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 4th 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.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS
ITEM PAGE
WARD 3
Application of Jennifer Keller 4 18870 ANC-3C
Application of Eli & Margaret Joseph
WARD 7
Application of Roslyn Taylor
WARD 2
Application of Planned Parenthood Assoc 24
WARD 6
Application of Growth Spurts
WARD 2
Application of SB Urban LLC
Application of SB Urban LLC
WARD 6
Application of Robert J. Searle

(202) 234-4433

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. 18870 of
4	Jennifer Keller.
5	Mr. Chairman, this is a request for a special
6	exception to allow and accessory apartment, under Sub-Section
7	202.10, as advertised.
8	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: All right, please identify
9	yourself. Just make sure your microphone is on. Is it push
10	the say something. I don't think your microphone is on.
11	MR. SEARLE: Sorry, yes.
12	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: There you go.
13	MR. SEARLE: Jennifer Keller.
14	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: You also have a request for
15	the Board to waive the requirement for proper certification,
16	self-certification requirement that attorney and/or an
17	architect certify your request for relief or a Zoning
18	Administrator letter.
19	MR. SEARLE: Yes.
20	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: What does the Board feel
21	about that, anyone?
22	For this particular relief, I could be supportive
23	of this, in this instance, because you're already the
24	property you're just trying to basically, clean up something
25	that's already been happening, and it's already been cited by

2	MR. SEARLE: I was when I purchased the
3	property in 2009, I was told it had a certificate of occupancy,
4	and I re-applied for it by mail.
5	In the process of having the apartment rent
6	though, I determined that it was not a certificate of
7	occupancy. It was a business license, and so, the apartment
8	had not been zoned.
9	I continued the lease and when my dweller left
10	the apartment, I've started the process with the Board of
11	Zoning.
12	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, Board ready to
13	deliberate on this? I mean, well, first it's a hearing, I'm
14	sorry.
15	I really don't have any other further questions,
16	that I need to ask. Board, any questions we need to drill down
17	and hear anything from this particular Applicant?
18	All right, it's up to you, to add anything if you
19	want to, but I don't believe it's necessary. We can go on and
20	proceed with the hearing, if that's your wish.
21	MR. SEARLE: Yes.
22	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, then let's turn to
23	the Office of Planning, and see if there is anything in addition
24	to what's already in the record.
25	MS. ELLIOTT: Good morning, Mr. Chairman,

DCRA I believe, is that right?

1	members of the Board.
2	For the record, I'm Brandice Elliott with the
3	Office of Planning.
4	We have nothing additional to add to the report.
5	We're recommending approval of the request.
6	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Thank you. Anyone here
7	from Department of Transportation? We do have a letter of no
8	objection to the requested relief.
9	Anyone here from ANC-3C for this matter?
10	ANC-3C?
11	We do have a letter of support from ANC-3C, which
12	we certainly give great weight to.
13	Anyone here wishing to speak in support? Anyone
14	wishing to speak in support? Anyone wishing to speak in
15	opposition? Anyone in opposition?
16	Then we'll close the record on this matter, and
17	I would move that we grant the relief requested in 18870.
18	VICE CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Second.
19	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Motion made and seconded.
20	Additional discussion?
21	All those in favor signify by saying aye.
22	(Chorus of ayes)
23	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Those opposed, nay. The
24	motion carries. Mr. Moy?
25	MR. MOY: Staff would record the vote as 4-0.

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

1	exception and is asking for a variance and then I think the
2	variance is being asked for from the front yard relief, but
3	we believe that's sufficient to do the special exception,
4	extension of the non-conforming use under 2001.3.
5	So, that's kind of what our discussion was about
6	here.
7	All right, does the Board have any issues or
8	questions with this application, since we've kind of talked
9	through that.
10	Mr. Cooke, as you may have heard, the Board
11	believes there is sufficient information here already in the
12	record to grant the relief for the special exception, and it's
13	also your opportunity, if you want to make a statement, you
14	can, but otherwise, you know, it's probably heavily suggested
15	that you want to move on.
16	MR. COOKE: We'll stand on the support of OP.
17	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, then turning to the
18	Office of Planning, is there anything additional that we have?
19	MS. VITALE: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members
20	of the Board. Elisa Vitale.
21	Office of Planning supports the requested
22	relief. We'll rest on the record and can answer any questions.
23	Thank you.
24	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Board, any questions of
25	Planning?

1	We also have a letter from Department of
2	Transportation, with no objection to the requested relief.
3	Is there anyone here from ANC-3D? We do have a
4	letter from ANC-3D, who stands in support of application.
5	Is there anyone here wishing to testify I mean,
6	anyone in support? Anyone wishing to speak in support?
7	We do have a letter from I've got to think.
8	We have a couple letters from neighbors who have written in
9	and supported their application.
10	Anyone here wishing to testify in opposition?
11	Anyone in opposition?
12	Then we would close the record on this matter,
13	and I would grant the I would move we grant the relief
14	requested for the special exception.
15	COMMISSIONER MAY: I would second it, and I would
16	also add the comment that I think that the addition is very
17	well designed to fit with the building and fit with the context,
18	and modest in scale and I appreciate that.
19	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Any further discussion,
20	Board? All those in favor of the motion, signify by saying
21	aye.
22	(Chorus of ayes)
23	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Those opposed, nay. The
24	motion carries. Mr. Moy?
25	MR MOY: Staff would record the vote as 4-0

1 This on the motion of Chairman Jordan to approve the amended relief for a special exception under Section 223 in 2001.3. 2 Second the motion, Mr. May. Also in support Vice Chair Allen 3 and Mr. Hinkle. Member not present. Motion carries. 4 5 CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, summary, please. 6 MR. MOY: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Thank you. 7 Next case? MR. MOY: Next application before the Board is 8 18864/18403. 9 This is the application of Roslyn Taylor. 10 As advertised, Mr. Chairman, advertised as 11 request for a modification of a previously approved special 12 exception order under Section 205, to allow expansion of a 13 child development center for 27 children and eight to nine 14 teachers at -- in the R-1-B District at premises 4428 Ord 15 16 Street, Northeast, Square 5117, Lot 838. CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, let's see how helpful 17 our Monday morning advice from Counsel was. I'll have to do 18 it here, because I missed the meeting yesterday. 19 Would you please identify yourself? 20 Good morning, Mr. Chair. For the 21 MR. HUGHES: record, my name is Dennis Hughes with the firm of Holland & 22 Knight, and joined with -- joining me today is Ms. Jessica 23 Bloomfield, also of Holland & Knight, and to my right is Ms. 24 25 Roslyn Taylor on behalf of the Applicant Lia's Rainbow Center.

1	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, Mr. Hughes, there's
2	a couple of issues here.
3	One, you're outside the filing for the
4	modification was outside the time frame for receiving the
5	modification.
6	So, we need you to file an application for this,
7	and pay the appropriate fees for the relief. The time period
8	had expired, when you filed for the modification.
9	So, therefore, the application is still not
10	alive. It requires you can't modify that which went out
11	of existence. So, we need you to do a new application.
12	We also need a new self-certification form, in
13	regards to this relief.
14	MR. HUGHES: Mr. Chair, I'm not following the
15	time limit concern.
16	With respect to the self-certification, we can
17	provide correspondence from the Ms. Taylor was actually
18	directed here by the Office of the Zoning Administrator, so
19	we can provide that documentation in their.
20	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, I'm going to ask OIG
21	to respond to timeliness.
22	MS. NAGELHOUT: The issue is that the when the
23	application was filed, the prior order was still in effect,
24	but has since expired, and you know, there was no
25	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay.

1	MS. NAGELHOUT: request for an extension.
2	So, that order the validity period of that order has expired.
3	So, that's why you would need a new ZA referral
4	or self-certification, in effect, a new application.
5	MR. HUGHES: Well, is it appropriate to dialogue
6	with this?
7	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes, go ahead, that's fine.
8	MR. HUGHES: I'm not following why the current
9	order 18403 is expired. We're operating under that order,
10	which I didn't understand had a time limit.
11	MS. NAGELHOUT: Well, the order itself has a time
12	two-year time limit, which ended, I think in September.
13	MR. HUGHES: Why does it have a two-year time
14	limit?
15	MS. NAGELHOUT: Because if you read the stuff at
16	the very end, it says, "This order is valid for a period of
17	two years."
18	MR. HUGHES: Unless within such period.
19	MS. NAGELHOUT: But it would you'd never ask
20	for an extension, is the point.
21	MR. HUGHES: But this is for special exception
22	of a child care center. It didn't have a lapse to it. We
23	weren't
24	MS. NAGELHOUT: Use to the lapse, just the order,
25	the validity of the order. So, this would be considered a new

1	application to expand an existing child development center.
2	MR. HUGHES: Okay.
3	MS. NAGELHOUT: Rather than to modify a prior
4	order.
5	MR. HUGHES: I'm not sure I agree with that, but
6	we're at the Board's you know, we're just following staff's
7	direction, and we'll certainly continue to do so, but there
8	is
9	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: This is what we're doing to
10	do. I am going to move that we waive any alleged untimeliness
11	here and that we take this as a modification, as requested.
12	MR. HUGHES: Thank you.
13	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Does that consensus with
14	the Board?
15	Yes, so, we'll make that by consensus.
16	Now, that we've taken care of procedural issues
17	here, I just have I guess there is really so, you're going
18	from you're going to have 27 children and nine teachers,
19	is that correct?
20	MR. HUGHES: That's correct.
21	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, so, it's an increase
22	of like 15 and so, it's an increase of 15 children and was
23	it another two?
24	MR. HUGHES: Two to three staff.
25	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Two to three staff persons,

1	and the you've seen the conditions recommended by the Office
2	of Planning?
3	MR. HUGHES: Yes, sir.
4	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Any issues with that?
5	MR. HUGHES: I'm sorry, could you repeat that?
6	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Any issues?
7	MR. HUGHES: Mr. Chairman.
8	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Let me go over them. So,
9	one is that the hours of operation shall be from 7:00 a.m. to
10	6:00 p.m.
11	MR. HUGHES: Seven a.m. to 6:00 a.m.
12	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Six a.m.?
13	MR. HUGHES: Twenty-three hours.
14	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: This is overnight, okay.
15	Yes, I'm sorry, a.m.
16	That the number of enrolled children shall not
17	exceed 27. The number of staff, including two onsite
18	residents shall not exceed nine.
19	Outdoor activities shall be supervised and
20	concluded by 8:00 p.m. Trash shall be kept onsite, collected
21	three times a week and the property shall be kept free of
22	debris.
23	Staff shall monitor the dropping off and picking
24	up of the children.
25	MR. HUGHES: Mr. Chair, the Applicant is

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

1	MR. HUGHES: The recycling occurs at the same
2	time as the trash removal.
3	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: All right, then I would
4	need to have input on the from the Office of Planning, who
5	suggested three times for this.
6	Board, any other questions of the Applicant?
7	Yes, please.
8	VICE CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Is the daycare now 23
9	hours?
10	MS. TAYLOR: Yes, ma'am.
11	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: It's 23 hours.
12	VICE CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Okay, thank you.
13	MS. TAYLOR: You're welcome.
14	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes, please.
15	COMMISSIONER MAY: So, what happened between the
16	last application and this one? I mean, why are you going so
17	much larger now?
18	MS. TAYLOR: Because of the needs of infant and
19	toddler slots in the District of Columbia.
20	D.C. bought out this grant earlier this year, for
21	infant and toddlers, and Lia's Rainbow/Roslyn Taylor happened
22	to be one of the recipients, who won that grant to do an addition
23	and increase the child care slots in the District.
24	COMMISSIONER MAY: So, you weren't going to do
25	an addition before?

1	MS. TAYLOR: No, sir.
2	COMMISSIONER MAY: That was just
3	MS. TAYLOR: No, sir.
4	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right, you were just going to
5	expand the capacity to 12, and that was what was approved, and
6	now, you've gotten a grant that allows you to go even bigger?
7	MS. TAYLOR: Yes, sir.
8	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay, thank you.
9	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes, it requires response
10	to the D.C. grant, wasn't that it?
11	MS. TAYLOR: Yes, sir.
12	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: That's what I thought,
13	okay. Ms. Allen?
14	VICE CHAIRMAN ALLEN: I just have one other
15	question.
16	How many of the children are infants? Toddlers?
17	Are they all?
18	MS. TAYLOR: No, we have six infants and six
19	toddlers currently.
20	VICE CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Okay, because I was
21	concerned and I guess we'll hear from OP, but I was concerned
22	that trash pick-up of sort of dirty soiled diapers, once a week,
23	might not be very healthy. Are you concerned about that? I
24	would be concerned about that.
25	MS. TAYLOR: Well, we did have concerns and we

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

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

CHAIRPERSON JORDAN:

25

It's sealed?

1	MS. TAYLOR: Yes, sir.
2	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Do you have a picture of it?
3	MS. TAYLOR: No, I don't.
4	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, that was my concern,
5	yes, okay.
6	All right, good. Yes, go ahead.
7	COMMISSIONER MAY: So, when you take the trash
8	out, is it all going to be bagged, as it goes into the dumpster,
9	when it goes into the dumpster? You need to be on the
10	microphone.
11	MS. TAYLOR: I'm sorry. The regular trash is
12	bagged and the diapers, we normally put them in a Genie bottle,
13	and tie the bags, seal them and put them in the bins.
14	COMMISSIONER MAY: What is a Genie bottle?
15	MS. TAYLOR: It's like it's like a diaper
16	pail, refill bags and we put them in this
17	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay.
18	MS. TAYLOR: so, it's seal-able.
19	COMMISSIONER MAY: Got it, okay.
20	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay.
21	COMMISSIONER MAY: So, it's sealed?
22	MS. TAYLOR: Yes, sir.
23	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Well, come on now.
24	Anyway, got it, okay.
25	COMMISSIONER MAY: Plenty of diaper time on my

1	side.
2	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, good. So, I don't
3	think there is anything else we need to hear from you, Mr.
4	Hughes, unless you something else you want to say.
5	Then we would modify this to one time for trash
6	pick up.
7	Board, any additional questions of the
8	Applicant? Mr. Cochran, anything additional you wanted to
9	say?
10	MR. COCHRAN: Just to be safe, you may want to
11	say something like in a sealed odor-free commercial container,
12	picked up by a professional service once a week.
13	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: We kind of hummed that
14	around, until we learned about the Genie bag.
15	MR. COCHRAN: You never know when they'll go out
16	of business.
17	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: All right, so, give me that
18	wording again.
19	MR. COCHRAN: A sealed odor-free commercial
20	container, to be picked up once a week by a commercial service.
21	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Mr. Hughes, you understand
22	what that request is? I think it's very reasonable.
23	MR. HUGHES: We agree, yes. Thank you, Mr.
24	Chair.
0.5	GUATERER GOVERNMENT OF THE STATE OF THE STAT

CHAIRPERSON JORDAN:

25

Okay, so, that is what

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

1	All right, I don't know if there is any need for
2	any rebuttal or closing, Mr. Hughes.
3	So, I would close the hearing, based upon the
4	record that we have, Board, any other discussion?
5	Then I would move that we grant the relief for
6	29 children and nine teachers, 10 teachers, and that the
7	conditions as read, with the modification to number five, that
8	required trash should be kept onsite and collected in a sealed,
9	odor-free commercial container and picked up once a week by
10	a commercial operation.
11	Okay, so, that would be my motion.
12	VICE CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Second.
13	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Motion made and seconded.
14	All those in favor, aye.
15	(Chorus of ayes)
16	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Those opposed, nay. The
17	motion carries. Mr. Moy?
18	MR. MOY: Staff would record the vote as 4-0.
19	This on the motion of Chairman Jordan to approve the request
20	for modification with the conditions as cited by the Board,
21	be amended - as amended.
22	Second the motion, Vice Chair Allen. Also in
23	support, Mr. May and Mr. Hinkle. We have member not present.
24	Motion carries, sir.
25	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Summary, please.

1	MR. MOY: Thank you.
2	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: All right, very good.
3	Thank you very much.
4	MS. TAYLOR: Thank you.
5	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: On 866.
6	MR. MOY: All right, next up is Application No.
7	18866. This is Planned Parenthood Association of D.C., as
8	advertised for variances from the Court under Section 536 and
9	parking requirements under Section 2101 and 2120, and a special
10	exception for office use under Section 508.
11	This is property in the SP-2 District at 1108 16th
12	Street, Northwest.
13	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, please identify
14	yourself.
15	MR. COCHRAN: Good morning. My name is
16	Christine Roddy and I am the attorney with Goulston & Storrs,
17	and with us today we have representatives of the Applicant.
18	We have both Ms. Lynn Hackney and Mr. Loren with us this
19	afternoon, and to my left, I have Erwin Andres, who is our
20	transportation consultant, and to my right, I have Jane Nelson,
21	who is our project architect.
22	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, a couple of things.
23	First, we'll grant the motion the request of the Office of
24	Planning and accept the report out of time.

If it's anybody else but you, Ms. Thomas, no.

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

We'll accept that report out of time.

2 Street Historic District. So, it's not a variance, and we are filing -- we 3 are also seeking a variance for the courtyard. The courtyard 4 5 would otherwise have to be 24 to -- 25 to 34 feet wide, and 6 we're providing a courtyard that is 14 feet wide. Just to back up, the property is currently 7 approved as a four-story office building that's owned and 8 operated by Planned Parenthood. 9 The first two floor facade, we will be retaining. 10 11 That is what has been deemed contributing to the Historic So, we will be retaining the first two floor 12 District. facades. 13 Planned Parenthood is relocating and we will be 14 redeveloping the site with an eight-story mixed office and 15 16 residential building. The office will consist of about 18,000 square feet and will have up to 17 residential units. 17 The project has simultaneously undergone review 18 by the Historic Preservation Review Board, which has granted 19 concept approval. We have gone to the ANC. The ANC has noted 20 that it has no objections to the project and we have the support 21 of the Office of Planning, as well as DDOT. 22 23 DDOT did have two recommendations in their 24 report, that we provide additional parking, and we have agreed 25 to do that.

since this is considered a contributing building to the 16th

We are working with DDOT on the exact dimensions 1 of what that bike parking will be, but we will be able to 2 3 accommodate the request. So, with that, I will turn to Ms. Jane Nelson 4 first, and she can walk through the roof trellises, as well 5 6 as the court and the parking. MS. NELSON: Good morning. Jane Nelson with 7 Nelson Architects. 8 I'll just quickly show you the location. 9 So, as Christine mentioned, it is within the 16th 10 11 Street Historic District, which terminates at the south from 12 -- at the White House. We are a few blocks north of that, south of Scott Circle. 13 It is a mid-block site. It is surrounded by 14 primarily commercial office buildings. 15 There is one 16 apartment building to the -- on the block to the south, and a representative of that apartment building did attend the ANC 17 Committee meeting, and they are in support of the project. 18 This is the context of the middle row of pictures, 19 it's our site. I quess you really can't see with the lights 20 on, but that is our site, right there. 21 Christine mentioned, it 22 As is an existing 23 four-story building, originally 1880, it was three row houses, three-story row houses, 1920, there was a new facade put on, 24 25 and then in 1954, a facade was added two stories to the top.

1 The site plan shows, you can just see the remnants of the row houses at the back, and there is a two-story addition 2 and a four-story at the front. 3 That is the current facade. The Historic 4 5 Preservation Office has concurred that the top two floors of 6 that facade are non-contributing and we are retaining the lower two floors of that historic facade. Everything behind it will 7 be removed. 8 The top row shows our new eight-story building 9 within that street scape. 10 As Christine mentioned, it is a mix-use project. 11 The existing two-story facade basically, acts as the organizer 12 of the new building with a three-bay division. 13 In keeping with 16th Street historic apartment 14 buildings, the organization vertically is base, shaft and 15 16 capital. We are -- this view shows to the side, the 17 courtyard and then we have a step-back out at the top floor. 18 The site plan here, this is the proposed site 19 So, you see the -- to the north top of the page is a 20 nine-story office building. To the left, the west across the 21 alley, is a 13-story office building, and then to the bottom, 22 23 the south is a five-story contributing historic building. The site is only 50-feet wide by 114 feet deep, 24 25 which did create a parking challenge.

As you can see from the first floor, so with --

you know, to do a below grade parking, the ramp is roughly 20 2 The drive aisle is 20 feet. 3 That leaves roughly less than 10 feet for -- we could have parallel parking on that lower 4 5 level. If we didn't do the ramp and you just parked 6 surface on the site, essentially, we would be pulling up to 7 the front of the building, behind the historic facade. 8 We certainly wouldn't want to see a garage, parking garage behind 9 the facade. 10 In addition to the fact again, at the width. 11 So, 12 the entry to the building with the core and the elevator, by the time you provide those elements, there is virtually nothing 13 14 left for the parking. The existing office building does have parking 15 16 at the rear of the building, and that is essentially where we 17 are providing parking. We are providing -- the existing building has 18 We are providing three, partly because we have 19 five spaces. to require -- we need to provide a van space, which has a much 20 wider requirement than the standard space. 21 We are -- there is -- just a note that one of the 22 23 spaces does allow for a smart-car size parking space. I will jump to the trellis, and we are not asking 24 25 for relief on those. They would be, you know, open trellises.

1	This is the roof plan. They would be eight-feet
2	tall, set back eight feet, minimum of eight feet. So, it would
3	be the one-to-one set back.
4	The penthouse, we are not asking for relief on
5	that, as well.
6	So, they would be basically, the architectural
7	embellishments for terraces roof terraces on the project.
8	The trellis that you see in the this corner
9	right here is actually the walk-out terrace at the eighth
10	floor. So, it does two things. One, it provides a very nice
11	for that unit, but also it cuts away that top element for the
12	court and brings additional eastern light into that court, and
13	that's if you have any questions on that, I'm happy to
14	answer.
15	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes, Ms. Allen?
16	VICE CHAIRMAN ALLEN: I have a couple of
17	questions. You said that you had to you were required to
18	have a van? Could you explain that a little more?
19	MS. NELSON: Sure.
20	VICE CHAIRMAN ALLEN: I'm sorry, you said that
21	you were required to have a van?
22	MS. NELSON: Accessible space, yes, has to be
23	you have to provide a van parking space.
24	VICE CHAIRMAN ALLEN: So, it's for I mean,
25	it's ADA accessible, okay.

1	MS. NELSON: And in this case, it also you
2	know, it helps for any short-term drop-off loading/unloading.
3	VICE CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Okay, and then you said
4	I think you said a smart-car? You had space for it? Is that
5	in addition to the three spaces that you were
6	MS. NELSON: That's in addition, yes, it's just
7	a note.
8	VICE CHAIRMAN ALLEN: All right.
9	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes, Mr. May?
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: So, why isn't a trellis
11	considered a roof structure?
12	MS. NELSON: It is 51 percent open and it's an
13	architectural
14	COMMISSIONER MAY: That means it's not it's
15	not a floor. It's the roof on it, but I don't understand why
16	it wouldn't be a structure.
17	I mean, we see roof trellises all the time that
18	are attached to penthouses and if they're not at the same height
19	as the penthouse, they require relief.
20	So, I don't understand why it wouldn't be a roof
21	the roof structure why it would not be considered a roof
22	structure.
23	MS. NELSON: The penthouse is 18.6.
24	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.
25	MS. NELSON: And we were certainly just trying

1	to minimize the from the Historic Preservation standpoint.
2	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.
3	MS. NELSON: Views from across the street.
4	COMMISSIONER MAY: Well, I mean, I understand
5	why you wouldn't want to have them at 18.6, and guess I wouldn't
6	have any problem with them being I don't know.
7	I mean, I think that there has to be some sort
8	of explicit form of relief, in order to have the trellises up
9	there, if they're not going to be, you know, at a uniform
10	height, and set back one-to-one.
11	MS. RODDY: Right, and we would be comfortable
12	requesting that relief if the Board would consider it.
13	We can review the roof plan, but as we said, the
14	roof structures would be set back from a one-to-one structure,
15	and a one-to-one set back.
16	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay.
17	MS. RODDY: And they would be at a 51 percent open
18	to the sky.
19	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay.
20	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes.
21	COMMISSIONER MAY: I'm not sure what how we'd
22	want to handle it, but I'm interested in hearing, maybe what
23	the Office of Planning has to say about it.
24	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Mr. Hinkle?
25	MEMBER HINKLE: Yes, thank you. I want to get

1	to the the requested relief for the parking.
2	I'm a little bit concerned about this. It's a
3	contributing structure, is what I am hearing, to the Historic
4	District, but you're only preserving just the first two floors
5	of the facade, is that correct?
6	MS. RODDY: That is correct, and for the width
7	of the lot along 16 Street, yes.
8	MEMBER HINKLE: And everything behind that
9	facade is demolished?
10	MS. RODDY: Correct.
11	MEMBER HINKLE: And you're asking for special
12	exception relief for the parking, under 2120.6.
13	So, just reading that, so, the Board can grant
14	relief from the parking requirements, as a result and I'm
15	going to quote this, "As a result of the location of the
16	historic resource, providing that the required parking will
17	result in significant architectural or structural difficulty
18	in maintaining the historic integrity or appearance of the
19	historic resource."
20	So, how would providing the required parking
21	result in some significant architectural or structural
22	difficulty in maintaining those first two floors of the facade?
23	MS. NELSON: Well, it's a combination of the site
24	width of the and the length of the lot, as well as the facade.
25	So, to do a below grade, as I discussed earlier,

2 the drive aisle, and then a 19-foot depth parking space. If you could do parallel spaces, those are 3 basically 20 feet long. You'd still only get a couple of 4 5 spaces down there. So, a ramp below grade structure is impractical. 6 If we just -- if we got rid of the ramp and 7 basically surface-parked under the building, again, 8 negative and impractical things. 9 One, we still have to have the core and the 10 11 corridor to get to that core. So, that basically adds up to about 15 feet of that 48 feet inside clear. So, that doesn't 12 leave enough for the surface parking on that first floor. 13 The negative to that is, we'd have to provide a 14 certain depth behind that facade, of actual occupied space, 15 16 so the facade doesn't -- behind that beautiful, classical 17 facade, does not -- you don't see a parking garage. But essentially the arguments 18 MEMBER HINKLE: I just heard from you are for a variance and not necessarily 19 a special exception, related to preservation of this historic 20 facade. 21 I mean, for me, the special exception gets to the 22 23 point of preserving a historic resource, and right, I am just not getting the relationship between the parking relief and 24 25 preserving the facade itself without additional structure

the width, the math basically doesn't work with the ramp width,

behind it.

MS. RODDY: Well, I think part of it goes to the point that below grade parking could compromise the facade, when you do the excavation below the building, as well as what she had said, it's a combination of preserving some space behind the existing facade.

So, it maintains that appearance along 16th Street and the providing the core.

I think though from what she had said, and we also have Mr. Andres here to discuss the impacts, which is part of the requirement as well, that this case also would fit the variance and satisfy the variance requirement.

It's unique in that it is only 50 feet wide and it also has those two -- first two floors that must be preserved, and we get the practical difficulty for all the reasons that Ms. Nelson just 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

1	public transportation, as well.
2	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: At some point, we're going
3	to keep hearing that argument. It's going to blow up.
4	MEMBER HINKLE: Yes, I mean, we hear this all the
5	time, right.
6	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Everybody uses the same
7	argument
8	MEMBER HINKLE: Right.
9	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: up and down the block,
10	throughout the District, and everybody is saying that no one
11	is going to park, but there's an awful lot of cars around, and
12	anyway, we'll get to that, under Mr. Andres.
13	But let me ask you. So, you could keep the five
14	spaces, but could you because you're eliminating two of the
15	spaces you already have, I mean, without impacting the
16	historical nature of the property.
17	MS. NELSON: We would not be able to get five.
18	The very most we could get would be four, because we are still
19	required the van space. So, again, it's a math. It's a
20	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: That's your election
21	though, right?
22	MS. NELSON: No, no, it's a requirement.
23	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: The van spaces.
24	MS. NELSON: The accessible van space.
25	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay.
J	i

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

38 1 With respect to the relief requested, it's to know, you know, basically where and 2 important what characteristics contribute to the parking demand. 3 With respect to the site location itself, as 4 shown on the screen, it's -- the site is located west of 16th 5 Street, just north of L, and if you notice the -- there are 6 three accessible metro-rail stations within three blocks, that 7 include two to three different lines with Farragut North on 8 the red line, and Farragut West and McPherson Square on the 9 blue and orange. 10 11 It's important that we are providing access to 12

three spaces behind the garage with an alley, a public alley that extends from L Street and dead-ends mid-block behind the property.

With respect to the relief, next slide, the relief that is being sought consists of 13 spaces. Currently, we're providing three, so the relief we're requesting is 10 spaces.

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.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	With respect to the justification itself, and Γ
2	think this goes to the heart of the issue, we believe that the
3	the parking that's provided and the amenities that are in
4	and around the site, as well as the demographics associated
5	with residents in and around the subject property, lends itself
6	to the amount of parking that we're providing.
7	With respect to the actual demographics from the
8	census tract, 60 percent of the two census tracts that this
9	site is located in and near, do not owe cars. So, there is
10	60 percent non-vehicle ownership.
11	The District average is in the 50 percent range.
12	So, it's a higher non-auto ownership, as compared to the
13	overall District.
14	With respect to destination of journey to work
15	information, which is information related to how people get
16	to and from work, 78 percent of the residents in the households
17	in these two census tracts where the site is located do not
18	drive to work.
19	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Seventy?
20	MR. ANDRES: Seventy-eight percent. So, only
21	22 percent either drive or car-pool to work, of the residents
22	that live in this within the census tracts.
23	So, it's important to note that even if they do
24	own a car, there is a portion that don't use their car to go
25	to work.

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

1	MR. ANDRES: No, I understand that, but you know,
2	certain residential developments attract certain types of
3	residents.
4	There are some residents that are not close to
5	the metro and have no real proximity to some of the amenities
6	that drive non-auto
7	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: But I thought you said in
8	your hypothesis that you included the people in the type of
9	area that this building is, with this same type of situation,
10	that's 78 percent.
11	MR. ANDRES: Yes, that's correct. So, with
12	respect to that 78
13	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: So, that would include the
14	same issue with being near mass transportation, etcetera.
15	MR. ANDRES: Yes, that's correct, but this also
16	includes some other residential buildings within the area that
17	have parking.
18	So, in this instance, we have a limited number
19	of parking, so, the way that the marketing for this
20	development, as well as other developments like this, are
21	looking to attract people who either are currently not reliant
22	on their personal vehicle or choose to live near where they
23	work.
24	I wouldn't be surprised if some of the residents
25	live within the Golden Triangle downtown bid area. So, that

they choose that -- you know, they'd rather spend their money 1 not on transportation, but obviously higher housing costs. 2 CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Where 3 your presentation, I didn't see it, maybe I missed it, where you've 4 5 offered some type of mitigation or deterrent for people to 6 park, to have cars, who want to park in this building? ANDRES: Well, with 7 MR. respect the 8 mitigation, I am going through that. So, the first is obviously, the demographic cuts 9 out a whole bunch of people --10 asking 11 CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: I'm for this 12 building, what are you -- what is being placed for this building, that's going to discourage people from owning cars? 13 Well, with respect to the TDM plan, 14 MR. ANDRES: the Transportation Demand Management 15 plan provides 16 opportunities to disseminate information, so that those who are non -- who are not inclined to drive or own a car, to get 17 the information they need to be able to access bike-share, 18 car-share, metro-rail, future street car line and there is 20 19 bus lines within three blocks of this site. 20 21 addition to that, we're providing each residential unit, car-share membership or capital bike-share 22 23 memberships, so it helps stimulate that environment of providing non-auto modes to commute, and then we're providing 24

onsite bicycling, which we've committed to as part of our

1 response to DDOT comments. addition to that, in our report, 2 identified a graphic that shows 34 offsite parking garages. 3 CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Now, let me ask you. 4 Does your TDM include that which has been offered from Department 5 Did it consolidate, because I --6 of Transportation? MR. ANDRES: No, it did not. Our TDM includes 7 a commitment to provide bicycle parking. 8 DDOT's comments identifies what that commitment should be, and we're committed 9

CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay.

to meet DDOT's requirements.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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.

So, if there are residents that come that -- if they're visitors for the residents during the day that don't have parking, they can park in those facilities, but the residents themselves have access to the green facilities, which provide overnight parking.

So, those green facilities, and there are 12 of

2	then within three blocks of the site, that provide the
3	necessary sort of overflow relief, with respect to parking
4	supply, in the event that despite all of the recommendations
5	that we're identifying, in the event that somebody still wants
6	to drive, there is an opportunity for them to use one of these
7	offsite parking garages that do provide overnight parking.
8	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Has the Applicant made any
9	arrangements with one of the parking garages?
10	MS. RODDY: Yes, we have made arrangements for
11	overflow parking in a garage next to the building.
12	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay.
13	MS. RODDY: And just to clarify, I know that we
14	were anticipating in the math that we did before, that there
15	would be 34 residents. We would anticipate there would
16	actually be 24 residents. We don't expect to have two
17	residents in the one-bedroom units.
18	So, with 24 residents in the building, that would
19	really be five spaces. The 22 percent comes out to five
20	spaces.
21	So, just wanted to clarify that. That's a
22	two-space overflow from what we're providing in that, we've
23	made arrangements, like I said, for overflow parking in a
24	neighboring garage.
25	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: So, what kind of

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

	specifically asked that question, in order to secure space
2	with the contract. You have to start paying a monthly fee,
3	that's the only way to secure them.
4	I'm happy to get that in writing from them, if
5	you'd like.
6	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, go ahead, please, go
7	ahead.
8	VICE CHAIRMAN ALLEN: So, when you I'm just
9	trying to understand what it is that when you talk to these,
10	what did you envision or what is your as you get closer to
11	it, what would be the contract that you would be seeking?
12	I guess I'm just trying to understand what is it
13	that you actually would are thinking about providing?
14	MS. HACKNEY: Sure, and coincidentally, my
15	office was directly across from both these garages for 11
16	years. We just moved to 14th Street a few months ago.
17	So, I personally used both of these garages for
18	11 years for my staff. So, I'm very familiar with the people
19	and how they run and how it works.
20	So, you lease each month, it's a 30-day renewable
21	and they charge anywhere from \$215 currently, to \$250 a month
22	for these spaces, and there is no they will not offer you
23	a long-term contract, but in 11 years, I never had an issue
24	renewing as many spaces as I needed for my staff.
25	We would have as few as 10 a month or as many as

1	20, depending on who needed parking at any given time.
2	VICE CHAIRMAN ALLEN: So, then with are you
3	talking about your former staff or the current staff, because
4	then that would indicate that you have anywhere from 10 to 20
5	people that are going to need parking spaces on any given month.
6	MS. HACKNEY: Well, we moved to 14th Street.
7	I'm just referencing that, because I've used these exact two
8	parking garages for a number of years.
9	VICE CHAIRMAN ALLEN: That's what I was asking.
10	So, the folks who you yes, right. So, Planned Parenthood
11	moved, but the people who are going to be in this building are
12	the ones that you're referencing, the five spaces or whatever
13	the 10 people, the 24, I got you.
14	MS. HACKNEY: Okay.
15	VICE CHAIRMAN ALLEN: All right.
16	MS. HACKNEY: Thank you.
17	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, anything else?
18	COMMISSIONER MAY: No, Chairman.
19	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: All right, anything else,
20	Ms. Roddy?
21	MS. RODDY: That's our presentation. I would
22	just add that, you know, we have advertised for a variance
23	relief for the courtyard, so if you'd be more comfortable in
24	proceeding with a variance for the parking, which as we walked

1	can satisfy parking.
2	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Well, if we're going to
3	I was going to take a break, but let me ask you, because that
4	just raised another issue, that I remember I had in my notes.
5	What do you claim is unique about this building?
6	MS. RODDY: This lot is only 50-feet wide, so
7	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Are there other buildings
8	on that other buildings on that in that block 50 feet
9	wide?
10	MS. RODDY: While we're looking for the
11	MS. NELSON: Is your question are there 50-foot
12	wide lots that provide parking? Is that the question?
13	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: I didn't ask all of that.
14	I'm just talking about the uniqueness for the building, that
15	you're your argument is for uniqueness, why you claim the
16	building is unique for the variance relief?
17	MS. NELSON: The 50-foot wide goes to the
18	difficulty and the impracticality of providing the parking.
19	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: I'm talking about step one,
20	not step two.
21	MS. RODDY: Right, it's a conflict of the width
22	of the lot, as well as the fact that we have to preserve the
23	first two floors, the first two-floor facade, and that
24	together, since the facade runs from north to south for the
25	entirety of the lot, creates the practical difficulty and the

uniqueness of the site.
CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: So, there is no other
building that has this historic significance on that block?
Is that what you're saying?
MS. RODDY: No, I'm not saying that there are no
other buildings. I am saying that the create the width of
this lot, coupled with the historic and the requirement to
provide parking.
The other properties on this site, I don't know
what their situation with parking is.
CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: All right, so, but you're
making the argument that this building is unique compared to
other buildings and other situations, and I'm saying you're
talking about your building.
MS. RODDY: Yes, and our's is a facade. I don't
know what the other historic attributes would be. They may
not be have to preserve the building, which would create
a different uniqueness.
Our's would be the
CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: But that's something you
just pulled out the air, without doing the research to find
out.
You know the standard better than I do, and the
fact that almost every building has something that they
consider themselves unique about it, but actually, we look at

1 it as required within the realm of the immediate universe, it 2 may not be. So, we're going to give you a change to deal with 3 that, and let's take a break for five. Five minutes. 4 5 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 10:56 a.m. and resumed at 11:03 a.m.) 6 7 CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, sorry, can 8 proceed, back in session. Thank you. Do you want to proceed? You had asked us --9 MS. RODDY: Well, wait. 10 CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Do we have Do you need seats? Yes, let's -- please, let's take 11 seats? 12 seats and -- thank you. MS. RODDY: You had asked us what was unique 13 14 about this property and if there were any other properties that were similarly wide, and if you look at the plot for Square 15 16 183, and I'm looking at one that was in Exhibit-C of our initial submission. 17 You'll note that the property to the south of us 18 is similarly wide, whereas the properties to the north, 19 directly to the north is considerably wider, as well as the 20 21 property north of that. Property north of that is narrow, as well. 22 The 23 difference though with our property is that we have no access 24 to L Street, as the practice -- property to our south does, and we have no access to an alley along the east-wide width 25

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

1	up with what the
2	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes, right.
3	COMMISSIONER MAY: The way our documents are
4	listed.
5	MS. RODDY: I'm sorry.
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: It's in the tab.
7	MS. RODDY: I am looking, essentially, we have
8	a plot, as well as a zoning map. The zoning map is it can
9	easily be used, as well.
10	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Let's proceed on it. You
11	might have to submit that, and more, that's not off the hip,
12	so that we can verify it, because I'm not going to hold up the
13	hearing for this, and because that's something that should have
14	been pointed out to us, and before. So, let's proceed on
15	it.
16	I don't think we're going to make a decision on
17	this, because there is some additional information that we're
18	going to need. That is one.
19	Any other questions of the Applicant at this
20	particular point?
21	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, I'm by the way, I
22	think we have the zoning map on Exhibit-11, right, which does
23	show it.
24	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Exhibit-11?
25	COMMISSIONER MAY: So, explain again, now that

1	we have this exhibit in front of us.
2	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Eleven?
3	COMMISSIONER MAY: Eleven, yes. If you might,
4	exactly what the your argument about the the wide why
5	it's different compared to the neighbors.
6	MS. RODDY: Yes. So, we're Lot 111, and you'll
7	note that we are similarly wide as Lot 106 to our south, Lot
8	98 and 91 to our north is narrower.
9	Lots 881 and Lot 105 are considerably wider, and
10	then Lot 884 also in our square, is much wider.
11	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: One-zero-six, what did you
12	say about 106?
13	MS. RODDY: It's similarly wide as our lot. So,
14	yes.
15	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: They're the same?
16	MS. RODDY: Yes.
17	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
18	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Got you, all right, that's
19	all right.
20	MS. RODDY: So, I would say out of those six lots,
21	one lot is narrower and one is the same as our's. The others
22	are much wider.
23	Of the two lots that one is narrow or similarly
24	wide, Lot 91 has access all along the length of it, along the
25	alley.

1	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Lot 91?
2	MS. RODDY: Yes, at the north to the north.
3	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Give me one second. I'm
4	going to have to enlarge this.
5	Ninety-one, over here, okay, is that 91? It's
6	upside down. Okay, I got you, 91 is what now?
7	MS. RODDY: It has access. You have the 16th
8	Street frontage as well as the frontage all on the east-west
9	length of that lot from the alley.
10	Similarly, Lot 106, which is similarly wide, has
11	16th Street access, as well as L Street and again, that's all
12	the entire length of that east-west length of that lot.
13	Our lot only has access from the alley in the
14	rear, for the 30-foot length of that lot. So, we have less
14 15	rear, for the 30-foot length of that lot. So, we have less flexibility in how to access or position the parking on our
15	flexibility in how to access or position the parking on our
15 16	flexibility in how to access or position the parking on our lot. It can only we'll never get approval to access parking
15 16 17	flexibility in how to access or position the parking on our lot. It can only we'll never get approval to access parking from 16th Street. I mean, well, even if we didn't have the
15 16 17 18	flexibility in how to access or position the parking on our lot. It can only we'll never get approval to access parking from 16th Street. I mean, well, even if we didn't have the facades.
15 16 17 18 19	flexibility in how to access or position the parking on our lot. It can only we'll never get approval to access parking from 16th Street. I mean, well, even if we didn't have the facades. But so, we can only look at the alley and the
15 16 17 18 19 20	flexibility in how to access or position the parking on our lot. It can only we'll never get approval to access parking from 16th Street. I mean, well, even if we didn't have the facades. But so, we can only look at the alley and the the access is from that point, whereas the others would have
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	flexibility in how to access or position the parking on our lot. It can only we'll never get approval to access parking from 16th Street. I mean, well, even if we didn't have the facades. But so, we can only look at the alley and the the access is from that point, whereas the others would have more flexibility.

CHAIRPERSON JORDAN:

25

They have access to the --

1	but I
2	COMMISSIONER MAY: Does 105 have parking in the
3	building?
4	MR. ANDRES: If you look actually, one of our
5	graphics show where the existing garages are.
6	None of the garages none of the buildings on
7	that square have garages, on that on our side of the alley.
8	All of the buildings that Ms. Roddy referenced
9	do not have parking.
10	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: They have no parking?
11	MR. ANDRES: Yes.
12	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: On that block?
13	MR. ANDRES: Well, there is no structured
14	parking in the building. So, they might have
15	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: In the building, they have
16	it on the property?
17	MR. ANDRES: If they do, it might be one or two
18	spaces in the alley, but not you know, nothing of
19	significance.
20	COMMISSIONER MAY: And 105 is a taller building,
21	is it not? That's the one to the north.
22	MS. RODDY: Yes, that is the taller building.
23	COMMISSIONER MAY: That is the taller building,
24	and 106 is the historic building on the corner that was just
25	redone, and they took off all the stucco or faux stucco, and

1	that doesn't have any parking in it, as I recall. That's a
2	historic building, right?
3	MS. RODDY: Correct.
4	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. So, we've seen many
5	cases where parking is extremely difficult because of the width
6	of or because of a dimension of the property, because you
7	know, you have a certain floor plate that is really necessary,
8	in order to have efficient structured parking.
9	Can you tell us what that might be? I mean, is
10	it does it become efficient at 60 feet? Eighty feet?
11	One-hundred feet?
12	MS. RODDY: Yes.
13	COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Andres is going to
14	answer, so, I'm interested in both, you know, whoever wants
15	to go first, but what you both have to say.
16	MS. NELSON: Yes, a 60-foot wide actually, so,
17	you have a 20-foot aisle, a 19-foot space on either side, that
18	allows for the two two feet for the exterior walls.
19	So, 60 feet was the magic number, where you could
20	provide a ramp down. That ramp then turns into a drive aisle.
21	You have parking on one side of that, and a few parking spaces
22	that could fit under the top of the ramp.
23	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay, and remind me again,
24	the width of the property.
25	MS. NELSON: Fifty feet.

1	COMMISSIONER MAY: Fifty feet, exactly, okay,
2	and but even at 60 feet, you've got room for two sets of spaces
3	on either side, and then one drive aisle, right? You don't
4	necessarily get a turnaround necessary for a ramp.
5	MR. ANDRES: Well, in that instance, you're
6	actually only have one side
7	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.
8	MR. ANDRES: and you can park on a few spaces,
9	underneath the ramp that's coming down.
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.
11	MR. ANDRES: So, depending what that clearance
12	is, you might squeeze some under the ramp, but other than that,
13	yes, that's all you're limited to.
14	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right, right. So, more or
15	less, everything that's I mean, that's not a I don't know,
16	probably 80 or 100 feet wide, it's not going to be very
17	efficient parking?
18	MR. ANDRES: In addition to that, there is a
19	depth issue, because if you start the ramp from the alley
20	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.
21	MR. ANDRES: and drop down, you know,
22	depending on what the depth of that lot is, there is also some
23	constraints, unless that ramp is, you know, upwards of 15 to
24	16 percent.
25	COMMISSIONER MAY: So, did you look at doing the

1 steepest possible ramp and getting down to a single parking level, instead of having those cellar apartments, and what kind 2 of numbers did you get out of that? 3 MS. NELSON: Yes, we did look at that and again, 4 5 the only parking that we -- we couldn't fit the perpendicular 6 We could only fit a row of parallel parking, and those spaces actually take like 21 to 22 feet in length because 7 8 of the --Right. 9 COMMISSIONER MAY: MS. NELSON: -- maneuvering ability, and so, if 10 you use the full lot of 114 feet, you basically get four --11 12 you know, five spaces. And you get three, maybe four 13 COMMISSIONER MAY: 14 outside, and I mean, the current design shows three and you could get a fourth, possibly. 15 16 MS. NELSON: Possibly. Well, you would have to -- the 20 -- you need to subtract the 20 feet for the drive 17 aisle, plus another five feet for pedestrian access. So, that 18 19 is --No, I'm not talking about 20 COMMISSIONER MAY: I'm talking about what -- you know, having a garage 21 additive. versus having the surface parking. The surface parking gets 22 23 -- your current scheme is three spaces, and then if you -- but if instead, you had a ramp down into the building, you would 24 25 get four or five spaces, you say.

On the surface or below? 1 MS. NELSON: COMMISSIONER MAY: Below. 2 MS. RODDY: Correct, and again, our current 3 scheme, it's three zoning compliance spaces, a fourth that does 4 5 not meet the zoning requirements. COMMISSIONER MAY: Got it, okay. So, Ms. Roddy, 6 7 lots of this size are fairly frequently developed for office or apartments, and the argument is typically made that a 8 variance is needed for parking in a -- because of these sorts 9 of circumstances. 10 In those kinds of cases, are they typically, you 11 12 know, truly unique properties, where you know, everything else on the block is 100 feet wide and this one only happens to be 13 50 feet, and so, therefore, it can't fit, or is it often in 14 places where there are other properties on the block that are 15 16 the same width or narrower? Well, I think again, we are -- the 17 MS. RODDY: difference here is that we're in the 16th Street historic 18 So, our frontage along 16th Street doesn't help us 19 district. with our access, and we have to preserve those first two floors. 20 So, I think that this situation is -- I know that 21 there are other situations where the lots aren't wide enough 22 23 to accommodate the parking, but this is the situation of both of those issues. 24

As we -- we wouldn't be able to provide -- I mean,

1 assuming we were located elsewhere in the District, we could 2 come off of the front, provide some parking from the front, and then provide additional parking, surface parking from the 3 alley. 4 But given that the fact that we have to preserve 5 the facade along the front, we can't do that. We're limited 6 7 only to the alley access, and I think that it's those factors that create the uniqueness. 8 COMMISSIONER MAY: What I was trying to do was 9 get a baseline for how -- just how unique a 50-foot wide 10 11 property can be, because it seems to me that when it comes to 12 building a building of any size on a 50-foot wide lot, that it's going to be a challenge to provide parking, no matter what, 13 14 and somehow in those cases, a case is made that the property is unique, even though there might be other 50-foot wide 15 16 properties on the block. Would you agree with that? I guess it's hard to say. Out of --17 MS. RODDY: without the context, but there could be a uniqueness about that 18 building, even if there are other 50-foot wide lots that are 19 on the same --20 Right. 21 COMMISSIONER MAY: 22 MS. RODDY: -- square. 23 COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay, all right. Thank you. 24 CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: All right, couple of 25 questions.

One, looking at your TDM, really not excited

2	about the fact that you're saying for only the first new
3	tenants, the first occupants of the building will be granted
4	the bike-share membership and etcetera. If it's something
5	I would want to see this to have for every first every new
6	tenant.
7	Additionally, is there anything that you're
8	proposing for your lease, that says that tenants can't have
9	a car?
10	MS. HACKNEY: Mr. Chairman, the units in this
11	building are going to be for-sale condominiums, and not rental,
12	in which case, the condominium documents would obviously be
13	handled by the residents and what they want to do, going
14	forward.
15	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Now it gives us a little bit
16	more 'umph' that we can use.
17	We would need that does not stop the condo
18	documents that have a covenant that they cannot owners in
19	this building cannot have cars.
20	Additionally, then we're talking about and
21	going further about additional sales of the building and the
22	condo docs, that the association makes sure that they are
23	provided the bike-share member, etcetera and car-share
24	membership.
25	I don't see that in your TDM kind of offering

here.

Here is the problem. You know, it's not just that you get passed us today and that, these things go away, once you walk out this room.

These buildings have a history and a whole life, and as you know, parking is a major, major issue in the District, and we see it all the time, and some of these reports from -- some other or some transportation experts, I can just take it, change the name of the Applicant and just put a new name on it, because they all read the same. They're all quessing about what is going to happen.

We put in these measures and what -- and parking is the issue, even places where there has been granted relief, based upon some of the same arguments that people aren't going to have parking in the District, and nobody is going to drive, and sure enough, those aspects of this, those buildings are up for a little bit, we find out people have cars, have parking, because they decide one, not just they have to go to work, but how are they going to get groceries on the weekend, and we're not taking the groceries on the metro, all of those kind of things.

So, we take it real serious, and I'm just saying to you, it's not the convenience of the Applicant. It's the convenience of the citizens of the District of Columbia, okay. That's really what we're looking at.

1	So, I raise these issues with you to see if you're
2	looking at the alternatives. I looked at your TDM, and I'm
3	like, "Oh my God, come on. This is drive-by TDM."
4	This Board has been more restrictive, have we
5	not, regarding TDM's and you know, you know first hand, Mr.
6	Andres, how we have been with TDM.
7	So, I just put I put forth to you, is it Ms.
8	Hackney?
9	MS. HACKNEY: That's correct.
10	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Ms. Hackney, that the fact
11	that they're condos versus apartments, that doesn't get you
12	any points with us, per se.
13	MS. HACKNEY: Fair enough.
14	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Because they have to be
15	real issues here and
16	MS. HACKNEY: Well, I mean, is the request that
17	you want to require in perpetuity?
18	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Well, I was just asking
19	you, have you considered what are those type of things, because
20	we have if you kind of follow and track how this Board has
21	operated, we're asking for those things.
22	We're asking, and I don't think this is kind
23	of RPP block, because it's a commercial street, so you can't
24	do RPP anyway, but if had it been a residential area, we would
25	have requested that, in addition.

1	MS. HACKNEY: I think that what we run into is
2	with the Condominium Board. We can put requirements and condo
3	docs from the initial public offering statement, but if the
4	Board subsequently votes to do something differently, we have
5	to
6	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: No, that doesn't that's
7	recorded with this property, that will go through that will
8	stay with this land, and everybody will be required to follow.
9	That's not the
10	MS. HACKNEY: Okay, I won't argue the legality
11	piece of it, but that's just based on experience, so, okay.
12	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, I'm just trying to
13	get you there, because I'm telling you, you've got a lift, and
14	I know you got a lift with this Board and as you can see, we
15	take these things really, really serious.
16	Okay, so, Board, any other questions?
17	Applicant, anything else you want to say before we go to the
18	Office of Planning?
19	Anybody? No? Please, then Ms. Thomas.
20	MS. THOMAS: Good morning, Mr. Chair. Karen
21	Thomas with the Office of Planning, for the record.
22	We are going to stand on the record of our report.
23	We've reviewed the application of a special exception,
24	including the parking issue that you're focusing on.
25	I'd just like to highlight one issue with respect

You were asking whether the property was unique 2 and to what extent, but when you -- the variance test requires 3 that there is an exceptional narrowness, and I would position 4 5 -- position that with respect to parking, it is exceptionally 6 narrow to provide parking on that site, because as Miss -- as the Applicant Ms. Roddy stated, there is a magic number to --7 and width, to be able to provide that situation below grade. 8 I'd be happy to take any other questions. 9 Yes, please. 10 CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: COMMISSIONER MAY: So, did you, either initially 11 or since I raised the issue, look into the question of the 12 trellises of the roof? 13 Well, since you raised the guestion 14 MS. THOMAS: with the trellises, having discussed it with other staff 15 16 members, this did not raise a red flag for us, because it was 17 open. We looked at it as an embellishment, and as in 18 the past, we have not had any issues with it, and based on DCRA's 19 interpretation in the past, this is --20 COMMISSIONER MAY: They wouldn't consider it a 21 roof structure, just because it doesn't have a roof over it. 22 23 MS. THOMAS: No, because it was 51 percent open, 24 because it was an open structure. 25 COMMISSIONER Okay, but penthouses MAY:

1

to the condition.

1 frequently don't have roofs at all. They're open to the sky and they just have enclosing walls. 2 So, those aren't roof structures, either? 3 MS. THOMAS: That would -- that is classified as 4 5 a roof -- a penthouse is classified as a roof structure, but a trellis has not been in the past. So, we did not --6 COMMISSIONER MAY: But I mean, usually they're 7 attached to the -- the penthouses are often -- they're attached 8 to the penthouse, in fact, part of this one is attached to the 9 10 penthouse. You know, the openness has never been a subject 11 of debate in my experience. I mean, that didn't -- that 12 suddenly didn't -- that did not suddenly get you a free pass. 13 I mean, my -- you know, unless somebody can show 14 me in the regulations, why I'm wrong, my conclusion is that 15 16 those trellises are roof structures and that means roof structures, possibly separate roof structures, and roof 17 structures requiring relief due to unequal heights, and 18 potentially even set-back issues, because of where they are 19 placed relative to the courtyard, because often, we wind up 20 having to grant explicit relief for set-back from courtyards. 21 In fact, we have that for the stairway exit from 22 23 the rear top floor unit, where it's not set back from the 24 courtyard.

I think all these things need to be addressed

1	explicitly and somebody needs to demonstrate why relief is not
2	needed or you need to request the relief, and I'd be very
3	interested in seeing what the Office of Planning has to say
4	about that, because I mean, you know, I'm just doing it based
5	on my recollection of past cases, when these sorts of issues
6	have come up and how we've addressed trellises in the past,
7	and what I'm seeing here is not consistent with what has
8	happened in the past.
9	My memory could be faulty. It could be that
10	you're you know, you're absolutely right, and everybody
11	and I'm the one in the wrong, and somebody just needs to show
12	me why I'm wrong.
13	MS. THOMAS: Okay, we'll be happy to look at it
14	further.
15	COMMISSIONER MAY: Thank you.
16	MS. THOMAS: Thank you.
17	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Anybody else, questions
18	for Office of Planning?
19	Applicant, questions for Office of Planning?
20	Okay, anyone here from Department of
21	Transportation? Yes, there he is. I'm sorry, I'm looking
22	right at you. Go ahead, please. Thank you for coming.
23	20: Happy to be here. I will largely stand on
24	the record
25	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Please identify yourself.

1	MR. ROGERS: Sure, Jonathan Rogers with the
2	District Department of Transportation, and happy to stand on
3	the record that the site, given its location and its excellent
4	access to transportation alternatives, will the parking
5	relief that is requested is will not have an adverse impact
6	on the transportation network.
7	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, let me ask, Mr.
8	Rogers, where does DDOT have the analysis based upon these
9	past projects for the TDM's that are similarly in place, the
10	success of it?
11	I know there was going to be a study done. Do
12	you have has that been produced?
13	MR. ROGERS: You're talking about
14	Transportation Data Management effectiveness, essentially?
15	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes.
16	MR. ROGERS: We do not have a study on that, and
17	but what we've found are more anecdotally is that TDM elements,
18	they work together.
19	So, it's not it's difficult to attribute a
20	certain performance to one particular element, but it's, how
21	does the entire plan work, given the other elements that are
22	in place, given context, given the demographics of the
23	residents and so on.
24	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: And I don't know if you had
25	the chance well, just reviewing the ones that is done by

1	Arlington and Fairfax County and some other places, and we're
2	we have a more intense use, I believe than those areas, I
3	mean, still some concerns.
4	Okay, Board, any other questions of Mr. Rogers?
5	Applicant, again, any questions of Mr. Rogers?
6	What ANC is this? Is anyone here from ANC, is it two? Which
7	ANC is it? ANC-2B?
8	Anyone here from ANC-2B? We do have a letter of
9	no objection from ANC-2B, in fact, I did just read that.
10	Is anyone here wishing to speak in support?
11	Anyone wishing to speak in support?
12	Anyone wishing to speak in opposition? Anyone
13	wishing to speak in opposition?
14	We will turn back to the Applicant for any
15	rebuttal and closing, please.
16	MS. RODDY: Well, in thinking about what you had
17	proposed, with respect to a covenant of property, to give some
18	assurance that there wouldn't be a parking impact, and I think
19	one of the things that we can look at doing is providing the
20	covenant that for the residents who will come, that there be
21	evidence of a monthly lease, so that they'd be parking in the
22	neighborhood, and not onsite.
23	Another possibility might be that we would
24	maintain a minimum number of spaces at an offsite location.
25	I think there is a couple ways that we can do this,

1	to get to your concern, through the use of the covenant.
2	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: So, you said the owners
3	would be required to produce a monthly lease? Was that the
4	first one?
5	MS. RODDY: Yes, if they have a car, that they
6	would have to provide evidence that they were not parking it
7	onsite, that they had a monthly lease with I'm sorry, with
8	the garage.
9	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: And the second thing that
10	you said?
11	MS. RODDY: Well, I think an alternative option
12	would be that we would maintain a minimum number of spaces at
13	an offsite garage.
14	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, is there anything
15	else you want to say in rebuttal?
16	MS. RODDY: Well, I would just I would
17	continue just to, you know, evidence that DDOT believes that
18	this will not have an impact. Our analysis shows the same.
19	We are providing the TDM. The ANC, which is
20	usually very strong in letting their voice be heard, if they
21	do have concerns about the parking, has no objection to this
22	application, and again, Office of Planning is supportive.
23	We are happy to provide those assurances as we
24	just went through, if that makes your more comfortable with
25	our request for the parking variance.

I think that our submission does evidence the

2	courtyard, the variance standard has been met for the
3	courtyard. I also believe that the office space, the evidence
4	is in there, that we meet the special exception standard for
5	the additional office space.
6	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: All right, thank you.
7	Then we will close the record. Any additional yes, but I
8	was just we're going to do deliberation or you want to just
9	
10	Okay, so, let's close the record with what we have
11	before use, and I note the Board is ready to deliberate, or
12	if there is additional information that we're going to need.
13	Mr. May?
14	COMMISSIONER MAY: Well, I think there is
15	probably there is some additional information, I certainly
16	requested some.
17	But I would very much like to start talking about
18	what issues are here, so that the Applicant knows best, what
19	to be submitting.
20	I think that the the Applicant has made the
21	case here, for relief from the parking. I mean, that seems
22	to be the big issue here. I have, you know, what I think are
23	minor concerns about the trellis, but I think they need to be
24	addressed, and they will be.
25	But the parking here parking relief here

really makes sense. There are certainly circumstances when parking relief for additional housing in certain neighborhoods is problematic because of the tendency for spill-over parking, for people to go ahead and, you know, have a car, even though their building doesn't have parking for them, and then they just go park in the neighborhood.

Well, the immediate vicinity here is not a residential neighborhood. You have to go a couple blocks to get to anyplace where there is -- where there even are residential parking spaces.

The building is not eligible for RPP. The people who are moving into this building are going to be buying condos, so they know that they will have to acquire a parking space, if they have to park a car there.

I mean, this is, I think fairly typical, you know, very urban living, to not have the parking associated or directly under the building where you live. If you live in New York City, if you live in Manhattan, you're going to have -- you know, it's not uncommon to have your building -- another building where you have your apartment and then you've got to walk a couple blocks to put your car in the garage, if you have a car.

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

MEMBER HINKLE: Yes, thank you. So, I think

we're talking about a variance on parking and I'm not quite

sure that the Applicant has made the 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

1 that uniqueness actually fits into the practical difficulty 2 to provide the parking. That practical difficulty discussion can include 3 sketches or what have you, that shows that you can't fit the 4 parking on the site, but I think we need more in the record 5 6 to show that. So, my suggestion is to have the Applicant 7 8 supplement the record. CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: I agree with that. 9 believe the record is very light, in regards to showing the 10 11 uniqueness, showing how there is an issue with parking, the 12 inability to park -- to create parking spaces underneath, the financial issue that may hit, trying to do it, even for the 13 14 four or five that you can put there. I mean, that is -- I would agree with that. Ms. Allen? 15 16 VICE CHAIRMAN ALLEN: I totally agree, and I just -- it always bothers me when I hear, "Well, we could do it this 17 way, and that would give us maybe four or five or six more 18 spaces, or four, five or six versus two or three. 19 I mean, the idea here is to not go against the 20 zoning regulations that are in place, and so, I would prefer 21 a presentation that shows, "Here is what we can do that can 22 23 give the maximum amount of spaces." You know, I mean, that would be helpful for me, 24 25 assuming you can get beyond the uniqueness test.

1 CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, let's do this. Let's keep the record open. Let's just -- what we need to see, 2 something from the Applicant regarding the issue of trellis 3 versus roof structure. 4 5 We need a stronger argument for you, with not just us sitting here looking at quessing, is this building smaller, 6 7 narrower or whatever, on uniqueness, regarding this property. Need a stronger TDM plan, in light of what we 8 The projected make up of what these residents 9 talked about. are going to be, you know, you say where one-bedroom, then 10 11 there's only going to be one person in a one-bedroom. People 12 do two people in two-bedrooms -- one-bedrooms all the time, you know, that kind of stuff. I don't know what you're 13 14 marketing is centering trying to do. The letter for some type of intent or letter of 15 16 interest from some parking garage that they believe that --I don't know when this building is suppose to come online, but 17 potentially, they think it might be still in existence, that 18 -- the location of the parking. 19 Let me look at my notes here. Anything else, 20 21 Board, you see that is needed? Mr. Hinkle? MEMBER HINKLE: Do we need a supplemental from 22 23 the Office of Planning? CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: I think Planning is very 24 25 clear.

1	MEMBER HINKLE: In terms of reviewing these
2	documents. On the trellis issue, they I did ask them to
3	respond.
4	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes, I asked them already.
5	I asked them, for the trellis issue.
6	Yes, you asked for OP to respond to that?
7	MEMBER HINKLE: Yes.
8	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, all right. So,
9	let's if you'll supplement the record with that.
10	Let's put this on for a continued hearing,
11	limited hearing. That means that everyone has had a chance
12	to already have their comments, regarding opposition and
13	support and all of that is already here.
14	We'll just do a limited, based upon the
15	submission. Mr. Moy, a date? Where are we?
16	MR. MOY: Well, Mr. Chairman, depending on the
17	labor of the Applicant
18	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: So, we were January or
19	February?
20	MR. MOY: Yes, because there is as I said
21	earlier, the last hearing for this month is the 16th, which
22	may or may not be too soon. Otherwise, we're into January.
23	Given the size of the docket, when are you back?
24	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Twenty-seventh of
25	December?

1	MR. MOY: The 27th of January, Mr. May, I'm told
2	will be here.
3	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay.
4	MR. MOY: So, that would be the 27th of January.
5	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: All right, the 27th of
6	January and so, when we
7	MR. MOY: Yes, may need filings a week before the
8	27th.
9	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes.
10	MS. RODDY: We were just wondering if there's any
11	possibility that we could go with the December 16th date?
12	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Mr. May won't be here.
13	MS. RODDY: Okay.
14	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: And it's important, I
15	think, that he's here for whatever addition that we're doing.
16	Okay, so, the submittal?
17	MR. MOY: Submittals, a week or eight days before
18	the 27th, perhaps Monday, January 19th. So, the Board will
19	have ample time to review.
20	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, all right. So, that
21	is where we are, and we'll continue until that date, with the
22	supplemental information to be placed into the file.
23	All right, thank you. Thank you, all.
24	Eight-six-seven, Mr. Moy?
25	MR. MOY: The next application is Application

1	18867 of Growth Spurts. If the Applicant is here, this a
2	request for a variance from the off-street parking
3	requirements under Section 2101.1 for a child development
4	center at 1802 D Street, Northeast.
5	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: All right, very good. Did
6	you give your cards to the Court Reporter? Okay, and were you
7	here to get sworn in? I didn't think so.
8	Okay, so, would you stand? Mr. Moy, we need to
9	give them the oath, please.
10	MR. MOY: Do you solemnly swear or affirm that
11	the testimony you're about to present in this proceeding is
12	the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth?
13	Thank you. You may be seated.
14	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: All right, please identify
15	yourselves. Make sure your microphone is on. There should
16	be a bright, glowing green light.
17	MR. SMITH: Calvin Smith.
18	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay.
19	MS. SMITH: Good morning. I'm Camilla Smith.
20	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Before we begin, I need to
21	know, was this property posted with the zoning sign, the
22	placards?
23	MS. SMITH: No.
24	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay.
25	MS. SMITH: You mean something on the wall or the

	79
1	door?
2	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes.
3	MS. SMITH: No.
4	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, so, we've had
5	we've got to end this hearing, and I thought the office had
6	conversations with one of you about that.
7	MS. SMITH: They had conversation with me on
8	Friday, but I was out of town, and
9	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: All right, so, we're going
10	to have to continue this for another time. You have to post
11	the property.
12	You have to get the placards from across the hall,
13	and you have to put it on your property for 15 days, so that
14	everybody knows what you're doing, and give them the
15	opportunity to comment on the relief that is requested. All
16	right, mandatory, okay?
17	Then you have to file with the Board, an affidavit
18	swearing that these things happened, okay?
19	MR. SMITH: Okay, got you. No one told us about
20	that.
21	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Mr. Moy?
22	MR. MOY: Yes, sir, given the time requirements
23	for posting, that would take bring us into January, again.
24	Given the number of hearing dates we have in
25	December, so, the earliest, the Board has eight or nine cases

1	for January 6th, which I would have preferred, and January 13th
2	is also similarly.
3	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: And be sure to stop with the
4	Office of Zoning across the hall, to make sure you know
5	everything that you're suppose to have for these things.
6	There is also a plaque, a document in that back
7	that tells you what needs to go on it, and online there is a
8	whole kind of step-through kind of tutorial, so be sure you
9	look at those things, or seek advice for some you know,
10	another person professional, to do so.
11	MR. MOY: But given the nature of this
12	application, I would suggest January 6th, sir.
13	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, so, January 6th.
14	We'll put this on the docket for January 6th, okay?
15	So, I would go over across the hall now, to get
16	the signage and etcetera, get that all worked out, so when you
17	get home or wherever you're going, get back to the property,
18	put it up, so you at least get that out the way. Okay, thank
19	you.
20	Let's go ahead and line up. Get 18852 and 18853.
21	MR. MOY: Yes, sir. Again, this would be
22	Applications 18852 and 18853, both are applications of SB Urban
23	LLC, multiple variance relief and special exceptions relief.
24	Both at premises 90 Blagden Alley Northwest, the
25	other property at 91 Blagden Alley Northwest.

1	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: As soon as Mr. May comes
2	back, we'll continue to introductions, please. We'll take
3	five minutes.
4	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off
5	the record at 11:43 a.m. and resumed at 11:46 a.m.)
6	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, are we ready, Mr.
7	Moy?
8	MR. MOY: Whenever you are, sir. I think
9	they're all at the table.
10	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, please identify
11	yourselves.
12	MR. KADLECEK: Good morning, members of the
13	Board. My name is Cary Kadlecek from the law firm of Goulston
14	& Storrs, on behalf of the Applicant, and I'll let the rest
15	of the team introduce themselves.
16	MR. KATZEN: My name is Brook Katzen with the SB
17	Urban, the Applicant.
18	MR. BALABAN: I'm Mike Balaban with the SB Urban.
19	MR. PERKINS: I'm Devon Perkins with Hickok Cole
20	Architects.
21	MS. MILANOVICH: Good morning. Jami Milanovich
22	with Wells & Associates, transportation consultant for the
23	project.
24	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Thank you. Okay, of
25	course, we've got to drill down in the parking, right?

1	I think let me see, the relief you're
2	requesting, sometimes I look at these things so far in advance,
3	I have to go back and read my notes on them. I can't read them.
4	For me, it's drilling down on the parking relief,
5	I think. I am good on moston all the other requests and
6	I think your application is supported.
7	Board, anything you want to drill down on?
8	MEMBER HINKLE: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chair. I
9	think most everybody at the table was here for the last
10	application. I have the same issues with this application,
11	as I had with the last.
12	I'm not sure if the special relief I mean, the
13	special exception for the parking relief is appropriate in this
14	case, and then secondly, on both lots, I need to hear more about
15	the uniqueness, and why that uniqueness would create a
16	practical difficulty in providing parking. So, that's where
17	I stand.
18	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, all right.
19	MR. KADLECEK: Okay, we're happy to provide that
20	information.
21	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Board, additional? We're
22	good, okay, all right.
23	MR. KADLECEK: I also wanted to preface it with
24	the fact that we've reviewed the DDOT report. They asked for
25	us to agree to four additional conditions, which we do agree

1	do, and with that, I'll let Devon and Jami discuss the parking.
2	First, I think we'll focus on the special
3	exception for the M Street lot, and then we'll talk about the
4	variance relief for the 9th Street lot.
5	MR. PERKINS: So, there are a couple of key
6	issues with the M Street lot, and looking at the screen, M
7	Street is on the south
8	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Is that one of your
9	exhibits?
10	MR. PERKINS: Yes, we submitted a set. Should
11	we hand out the package?
12	MR. KADLECEK: It's in the pre-hand.
13	MR. PERKINS: Okay, if you note on the north end
14	of the property, there is a historic structure. It's a
15	historic garage structure that we have to maintain.
16	So, putting any type of parking on the
17	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Excuse me, Mr. Moy, can we
18	have the lights, please? Can you just turn them on?
19	MR. PERKINS: Okay, so, talking about the M
20	Street building, located here.
21	At the north end of the property is a historic
22	structure that we have to maintain in whole. So, providing
23	any sort of access into the building through this historic
24	structure would not be acceptable to HPO, and we are also not
25	allowed to have curb cuts along M Street at South, and we have

1	a very narrow alley to the west side of the site. The alley
2	is only 15 feet wide.
3	So, it's actually extraordinarily difficult to
4	find an appropriate place into the building.
5	I'm going to go to another diagram, as well.
6	The site itself is 68 feet wide, but the building
7	portion is only 50 feet wide. We have FAR limitations that
8	control the size of the building that we can build, and in this
9	particular diagram, it's oriented 90 degrees differently.
10	The historic structure is at the back, which we
11	cannot go under, and so, that leaves us this portion of the
12	building.
13	Aside from the fact that we can't come in at the
14	front and it's very difficult to come in the side, and we can't
15	come in at the back, just accessing the building is
16	extraordinarily difficult, and also, the 50 foot width, when
17	you look at this diagram, you know, by the time you have a drive
18	aisle and a ramp you're left with about nine feet in the center,
19	which would be enough just to get a couple of parking spaces
20	and we could get one row at the end.
21	What this results in is more than 1,000 square
22	feet of space.
23	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Where did you say you could
24	get one row in?
l	

MR. PERKINS:

On the end here.

25

If we could

1	figure out how to get access off of the alley and into a ramp,
2	we can get approximately five spaces on the end of the building.
3	However, when you look at the overall
4	configuration of the plan, more than 78 percent of the plan
5	is required just for circulation of the vehicles, and so, you
6	end up providing over 1,000 square feet of space for each
7	vehicle, simply because of the practical of the practical
8	issues of the building of that width.
9	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes, so, you can't get
10	another row in without because you don't have access. You
11	wouldn't have access to that row.
12	MR. PERKINS: Yes, if we can get the turns to
13	work, to get in
14	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Got you.
14 15	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Got you. MR. PERKINS: So, we can get about eight spaces
15	MR. PERKINS: So, we can get about eight spaces
15 16	MR. PERKINS: So, we can get about eight spaces
15 16 17	MR. PERKINS: So, we can get about eight spaces or nine spaces per floor at the max, and practically speaking
15 16 17 18	MR. PERKINS: So, we can get about eight spaces or nine spaces per floor at the max, and practically speaking CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: But you couldn't get
15 16 17 18 19	MR. PERKINS: So, we can get about eight spaces or nine spaces per floor at the max, and practically speaking CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: But you couldn't get MR. PERKINS: it's just really inefficient.
15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. PERKINS: So, we can get about eight spaces or nine spaces per floor at the max, and practically speaking CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: But you couldn't get MR. PERKINS: it's just really inefficient. CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: You couldn't get to it.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. PERKINS: So, we can get about eight spaces or nine spaces per floor at the max, and practically speaking CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: But you couldn't get MR. PERKINS: it's just really inefficient. CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: You couldn't get to it. MR. PERKINS: It would be very, very difficult.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. PERKINS: So, we can get about eight spaces or nine spaces per floor at the max, and practically speaking CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: But you couldn't get MR. PERKINS: it's just really inefficient. CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: You couldn't get to it. MR. PERKINS: It would be very, very difficult. It would be an extraordinarily difficult entrance.

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

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

CHAIRPERSON JORDAN:

25

Okay, proceed.

	88
1	MR. PERKINS: Okay, so, 9th Street has similar
2	issues. The 9th Street property is even smaller. It is only
3	57 feet across in the width, and about 130 feet in length, and
4	again, if we provide a ramp coming off of the alley at the back,
5	a ramp coming down, the ramp takes up more than two-thirds of
6	the length of the property, and we can again, in an 8,000
7	square foot area, at the very max, get eight spaces.
8	It also has, you know, just detrimental impacts
9	on what we would like to actually accomplish on the alley, which
10	is keeping the activity and the pedestrian quality of the alley
11	itself.
12	So, again, it's just an extreme challenge and an
13	extreme inefficiency on a building of this size.
14	MR. KADLECEK: Devon, would you say it's an
15	unusual condition to have a property flanked on two sides by
16	an active pedestrian alley?
17	MR. PERKINS: Yes, extremely unusual. This
18	particular alley has numerous restaurants, shops, exercise
19	centers, coffee shops, and it's very, very, heavily active by
20	pedestrians, so, keeping cars out of this alley is very
21	desirable, because as you know, alleys don't have sidewalks,
22	so that are a lot of people that use this alley. So, minimizing
23	the impact of vehicles on this alley is critical to the design.
24	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Why did you say that on the

25

9th -- go back to the 9th Street.

1 The first thing you said about the -- what was 2 the width of the alley portion? The maximum width is 68 feet across MR. PERKINS: 3 The property then steps in a little bit and the building 4 here. about, our residential building is a 50 foot wide building. 5 6 CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okav. PERKINS: Which allows 7 MR. to have us residential unit on either side and a corridor down the center. 8 CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: All right, continue. 9 So, as you know, the parking 10 MS. MILANOVICH: 11 required by code for the 9th Street building would be 44 units. For the M Street building would be 79 units, and we are seeking 12 relief from those requirements, as we will be providing no 13 14 parking. The site is ideally situated with a multitude of 15 16 transportation options. The site is a five-minute walk to the There are six metro bus lines and a D.C. 17 metro station. circulator line that serve the project with bus stops in 18 immediate proximity to the site. 19 There are 19 car-sharing vehicles that are within 20 a quarter-mile of the project, and there are two Capital 21 bike-share stations within two blocks of the site. 22 23 In addition, there are an abundance of nearby amenities, such -- and services, such as grocery stores, 24 25 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 coordinator for the buildings. Again, that coordinator will notify potential residents that they won't be eligible for residential parking permits, and that they will be prohibited from obtaining residential parking or temporary parking permits.

They will direct residents to the property's website, where they'll find various information on all of the transportation options available to them.

The transportation management coordinator will also maintain a current list of neighborhood retail and service uses that are available within walking distance.

1	There will be transit screens provided in both
2	residential buildings. Car-share memberships will be
3	provided for all residents of the buildings, for the initial
4	term of their lease, and that will be done in perpetuity.
5	Capital bike-share memberships will also be
6	provided, however, instead of being provided for residents who
7	do not own bikes, at DDOT's request, we will providing them
8	for all residents of the buildings for the initial term of their
9	lease, and again, that will be done in perpetuity.
10	There will be bike parking inside the building
11	for residents. There will be a bicycle repair facility
12	inside.
13	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes, we have the TDM's.
14	You're reading the list of TDM's that you're submitting right?
15	MS. MILANOVICH: Correct.
16	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: We can do that.
17	MS. MILANOVICH: Okay.
18	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, but questions,
19	Board? Yes? Mr. Moy, may we have the lights on, please?
20	VICE CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Thank you. I just want to
21	make sure I understand the nature of this building.
22	It's a 100 unit building. Is it some kind of a
23	temporary housing or whatever? So, I just
24	MR. BALABAN: Yes, I can offer
25	VICE CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Let me just let me

1	finish my question.
2	So, we're talking 100 units. We're at you're
3	suggesting absolutely zero parking, and I didn't hear any
4	discussion about even loading, like how this 100 unit parking,
5	where people are going to you know, they have to have
6	something, I guess, some kind of a car or truck to load whatever
7	they're bringing to the building.
8	So, I mean, I have to tell you, I'm very concerned
9	about this, and would really like you to discuss that a little
10	more.
11	MR. BALABAN: We appreciate the
12	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: And because there are 69
13	60 more spaces required, isn't that correct?
14	You're required to have 61 parking spaces? Am
15	I right or wrong?
16	MR. KADLECEK: You're correct, 62.
17	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: And you're asking for zero?
18	MR. KADLECEK: That's correct.
19	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: That's a lift.
20	MR. BALABAN: So, we appreciate the question. We
21	should describe a couple things about the project and the
22	community and our model that may be helpful.
23	First of all, of the 123 units, they will be 100
24	percent studio apartments. We formed our company
25	specifically to develop and operate for the long-term, small

household, small unit rental apartments.

Number two, they will all be furnished. So, there will be no move-in or move-out deliveries of a conventional kind.

Number three, Jami referred to the parking restrictions, and our leases will not only point out that one cannot have a residential parking permit, but the leases will preclude in such a way that it would be a breach of the lease, any tenant from seeking by any means, any parking arrangements for any automobile that they may have, 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 person 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

2	two-bedrooms. There are no families. The units average 380
3	square feet. We do not expect even many couples and the
4	couples that we will have from time to time, will be people
5	who are urban and share the perspective of all of the members
6	of our community, that they want to be immediately proximate
7	to transportation. They want to be immediately proximate to
8	pedestrian-accessible urban amenities, and they want to have
9	immediate access to the workplace.
10	So, I hope that's helpful in describing why it
11	is that we're convinced that we won't have cars, and what we're
12	doing affirmatively by choice to make sure that our tenants
13	don't have cars, and it's because of that, that we chose to
14	change the address of these buildings to Blagden Alley
15	addresses, which are not eligible for parking permits.
16	It's completely consistent with our model, and
17	I hope that's helpful.
18	MR. KADLECEK: Mr. Balaban, can you also explain
19	the extent to which the units are furnished and the nature by
20	which you anticipate residents arriving to the building, i.e.,
21	moving in?
22	MR. BALABAN: Yes, the units, as I said, are 100
23	percent furnished. So, we expect that most of our tenants will
24	arrive by taxi or by metro or by being dropped off.
25	They'll have a suitcase and a little bit of stuff,

There are no one-bedrooms.

if they have anything more, if they have any china or they have 1 2 any furniture from grandma, they won't choose to live here, because there is no room for it in the unit. 3 With regard to the loading plan, actually we'd 4 be pleased to describe briefly and I think others can address 5 it more extensively. 6 We have discussed with the ANC at length, a 7 loading and trash operations plan, which does everything that 8 we can to preclude in a way that's consistent with this profile 9 of tenant and community that I've described to you, that we 10 will not have vehicular traffic contributed to the alley. 11 12 CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Basically, your loading plan is that the tenant would be required to provide notice 13 to you, couple weeks or so in advance, and they are doing 14 on-street loading and unloading, correct? 15 16 MR. BALABAN: There is a designated loading area on 9th Street, and our staff is obligated by the conditions 17 to advise all persons and parties who may do loading that there 18 is parking on 9th Street, that parking is not permitted in the 19 alley, and we expect there will be very few people who will 20 actually arrive with anything that requires a loading stop of 21 any kind. 22 23 CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: When you say parking on 9th 24 Street, what do you mean? 25 MR. KADLECEK: It's commercial loading.

	96
1	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay.
2	MR. KADLECEK: It's a commercial loading.
3	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: That's what you mean?
4	MR. KADLECEK: Yes, it's commercial loading
5	space.
6	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes.
7	VICE CHAIRMAN ALLEN: And let me just ask about
8	the building itself.
9	Is there any storage for each of the units?
10	MR. BALABAN: Yes, there is storage in the
11	building. The units themselves are designed to include as
12	much storage within that square footage, as can be arranged,
13	and there is storage in the building available to the tenants.
14	VICE CHAIRMAN ALLEN: So, then they could arrive
15	with grandma's china, but just I wondered, okay. Thanks.
16	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Anything else?
17	MR. KADLECEK: We have nothing additional.
18	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Board, anything additional
19	from the Applicant?
20	Office of Planning, please.
21	MR. JESICK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members
22	of the Board. My name is Matt Jesick.
23	For most of my testimony, I will rest on the
24	record, just to address the parking question.

the

that

felt

Wе

25

adequately

application

M Street property, as well as the variance test for the 9th 2 Street property. 3 We had requested that the Applicant produce 4 5 diagrams showing what a potential parking layout would look like, if one were to somehow be provided, and you can find that 6 in the pre-hearing submission, and they were shown in the 7 Applicant's PowerPoint. 8 So, we are comfortable with the requested relief 9 and recommend approval of the project. 10 We are also 11 comfortable with the proposed TDM plan, which is similar to other TDM plans approved by the Board in the past, including 12 at 15 Dupont Circle, which was BZA case from last year and had 13 14 a very similar TDM package. That concludes my testimony. I'd be happy to 15 16 take any questions. CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: This is a hard something to 17 swallow with 62 parking spaces gone in kind of a residential 18 neighborhood, and what is your opinion about that? You don't 19 find there is any -- it won't have an impact on this 20 neighborhood? 21 I believe the conclusions both of 22 MR. JESICK: 23 the Applicant's transportation study, as well as Department of Transportation, who was here to testify, is that there 24 25 wouldn't be an impact.

addressed the special exception test for parking relief on the

	98
1	The residents would not be permitted to park on
2	the street. There are numerous transit options available. I
3	think as was alluded to in the previous case this morning, the
4	people who choose to live in this location would and in the
5	specifically, the type of units that are being provided,
6	would likely not even have vehicles.
7	So, yes, we are comfortable with granting the
8	relief.
9	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Any other questions for
10	Planning, Board?
11	Applicant, any questions for Planning? Mr.
12	Rogers, transportation?
13	MR. ROGERS: Good afternoon. I'm Jonathan
14	Rogers with the District Department of Transportation.
15	Again, largely rest on the record and only say
16	that between the transportation options that are plentiful and
17	available on the vicinity, the transportation demand
18	management plan and the parking restrictions and plans
19	included in the application, DDOT finds that there will be no
20	significant negative impact to the transportation network, and
21	also, DDOT acknowledges and appreciates the Applicant's
22	inclusion of the four addition TDM measures in their
23	application. I'll be happy to answer any questions.
24	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: So, no impact for not
l l	1

having 62 parking spaces in a building that has at least 175,

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

1	years from now, these buildings are up and running, and we've
2	got a parking problem? How do we go back and say undo? Is
3	there a way?
4	No, that was rhetorical. That's okay. So, and
5	this is a residential neighborhood, which is even different
6	than that on 16th Street, although there is a lot more teeth
7	here, with this application.
8	Anyway, any other questions for transportation?
9	Anybody? All right.
10	Is there anyone here from ANC-2F? ANC-2F?
11	Please. Whoever is the representative, please come forward.
12	Who is the designated representative?
13	MR. CAIN: That would be myself and Greg.
14	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, we usually have one
15	designated representative by the ANC, but okay, that's fine.
16	Would you please come up?
17	MR. CAIN: My name is Walt Cain.
18	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Just make sure that the
19	microphone is on, please.
20	MR. CAIN: My name is Walk Cain. I'm the Vice
21	Chair for ANC-2F, and the reason that we felt it important to
22	have both myself and Greg here, is that in my capacity as Vice
23	Chair, I also Chair our community development committee, which
24	is the formal first impression for the ANC, for BZA matters,
25	HPRP matters, those types of things.

1	Greg sits on that committee and it's also
2	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: And Greg's last name is?
3	MR. CAIN: My name is Walt Cain. This is Greg
4	Melcher.
5	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Greg Melcher.
6	MR. CAIN: And Greg sits on that committee, and
7	also is the Commissioner who represents the single-member
8	district, where the project would be located.
9	He is also very involved with the Blagden Alley
10	and Naylor Court Community Association, so, I thought that he
11	had a very unique perspective that would be valuable to
12	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay.
13	MR. CAIN: to the Board.
14	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: But just make sure we have
15	our five minute on our timer, please, Mr. Moy.
16	All right, very good. Thank you, and welcome,
17	please.
18	MR. CAIN: Thank you. I'll keep this brief, but
19	I wanted to say that your initial reaction was the same as mine.
20	The ANC has been working with SB Urban on this project for
21	several months, trying to arrive at a conclusion that we
22	thought was beneficial for the neighborhood.
23	Then they first came, I looked at the application
24	and again, said exactly what you said, "Are you telling me zero
25	parking places, and but since then, and over the course of

the past several months, we've come to a place where I think that this is -- it's in the best interest of the community, and I think it will really be a benefit to the community, and the things that specifically 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 to need parking.

I'll wrap up my portion, just by saying that we

and these folks have really been our example of the way the 2 process should work. 3 collaborative, 4 They've been very very 5 responsive. They've taken the feedback of the ANC and responded positively and substantively to that, and made 6 changes that really addressed the concerns of the ANC. 7 CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Mr. Melcher. 8 Okay, thank you. Yes, I'm the 9 MELCHER: President of the Blagden Alley/Naylor Court Association, as 10 well as a single-member district from ANC-2F06. 11 12 By the way, as a matter of record, I testified here in opposition to a BZA proposal in 1994 to change this 13 alley to commercial, which was approved. I just thought I'd 14 note that, although I'm glad to see that at least now 2014, 15 16 I do welcome our commercial neighbors coming into the alley, the shops, the restaurants, and the other things going on 17 there. 18 But I'm also very glad to see that these two large 19 lots are going to be residential for the most part. 20 In considering the proposal, I was looking very 21 carefully at the interior of Blagden Alley and all the other 22 23 development activity currently underway. I'm looking at it more as a system that we have 24 to work together, not as individual properties. 25

work with a lot of developers on a lot of different projects,

1 What I've concluded is that the ideal solution for future development is one that does not add any additional 2 vehicle traffic to the interior of the alley. 3 We believe it's very important that Blagden Alley 4 become a living alley full of pedestrians either walking in 5 or between their places of residence and the restaurants and 6 7 bars that are here or soon to come. We should also be capital that there's a metro 8 stop that is a short two blocks away, and by the way, if you 9 walk out of that metro, you walk under the underpass. 10 you're literally only going about 100 feet before you're in 11 this building, or actually outside, exposed to the elements. 12 In any event, for that reason, I've reached the 13 conclusion that I don't really want to see any additional 14 parking or parking garage entrances in the alley. 15 16 At present, we have one restaurant, Roque 24, one bar the Lost and Found, a doggie daycare place, a yoga studio, 17 a supper club, a couple art galleries, all that are co-existing 18 in there, and we're expecting to have additional restaurants 19 and bars that will open in the near future. 20 All this again, is leading to the desire of 21 Blagden Alley to become a walk-in paradise and any additional 22 23 uses should be ones that do not add additional vehicle traffic. You just need to go there a few minutes on a 24 25 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 fifth try at this location in 20 years, to get something to happen. It's fortunate we found a project that's both residential and fits with our downtown close to metro location, and just keep in mind that something could come back, if this project doesn't go through, it could be C-2-A, it could be fast food restaurants, who knows what would go in those lots.

I think this is one that's worked, and I ask you

to approve it. CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Board, any questions of the 2 3 ANC representatives? I take it when you say this is in the best interest 4 5 of the community, it's because there have been vacant Is that -- and that you think it's better for --6 MR. MELCHER: They're basically -- have been 7 used for parking of the -- the old warehouse, the historic 8 building has had storage in it and the rest of the two lots 9 are just parking lots, at this point. 10 CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: And so, you don't perceive 11 there is any impact of not having -- thus having zero to 62 12 less parking spaces? 13 Well, clearly, there is going to 14 MR. MELCHER: 15 be impact when you build a new building, you know. Clearly, 16 there will be more people. There will be more density. That's going to happen, whatever you put there. 17 I just think in this case, they built the case 18 to justify minimizing it, and further, if you look at the entire 19 alley and think of the historic alley, what you want it to be, 20 I envision it full of people walking around, going to the 21 restaurants, the bars, using the shops that are back there, 22 23 and if you add additional garage door entrances and more cars 24 and more trucks going in there, then you're never going to 25 achieve that vision.

Thank you.

1	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: All right, any other
2	questions, Board?
3	Then is there any one here thank you for
4	coming.
5	Anyone here wishing to speak in support? We do
6	have a letter from the Coalition of Smarter Growth and letters
7	of another neighbor. Anyone else want to speak in support?
8	Please come forward, and you have three minutes.
9	Okay, please.
10	MS. CORT: Thank you, Chairman. My name is
11	Cheryl Cort. I'm with the Coalition for Smarter Growth. I
12	did submit written testimony in advance.
13	We are a non-profit in the Washington, D.C.
14	region, where we're based in D.C., making the case for smart
15	growth. Our mission is to promote walk-able, inclusive and
16	transit-oriented communities, and the land-use and
17	transportation policies and investments needed to make those
18	communities flourish.
19	We wish to express our strong support for this
20	residential housing project and the variances needed to make
21	it feasible and appropriate to its unique context, which I note
22	is a treasured pedestrian oriented historic alley, and I really
23	recommend that everybody, if you haven't been there, you really
24	need to go there. It's a wonderful it's a wonderful place.
25	Given the continued strong demand to live in this

108 1 growing neighborhood and in the city in general, the site's 2 walking and bicycling proximity to hundreds of thousands of jobs and the neighborhood's low car ownership rate, this 3 project is a helpful contribution to making the city's --4 5 meeting the city's need for housing. The project is especially welcome with its 6 addition of 11 inclusionary zoning units, half of 50 percent 7 AMI and half at 80 percent AMI. 8 The building has -- could require a level of 9 parking that's actually even inappropriate, in terms of what 10 11 we were seeing, in terms of a typical market development would typically do, sort of dig down like one level, about the .3 12 This is that higher .5, which developers 13 parking ratio. 14 consistently tell me is just too high for these great 15 transit-oriented neighborhoods. 16 But no-vehicle parking is appropriate for this location for the following reasons. 17

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

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

would be significantly degraded by adding parking facilities. 1 We note actually, if you look at the commute 2 pattern for the census tract that most commuters are walking 3 to their jobs. Thirty-seven percent of people going to work 4 5 every day are walking to their jobs, and that is followed by riding transit at 31 percent. 6 The area already enjoys 41 percent car-free 7 renters, and that's before trying to attract and -- attract 8 car-less households. That's just passively, not actively 9 seeking out those who don't need cars and those who are seeking 10 to live in a place where it is very easy not to own a car. 11 12 I think what's important about this project is that it offers a sound alternative to unworkable parking 13 and demonstrates the fallacy of the notion that requirements 14 there is a fixed amount of parking demand per housing unit. 15 16 This is specific to a context, to the type of person that is being attracted to a particular housing project, 17 and we welcome this added housing, taking advantage and --18 taking advantage of this location and really building on the 19 strength of the transit accessability, but even more so 20 actually, the walk -- this incredibly high walk to work rate. 21 So, it's not even we're talking about transit 22 23 here. We're actually just talking about people walking to 24 their jobs.

We agree with ANC-2F, that the developer has

demonstrated a compelling 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 we are very enthusiastic about this very 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 sure the microphone is on. Thank you.

MR. LEFEBVRE: Hello. My name is Alexis Lefebvre. I'm a resident on the 1400 block of Church Street. I used to live at 16th and R, so I'm well aware of how difficult parking is in neighborhoods around Logan Circle.

I know there was another sort of controversial

1 parking variance case on my block recently, and I supported 2 the approval of that one, as well. I think sort of -- we've touched on the issue here 3 that for most people like me, and I'm just speaking anecdotally 4 5 for me and my friends in the neighborhood, it's a very conscious choice to live a denser metro-accessible area. 6 It's a lot of people that don't have cars, don't want cars, that like the 7 walk-ability. That's really an appeal of the neighborhood. 8 Again, just speaking from either me and my 9 friends of the five households that I am friends with in this 10 area, three of those have cars. We all have garage parking. 11 I have a friend who moved there with a car, after two weeks, 12 he couldn't take the parking. He sold it, didn't need it. 13 People's attitudes towards driving and parking 14 are changing, particular in this neighborhood. So, I would 15 16 urge BZA to approve this and other projects like it, particularly where the developer, I think is really gone to 17 great lengths to address the concerns. 18 I wasn't even aware of the Blagden Alley address 19 I think that's, you know, a great addition to this 20 21 project, so, thank you. 22 CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Board, any questions? 23 Applicant, any questions? Thank you, two, for coming. 24 Thank you very much. 25 Anyone here wishing to speak in opposition?

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

(Witnesses sworn)

CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Please identify yourself.

MR. NELSEN: My name is Craig Nelsen. I live in Blagden Alley, and what it seems like this project is, is just an attempt to take -- to jam as many apartments and as many people as possible into a small area, regardless of the impact it might have on the people who already live there.

As I understand it, this project is planning to widen the alley and turn -- co-op the alley, usurp it basically, to provide a common area for the residents of this project, and this is -- this is something that they're selling as a way to keep people from going crazy, living in apartments the size of two parking spaces.

This is -- if anything is going to harm the character of Blagden Alley and its historical nature, it's seems to me, this would be it. It's not even close to keeping it within the character of the alley, as it is today.

So, I think -- you know, I just hope that the -- I think what -- some of the objections I've heard from the Chair has been -- have been right on, and I think that the people -- the greed that sort of is -- the engine behind this project should be -- if left unchecked, is just going to destroy what is there, and that would be a shame, because as you said, if that happens, there is no going back. Once this is done, you know, it's over and the whole city will have lost something

that's kind of a treasure.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Thank you very much.
Board, questions? Applicant, questions? Our next witness,
please.

MS. BEEBE: Good morning. My name is Carolyn Beebe, and I have lived on M Street, three doors down from this proposed development since 1980. I raised my daughter in this house and my daughter and her husband are now raising their three children in this house.

We are clearly committed to this residential neighborhood and to the city, and this neighborhood, as we've already discussed, is unique. It's the first residential block north of 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 the neighborhood, the residential character of the neighborhood, and it requesting that there would be small scale commercial 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

1 on a residential block. 2 They say they have a kitchen. It's two burners and a little fridge, which is what you get in a hotel room. 3 So, this is not appropriate for this residential 4 block, apart from parking, which is another issue, but it's 5 a very dense development that is going to detract from the 6 7 residential character of M Street. CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: 8 Thank you, Ms. Beebe. Board, any questions? Applicant, questions? 9 Our next witness, please? 10 MS. SCHAUER: Good morning. My name is Barbara 11 I am -- my building is at 937 M Street. 12 I've been in the area since 1988, and as Carolyn said, Zoning Commission 13 Order No. 782, dated February 12, 1996 re-zoned the interior 14 of the alley form R-4 to C-2-A, with 10 pages of discussion 15 16 as to what the limits would be on this development. It was C-2-A with many limits, in terms of the density of the 17 commercial development was allowed. 18 Back in 1996, and I was there, so I remember, 19 nothing of this sort would have ever been agreed to, and this 20 is not just an apartment building. It's like a dormitory --21 it's a short residents hotel, three to six months per person. 22 23 Yes, people will find ways of finding parking. They can go down to the local police station and get a card 24

in their window for a month. So, this notion that

to stick

1 that's going to be prevented it not true. 2 Number two, the third prong of the variance proof is that you have to show substantial detriment to the public 3 good or impairment of the intent purpose or integrity of the 4 5 zoned plan does not occur. 6 They have not made an argument that this 7 development does not do all of those things. Historic Blagden Alley is unique. It's unique in 8 It's unique in Washington. It is not a 9 the east coast. pedestrian alley. Just about every street that leads into it 10 has a garage behind the house, including myself, Carolyn and 11 many of these people. People drive through the alley. 12 The notion that it's going to become some kind 13 of a Venetian piazza is a fantasy. It's a drive-able alley 14 with lots of garages in back, and in fact, the building that 15 16 they're incorporating into the development is a garage. not a beautiful house. It's not a store. It is not a pedestrian 17

If you come in there, you'll see there are not many cafes. There is one coffee and there is one tiny, little restaurant that is only open three days a week for special evening events and a bar that just opened last week.

So, it is not a busy commercial zone. That's absolutely not true, and finally, there were many people who would have come here today. I have signatures here for 74

alley.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	people who are adamantly opposed to this, for a variety of
2	reasons.
3	We want protection of our precious alley. It's
4	a resource for us, for our future generations, for the entire
5	city, for the country. It's on the National Register. It's
6	also in a D.C. historic zone.
7	Secondly, the issue of this loading and unloading
8	of trash. How does 100 how does trash for 125 people get
9	removed from a building and put on the sidewalk? This is their
10	proposal. There's no loading dock, and this notion that
11	people are going to be biking up with their little satchel to
12	go into an apartment is absurd.
13	They're short-term rentals, three to six months.
14	People are going to be coming and going in droves, like a hotel.
15	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, I appreciate
16	MS. SCHAUER: And that's the end of my statement.
17	Thank you.
18	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: No, no, I think it was
19	impactful. Thank you.
20	MS. SCHAUER: But I would like to put some things
21	into the record, that I brought.
22	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: No, we've used the time,
23	but if you could submit your
24	MS. SCHAUER: Yes, I put my paper in, yes.
25	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay. Board? Applicant?

2 Mr. Chairman, I was wondering if MR. MIKHAILOV: in light of the fact that we do have 75 signatures from the 3 neighbors, if you can allow us --4 5 CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: No, two minutes. Go ahead. 6 MR. MIKHAILOV: All right. So, I do agree with 7 the second Zoning Commission ANC Commission that re-zoning 8 back in 1996 to create C-2-A zone did create a problem, and 9 I guess my recommendation for this, I think that to really 10 11 correct this issue, it should not be done at the BZA level. Should go back to Zoning Commission and actually get re-zoned 12 back. 13 Now, addressing the various variances requests, 14 15 I do -- I'm encouraged by the fact that in the previous case, 16 for the Church Street development project, that the Board voted 3-2, just barely in favor of the project, and I feel that the 17 increased magnitude of this project and even a more brazen 18 request for, you know, zero parking spaces, it's provided six, 19 convinces some members to vote in opposition. 20 Now, I did some -- I will submit a -- I guess a 21 15 page report, which I hope you will read a little bit. 22 23 tried to make arguments for all the prongs, the variances 24 tests.

I am not at all convinced that either property

25

1

Next, please.

1	is exceptional. Generally, the Applicant essentially lists
2	several factors, majority of them are in fact, favorable, and
3	then they declare that there is a combination of factors as
4	to how it constitutes exceptional condition.
5	You know, and I have a long list, which I don't
6	have time to review right now, but just from a review of those.
7	So, I do not believe that the exceptional
8	condition has been met.
9	Going addressing the issue of practical
10	difficult for parking, again, their argument is that the
11	general garage will be inefficient. As far as I know,
12	inefficiency by itself is not doesn't have any bearing in
13	BZA deliberations.
14	There is a long sort of gap between inefficiency
15	and practical difficulty. So far, this has not been proven.
16	Now, there are other ways to achieve efficiency.
17	I have several appendices that are attached, that suggest that
18	one can use a car elevator or an automated parking system to
19	achieve greater efficiency.
20	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: You're over your time.
21	So, and we've seen what you submitted.
22	MR. MIKHAILOV: Well, I do request that you read
23	the report.
24	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: I know you have submitted
25	information before, and we've already looked at that. So,

2 But we appreciate your concern and certainly, the depth of your concern and research and work here on this 3 particular -- because I do know we've had that, and that these 4 5 things are very important. Next witness, please. 6 MR. LIPINSKI: My name is Don Lipinski. I live 7 at 937 M Street. I'm just not in favor of this project. 8 Even if the variances weren't needed, the project 9 is just too large and too dense for Blagden Alley Historic 10 District, and the surrounding residential area. 11 12 Protection of this area was promised in the re-zoning of 1996 and it was intended to offer some commercial 13 development, to stabilize the neighborhood alley. 14 Now, we're faced with a situation where the 15 16 excessive development threatens to overtake the alley, and this shouldn't be allowed. 17 What is proposed is far beyond thinking of behind 18 I have lived there since 1989 and this type 19 the re-zoning. of development was never envisioned. 20 The alley is a rare historic area, and the 21 intention was for protection, not for commercial development. 22 23 The area is on the national historic registry for historic places, and development must be modest, scaled to preserve the 24 25 history.

1

just to let you know that.

1	The surrounding Victorian row houses must also
2	be protected from the encroachment of commercial development.
3	It's quite obvious that any hardship the
4	developers feel they may have is one of their own making. The
5	site is develop-able, but at reasonable scale, and that
6	concludes my
7	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Thank you for your
8	comments. We understand the impact, yes, but it's kind of
9	caught all in.
10	Board, any questions? Thank you. Our next
11	witness.
12	MS. CORRIGAN: My name is Colleen Corrigan and
13	I live right on the alley. I'll show you where.
14	I live right here, and this this community
15	development is really going to affect me.
16	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: I have to have you on the
17	microphone.
18	MS. CORRIGAN: Okay, no problem. Right behind
19	my house. I have a unique house. I have 10 unit a small
20	10 unit apartment building. So, I am aware of what apartments
21	are.
22	Out of my 10 units, four of my tenants have cars.
23	I have two studios and I have two studios and eight
24	one-bedrooms, and to say that they will not get cars is a fluke.
25	They will get cars. People do want to drive places. They want

1	to go see mom and dad. They want to drive.
2	They also rent cars. Enterprise is right down
3	the street, and they rent a car and they'll bring their rental
4	car right back, and my tenants do rent their cars rent cars,
5	and they have to find parking on the street.
6	It's very hard to find parking on the street now,
7	and it's going to be absolutely insane to find parking on the
8	street with this property 122 units coming.
9	My husband is also handicapped. Have to get him
10	out the back door of my I have a ramp built in the back of
11	my house, to try to get him out my back out my back door,
12	and I need access, and it's been very hard right now, to get
13	access back and forth. I need access to 9th Street and in the
14	alley.
15	If this becomes pedestrian only, I will not be
16	able to get him out the door. Thank you very much.
17	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Thank you. Our next
18	witness, please.
19	MR. HORVATH: Yes, my name is Ed Horvath. I live
20	at 929
21	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Last name?
22	MR. HORVATH: Horvath, H-O-R-V-A-T-H. I live
23	at 929 M Street. It's three lots away from this development.
24	This is a very unique situation, special
25	situation. One thing which hasn't been raised and which is

2 property is immediately adjacent to the D.C. Convention 3 Center. Both of the -- the D.C. Convention Center is 4 5 within 200 feet of both of these properties. At the D.C. Convention Center, that was plopped in the middle of our 6 neighborhood. We have at times 45,000 people there for 7 events, with zero public parking. 8 This just adds too that burden. Even the parking 9 that we have, when we have special events, special national 10 11 emergency events, the President is there, our streets are blocked off. 12 We have 10 foot fences in front of our homes. 13 We 14 need to, you know, be able to get in and out. So, this is not a normal street in a normal 15 16 neighborhood. Blagden Alley is 30 feet wide there. The idea of mechanical parking is something which again, could 17 alleviate the -- and allow for denser parking within parking 18 19 structures. While 62 spaces may be a lot, I think that at least 20 21 two-thirds of that number would be a reasonable way to go. Don't have to have everything, but I have friends who are major 22 bike riders, and they say, you know, they can't envision 123 23 24 units of people, even who were serious bikers, not having 25 vehicles.

not in the OP's report is this property is -- the 9th Street

1	One of the other things that was brought in the
2	prior case was, there is no provision for ADA parking either.
3	Zero parking, and you know, I think this is just such a burden
4	on the neighborhood.
5	We had other buildings, right on the same square
6	where zero parking was proposed. They went back and re-did
7	their designs, put in two levels of parking, and across the
8	street from this, immediately across the street, the Whitman
9	condo, that was built and we had influence on the architect
10	there. They have more than a one-to-one ratio of parking per
11	unit.
12	Parking is off-street parking in garages is
13	needed in this neighborhood. Thank you.
14	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Thank you. Appreciate
15	your concern and comment.
16	I think we have one other person that came in.
17	No? Yes?
18	MS. BAKKER: Yes, I did.
19	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: All right, you have two
20	minutes, please.
21	MS. BAKKER: Sorry?
22	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Two minutes, please.
23	MS. BAKKER: My name is Sara Bakker.
24	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Just make sure your
25	microphone is on.

My name is Sara Bakker. I'm at 1235 1 MS. BAKKER: 4th Street, and I have similar concerns as other neighbors have 2 stated. 3 But specifically, the biggest concern is with the 4 transportation analysis, and that the Applicant was allowed 5 to reduce the trip generation number by 90 percent. 6 This yielded number is below a threshold of a 7 required full traffic impact study, and when my husband, Sergi 8 Mikhailov spoke with Jonathan Rogers, the development reviewer 9 for DDOT, he was asked, why the 90 percent reduction was --10 how it was rationalized and why 90 percent and not 75 percent? 11 12 He stated, Mr. Rogers stated that the DDOT felt that the 90 percent was reasonable, without citing any concrete 13 14 In fact, there was no study to back the generous 90 percent reduction. 15 16 Essentially, he had allowed the Applicant to make assertions without any factual basis, and we find this to be 17 arbitrary and capricious. 18 In other matters, the domino effect, because we 19 don't live directly in that neighborhood, but the domino effect 20 of parking due to events in the Convention Center, and 21 otherwise, we have a family and we find it very difficult to 22 23 find parking, especially on weekends. So, we foresee that increasing. 24 25 The speaker mentioned earlier that he foresees

1	because it is fully rented or fully furnished, that there
2	will be no nobody will be driving, and that's incorrect
3	because it's similar to dorm living, and if anyone has children
4	in dorms, you bring a lot of stuff for them. You drive. They
5	have families. They will buy stuff. The premise is that they
6	will have cheaper living, so they will probably spend more
7	money.
8	You have Uber, which is a new form of
9	transportation and it is prevalent in our neighborhood. They
10	come, they go to the alleyways, the find parking on the street.
11	They double-park, and that he mentioned, there will be other
12	forms of transportation, including being picked up, and that
13	is a very frequent and encouraged way now.
14	So, it impacts many people. Excuse me.
15	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Well, your time is up.
16	MS. BAKKER: Two minutes? Okay.
17	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Thank you. We appreciate
18	all the comments. Board, questions? Applicant, questions?
19	We thank you all for coming down. Your input is
20	very important. We know generally, the gist of where you are,
21	and other comments were the same, you know, kind of boxed in.
22	That's why we're able to kind of convince it.
23	We understand the issue, and we're taking a good,
24	hard look at this. So, thank you all for coming down.
25	Mr. Kadlecek, rebuttal? Let me ask one

1	question. Is the property you said the property is going
2	to be furnished. Is it optional? Can I take the furniture
3	out?
4	MR. KADLECEK: I'll let Mr. Balaban speak to
5	that, but my understanding is no, and I also want to emphasize,
6	not only are they furnished, by the provide everything from
7	linens, dishes, utensils. It's not like a dorm. People don't
8	have to bring anything.
9	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Like a hotel?
10	MR. KADLECEK: Except you have to have a lease.
11	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: How long is the lease?
12	MR. BALABAN: There will be no leases shorter
13	than 90 days.
14	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: It's extended-stay hotel.
15	MR. BALABAN: We certainly wouldn't call it
16	that. There will be residential leases and we expect to have
17	many 12 month leases and if it's convenient for a specific
18	tenant to make shorter arrangements, because it is so easy to
19	move in and move out, because as Mr. Kadlecek said, everything
20	is provided, we expect there will be some short-term tenants.
21	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Rebuttal, Mr. Kadlecek?
22	MR. KADLECEK: Yes, Mr. Milanovich is going to
23	speak a little bit about TDM.
24	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: What about them? We've
25	got the TDM plan.

Effectiveness of TDM. 1 MR. KADLECEK: CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: It's not rebuttal, right? 2 Well, the -- I believe that the 3 MR. KADLECEK: neighbors testified that they think there is going to be a 4 5 significant impact on the neighborhood. 6 CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Go ahead. MS. MILANOVICH: I just thought it might be 7 helpful to cite a few case studies, that show that the TDM plan 8 is actually -- they do work. They are effective in reducing 9 vehicular trips, and the case studies that I'm going to cite 10 are actually -- the TDM plans aren't nearly as robust as what 11 12 we're proposing. So, we've done annual studies at a number of 13 14 developments. I'm going to talk about one in the District 15 that's near the Foggy Bottom metro station, and then the other 16 three are actually in Fairfax County, and the reason I've 17 selected those is because those are not near metro, and it's sometimes hard to understand if you're looking at a site near 18 metro, how much of the reduction in vehicular trips is simply 19 just because you're adjacent to metro versus how much is from 20 21 the effectiveness of the TDM plan. So, the Square 54 development, which is adjacent 22 to the Foggy Bottom metro station, has -- it's where the Whole 23 Foods is at 22nd and I. There is residential and office 24 25 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

1 This was done pre-silver line. station. 2 Their goal again, was a 20 percent non-single occupant vehicle and in November of 2013, they were actually 3 achieving 30 percent non-single occupant vehicle, and I just 4 5 do want to note that none of those projects included Capital bike-share memberships for residents or car-share memberships 6 for residents, not at initial occupancy and certainly, not in 7 perpetuity of the project. 8 As I said, three of the four are nowhere near 9 metro. In our case, we're near metro, so we're having the 10 benefit not only of the TDM plan, but also the proximity to 11 12 metro. So, I thought that might just help put it in 13 context and show that TDM plans really do work. 14 Certainly, and I would want 15 CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: 16 you to submit those studies and your analysis on that, so we can see the actual comparable's of TDM's that were in place, 17 what the initial goal was within the reduction and the time 18 That would be good. Thank you. 19 period. All right, anything else? 20 21 Yes, I just have a short closing. MR. KADLECEK: Yes, please. 22 CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: 23 MR. KADLECEK: Three main points I want to make 24 in closing. 25 The first is, I want to re-emphasize Mr.

2 building. They're not the kind of people who are going to 3 be bringing a lot of stuff. They are choosing to live in this 4 neighborhood and in this type of project precisely because they 5 6 want to be near transit. They want to be near amenities. Thev want to be near restaurants. They want to be near jobs. 7 They want to be near gyms. They want to be near everything that 8 they can get to within a short walk, with metro, with bus. 9 If they want to have a car, there are plenty of 10 11 other options in the District, even in this neighborhood, there 12 are other options for people to have cars where they can park in their building. 13 14 That's not the type of marketing that this project is oriented towards. These are not the types of people 15 16 that are going to live in this building. Secondly, when you're talking -- when people are 17 making comparisons about people parking on the street, we have 18 to remember that this is an atypical type of apartment. 19 It's not a standard one-bedroom. It's also not eliqible for RPP, 20 which in think differentiates it from a lot of the other 21 buildings in the neighborhood that some of the neighbors have 22 23 testified to. 24 second main point is, there Му some was 25 discussion about -- concern about preserving the Blagden

Balaban's testimony about the nature of the residents in this

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.

The ANC felt, as you heard, very strongly that we went above and beyond to meet the concerns of the community that were expressed at those meetings of the ANC Commissioners. That's 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.

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

the -- the letter amended in the record. 1 2 Board, anything else you want to see? I don't think we're ready for a decision on this, are you? 3 Okay, so, Mr. Moy, I want to put this over for 4 -- on the hearing docket, just in case there is some additional 5 questions, but for hearing/decision date. 6 7 I'm telling you, that study is going to be very key, because it's a -- you know, I've looked at the Arlington 8 and Fairfax County studies myself. I've been always waiting 9 for the District to do its -- you know, because you're right. 10 I mean, your Arlington is still -- and Fairfax is still not 11 the District, and we keep hearing, it's coming, it's coming 12 and coming and coming, and these -- you know, this project is 13 going from a required 61 or 62 parking spaces to zero in a 14 15 residential neighborhood. 16 Yes, that alley is zoned commercial. that's another aspect this Board has got to look at, the impact 17 of what went on in the Zoning Commission hearing when it was 18 designated as commercial. I think that's a fair consideration 19 also. 20 So, and now, we hear that the ANC vote was 21 actually 4-3 and it wasn't a slam dunk there, as I was kind 22 23 of getting the impression, it was a slam dunk. So, I want to put this on for another date, Mr. 24 That's fair. 25 Moy.

1	So, I think as soon as December 27th? No, I'm
2	sorry.
3	MR. MOY: January 27th.
4	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: January 27th is fine. No,
5	no, January 27th is fine with me.
6	You know, we you know, we've got to do these
7	things with you know, certainly with some speed, but it's
8	got to be deliberate speed.
9	These things are not like, you know because
10	these decisions are going to impact people for a long time.
11	Mr. Moy?
12	MR. MOY: Okay, as I heard Mr. Chairman, that was
13	continued hearing, as opposed to a decision meeting for January
14	Tuesday, January 27th. Any filings as the Board requests,
15	by January 20th, because I believe the 19th is a holiday. I
16	believe that's a Monday, I think, but I could be second-guesses
17	on that.
18	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: So, the 27th?
19	MR. MOY: Yes, sir.
20	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: And in on the 19th?
21	MR. MOY: Twenty.
22	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: They've got to get it in by
23	the 20th? What's the docket look like? We've been stacking
24	some stuff up for the 27th.

MR. MOY:

25

Yes, but I have high confidence in this

2	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: What the heck does that
3	mean? Twenty-seventh, please, okay, and with the submission
4	beforehand.
5	Thank you, all. Thanks, everybody. Thank you
6	all for coming down and being diligent on this. I know this
7	is it's one of those issues. It's one of those life
8	impactful issues and we understand that.
9	All right, a brief three minutes and then we're
10	up and running. We'll take the last case for the day, and
11	that's got to move expediently.
12	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off
13	the record at 1:00 p.m. and resumed at 1:06 p.m.)
14	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: This is Case No. 18841, the
15	continuation hearing of Robert Searle for the variance for
16	addition to row-dwelling in the R-4 District at 1522 8th
17	Street, Northwest.
18	This case was previously heard in October 28th
19	was it October 28th, that long ago? October 28th, it seemed
20	like just yesterday. October 28th, 2014.
21	The case was kept open for the Applicant to
22	present to the Board, issues that were raised during the
23	hearing, including explanation of other alternatives and
24	options and why it's not feasible why those things are not
25	feasible, and to further clarify the structural reasons for

Anyway, okay, good. So, the Board has reviewed 2 the record on the matter. I think we see what's going on. 3 me find out. 4 5 Board, was there any other questions we want to ask this Applicant about the supplemental filing? 6 I kind of -- if we can do -- if you bear with me 7 a minute, let me go and ask a question of OP on their report, 8 because it's my understanding, Ms. Vitale, you still are not 9 in support of the relief for the third floor, correct? 10 That is correct. 11 MS. VITALE: 12 CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: And let me ask you, because you wrote in your report, some potential alternative ways to 13 do the -- how to handle the structural issue with the building, 14 that the Applicant could refrain -- re-frame the existing third 15 16 floor roof and distribute the roof load to the parting wall and dog-leg the wall, or the Applicant could restructure and 17 stabilize the under-pinning. 18 If doing it your way, would they not need any 19 zoning relief to do this project? 20 I actually did speak with the Office 21 MS. VITALE: of the Zoning Administrator in DCRA, to confirm that if the 22 23 Applicant were to pull permits to, you know, renovate and stabilize the existing structure without the addition, if that 24 25 could be done, without the need for relief, and they indicated

1

the third floor expansion.

1	that was in fact, the case.
2	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: All right. So, back to the
3	Applicant, to respond to that and/or yes, I got you.
4	No, I didn't do it. That's my fault. You
5	weren't on. There you go. Now, you can do it.
6	MS. MOLDENHAUER: At this point, can I
7	cross-examine Office of Planning based on that statement or
8	are we jumping around?
9	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes, because we're already
10	in the hearing. So, let's I think unless there is something
11	else you think you need to present to the Board, that you
12	haven't presented to us.
13	MS. MOLDENHAUER: Well, one, I'd like to
14	cross-examine Office of Planning.
15	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Go ahead.
16	MS. MOLDENHAUER: And then I can provide
17	additional supplemental.
18	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Certainly, that would be
19	good. Go ahead.
20	MS. MOLDENHAUER: So, my question would be,
21	based on your proposed options, is it your understanding that
22	structurally, you would have to underpin and thus, demolish
23	the existing basement structure?
24	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Say that again. Could you
25	rephrase that?

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

1	had answered the question, that they haven't evaluated the need
2	to
3	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Well, first let me was
4	that the question, as I rephrased it?
5	MS. MOLDENHAUER: Not exactly.
6	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: All right, so, let's make
7	sure we're clear on the question, because I
8	MS. MOLDENHAUER: The question was, in your
9	proposed alternatives, did you consider the fact that those
10	proposed alternatives would require waste and demolition of
11	a portion of the cellar unit that has been renovated?
12	MS. VITALE: Yes, I did. I know it at the last
13	hearing, you did indicate that the basement unit had been
14	renovated recently.
15	I did check permit records, didn't see any permit
16	records for extensive renovation work for the basement.
17	So, I did. I understood that certainly, that's
18	finished space and to underpin in a finished space, would
19	require some disruption, certainly of that space.
20	MS. MOLDENHAUER: And that does not evaluate in
21	regards to wasteful renovation or something that would be
22	practically difficult? In other words, to wasting an existing
23	structure that's been renovated already?
24	MS. VITALE: I'm not certain how that's relevant
25	to the case before us and the need for the third floor.

1	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Let me say this. Ms.
2	Vitale, relevance, don't worry about that. Let's just answer
3	the question. We'll handle the relevance, okay? I
4	understand. Just answer the question.
5	I understand where you're coming from, but just
6	answer the question. I think I understand what she's
7	asking
8	MS. VITALE: As I stated, yes, I understand that
9	you would certainly need to disrupt some existing finished
10	space, in order to underpin that wall.
11	MS. MOLDENHAUER: Then no other questions at
12	this point for OP.
13	We'll then just simply we have obviously, we
14	can elaborate on the information that was provided in regards
15	to the civil engineer, and we also, in part of the revised
16	plans, have shown that the roof top access has been removed
17	from the structure, and I believe that the Applicant would like
18	to provide a brief statement, as well, to the Board.
19	MR. SEARLE: Good afternoon, Chairman Jordan and
20	the Board.
21	I'll try to be quick and brief on this.
22	I just want to give, from my perspective, you
23	know, the difficulty that is, you know, on the decision of how
24	to remedy this wall in my unique situation, as we talked about.
25	There is an internal wall. It's got a lot of gracks. It's

even buckling in a spot, and it's causing a lot of problems and something has to be done to remedy, and this was done through previous owners, through modifications and failure to keep upkeep of the property.

In consulting initially 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

1	underneath and saw the casing how the footing is and the
2	foundation, and so, I would like to rest on their expert
3	opinion, and their advice to me, which is the best option would
4	be to carry the load through that to that rear wall, and
5	that's all I have. Thank you, sir.
6	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Thank you. Anything else
7	that you think the Board needs to hear? Board, questions?
8	Yes, Mr. May?
9	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay, well, first of all, I
10	appreciate the fact that you removed the rooftop access. That
11	was problematic for me.
12	Let's talk about this "condemned wall". I mean,
13	condemned wall is just that's the term that the engineer
14	used for it, right? It's not you haven't you don't have
15	a condemnation sticker on it from DCRA or anything like that,
16	right?
17	MS. MOLDENHAUER: No, it was what the
18	COMMISSIONER MAY: What they called it? What
19	they how they referred to it?
20	MS. MOLDENHAUER: How they referred to it.
21	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay, so, tell me more about
22	why it's condemned.
23	The wall extends from the presumably the
24	basement level, all the way up to the roof? Correct?
25	MS. MOLDENHAUER: I am not a civil engineer and

1	we don't have our civil engineer here with us.
2	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay, well, your architect
3	sure be able to answer that question.
4	MS. FOWLER: Sure, yes. It does extend from the
5	basement level and it carries the load of the partial third
6	floor.
7	COMMISSIONER MAY: Partial third floor, right
8	and the roof, right? Carries to the roof?
9	MS. FOWLER: Yes, the roof load from the third
10	floor.
11	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right, it doesn't include
12	actually carry any load from the third floor, because that's
13	carried by bearing the party walls.
14	MS. FOWLER: Right.
15	COMMISSIONER MAY: So, the what portion of
16	this wall is bad? I mean, is it bad from the basement? I mean,
17	from the cellar all the way to the roof?
18	MS. FOWLER: That's correct. Yes, we observed
19	cracks and bowing, kind of throughout from the basement level,
20	all the way up through
21	COMMISSIONER MAY: So, how much bowing are you
22	talking about?
23	MS. FOWLER: He had in his letter, kind of
24	states that there is
25	COMMISSIONER MAY: The only dimension I saw was

1	three-eighths of an inch, which is not much.
2	MS. FOWLER: Out of plain movement that he
3	mentioned in the letter.
4	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
5	MS. FOWLER: There is one particular area in the
6	basement where you can see you can visually see that there
7	is there has been movement in that wall.
8	COMMISSIONER MAY: It's moving, it's bowing?
9	MS. FOWLER: It's bowing, yes.
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay, is the mortar in tact?
11	MS. FOWLER: No, there is definitely areas where
12	the mortar is not.
13	COMMISSIONER MAY: I mean, in the area where it's
14	bowing, is the mortar in tact?
15	MS. FOWLER: In that area, it's not exposed.
16	The mortar is not exposed, but we can see other damage and
17	bowing from the finished wall.
18	COMMISSIONER MAY: So, it's pushing on the
19	finished wall?
20	MS. FOWLER: Right.
21	COMMISSIONER MAY: And you can't see it?
22	MS. FOWLER: That's what we think. That's what
23	we believe.
24	COMMISSIONER MAY: In the basement level?
25	MS. FOWLER: Correct.

1	COMMISSIONER MAY: So, you're going to have to
2	take apart that wall anyway, in order to fix that, right? You
3	don't want to have the I mean, you're not going to want to
4	have the masonry wall start pushing through the drywall.
5	MS. FOWLER: I think once the load is removed,
6	we won't need to
7	COMMISSIONER MAY: It's not going to bow
8	anymore. It's only going to bow as much as it has.
9	MS. FOWLER: I believe so.
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay.
11	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: What caused the damage to
12	the wall, anyway, the structure?
13	MS. FOWLER: There was as we testified
14	previously, there have been holes put through the wall over
15	time, for duct work and other utilities, doorways put through
16	without proper support, and also, we believe that that
17	foundation based on other projects that I've experienced
18	through work, there is potentially no footing under that
19	particular wall.
20	Usually, it's just kind of a brick wall laid on
21	the dirt. So, we believe that there is settling it's
22	settling differently than the perimeter walls.
23	COMMISSIONER MAY: So, where to what extent
24	have you been able to examine the actual masonry? Is it on
25	the first floor? Second floor? Inside only? Second floor

1	or third floor inside only?
2	MS. FOWLER: Inside, mostly, but there is a
3	photograph we had in the
4	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, I saw one where there is
5	a sort of a column
6	MS. FOWLER: Right.
7	COMMISSIONER MAY: piece that is exposed, and
8	it's obviously, in very bad shape behind the drywall. Is that
9	the extent to which it has been you've examined the masonry?
10	MS. FOWLER: On the upper levels, we've seen
11	cracks there is plaster walls
12	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.
13	MS. FOWLER: so, we were able to see cracks
14	that have occurred from the
15	COMMISSIONER MAY: It's the differential
16	settlement, right?
17	MS. FOWLER: Correct, and where the wall meets
18	the party walls
19	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
20	MS. FOWLER: where it's separated.
21	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right, it's settling a little
22	bit more in the middle because it doesn't have the foundation,
23	right.
24	MS. FOWLER: But it's much easier to tell with
25	the plaster walls than it is for instance, in the basement

1	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.
2	MS. FOWLER: where this is drywall.
3	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right, so, how much do you
4	think it has actually settled there?
5	I mean, because those cracks at corners like that
6	are quite common in older plaster you know, houses with
7	plaster.
8	MS. MOLDENHAUER: I think the issue is, and I
9	think we can kind of go back and forth with this, but what we
10	did from the last time is, we actually went and we obtained
11	a civil engineer from them, to provide their expert opinion.
12	COMMISSIONER MAY: And I read it, and I have
13	questions about it, and he's not here. So, I'm trying to
14	figure out what I need to figure out.
15	MS. MOLDENHAUER: I'm just trying to say that
16	obviously, you know, one of the things we're relying upon is
17	his, you know
18	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.
19	MS. MOLDENHAUER: opinion that wall and
20	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay, let me tell you what
21	what he described in the letter is no worse than conditions
22	that I've seen in multiple townhouses over the years, and
23	particularly on that back wall.
24	So, I'm trying to understand if that wall really,
25	truly is in jeopardy or not, because based on the description,

1	it's not compelling.
2	So, I'm trying to find that out. If you want me
3	to stop
4	MS. MOLDENHAUER: No.
5	COMMISSIONER MAY: I'll stop and vote, you
6	know.
7	MS. MOLDENHAUER: I'm just trying to
8	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay.
9	MS. MOLDENHAUER: focus what we have,
10	obviously on the
11	COMMISSIONER MAY: I understand, I understand
12	and it's, you know, as you can probably tell, it's not
13	compelling enough for me.
14	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: As I always say, and you
15	know certainly, we've already read the record. So, we know
16	what we read.
17	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.
18	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: So, the questions are just
19	follow-ups that we need to get the answers to.
20	COMMISSIONER MAY: So, in terms of the actual
21	construction that you would do here, at this point, you would
22	take down the wall from the level of the floor, the first floor,
23	all the way up to the roof, essentially.
24	MS. FOWLER: That's correct.
25	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay, and then the roof load,

1 you expect to use a king beam to carry that, the rest? Correct. We were planning to 2 MS. FOWLER: reinforce --3 COMMISSIONER MAY: An existing king beam? 4 5 MS. FOWLER: -- forward king beams and then install new king beams further back. 6 COMMISSIONER MAY: I see, yes, right, because 7 it's too far to span. 8 So, is there anything that would prevent you from 9 simply spanning from the existing brick wall, to rebuild the 10 back wall, at the third floor with just wood framing? 11 I mean, is there any reason why you couldn't just 12 stop it there and maintain the same envelope? 13 I mean, you're arguing that this is structurally 14 necessary because you need to remove that wall, and the only 15 16 solutions that we've heard so far is that you'd have to demolish the thing down to the basement and put in a new footing and 17 build it all up and masonry. 18 But you're also -- you know, you're showing king 19 beams that are being carried by the party walls and by the 20 dog-leg wall, and if those are strong enough to carry king beams 21 that will carry the roof load, couldn't you, you know, span 22 23 that, you know, at the top of the second floor, span and then put your wall, you know, your back wall right on top of that 24

and then maintain the envelope and comply with the zoning?

25

1	MS. FOWLER: I mean, part of the strategy here
2	is to remove the load from that the wall that the engineers
3	condemned, and spread it out over multiple points, and which
4	are also carrying down onto walls that we believe have more
5	viable foundations than the wall that's currently carrying the
6	loads.
7	So, the idea is to disperse this load over
8	different walls that we've seen have better foundations.
9	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay.
10	MS. MOLDENHAUER: And if you were what would
11	be another option? Would it be to carry out to the original
12	existing exterior wall?
13	COMMISSIONER MAY: I'm just asking why not?
14	MS. MOLDENHAUER: But what I'm saying, if they
15	pulled it out to the original existing wall, which is the second
16	one, that would still then require zoning relief. It would
17	just
18	COMMISSIONER MAY: No, no, no, I'm not talking
19	about the original existing wall. I'm talking about the wall
20	that is bad, essentially in the same plain, have a beam that
21	goes from the party wall at the top to the you know, the
22	viable masonry wall, you know, at the end of the dog-leg there,
23	and carry the load down that way, and build up.
24	MS. FOWLER: We're kind of basing what we our
25	degign on the regemmendations of the structural engineer and

1	what he thought was the most efficient way to address the issue.
2	COMMISSIONER MAY: So, the structural engineer
3	who gave us this report most recently, was the one who advised
4	you originally to extend the roof all the way to the back of
5	the house?
6	MS. FOWLER: He didn't originally, but when we
7	showed him the designs and we walked through the house, he
8	concurred that that was the best solution.
9	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay, all right. It's
10	unfortunate that he's not here to testify to that, because
11	that's not what he wrote in his letter. He wrote that the
12	letter that the wall is not viable and should come down,
13	and you know
14	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: There was a lot of detail.
15	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, it's I'll leave it
16	there. I don't have any further questions.
17	MS. MOLDENHAUER: I want to ask Jennifer a
18	question.
19	So, if based on what obviously, the structural
20	engineer informed you, that this wall, this entire wall is not
21	viable, what would be the alternative, if you were to use this
22	wall, the original, which I'm just going to kind of going
23	over on a cursory here.
24	This was the original wall of the property.
25	Would that still require zoning relief? You're expanding not

1	all the way to the far back wall, all the way to the far
2	to the far back wall, but to the middle wall, which is the
3	original wall, would that still require zoning relief, if you
4	went back to that portion?
5	MS. FOWLER: Yes, it would also have its own
6	challenges, as well, because the wall has been removed in many
7	locations.
8	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, Board, any
9	additional questions?
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: Actually, I do have another
11	question.
12	So, you have in your submission, you included
13	information about the garage, that indicates the garage has
14	been there for a long time. Is it a contributing structure
15	in the Historic District?
16	MS. MOLDENHAUER: We have not yet gone to HPO.
17	We were going through the BZA process first, and then we're
18	going to be going to the Historic Preservation process.
19	But what we did pull up was just a
20	COMMISSIONER MAY: I saw what you submitted,
21	yes.
22	MS. MOLDENHAUER: Also that from the 1907
23	picture on the left here, is a picture of all of the original
24	garages that were built at that time, and if you look at the
25	picture on the right, that's actually a picture from our

_	current.
2	So, obviously, majority, almost all of those
3	original structured garages have been removed from this entire
4	square. You can see the picture on the right, where there is
5	really only one other garage structure from the image.
6	So, we have not yet pursued HPO. We are going
7	go through the BZA process first, but we do believe it would
8	be an issue, in regards to, you know, addressing that, since
9	this was is one of the few garages that are left.
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay, so, in your original
11	submission on page C4, you have a photograph of that garage,
12	which shows a concrete block garage with a double door on it.
13	That's what I'm that's the garage, right?
14	MS. MOLDENHAUER: That's the interior side, yes.
15	COMMISSIONER MAY: It's the alley side.
16	MS. MOLDENHAUER: Is that the alley side?
17	Sorry.
18	COMMISSIONER MAY: I'm looking at the alley
19	side. I don't have the picture of the of the interior side.
20	Yes, I mean, I'm seeing basically a block wall
21	garage.
22	I mean, I guess what it my point is that even
23	I'm sorry, and the current iteration of the garage, it
24	borders the alley directly, right? It's not off-set the way
25	it's shown in the basement up on the left.

1	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Is that flipped?
2	COMMISSIONER MAY: No.
3	MS. MOLDENHAUER: It appears to be.
4	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right. So, one of the
5	solutions to the I'm sorry, is one of the solutions for the
6	garage to be removed, and then to build the addition the
7	expansion the way you want?
8	MS. MOLDENHAUER: We believe that that would
9	create a practical difficulty, in regards to waste of an
10	existing structure, and we also believe we'd have to
11	COMMISSIONER MAY: And this and I understand
12	that's what you would argue, but that's not what I asked.
13	Would that be a solution? It would be it may
14	not be the solution you want, but is that a solution, that if
15	you took the garage away, would you be compliant with zoning,
16	with this addition?
17	MS. MOLDENHAUER: If you removed the garage
18	structure it would reduce the lot occupancy and
19	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.
20	MS. MOLDENHAUER: Yes.
21	COMMISSIONER MAY: So, you'd be zoning
22	compliant.
23	MS. MOLDENHAUER: But so I it's so, it would
24	not though, you would have to have an issue with the court,
25	because the issue here is the court, and so

Τ	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.
2	MS. MOLDENHAUER: it would not change the
3	court issue, and the court obviously provides the light and
4	air that, you know, courts were designed for that purpose.
5	So, you would still
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right, but it's a different
7	test for court versus lot occupancy, right?
8	MS. MOLDENHAUER: But the relief that we're
9	seeking now
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: You have a 223 relief on
11	extending a non-compliant court, but you can't, for
12	non-compliant non-conforming lot occupancy.
13	MS. MOLDENHAUER: No, exactly, so, obviously,
14	you know, but that obviously goes to the degree of relief and
15	here, if we were the same issue is the case here.
16	We have a question of a non- conforming court,
17	and if we wanted to increase that non-conforming court, we
18	would still need zoning relief, and then that actually just
19	goes to
20	COMMISSIONER MAY: But the special exception
21	relief as opposed to variance relief.
22	MS. MOLDENHAUER: It goes to then the case of
23	1700 N Street, in which the Court evaluated Barber and they
24	indicated that that case was distinguishable, "Because the
25	owner of the property had two alternative methods that could

1	be constructed without full compliant within full
2	compliance of the zoning regulations."
3	Whereas, here in this in the case of 1700 N
4	Street, the YMCA had not feasible alternative methods that
5	would provide both a pool and also require the parking spaces.
6	So, we are arguing that this is a same situation
7	as the Court of Appeals determined in that case, which was
8	distinguished from Barber.
9	We have alternatives, but any of those
10	alternatives would still require zoning relief. The option
11	that you just presented, Commissioner May, would still require
12	a degree of zoning relief, and it would also then, in our
13	opinion, create more practical difficulty because it would
14	not allow the maintenance or the maintaining of structures,
15	such as a parking structure.
16	We've heard a lot of testimony about, you know,
17	the need for parking in the area, and we believe that it would
18	be a practical difficulty to demolish the
19	COMMISSIONER MAY: Elimination of the garage
20	doesn't take away parking.
21	MS. MOLDENHAUER: It reduces the style of
22	parking that you're being provided.
23	COMMISSIONER MAY: Changes it.
24	MS. MOLDENHAUER: And storage, and so, we but
25	to the legal issue, the legal issue identifies in the 1700 N

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

COMMISSIONER MAY:

25

Right, but there is an

1	essential difference between special exception relief and
2	variance relief, right, and I'm not sure that the case you're
3	citing has anything to do with that.
4	MS. MOLDENHAUER: There is no specific case that
5	relates to both that is is comparing that, and
6	unfortunately, we have limited
7	COMMISSIONER MAY: You're the one that brought
8	it up. That's why I asked.
9	MS. MOLDENHAUER: But I believe it's so
10	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Okay, okay,.
11	MS. MOLDENHAUER: parallel on the legal
12	issues.
13	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: I think we can do this all
14	day. I think we're ready to wrap this up.
15	Is there any other evidence? Board, any
16	additional questions from the Board?
17	Okay, then we will close the record in this case.
18	Is the Board ready to deliberate?
19	Okay, then we'll move into deliberations on this.
20	This is a matter which I think you can kind of
21	toss up, in regards to how you take care of the structural
22	issue, but clearly, there is a showing that this building has
23	some uniqueness and has been defined by the evidence presented
24	by the Applicant, and that there is a structural issue with
25	this wall.

1 How you do it, I think you can probably get 15 experts in the room and you'll probably get 12 different ways 2 handle the structural issue. But I think it 3 of how you can presents enough that the structural issue shows that there is 4 a deterioration of some sort, an erosion in this building, and 5 there has got to be some kind of aspect of attacking that third 6 7 floor wall and that half-portion of the roof. Again, question about where the experts are, and 8 I would -- I believe that doing so still is going to require 9 some type of practical difficulty, in regards to this property, 10 11 and depending on which way you do it, will have an affect upon the cellar and require some additional spending of money, maybe 12 in the area that didn't need it. 13 14 But again, you can go back and forth with the I think it's -- I can support this application, based 15 16 upon what I've heard so far, what I've heard in this case. Based upon that, I think again, the argument how 17 you do it and 15 different ways to do it, it's still 18 questionable, but I think there has been reasonable evidence 19 presented by the Applicant, to support this and that's my 20 21 thought. Anyone else? Certainly. So, as you might 22 COMMISSIONER MAY: 23 don't support granting a variance in this 24 circumstance.

Certainly, the idea of fixing the problem with

25

the wall by extending the load and carrying the load, distributing it over more of the walls is a way to solve the problem. It is not the only way to solve the problem, and I don't believe that it is necessarily even the most cost-effective way to solve the problem.

It is the most cost-effective way for 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.

I think that -- I mean, you know, yes, 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 the fact, in order to justify

1	the solution. At least, that's the way it looks to me.
2	So, I agree with the Office of Planning, this is
3	not something that we should be granting.
4	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: I would move we grant the
5	relief in this matter.
6	VICE CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Second.
7	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Motion made and seconded.
8	Any additional discussion from anyone?
9	All those in favor of the motion, signify by
10	saying aye.
11	(Chorus of ayes)
12	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Those opposed nay. The
13	motion passes. Mr. Moy?
14	MR. MOY: Staff would record the vote as 3-1.
15	This is on the motion of Chairman Jordan or approve the
16	application for the relief requested. Second the motion, Vice
17	Chair Allen. Also in support, Mr. Hinkle. Opposed to the
18	motion, Mr. May and we have a member not present. The motion
19	carries, Mr. Chairman.
20	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: The motion passes. Let's
21	have a full order. Maybe, no, we can do a summary order.
22	We can't have a summary. We need a full order.
23	Make it full, okay, all right.
24	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off
25	the record briefly at 1:37 p.m.)

1	MR. MOY: Before we close the hearing, Mr.
2	Chairman, can I make just a real quick announcement?
3	CHAIRPERSON JORDAN: Yes.
4	MR. MOY: Yes, just for the record, just to leave
5	a paper trail, two cases that were rescheduled, 18899 Ron
6	Rogers was rescheduled to December 9th and the hearing case
7	of Kevin Latner 18865 was rescheduled to December 16th.
8	That's all I have, Mr. Chairman.
9	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off
10	the record at 1:40 p.m.)
11	
12	
12	