GOVERNMENT OF

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

+ + + + +

REGULAR PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY

MARCH 30, 2022

+ + + + +

The Regular Public Meeting 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 Chairperson CARL BLAKE, Board Member CHRISHAUN SMITH, Board Member (NCPC)

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

PETER MAY, Commissioner ROBERT MILLER, Commissioner

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

CLIFFORD MOY, Secretary PAUL YOUNG, Zoning Data Specialist

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

BRANDICE ELLIOTT MATT JESICK JONATHAN KIRSCHENBAUM STEPHEN MORDFIN CRYSTAL MYERS

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PRESENT:

MARY NAGELHOUT, ESQ.

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Regular Public Meeting on March 30, 2022.

1 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 2 9:39 a.m. 3 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Welcome to the Board of Zoning Today's date is 3/30/2022. This meeting will 5 please come to order. 6 My name is Fred Hill, I'm Chairperson of the 7 District of Columbia Board of Zoning Adjustment. Joining me today is Lorna John, Vice-Chair, Board Members Carl Blake and 8 Chrishaun Smith, and Zoning Commissioners Peter May and Rob 9 Miller. 10 Today's meeting and hearing agenda are available 11 12 to you on the Office of Zoning's website. Please be advised that this proceeding is being recorded by a court reporter, 13 14 and is also webcast live via WebEx and YouTube live. The video of the webcast will be available on the 15 Office hearing. 16 of Zoning's website today's after 17 Accordingly, everyone who is listening on WebEx telephone will be muted during the hearing. 18 19 Also, please be advised that we do not take any 2.0 public testimony at our decision meeting session. If you're 2.1 experiencing difficulty accessing WebEx or when you do 22 telephone call-in, then please call our OG hotline number at (202) 727-5471 to receive WebEx calling instructions. 2.3 24 the conclusion of the decision meeting,

shall, in consultation with the Office of Zoning, 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 made if the Board's decision differs from the Office of Planning's recommendation. Although it is fair to refuse summary orders that are impossible, an applicant may not request the Board to issue such an order.

In today's hearing session, whoever's listening on WebEx or by telephone, we needed during the hearing, the only persons who have signed certificates to later testify will be unmuted at the appropriate time.

Please state your name and home address before providing oral testimony on your presentation. Oral presentations should be limited to the summary of your point. When you're finished your speaking, please mute your audio feature and mike so there's participant making inside or background noise.

Once again, if you're experiencing difficulty accessing WebEx, please call our OV hotline at (202) 727-5471. All persons planning to testify, either in favor or in opposition, should have signed up in advance. They'll be called by name to testify.

If this is an appeal, only parties are allowed to testify by signing up to testify. All participants completed

the oath and affirmation, as required by Subtitle Y, 408.7.

Requests to enter evidence in time in all non-virtual hearing situations, and testimony or additional supporting documents under the live video, which may not presented as part of the testimony, may be allowed pursuant to Subtitle Y, 103.13, provided that the persons making the request and entering exhibits for (a) how the program is relevant, (b) is a good cause to justify the filing of exhibits into the record, including an explanation of why their questions were not filed prior to the hearing, pursuant to Y 206, and how the proposals then would not unreasonably prejudice the parties.

The order of procedures are intended to establish in set and variances, pursuant to Y 409, the order of appeals are in Y 507.

At the conclusion of each case, an individual who is unable to testify because of technical issues, may file their request for relief by filing a written version of the planned testimony to the record within 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 its next meeting session, but no earlier than 48 hours after the

2.1

hearing. Moreover, the Board may request additional certificate information to meet the record.

The Board and Staff will specify again at the end of the hearing exactly what is expected, and the date when persons submit to BZA Office of Zoning. No other information shall be accepted by the Board.

Finally, the District of Columbia Administrative Procedures Act requires that public hearing on each case be held in the open for the public. However, pursuant to Section 405(b) and in accordance with that Act, the Board may, consistent with its rules and procedures and the Act, enter into closed meetings on occasions, for purposes of seeking legal counsel in a case, pursuant to D.C. Official Code, Section 2-575(b)(4), and/or to delay a case pursuant to D.C. Official Code, Section 2-575(b)(13), but only after providing administrative public notice in the case, emergency closed meeting has taken the roll call vote. Mr. Secretary, do we have any preliminary matters?

MR. MOY: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members of the Board. We do have preliminary matters, but as customary, I think it's more efficient for the Board to address those when I call the specific case application.

Other than that, I do want to take a moment to announce case applications that are not on today's docket. Case application number 20086A, this is the application of

2.0

2.1

1	Oak Park Apartments LLC, was withdrawn by the applicant.
2	20549, which is the appeal of ANC-6B, was rescheduled to
3	April 6, 2022.
4	Case application number 20647 of 1345 Madison
5	Street NW LLC was rescheduled to April 13, 2022. And
6	finally, application number 20239 of 2629 MLK LLC was
7	rescheduled to May 25, 2022. And that's it for me,
8	Mr. Chairman.
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: All right, thanks, Mr. Moy.
10	So, this first case Ms. John is not on. So, Ms. John, if we
11	can excuse you for a minute. And then, Mr. Moy, if you can
12	call out a first decision, I think there's some issues that
13	I'd like to resolve with the Board. And I think, is
14	Commissioner Miller on this one?
15	MR. MOY: No, sir. Within Zoning Commission
16	Chair Anthony Hood.
17	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Oh, right, right. Yep, yep,
18	yep. Okay. Normally right, Chairman Hood, but there's some
19	discussions that I'd like to have with the Board, so great.
20	MR. MOY: Great. And you still have a quorum for
21	this case?
22	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Great, thank you.
23	MR. MOY: Should I read this into the record?
24	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes, please.
25	MR. MOY: All right, this is case application

number 20643 of the Maret School. This Board is aware it's an application for special exceptions from the matter-ofright uses Subtitle U, Section 201, in pursuant to Subtitle U, Section 203.1(m), Subtitle X, Section 104.1 and 901.2, Subtitle Χ, Section and the parking location Subtitle C, Section 710.2, pursuant restrictions of Subtitle C, Section 710.3 and Subtitle X, Section 901.2.

This would permit a private school use in the R1B zone property location as part of 5901 Utah Avenue, NW, Square 2319, Lot 832.

And I should remember, Mr. Chairman, this was last heard at the Board's hearing on March 9.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, thank you. All right, so just to let the Board members know, and this is what I had done, there was a request to reopen the record from the ANC.

And so, what I had done is go ahead and reopen the record from the ANC and allowed what the ANC had wanted us to see into the record.

And so, in order for the correct time to pass, in order for there to be any kind of responses from the parties, I'm going to put off the decision for this until next week. So, we would decide that on April 6th.

So, unless anybody has any issues with that, and if you do, just raise your hand. Seeing nobody raising their hand, Mr. Moy, let's go ahead and put this off for one week

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

1	for decision. Okay?
2	MR. MOY: Yes. Thank you, sir.
3	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right, Mr. Moy. You
4	can go ahead, and I think you get Vice-Chair John back. And
5	then, whoever the Commissioner is can join us on the next two
6	expedited reviews.
7	MR. MOY: And that would be Mr. Peter May, sir.
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, great. Commissioner May.
9	Good morning, Commissioner May.
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: Good morning.
11	(Simultaneous speaking.)
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sure. Go ahead, please.
13	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. The first two cases that
14	are designated as expedited review is application
15	number 20679 of J.B. Lurie, L-U-R-I-E. This is a request for
16	special exception relief from the lot occupancy requirements
17	of Subtitle E, Section 304.1, pursuant to Subtitle E,
18	Section 5201 and Subtitle X, Section 901.2, rear yard
19	requirements, Subtitle E, Section 306.1, pursuant to
20	Subtitle E, Section 5201 and Subtitle X, Section 901.2.
21	This would construct a rear deck addition to an
22	attached two-story with basement principal dwelling unit in
23	the RF1 zone, property located at 2205 Flagler,
24	F-L-A-G-L-E-R, Place, NW, Square 3122, Lot 60.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. We already talked about

1	this, okay? Again, this rear deck addition to a two-story
2	attached principal dwelling.
3	After I have reviewed the record, I didn't really
4	have a particular issue with it. I mean, I would have
5	preferred that we had gotten something from the ANC, just to
6	get their thoughts. But I know that in the information that
7	was submitted by the applicant, they did say that they
8	reached out to the ANC.
9	I guess the ANC maybe thought that this was
10	something that was not of interest to them. They also did
11	say that they submitted to Bloomingdale Civic Association.
12	But I had not seen anything from them.
13	However, beyond that, we did get reports from the
14	Office of Planning, as well as DDOT, and I was comfortable
15	with the announcement that DDOT has provided, as well as the
16	argument that the applicant has made for meeting the criteria
17	for us to grant the relief. So, I'm going to be voting in
18	favor. Mr. Smith, do you have anything to add?
19	Okay, he's shaking his head no. Commissioner May,
20	do you have anything to add?
21	COMMISSIONER MAY: I do not.
22	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Mr. Blake, do you have
23	anything to add?
24	MEMBER BLAKE: Yes. I would agree that I would
25	have like to have heard something from the ANC, but I do

1	believe that the applicant met the burden of proof in this
2	case, and I would be prepared to support it.
3	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you, Mr. Blake. Vice-
4	Chair John, do you have anything to add?
5	VICE CHAIR JOHN: No, Mr. Chairman. This is a
6	straightforward application, and I am in support of the
7	application.
8	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Great. Thank you. I'm going
9	to make a motion to approve application number 20679, as
10	captioned and read by the Secretary, and ask for a second.
11	Mr. John?
12	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Second.
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Motion has been made and
14	seconded, Mr. Moy. Can you take a roll call?
15	MR. MOY: Thank you, sir. When I call each of
16	your names, if you would please respond with a yes, no, or
17	abstain, for the motion made by Chairman Hill to approve the
18	application for the relief that was requested. This motion
19	was seconded by Vice-Chair John. Zoning Commissioner May?
20	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
21	MR. MOY: Mr. Smith?
22	MEMBER SMITH: Yes.
23	MR. MOY: Mr. Blake?
24	MEMBER BLAKE: Yes.
25	MR. MOY: Vice-Chair John?

1	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Yes.
2	MR. MOY: Chairman Hill.
3	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.
4	MR. MOY: Staff would record the vote as 5-0-0,
5	and this is on the motion made by Chairman Hill to approve.
6	The motion to approve was seconded by Vice-Chair John. Also
7	in support of the motion to approve, Zoning Commissioner
8	Peter May, Mr. Smith, Mr. Blake, and of course Vice-Chair
9	John and Chairman Hill. The motion carries on the vote of
10	5-0-0.
11	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you, Mr. Moy. You can
12	go ahead and call our next case when you get a chance.
13	MR. MOY: Yes. So, this would be case application
14	number 20682 of Robert Contee and Asure, A-S-U-R-E, Contee.
15	Again, this is a request for special exception relief from
16	the rear yard requirements, Subtitle D, Section 306.1,
17	pursuant to Subtitle D, Section 5201 and Subtitle X,
18	Section 901.2.
19	This would construct a rear deck addition to an
20	existing detached two-story with basement principal dwelling
21	unit in the R1B zone property located at 5526 MacArthur
22	Blvd., NW, Square 1445, Lot 65.
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, great. Thank you,
24	Mr. Moy. So, this is, again, an expedited review for a rear
25	deck addition to an existing two-story principal dwelling.

1	I thought this was even more straightforward than the other
2	one.
3	Like, I didn't have any problems or issues with
4	it. I thought that they're meeting the criteria for us to
5	grant the relief requested. I thought it was pretty, again,
6	nominal, straightforward, and I didn't have any concerns.
7	I would give great weight to the analysis that the
8	Office of Planning's report has provided, as well as that of
9	the ANC in support, and DDOT with no objection.
10	I'm going to be voting in favor. Commissioner
11	May, do you have anything to add?
12	COMMISSIONER MAY: I do not.
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Mr. Smith, do you have
14	anything to add?
15	MEMBER SMITH: I do not.
16	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Mr. Blake, do you have anything
17	to add?
18	MEMBER BLAKE: Nothing, Mr. Chair, other than
19	there are three lists in the record from the two adjacent
20	neighbors, which are also considered favorable in this.
21	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Great. Thank you, Mr. Blake,
22	for pointing that out. Vice-Chair John, do you have anything
23	to add?
24	VICE CHAIR JOHN: No, Mr. Chairman. This is
25	straightforward.

1	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. Then I make a motion to
2	approve the application of 20682, as captioned and read by
3	the Secretary, and ask for a second. Ms. John?
4	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Second.
5	CHAIRPERSON HILL: The motion has been made and
6	seconded. Mr. Moy, if you can take a roll call, please?
7	MR. MOY: When I call each of your names, if you
8	would please respond with a yes, no, or abstain, to the
9	motion made by Chairman Hill to approve the application for
10	the relief that is requested. This motion was seconded by
11	Vice-Chair John. Zoning Commissioner Peter May?
12	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
13	MR. MOY: Mr. Smith?
14	MEMBER SMITH: Yes.
15	MR. MOY: Mr. Blake?
16	MEMBER BLAKE: Yes.
17	MR. MOY: Vice-Chair John?
18	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Yes.
19	MR. MOY: Chairman Hill.
20	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.
21	MR. MOY: Staff would record the vote as 5-0-0,
22	and this is on the motion made by Chairman Hill to approve.
23	The motion to approve was seconded by Vice-Chair John. Also
24	in support of the motion to approve, Zoning Commissioner
25	Peter May, Mr. Smith, Mr. Blake, and of course Vice-Chair

1	John and Chairman Hill. The motion carries on the vote of
2	5-0-0.
3	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Great. Thanks, Mr. Moy.
4	Commissioner May, I think you're out for the next couple.
5	And then, we're going to bring you back in. And then,
6	Commissioner Miller is with us. You're on mute, Commissioner
7	May, but I'm sure you're saying something very clever.
8	COMMISSIONER MAY: No, not clever. I will try to
9	listen in and jump back in when you're ready for me. But if
10	for some reason you call me and I'm not answering, somebody
11	sent me a text or something.
12	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, great. Thanks,
13	Commissioner.
14	COMMISSIONER MAY: Thank you. Bye.
15	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Welcome, Commissioner Miller.
16	COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thank you. Good to see you
17	again.
18	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Let's see, Mr. Moy, if you
19	could call the decision about the yeah, the decision about
20	the appeal.
21	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I don't believe
22	I'm on the next two cases.
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay.
24	MR. MOY: That's correct. Okay, so the next case

4721 Sheriff Road NE LLC, captioned and advertised as an appeal pursuant to Subtitle X, Section 1100, from the decision September 15, 2021 made on by the Zoning Administrator, Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs. Property's located at 4719 Sheriff Road, NE, Square 5151, As you will recall, Mr. Chairman, the Board last Lot 144. heard this case at its public hearing on March 23rd.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Great, thank you. Okay, so I know that I've gone through this with some members. And I believe that the Board will like some further clarification information about this appeal.

And so, what I would propose is actually that we go ahead and reopen this and have a continued hearing on the appeal itself.

I know that there was some clarity that some Board members were interested in hearing, and I'm going to try to summarize that and go around the table and see if I'm getting this correct, and if there is anything that anyone else needs.

I believe that what has been asked for is for the appellant to provide a little bit more clarity into the record, as to how -- and I'll use my words for this part a little bit -- as to how the process works, as to how this product is delivered.

Like, I mean, I understand it's a plant. We all

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

agree that it was a plant. So, you plant the plant. And then, I'd like to know exactly you move through whatever it is. Planting the plant until whenever it finally gets to its next destination. Right?

I'd like to know specifically in the record how that process works. Right? So, that's one thing that I'd like to know, that I'm going to again provide a little bit more clarity about what I believe some of the Board members would like to hear about it, and also give the Board members an opportunity to speak.

The other thing that I'd like to know, and this is from the Zoning Administrator, I guess, I'd like to know how many other similar applications the Zoning Administrator has put into this light manufacturing category.

Like, I don't need to know the specific names or anything. But I'd like to know how many previous times the Zoning Administrator has made this determination in this capacity. I'd like to know that. And again, since we're having a continued hearing, we'll be able to ask more questions.

I guess also, a list of the medical canvass products that this facility will produce. Then, I guess, from the appellant, describe how this operation differs from those other medical marijuana cultivation centers that are currently licensed in the District of Columbia. Like, why

2.1

are they different than the other facilities. How is it that 1 their process is different than the other facilities? 2 3 However, and this is what I'm going to ask about 4 when we're actually in the continued hearing, I want to know 5 what their process is. I don't want them to change their I just want to know what their process is. Right? 6 7 I think that was it, unless I missed something. 8 Mr. Smith, did I capture most of that? 9 MEMBER SMITH: I think you captured my thoughts 10 on the additional information that we need. But I will 11 expand on that first item that you stated, where you're 12 asking for additional information about the practices from the time you plant a plant onward. 13 14 Just to be straightforward, I think what would be great if the application would submit into the record their 15 16 business plan of operations for the cultivation center. 17 front how you out propose to cultivation center. 18 19 So, I would request that formally, the business 20 plan that they may already have, since they're appealing this 2.1 determination of the Zoning Administrator. 22 CHAIRPERSON HILL: When you say business plan, 23 Smith, do you mean like schematics or a diagram or 24 something? What do you mean?

MEMBER SMITH: No, just the scope of the work that

they propose to do. Essentially what you said. 1 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Got it. I understand. 2 3 MEMBER SMITH: Yeah. Mm-hmm. 4 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Ι understand. Okay. 5 Mr. Blake, did I capture your thoughts? 6 You did, Mr. Chair. I think that MEMBER BLAKE: 7 the applicant did provide a pretty good argument as to the 8 agriculture aspect of Gulf Vision. But it would be helpful 9 to get a better understanding of the why in the work of the 10 cultivation center, and this in particular, is not light 11 manufacture. 12 That would be very valuable to me, understand why he would define his facility not as light 13 manufacturing, as opposed to saying to agriculture. 14 15 would be a good help for me. 16 And also, I think that it would be helpful in 17 getting that to see the schematic of this proposed facility, that would get to the magnitude of the -- at least some rough 18 schematic unless there's some prohibition in doing that, it 19 2.0 would be helpful to see that. At least a description of the 2.1 mechanical equipment. Let's say that. 22 All right, I mean, CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. 23 don't see why they can't give us a schematic, unless there's 24 some reason why. But, I don't know. But either I think the appellant understands the questions. And if not, then the

Secretary can help clarify. Commissioner Miller, do you have anything you'd like to add?

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I guess in addition to everything that you've all requested, I guess in order to be able to ask a question about it -- so I don't know if we're having a limited scope hearing, or whatever, let me just bring it up in case I want to ask the Zoning Administrator again about the distinction between the brew pub process, which has been allowed, and all commercial zones, not just manufacturing zones.

So, a distinction between the brew pub process and the medical cannabis production process onsite, other than the onsite consumption. I'm just talking about the process here, the intensity of the process. So, I'd want to know the distinction between the brew pub and the medical cannabis, and yeah, that's it. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay, great. Yeah, we can open it up for anything. Like, I mean, this isn't a limited scope hearing. I mean, it's an appeal. So, I want the Board to feel free to ask any questions about anything that has come up during the appeal, because we want to figure out and make sure that we have this correct. Mr. Blake?

MEMBER BLAKE: Mr. Chair, it would be helpful also, if we're going to reach out to the Zoning Administrator, to get a clearer understanding of the process

2.0

and his engagement with ABRA. He did indicate verbally how 1 the process kind of worked. I'd like to be clearer as to 2 3 when he weighs in and how it proceeds to ABRA for their 4 evaluation. 5 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. that differs from the 6 MEMBER BLAKE: And how instances, and how this may have taken 8 historically. 9 And maybe there is CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. 10 somebody from ABRA that we can ask to come if the Board would 11 like somebody to ask questions from ABRA. Is that something 12 that the Board would like us to request? Yes, I'd love that information. 13 MEMBER BLAKE: CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. All right. Okay, I see 14 15 two nods. So, Mr. Moy, we'll ask someone from ABRA to attend, so that we can ask questions of them as well. 16 17 Mr. Moy, when can this happen? 18 MR. MOY: All right, let me -- well, I heard that this is going to be reopened as a limited scope hearing. 19 2.0 let me pose this, knowing that the ANC may be participating. 2.1 Because I recall that the ANC meeting in April is April 14th. So, if we schedule the hearing for April 20th, and then work 22 23 backwards from April 20th. 24 So, responses where the appellant and DCRA can

respond to submissions by April 15th and by April 8th, where

1	the appellant, DCRA, can respond to the specific questions
2	that the Board has now proposed. So, let me do that again.
3	So, for the appellant and DCRA to respond to the
4	request for supplemental information, due Friday, April 8th,
5	and then to allow responses from the parties specifically,
6	the appellant, DCRA, and ANC by April 15th. And then, the
7	limited scope hearing on April 20th. So, what changes would
8	you like to make in that timeline?
9	CHAIRPERSON HILL: What changes, Mr. Moy? I'm
10	sorry.
11	MR. MOY: No, no. Are you fine with that
12	timeline, or do you want to readjust the dates?
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Sorry, Mr. Moy. I started to
14	look at the next case. So, the dates I'm sorry, can you
15	tell me again?
16	MR. MOY: Okay. So, real quickly, submissions by
17	Friday, April 8th, responses to the submissions by
18	April 15th, and the limited scope hearing on April 20th.
19	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yeah, I guess that's the
20	fastest we can get back here, right?
21	MR. MOY: Yeah, that is the quickest.
22	CHAIRPERSON HILL: And the other thing we've got
23	on the 20th. That's the fastest we can get back here.
24	MR. MOY: Yeah.
25	CHAIRPERSON HILL: The other case we've got on the

1 20th? I know we got a lot. I'll tell you in a second. 2 MR. MOY: The Board 3 has -- apart from the one expedited review case, the Board has nine cases. Nine new cases. 5 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. And we'll probably, just so people know, we're probably going to do this last, because 6 7 Vice-Chair John is not on this, so her day can end before 8 this case. 9 Commissioner Miller, are you with us Oh, wait. 10 on that day? You're okay with everything? Is that what you're saying, Commissioner Miller? Okay, great. 11 or we can work it out amongst yourselves as well later. But okay, we're back here on April 20th. Correct, 13 Is that what you said? 14 Mr. Moy? 15 MR. MOY: Yes, sir. 16 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. And Commissioner Miller 17 is on the next one as well, when you get an opportunity, 18 Mr. Moy. Mr. Moy, you're on mute. 19 I've got to repeat myself. MR. MOY: Oh man. 20 CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. No, that's all right. 2.1 That's my bad. All right, so before the MR. MOY: Board is case application number 20599 of Stephanie Ann Glier 22 23 and Brandon Woodward Glier, trustees. This is their request 24 for special exception relief from the rear yard requirements

Subtitle D, Section 306.1, pursuant

to

Subtitle

Section 5201, and Subtitle X, Section 901.2.

This will construct a two-story rear addition over the cellar, to an existing detached two-story over a cellar principal dwelling unit. This is an R1A zone property located at 3200 Ellicott Street, NW, Square 2035, Lot 812. This was last heard at the Board's public hearing on March 23rd.

CHAIRPERSON HILL: Okay. So, we gave the applicant time to continue to work with their neighbors. I'm glad that they had an opportunity to talk with one another, and at least come to some agreement as to how they would like to proceed and get along.

In terms of the application itself, I actually did not have issues with the application. I did think that the rear yard was any kind of an undue impact, or particularly objectionable.

I think it actually kind of became more of a side yard issue, and I thought that the design itself actually was more in character with the neighborhood and the street, and I was actually quite, as I say, comfortable with the application.

In addition to that, the ANC has provided their analysis, who we are supposed to give great weight to, and they were also in support, as well as that of the Office of Planning. And I would agree also with the Office of

1	Planning's analysis that is in Exhibit 17 of the their
2	report is in Exhibit 17.
3	So, I didn't have anything particularly to add,
4	other than that. I'm going to be voting in favor. May I
5	turn to you, Mr. Smith?
6	MEMBER SMITH: Sorry. I completely agree you.
7	I don't have too much to add on this, but to thank the
8	applicant for working with the neighbor to do some tweaks to
9	the design to glaze the windows, to address some of the
10	comments raised by what's formerly the party-in-opposition,
11	which I understand they've withdrawn their opposition. So,
12	with that, I was for the application.
13	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Great, thank you. Commissioner
14	Miller?
15	COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
16	I concur with your comments and those of Chrishaun Smith and
17	pleased that the Gliers and their neighbor behind have
18	reached an agreement. Thank you.
19	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. Mr. Blake?
20	MEMBER BLAKE: Yes, sir. I'd first like to
21	acknowledge the efforts of the applicant, the ANC and the
22	neighbors and the property owner work together to come up
23	with a workable solution and design.
24	I give great weight to the recommendation the
25	Office of Planning written in support for the ANC 3F, and

1	would be prepared to support the request for relief.
2	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Thank you. All right, and
3	that'd be, just to make note, that the revised architectural
4	plans that note at least the items of discussion are 35A as
5	in apple, in the exhibit.
6	I'm going to make a motion to approve application
7	number 20599, as captioned and read by the Secretary, and ask
8	for a second. Mr. Blake?
9	MEMBER BLAKE: Second.
10	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Motion has been made and
11	seconded, Mr. Moy. Could you take a roll call?
12	MR. MOY: When I call each of your names, if you
13	would please respond with a yes, no, or abstain, to the
14	motion made by Chairman Hill to approve the application for
15	the relief that's being requested. This motion to approve
16	was seconded by Mr. Blake. Zoning Commissioner Rob Miller?
17	COMMISSIONER MILLER: Yes.
18	MR. MOY: Mr. Smith?
19	MEMBER SMITH: Yes.
20	MR. MOY: Mr. Blake?
21	MEMBER BLAKE: Yes.
22	MR. MOY: Chairman Hill.
23	CHAIRPERSON HILL: Yes.
24	MR. MOY: Staff would record the vote as 4-0-1,
25	and this is on the motion made by Chairman Hill to approve.

1	The motion to approve was seconded by Mr. Blake. Also in
2	support of the motion to approve, Zoning Commissioner Rob
3	Miller and Mr. Smith, and also Mr. Blake, and of course
4	Chairman Hill, no other Board members participating. The
5	motion carries on a vote of 4-0-1.
6	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the
7	record at 10:14 a.m.)
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
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 Meeting

Before: DC BZA

Date: 03-30-22

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