1

GOVERNMENT

OF

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

TUESDAY

MAY 5, 2015

+ + + + +

The Regular Public Meeting convened in the Jerrily R. Kress Memorial Hearing Room, Room 220 South, 441 4th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20001, pursuant to notice at 9:41 a.m., Lloyd Jordan, Chairperson, presiding.

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT MEMBERS PRESENT:

LLOYD JORDAN, Chairperson
MARNIQUE HEATH, Vice-Chairperson
JEFF HINKLE, Board Member (NCPC)

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBER PRESENT:

ANTHONY HOOD, Chairman

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

CLIFFORD MOY, Secretary JOHN NYARKU, Zoning Specialist

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PRESENT:

SHERRY GLAZER, ESQ.

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Public Meeting held on May 5, 2015.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

	PAGE
Application number 18988 of	David and Grace Steckler 5
Application number 18958 of	Patrick Scott 6
Application number 18964 of Southeast, LLC	1220 Potomac Avenue 7
Application number 18886 of	Hoorazor 9

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

(9:40 a.m.)

BZA CHAIR JORDAN: Good morning. Can we please come to order? Today's date is what, oh, May 5th, 2013 and we're here at the Jerrily R. Kress Memorial Hearing Room at 441 4th Street, Northwest and we're here for the meeting of the Board of Zoning Adjustment of the District of Columbia.

My name is Lloyd Jordan, Chairperson. To my right is Jeffrey Hinkle, Member of the Board. To my left is Vice Chair Marnique Heath and to her left is the Chairman of the Zoning Commission, Anthony Hood sitting in as a member of the Board of Zoning Adjustment today.

Please be advised that today's proceedings are being webcast live and, oh there he is. All right. And being recorded by a court reporter who moved on me from his normal position down there to down here. So therefore, I'm going to ask you to refrain from any disruptive noises here in the hearing room today.

Please be sure at this time that your cell phones and other devices that my ring and buzz loudly are turned off or muted or et cetera. If you're going to provide testimony to the Board, that means if you're going to read a statement, sit at the witness table and say anything to the Board today, I'm going to need you to do two things.

That's two things I'm going to need you to do, the first

2 two witness cards per person. And prior to taking a seat at 3 this table, please give those two cards to the court reporter 4 who's down to my right. Okay, so prior to, two cards, give 5 them to the court reporter. The second thing I'm going to need you to do is to now 6 7 stand and be sworn in my Mr. Moy, the Secretary to the Board. 8 (Multiple witnesses sworn) 9 BZA CHAIR JORDAN: Okay, are there any announcements, 10 Mr. Moy? MR. MOY: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, 11 12 good morning, Members of the Board. I believe today is Cinco 13 de Mayo as a matter of fact. One announcement actually for 14 the case record. There are two cases on today's docket that 15 have been postponed and rescheduled. 16 The first is application number 18897 of Laudi. And that 17 has been rescheduled to June 16th, 2015. Also 18967, this is 18 the application of the Buddhist Congregational Church of 19 And that has been postponed and rescheduled to June 20 That completes the Staff's introduction, Mr. Chairman. 9th. 21 (Off microphone comments) 22 BZA CHAIR JORDAN: Okay. Then let's take our first 23 meeting case, please. 24 Okay. All right, there are two applications 25 on the expedited review calendar. The first of the two is

of which is to complete two witness cards per person. That's

1 Application number 18988 of David and Grace Steckler. 2 Is the Board ready to deliberate on BZA CHAIR JORDAN: 3 18988? I think the record indicates the need for the relief, 4 it's substantiated in the record, except I think we need to add has been recommended by counsel and also by the Office of 5 Planning that it requires relief from 2001.3 for expansion of 6 a non-conforming use. 7 8 So with that, I would move that we grant the relief on 9 18988 with the additional relief of 2001.3. I'll second. 10 MEMBER HINKLE: Motion made and second. 11 BZA CHAIR JORDAN: Any 12 additional discussion? All those in additional 13 discussion? All those in favor of the motion, aye? 14 (Chorus of ayes) 15 BZA CHAIR JORDAN: Those opposed, nay. 16 (No response) 17 BZA CHAIR JORDAN: The motion carries. Mr. Moy? 18 MR. MOY: Staff would record the vote as four to zero. 19 This is on the motion of Chairman Jordan to approve the 20 application for the relief requested, special exception 223 21 plus amended to add 2001.3. Second the motion, Mr. Hinkle. 22 Also support, Vice Chairperson Heath and Mr. Hood. We have a 23 Board seat vacant. The motion carries four zero, sir. 24 BZA CHAIR JORDAN: Summary, please? 25 MR. MOY: Thank you.

1	BZA CHAIR JORDAN: Our next one?
2	MR. MOY: Yes. The second of two cases on the expedited
3	calendar is Application number 18958. This is of Patrick
4	Scott.
5	BZA CHAIR JORDAN: All right, now there's no Affidavit
6	of Posting in this case, and there's not a completed
7	self-certification form also in this case. I think we've
8	carried this case once before. And I understand, Mr. Moy,
9	you've had conversation or your office has had conversation
10	with this applicant?
11	MR. MOY: Yes, sir. Staff has reached out to this
12	individual.
13	BZA CHAIR JORDAN: Let's put this on a show cause.
14	MR. MOY: Yes, sir. Thank you.
15	BZA CHAIR JORDAN: And we'll follow up. And in the
16	notice to them that this is on show cause, let's be sure to
17	let them know the procedural problems they have with this and
18	that they have to be corrected within the show cause next
19	hearing date. And when would that be scheduled?
20	MR. MOY: Staff would suggest putting this case out for
21	another month, sir. So that would be June the 16th, sir.
22	Done.
23	BZA CHAIR JORDAN: All right, then. Let's call our
24	next one, please.
25	MR. MOY: All right. The next case for decision is

Our next one?

BZA CHAIR JORDAN:

Application number 18964. This is of 1220 Potomac Avenue Southeast, LLC. This was last heard on March 31st, 2015, Mr. Chairman. And I believe the record was closed. No post hearing documents requested.

BZA CHAIR JORDAN: All right. Is the Board ready to deliberate on this case? This is one where I would recommend to the Board that we grant the relief requested. I believe there's been a showing that this site, this one is unusually large for this particular square.

It's irregularly shaped, and in fact it's the largest lot, I believe, in that particular square, and that it has some unique physical characteristics as it being kind of in a hexagon kind of shaping. And there's a practical difficulty, particularly in being able to revive the needed parking due to historic preservation issues and the getting the curb cut.

I think there's been a proper showing that there is not being any substantial detriment to the public good. The Department of Transportation has signed off on this and there are some TDM measures which we would need to put in place.

But I believe that there's no substantial impact on the neighborhood and that this property would be RPP restricted, and we would require that the Applicant file the proper covenants to run with the land restricting any residential parking permitted.

They had first offered to have one, only allow one car

1 per unit, but I believe that we just need to restrict the whole 2 building from no residential parking permits and that we need 3 to see whether or not this property is going to be an apartment, 4 then in every lease it needs to make that a provision in every 5 lease. And if it's a condo, it also needs to be reflected in 6 7 the proper condo docs. But overall, with the land it needs 8 to be recorded with the Recorder of Deeds that there is a 9 prohibition for this and that the Applicant provides 10 Smartcards for every new resident in this building, and even if it's a condo, there's certainly new owners. 11 12 And that would include bike membership and/or car 13 membership to one of the car services to relieve, if there's 14 going to be any issue regarding traffic. But the studies all 15 indicate that there's not going to be that type of impact. 16 that would be my recommendation. Anyone else? 17 Then I would move that, that we grant the Okay. Yes. relief requested in 18964 with the conditions as stated. 18 19 VICE CHAIRPERSON HEATH: 20 BZA CHAIR JORDAN: Motion made and second. Further 21 discussion? All those in favor, aye? 22 (Chorus of ayes) 23 BZA CHAIR JORDAN: Those opposed, nay? 24 (No response) 25 BZA CHAIR JORDAN: Motion carries. Mr. Mov?

1	MR. MOY: Staff would record the vote as four to zero.
2	This is on the motion of Chairman Jordan to approve the
3	application for the relief requested with the conditions as
4	cited. Seconded the motion, Vice Chairperson Heath. Also in
5	support, Mr. Hood and Mr. Hinkle. We have a Board seat vacant.
6	The motion carries four to zero, sir.
7	BZA CHAIR JORDAN: Okay. Then let's move to our next
8	decision case.
9	MR. MOY: Are you waiving the requirements for a summary
10	order?
11	BZA CHAIR JORDAN: No. We had a party in status, didn't
12	we? We had a party in opposition in, I believe, in that case.
13	Am I right or wrong?
14	MR. MOY: That was direct.
15	BZA CHAIR JORDAN: Then let's do summary. Okay, thank
16	you.
17	MR. MOY: All right, thank you, sir. The next and last
18	application for decision is 18886, Hoorazor. This was last
19	heard, if you will recall Mr. Chairman, on March 31st, 2015.
20	The record was closed except for three post-hearing
21	supplemental information, and I believe that's in your case
22	records which also includes draft findings of fact,
23	conclusions of law. Okay, I'm going to leave it at that, Mr.
24	Chairman.

What?

I'm sorry.

BZA CHAIR JORDAN:

2 BZA CHAIR JORDAN: You're done. Okay, give me one 3 second, please. All right, that makes sense. Okay. All 4 right, got it. There are some, is there some preliminary 5 issues in this case? Well, they're soft ones, Mr. Chairman. 6 MR. MOY: Yes. BZA CHAIR JORDAN: Because I remember you --8 MR. MOY: Yes, the opponent submitted a corrected sun 9 study which was posed on Monday, yesterday May 4th. 10 although they had submitted an earlier version which was timely under Exhibit 71 and 72. But I believe this one is the correct 11 12 one, a corrected copy. 13 BZA CHAIR JORDAN: Yes, there's a lot of things going 14 on in this file which the Board's not happy with. When we've 15 directed what additional documents could be placed in the 16 record and we had other things. 17 For instance, the Applicant submitted an Exhibit 70 with 18 argument which we did not request. And we asked for additional 19 sun study and et cetera. So I believe that we will strike 20 Exhibit 70 except for the screening recommendation that's there. 21 22 There's a request for -- and we have to be careful, Mr. 23 Moy, what we have and what we accept and put in our record 24 because once we started getting those numbers. The Opponent's 25 Exhibit 74 is requesting lead to file alleging errors in the

I'm done.

MR. MOY:

Applicant's sun study.

I didn't notice that there was any errors identified in that. We will accept the additional sun study. But for what it's worth, but I don't think it gives me any real difference in credence as to what's already been filed and what I'm thinking would be the ultimate result in this case.

This is a case that we've had a lot of testimony, a lot of documents, long hearing and given a lot of thought, frankly, probably three more hours which is longer than usual going through some of these cases, trying to review the documents. And I actually went back and looked at the hearing again like I didn't have anything else to do.

And are you okay? So is the Board ready to deliberate in this case? This is a request for special exception to allow a two story side and rear addition to a one family dwelling, not meeting the lot occupancy and side lot, and enlargement of non-conforming structure.

The real issue here is that this addition is just about being done as a matter of right. But what happened, there was some mis-measurements and after the property was actually constructed, the addition was constructed, the property was, the side yard was 6/10 of a foot short. That's 0.06 short and therefore had to be included in the lot occupancy numbers, and it increased the lot occupancy from 39 percent to 44 percent.

It was requested special exception under 223. And

among other things, the important part of 223 is that you have to show that the light and air available to neighboring properties shall not be unduly affected, and that the privacy of the use and enjoyment of the neighboring properties shall not be unduly compromised.

The shadow studies, and there were several sets of shadow studies, and you needed a magnifying glass, to me, I did, to try to see if there was any differences in the study and the effect in the examining shadow studies. And I think that's generally been left.

If you look at what the existing property, the shadows being cast in the area, the shadows of the addition, and then I think the Applicant also provided a matter of right shadow study which we're allowed under the law to consider.

The shadow studies offered by the appellant and the opponent parties to me did not show any additional, any of the addition creating a substantial impact to the light of any of the joining properties.

Now there may be some minimal intrusion during the time of December 12th noon period and March around noon periods. Those seemed like they had some additional shadowing, but there wasn't substantial. I mean, you had to, you know, really nail down, in fact I did get my magnifying glass to take a look at it.

Except for the McKey property, the property provides

more than required space in between the properties. The light and air available to the Cunningham property, the property to the south does not unduly affect the addition.

The side yard between the building and the Cunningham's property is, it ranges between eight feet, or a little more than eight feet, to eleven feet. This exceeds the eight feet minimum requirements that we have.

The Cunningham property additionally has 13 feet of vegetation on top of that, and therefore their privacy is, in my opinion is preserved. And I don't believe that this addition unduly affects their property.

There was a claim that the rear of the addition intruded on the privacy of the neighbors across the alley. But at a minimum, and unlike any one of a few places in the District of Columbia, there's at least 45 feet of open space including the alley space and et cetera between the rear of this addition and the property across the alley.

And in fact, it appeared that the viewing was more so by the other property and not the Applicant's property. And so contrary. Regarding the McKey property, we have some discussion, particularly Mr. Hood had some discussion about concern about the privacy, possible privacy intrusion.

There's little light and air intrusion if you weigh it against the pre-existing light and air issues. Regarding privacy, since it's right generally abut to this property,

there might be some minimum privacy issues. But I would suggest to the Board as Mr. Hood has suggested and discussed during the time of the hearing that that can be mitigated with some decorative screening.

I would offer that the Board give credit to the Office of Planning's report which was very thorough and actually looked at the other elements whether or not this met the, kept in tune with the zoning regulations and the neighborhood. And so I would give them, I would ask the Board to credit the Office of Planning's report.

Regarding the AMC report which at the Board we give great weight to and really appreciate the input from ANC and Dr. May, I think this was good input. However, I would suggest that the Board not accept the recommendation of the ANC.

The ANC's basically, and I understand their frustration, it's communication with neighbors, communication on development in these communities have to happen. I guess we say it all the time.

And we try to have conversation here, and I think there was conversation at least for two hours and I don't know what happened afterwards. But the ANC report generally centered on the fact that the Applicant, their recommendation was because the Applicant had disregarded established procedures in seeking a special exception prior to building their unit, which I understand that.

1 But I hear there was some excusable kind of neglect or 2 issues that arose after the fact that the building was there 3 and they got down to, it became a 6/10 of a foot issue from 4 instead of being five feet it was 4.96 I believe. It was 4.94 5 in difference. And so they thought they could do it within the 6 7 So with that, and because of regulations. that, 8 recommendation of the ANC was really based upon that. 9 So for the reasons I've just stated, I would recommend 10 that the Board grant the relief requested with the condition that the Applicant must provide some form of decorative 11 12 screening for the McKey property, and that the screening should 13 be selected in cooperation with the McKeys. 14 And if there's no reasonable agreement for that, then 15 the Applicant be allowed to provide the good faith acceptable That would be what I look at the case. 16 decorative screening. 17 Any others, please? 18 ZC CHAIR HOOD: Mr. Chairman, I would agree. I was more 19 concerned about that one particular window, I think it was 20 floor level if my memory serves me correct. But if we're 21 talking about the whole screening, I would agree. And if that 22 was a motion, I'll second. 23 BZA CHAIR JORDAN: I didn't move it, but you can. 24 No, you go ahead. I think your motion ZC CHAIR HOOD: 25 was succinct and there's no sense in me being redundant.

1	BZA CHAIR JORDAN: Okay. Well I would
2	ZC CHAIR HOOD: And I will note, I will note though that
3	Office of Planning recommends that we not require a screen.
4	But I think it's important that we do in this case.
5	BZA CHAIR JORDAN: Then I would move that the Board
6	grant the relief requested in 8886 with the condition as I've
7	provided.
8	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Second.
9	BZA CHAIR JORDAN: Motion made and second. Any
10	additional discussion? All those in the favor of the motion,
11	aye?
12	(Chorus of ayes)
13	BZA CHAIR JORDAN: Those opposed, nay?
14	(No response)
15	BZA CHAIR JORDAN: The motion carries. Mr. Moy?
16	MR. MOY: Yes, sir. Staff would record the vote as four
17	to zero. This is on the motion of Chairman Jordan to approve
18	the application for the relief requested with the one condition
19	as cited by the Board. Second the motion, Mr. Hood. Also in
20	support, Vice Chairperson Heath and Mr. Hinkle, board seat
21	vacant. Motion carries, sir.
22	BZA CHAIR JORDAN: Thank you, Mr. Moy.
23	(Whereupon, the meeting in the above-entitled matter
24	was concluded at 10:02 a.m.)