, who actually saw the uniqueness of my property, have been able to look at the walls, the deterioration of the walls, look underneath and saw the casing -- how the footing is and the foundation, and so, I would like to rest on their expert opinion, and their advice to me, which is the best option would be to carry the load through that -- to that rear wall, and that's all I have. Thank you, sir.

CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Thank you.

Anything else that you think the Board needs to hear? Board, questions? Yes, Mr. May?

COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay, well, first

1	of all, I appreciate the fact that you removed the
2	rooftop access. That was problematic for me.
3	Let's talk about this "condemned wall".
4	I mean, condemned wall is just that's the term
5	that the engineer used for it, right? It's not
6	you haven't you don't have a condemnation
7	sticker on it from DCRA or anything like that,
8	right?
9	MS. MOLDENHAUER: No, it was what the
LO	
L1	COMMISSIONER MAY: What they called
L2	it? What they how they referred to it?
L3	MS. MOLDENHAUER: How they referred to
L4	it.
L5	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay, so, tell me
L6	more about why it's condemned.
L7	The wall extends from the presumably
L8	the basement level, all the way up to the roof?
L9	Correct?
20	MS. MOLDENHAUER: I am not a civil
21	engineer and we don't have our civil engineer here
22	with us.

1	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay, well, your
2	architect sure be able to answer that question.
3	MS. FOWLER: Sure, yes. It does
4	extend from the basement level and it carries the
5	load of the partial third floor.
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: Partial third
7	floor, right and the roof, right? Carries to the
8	roof?
9	MS. FOWLER: Yes, the roof load from
10	the third floor.
11	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right, it doesn't
12	include actually carry any load from the third
13	floor, because that's carried by bearing the
14	party walls.
15	MS. FOWLER: Right.
16	COMMISSIONER MAY: So, the what
17	portion of this wall is bad? I mean, is it bad from
18	the basement? I mean, from the cellar all the way
19	to the roof?
20	MS. FOWLER: That's correct. Yes, we
21	observed cracks and bowing, kind of throughout from
22	the basement level, all the way up through

1	COMMISSIONER MAY: So, how much bowing
2	are you talking about?
3	MS. FOWLER: He had in his letter,
4	kind of states that there is
5	COMMISSIONER MAY: The only dimension
6	I saw was three-eighths of an inch, which is not
7	much.
8	MS. FOWLER: Out of plain movement that
9	he mentioned in the letter.
LO	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
L1	MS. FOWLER: There is one particular
L2	area in the basement where you can see you can
L3	visually see that there is there has been
L4	movement in that wall.
L5	COMMISSIONER MAY: It's moving, it's
L6	bowing?
L7	MS. FOWLER: It's bowing, yes.
L8	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay, is the mortar
L9	in tact?
20	MS. FOWLER: No, there is definitely
21	areas where the mortar is not.
22	COMMISSIONER MAY: I mean, in the area

1	where it's bowing, is the mortar in tact?
2	MS. FOWLER: In that area, it's not
3	exposed. The mortar is not exposed, but we can see
4	other damage and bowing from the finished wall.
5	COMMISSIONER MAY: So, it's pushing on
6	the finished wall?
7	MS. FOWLER: Right.
8	COMMISSIONER MAY: And you can't see
9	it?
10	MS. FOWLER: That's what we think.
11	That's what we believe.
12	COMMISSIONER MAY: In the basement
13	level?
14	MS. FOWLER: Correct.
15	COMMISSIONER MAY: So, you're going to
16	have to take apart that wall anyway, in order to
17	fix that, right? You don't want to have the I
18	mean, you're not going to want to have the masonry
19	wall start pushing through the drywall.
20	MS. FOWLER: I think once the load is
21	removed, we won't need to
22	COMMISSIONER MAY: It's not going to

1	bow anymore. It's only going to bow as much as it
2	has.
3	MS. FOWLER: I believe so.
4	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay.
5	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: What caused the
6	damage to the wall, anyway, the structure?
7	MS. FOWLER: There was as we
8	testified previously, there have been holes put
9	through the wall over time, for duct work and other
10	utilities, doorways put through without proper
11	support, and also, we believe that that foundation
12	based on other projects that I've experienced
13	through work, there is potentially no footing under
14	that particular wall.
15	Usually, it's just kind of a brick wall
16	laid on the dirt. So, we believe that there is
17	settling it's settling differently than the
18	perimeter walls.
19	COMMISSIONER MAY: So, where to what
20	extent have you been able to examine the actual
21	masonry? Is it on the first floor? Second floor?
22	Inside only? Second floor or third floor inside

1	only?
2	MS. FOWLER: Inside, mostly, but there
3	is a photograph we had in the
4	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, I saw one where
5	there is a sort of a column
6	MS. FOWLER: Right.
7	COMMISSIONER MAY: piece that is
8	exposed, and it's obviously, in very bad shape
9	behind the drywall. Is that the extent to which
10	it has been you've examined the masonry?
11	MS. FOWLER: On the upper levels, we've
12	seen cracks there is plaster walls
13	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.
14	MS. FOWLER: so, we were able to see
15	cracks that have occurred from the
16	COMMISSIONER MAY: It's the
17	differential settlement, right?
18	MS. FOWLER: Correct, and where the
19	wall meets the party walls
20	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
21	MS. FOWLER: where it's separated.
22	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right, it's

1	settling a little bit more in the middle because
2	it doesn't have the foundation, right.
3	MS. FOWLER: But it's much easier to
4	tell with the plaster walls than it is for instance,
5	in the basement
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.
7	MS. FOWLER: where this is drywall.
8	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right, so, how much
9	do you think it has actually settled there?
10	I mean, because those cracks at corners
11	like that are quite common in older plaster you
12	know, houses with plaster.
13	MS. MOLDENHAUER: I think the issue is,
14	and I think we can kind of go back and forth with
15	this, but what we did from the last time is, we
16	actually went and we obtained a civil engineer from
17	them, to provide their expert opinion.
18	COMMISSIONER MAY: And I read it, and
19	I have questions about it, and he's not here. So,
20	I'm trying to figure out what I need to figure out.
21	MS. MOLDENHAUER: I'm just trying to
22	say that obviously, you know, one of the things

1	we're relying upon is his, you know
2	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.
3	MS. MOLDENHAUER: opinion that wall
4	and
5	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay, let me tell
6	you what what he described in the letter is no
7	worse than conditions that I've seen in multiple
8	townhouses over the years, and particularly on that
9	back wall.
10	So, I'm trying to understand if that
11	wall really, truly is in jeopardy or not, because
12	based on the description, it's not compelling.
13	So, I'm trying to find that out. If you
14	want me to stop
15	MS. MOLDENHAUER: No.
16	COMMISSIONER MAY: I'll stop and
17	vote, you know.
18	MS. MOLDENHAUER: I'm just trying to
19	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay.
20	MS. MOLDENHAUER: focus what we
21	have, obviously on the
22	COMMISSIONER MAY: I understand, I

1	understand and it's, you know, as you can probably
2	tell, it's not compelling enough for me.
3	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: As I always say,
4	and you know certainly, we've already read the
5	record. So, we know what we read.
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.
7	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: So, the questions
8	are just follow-ups that we need to get the answers
9	to.
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: So, in terms of the
11	actual construction that you would do here, at this
12	point, you would take down the wall from the level
13	of the floor, the first floor, all the way up to
14	the roof, essentially.
15	MS. FOWLER: That's correct.
16	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay, and then the
17	roof load, you expect to use a king beam to carry
18	that, the rest?
19	MS. FOWLER: Correct. We were
20	planning to reinforce
21	COMMISSIONER MAY: An existing king
22	beam?

1	MS. FOWLER: forward king beams and
2	then install new king beams further back.
3	COMMISSIONER MAY: I see, yes, right,
4	because it's too far to span.
5	So, is there anything that would
6	prevent you from simply spanning from the existing
7	brick wall, to rebuild the back wall, at the third
8	floor with just wood framing?
9	I mean, is there any reason why you
LO	couldn't just stop it there and maintain the same
L1	envelope?
L2	I mean, you're arguing that this is
L3	structurally necessary because you need to remove
L4	that wall, and the only solutions that we've heard
L5	so far is that you'd have to demolish the thing down
L6	to the basement and put in a new footing and build
L7	it all up and masonry.
L8	But you're also you know, you're
L9	showing king beams that are being carried by the
20	party walls and by the dog-leg wall, and if those
21	are strong enough to carry king beams that will
22	carry the roof load couldn't you you know span

1	that, you know, at the top of the second floor, span
2	and then put your wall, you know, your back wall
3	right on top of that and then maintain the envelope
4	and comply with the zoning?
5	MS. FOWLER: I mean, part of the
6	strategy here is to remove the load from that
7	the wall that the engineers condemned, and spread
8	it out over multiple points, and which are also
9	carrying down onto walls that we believe have more
10	viable foundations than the wall that's currently
11	carrying the loads.
12	So, the idea is to disperse this load
13	over different walls that we've seen have better
14	foundations.
15	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay.
16	MS. MOLDENHAUER: And if you were
17	what would be another option? Would it be to carry
18	out to the original existing exterior wall?
19	COMMISSIONER MAY: I'm just asking why
20	not?
21	MS. MOLDENHAUER: But what I'm saying,
22	if they pulled it out to the original existing wall,

1 which is the second one, that would still then require zoning relief. It would just --2 COMMISSIONER MAY: No, no, no, I'm not 3 4 talking about the original existing wall. I'm talking about the wall that is bad, essentially in 5 6 the same plain, have a beam that goes from the party 7 wall at the top to the -- you know, the viable masonry wall, you know, at the end of the dog-leg 8 there, and carry the load down that way, and build 9 10 up. MS. FOWLER: We're kind of basing what 11 we -- our design on the recommendations of the 12 13 structural engineer and what he thought was the most efficient way to address the issue. 14 So, the structural 15 COMMISSIONER MAY: 16 engineer who gave us this report most recently, was the one who advised you originally to extend the 17 roof all the way to the back of the house? 18 19 MS. FOWLER: He didn't originally, but 20 when we showed him the designs and we walked through the house, he concurred that that was the best 21 solution. 22

1	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay, all right.
2	It's unfortunate that he's not here to testify to
3	that, because that's not what he wrote in his
4	letter. He wrote that the letter that the wall
5	is not viable and should come down, and you know
6	
7	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: There was a lot of
8	detail.
9	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, it's I'll
LO	leave it there. I don't have any further
L1	questions.
L2	MS. MOLDENHAUER: I want to ask
L3	Jennifer a question.
L4	So, if based on what obviously, the
L5	structural engineer informed you, that this wall,
L6	this entire wall is not viable, what would be the
L7	alternative, if you were to use this wall, the
L8	original, which I'm just going to kind of going
L9	over on a cursory here.
20	This was the original wall of the
21	property. Would that still require zoning relief?
22	You're expanding not all the way to the far back

1	wall, all the way to the far to the far back wall,
2	but to the middle wall, which is the original wall,
3	would that still require zoning relief, if you went
4	back to that portion?
5	MS. FOWLER: Yes, it would also have
6	its own challenges, as well, because the wall has
7	been removed in many locations.
8	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, Board, any
9	additional questions?
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: Actually, I do have
11	another question.
12	So, you have in your submission, you
13	included information about the garage, that
14	indicates the garage has been there for a long time.
15	Is it a contributing structure in the Historic
16	District?
17	MS. MOLDENHAUER: We have not yet gone
18	to HPO. We were going through the BZA process
19	first, and then we're going to be going to the
20	Historic Preservation process.
21	But what we did pull up was just a
22	COMMISSIONER MAY: I saw what you

1	submitted, yes.
2	MS. MOLDENHAUER: Also that from the
3	1907 picture on the left here, is a picture of all
4	of the original garages that were built at that
5	time, and if you look at the picture on the right,
6	that's actually a picture from our current.
7	So, obviously, majority, almost all of
8	those original structured garages have been
9	removed from this entire square. You can see the
10	picture on the right, where there is really only
11	one other garage structure from the image.
12	So, we have not yet pursued HPO. We are
13	going go through the BZA process first, but we do
14	believe it would be an issue, in regards to, you
15	know, addressing that, since this was is one of
16	the few garages that are left.
17	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay, so, in your
18	original submission on page C4, you have a
19	photograph of that garage, which shows a concrete
20	block garage with a double door on it. That's what
21	I'm that's the garage, right?
	1

MS. MOLDENHAUER: That's the interior

1	side, yes.
2	COMMISSIONER MAY: It's the alley
3	side.
4	MS. MOLDENHAUER: Is that the alley
5	side? Sorry.
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: I'm looking at the
7	alley side. I don't have the picture of the of
8	the interior side.
9	Yes, I mean, I'm seeing basically a
10	block wall garage.
11	I mean, I guess what it my point is
12	that even I'm sorry, and the current iteration
13	of the garage, it borders the alley directly,
14	right? It's not off-set the way it's shown in the
15	basement up on the left.
16	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Is that flipped?
17	COMMISSIONER MAY: No.
18	MS. MOLDENHAUER: It appears to be.
19	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right. So, one of
20	the solutions to the I'm sorry, is one of the
21	solutions for the garage to be removed, and then
22	to build the addition the expansion the way you

1	want?
2	MS. MOLDENHAUER: We believe that that
3	would create a practical difficulty, in regards to
4	waste of an existing structure, and we also believe
5	we'd have to
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: And this and I
7	understand that's what you would argue, but that's
8	not what I asked.
9	Would that be a solution? It would be
10	it may not be the solution you want, but is that
11	a solution, that if you took the garage away, would
12	you be compliant with zoning, with this addition?
13	MS. MOLDENHAUER: If you removed the
14	garage structure it would reduce the lot occupancy
15	and
16	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.
17	MS. MOLDENHAUER: Yes.
18	COMMISSIONER MAY: So, you'd be zoning
19	compliant.
20	MS. MOLDENHAUER: But so I it's
21	so, it would not though, you would have to have an
22	issue with the court, because the issue here is the

1	court, and so
2	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.
3	MS. MOLDENHAUER: it would not
4	change the court issue, and the court obviously
5	provides the light and air that, you know, courts
6	were designed for that purpose.
7	So, you would still
8	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right, but it's a
9	different test for court versus lot occupancy,
10	right?
11	MS. MOLDENHAUER: But the relief that
12	we're seeking now
13	COMMISSIONER MAY: You have a 223
14	relief on extending a non-compliant court, but you
15	can't, for non-compliant non-conforming lot
16	occupancy.
17	MS. MOLDENHAUER: No, exactly, so,
18	obviously, you know, but that obviously goes to the
19	degree of relief and here, if we were the same
20	issue is the case here.
21	We have a question of a non-conforming
22	court, and if we wanted to increase that

1	non-conforming court, we would still need zoning
2	relief, and then that actually just goes to
3	COMMISSIONER MAY: But the special
4	exception relief as opposed to variance relief.
5	MS. MOLDENHAUER: It goes to then the
6	case of 1700 N Street, in which the Court evaluated
7	Barber and they indicated that that case was
8	distinguishable, "Because the owner of the
9	property had two alternative methods that could be
10	constructed without full compliant within full
11	compliance of the zoning regulations."
12	Whereas, here in this in the case of
13	1700 N Street, the YMCA had not feasible
14	alternative methods that would provide both a pool
15	and also require the parking spaces.
16	So, we are arguing that this is a same
17	situation as the Court of Appeals determined in
18	that case, which was distinguished from Barber.
19	We have alternatives, but any of those
20	alternatives would still require zoning relief.
21	The option that you just presented, Commissioner
22	May, would still require a degree of zoning relief,

1	and it would also then, in our opinion, create more
2	practical difficulty because it would not allow
3	the maintenance or the maintaining of structures,
4	such as a parking structure.
5	We've heard a lot of testimony about,
6	you know, the need for parking in the area, and we
7	believe that it would be a practical difficulty to
8	demolish the
9	COMMISSIONER MAY: Elimination of the
10	garage doesn't take away parking.
11	MS. MOLDENHAUER: It reduces the style
12	of parking that you're being provided.
13	COMMISSIONER MAY: Changes it.
14	MS. MOLDENHAUER: And storage, and so,
15	we but to the legal issue, the legal issue
16	identifies in the 1700 N Street block case that if
17	the only other alternatives would still require
18	zoning relief, then in those regards, the standard
19	has been met and we present that
20	COMMISSIONER MAY: So, in that case
21	that you're citing

1	alternatives
2	COMMISSIONER MAY: In the case that
3	you're citing, is that one where it was one variance
4	versus another variance?
5	MS. MOLDENHAUER: It was whether or not
6	they could provide a pool. So, it was actually
7	it was literally the desire to have a pool for the
8	YMCA, and also provide parking.
9	So, they had indicated that they could
10	not provide both the pool and parking, and so, here
11	we're indicating that if you had any other
12	alternative, you would either be, you know,
13	wastefully destructing or destroying a portion of
14	the structure, or you would still need relief from
15	special exception relief, or if you were even
16	even too, as we were talking about, pull the wall
17	back to possibly maybe another portion of the
18	structure, you would still then need court relief.
19	You just would not need the degree would change.
20	So, based on
21	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right, but there is
22	an essential difference between special exception

1	relief and variance relief, right, and I'm not sure
2	that the case you're citing has anything to do with
3	that.
4	MS. MOLDENHAUER: There is no specific
5	case that relates to both that is is comparing
6	that, and unfortunately, we have limited
7	COMMISSIONER MAY: You're the one that
8	brought it up. That's why I asked.
9	MS. MOLDENHAUER: But I believe it's so
10	
11	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, okay,.
12	MS. MOLDENHAUER: parallel on the
13	legal issues.
14	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: I think we can do
15	this all day. I think we're ready to wrap this up.
16	Is there any other evidence? Board,
17	any additional questions from the Board?
18	Okay, then we will close the record in
19	this case. Is the Board ready to deliberate?
20	Okay, then we'll move into
21	deliberations on this.
22	This is a matter which I think you can

kind of toss up, in regards to how you take care of the structural issue, but clearly, there is a showing that this building has some uniqueness and has been defined by the evidence presented by the Applicant, and that there is a structural issue with this wall.

How you do it, I think you can probably get 15 experts in the room and you'll probably get 12 different ways of how you can handle the structural issue. But I think it presents enough that the structural issue shows that there is a deterioration of some sort, an erosion in this building, and there has got to be some kind of aspect of attacking that third floor wall and that half-portion of the roof.

Again, question about where the experts are, and I would -- I believe that doing so still is going to require some type of practical difficulty, in regards to this property, and depending on which way you do it, will have an affect upon the cellar and require some additional spending of money, maybe in the area that didn't

1 need it. But again, you can go back and forth 2 with the experts. I think it's -- I can support 3 4 this application, based upon what I've heard so far, what I've heard in this case. 5 6 Based upon that, I think again, the 7 argument how you do it and 15 different ways to do it, it's still questionable, but I think there has 8 9 been reasonable evidence presented bу the 10 Applicant, to support this and that's my thought. 11 Anyone else? Certainly. 12 COMMISSIONER MAY: So, as 13 you might guess, I don't support granting a variance in this circumstance. 14 Certainly, the idea of fixing the 15 16 problem with the wall by extending the load and carrying the load, distributing it over more of the 17 walls is a way to solve the problem. It is not the 18 19 only way to solve the problem, and I don't believe that it is necessarily even the most cost-effective 20

It is the most cost-effective way for

21

22

way to solve the problem.

the home owner to expand the dwelling and not lose their garage and not lose the basement apartment during the course of construction.

But frankly, I don't see that either -you know, any of those issues warrant granting a
variance in this circumstance.

Experts can differ on these things, but we're not talking about really super complicated stuff here. This is pretty basic stuff, and I think that it — there is a solution that doesn't involve anything nearly this complicated or this — that requires granting, you know, extra space to a rather lot occupancy relief, in order to fix a problem of a structural wall. I think that those are issues that can be fixed in much more understandable and zoning compliant ways, and I just didn't see anything that was compelling in the evidence that was provided.

It was -- you know, this was a solution that the architect came up with and consulted with the civil engineer or the structural engineer after

1	the fact, in order to justify the solution. At
2	least, that's the way it looks to me.
3	So, I agree with the Office of Planning,
4	this is not something that we should be granting.
5	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: I would move we
6	grant the relief in this matter.
7	VICE CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Second.
8	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Motion made and
9	seconded. Any additional discussion from anyone?
10	All those in favor of the motion,
11	signify by saying aye.
12	(Chorus of ayes)
13	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Those opposed
14	nay. The motion passes. Mr. Moy?
15	MR. MOY: Staff would record the vote
16	as 3-1. This is on the motion of Chairman Jordan
17	or approve the application for the relief
18	requested. Second the motion, Vice Chair Allen.
19	Also in support, Mr. Hinkle. Opposed to the
20	motion, Mr. May and we have a member not present.
21	The motion carries, Mr. Chairman.
22	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: The motion

1	passes. Let's have a full order. Maybe, no, we
2	can do a summary order.
3	We can't have a summary. We need a full
4	order. Make it full, okay, all right.
5	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went
6	off the record briefly at 1:37 p.m.)
7	MR. MOY: Before we close the hearing,
8	Mr. Chairman, can I make just a real quick
9	announcement?
10	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes.
11	MR. MOY: Yes, just for the record,
12	just to leave a paper trail, two cases that were
13	rescheduled, 18899 Ron Rogers was rescheduled to
14	December 9th and the hearing case of Kevin Latner
15	18865 was rescheduled to December 16th. That's
16	all I have, Mr. Chairman.
17	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
18	went off the record at 1:40 p.m.)
19	
20	
21	
22	