GOVERNMENT

OF

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

+ + + + +

REGULAR PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY

JULY 29, 2020

+ + + + +

The Regular Public Meeting of the District of Columbia Board of Zoning Adjustment convened via video conference, pursuant to notice at 9:46 a.m. EDT, Frederick L. Hill, Chairperson, presiding.

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT MEMBERS PRESENT:

FREDERICK L. HILL, Chairperson CARLTON HART, Vice Chair (NCPC) LORNA JOHN, Board Member

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

ANTHONY J. HOOD, Chairperson ROBERT MILLER, Vice Chair MICHAEL G. TURNBULL, FAIA, Commissioner (AOC)

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

CLIFFORD MOY, Secretary
PAUL YOUNG, Zoning Data Specialist

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL STAFF PRESENT:

ALEXANDRA CAIN, Assistant Attorney General

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Regular Public Meeting held on July 29, 2020.

## C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

I. <u>DECISIONS</u>	
Application No. 29257 of MCRC Erie Street LLC	8
Application No. 20259 of Federal Realty	10
II. CONSENT CALENDAR	
Application No. 20053 of District Properties.com Inc	12
Request for Modification of Consequence	28
III. DECISION CASES (cont.)	
Application No. 20258 of William G. Springer and Forrest Kettler	36

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

2.0

2.1

9:46 a.m.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. We are convened and broadcasting this decision meeting by video conference. This is the July 29, 2020, public meeting session, Board of Zoning Adjustment of the District of Columbia.

My name is Fred Hill, Chairperson. Joining me today is Carlton Hart, Vice Chair, and Lorna John, Board Member. And representing the Zoning Commission is Rob Miller -- I'm sorry, is Michael Turnbull, as well as Anthony Hood, for the meeting session. And then we are going to have, I believe, maybe Mr. Miller as well for the main session, and then also Mr. Miller, as well as Chairman Hood, for the hearing session.

Today's meeting agenda is available here on the Office of Zoning website. Please be advised that this proceeding is being recorded by a court reporter, and is also webcast live. Accordingly, everyone who is listening on Webex or by telephone will be muted during the meeting. We do not take any public testimony at our decision meeting, unless the Board asks someone to come forward.

If you are experiencing difficulty using Webex or your telephone call in, please call our OZ hotline number, and I'll repeat the number twice, 202-727-5471, once again,

202-727-5471, to receive Webex login or call in instructions.

At the conclusion of this meeting session, I, in consultation with the Office of Zoning, will determine whether a full or summary order may be issued. A full order is required when the decision it contains is adverse to a party, including an affected ANC. A full order may also be needed if the Board's decision differs from the Office of Planning's recommendation. Although the Board favors the use of summary orders whenever possible, an Applicant may not request the Board's use of such order.

Preliminary matters are those which relate to other cases we should be hearing today, such as requests for postponement, continuance, or withdrawal, or whether proper and adequate notice has been given.

Mr. Secretary, do we have any preliminary matters?

MR. MOY: We do not have any preliminary matters

for the decision cases, Mr. Chairman.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great. All right.

Well, before we start, and I know that I've already kind of mentioned this, I should say Mr. Turnbull kind of brought this up, also, Vice Chair Hart, this is his second to last day, and, you know, I've been working with you now for, I guess, three years, or something thereabouts, and I'm really -- and I will get to say this again on your last day, which is next week, but I've really enjoyed working with

2.0

2.1

you and, you know, really, I'm sure that, you know, the Mayor, as well as all the people that are involved with the City, would thank you for your service, and you will be definitely missed. And so, thank you very much.

I don't know if Mr. Turnbull or Ms. John, if you'd like to add anything.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: No, I would just agree with you. I think Carlton has been a pleasure to work with, even-tempered, and just very calm, relaxed, and just very thoughtful and insightful on all the things we go through. So, it's -- I've been inspired by his thoughts on what we do, and so he will be missed.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Ms. John? We can hear you now.

MEMBER JOHN: You can hear me now? I'm not having
a good day so far.

So, I just wanted to say how much I will miss Carlton and how I enjoyed working with him and sitting next to him, and asking for those clarifications on the architectural drawings. And so, I will really miss having — to be able to manage without you, it's going to be really, really very hard. So, I will miss you, Carlton.

VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: Well, thank you all. This is, as the Chairman said, this is not my last day. My last day is next Wednesday. But, I really don't think you guys know how much I have enjoyed doing this, and I think that

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

part of that has been because of you all, the Board, as well as the Zoning Commission Members that have helped, and that I've been able to, you know, know a bit better and to work with has really been special.

And I'll also note that the Office of Zoning staff, the Office of Planning staff, have also been top notch in helping us be able to do the work that we do, which I think is an important, you know, part of, you know, living in a City, an urban environment. And I just try to bring as much of my experience that I've had over the years, almost, wow, 25 years, about 25 years in Planning.

So, I just really do appreciate it, and we've got a long day, so I'll stop it there, and I will turn it back over to you, Mr. Chairman.

So, thank you very much, and I definitely will miss all of this. And, I'd also say, having to do this virtually is really a disappointment, because I like being, you know, around you all, and, you know, kind of talking and joking about, you know, everything that's going on. So, that part of the day I will most definitely miss.

And, you know, it's kind of our reality right now, and, hopefully, in the future we will be able to at least get together and, you know, maybe have a meal together. That would be great.

So anyhow, thank you.

2.1

Okay, great. All right, well as 1 BZA CHAIR HILL: 2 you know, we are going to do this one more time again, Mr. 3 Hart, next week. 4 I want everybody to get a chance, 5 people aren't going -- who knows, who knows what already missed, right? 6 7 VICE CHAIRPERSON HART: 8 BZA CHAIR HILL: All right. Mr. Moy, you may go 9 ahead and call our first meeting case. 10 MR. MOY: Excuse me. All right, good morning, Mr. 11 Chairman and Members of the Board. 12 The first case application for a decision is Application No. 20257, of NCRC Erie Street LLC, and this is 13 captioned and advertised for a special exception under the 14 15 Voluntary Inclusionary Zoning modifications, Subtitle 16 Section 1001.2(b)(3) and Subtitle D, Section 5206.2, 17 subdivide the vacant property into eight lots and construct eight single-family row homes in the R-3 zone at premises of 18 19 the 1500 block of Erie Street, Southeast, Square 5828, Lots 2.0 Participating on the discussion is the Chairman, the 2.1 Vice Chair, Ms. John, and Zoning Commission Michael Turnbull. 22 Okay, are you all ready to BZA CHAIR HILL: 23 deliberate? All right. Okav. 24 so we did deliberate, did see, or we

preliminary deliberations last week. We had this case,

1	heard it last week, and I don't have anything new to add from
2	my deliberation from last week. And so, I'm still going to
3	be, and there's nothing new into the record, so I'm still
4	going to be I will be voting in favor.
5	Is there anything anyone would like to add?
6	MEMBER JOHN: No.
7	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. I'm going to make a motion
8	to approve Application No. 20257, as captioned and read by
9	the Secretary, and ask for a second, Ms. John.
10	MEMBER JOHN: Second.
11	BZA CHAIR HILL: The motion has been made and
12	seconded. Mr. Moy, will you please take a roll call vote?
13	MR. MOY: All right. When I call your name if you
14	would please respond with a yes, no, or abstain, on the
15	motion moved by Chairman Hill, to approve the application.
16	The request was seconded by Ms. John.
17	So, Zoning Commission, Michael Turnbull?
18	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes.
19	MR. MOY: Vice Chair Hart?
20	VICE CHAIR HART: Yes.
21	MR. MOY: Ms. John?
22	MEMBER JOHN: Yes.
23	MR. MOY: Chairman Hill?
24	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes.
25	MR. MOY: Staff would record the vote as 4-0-1,

and this is on the motion of Chairman Hill to approve the 1 application, seconded by Ms. John, also in support, Mr. 2 Michael Turnbull and Vice Chair Hart. 3 The motion carries, 4 sir. 5 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, thank you, Mr. Moy. You can call our next one when you have an opportunity. 6 7 MR. MOY: Okay, that would be Case Application No. 8 20259, of Federal Realty, it's captioned for a special 9 exception under Subtitle H, Section 1200 from the designated 10 use requirements of subtitle H Section 1101.3(a). This would permit excess GFA for a financial services use in the NC-3 11 12 Zone at premises 3501-3527 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest, Square 2222, Lot 15. Participating is the Chairman, the Vice 13 Chair, Ms. John, and Zoning Commission, Michael Turnbull. 14 Are you all ready to 15 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. 16 deliberate? Okay. 17 We did preliminary deliberations last week when we heard this case, and we don't have anything new into the 18 19 I don't have anything to add from the deliberation record. 20 that I said last week, and I'm going to be voting to approve. 2.1 Is there anything anyone would like to add? 22 MEMBER JOHN: No. 2.3 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: No. BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. I'm going to make a motion 24 to approve Application No. 20259 as captioned and read by the

1	Secretary and ask for a second, Ms. John.
2	MEMBER JOHN: Second.
3	BZA CHAIR HILL: The motion has been made and
4	seconded.
5	Mr. Moy, can you please take a roll call vote?
6	MR. MOY: When I call your name if you would
7	please respond with a yes, no, or abstain, on the motion made
8	by the Chairman to approve the application for the relief
9	being requested, seconded by Ms. John.
10	Zoning Commission, Michael Turnbull.
11	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes.
12	MR. MOY: Vice Chair Hart?
13	VICE CHAIR HART: Yes.
14	MR. MOY: Ms. John?
15	MEMBER JOHN: Yes.
16	MR. MOY: Chairman Hill?
17	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes.
18	MR. MOY: Staff would record the vote as 4-0-1 for
19	the motion of Chairman Hill to approve, seconded by Ms. John,
20	also in support, Zoning Commission, Mr. Turnbull, Vice Chair
21	Hart. The motion carries, sir.
22	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Mr. Turnbull, I don't know
23	if you have a fan, or Ms. John, if you don't mind going on
24	mute. Thank you. And then, I'll unmute you again.
25	Is Mr. Turnbull on 17996 C, Mr. Moy?

1	MR. MOY: No, that is 20053.
2	BZA CHAIR HILL: And then, who is on 20258?
3	MR. MOY: That would be that would be Mr. Hood.
4	BZA CHAIR HILL: Got it, okay.
5	Now, let's go ahead and do 20053 now with Mr.
6	Turnbull.
7	MR. MOY: Okay, thank you, Mr. Chairman. So, Case
8	Application No. 20053 of District Properties.com Inc., as
9	amended for area variances from the side yard requirements
10	of Subtitle D Section 206.2, and from the lot dimension
11	requirements of Subtitle D Section 302.1, to construct a new
12	detached, principal dwelling unit in the R-1-B Zone at
13	premises 2433 Girard, G-I-R-A-R-D, Place, Northeast, Parcel
14	155/7. And participating is the Chairman, the Vice Chair,
15	Ms. John, and Zoning Commission, Michael Turnbull.
16	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great. Thank you, Mr. Moy.
17	Are you guys ready to deliberate, because we did
18	not do this last time.
19	Mr. Hart, we will start with you, if that's
20	alright.
21	VICE CHAIR HART: Sure. So, we had a lot of
22	this project application has taken quite a while to,
23	actually, get to us, and then finally after hearing it and
24	going through the actual hearing last week.
25	So, I have to say I struggled with some of this,

and I'll kind of talk about that. So, the issue here is, in my estimation is, does the Board think that the Applicant has provided sufficient information to demonstrate how the Applicant is meeting the three prongs of the variance test.

And, in my mind, first we have to look at the exceptional condition prong of the test. The Applicant and OP believe that the size dimensions of the lot is sufficient to say that this is an exceptional condition. And OP also raises the issue of this being a parcel, and they raised that both in the testimony as well as in the OP report itself.

OP also suggested during the hearing last week that any small parcel or a tax lot that is not a record lot would have an exceptional condition, as an individual could not build on it without being -- without it being a record lot.

Unfortunately, I just didn't think that this was relevant in this case, because the existence of so many parcels in this neighborhood, as, actually, evidenced by the OP report, and they have a map that shows where all the parcels are. They are the purple areas in the map that's in their report, in Exhibit 31.

Т didn't believe being that parcel а is justification for exceptional condition in this instance, since there so many parcels in this immediate were neighborhood.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

In addition, the OP report and testimony stated that the construction of this development would be in keeping with the overall development pattern of the neighborhood, and, unfortunately, I did not agree with this either, since it seems that there is really an eclectic development pattern in this neighborhood, and there aren't any, you know, kind of odd vacant lands, or, you know, they were, actually, calling it think either tooth admission Ι gap or an development.

In my view, this parcel appears to be a side yard for the house next to it. This also appears to be a development pattern for this, at least along this portion of the street, with a house and a side yard next to it.

I'll note that Commissioner Montague also testified, who is the ANC Commissioner, also testified that this was an historic development pattern for this part of the neighborhood, at least this part of the neighborhood. And he seemed to know a great deal about the neighborhood history, and I would take him at his word for that.

So, what else is exceptional? The Applicant notes the small parcel size and width in comparison to what the Zoning requirements are for the R-1-B Zone, it makes it an exceptional condition. And I would just kind of note that there appear to be quite a number of other parcels along Girard, which is the street that this is on, Belair, which

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

is one of the streets that terminates at Girard, and Hamlin Streets, which is within close proximity to the street as well. They all appear to have very either the same or very similar lot dimensions, which again would not make it exceptional.

So, I just couldn't get past the exceptional condition aspect of it, but I understand that this is -- that the applicant has had -- they believe that this is a --

condition aspect of it, but I understand that this is -- that the applicant has had -- they believe that this is a -- there will be a difficulty in developing this site without having the relief. I just couldn't get past the exceptional condition prong, so I would be not in support of this application. I would vote to deny the application.

I know that this is probably not a view that you all hold as well, but I just wanted you to know where I kind of stood on it and, you know, I'll listen to what else, what my other Board members have to say.

Thank you.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Mr. Turnbull.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Hart has, basically, said exactly how I feel. I think the cases, the one he's pointed out from the OP report, and the exceptional conditions of the site, and how it doesn't meet that criteria as an exceptional condition, I think is totally where I feel, is where I'm coming from. I think he's totally correct, and I would also be in the

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

position of denying this application. 1 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. 2 Ms. John? 3 You are on mute, Ms. John. 4 Mr. Young, could you help unmute her, 5 please? Yes, thank you. 6 MEMBER JOHN: 7 Mr. Chairman, I was going to ask you to go ahead and give your thoughts before I give mine, because I'm still 8 9 deciding. 10 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. And I have a few thoughts, but I'm 11 MEMBER JOHN: not sure exactly where I will end up. BZA CHAIR HILL: 13 Okay. And we'll just leave you unmute, Ms. John. 14 15 I've got to say, I'm kind of torn on this. mean, I think that the Office of Planning, I can understand 16 17 their argument. And, you know, I think that -- I don't know what you do with that lot, right? And I know that that might 18 not be exactly what -- well, I shouldn't say that -- I think 19 2.0 they, you know, are making good argument for 2.1 variance. And I still think that, you know, and I'm kind of just going over the Office of Planning's report here again, 22 23 and having the questions that they have, that I quess the 24 part that I kind of struggled with I suppose was that they

were saying that if they had to turn it into a record, the

16 fact that it wasn't a record lot, was somehow part of their 1 And I didn't necessarily agree with that side of 2 analysis. it, but, I guess we are still having the discussion. I don't 3 I mean, Ms. John, I don't know if that helped you at 5 all, you know. MEMBER JOHN: 6 No. 7 BZA CHAIR HILL: But, I just don't know where I'm landing on this either. I've got to be honest. 8 9 MEMBER JOHN: Yes and no. 10 So, I have struggled with this case, because I agree with Mr. Hart and Mr. Turnbull that, number one, there 11 12 are other parcels in the square, and the fact that it's a parcel doesn't make it an exceptional condition. 13 So, Ι disagree with OP in that regard. 14 What's leading me towards saying that there's an 15 exceptional condition is the fact that this is really at the 16 17 end of the street. The Applicant is not able to increase the

What's leading me towards saying that there's an exceptional condition is the fact that this is really at the end of the street. The Applicant is not able to increase the size of the property, and that it borders, while one side borders on a developed lot, the other side is, I believe, partly on a public street, and abuts the property of one of the witnesses who testified.

So, I think that is a little distinct, and so I'm leaning towards saying that those things together create an exceptional condition.

And so, if it is an exceptional condition, then

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

I can make the argument that it would prevent compliance with the Regulations.

I am mindful of the testimony of the ANC and the discussion of the history of the development. But, at the same time we need to look at the property as it is now, and the street as it is now. And what we have here are tax lots.

At the same time, I looked at the property on Google after reviewing ANC's presentation, and, really, the houses are sort of, you know, eclectic in a way. It's not a cookie cutter pattern where this one house would stand out. So, I agree with -- it would be different, but I agree with OP that the changes that the Applicant made would more -- would sort of bring the house more into, I don't want to say compliance, but more like some of the other houses that are there. It would, of course, be smaller.

But, in terms of not being in keeping with the character of the neighborhood I would agree with OP on that score.

So, because in the past the Board has applied the principle that the inability to increase the size of the lot is a factor that can be considered as an exceptional condition, I would lean towards calling it an exceptional condition.

There was one thing else I wanted to add, but it is escaping me at the moment. And while we are having a

2.0

2.1

discussion, I will, perhaps, remember it.

2.1

2.3

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Mr. Hart?

VICE CHAIR HART: Yes.

BZA CHAIR HILL: You don't think they are meeting the first prong, you don't think there's anything exceptional, right?

VICE CHAIR HART: No, it's a rectangular lot. There are other lots to it that are within 200 feet of the site that are vacant and it looks -- and I said vacant, they are just not built upon, and it looks as though there was a -- if you look along the southern portion of Girard Street, that are the house -- that are the lots that are -- that are just to the west of it, it looks -- the pattern to me looks like house and then open space on the one side or the other of that house.

There's one parcel that seems as though there was a duplex put on it, but that seems to be the exception versus the rule. Every other house has an open space either on one side or the other of it, and this would be, adding this building would be kind of contrary to that.

And I still am wondering if the -- you know, they said that the -- at the hearing they said that they couldn't sell that middle house -- excuse me, they couldn't sell the property that was to the west of it, if you are looking at the property to the right of it, which is the existing house.

So, remember there were three properties, this is the eastern-most of the three properties that were at one point up for sale, I guess it was last year. And the house in the middle, and then there were two single properties on either side of that house.

And it is interesting that that existing house, that is, you know, not the Applicant's application before us, but the property just to the west, was not -- and it's still vacant. And the neighbors are making a guess as to why they think that's the case, and they are just saying that it has to do with the uncertainty around the properties that are on either side of it, because those properties don't have a house on it, and they've probably been told, the prospective owner, buyers, have probably been told that that is going to be -- there might be a house next to it. And people are just kind of like I'm not sure if I want to do that.

So, I know those things are kind of extraneous to all of this, but I think that the context is just interesting for this. In my estimation, you know, while the owner -- I understand that I am saying that the owner of the property, I don't believe that they have an exceptional condition, I think that, you know, the possible option could be something like they sell it to the property, the house that's right next door to it. Or, they can split it and have the person that is to the east or west, you know, have ownership of it.

2.0

2.1

2.3

it though there just seems as is an alternative that's out there that may not be a house, but it may be a sale. And there may be some other, you know, avenue that they go down that I'm just not thinking of, but I just -- if this were in an area that had -- this was the only this, that like then I might be thinking was differently about it. But, I mean, just looking at the OP report and the map that they had, they have all these purple, you know, shaded areas. All of those purple shaded areas are parcels in the immediate vicinity. There are probably within, you know, an 1/8 of a mile of this site.

And some of them are larger, but some of them look they are almost the exact same size as this, and it just becomes -- it begs the question to me that this doesn't seem to be a unique condition or an exceptional condition in my estimation.

And, you know, I just -- I can't get past that part of it, and so it makes it hard for me to be able to support the application as -- that is before us right now.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. And then also, you don't agree with substantial detriment to the public good, meaning that you don't -- you think that the character of the rhythm, there's nothing, you know, unique about that either.

VICE CHAIR HART: Well, I just think that once you can't get past the exceptional condition aspect of it,

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

everything else is kind of, if you can't get past that part of it, then you can't get to the rest of the argument, and I just can't get past that aspect of it.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Mr. Turnbull, do you have anything to add?

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes. I would just reiterate what the Vice Chair has said. If you want to talk about -- I mean, this is a unique area in the sense of the part of the City that these are all parcels. But that does not elevate it to a unique condition. The fact that you have all these parcels in this part of the City is just the way the City developed.

And I think that as the Vice Chair said, this is not really a unique condition, these are all parcels. This is what the nature of the neighborhood is.

So, I think it's a double-edged sword, and I think as Ms. John was talking about, how she could see that this, the site can't grow, and so that makes it an exceptional condition. Well, none of these sites can grow. So, in one way it's -- I'm not making a case for approving this, I'm just saying it's a unique situation with the City that you have these parcels.

How that gets addressed in the future, I'm not sure. Maybe something has to be done zoning-wise to elevate this, but I think as of right now, looking at the strict

2.0

interpretation of the Zoning Regs, I think the Vice Chair is correct. This is not really an exceptional condition.

I think the house, the way it is situated, with three-foot-nine side yards doesn't help the situation on the impact on the house that's next door to it. But, you have to get by the first prong to be able to get to that condition and analyze that. If we ever got by that, then I would have situation that Ι don't think that if this was exceptional condition, this is not an exceptional design that mitigates that condition also going forward.

So, I'm still stuck on the first prong, before I even get to the second prong. If I get to the second prong, I have issues with that, but I'm stuck on the first prong myself right now.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. Well, I don't know, and Mr. Hart, this is kind of just go back and Ms. John, I'll circle back to you as well.

Again, you know, part of what I understood the variance is, you know, you can't -- it's outside of the Regulations, right? And, you know, this lot now, and this is where I'm kind of -- and maybe we can put this off for another week, you know, and just see, you know, look at it a little bit more and then come back around by next week.

I mean, you know, what is it that they are supposed to do with that lot, Mr. Hart, as you just said,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

like they are supposed to then, you know, the Regulations are
-- the variance is here to provide relief, right, if they can
meet the criteria. And I'm just kind of talking out loud.

VICE CHAIR HART: I understand.

BZA CHAIR HILL: You don't think they meet the first prong. And so, then, you know, they now -- you now have a piece of property that they have to, it just lies dormant, right?

VICE CHAIR HART: Well, but this is the hard part that I have with the argument that you are making, is we are tasked with looking at whether or not someone meets a test, not whether or not it is developable.

So, if we believe that there is a test, if we believe that they pass the test, then they can develop it. But, the Applicant went into this knowing that they had a property that had -- that was less than the developed ones. This is a developer, it's not a property owner that has no idea about any of this. They went in, you know, with eyes open, understanding that this is not a given, and so we have to look at the case, at each case, and I'm looking at this case and saying, well, this is, actually, not -- I don't see this as being, you know, an exceptional condition in this case.

BZA CHAIR HILL: I just want to interrupt, because

I want to be clear. I wasn't saying that since it's not

2.0

developable that's something that goes beyond the variance 1 criteria, right? I was just kind of having a little bit more 2 3 of a discussion I suppose. But, right, you are still not getting that first prong. 5 Ms. John, is there anything else you'd like to Otherwise, I just think we table this for a week. add? 6 7 MEMBER JOHN: No, I could benefit from having to, 8 you know, think about it, you know, again. The thing I wanted to add earlier was that there 9 10 is no evidence that this owner contrived to have 11 purchase this lot. There was some discussion that the owner, 12 you know, was part of the whole process of cutting up the record lot into these three pieces. 13 14 I have to discount that information, And so, 15 because the Applicant denied it. I think if this is a case 16 where there was an Applicant who had a lot that, you know, 17 could be developed without relief, but then contradicted it in a way of a variance. But, that's not the situation here. 18 19 So, that's what I wanted to add. So, I'm not 20 opposed to putting this off for another week. 2.1 BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Hart? Okay. 22 VICE CHAIR HART: Yes, one more thought. So, one 2.3 of the other things that I was thinking about in terms of, 24 you know, the parcel issue, is that there are a number of

parcels in this area that are about this size.

And it begins

to -- it dawned on me that any Applicant could come in say that, well, this is a parcel and it's less than what's, you know, allowed in Zoning. So, we would be giving -- allowing the variance for all of the parcels, and there are a number of them.

And I just had a hard time seeing how that was, you know, an acceptable condition for each of these, these would be very similar, it would be very difficult to parse out how this one was different than the others that are in this immediate vicinity.

So, it became, and maybe this is a zoning issue, Mr. Turnbull, Commissioner Turnbull, that needs to be looked at, you know, and I don't know exactly how to deal with that as a zoning issue, but that may be the direction to start trying to kind of deal with this. And maybe this is not just the only neighborhood that this is an issue in. So that, you know, there is some criteria that you could use outside of it being an acceptable condition to have to address this sort And I say larger in that it's a of larger scale concern. neighbor -- there seem to be more things in the neighborhood than other parts of the City, where development has maybe actual lots qoinq they have the record on, or established for a longer period of time.

But, you know, those are my end thoughts.

BZA CHAIR HILL: I appreciate that. Actually,

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

2.3

24

1	Mr. Hart, that kind of leans me a little bit more in your
2	direction, I suppose, to be quite honest. But, we'll see
3	so, everybody okay, we'll put this off until next week?
4	MEMBER JOHN: Yes.
5	BZA CHAIR HILL: All right. Mr. Moy, can you put
6	this back on the meeting calendar for next week?
7	MR. MOY: Yes, sir, so that would be rescheduled
8	or continued discussion to August the 5th, which is next
9	Wednesday.
10	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Mr. Turnbull, you get to
11	say goodbye to Mr. Hart again one more time.
12	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay, all right. I'll see
13	you all next week.
14	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great, thank you.
15	I guess we want to bring in
16	MR. MOY: Mr. Hood?
17	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes, well, there's still the
18	meeting for the school.
19	MR. MOY: We could do that, too.
20	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes, is Mr. Miller around?
21	MR. MOY: Mr. Young, do you have Mr. Miller out
22	there somewhere?
23	BZA CHAIR HILL: Do you have Mr. Miller?
24	MR. MOY: There we go.
25	MR. MILLER: I'm here.

1 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, Mr. Miller, I'm just going 2 to pop you in real quick for this one. Mr. Moy, could you please read in the application? 3 4 MR. MOY: Yes, sir, with pleasure. 5 This would be Case Application No. 17996-C, The Beauvoir, B-E-A-U-V-O-I-R, School, the National Cathedral 6 7 Elementary School. This is a request for a modification of 8 consequence to the conditions of BZA Order No. 17996-B, to 9 decrease the minimum parking requirements and to permit the 10 installation of temporary classroom space on the school's property in the R-1-B Zone at 3500 Woodley Road, Northwest, 11 12 Square 1944, Lot 25. And participating is the Chairman, the Vice Chair, Ms. John, and Zoning Commission Robert Miller. 13 14 Okay, thank you. BZA CHAIR HILL: So, I looked over this, and again, so this 15 16 is for temporary facilities during the pandemic. And I looked 17 in the Office of Planning's report, and they are in approval. 18 I didn't see -- I saw there was conditions that the ANC had, and those conditions I quess were in terms of, 19 2.0 you know, the generator will operate only during the school 21 day until the weather necessitates otherwise, meaning I guess 22 they can use the generator if -- at night, if there needs to be some kind of weather-related issue. 23 24 There shall be no safety lighting or lighting from

the trailers at night. A traffic facilitator shall manage

drop off and pick up operations during the hours specified for those operations, and will be where the drivers with destinations other than Beauvoir are using Woodley Road and 31st Street, 35th Street.

Beauvoir shall require parents or anyone that ordinarily drives to the school to pick up or drop off a student to park on the closed and not on neighborhood streets during the specified pick up and drop off hours.

Well, first of all, I'll ask my fellow Board members, I don't really have any issues. I wish we had the Applicant here, I suppose, actually, to just kind of talk about these conditions or anything. And I'm going to look up the ANC report.

Mr. Hart, would you like to go next?

VICE CHAIR HART: Yes, sure. I didn't have a whole lot of, you know, thoughts on this application. It seems as though this is, you know, it's interesting I guess this is one of the first cases that we are really listening to that has -- that is directly related to COVID, because they are trying to accommodate, you know, or deal with how to have school, you know, in the midst of a pandemic.

And, you know, they are noting that this is a temporary aspect of this as well. So, I didn't really have a lot of comments on it.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay.

2.0

2.1

VICE CHAIR HART: All right.

BZA CHAIR HILL: I'm just going to interrupt and clarify my other statement, which there is something now from the Applicant that says that they are in agreement with the conditions put forth by the ANC.

Mr. Miller?

2.0

2.1

ZC VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Yes, I support this application for the temporary classroom trailers so that the Beauvoir School can attempt to do appropriate social distancing, you know, less kids in the classroom, I guess, than the regular classrooms as part of their reopening plan.

I'm curious whether -- well, the Zoning Commission is about to take up a rulemaking on, emergency rulemaking tomorrow, to give flexibility to colleges and universities to temporarily, due to the pandemic, veer from their flexibility from their campus plans, which have certain use, on campus housing requirements for example, for at least three universities where many of the kids have to be on campus, live on campus, and then use restrictions on some of the facilities.

So, that just made me think about whether Beauvoir needed a campus plan modification for it's -- or National Cathedral School, Beauvoir component of the National Cathedral School. But, we don't have the Applicant here.

1	Is OP here, or does OAG have an opinion on whether or not
2	has the issue it doesn't seem to have come up in the
3	exhibits we have whether there needs well, I guess it
4	would be the Zoning Commission that would do the
5	MS. CAIN: There is, I don't believe the National
6	Cathedral School and Beauvoir are subject to a campus plan,
7	you know, insofar as that text amendment that the Zoning
8	Commission, I believe they took action on Monday. I don't
9	believe it's subject to that; private schools, I believe, are
10	sort of their own thing within the zoning regulations.
11	ZC VICE CHAIR MILLER: Right, correct. They have
12	their own campus plan.
13	MS. CAIN: So, I think in this case doing it as
14	a modification is the most appropriate way to move forward
15	with it.
16	ZC VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes, it would, essentially,
17	be a temporary modification.
18	MS. CAIN: I think that's what the Board needs to
19	keep in mind, is the Applicant and OP have highlighted this
20	is temporary, this is only for the 2020-2021 school year, so
21	that is something that the Board should verify. This is very
22	limited in scope, just to the next academic year.
23	ZC VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. And because the
24	Applicant, as Chairman Hill has said, has, apparently, agreed
25	to the four conditions that the ANC included as part of its

conditional approval, I have no problem with that. So, I'm ready to move forward.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, and just to clarify also, so in Exhibit 7, the Applicant is modifying, or trying to modify condition number three, or to add a condition it looks like, that is speaking more, specifically, to the parking spaces. And then, they again repeat all of the issues that the ANC had put forward in terms of conditions.

I do think that, you know, they are -- you know, we can parse out whether or not they are completely going to adverse impact, but it seems like to me like, you know, the generator, the lighting, you know, some traffic management, since the Applicant and ANC are in agreement on this, and I think that the Applicant is further specifying the conditions on, the modifying condition number three in their exhibit.

I would be fine with all of the conditions that are in Exhibit No. 7, putting that in the order. And so, that's what I would ask OAG when they are writing the order, to put that in there.

And, Ms. John, do you have anything else to add?

MEMBER JOHN: No, I don't have anything else to

add. I support the request for modification, and I think the

conditions are related to mitigate any potential impacts.

So, I would support the application.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Then I'm going to make a

2.1

2.3

1	motion oh, no, I can't can I make it, oh, yes, it's
2	a meeting. So, this is a meeting. So I'm going to make a
3	motion to approve Application No. 17996-C, as in Charlie,
4	including the conditions that are in Exhibit No. 7, and ask
5	for a second, Ms. John?
6	MEMBER JOHN: Second.
7	BZA CHAIR HILL: The motion has been made and
8	seconded. Mr. Moy, can you please take a roll call vote?
9	MR. MOY: to approve the application
10	MR. YOUNG: You were on mute, if you could start
11	back over, sorry.
12	MR. MOY: Okay. Can you hear me?
13	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes.
14	MR. MOY: Okay. So, where was I, if you would each
15	respond with a yes, no, or abstain to the motion made by
16	BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Moy, could you I'm sorry,
17	maybe I'm interrupting, you were cut off saying that I made
18	a motion, seconded by whoever, and now I cut you off again,
19	so just start again. I'm sorry.
20	MR. MOY: No, that's okay. So, when I call your
21	name if you would please respond with a yes, no, or abstain,
22	to the motion made by Chairman Hill to approve the
23	application along with the four conditions that I believe the
24	specified as listed in their Exhibit 7, yes?
25	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes.

1	MR. MOY: Seconding the motion is Ms. John.
2	Zoning Commission Robert Miller?
3	ZC VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.
4	MR. MOY: Vice Chair Hart?
5	VICE CHAIR HART: Yes.
6	MR. MOY: Ms. John?
7	MEMBER JOHN: Yes.
8	MR. MOY: Chairman Hill?
9	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes.
10	MR. MOY: Staff would record the vote as 4-0-1,
11	this on the motion made by the Chairman to approve the
12	application with four conditions. The motion was seconded by
13	Ms. John, also in support Zoning Commission Rob Miller, Vice
14	Chair Hart, we have a board seat vacant, and the motion
15	carries 4-0-1.
16	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, thank you, Mr. Moy.
17	Mr. Miller, we'll see you in a while, actually.
18	I think the first hearing is going to take a little bit.
19	ZC VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, see you later.
20	BZA CHAIR HILL: Bye-bye.
21	Now, we need, I guess, Chairman Hood, Mr. Young.
22	ZC CHAIRMAN HOOD: Good morning, everyone.
23	MEMBER JOHN: Good morning.
24	BZA CHAIR HILL: Good morning, Chairman Hood.
25	ZC CHAIRMAN HOOD: So, I heard you all giving the

accolades and comments to Vice Chair Hart. So, what I've decided to do, since I was looking for my way to try to get into the hearing so I could speak, I had already invited myself back next week. So, I will be back next week, and I want Mr. Moy and Mr. Young to know I need access, because I would like to talk about Mr. Hart's balance, his stick-toitiveness, his even keel, his, I like to call him a magician, the way that he comes up with stuff that I hadn't even thought of. I may have read all night, but he comes up with something that really adds to the case. But, I'll talk about I just need to make sure I have access, and that next week. it's been a pleasure to serve with him, but I have more to say next week, and, basically, I'm inviting myself.

BZA CHAIR HILL: All right, Chairman, we'll make sure you get in there for your due time.

Mr. Moy, if you could call this decision case, or meeting case.

MR. MOY: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is the last of the decision cases for the meeting session this morning.

Case Application No. 20258 of William G. Springer and Forrest Kettler. It's captioned for special exception under Subtitle F Section 5201, for the maximum lot occupancy requirements Subtitle F Section 604.1, to construct a two-story rear addition to an existing attached principal

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

dwelling in the RA-8 Zone at premises 1416 15th Street, Northwest, Square 195, Lot 104.

Participating is the Chairman, the Vice Chair, Ms. John, and Zoning Commission Chair Anthony Hood.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Are we all ready to talk about this a little bit? Okay, I can start.

So, I went to -- we had kept this open until today, because we had gotten some additional information into the record, and we wanted people to have an opportunity to look at that information, and then also have time for the parties to respond. That time has passed. And I went back over the Office of Planning's report, as well as the record, and I think that the 2 percent increase proposed from the existing seems somewhat, you know, de minimis to me. I went back over again the OP report and would agree with them about light, and air, and privacy not being unduly affected. I did note that HPO had also signed off on this.

The people -- some of the people in opposition to this have mentioned the windows in the back of the property, and the light and air being affected. I didn't think that the light and air was going to be unduly affected, as also gone over by the Office of Planning's report. In terms of the windows in the back, I looked into the record, and also even some of the things that the opposition had put forth, and, you know, there's windows all over, like it's a normal

2.0

2.3

backyard in the City, where everybody's backyard looks into everybody's backyard.

So, I didn't think that that was anything new that would change my opinion as to what I think they are meeting the standard for us to grant the application. So, I'm going to be voting in favor, but I'm going to let my fellow Board Members give me their opinion.

I'll start with you, Mr. Hart, if that's all right.

VICE CHAIR HART: Sure, thank you. And thank you Zoning Commission Chair Hood for your kind words, and I look forward to our discussion tomorrow, or next week.

So, Chairman Hill, so after reviewing the record and listening to the Applicant, as well as the testimony that we heard, I believe that I would be in support of the proposal to construct a two-story rear addition to the existing attached principal dwelling.

I believe that the Applicant has provided sufficient information for me to be able to support it. And I'll note that -- and I'll note that, like you, Mr. Chairman, I think that the Office of Planning report was one that described what the impacts were. And I am -- I don't think anybody is doubting that there's going to be an impact. The question that we have to really deal with is whether or not we believe that's an undue impact.

2.0

2.1

So, there was some testimony in opposition to the application, noting that this project would restrict air, light, and privacy of the residents and complexes of homes on the alley. And that was kind of taken from the -- one of the letters that had come in, testimony that had come in.

And I understand that their opposition -- that they have opposition to this application, but again, I get to the aspect of this being undue impacts. So, the two letters that we received that were in opposition, that were received after the hearing, that were in opposition, raised issues of light and air, impacts on light and air. And I'll note that they described where they lived with relationship to the Applicant, and they are, actually, along -- they are south of where the Applicant is located. live in, I quess, in condos. They said units, so I'm assuming those were something like a condo or an apartment, I'm not exactly sure. One was an owner, so I am assuming that they are both, I don't know that. I don't recall that.

But regardless of that, they are -- they live south of the Applicant. And what that means to me is that any shadow from the project that is being proposed shadows, because of the sun angle, the shadows would be north of the Applicant, and not south.

So, while there may be some impacts to the air, the light aspect of it I think is -- there really isn't a

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

shadow issue that we are talking about.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

Now, and I think Chairman Hill you talked about the issue of privacy, and I would agree that this is a kind of a regular backyard environment in an urban environment, that has, you know, windows kind of, you know, really around this particular area.

And so, for all of this I would say that there wouldn't be, in my estimation, any undue impacts on light, air, or privacy, as this is located in an urban area, and as this property is located south of the Applicant that is before us. So, I would be in support of the application.

Thank you.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Chairman Hood?

I heard so far. And I really appreciate the ANC when they talk about minimal. I think that was very key for me in this whole process, and I agree with all the comments that I've heard.

One of the things I will note is that, as you mentioned, this is going on in urban areas anyway, as far as the back yard goes, but I was trying to read, there are some impacts when I was analyzing this. But, for me I recognize the impacts, as the Vice Chair has already mentioned, but the impacts to me are minimal and I think they different, and I think that's what the opposition is.

1	And I know the Supreme Court talks about views,
2	so we already know what the issue is there with views.
3	So, Mr. Chairman, I'll be supporting this
4	application.
5	BZA CHAIR HILL: Ms. John?
6	MEMBER JOHN: I agree with everything that's been
7	said, and, especially, Chairman Hood's comment that views are
8	not protected. I agree, generally, that the backyard looks
9	like any urban well, it looks like a D.C. backyard, and
10	that I struggle to see how privacy and air would be affected.
11	I looked again at the testimony from one of the
12	witnesses, and I could not see where there would be any
13	privacy impact, as I believe Mr. Hart said, there are a lot
14	of windows on the houses, a lot of rear windows on the
15	houses, you know, in that area.
16	And so, I agree that the application meets the
17	criteria of the regulations, and that there is no undue
18	impact in this case on privacy and air.
19	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. I'm going to make a motion
20	then to approve Application No. 20258, as captioned and read
21	by the Secretary, and ask for a second, Ms. John?
22	MEMBER JOHN: Second.
23	BZA CHAIR HILL: Motion made and seconded.
24	Mr. Moy, could you please take a roll call vote?
25	MR. MOY: Yes. When I call your name, if you

1	would please respond with a yes, no, or abstain, to the
2	motion made by Chairman Hill to approve the application for
3	the relief requested, seconded by Ms. John.
4	Zoning Commission Chair Anthony Hood?
5	ZC CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.
6	MR. MOY: Vice Chair Hart?
7	VICE CHAIR HART: Yes.
8	MR. MOY: Ms. John?
9	MEMBER JOHN: Yes.
10	MR. MOY: Chairman Hill?
11	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes.
12	MR. MOY: Staff would record the vote as 4-0-1 to
13	approve the application on the motion of Chairman Hill,
14	seconded by Ms. John, also in support of the motion is Zoning
15	Commission Chair Anthony Hood, Vice Chair Hart. We have a
16	board seat vacant, and the motion carries, sir.
17	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great, thank you, Mr. Moy.
18	So, we have our hearings are starting, and
19	maybe we'll take a quick break before the hearings begin.
20	But, can I just read into the hearing session, Mr.
21	Moy, before he takes a break.
22	MR. MOY: Yes, please.
23	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay.
24	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter was
25	concluded at 10:46 a.m.)

## <u>C E R T I F I C A T E</u>

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Public Meeting

Before: DC BZA

Date: 07-29-20

Place: teleconference

was duly recorded and accurately transcribed under my direction; further, that said transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

Court Reporter

near 1 ans 8