GOVERNMENT
OF

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

+ + + + +

REGULAR PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY

SEPTEMBER 16, 2020

+ + + + +

The Regular Public Hearing of the District of Columbia Board of Zoning Adjustment convened via Videoconference, pursuant to notice at 9:30 a.m. EDT, Frederick L. Hill, Chairperson, presiding.

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT MEMBERS PRESENT:

FREDERICK L. HILL, Chairperson LORNA JOHN, Vice Chair CHRISHAUN SMITH, Board Member

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBER PRESENT:

ANTHONY HOOD, Chairperson PETER SHAPIRO, Commissioner

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

CLIFFORD MOY, Secretary
PAUL YOUNG, Zoning Data Specialist

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

CRYSTAL MYERS ELISA VITALE

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PRESENT:

DANIEL BASSETT, ESQ. MARY NAGELHOUT, ESQ.

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Regular Public Hearing held on September 16, 2020.

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

2 (10:35 a.m.)

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

BZA CHAIR HILL: The hearing will please come to order. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. We are convening and broadcasting this public hearing by video conferencing. This is the September 16th, 2020 public hearing of the Board of Zoning Adjustment in District of Columbia. name is Fred Hill, chairperson. Joining me today is Lorna John, vice chair, and Chrishaun Smith, board member. And representing the Zoning Commission is Peter Shapiro as well as Anthony Hood on a continued case.

Today's hearing agenda -- excuse me.

Today's hearing agenda is available to you on the Office of Zoning's website. Please be advised that this proceeding is being recorded by a court reporter, and is also webcast live via WebEx and YouTube Live. The webcast video will be available on the Office of Zoning's website after today's hearing.

Accordingly, everyone who is listening on WebEx or by telephone will be muted until the hearing. And only persons who have signed up to participate or testify will be unmuted at the

appropriate time. Please state your name and home address before providing oral testimony or your presentation. Oral presentation should be limited to the summary of your most important points. When you're finished speaking, please turn your audio off so that your microphone is not picking up sound or background noise.

If you're experiencing difficulties accessing WebEx, or your telephone call-in, or if you have forgotten to sign up 24 hours prior to this hearing, then please call our Office of Zoning hotline number. It's listed on the screen there, and I'm also going to repeat the number twice. The number is 202-727-5471. Once again, 202-727-5471 to sign up to testify, and to receive WebEx log-in or call-in instructions.

All persons planning to testify either in favor or in opposition should have signed up in advance. They will be called by name to testify. By signing up to testify all participants have completed the oath or affirmation as required by Subtitle Y 408.7.

The request to enter evidence at the time of an online virtual hearing such as written testimony or additional supporting documents other

than live video which may not be presented as part of the testimony may be allowed pursuant to Subtitle Y 103.13 provided that the persons making the requests to enter an exhibit explains how the proposed exhibit is relevant, the good cause that justifies allowing the exhibit into the record including an explanation of why the requester did not file the exhibit prior to the hearing pursuant to Subtitle Y 206. And how to perceive — and how to perceive exhibits when not necessarily prejudice any party. The order procedures for special exceptions and variances are also listed in Y 409. The order of appeals is in y 507.

At the conclusion of each case an individual who is unable to testify because of technical issues may request a request for a leave to file a written version of the planned testimony to the record without 24 hours following the conclusion of public testimony in the hearing. If additional written testimony is accepted, then parties will be allowed a reasonable time to respond as determined by the Board.

The Board will then make its decision at the next meeting, but no earlier than 48 hours after a hearing. Moreover, the Board may request

additional specific information to complete the record. The Board and the staff will specify at the end of the hearing exactly what is expected and the date when persons must submit the evidence to the Office of Zoning. No other information shall be accepted by the Board.

The Board's agenda may include previous cases set for decision after the Board adjourns the Zoning in consultation hearing, consultation with myself -- the Office of Zoning in consultation with myself 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 to issue such an order.

Administrative Procedures Act requires that the public hearing on each case be held in the open before the public pursuant to Section 405(b) and 406 of that act. The Board may, consistent with its rules and procedures and the act, may appear

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

in a closed meeting on a case for purposes to seek legal counsel on a case pursuant to D.C. official code section 2-575(b)4, and/or deliberating on a case pursuant to D.C. Official Code section 2-575(b)13, but only after providing the necessary public notice and in the case of an emergency closed meeting after taking a roll call vote.

Preliminary matters are those which relate to whether a case will or should be heard today such as a request for a postponement, continuance or withdrawal, or whether proper and adequate notice of the hearing has been given. If you're not prepared to go forward with the case today, or believe the Board should not proceed, please let us know when you get allowed into the hearing. Mr. Moy, do we have any preliminary matters before we take a break? You're on mute, Mr. Moy.

SECRETARY MOY: Okay, here we go.

Let's see, the only preliminary matter I have is

for the record that case application 20261 of Ramon

Argueta has been postponed to a virtual public

hearing rescheduled to October 21st, 2020. And

that's it for me, Mr. Chairman.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great. So if

1 it's all right with the Board, let's go ahead and take a 15 minute break if that's good and we'll 2 get back here like 10:55, or 10:55, 11:00, whatever, 3 Thank you. 4 okay? 5 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 10:40 a.m., and went back 6 7 on the record at 10:58 a.m.) BZA CHAIR HILL: All right, so before 8 9 we start, I guess I have -- so the next case, and I'll let -- well, actually, Mr. Moy, why don't you 10 11 read into the next case before I say everything 12 and before we allow everybody in, Mr. Young. hold on a second. Hold on. Wait one second again. 13 I'm sorry, I was waiting for --14 15 ZC CHAIR HOOD: Moy, sorry, Mr. 16 notice that you have two strikes on the mute and 17 unmute button, so I'll be watching the rest of the day when I go off to see if you get that third one. 18 19 BZA CHAIR HILL: All right, sorry, I 20 just needed to get confirmation on something. 21 So, Mr. Moy, if you could just -- well, 22 actually, how should I do this? Okay, just allow 23 everybody in. Mr. Young, you can allow everybody 24 in.

MOY:

All

SECRETARY

25

Mr.

right,

Chairman, the Board is back in session after a brief 1 And the time is at or about 10:59, and 2 3 we're beginning the start of our cases for the hearing session. 4 5 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great. you read into the first case please, Mr. Moy? 6 7 SECRETARY MOY: Yes, thank you. would be case application number 20121 of Bridges 8 9 2 Psychological Services and Consultation, LLC 10 captioned and advertised for a use variance from 11 the use requirements of Subtitle U Section 201.1 12 convert an existing detached residential This is 13 building to a medical office building. in the R-2 zone at premises 639 Atlantic Street 14 Southeast, Square 3105, Lot 72. And the Board last 15 heard this at a public hearing on July the 15th. 16 17 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great. Thanks, 18 Well, what I was going to say is that, 19 A, I have read into the record, and I've been fully 20 reviewed on it because I wasn't on the previous 21 hearings. Vice Chair Hart at the time was. 22 Smith, could you also verify that you have done 23 that? 24 MEMBER SMITH: Yes. And I've read 25 into the record and been thoroughly briefed.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. And then I also asked Vice Chair John if she would mind introducing everybody and leading this because she had sat on the previous two hearing, and she kindly agreed So that being the case, I'll go ahead and turn this over to Ms. John. And, Ms. John, if you have any questions about procedurally how things go or whatever I've done in the past, I mean I'm happy to offer any kind of suggestions or help. But I've been talking for the past two and a half hours, so I'm happy to have someone else talk. So thank you very much, and Ms. John, I'll turn it over to you.

VICE Good CHAIR JOHN: morning, Good morning, Mr. Bello. So when we everyone. were here the last time, we continued a case because there was some exhibits that were introduced at the last minute and the Board didn't have the opportunity to review them. So at this point, I think I would ask you to go ahead and introduce yourself for the record, and also give us your And I see Ms. Dickerson is here with you address. as well.

MR. BELLO: I believe so, yes.

VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. Ms.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	Dickerson, are you choosing not to use your video?
2	Well, Mr. Bello, let's go ahead and have you
3	introduce yourself and if you need to have her
4	testify, we can address it at that point.
5	MR. BELLO: Thank you.
6	VICE CHAIR JOHN: There she is. Ms.
7	Dickerson, welcome.
8	MS. DICKERSON: Hi.
9	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Good. Would you
10	introduce yourself, Mr. Bello, and give your name
11	and address for the record?
12	MR. BELLO: Yes. Good morning, Board
13	members. Olutoye Bello representing the
14	applicant.
15	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Ms. Dickerson.
15 16	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Ms. Dickerson. MS. DICKERSON: Hi, Angelina
16	MS. DICKERSON: Hi, Angelina
16 17	MS. DICKERSON: Hi, Angelina Dickerson, property owner of 639 Atlantic Street,
16 17 18	MS. DICKERSON: Hi, Angelina Dickerson, property owner of 639 Atlantic Street, Washington, D.C.
16 17 18 19	MS. DICKERSON: Hi, Angelina Dickerson, property owner of 639 Atlantic Street, Washington, D.C. VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay, thank you.
16 17 18 19 20	MS. DICKERSON: Hi, Angelina Dickerson, property owner of 639 Atlantic Street, Washington, D.C. VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay, thank you. So, Mr. Bello, I think what would be appropriate
16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. DICKERSON: Hi, Angelina Dickerson, property owner of 639 Atlantic Street, Washington, D.C. VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay, thank you. So, Mr. Bello, I think what would be appropriate at this time is to ask you just to go ahead and
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS. DICKERSON: Hi, Angelina Dickerson, property owner of 639 Atlantic Street, Washington, D.C. VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay, thank you. So, Mr. Bello, I think what would be appropriate at this time is to ask you just to go ahead and bring us up to speed on where you are, and we'd

1	on the call? Mr. Moy? Okay. So
2	SECRETARY MOY: Yeah, I think is
3	setting that up.
4	(Simultaneous speaking.)
5	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. So let's
6	
7	SECRETARY MOY: But I'll keep a record
8	for you, Vice Chair John.
9	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you. Go
10	ahead, Mr. Bello.
11	MR. BELLO: Thank you, Madam Chair.
12	So the exhibit of interest would be Exhibit 77,
13	which is a PowerPoint presentation of the brief
14	of the case law which was the instructions that
15	the Board gave as of the last hearing in December
16	2019. For the applicant to brief the pertinence
17	of this case law to the relief of request.
18	Essentially, the issue is the doctrine
19	of reasonable use of a property, and whether that
20	reasonable use results in the reasonable return
21	on investment. So those two case laws briefs in
22	the PowerPoint presentation, that'll be Gilmartin
23	and Palmer. And if Mr. Young could put that up,
24	I think it's easier to just go through the

25

PowerPoint presentation.

1	MR. YOUNG: What exhibit was it? I
2	didn't get an email with it so I just need exhibit
3	numbers so I can pull it.
4	MR. BELLO: Exhibit 77.
5	VICE CHAIR JOHN: So it seems as if
6	we're having difficulty getting the exhibit up.
7	Mr. Bello, are you comfortable
8	MR. YOUNG: I have it up.
9	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Do the Board members
10	have copies and are they prepared to oh, here
11	we go.
12	MR. BELLO: Thank you.
13	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you, Mr. Young.
14	MR. BELLO: So if we can go to the
15	second pane please. Yes. So all the statements
16	in quotations are direct excerpts from these two
17	case laws, and I will read them as I also provide
18	context to the application in question. To support
19	a variance it is fundamental that the difficulties
20	or hardships be due to unique circumstances
21	peculiar to the applicant's property and not to
22	the general conditions in the neighborhood. The
23	statute does not preclude the approval of variance
24	where the uniqueness form a confluence of factors.

So the applicant's contention is that

this property does have a confluence of factors affecting it, and those factors are listed in the next pane. The factor, the subject property's uniqueness is the only single family detached dwelling in this neighborhood or location which predominately comprise semidetached dwelling on smaller lots and apartment houses. The factor of the physical shape and size of the subject for the zone district, or location comprises over 8,000 square feet of lot size. And a neighborhood that is predominately improved with smaller lots and semi-detached residences.

In this case, the size of a property, which is the largeness of a property, it's the particular hardship here because it is out of place for the zone of location. Third point, the unique features of the interior of the existing building which include five foot wide corridors, commercial grade fire alarm with sprinkler systems, self-closing doors, commercial exit signs, accessibility features given that the constructed from building was inception for purposes of a community residence facility and not a single family dwelling.

The fact of the history of the uses of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the subject premises as a CRF, which is community residence facility, and never having been occupied for purposes of a private residence. The fact of the commercial tax classification of the property, and I reference the exhibits that submits evidence of that effect. The fact of the applicant's good faith reliance upon DCRA's direction in incurring expenses for repairs to make premises compliant with construction codes for commercial use. those are the confluence of factors effecting this And they are unique to the problem, and property. no other property in that neighborhood suffers or has this set of confluence of factors. Next page please.

Extraordinary and exceptional situation or condition of property. This term is referenced -- the term defined in reference to economic, geographic, or topographic situation or condition connected with or affecting the lot for which the variance is sought.

Economic situation of subject property of application is the inability to attract a conforming use which is interchangeably used for a reasonable use which results in a fair and reasonable return or reasonable income. The

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

maximum rental income is approximately \$3,000 which is evidence that we provided in record in previous hearings. Whereas, the income necessary for debt service and other property maintenance costs is approximately \$4,600 resulting in negative cash flow. The large size of the subject property for its geographical location is directly related to its economic disadvantage. Next page please.

difficulties Practical and undue hardship. The New Jersey Supreme Court expressed a view where peculiar and exceptional practical difficulties exist, SO does undue Applicant concedes that the higher burden of exceptional undue hardship is the applicant's standard for the granting of the use variance. Subject property's practical difficulty is the inability to attract conforming use after nearly two years of advertisement of the property for lease without pre-condition as to use of interest. property's hardship Subject undue is the neighborhood rent schedule comparable is less than fair and reasonable return or reasonable that's provided in Exhibit And evidence of that. Next page please.

The use variance can be granted when

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

a situation arises where reasonable use cannot be made of the property in a manner consistent with the zoning regulations. Where the inability to put property to a more profitable use or loss of economic advantage not sufficient to constitute a hardship. And this is not the case here. It's not the case that the applicant has a profitable use to which they can put the property, and that the desire is just for more profit. This is a situation in which the reasonable or conforming use actually results in negative cash flow for the applicant.

Regulations must be shown to preclude use of a property for any conforming use with a fair and reasonable return. So essentially, the case law does not overtly state that when a property can be used for a conforming use, that's the end of it. That conforming use must result in fair and reasonable return on investment. And we have evidence after two years of advertisements in the public sphere without attracting any conforming use that is able to guarantee a return on investment of the applicant. Use of subject premises for residential use results in a negative cash flow. Use of subject property would not produce a

reasonable income or any income at all. Next page.

There was a suggestion at the last hearing that the property could be redeveloped and that that constituted a reasonable use of property. But a causerie analysis of that actually negates that narrative. To do that, we would have to demolish the building, the existing structure in entirety.

It's applicant's contention that the Board is constrained to review the application it, and not what the before property could potentially be used for in the future. reasonable use standards go to the use of subject time of property as it exists at the And, moreover, neighborhood sales application. comparable does not support redevelopment subject property as a viable project, and we've gone through some numbers in Exhibit 70. please.

Substantial detriment to public good, and substantial impairment of intent, purpose, and integrity of the zone plan. Subject property was constructed for purposes of an intermediate care facility for the mentally challenged, six residents and two rotating staff. That's the only history

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

of use of this property since it was constructed for that purpose. Subject premises has never been occupied as a private residence or for residential use.

reports state that the medical office use should not cause substantial detriment to the public good, and the OP is supportive of neighborhood serving medical offices. Loss of residential dwelling unit does not constitute substantial harm to the intent and purpose of the zone plan because the loss is temporary and not permanent should the Board grant this use variance. The Board has the discretion to mitigate any potential harm by condition of approval with a sunset or expiration date of an approval should they grant an approval. Next page please.

No substantial harm or detriment to the zone plan. Medical office use or the home offices of a medical practitioner or a dentist is permitted in the R-2 zone district under the Home Occupation Provisions cited, provided that no more than two persons not resident on the subject premises shall be permitted as employees.

The proposed medical office use will have only one employee. The medical office use

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

will operate between the hours of 9:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. Wednesdays and Fridays, and 1:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. on Thursdays. Mondays and Tuesdays are offsite client counseling visit days. In the three days of office operation, not more than five to seven clients will be present on premise on any given day.

The proposed will use serve neighborhood clients in close proximity to the subject property, hence will not result in increasing traffic impact or effect street parking. The subject property has capacity on-premise parking area which will accommodate for the five automobiles. The objective of the owner is to bring mental health services to an underserved area so designated by the National Health Service Corps as a health professional shortage area. Hence, there is inherent public establishing this use for this premises. Next screen please.

The applicant believes that they comply with the three-prong variance test. Applicant is unable to use the property for conformed use which produces a fair and reasonable return on income or investment. The proposed medical office use

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.1 1 will serve the public good of bringing mental health a designated underserved 2 services to 3 Applicant respectfully requests approval of relief sought for all the foregoing reasons. 4 5 Now I just add in conclusion that the applicant is aware of OP's supplemental report, 6 7 and states that the undue hardship that the applicant has put forth is not solely based on DCRA 8 permit timeline or the confluence of factors. 9 10 DCRA permit timeline only forms one of those 11 confluence of factors. And that timeline, which 12 clearly shows that the applicant was not properly advised, is uploaded as Exhibit 80. It took five 13 months before the applicant was advised of the need 14 15 for BZA after she had been advised to make 16 substantial changes for commercial use of that

VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you, Mr. Bello.

Thank you. Were you planning to have Ms.

Dickerson speak?

building. And that will be our presentation, Board

Thank you.

MR. BELLO: Yes, I would have Ms. Dickerson testify as a fact witness to her experience with the permit process at this hearing.

VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. Thank you.

Members.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Ms. Dickerson?

MS. DICKERSON: Yes. Can you hear me?

VICE CHAIR JOHN: Yes.

MS. DICKERSON: Okay. I had spoken about this during the first hearing that we had, I believe that was back in December, that I had spent literally about four to five months going to DCRA, literally sometimes twice a week, to gain some assistance in terms of how to obtain a permit for the tentative applicant that I had which I don't have anymore. And I was initially told that I needed to file for a building permit, and then to get the certificate of occupancy.

I had another conflicting information from another person by the name of Nestor Warren. He has said that basically I could be able to get a conditional certificate of occupancy. And this was in February actually in 2019 with -- I believe it was February 25th. So when I proceeded to go to his office to obtain the certificate of occupancy that he had mentioned, he had told me to speak with his supervisor which was Mamadou, and Mamadou had told me that before he could issue me a certificate of occupancy, that he needed to send an inspector there

just to look at the place and see if it was okay.

And then the inspector went and saw the place, and had several things for me to complete, commercial grade, you know, repairs to do. And he had mentioned that basically I had to get the RV6, I think it was six fire exit alarms in working order because some of them weren't working, had to get a fire inspection, certificate of, you know, of the sprinkler system. Everything in working order, and that I have to maintain it every year. And everything that he requested for me to do was for commercial-grade repairs to do.

And I went and even to get an engineer to go there and look at the structure of the place, I spent close to about \$7,000, you know, to do the repairs that was requested of me knowing that when I was done with the repairs, I would be given the certificate of occupancy. And that straight came from, you know, Mamadou. He was a supervisor there. And then once the repair was done, it took probably another month and a half just to get an inspector back there to, you know, to confirm the repair and close the permit. And there was a conflict, you know, with that as well.

So none the less, you know, I finally

1	got all the commercial grade repairs that they told
2	me to do, and then I was issued the certificate
3	of occupancy back in August of 2019. Yeah, we've
4	been here for a while. But throughout this
5	process, you know, I didn't get the notification
6	of memorandum for BZA till late March or May. But
7	initially, I was informed that once I get the
8	repairs done, I would be issued a certificate of
9	occupancy, and once the repair was done, things
10	change from that point on.
11	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. So I just have
12	one question. Are you going to live in the
13	property?
14	MS. DICKERSON: Am I what?
15	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Are you planning to
16	live in the property?
17	MS. DICKERSON: No.
18	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. Your attorney
19	mentioned something about a home office exception,
20	so I wanted to clarify that with you. I don't have
21	any questions at this time. Do any of the board
22	members have questions for either Mr. Bello or Ms.
23	Dickerson?
24	MEMBER SMITH: I have a question. Mr.
25	Bello, could you elaborate, you said in your

presentation, could you elaborate on how the size of the property is directly related to its economic disadvantage? Could you expound on that a little bit more?

MR. BELLO: Certainly. The property used to be zoned R-5-A, and was down-zoned I believe in 2008 down to R-2. Be that as it may, both of those zones only require about 3,000 square feet of lot area for semi-detached structure. This property is over 8,000 square feet. This will be a lot size that will be consistent with being in the R-1-A zone district. And it's improved -- it's the only property in its neighborhood that's improved as a detached dwelling with a history of use as a community residence facility.

The nexus to the economic disadvantage is that, one, the fact that the property was advertised and sold to Ms. Dickerson as a commercial property, which would not be unusual because, you know, the lay person would necessary not think a community residential facility to be a residential use. They would consider it an institutional use.

So the nexus to the economic disadvantage here is that, whereas, properties that are semi-detached rent for about \$3,000 here. In

order for her to be able to service the debt on 1 this property and maintain that property, she needs 2 to generate an income of at least \$400 to \$600. 3 And there are no comparables in that neighborhood 4 5 that would allow that kind of rent to be attractive to this property. So that size and the type of 6 7 structure are necessarily connected to the advantage of the owner. 8 9 MEMBER SMITH: Okay, thank you. Ι 10 don't have any other questions. 11 VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. Are there any 12 other questions? I don't want to cut anybody off. 13 So if there are no other questions, I'll go to the Office of Planning. 14 15 ZC CHAIR HOOD: Sorry, Madam Vice 16 Chair, I do have a question. I thought the Chairman 17 had raised his hand, but I do have a question. 18 VICE CHAIR JOHN: Yes, sir. 19 ZC CHAIR HOOD: Okay, this goes to Ms. 20 Ms. Dickerson, I think your last Dickerson. 21 comments was once you were told -- I forgot how 22 you phrased it, to make the improvements by DCRA, 23 there was no other interaction or no -- you heard 24 nothing else until after you completed that to go

-- you're now ready to go get your C of O.

1	the sequence of events?
2	MS. DICKERSON: Yes.
3	ZC CHAIR HOOD: So there was no check,
4	no conversation in between while the work was going
5	on or anything?
6	MS. DICKERSON: There was a memo that
7	when Mr. Reese first went to actually Mamadou
8	had sent Mr. Reese to go inspect the place after
9	I went there, and Mr. Reese had indicated that the
10	premise had already been inspected by a previous
11	I guess previous tenant that was also interested
12	in the property. And I had told him that I was
13	not aware of that particular inspection.
14	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Okay. So that was the
15	only interaction about the property as you were
16	doing the renovations and upgrades that DCRA asked
17	you to do?
18	MS. DICKERSON: Yes, from the time that
19	Mr. Reese went in in there, it was basically the
20	mode of fixing the repairs that he requested so
21	that the prospective tenant could be able to provide
22	services that he wanted to rent the property for.
23	ZC CHAIR HOOD: So let me back up
24	because I know it's in the record, but I'm just
2.5	trying to go off the top of my head. But when you

purchased the property and the zoning was listed, was that from a real estate agent, or what did you rely on?

MS. DICKERSON: It was from a real estate and was listed as a commercial property.

And I think I even had -- Mr. Bello I believe has a copy of that advertisement as well.

Verifications of the -- and maybe this is for Mr. Bello, was there any verifications of what the real estate company advertised? No verifications, no back checking to make sure -- presumably they do that all the time and misrepresent a zone, or misrepresent an area, or misrepresent where it's located. A lot of stuff they misrepresent.

MR. BELLO: Well, general my experience is that often times, you know, real estate brokers are not very informed about the zoning regulations and would generally rely on the history of the use property for of а advertisements. So it's not inconceivable for a property to be located in a residential zone, but have a history of commercial use. That can be continued if that nonconforming use has not been discontinued. So, you know, I would be reticent

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	to say that it's willful misleading. It's actually
2	ignorance most of the time.
3	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Okay. All right. I
4	would concur. Okay, thank you, Madam Chair.
5	Madam Vice.
6	VICE CHAIR JOHN: So if the Office of
7	Planning is available, I'll go to them.
8	BZA CHAIR HILL: Madam Vice Chair?
9	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Oh, I can't see you,
10	Mr. Chair. Oh, there you are.
11	BZA CHAIR HILL: Oh, I'm sorry, I'm at
12	the top. I just had a question. So, Ms.
13	Dickerson, the C of O that you were you did get
14	a C of O in August, right?
15	MS. DICKERSON: Yes.
16	BZA CHAIR HILL: And it was for what?
17	MS. DICKERSON: It was a conditional
18	certificate of occupancy.
19	BZA CHAIR HILL: For what?
20	MS. DICKERSON: For medical office
21	use.
22	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. So not for the
23	CRF, is that right, Mr. Bello?
24	MR. BELLO: That's correct. But the
25	certificate of occupancy is for the medical office,

1	not for the CRF. And
2	(Simultaneous Speaking)
3	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes
4	MR. BELLO:it was a conditional
5	certificate that expired in December, but this was
6	the accommodation that was extended to Ms.
7	Dickerson because of all the
8	(Simultaneous Speaking)
9	BZA CHAIR HILL: I know this is in
10	the record, but I'm trying to and I was going
11	to ask the Office of Planning a bunch of stuff.
12	But like the certificate of occupancy that you got
13	in August, Ms. Dickerson, was for a commercial
14	medical building?
15	MS. DICKERSON: Yes.
16	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. And then what
17	again brought you back to us?
18	MR. BELLO: If I the certificate was
19	conditional to expire as of December of 2019 which
20	would have coincided with perhaps a decision of
21	the use variance application before the Board.
22	BZA CHAIR HILL: Oh, so you got a
23	conditional C of O based on the fact that you were
24	going to be before the Board for the use variance?
25	MR. BELLO: That's correct.

BZA CHAIR HILL: So you didn't actually 1 get -- I'm just being clear, you didn't actually 2 get a permanent C of O, you got a conditional C 3 of O based on the BZA application process? 4 5 MR. BELLO: Yeah, pending the outcome of the BZA process, but as an accommodation of Ms. 6 7 Dickerson's experience at DCRA. BZA CHAIR HILL: I understand. 8 Okav. 9 Thank you, Madam Vice Chair. 10 VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you, Mr. 11 Chairman. So I don't see any other hands up. So 12 we'll just go to the Office of Planning. 13 MS. MYERS: Hello. Crystal Myers with the Office of Planning. The Office of Planning 14 15 continues to recommend denial of this case. should start off by saying that we are not against 16 17 medical office uses in residential areas, but we of residential units 18 against the loss 19 especially units that are still configured for 20 housing in a residential neighborhood. The 21 applicant seems to be the victim of misadvertising. 22 The property was advertised as a commercial property, and unfortunately, she made decisions, 23 24 investments related to that, but the property was

never a commercial property.

The tax assessor does consider it commercial according to the way they do things, but the zoning regulations have never -- or do not identify CRF uses, which is what it was previously used as, the zoning regulations do not identify as a commercial. It identifies it at residential. And as the floor plan shown, the set-up is still a residential set up. And the tax assessor could always reevaluate if the use were So as the CRF, it's considered to change. commercial, but if it were used as a single family house, it could be reevaluated accordingly.

Another thing I wanted to bring up is the DCRA issues. According to the timelines provided, I was having a difficult time finding a point where the applicant -- or evidence that the applicant was misled. The information seems to indicate that it was flagged a couple of times that this is a residential property. I mean number one as the applicant has even stated, the original commercial tenant that was -- or perspective commercial tenant was told by DCRA that this is a residential property which is why they weren't able to get their permits.

And then further along, when the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

applicant worked with DCRA, it seems, and I, you know, I have only what was provided in a timeline, so, you know, I have to caution that way, but it seems that the applicant was told by DCRA that a variance relief was going to be needed. And at one point, she had indicated, you know, should I —— or should she make certain investments to change the property for commercial purposes. But she had asked about that around the same time she was told that a variance was going to be needed.

So just from the timeline, it looks like that in March it was flagged that a variance was going to -- that there was issues and a variance was going to be needed, and no changes, or at least it looks like changes were not made at that time. And then as you point out, changes to the property were made subsequently later on, and then obviously, the conditional C of O in August. But it had been flagged back in March that there was a problem and a variance was going to be needed.

So just from what we can see in the timeline information and what has been discussed at the hearings, we were not able to identify a point where DCRA was negligent to base that as an argument for an exceptional situation resulting

in an undue hardship. But we understand there's a confluence of factors issues. We've discussed the other issues in previous hearings about the size of the property, et cetera, so I won't, you know, go back in to that. I just wanted to touch upon some of the new information that's been presented and our position on it.

So, again, you know, we think it's an unfortunate series of events, but at the end of the day, it's a residential property that has been zoned residential in a residential neighborhood that's still configured as a residential property, and OP's position is that we do not want to see a residential property for a commercial use. So that's all I have. Any questions?

VICE CHAIR JOHN: So just to refresh your recollection, can you go over the exceptional condition prong of the variance test one more time?

MS. MYERS: So you have to identify an exceptional situation resulting in a hardship on the owner. And as the applicant has discussed, they're going with a confluence of factors issues. The DCRA argument, we did not find that argument to be at the level of an exceptional situation. We could not find evidence of there being an issue

or -- we could not find evidence to support the argument that there was an issue with DCRA.

When it comes to the tax assessors or the identification of it being a commercial property at one point in time, that's not related to land use or zoning regulation issues. That's something that the previous owner misadvertised, and so that's an issue with that previous owner. It's not an issue with the property itself.

When it comes to the size of the property, it is а large property in the neighborhood, but it is developed with a single family house, and, you know, in theory, you could use it as a house or you could use it as a CRF use. I believe you were mentioning earlier, Vice Chair, the opportunity that you can, you know, do like a home occupation. I mean there is a variety of uses under the R zone that qualifies residential that would not take you to a variance use.

So, you know, our position is we don't see an exceptional situation here. We understand that there's some economic hardships, but it seems to be more related to the misadvertisement of the property, and perhaps the applicant has a very credible issue with the previous owner. But as

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

for the property itself, we're not seeing 1 resulting in an exceptional situation. 2 3 VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay, thank you. Mr. Bello, do you have any questions for the Office 4 5 of Planning? MR. BELLO: No, Madam Chair. 6 Thank 7 you. VICE CHAIR JOHN: Do any --8 9 MR. BELLO: No question. 10 VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you. 11 of the Board members have questions for the Office 12 of Planning? ZC CHAIR HOOD: Madam Chair, I would 13 just like to ask Ms. Myers. So as I'm trying to 14 15 decipher something, and these are not my favorite type of cases, especially when there seems to be 16 17 the question of whether the government 18 predictable or whether things were not predictable, 19 and with the false advertisement. I mean not false 20 -- the not knowing the factual advertisement of 21 how it should have been advertised. 22 Would you -- because you did a thorough 23 background on looking at whether the government was predictable or not, so is it the Office of 24 Planning's testimony, and this wasn't specifically 25

like this in your report, but DCRA did not send mixed messages because it sounds to me like DCRA said one thing, and then they said something else.

So at some point in time I guess when does the Department of Commercial Regulatory Affairs -- because that is something that's predictable because it sounds to me -- well, first of all, the government should be predictable.

Is it your assessment or your analysis that the government was predictable, and it was just a misunderstanding because of the advertisement which was not the government's fault if you understand the way I phrased that question?

MS. MYERS: Well, you know, I wasn't there. And I don't want to, you know, say something that, you know, that is misleading because I really don't know. But just judging by the paper trail provided in the timeline, the applicant provided a letter that explains her experience. And she says on the same day that it was noted, that there was a need for a variance, she had asked, you know, should I make the changes to my property. But that was the same day it was also noted that there was variance.

So, you know, in that letter it made

it clear to, you know, from the OP point of view is that she had an opportunity to pause at that point when it was flagged that a variance would be needed. So she did not have to proceed with any changes at that point when it was told to her that you would have to go to BZA. She offered to do changes. But, you know, it was told to her pretty clearly by I think a couple of folks at DCRA that she would need to go through the variance process. And then there was a letter I believe like a week or two later following up on that explaining the variance — that she would need a variance.

So, you know, just kind of judging by that, and then like I mentioned a little earlier, the fact that her tenant originally went to DCRA was told that there was a problem with the property to begin with. Now I see what you're, you know, saying maybe somewhere between that point and the point in March where the inspector came out and then flagged that, you know, a variance would be needed, or the DCRA when she went back to the DCRA, flagged that the variance would be needed, maybe there was something going on there.

But it's a back and forth discussion,

1	you know, between DCRA and the applicant. And,
2	you know, when it came down to actual giving her
3	information, it seems that, you know, it ended up
4	that the correct determination that a variance
5	would be needed roughly, you know, I would say like
6	a month during the process. So the process started
7	in January, and before she was given any approvals
8	or anything, she was told a variance would be needed
9	like about a month and a half later.
10	So just judging by the paper trail,
11	that's kind of where we ended up. I don't know
12	what was said sort of, you know, just back and forth
13	in discussion, but when it came down to the paper
14	trail, it's showing that a variance was flagged.
15	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms.
16	Myers. Thank you, Madam Vice Chair.
17	VICE CHAIR JOHN: So I have one
18	follow-up question, Ms. Myers. The D.C. permit
19	timeline, is that at Exhibit 80?
20	MS. MYERS: Yes.
21	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. I have no
22	additional comments for Ms. Myers at this time.
23	Are there any other board members who'd like to
24	ask questions? So

MEMBER SMITH: Ms. Myers, I do have one

1	additional question. You had briefly described
2	different types of by-right or matter-of-fact uses
3	that would be allowed in the R-2 zone by right to
4	the applicant. Based on the size of this lot, could
5	you elaborate on what is the conforming lot size
6	for a single detached building?
7	MS. MYERS: Single detached, or
8	MEMBER SMITH: Detached, sorry.
9	MS. MYERS: I apologize, I think I had
10	that information at the first hearing. Just
11	quickly
12	(Simultaneous speaking.)
13	MEMBER SMITH: Would you
14	MS. MYERS: No, my apologies. I know
15	it conforms.
16	MR. BELLO: Look, I can help out if you
17	don't mind. It's 4,000 square feet.
18	MEMBER SMITH: Four thousand square
19	feet?
20	MR. BELLO: That's correct.
21	MEMBER SMITH: Ms. Myers, is that
22	MS. MYERS: Yeah, that's correct.
23	MEMBER SMITH: Okay. Thank you,
24	that's the only question that I had.
25	VICE CHAIR JOHN: So I think I'll go
	NEAL D. ODOGO

1	to the ANC. Is the ANC here? No. And I don't
2	see any other witnesses. Are there any witnesses
3	in support? Any witnesses in opposition? To
4	support
5	MR. YOUNG: No one signed up for this
6	case.
7	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you. Does the
8	Board have any more questions before I close the
9	hearing? So I didn't hear any request oh, Ms.
10	Dickerson, it's out of order, but we'll allow your
11	question. You're muted, Ms. Dickerson.
12	MS. DICKERSON: I just wanted to make
13	it known that the only reason that I proceeded with
14	the repairs that Mr. Reese had indicated was that
15	Mamadou had specifically indicated as well that
16	once I get the repairs done, he will issue me a
17	Certificate of Occupancy. And I didn't get a
18	memorandum for the BZA until May. May 1st
19	actually.
20	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Madam Vice Chair, can
21	I ask Ms. Dickerson a question about what she just
22	said?
23	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Yes.
24	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Ms. Dickerson, and if
25	I missed it, forgive me, but is that anywhere in

writing, or, Mr. Bello, can you show me where that 1 was because I'm sure you just didn't take it 2 verbally? Do you know what exhibit it is? 3 VICE CHAIR JOHN: It would be Exhibit 4 5 80, and then we have email attachments in support of each itemized timeline. 6 7 ZC CHAIR HOOD: So in Exhibit 80, and I don't know how I missed this because I was trying 8 9 to get the sequence of events. So in Exhibit 80, 10 it says your Mr. Magoo or -- had informed Ms. 11 Dickerson that he would issue her a C of O after 12 she makes these renovations? Am I repeating that 13 back correctly because when I go back and look at it, I want to make sure I understand? 14 15 If I can respond to that, MR. BELLO: 16 I do not believe that that particular conversation is an email. So what we have in the email timeline 17 is the email that was sent to her about a referral 18 to the Board of Zoning Adjustment. This was in 19 20 May. 21 ZC CHAIR HOOD: So what I want, Mr. 22 Bello, is something in black and white for what 23 she just said that would help me get to where you 24 all are trying to get to. That would really help

But right now, I'm just hearing her say what

1	somebody told her.
2	MS. DICKERSON: Oh, I actually have an
3	email that I had sent to Mamadou. It was on July
4	30th, 2019 with regards to that.
5	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Okay. And he
6	responded back that he would give you the C of O?
7	MS. DICKERSON: Okay.
8	ZC CHAIR HOOD: That's okay. I'm not
9	sure, Madam Chair, where you're going with this,
10	but if she has that, that would be beneficial for
11	at least myself. So, thank you, and thank you,
12	Madam Vice Chair.
13	VICE CHAIR JOHN: So now that it seems
14	we're conduct the hearing again, Ms. Dickerson,
15	when did you first hear that you needed zoning
16	approval, and do you have any documentation of that?
17	MS. DICKERSON: That was back when
18	after Mr. Reese had went to the property and went
19	and informed Mr. Mamadou of what I needed to get
20	done, you know, all the commercial grade level work
21	that he wanted to do. And I believe that was
22	towards the end of March.
23	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. So you agree
24	with OP that at the end of March you knew that you
25	might need zoning approval?

MS. DICKERSON: Yes. And also at the 1 same time, Mamadou had indicated once I finish doing 2 3 all these repairs that has been requested and the premise closed, he will issue me a conditional 4 5 certificate of occupancy. VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. All right. 6 7 MS. DICKERSON: So that was my goal. VICE CHAIR JOHN: Mr. Chairman? 8 9 BZACHAIR HILL: Yeah, no. Ms. 10 Dickerson, I'm just trying to understand this 11 You were told by DCRA that you -- and this again. 12 is where I'm kind of looking back at your timeline, that you would need a variance. However, if you 13 did the changes, you would be issued a conditional 14 15 C of O while you went through the variance process, 16 correct? 17 MS. DICKERSON: Yes. 18 BZA CHAIR HILL: So I quess my question 19 back to you, and then Mr. Bello is also -- and this is where I'm a little unclear as to whether or not 20 21 it was understood by you, Ms. Dickerson, I quess 22 you can just give me an answer, right, is that, 23 you know, you were basically doing things and making 24 improvements not knowing whether or not you were

going to get a permanent certificate of occupancy?

1	You still had to go through the BZA process in
2	order to get approval, correct?
3	MS. DICKERSON: Initially, to me as a
4	lay person, it was just a certificate of occupancy
5	that we were looking at. So I got educated, it
6	became a conditional certificate of occupancy
7	because that go ahead.
8	BZA CHAIR HILL: I'm sorry. So you
9	were saying you were just you didn't understand
10	at the very beginning that it was a conditional
11	certificate of occupancy based upon your getting
12	BZA approval for your variance?
13	MS. DICKERSON: I was just told a
14	certificate of occupancy, and then as, you know,
15	it proceeded, it indicated conditional certificate
16	until I got the BZA approval.
17	BZA CHAIR HILL: So
18	(Simultaneous Speaking)
19	MS. DICKERSON: I think we're saying
20	the same thing, I'm sorry.
21	BZA CHAIR HILL: That's all right.
22	Mr. Bello, I'm going to ask you the question if
23	I can.
24	MR. BELLO: Yes.
25	BZA CHAIR HILL: I want to understand,
	NEAL R. GROSS

1 | right?

2 MR. BELLO: Yeah.

BZA CHAIR HILL: You know, that if it sounds to me, and this is where I'm looking back at your Exhibit 80, it sounds to me as though DCRA went out and said you're going to need a variance. And then they said, okay, you're going to need a variance, but if you make these changes so that you're complaint with commercial, emergency signs, et cetera, and so forth, we'll give you a conditional C of O while you go through that variance process.

They didn't say they were going to, you know, maybe they weren't clear that this is still a risk, right? Like you're investing money in something that you might not get, but if you want to invest it, we'll go ahead and give you a conditional C of O while you're going through this process. Is that correct?

MR. BELLO: That's not correct. And I think perhaps my experience working at DCRA may be helpful here. If you look at the timeline, Ms. Dickerson first applied for building permit application in January of 2019.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Can you give me that

item number, I'm looking at your timeline? 1 Are you talking about number --2 (Simultaneous Speaking) 3 MR. BELLO: That would be item number 4 5 one. The first application was in January 28. BZA CHAIR HILL: 6 Okay. 7 And that permit was on MR. BELLO: instructions given to Ms. Dickerson to file a 8 9 building permit in order to bring the building into 10 compliance with the use that she proposed the 11 building for. Now ordinarily, the applicant is 12 not required to be the expert in zoning matters. When the applicant goes to DCRA, that first contact 13 is when she should have been told that she would 14 15 need a BZA. And would have had the opportunity 16 to decide whether she wanted to make repairs, apply 17 for a building permit, take the risk, or go straight to the BZA to find out whether they'll get this 18 19 review or not. So the applicant should not have 20 been told to file a building permit to pursue 21 repairs for a use that DCRA knew could not be 22 established as a matter of right. 23 So, Mr. Bello, can VICE CHAIR JOHN: 24 you go over that building permit and talk about

what repairs were being done? It seemed to me that

those were repairs to bring the building up to code, 1 not to make changes for a commercial -2 3 (Simultaneous speaking.) MR. BELLO: Well, when DCRA sends out 4 5 an inspector, he would see an email from Mr. Reese indicating that there had been a prior inspection 6 7 of the property, and that he relied on some of that information to tell Ms. Dickerson what repairs 8 9 needed to be done. And there was an email exchange 10 between January and I believe late April back and 11 forth with instructions as to what Ms. Dickerson 12 needed to do in order to occupy the building. 13 14 BZA CHAIR HILL: As а commercial, 15 Mister -- I'm sorry to interrupt you, Mr. Bello. 16 MR. BELLO: Yeah. 17 BZA CHAIR HILL: As a commercial use? 18 MR. BELLO: DCRA knew from the very 19 beginning what the intended use was. Ms. Dickerson 20 at no time indicated that she wanted to reoccupy 21 the building as a CRF or convert it for purposes 22 of a private residence. 23 MEMBER SMITH: Mr. Bello, if I can 2.4 interrupt, I'm looking at attachment 7 and to your 25 point, the permit that was issued, it says permit

type alteration and repair, the existing use was as a single family dwelling, and the proposed use was a single family dwelling. Could you elaborate a little bit more on the understanding of the applicant whose name is on it says permission granted to Angelina Dickerson that the property — that this permit was for a commercial building — conversion to a commercial property as opposed to a single family dwelling.

So, again, when MR. BELLO: Okay. DCRA, they follow applicants go to the instructions that they're given in order to get what they need to get to where they need to get So that would have been on the advice that the only way she could get a permit was to indicate that those uses were the same. Obviously, the history of use of a property was not as a single family dwelling, but it was as a community residence facility. So I believe that she simply, as a lay person, was just following instructions given to her.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Yeah, but, Mr. Bello, the CRF was allowed there.

MR. BELLO: Yeah. So community residence facility is a permitted use. And my

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	point is that if she had not been if she had
2	been given proper instructions, then the existing
3	use would have been a community residence facility
4	being converted to a residence, a single property
5	dwelling. It wouldn't say single family dwelling
6	to a single family dwelling.
7	VICE CHAIR JOHN: So I just want to
8	mention that Exhibit 80 attachment 6 has a letter
9	from Ms. Dickerson to Ms. Wanda Lockridge
LO	describing the process that had happened to date.
L1	And as of March 28th, Ms. Dickerson knew that she
L2	needed relief, BZA relief to change the zoning from
L3	residential to medical office use.
L4	MR. BELLO: In 90 days after she filed
L5	a building permit application.
L6	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Right. But she
L7	still knew on March 28th.
L8	MR. BELLO: That's correct.
L9	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. So unless the
20	Board has any more questions, I think I'd like to
21	close the hearing. So does the Board have any
22	thoughts on whether we should have a discussion
23	now, or just set this down for a hearing next week
24	Wednesday?
l	

ZC CHAIR HOOD: Madam Chair, I would

Τ	Tike to review some of the information again that
2	I have a clearer understanding, especially with
3	Exhibit - going back to Exhibit 80, and some of
4	your comments and the other comments of the Board
5	members. And also testimony that's been received.
6	I in turn will be back next Wednesday, so that's
7	my vote that we be able to look at it and we
8	deliberate I guess upon and decide it next week
9	if that's the wishes of the Board.
10	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you, Mr.
11	Commissioner Hood. Anybody else? Okay. So we
12	will hear this again on next week Wednesday, and
13	we will make our decision then. Thank you, Mr.
14	Chair. Oh, Mr. Moy?
15	SECRETARY MOY: Yes, just a logistic
16	question, Vice Chair John. Is that a decision
17	here, or a continued hearing?
18	VICE CHAIR JOHN: A decision. I'm
19	sorry, for a decision. Thank you. Thank you, Mr.
20	Ritting (Phonetic.) I saw your hand up.
21	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Madam Vice Chair, I
22	think that's it for me. May I be dismissed?
23	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Yes, Mr.
24	Commissioner.
2.5	7C CHAIR HOOD: All right, thanks.

1	See everybody later. Take care.
2	VICE CHAIR JOHN: And Mr. Chairman
3	Hill, may I now be dismissed?
4	BZA CHAIR HILL: No, but I guess you
5	can turn off your microphone. All right, I am going
6	to ask for a three minute break. Okay? I'll be
7	right back.
8	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
9	went off the record at 11:58 a.m. and resumed at
10	12:04 p.m.)
11	BZA CHAIR HILL: All right, Mr. Moy,
12	you can read us in, bring us back and read us into
13	our next case. You're on mute, Mr. Moy. You're
14	still on mute, Mr. Moy.
15	SECRETARY MOY: I'm sad Mr. Hood left
16	because he was tracking keep of it. Okay.
17	Application number 20318 of Bernard Berry captioned
18	and advertised for a special exception under
19	Subtitle C, Section 1504.1 for the penthouse
20	setback requirements Subtitle C, Section
21	1502.1(c).
22	This would allow the construction of
23	a glass guard rail on the roof top of a three story
24	detached principal dwelling unit, RF-1 zone at
25	premises 509 O Street Northwest, Square 479, 4-7-9,

1	Lot 818. And the preliminaries here, Mr. Chairman,
2	is that two of the documents were late. The
3	affidavit posting under exhibit 39 was four day
4	late. Affidavit and maintenance under Exhibit 40
5	is one day late.
6	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right, Mr.
7	Berry, are you there? Hello? Mr. Berry, I'm
8	sorry, I can't hear you. There we go.
9	MR. BERRY: Good. Now you can hear me?
10	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yeah, yeah.
11	MR. BERRY: Okay. All right, great.
12	BZA CHAIR HILL: All right, Mr. Berry,
13	could you introduce yourself for the record please?
14	MR. BERRY: Sure. My name is Bernard
15	Berry, owner of 509 O Street Northwest, D.C.
16	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Mr. Berry,
17	you're the only one today?
18	MR. BERRY: Yeah. Yeah, yeah.
19	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Mr. Shapiro,
20	you can't hear Mr. Berry?
21	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Sorry, Mr.
22	Chair, it's just soft.
23	BZA CHAIR HILL: Oh, okay. Well, Mr.
24	Berry, try to speak up a little bit more.
25	MR. BERRY: Okay.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Be a little bit more 1 articulate if you can. 2 3 MR. BERRY: No problem. COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Thanks, Mr. 4 5 Berry. BZA 6 CHAIR HILL: So, Mr. Berry, 7 actually before we get into all of this, I know that there has been some discussion that you might 8 9 not even need before us in terms of that the zoning 10 administrator might believe that your guardrail 11 actually would count as a parapet wall, and so 12 there's not something that needs to be approved. 13 Are you aware of this? MR. BERRY: No. 14 15 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. So the Office 16 of the Attorney General has reached out to the 17 Zoning Administrator to try to find clarification 18 if in fact you need -- or maybe it was the Office of Planning. I don't know who reached out, and 19 20 I'll let the Office of Planning talk in a second. 21 But if you in fact do you need this relief. Okay? 22 So what I would go ahead and propose is clarification from the Zoning Administrator this 23 24 week, and then we'll do this again next week.

if you don't need the relief, then you can just

1	go ahead and withdraw the application. But let
2	me go ahead and clarify that with the Office of
3	Planning. Ms. Vitale, would you please introduce
4	yourself?
5	MS. VITALE: Good afternoon, Mr.
6	Chair, members of the Board. Elisa Vitale with
7	the Office of Planning. And we would defer to the
8	Zoning Administrator for any interpretations of
9	the zoning regulations.
10	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. So then where
11	we don't have OAG with us, do we, Mr. Moy? Mr.
12	Moy, you're on mute.
13	SECRETARY MOY: I have tried to talk
14	yet so that doesn't count against me, Mr. Chairman.
15	Okay. Yeah, the OAG person should be there. It's
16	
17	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. That's all
18	right. I'm pretty I mean or Mr. Young can
19	let OAG in. Oh, there we go.
20	SECRETARY MOY: Yeah, there he is.
21	BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Bassett, have you
22	heard everything I've said?
23	MR. BASSETT: No, I just got let in on
24	this one, sorry.
25	BZA CHAIR HILL: That's all right.

56 Ι understand is that is What there some going with clarification on the Zoning Administrator as to whether this relief is needed at all due to that quardrail being considered a parapet wall. And so I'd rather just go ahead and get -- I mean, Mr. Berry, you have gone down this road SO we're prepared, you're prepared, everybody's prepared to move forward. So even if you do need to do this, you've already gone through the Office of Planning, you've already gone to the ANC. I think you did at least. MR. BERRY: I did.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. And so, you know, we would be able to go ahead and have the hearing, but if we don't have to have the hearing, then that's fine with me.

> MR. BERRY: Okay.

BZA CHAIR HILL: So let's go ahead and wait until next week and see if there's some clarification with the Zoning Administrator. You don't need to do anything. This is all going to happen and somebody will reach out to you.

Okay. So does Mr. Bassett MR. BERRY: not know is what he's saying?

> BZA CHAIR HILL: Someone at OAG has

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

	reached out to the Zoning Administrator, and Mr.
2	Bassett, I guess if you can get back to Mr. Berry
3	with further clarification maybe when you hear back
4	from the Zoning Administrator.
5	MR. BASSETT: I believe that the Office
6	of Zoning has been in contact with Mr. Berry about
7	what the next steps would be. I believe that Kira
8	(Phonetic.) sent him correspondence about what
9	questions he should be asking the Zoning
10	Administrator. And is that not accurate?
11	BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Berry doesn't seem
12	to know anything about this?
13	MR. BERRY: No, this is all new to me.
14	MR. BASSETT: Okay. I can follow up
15	with Kierra and make sure that he has our
16	instructions on what he should be asking for from
17	the Zoning Administrator.
18	BZA CHAIR HILL: So I guess, Mr. Berry,
19	what this is doing to you now, and I didn't know
20	exactly until right now, is that someone from the
21	Office of Zoning is going to give you information
22	to ask the Zoning Administrator, right? And this
23	seems to be going down this road, so that's why
24	I'm following this road, right?

MR. BERRY: Okay.

1	BZA CHAIR HILL: Is that go ahead and
2	talk to the Zoning Administrator, and you might
3	not have to be back here again next week. However,
4	if you do end up back here again next week, we'll
5	accommodate your schedule and put you first.
6	MR. BERRY: Thanks.
7	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Mr. Moy?
8	SECRETARY MOY: Thank you, Mr.
9	Chairman. I'd just like to add for the record that
10	our office has been in touch with ZA's office
11	regarding this particular issue. So we can
12	collaborate with OAG to move forward on it, and
13	OZ can take the lead and have direct contact with
14	Mr. Berry on the status of this issue.
15	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay.
16	SECRETARY MOY: between now and next
17	week, okay?
18	BZA CHAIR HILL: So OZ will reach out
19	to Mr. Berry and help him understand what the next
20	steps are?
21	SECRETARY MOY: Yes.
22	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay.
23	MR. BERRY: Who will reach out? I'm
24	sorry.
25	BZA CHAIR HILL: The Office of Zoning.

1	MR. BERRY: The Office of Zoning will
2	reach out.
3	So I'll expect to hear from them then. Okay.
4	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yeah. Okay?
5	(Simultaneous speaking.)
6	MR. BERRY: Okay. All right.
7	BZA CHAIR HILL: And so I guess is that,
8	Mr. Berry, I'm kind of curious now because you might
9	not be back with us again.
10	MR. BERRY: Yeah.
11	BZA CHAIR HILL: So or at least I
12	hope so as well, Mr. Berry. So how much of the
13	house is done?
14	MR. BERRY: I'm working on the inside
15	now, yeah. The exterior's done, yeah.
16	BZA CHAIR HILL: Is the pool finished?
17	MR. BERRY: They start tiling it in
18	like two weeks, but it's on the roof.
19	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Good for you,
20	Mr. Berry.
21	MR. BERRY: Thank you.
22	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Are you looking
23	for a site visit, Mr. Berry?
24	MR. BERRY: It was cool to watch it go
25	up there and the cranes and all that stuff. It

1	was good.
2	BZA CHAIR HILL: All right. So we'll
3	hopefully not see you next week, Mr. Berry.
4	MR. BERRY: All right.
5	BZA CHAIR HILL: Otherwise, see you
6	next week. Okay?
7	MR. BERRY: All right. All right, got
8	you. Thank you.
9	BZA CHAIR HILL: Bye-bye.
10	MR. BERRY: Bye.
11	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. So, Mr. Young,
12	you can release Mister okay, great. All right.
13	So we're now going to so that's getting
14	postponed until next week and we'll see what
15	happens, correct, Mr. Moy? I'm going to assume
16	he said yes.
17	SECRETARY MOY: Yes, sir.
18	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. And so that's
19	
20	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Mr. Moy, Mr.
21	Chair, if I may.
22	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yeah.
23	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Just while we
24	have this, I will not be available next week. I'm
25	not sure that it matters because we've not heard

1	any of the merits of the case. But I just want
2	to be clear about that.
3	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. We'll see what
4	happens. But then, Mr. Moy, you might have to
5	if we do have to do it, then the other ZC.
6	SECRETARY MOY: Well, yeah, if it is,
7	you know, it's going to be Chairman Hood.
8	BZA CHAIR HILL: Oh, is he next? Is
9	he next? He's back with us again?
10	SECRETARY MOY: Next week, sir.
11	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right,
12	let's go ahead and do our last one.
13	SECRETARY MOY: Okay. So this (audio
14	interference)
15	SECRETARY MOY: Okay. So this is
16	appeal number 20252 of the Citizens Against
17	Developers Greatly Obfuscating captioned and
18	advertised as the appeal for the decision made on
19	July 5th, 2019 by the Zoning Administrator,
20	Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs to
21	issue building permit number B1707176 to construct
22	a new two-story principal dwelling unit on a vacant
23	lot in the R-3 zone at premises 1602 V Street
24	
24	Southeast, Square 5777, Lot 694.

1	SECRETARY MOY: The only thing I want
2	to add is that DCRA uploaded PowerPoint slides that
3	was submitted less than 24 hours before the hearing,
4	sir. And I believe there was a response by the
5	applicant objecting to the submission.
6	BZA CHAIR HILL: Got it. Okay. Let
7	me see. Mr. Theresa, are you there?
8	MR. THERESA: Yes.
9	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Are you
10	choosing not to use your video which is fine, I
11	just want to know if there's a problem.
12	MR. THERESA: I'd like to use my video.
13	I don't know what's going on with it.
14	BZA CHAIR HILL: Maybe hover over the
15	screen and then it should put something in the
16	bottom that says video.
17	MR. THERESA: Ah, got you. Okay.
18	Cool. All right.
19	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, there you go.
20	Mr. Theresa, could you introduce yourself for the
21	record please?
22	MR. THERESA: My name is Aristotle
23	Theresa. I'm a member of CADGO and resident at
24	1604 V Street, Southeast, and so I filed this
25	appeal.

1	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Thank you, Mr.
2	Theresa. Is it Theresa?
3	MR. THERESA: Yes.
4	BZA CHAIR HILL: Theresa. Mr. Green,
5	could you please introduce yourself for the record?
6	MR. GREEN: Yes. Good afternoon,
7	Chairman and members of the Board. My name is Hugh
8	Green, attorney with the DCRA.
9	BZA CHAIR HILL: All right. Mr.
10	LeGrant.
11	MR. LEGRANT: Good afternoon, Matt
12	LeGrant, Zoning Administrator, DCRA.
13	BZA CHAIR HILL: All right, Mr.
14	LeGrant, are you not using your camera, which is
15	fine, I just want to make sure it's not a problem.
16	MR. LEGRANT: I am trying to turn it
17	on. There we go.
18	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great. Thank
19	you. Well, welcome. All right. So there's a
20	couple of preliminary issues, and I'd like to kind
21	of address those with the Board first. I guess,
22	Mr. Theresa, and Mr. LeGrant, if you don't mind
23	putting your microphones on mute just so I don't
24	get any feedback, and then we'll call on you as
25	needed. Thank you.

1	So there's a motion for a continuance.
2	There's two things, right? So there's a motion
3	for a continuance about this easement issue, okay?
4	And so oh, wait, is the property owner here?
5	Mr. Green?
6	MR. YOUNG: I have the property owner
7	and the property owner's attorney that are calling
8	in by phone, so I can unmute them.
9	BZA CHAIR HILL: Oh, okay. Yeah. Can
10	you let me talk to the property owner? Well, let's
11	they both need to introduce themselves for the
12	record. That's what I'm trying to figure out.
13	MR. TASEW: Okay, my name is Zayed
14	Tasew.
15	(Simultaneous Speaking).
16	MR. YOUNG: They're unmuted, they can
17	talk now.
18	MR. TASEW: Oh, Zayed Tasew.
19	MR. HUNT: Thank you, sir, this is
20	attorney Paul Hunt representing the owner. He is
21	present and he may introduce himself as well.
22	MR. TASEW: My name is Zayed Tasew,
23	this is the owner of V Street.
24	BZA CHAIR HILL: Could you say your
25	last name again please, sir?

MR. TASEW: Tasew, T-A-S-E-W.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great. All right, well, welcome everyone. So there is a motion for a continuance, and I guess what the motion on the table seems to be to me is that there is -- and I'll let Mr. Theresa actually, he can tell me more about it, but there's like, you know, it's the court's right now as to whether or not the easement is going to be upheld. And my opinion after reading everything is that if that easement is upheld, then this appeal might not be before us, right?

So the idea is for first the court's to determine whether or not this easement will be upheld, and that is what the motion is for the continuance. And so I would be in favor of granting the motion for the continuance to see whether or not this easement is going to be upheld or not, and because if it is, then, you know, then that's that, right? And so I'll let the board kind of tell me what their thoughts on the about the record with that in one second.

And then the other is the timeliness issue. I actually would like to talk about the timeliness issue one way or the other just because

1	I'd like to get that off of the table if, in fact,
2	we're back again here at some point in time. Okay?
3	So I'm going to go around the table and see what
4	my fellow board members think of what I just
5	suggested. And I'm going to start with
6	Commissioner Shapiro.
7	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Thank you, Mr.
8	Chair. I agree with you related to the
9	continuance. I think that that is information that
10	would help us decide whether to go forward or not,
11	so, yes. And also looking forward to discussing
12	the timeliness issue, but I'll hold off on that
13	until our next round of conversation I assume.
14	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, thank you. Ms.
15	John? You're on mute, Ms. John, I'm sorry.
16	VICE CHAIR JOHN: So I concur that we
17	should consider the continuance but discuss the
18	timeliness issue so we take care of that issue.
19	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Mr. Smith?
20	MEMBER SMITH: I do concur with my
21	other colleagues. I think we do need to give time
22	for the courts to consider the discussion of the
23	easement. But I am open and welcome to a discussion
24	about the timeliness issue.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. So let's see.

1	Well, yeah, I guess, Mr. Theresa, I mean you're
2	the one who made the motion, correct? Yeah, you
3	can just nod. You can just nod. I think that's
4	correct. And then since, Mr. Hunt and Mr. Tasew,
5	I just want to understand I just want you to
6	understand what's about to happen. Do you
7	understand?
8	MR. HUNT: This is counsel from the
9	owner. I completely understand, and in fact, I
10	must concur that the resolution would most
11	appropriately be in superior court, and then
12	deferred back.
13	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. So
14	I'm going to go ahead and make a motion then to
15	approve the emotion to approve the motion for
16	continuance that was provided by the appellant,
17	and ask for a second, Ms. John?
18	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Second.
19	BZA CHAIR HILL: The motion been made
20	and seconded. Mr. Moy, could you please take roll
21	call vote?
22	SECRETARY MOY: Thank you, Mr.
23	Chairman. So when I call your name, if you would
24	please response with a yes or no to the Chairman's
25	motion to continue this appeal, seconded by Ms.

1	John. Zoning Commissioner Peter Shapiro?
2	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Yes.
3	SECRETARY MOY: Mr. Smith?
4	MEMBER SMITH: Yes.
5	SECRETARY MOY: Vice Chair John?
6	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Yes.
7	SECRETARY MOY: Chairman Hill?
8	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes.
9	SECRETARY MOY: Staff would record the
10	vote as four to zero to one. We have a board seat
11	vacant, and this is to the Chairman's motion to
12	continue this appeal to a future date, seconded
13	by Vice Chair John. Also in support the motion,
14	Mr. Smith and Zoning Commissioner Peter Shapiro,
15	board seat vacant, staff record the vote as four
16	to zero to one.
17	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great. Thank
18	you, Mr. Moy. All right. So the next issue
19	yeah, sure, Mr. Shapiro?
20	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: I'm just
21	wondering if anyone on the call has any information
22	about the status of the court proceedings. If we
23	have any sense of what the timing's going to be
24	like? I know that's a hard thing to prognosticate
25	this year.

Okay, hold on, hold 1 BZA CHAIR HILL: on, hold on. Let me ask Mr. Theresa to go first 2 3 because it's his motion. Mr. Theresa? THERESA: Well, right now the 4 MR. 5 hearing has been delayed till December 15th because The timeline to respond has been 6 of Covid. 7 extended. So I don't know when the hearing will be on that. It's too hard to determine. 8 9 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Mr. Hunt, do 10 you have any comment? 11 Yes, sir. To some degree MR. HUNT: 12 I must concur because if this becomes a contested issue requiring a trial, it's just not clear what 13 the timelines are in Superior Court right now. 14 15 So I would concur to that degree. 16 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Mr. Shapiro, 17 does that -- okay, does that answer your question? 18 All right. Let's see. So then now I'm going to 19 move on to the timeliness issue. So I quess we, 20 the Board, have read the record concerning all of 21 the timeliness information that was put forward. 22 And I guess the motion is that this be dismissed 23 due to timeliness. And I suppose, Mr. Green, you 2.4 made the motion, correct? 25 That's correct, Chairman. MR. GREEN:

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Mr. Green, I kind of already know where I am with this one, but you can go ahead and give your argument for it if you like.

MR. GREEN: No, it's fairly brief, Chairman. I appreciate the time. It's basically -- it's been laid out in our brief and our filing. And the timeframe in which to file this appeal was 60 days as the Board is well aware, and it's over 200 days in which it was filed. The issue that -- certainly for preservation of DCRA's position and the record, that we filed this motion that it was untimely, and that's really where our position is. So at this point we believe it wasn't filed timely, and we would ask that it be dismissed.

I'm sorry, I'm going to let the Board ask questions after I go through this real quick. Mr. Theresa, so we read your filings and everything, right, and again, what it kind of hinges on upon is, you know, known or should have known that anything was going on next door, right? And I'm going to kind of just come forward and give my opinion right now which is that I think that I want to have a discussion with DCRA a little bit about this, because I still

get a little confused which is the known and should have known.

From Mr. Theresa's filings, nothing was going on next door. Nothing was being -- nothing was posted. No one was mailed anything, right? How would you know or should have known that any construction was going on, that anything was going on next door to your house? So, Mr. Theresa, I basically just made the argument for you, but please go ahead and tell me why you believe that your filing is not untimely.

MR. THERESA: Basically I received no notice, and so the only notice I got was some contractors in my yard, and I talked to them and they said that, you know, they were about to begin construction. And I said, hey, do you guys have a building permit because nothing still was posted? And they said, yeah, we have one. And so I immediately went to DCRA, looked to see if they had one. They did have one, and, you know, I filed this within days.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Right. So you filed your appeal a few days after talking to people in your yard, outside your yard, correct?

MR. THERESA: Yes. Yes. Yes.

1	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yeah?
2	MR. THERESA: Yeah.
3	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Does the Board
4	have any questions for Mr. Green or Mr. Theresa?
5	Mr. Shapiro?
6	(Simultaneous Speaking)
7	MEMBER SMITH: Oh, go for it.
8	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Thank you, Mr.
9	Chair. Yeah, my question is your question which
10	is to Mr. Green or Mr. LeGrant, was there some
11	information that wasn't communicated or what is
12	it that you're using to say that he, you know, that
13	your assumption would be that he should have known?
14	MR. GREEN: That's the open question
15	that the applicant has to present. In other words,
16	I do know that the application was filed for a
17	building permit in 2017, and I know Mr. Theresa
18	received notice of that. Obviously, we're talking
19	about the building permit which is a different set
20	of facts and circumstances.
21	The filing, the response to it became
22	clear. However, the original filing for this
23	appeal was unclear of exactly when Mr. Theresa had
24	received notice for this building permit. I
25	believe, and I'll have to take a look at the filing,

I believe it was -- I think I'm hearing now that there were workers on the premises, and I believe the original filing was it was due to some -- the facts were a little unclear from the DCRA's perspective of when notice was received.

So with respect to that, Mr. Shapiro, that's a fair assessment to DCRA to assert that And for the respondent or the -- excuse right. me, the appellant in this case to say when they received notice. It certainly was unclear in the But I do know from the fact of the filings. application, again, we're dealing with the building code that the neighbor notification was received and signed by Mr. Theresa so there is a possibility that he had been following the process all along. And so that's now Mr. Theresa has provided some further information. So that's my response to your question, Mr. Shapiro.

COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Well, thank you. Let me make sure I'm clear about that. What was it in 2017 that you know that he did receive notice of?

MR. GREEN: That would be the neighbor notification form for the application for the building permit. I've got a certified green card

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	from 2017 that was signed, and I can show it to
2	the Board, but it's certainly not part of the
3	record. But that's 2017, we're now obviously in
4	2020. But there is
5	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Right.
6	MR. GREEN: it's an open question
7	whether or not Mr. Theresa had been following along
8	with this process.
9	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: But is that
10	what was the neighbor notification 2017, does
11	that typically trigger the known or should have
12	known?
13	MR. GREEN: I think the question is
14	that certainly that from DCRA's perspective, that
15	a neighbor would be on notice of this application
16	and would contribute to the known or should have
17	known within the activity of building, you know,
18	that this project would be proceeding.
19	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Right. And
20	just for my clarification, Mr. Theresa
21	BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Theresa I'll get
22	to you in a second.
23	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Okay. I mean
24	I was going to ask him whether he remembered
25	receiving that in 2017.

BZA CHAIR HILL: That was for Mr. Theresa? Yeah, if your question's for Mr. Theresa, please go ahead.

COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Yeah.

MR. THERESA: The only thing I remember receiving about the historic from them was preservation review. And I don't remember signing I'll say this that I think this is a anvthing. very slippery slope and I don't think people are responsible to stay abreast of an application once an application's been filed. So even if I did see the application, which I do not recall seeing, and I would say that I had not seen one, I don't think that this qualifies as me having known because still, there's no date for when I would have known.

And there's also case law for people who do applications in piecemeal, and you don't know when the notice started because it was piecemeal. You don't know when it ended, when everything ended. So I think you have to count from when the building permit was issued, not, you know, when the application was made, and I don't recall getting anything like that.

And I think that's a heavy burden to put on someone to follow along a process for three

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	years, and even if they did follow along a process
2	for three years, when is the point where you're
3	responsible for having known or should have known?
4	Do you have to look every week? Do you have to
5	look every month, every three months? Like, you
6	know, how do you follow along this process for three
7	years? I don't know. I don't recall seeing
8	anything like that.
9	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Thank you, Mr.
10	Theresa sorry, Mr. Shapiro?
11	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Just two.
12	Assuming you received the neighbor notification
13	in 2017, and maybe this is just my ignorance, is
14	that a moment in time when one can appeal?
15	BZA CHAIR HILL: Are you asking OAG,
16	Mr. Shapiro?
17	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: I guess DCRA or
18	OAG would be, you know, either/or.
19	BZA CHAIR HILL: Ms. Nagelhout, do you
20	know?
21	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Perhaps (audio
22	interference.)
23	MS. NAGELHUOT: I would let the parties
24	I think the parties should address that. But
25	it has to be a zoning decision. I'm not sure what

1	exactly you're talking about, the notice.
2	MR. GREEN: That sits with the building
3	codes. Sorry, this is Hugh Green. It's a building
4	code requirement, not necessarily strictly a zoning
5	code requirement. But I guess I had one further
6	follow up, question. I'll wait for the Board to
7	continue on the line of questions.
8	BZA CHAIR HILL: You have a question
9	for whom, Mr. Green?
10	MR. GREEN: Yeah, I was just curious
11	in terms of the so one of the issues is that
12	
13	BZA CHAIR HILL: That would be your
14	question, Mr. Green. I'm sorry, who do you have
15	a question for?
16	MR. GREEN: I'm sorry, I had a question
17	for the property owners.
18	BZA CHAIR HILL: Oh, okay. Hold on
19	give me a second then. Give me
20	MR. GREEN: Okay, that's fine.
21	BZA CHAIR HILL: That's all right.
22	Because I have a question for the property owner.
23	Mr. Hunt, can you hear me?
24	MR. HUNT: Yes, I can.
25	BZA CHAIR HILL: Do you have any kind
	NEAL D. CDOSS

of proof that you've notified Mr. Theresa of this 1 building permit being issued? 2 3 MR. HUNT: Your Honor, I have statements that I'm texting with my clients that 4 5 they do exist. I have just been retained on this case within the last week and had focused on the 6 7 civil action. So I wasn't part of that process What I was thinking was is that this issue myself. 8 9 might -- if it carries forward be supplemented by 10 that type of information. 11 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, that's fine. 12 We can talk about all that later. I mean let's 13 just give me a second, Mr. Theresa. I know you look like you want to say something. 14 Mr. Green, 15 what was the question that you had for Mr. Hunt? 16 MR. GREEN: It was precisely that is 17 were there any communications or conversations 18 between the neighboring owner and Mr. Theresa 19 regarding this activity. I think that bears into 20 whether or not -- and who the permit was really 21 I think that's a question which I was going 22 to ask Mr. Hunt and his client. 23 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okav. All right. 24 So, Mr. Hunt, you were about to say something? 25 Yeah, if I may in response. MR. HUNT:

1	The contours of the lawsuit in superior court have
2	to do with a title change and issues that are
3	somewhat independent of that question. So, again,
4	I think I would respond that if we would be allowed
5	to supplement the record, I can dig into that
6	further having been in this less than a week
7	actually at this point.
8	BZA CHAIR HILL: All right. Well,
9	we'll see what happens. Mr. Tasew, can you hear
10	me?
11	MR. TASEW: Yes, sir.
12	BZA CHAIR HILL: hold on, Mr. Theresa,
13	one second. And I don't know if I'm pronouncing
14	it right. Mr. Tasew?
15	MR. TASEW: Yes. Yes, sir. Yes, sir.
16	Mr. Tasew, correct.
17	BZA CHAIR HILL: Do you have any proof
18	do you have any proof that you've notified Mr.
19	Theresa inside of 60 days that the building permit
20	was issued?
21	MR. TASEW: Actually, I just started.
22	Actually I got the building permit December 4.
23	The 1600 V so I started with this actually to
24	try to start the project. But I have never noticed
25	him.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Mr. Theresa -I mean -- I'm sorry. Mr. Tasew, you know, what
we're trying to figure out is that should the
applicant have known or should have known within
60 days that your building permit was issued. And
so far there's nothing in the record that indicates
that he should have known. That there's some kind
of, you know, definitive, yes, I knew. Okay?

So if you want to add something into the record that you think you can have because this might go on for a little while longer, we can hold the timeliness issue in abeyance for if we come back here again. I do want to have a discussion, however, with DCRA about this issue. So at this point I'm just saying we'll go ahead and hold it in abeyance. However, Mr. Theresa, you seem like you have something you wanted to say?

MR. THERESA: Yes. You know, I disagree with this. I feel like if he had notified me, it should be on the record. I don't feel like we should be at a hearing now and him talking about, you know, presenting some sort of post facto evidence of notification. Like it's simple. This should have been on the record. If he notified me, put it on the record, put the evidence on the

1	record. We shouldn't allow him the opportunity
2	to create some sort of document to put that on the
3	record and there be some question as to this.
4	There is a requirement when you file
5	for this to give notice. I have not received
6	notice. I would like for this to be ruled on today.
7	I don't believe that it's fair for the person
8	applying for this permit to have a chance to go,
9	you know, do whatever and make whatever documents.
10	This stuff should be in the record at this point.
11	This case has been outstanding for a while now.
12	BZA CHAIR HILL: I mean hold on a
13	second. Hold on a second.
14	MR. TASEW: Can I say something first?
15	BZA CHAIR HILL: and
16	(Simultaneous Speaking)
17	MR. THERESA: And also
18	BZA CHAIR HILL: Excuse me, excuse me.
19	Excuse me, I'm going to respond. I don't want
20	anybody else to talk right now. Whoever is on the
21	phone just hold on a second. Mr. Theresa, I'm not
22	disagreeing with you. I'm just saying right now
23	that somebody has just said that they have something
24	that may and people can't create evidence, right?
25	You're talking about people like faking

documentation, right?

And so like I whether or not I
want to have a I was trying to have a discussion
with DCRA about how this system doesn't seem to
be very definitive, right? There's not like a time
like you were mailed something that says this
is going on next door to your house, right? And
the only thing so far that I've heard is there's
maybe a card that you might have signed three years
ago, which by the way, I don't think you should
be responsible for tracking stuff, you know, for
three years that's going on next door to your house.

So I think we're all in the same place, we're just trying to get everything on the record. And since this isn't -- and I'll let my fellow Board members speak up in a minute, but this isn't going to come back to us one way or the other perhaps until January or February, we can see what happens with the timeliness issue there. But I can let my fellow Board members also state their opinion. But you have now told me what you think and I can hear somebody on the phone. I guess Mr. Tasew, you're trying to say something?

MR. TASEW: Yes, sir. Please allow me. We posted it, and had a picture and we sent

to DCRA. Also I have been discussing with him, with Mr. Theresa, I have been discussing with him so many times, we're going to build two houses and then we have a lot of conversation --

(Simultaneous Speaking)

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, okay. So, Mr. Tasew, this is obviously something that's going to court and I don't want to get all involved in all this stuff. We have a simple matter we're trying to talk about right now, and if we want to hold this in abeyance, then we're going to hold this in abeyance, right?

As of now, I've seen nothing in the record that shows me that Mr. Theresa should have known that this thing was going to on next to his house, right? So I'm going to turn to my fellow Board members right now, okay, and ask you, and I'll start with Mr. Shapiro and go to Ms. John, and then Mr. Smith, I would just go ahead and hold this in abeyance the timeliness issue and see if anything definitive comes in to the record -- Mr. Theresa, I see your hand -- and see if anything definitive comes into the record that changes what currently is in the record, right? And so that would just be my opinion. I don't know, Mr.

1	Shapiro?
2	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Thank you, Mr.
3	Chair. Where you were going with your question,
4	I thought you were going to was to direct this a
5	little bit towards DCRA because I'm also not clear
6	about what the standard of notification is here.
7	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yeah, that was more
8	I was kind of getting past this discussion a
9	little bit. And then kind of asked my questions
10	directly of DCRA like what is there and
11	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Right.
12	BZA CHAIR HILL: I guess we can have
13	this conversation now, but what I first am curious
14	of is what do you think of the abeyance issue?
15	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: That makes
16	perfect sense to me. But I also I think I'll
17	be informed by what DCRA has to say about the
18	standard of notification.
19	BZA CHAIR HILL: All right, then let's
20	do that first.
21	(Simultaneous Speaking)
22	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Based on
23	everything
24	BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Green, Mr.
25	LeGrant, what is the standard of notification?
	NEAL D. ODOGO

MR. GREEN: Well, I didn't hear yet
I don't know what you mean by and let me just
respond to two points. One is the standard of
notification, in terms of when we get to these
timeliness issues, all of these timeliness issues
are really fact specific. All of the cases that
I have read concerning the BZA is when did someone
know? Was it an email, was it not? And I know
the Board has been enmeshed in many of those. So
let me just say it's always a factual specific
it many times boils down to facts specific issues
with regards to when someone knew or should have
known.
Now I guess the question you're asking
is what is and I apologize if you could repeat
it, your question is what is reasonable notice?
Or can you repeat the question that you wanted
answered?
COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: How is one
notified?
MR. GREEN: Of a building permit? So
it's really available on our website. Mr. LeGrant,
I know we know and, of course, I'm not punting

it to him, but I know it's been a practice of ANCs

are notified of new building permits.

And sorry,

Mr. LeGrant, is there anything you wanted to add in terms of the general process internally?

MR. LEGRANT: Yes. Thank you, So two points. There is nothing in the Green. regulations that require notice issuance of a building permit be given to adjacent owner or any property owners, or any other As a transparency measure, and as I've parties. been a zoning administrator, the permit operations division of DCRA publishes a list of issued building permits, building permit, address, and the date that is available, channeled I believe on our webpage specific which will give more details to each ANC.

And so each ANC gets a notice of the date, the building permit number, and the address for those building permits. And then my experience in the past is those ANCs if there's a question and they follow up, they can drill down all the building permit information including the scope of work. Plans are available to any party online.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. I'm going to go back. But I have changed my mind now about the timeliness. Like we can talk about it a little bit more now as well if you want. But I'm --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	(Simultaneous Speaking)
2	MEMBER SMITH: Mr. Chair, I have a
3	question.
4	BZA CHAIR HILL: A little bit out of
5	order, but okay, Mr. Smith, go ahead.
6	MEMBER SMITH: This probably is
7	directed to Mr. LeGrant and Mr. Green. As far as
8	the regulations of posting of building permits,
9	when is a building permit required to be posted?
10	Is it after it has been issued? And on the
11	question of notification, would posting of a
12	property with a building permit constitute
13	notification for an adjacent property owner? Is
14	the applicant required to post the building permit
15	at the site?
16	MR. GREEN: Yes, a building permit has
17	to be you know, and Mr. LeGrant can talk to a
18	little bit more about it, but the posting is a
19	requirement I believe
20	(Simultaneous Speaking)
21	BZA CHAIR HILL: only when the
22	construction starts, correct, Mr. Green?
23	MR. GREEN: I believe so.
24	BZA CHAIR HILL: Right. Mr. LeGrant,
25	is that correct?
	NEAL D. ODOGO

MR. LEGRANT: To be fully up front with people, because it's a building code requirement to post a building permit, I am not aware of the actual requirement do you -- after you get your building permit in hand do you have to post it at the start of construction, or do you have to post it in some time period? I do not know that particular building code provision.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. I'm going to back a little bit. I got to talk my board members here a second now. So the discussion I was trying to have with DCRA, and, Ms. John, you know this because we've talked about all this in terms of timeliness issues, right? And as Mr. Green has said, it's very much case specific, right? by case basis, we look at everything on a case by case basis, right? And I guess I'm going to kind of offering something to the Zoning Administrator, DCRA, whatever is that if there were a more definitive way to start that clock, it would be easier for us to have a discussion about it.

And I don't know, maybe there's not.

I don't know. And maybe it's not necessarily
worth it. I, again, don't know, right? But I do
now believe, now that I've thought about this a

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

little bit more, and you guys can talk about it, that Mr. Theresa is going to have a building put up right next to his house. It's going to take away half of his possible easement, and to think that he didn't put an appeal out as soon as he knew, I now believe that, you know, it's timely, okay?

So as a case by case thing, right, I don't think he knew, okay? And I think that as soon as he knew, he would have filed his appeal.

Okay? And as soon as he did know when somebody was talking in his yard, he filed his appeal. So I think it's timely and I'm going to move on then for the -- you know, the case by case thing. You know, so I believe him. Okay? So now, Ms. John, what do you think? And I'll be happy to go back to the abeyance thing if you all have different thoughts. But, Ms. John?

VICE CHAIR JOHN: So, Mr. Chairman, when you mentioned the abeyance option, I was not thinking for a year, I was thinking of maybe two weeks to allow them to submit something. And like you, I don't believe there's anything there because I don't think Mr. Theresa is crazy. You know, he's got an easement, and if someone's putting up, you know, a building on his easement, he would do

something if he knew. So I believe that, too.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, all right.

VICE CHAIR JOHN: So having said that, though, I do have an issue with this known or should have known question that keeps coming up because, number one, the public does not know. There are no rules. It's like whack-a-mole. And so to me the DCRA should be able to come up with some solution so that the home owner doesn't have to sit there and depend on the ANC to let them know if there's a significant, you know, construction, you know, about to start. Or has to sit at the computer every weekend checking to see if there's a permit, you know, next to the homeowner.

So I have a really serious problem with this issue. I think DCRA should be able to come up with a rule that says places the burden on the property owner. And that says the property owner has to post a permit within a certain time. And I think that would really solve a lot of this litigation about knew or should have known, he said/ she said, and that's how I see it. I don't want to be the homeowner who has to having received a notice three years ago have to sit at my computer, and did I mention as a senior citizen, and try to

be my two cents. 2 3 BZA CHAIR HILL: Yeah. So, again, I'm going to back -- and I know, Mr. LeGrant and Mr. 4 5 Green, I mean, you know, they issued a building permit, they have up to a year to kind of do anything 6 7 with it, so I don't know what the specifics are, like, you know, I don't see how something can be 8 9 posted for a year or I don't know how you get over 10 this or what solutions there may be. 11 But I don't necessarily know if we're 12 going to address them here now. But this is something that I think we're curious of because 13 it does happen to us every now and -- meaning the 14 15 BZA in terms of timeliness issues or not. So I'm back to denying the motion for timeliness, and I 16 17 think I got one with Ms. John. And I want to hear, Mr. Shapiro, are you good with voting on this today? 18 19 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Yes. 20 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, Mr. Smith? 21 MEMBER SMITH: Yes. 22 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. So 23 I'm going to make a motion to deny the motion for 24 timeliness as this is now a timely appeal, and I'm 25 going to ask for a second, Ms. John?

figure out what's going on next door. So that would

1	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Second.
2	BZA CHAIR HILL: The motion made and
3	seconded. Mr. Moy, will you please take a roll
4	call? Mr. Moy, you're muted.
5	SECRETARY MOY: Okay, thank you, Mr.
6	Chairman. Yes, I was trying to manipulate my
7	fingers on this keyboard here. Okay. So when I
8	call your name if you would please respond with
9	a yes or no to the motion made by Chairman Hill
10	to deny the motion to deny the motion to dismiss
11	on timeliness, seconded by Vice Chair John. Zoning
12	Commissioner Peter Shapiro?
13	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: I vote yes to
14	deny.
15	SECRETARY MOY: Yes. Mr. Smith?
16	MEMBER SMITH: Yes to deny.
17	SECRETARY MOY: Chairman Hill?
18	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes to deny.
19	SECRETARY MOY: Staff would record the
20	vote as four to zero to one. And this is on the
21	motion of Chairman Hill to deny the motion to
22	dismiss based on timeliness, seconded by Ms. John.
23	Also in support of the motion to deny is Zoning
24	Commissioner
25	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Did you ask for

1	Ms. John's vote?
2	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Pardon?
3	SECRETARY MOY: What's that?
4	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Did I miss
5	that? Did I fall asleep for a second? Did you
6	ask for Ms. John's vote?
7	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Oh, missed
8	(Simultaneous Speaking)
9	SECRETARY MOY: Yes, I did. I thought
10	I did.
11	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Oh, okay. All
12	right. I'm sorry.
13	SECRETARY MOY: No, that's okay.
14	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: I blinked for
15	a second.
16	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Well, if
17	(Simultaneous Speaking)
18	SECRETARY MOY: No, that's all right,
19	it's always good to double check me.
20	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Yes. No, if you did,
21	the vote is yes.
22	SECRETARY MOY: Yes, thank you.
23	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you, Mr.
24	Shapiro.
25	SECRETARY MOY: Okay. So staff would
	NEAL R. GROSS

1	record the vote as four to zero to one. We have
2	a board seat vacant. In support of the motion to
3	deny is Zoning Commission Peter Shapiro, Mr. Smith,
4	Vice Chair John, and Chairman Hill. Again, the
5	vote is four to zero to one, the motion to deny
6	is passed.
7	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Mr. Green, you
8	guys submitted a slide deck, is that right?
9	MR. GREEN: Yes, sir.
10	BZA CHAIR HILL: Which exhibit is it,
11	Mr. Green? I don't know why I'm having a tough
12	
13	MR. GREEN: They haven't they were
14	not admitted
15	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay.
16	MR. GREEN: because it was delayed.
17	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay.
18	MR. GREEN: So I can talk about that,
19	or refile it in a time I mean it's
20	BZA CHAIR HILL: So that's all right.
21	So it's going to be moot now because this is going
22	to be open now until we're back again or not, right?
23	So, Mr. Theresa, that slide deck will probably
24	get into the record at some point, and you'll have
25	an opportunity to take a look at it. If in fact

1	we get to that point, right? So Mister let's
2	see, I'm going to Mr. Hunt, do you understand
3	everything that's going on?
4	MR. HUNT: Yes, sir.
5	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Mr. Tasew, do
6	you understand that's going on?
7	MR. TASEW: Yes, sir.
8	BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Theresa, do you
9	understand everything that's going on?
10	MR. THERESA: Yes.
11	BZA CHAIR HILL: All right. Then I guess
12	we'll postpone this until after the court thing
13	whenever that is. Okay?
14	MR. HUNT: That would seem
15	appropriate, and a long time line does make sense
16	even into the New Year.
17	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Mr. Moy, you had
18	your hand up?
19	SECRETARY MOY: Yes. Two things, Mr.
20	Chairman. So for clarity for the record, then the
21	Board is allowing DCRA's PowerPoint slide deck into
22	the record, correct?
23	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes.
24	SECRETARY MOY: And the second thing
25	is I think it might be helpful for the Board to

2 hearing. 3 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. So I do have a question now again. So like, you know, as far 4 5 as the record being open, so then like, you know, Mr. Green just submitted something. I don't know 6 7 whether Mr. Theresa wants to bother writing anything against it right -- or not against it, 8 9 writing anything to that slide deck right now or 10 just waiting to see what happens. But how would 11 we keep the record open, and how would this -- I 12 quess the record will be open until we come back 13 for this supposed date. Is that correct, Mr. Moy? SECRETARY MOY: I believe so, but I 14 15 would defer to Counselor Nagelhout. 16 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Then I'll ask 17 Ms. Nagelhout in a moment. Then as far as the 18 supposed date, I don't know I heard January is when 19 they're going to in court. And so I guess I don't 20 anything happening until February, you know? 21 MR. HUNT: Or even further to be quite 22 honest on behalf of the owner. 23 Well, I mean, BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. 2.4 Mr. Hunt, do you have a timeline to propose? 25 To actually get to a point MR. HUNT:

put a placeholder with regards to the continued

1	where there could be reasonable movement in the
2	case, I could see even going out into the spring
3	like April.
4	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Mr. Moy, how
5	do you do that? You don't schedule that far out.
6	SECRETARY MOY: Well, we haven't gone
7	that far out in the past, but I could hold this
8	aside with a future date to come. But I at
9	present, given the number of applications that have
10	been filed to the Office of Zoning, dockets are
11	getting filled. I'm not that far out yet, but it
12	won't be long. We're
13	(Simultaneous Speaking)
14	BZA CHAIR HILL: All right. Okay.
15	Then go ahead and put April 7th down and we'll just
16	see what happens.
17	SECRETARY MOY: Okay, that's good
18	because we can always move that depending on the
19	status.
20	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. So
21	I guess that's it unless anybody has anything else?
22	No?
23	(Simultaneous Speaking)
24	MR. HUNT: Not at this time. No.
25	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right.
	NEAL P. GPOSS

1	Well, thank you, all, very much, and we'll see what
2	happens. Thank you.
3	MR. HUNT: Great. Very well. Thank
4	you, all.
5	BZA CHAIR HILL: I guess then, Mr. Moy,
6	that keeps us here, right? And is it well, gosh,
7	is there anything else before the Board?
8	SECRETARY MOY: Well, not anything from
9	the staff, sir.
10	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Well, then
11	we're adjourned, everyone.
12	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
13	was concluded at 12:55 p.m.)
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

<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 Hearing

Before: DCBZA

Date: 09-16-20

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 aus 8