GOVERNMENT

OF

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

+ + + + +

REGULAR PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY

APRIL 13, 2022

+ + + + +

The Regular Public Hearing of the District of Columbia Board of Zoning Adjustment convened via Video Teleconference, pursuant to notice at 9:48 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 MEMBER PRESENT:

ANTHONY HOOD, Chairperson

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

CLIFFORD MOY, Secretary
PAUL YOUNG, Zoning Data Specialist

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

STEPHEN MORDFIN
ANNE FOTHERGILL
KAREN THOMAS
BRANDICE ELLIOTT
MAXINE BROWN-ROBERTS
STEPHEN COCHRAN

CRYSTAL MYERS JONATHAN KIRSCHENBAUM MATT JESICK

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PRESENT:

MARY NAGELHOUT, ESQ.

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Regular Public Hearing held on April 13, 2022.

CONTENTS

Application No.	20647 o	of	1345 Madison Street, NW, LLC .	4
			Chelsea O. Blake and	11
Application No.	20664 0	of	701 Quincy St NE, LLC	17
Application No.	20667 o	of	Samuel C. Medvene	31
Application No.	20668 0	of	DANEX, LLC	64
Application No.	20670 o	of	Katherine Steel	108
Application No.	20671 o	of	Jeremy Kern and Rebecca Fitch	113
Application No.	20672 0	of	Sarah Audelo	119
Application No.	20673 0	of	Karl Driessen	127
Application No.	20675 o	of	Krzysztof Laski	133
Application No.	20680 o	of	DMV Realty Investments, LLC	142

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

(9:48 a.m.) 2 3 And that being the case -- that BZA CHAIR HILL: 4 being the case, Mr. Moy, if you could call our first case. 5 MR. MOY: Oops. Okay. All right. This would be Case Application Number 20647 of 1345 Madison Street, NW, LLC 6 7 and Mr. Chairman, this is a self-certified application for 8 a special exception from the matter-of-right easements of 9 Subtitle U Section 401 pursuant to Subtitle U Section 421 and 10 Subtitle X Section 901.2. This would construct a three-story rear addition and add three additional residential units to 11 12 an existing semi-detached two-story flat in the RA-1 zone, property located at 1436 Eastern Avenue NW, Square 5171, Lot 13 14 And that's it from me, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, 15 BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Moy. Mr. 16 Sullivan, can you hear us? 17 SULLIVAN: Yes, can. Thank you, Ι Mr. 18 Chairman and Members of the Board. Marty Sullivan with 19 Sullivan & Barros on behalf of the applicant. 2.0 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Great. Mr. Sullivan, I 2.1 see that we did get a letter from the ANC Chairman Holmes, 22 and so that's something I'm just kind of review real quick 23 If you want to go ahead and walk us through why 24 you believe your applicant is meeting the standard for us to

grant the relief requested? I'm going to put 15 minutes on

25

the clock just so I know where we are. I see your PowerPoint present in Exhibit 31. You can begin whenever you like.

MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. If Mr. Young could load the PowerPoint presentation? This is 1436 Eastern Avenue NE. The only request is for approval under the RA-1 regulations under U 421. Next slide, please.

These are some of the zoning criteria. It's a -essentially, it's a three-story addition to what is two-unit
semi-detached building. We do have a letter of support from
the attached property to add three units for a total of five
units. Next slide, please.

We have the support of the Office of Planning and a very detailed report, and no objection from DDOT. And we're happy to be able to add the ANC support to this list as well. And next slide, please. And with us is architect Mike Rouse who can take you through the plans.

MR. ROUSE: Chairman and Board, my name is Michael Rouse. I'm an architect at MPR Architecture, and I reside at 1232 Hamilton Street, NW, Washington, D.C. This just basically shows you where the property is located at 1436 Eastern Avenue, kind of an aerial there on the bottom left and then a street perspective showing that it is an attached property. Next slide, please.

This is the rear of the property just to show you we've got a nice deep lot. That's where the addition is

2.0

2.1

going to be built. Next slide, please. You can go to the next slide as well. Perfect.

This is a site plan before, is in the middle of the page there showing the two-unit flat, and then up above in the light gray box is the proposed three-story addition which would house three units, and below is showing a side elevation just showing that we're meeting the zoning regulations for height. Next slide, please.

At top there is our landscape plan which has also been submitted into the record and then a grading plan. Next slide, please. We were asked to do some shadow studies with most of the shadows -- you know, it's kind of evident where they're falling. Next slide, please. Some floor plans of the unit layouts. Next slide, please. And again, this would be the second and third level showing a two-bedroom layout. Next slide, please.

Finally, the color rendering showing the materials. So the existing two-unit building is a brick building, and then this would also be a brick and painted siding building. We are putting most of the mass towards the back so that the views from the street would be minimized. Next slide.

And then this is the elevation facing the attached property. We are proposing to do some blind windows with piece -- soldier course lintels there. Next slide. Just

2.0

kind of a section through the building. Next slide. I'll hand it back over to Mr. Sullivan.

MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you, Mr. Rouse. So the project meets the general requirements of Subtitle X 901.2. It is in harmony with the purpose and intent of the zoning regulations. It's a relatively small project for the RA-1 zone with just five units, maintaining the existing side setback and not requiring relief from any of the area development standards and just adding three units. Next slide, please.

Regarding the specific requirements, it has been referred to the relevant agencies. Next slide, please. And it's for the Office of Planning. The Office of Planning has made some very detailed findings on all of the criteria cited in 421.3. And I believe that's it, so if there are any questions -- thank you.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. I'm starting with my fellow Board Members. I'm going to first turn to the Office of Planning and then have questions for everybody. Ms. Elliott, are you there?

MS. ELLIOTT: I sure am, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. I am Brandice Elliott representing the Office of Planning for BZA Case 20647. The Office of Planning is recommending approval of the relief that's been requested. It is a new residential apartment house development, but it does comply

2.1

2.3

with all of the relevant development standards for the zone. 1 I am aware of the Board's heavy agenda today, so I'm happy 2 3 to stand on the record of our report, but if you prefer, I can give a summary of that report as well. 5 BZA CHAIR HILL: That's okay. Thank you, Ms. Let me get to questions from the Board, please. Elliott. 6 Does the Board have any questions for the applicant or the 8 Office of Planning? 9 Okay. Is there anyone here wishing to speak, Mr. 10 Young? 11 MR. YOUNG: We do not. 12 MS. HAMILTON: Okay. I would like to mention to my fellow Board Members, I mean I'm trying to be efficient. 13 However, if you do have any questions, please ask them. 14 15 Again, however, I think there will be cases that will take 16 some time today and won't necessarily move quickly. All 17 Mr. Sullivan, do you have anything you'd like to add at the end? 18 19 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Going to go ahead and 2.0 close the hearing and the record. Mr. Young, if you could 21 please excuse everyone. Okay. All right. Almost. Okay. I really didn't have any issues with this application. 22 23 thought that the applicant made a good argument as to why 24 they're meeting the relief -- I'm sorry -- the standards that

we need to look at in terms of granting the relief requested.

would also agree with the analysis of the Office of 1 Planning's support as well as that of DDOT. 2 There were some 3 people in support as well. And then the ANC Commission Chairman Holmes' letter of support. I'm going to be voting 5 Mr. Smith, do you have anything you'd like to add? No, Mr. Chairman. 6 MEMBER SMITH: I agree with 7 your analysis and will support the application. 8 BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Blake? 9 MEMBER BLAKE: Voting in favor of the application 10 as well. I believe the applicant has met the burden of proof to be granted relief under U 421 and X 901.2, and I give 11 12 great weight to the Office of Planning's recommendation, DDOT's obviously no objection, ANC and DCAR and Federation 13 of Citizens Associations are in support and also have in 14 15 support adjacent property owner. So for those reasons, would be in support of the application. 16 17 BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. Chairman Hood. ZC CHAIR HOOD: 18 I agree with everything that's been said and also the merits of this case, and I'll be 19 20 voting in favor. Thank you. 2.1 BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. Vice Chair John? 22 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: I believe this is very straightforward and I'm in support of the application. 23 24 BZA CHAIR HILL: All right. I'm going to make a

motion to approve Application Number 20647 as captioned and

1	read by the secretary and ask for a second. Ms. John?
2	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Second.
3	BZA CHAIR HILL: The motion was made and seconded.
4	Mr. Moy, can you take a roll call?
5	MR. MOY: Thank you, sir. When I call each of
6	your names, if you would please respond with a yes, no,
7	abstain to the motion made by Chairman Hill to approve the
8	application for the relief that's requested. The motion to
9	approve was second by Vice Chair John. Zoning Commissioner
10	Chair Anthony Hood?
11	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Yes.
12	MR. MOY: Mr. Smith?
13	Mr. Blake?
14	MEMBER BLAKE: Yes.
15	MR. MOY: Vice Chair John?
16	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Yes.
17	MR. MOY: Chairman Hill?
18	Staff would record the vote as 5-0-0 and this is
19	on the motion made by Chairman Hill to approve the
20	application following the motion to approve second by Vice
21	Chair John. Also in support of the motion to approve, Zoning
22	Commissioner Chair Anthony Hood, Mr. Smith, Mr. Blake, and
23	of course, Vice Chair John and Chairman Hill. Motion carries
24	on the vote of 5-0-0.
25	BZA CHAIR HILL: Great. Thank you, Mr. Moy. When
ļ	NEAL D. CDOCC

you have a chance, you can call our next one.

2.0

2.1

MR. MOY: Before the Board is Case Application Number 20652 of Chelsea O. Blake and Kevin K. Blake. This is a self-certified application for special exception from the lot occupancy requirements of Subtitle E Section 304.1, pursuant to Subtitle E Section 5201 and Subtitle X Section 901.2. This would construct a one-story, rear addition to an existing, attached, two-story with basement, principal dwelling unit in the RF-1 zone. Property is located at 909 Kent Place, NE, Square 931, Lot 19.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you, Mr. Moy. Ms. Wilson, can you hear me? Could you introduce yourself for the record, please?

MS. WILSON: Yes. Hi. Alexandra Wilson from Sullivan & Barros on behalf of the applicant in this case.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Great. Ms. Wilson, I see your PowerPoint presentation. If you could go ahead and walk us through why you believe your client is meeting the standard for us to grant the requested relief? I'm going to put 15 minutes on the clock, so I know where we are, and you can begin whenever you like.

MS. WILSON: Great. Thank you so much. Mr. Young, could you pull up the presentation, please? In this case, we are requesting special exception relief to do a onestore addition at the rear of the building. Next slide,

please. The subject property is currently improved with a two-story, single-family row building. As I mentioned we are proposing to construct a one-story addition at the rear and are seeking lot occupancy relief; 67.5 percent is proposed whereas 60 is the maximum.

ANC 6A supports the application. The Office of Planning is recommending approval. DDOT has no objection and the Capitol Hill Restoration Society also voted to support, and the application has received three letters of support and each from the adjacent neighbors as well. Next slide, please.

This is just showing the location of the subject property and again, as I mentioned, both adjacent neighbors are in support. Next slide, please.

In terms of the general special exception requirements, the area is made up of row dwellings which occupy larger portions of their respective lots as many of the lots are substandard, and the addition is only one story, it will extend 8.3 feet pass the building to the east, but the building to the west will continue to be longer than even the proposed addition. Next slide, please. This is showing the rear of the subject property for some context. Next slide, please.

In terms of the specific requirements, the addition is only one story, only extends 8.3 feet, and it's

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

only an additional 7.5 percent lot occupancy. The addition will not have any windows facing the neighboring buildings to the east or west, and the only windows face south overlooking the property's rear yard, and the area is made up row dwellings such as this. The addition is only one story, and it will not be visible from Kent Place, and there is a fence along the rear lot abutting the alley which will limit visibility from the alley. Next slide, please.

So we do have the architect here if you have any questions about the proposed addition and plans. We can answer questions from the Board, or he can walk through it now. Whatever you prefer.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Ms. Wilson, why don't you just continue on, and if the Board has questions of the architect, I'll get them at the end.

MS. WILSON: Right. Okay. Shawn or Ellen, would you like to walk through the couple pages of plans, please?

MR. BUEHLER: Hi. My name is

Shawn Buehler. I'm the architect from Bennett Frank McCarthy Architects. The project -- if you go to the next slide, you can see floor plans that show -- the white partitions are the existing walls, and then at the rear of the house is a one-store addition over unfinished basement space to expand the kitchen toward the backyard. If you go to the next slide, please.

2.0

2.3

1	This shows in the top left corner our rear
2	elevation. Again, the addition is one-story and you can see
3	the two-story row house rising up beyond it. On the top
4	right is a side elevation which would be shown from the
5	neighbor to the east, which is the house that's slightly
6	shallower than ours would be. And then the bottom drawings
7	are sections through the addition that show, again, a one-
8	story addition behind a two-story row house. I believe
9	that's everything and I'm happy to answer any questions if
10	there are any.
11	MS. WILSON: Thank you, Shawn. Yes. That's the
12	end of our presentation.
13	BZA CHAIR HILL: All right. Let me go ahead and
14	drop that. Can I go ahead and turn to Ms. Thomas real quick?
15	MS. THOMAS: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, Members
16	of the Board. Karen Thomas for the Office of Planning, and
17	the Office of Planning is recommending approval of the one-
18	store rear addition. And I would stand on the record of our
19	report. Thank you.
20	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Does the Board have any
21	questions of either the applicant or the Office of Planning
22	and if so, raise your hand? Mr. Young, is there anyone here
23	wishing to speak?
24	MR. YOUNG: We do not.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Ms. Wilson, do you have anything

you'd like to add at the end?

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Okay. All right. I'm going to go ahead and close Mr. Young, if you could excuse the hearing and the record. everyone, please. Okay. Again, in this particular case, I didn't have any issues with the application. I thought that I would agree with the argument that the applicant has put forward as to how they're meeting the standard to grant the relief requested. I would also agree with the analysis of the report that the Office of Planning has provided as well as the ANC being support. There are letters in support including adjacent properties; also, the Capitol Hill Restoration Society and DDOT. Again, I just thought it was pretty straightforward, so I'm going to be voting in favor of the application. Mr. Smith, do you have anything you'd like to add?

MEMBER SMITH: NO. I agree with your analysis, Chairman Hill, will support the application. I would just note that the Capitol Hill Restoration Society submitted a letter in support, and we do have letters in support from the adjacent property owners, so I give OP staff report great weight and support the application.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. Mr. Blake?

MEMBER BLAKE: I'm voting in favor of the application as well. I have nothing to add to your comments.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Chairman Hood?

1	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Nothing to add. I support the
2	application.
3	BZA CHAIR HILL: Vice Chair John?
4	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Very straightforward so
5	I'm in support of the application.
6	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. I'm going to go make a
7	motion to approve Application Number 20652 as captioned and
8	read by the secretary and ask for a second. Ms. John?
9	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Second.
10	BZA CHAIR HILL: The motion was made and seconded.
11	Mr. Moy, if you can you take a roll call, please?
12	MR. MOY: Thank you, sir. When I call your names,
13	if you 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 requested. The motion to approve was second by
16	Vice Chair John. Zoning Commissioner Chair Anthony Hood?
17	Mr. Smith?
18	Mr. Blake?
19	Vice Chair John?
20	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Yes.
21	MR. MOY: Chairman Hill?
22	Staff would record the vote as 5-0-0 and this is
23	on the motion made by Chairman Hill to approve. The motion
24	was second the motion to approve was second by Vice Chair
25	John. Also in support of the motion to approve, Zoning

Commission Chair Anthony Hood, Mr. Smith, Mr. Blake, and of 1 course, Vice Chair John, Chairman Hill. 2 Motion carries on 3 the vote of 5-0-0. 4 BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you, Mr. Moy. You can go 5 ahead and call or next one if you like, Mr. Moy. 6 Before the Board is Case Application MR. MOY: 7 Number 20664 of 701 Quincy Street NE, LLC. This is self-8 certified application for special exception relief from the 9 matter-of-right uses of Subtitle U Section 401, pursuant to 10 Subtitle U Section 421 and Subtitle X Section 901.2. This would construct two additional residential units 11 12 existing, semi-detached, two-story with cellar, apartment house in the RA-1 zone. Property located at 701 13 Ouincy Street, NE, Square 3820, Lot 01. 14 15 MEMBER BLAKE: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say I'll be recusing myself from this case. 16 17 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Blake. Ms. Wilson, can you hear me? If you'd introduce 18 right. yourself for the record, please? 19 Alexandra Wilson from Sullivan 20 MS. WILSON: Hi. 2.1 & Barros on behalf of the applicant in this case. 22 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Ms. Wilson, if you could go ahead and walk us through your client's application and 23 24 how you believe your client is meeting the standard for us grant the requested relief? If you could speak a little

bit more to the ANC and some of their --

MS. WILSON: Yes.

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

25

BZA CHAIR HILL: -- concerns? I know that they had a construction management agreement that we may or may not include as conditions as to whether or not the Board feels that it's within our purview. And then also -- those would be my initial thoughts. And I've got your PowerPoint presentation pulled up. I'm going to put 15 minutes on the clock, and you can begin whenever you like.

MS. WILSON: Great. Thank you so much. Mr. Young, could you pull the PowerPoint presentation up when you have a chance. And in terms of the ANC, we had overall positive discussions with the SMD and the surrounding We attended an SMD meeting and they requested neighbors. that we provide a construction management agreement, because one of the concerns raised had to do with just construction alley, in general. just So we agreed construction management agreement. That's signed and that has been submitted to the record. And I'm happy to answer any other questions, but I think that was the main concern, just how to control the construction in that alley. also changed up the widow pattern on one of the sides as Mr. Young, could you go to the next slide, please? So the property is located in the RA-1 zone.

currently improved with a four-unit apartment building.

The

proposed project consists of adding two units in the cellar 1 for a total of six units. The applicant is not proposing to 2 alter the existing building exterior envelope or enlarge the 3 footprints. The project does require 5 exception approval pursuant to U 421. The Office of Planning is recommending approval. 6 7 not objection and ANC 5B does support 8 application along with the construction management plan which 9 is in the record. Next slide, please? 10 BZA CHAIR HILL: Ms. Wilson, for the record, your 11 client agrees and will uphold that construction management 12 plan, correct? Absolutely. 13 MS. WILSON: The one in the record should have his signature as well, so it's already signed by, 14 15 I think, both the ANC and our client. 16 I can see it. Okay. Thank you. BZA CHAIR HILL: 17 MS. WILSON: Yes. So in terms of the general special exception requirements, the project is in harmony 18 19 with the general purpose intent of the zoning and 20 regulations. The proposal is for a moderate density multi-21 family residential building. Again, the applicant is not proposing to alter the existing building footprint, just to 22 2.3 add two units in cellar space. And the project is also

24

25

providing four parking spaces.

Next slide, please.

This is just showing the location of the property.

Next slide, please? Again, we are not proposing to alter the building footprints and will maintain the same style. Next slide, please.

In terms of the specific criteria for approval under U-421, it is expected that the Office of the State Superintendent of Education will not have an issue with the increase in residents. There are only two additional units. The applicant is only proposing two units and four parking spaces. The property is located relatively close to the Metro. The new residents should be adequately served by the surrounding public streets and public transportation options. Next slide, please.

not altering The applicant is the existing building footprints. The applicant is maintaining the existing 25-foot rear yard and the 7'6" side yard on the west side of the property, and the applicant has submitted all of We -- I think we are requesting to the relevant materials. waive the requirement for an existing and proposed grade plan as the grade is not being altered, and the applicant is not proposing any new rights-of-ways or easements. Next slide, please.

We do have a set of plans and I have the architect here if there are any questions, but that concludes my presentation.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Mr. Young, if you'd drop

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

1	that. Okay. Does the Board have any questions for the
2	applicant? Chairman Hood?
3	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Question, very briefly, Ms.
4	Wilson. You said the applicant is providing parking. So I'm
5	trying to figure out, isn't that public is there parking
6	around back, or is that public street parking?
7	MS. WILSON: Yes. There are four parking spaces
8	at the rear of the property.
9	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Okay. I'm familiar with the area.
10	I never knew that. Okay. Thank you.
11	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Yes.
12	BZA CHAIR HILL: Sure. Vice Chair John?
13	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Ms. Wilson, can you point
14	out where the IZ unit will be located?
15	MS. WILSON: (Audio interference) any IZ unit.
16	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay. So I have do I
17	have the wrong case? One of the units will be that's in
18	the OP report. This is 701 Quincy?
19	MS. WILSON: I'll defer to the OP reviewer,
20	because one of the proposed units will not be an IZ unit.
21	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay. I'll hear from OP
22	then. Maybe I'm mixing
23	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes no. Vice Chair John,
24	you're looking at the correct line item. I can ask the
25	Office of Planning. I don't know whether that well, first

1	let me go ahead and turn to the Office of Planning for their
2	report.
3	MS. THOMAS: Good morning, Mr. Chair, again,
4	Members of the Board. We are recommending approval of this
5	application because we believe it meets the criteria, and if
6	you see a request for IZ unit in here, that's incorrect.
7	I didn't that's incorrect.
8	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay.
9	MS. THOMAS: That's not what was not part of
10	the application. I don't see it but
11	MEMBER SMITH: It's in the table, Section 3 of the
12	new residential development.
13	MS. THOMAS: Oh, I'm sorry. That's incorrect.
14	Thank you for pointing that out.
15	MEMBER SMITH: Okay.
16	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. So that'll be
17	that's an error so that'll be
18	MS. THOMAS: Yes.
19	BZA CHAIR HILL: corrected. All right. Let's
20	see, anyone else for the Office of Planning? Mr. Young, is
21	there anyone wishing to speak?
22	Ms. Wilson, is there anything you'd like to add
23	at the end?
24	MS. WILSON: No. Thank you.
25	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Mr. Ali, how are you

1 doing.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

MR. ALI: Good. How are you?

BZA CHAIR HILL: Good. You want to introduce yourself for the record, Mr. Ali?

MR. ALI: I'm Ramy Ali with Ramy Design Yes. Architects. We're the architect and engineer for this project. I believe Alex pretty much covered the full scope. We're not proposing any additions or change of footprints of the structure. Most of the work is interior of the building. We're adding four parking spaces, as Alex indicated, and screening that with 6-foot high fences, mechanical roll-up And the only other change that we're doing on the exterior is the window patterns. We're just replacing the four-foot high windows to 6'8" high windows, and that's pretty much the list of changes that we're doing to the exterior.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, Mr. Ali. I just wanted to say hello. I haven't seen you in a little while there. You know, it's been -- you remind me of when there wasn't COVID.

MR. ALI: I know.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. I'm going to go ahead and close the hearing and the record. Okay. Mr. talking trouble Smith. can Ι you to start deliberation or somebody else? I'm just trying to spread out the wealth here.

MEMBER SMITH: Okay. I mean I can begin the deliberations. I think that the applicant has met the burden of proof for us to be able to grant the special exception from Subtitle U-421 for a new residential development, to increase the number apartments at the property from four to I believe they've met the standards of Section 901.2. six. They wouldn't be expanding the physical footprint of the The new additional -- the additional units will building. be located within the cellar. So it wouldn't change the of character the neighborhood. So Ι believe it's in character with Section 901.2(a) and also (b) based off of the physical nature of where the apartments being that they wouldn't expand the apartment building.

So we have the support of the ANC conditioned upon a couple of conditions. Let me pull them up. Attempt to maintain as much green space as possible, incorporation of pervious pavers and grass or other filler plants to be used as pavers in the parking area, and they were also asked to develop or to consider planting additional trees. And finally, the residents asked that construction vehicles not block the alley behind the property.

As far as some of these conditions, the last one where they're requesting vehicles not to block the alley and construction be done between Monday and Friday, I think that's taken care of by the construction management

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

agreement. I think it would be properly regulated through the construction management agreement and the administrative requirements that DCRA has as part of the building permit process.

As far as maintaining green space, the applicant is not proposing to expand the existing building, so I believe that, you know, the very nature of the special exception, the green space -- existing green space will be maintained. But I am open to hear what the rest of my Board Members feel about a condition about filler plants used between the pavers in the parking area.

So with that, you know, I give great weight to OP's staff report and will support this application, and I just welcome any feedback from my Board Members about any conditions as recommended by the ANC.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Thanks, Mr. Smith. Thank you for starting that. I -- yeah. So my thoughts on the construction management agreement were that the applicant and the ANC have gone already over the construction management agreement and the applicant has agreed to it. That would be the only thing that I would reference in the order but not use it -- or it needs my thoughts -- not put it in as a condition as it would be something that I think some of it is outside of the Board's purview. However, to quote Chairman Hood and the Good Neighbor Policy, it is something

2.0

2.1

that I think has been now agreed to that they will follow up on. So that's what I would propose.

Ms. John, do you have anything to add?

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Well, I appreciate Board Member Smith's detailed analysis, and I don't have anything to add to it. I agree that some of these conditions proposed by the ANC should not be included in the order, but I also support including the condition number 2, including the plans in the parking area and the landscaping because -- yes, I believe those are appropriate. And of course, I would suggest that we refer to the construction agreement. don't typically include them in the order, although they're quite useful to the neighbors and the ANC, and we like to see But the Board cannot enforce them. But what the Board could enforce, I believe, would be conditions 2 and 3 because they would be in the plans. And I need to be sure that they're actually in the plans.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Is that from -- that's from the -- which Exhibit is it?

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: That would be -- the ANC Exhibit is Exhibit 23, and I was looking for the plans. Maybe someone can help me figure out if the landscaping is there. If not, we should include it.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Vice Chair John, I'm just looking for the 2 and 3.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

1	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay. Let's pull up
2	Exhibit 23.
3	BZA CHAIR HILL: I don't know why I don't see the
4	2 and 3.
5	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: I'm trying to pull it up,
6	23.
7	BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Smith, do you know where
8	number 2 the exhibit that's being referenced.
9	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: It's 23.
10	MEMBER SMITH: It's in the ANC Report.
11	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: ANC Report.
12	BZA CHAIR HILL: Mine's not showing that. Okay.
13	Residents are asked to maintain green space as much as
14	possible at the property, pervious pavers and grass or other
15	filler plants be used between the pavers in the parking area,
16	plant trees or other suitable sized landscaping in the front
17	yard. Are those the conditions that you all are speaking to?
18	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Yes.
19	MEMBER SMITH: Yes.
20	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. I'm fine with those.
21	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Except for the green
22	space. I mean based on what Mr. Smith said, I agree with
23	that. There's no change to the footprint so I'm not sure
24	what that refers to, but I would agree that the section that
25	discusses pervious pavers and grass or the filler plants and

planting trees or other suitably sized landscaping. 1 basically a best efforts condition, so I don't have any issue 2 3 with it. 4 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. I quess my -- I mean I can -- we can either add them as conditions or that this is 5 something that they agreed to and we can reference the -- I 6 7 don't know if it's in their construction management plan or But I'm happy to do it either way. 8 If you want to put 9 them in as a condition, that's fine as well. Is that what 10 you all would like? I would hear from the 11 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: 12 others. Okay. Mr. Smith, you want it as 13 BZA CHAIR HILL: 14 a condition or you want me to reference it? 15 MEMBER SMITH: I would prefer to have it as a condition. 16 17 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Chairman Hood, do you have anything you would like to add? 18 19 No, but I would agree with the ZC CHAIR HOOD: 2.0 comments I've heard. I mean I know we go back and forth on 2.1 conditions and referencing, but it sounds to me like there's a good relationship with the community as well as 22 23 applicant, so I don't have any reasonable doubt to believe 24 that this won't be taken care of. So whichever way you all

choose, I'm fine.

1	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. Well, I think
2	that the applicant also has met its burden of proof and also,
3	I would agree with the analysis of the Office of Planning's
4	report as well as that of the ANC. I'm going to go ahead and
5	make a motion to approve Application Number 20664 as
6	captioned and read by the secretary including the condition
7	that they install pervious pavers and grass or other filler
8	plants to be used between the pavers in the parking areas as
9	well as planting trees or other suitably sized landscaping
10	in the front yard as much as possible and ask for a second.
11	Ms. John?
12	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Second.
13	BZA CHAIR HILL: All right. I'm going to make a
14	motion to approve Application Number 20647 as captioned and
15	read by the secretary and ask for a second. Ms. John?
16	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Second.
17	BZA CHAIR HILL: Motion made and seconded. Mr.
18	Moy, if you'd take a roll call, please?
19	MR. MOY: When I call your names, if you would
20	please respond with a yes, no, or abstain to the motion made
21	by Chairman Hill to approve the application for the relief
22	requested including the two conditions as cited in the
23	motion. The motion was second by Vice Chair John. Zoning
24	Commission Chair Anthony Hood?
25	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Yes.

MR. MOY: Mr. Smith? 1 2 Vice Chair John? 3 Chairman Hill? 4 BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes. 5 MR. MOY: have Board Member We one not Staff would record the vote as 4-0-1 and this participating. 6 7 is on the motion made by Chairman Hill to approve with 8 conditions. Motion to approve was second by Vice Chair John. 9 Also in support of the motion to approve, Zoning Commissioner 10 Chair Anthony Hood, Mr. Smith, and of course, Vice Chair John, Chairman Hill, Board Member not participating. 11 12 carries on the vote of 4-0-1. All right. 13 BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. Can we 14 all try to do one -- you want to do one more, and then we'll 15 take a break, or you want to take a break? One more and take Mr. Moy, you want to call our next one? 16 a break, okay. 17 MR. MOY: This would be Case Application Number. 20667 of Samuel C. Medvene, and this is as amended, a self-18 application 19 for certified special Exceptions for the 2.0 following; the matter-of-right uses of Subtitle U Section 21 301, pursuant to Subtitle U Section 320.2 and Subtitle X 22 901.2 rooftop architectural Section from the elements requirements of Subtitle E Section 206.1 pursuant to Subtitle 23 24 E Section 206.4, Subtitle E Section 5207.1 and Subtitle X 25 This would construct a third story and rear Section 901.2.

31 addition and to convert to a three-unit apartment house, an existing, semi-detached, two-story with basement, principal dwelling unit in the RF-1 zone. Property is located at 826 Varnum Street, NW, Square 3024, Lot 49. BZA CHAIR HILL: Good morning, Mr. Williams. Can Could you introduce yourself for the record, you hear me? please? MR. WILLIAMS: Yes. Zach Williams, land use attorney with Venable representing the applicant. Ms. Williams, I see your BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. PowerPoint presentation in the record. I'm going to go ahead If you could explain to us and put 15 minutes on the clock. why you believe your client is meeting the standard for us

to grant the requested relief? And you can begin whenever you like.

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you. Great. Mr. Young, if you could pull up that presentation? Thank you. This application is for a property located at 826 Varnum Street Next slide, please. And here is an excerpt from the NW. zoning map showing the property highlighted there. this is in the RF-1 zone on Varnum Street, NW between 8th and 9th Streets. Next slide, please.

There's a -- this slide shows an excerpt from the survey of the existing property and existing structures. This is a lot that has just under 3,300 square feet.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

2.3

24

alley access in the back, 15-foot public alley, the Zone RF
1. There's currently a semi-detached row home on this property. It's one of a matched pair as we'll get into in the presentation. The other matched pair is at 824 Varnum Street, and it's depicted as Lot 50 here. And as you can see, that original footprint has been expanded in the last few years of the attached pair, matched pair row home. Next slide, please.

These All right. The current conditions today. You can see the property at issue in this matter is on the The matched -- the original matched pair is on the right. That was recently renovated with the third-story addition, and what we're ultimately looking to do today is to bring the property at 26 into conformance, add a third story addition and more or less match what was done on the matched pair properties several years ago. You can see the back of the property there as well. There you can really start to appreciate the addition that was put on the matched pair on the 24 Varnum compared to the original house, which is on the left in that photo, and sort of understand the difference in massing. And ultimately, what we're going to be looking to do is to align with that new party wall on the matched pair house at 824. Next slide, please.

There are some architectural illustrations of the proposed project. You're looking -- in the illustration on

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

1	the left, you're looking at the house from the west, and so
2	you're looking at that existing bay window. Again, this is
3	a semi-detached house, so there's actually a side yard here.
4	That's a bay window that currently exists on the house in the
5	middle there, and there'll be an extension of the third
6	floor. The front of the house, which is on the right here,
7	will just be the same gambrel roof line. It'll be raised
8	again to match more or less match the matched pair house
9	that was renovated several years ago. Next slide, please.
10	BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Williams, before you move on
11	Mr. Young, could you go back one? That's the roof that
12	the neighbor was concerned about, correct?
13	MR. WILLIAMS: That's correct.
14	BZA CHAIR HILL: And so the neighbor is to the
15	east, is that correct?
16	MR. WILLIAMS: To the west.
17	BZA CHAIR HILL: To the west?
18	MR. WILLIAMS: Yes.
19	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay.
20	MR. WILLIAMS: So
21	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. I just wanted to get a
22	picture of where that roof deck was. Okay. Please go ahead.
23	MR. WILLIAMS: Next slide, please? We are
24	requesting two special exceptions in this case. One is the
25	special exception to convert to a three-unit apartment house

in the RF-1 zone. And the special exception is to alter the rooftop architectural element related to that gambrel roof line.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Williams, I'm sorry to interrupt you. The property that is concerned, when you said it's to the west, that's not the matching pair one?

MR. WILLIAMS: No. It's not the matched pair.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Right. Okay. Got you. It's the one across from the side yard?

MR. WILLIAMS: Correct.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Great. Thank you.

MR. WILLIAMS: Next slide, please. So working through the special exception standards here, as we know, the first standard is that it must be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the zoning regulations. This is an apartment house conversion that is permitted in the RF-1 zone for structures older than 1958, which is the case here. hundred square feet of land area is required per unit. have just under 1,100 square feet per unit for this property. As I've mentioned a few times, we'll be looking to mirror the attached matched pair home at 824 Varnum, which was expanded in the last five years. We'll also be providing housing for the neighborhood. This project will provide a two-bedroom, two-bath unit in the basement, three bed, three bath unit on the first and second floor, and a four bed, 2-1/2 bath unit

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

on the second and third floor. Next slide, please.

The second important standard is that the project will not adversely affect neighboring properties, and we don't believe it will. Here again, as far as the property to the east goes, we will be aligning with that party wall and more or less bringing this building back into sort of a matching conformance with its original configuration. The property to the west is -- does have a side yard separating it, so there's already a buffer area, if you will, between the two properties. The mirror image house will more or less match what we're looking to do here. There's a slight variation in height based on the way that we measure the sort of max side of the house versus the way that it was measured several years ago, but we're providing the max height that We're also providing two parking spaces, will help we can. to alleviate any concerns about parking. Next slide, please.

With respect to the rooftop element, working through the special exception standards for that relief, essentially there's three standards that we must meet. First, the light and air of the neighboring properties must not be unduly affected. The privacy of use and enjoyment of neighboring properties must not be unduly compromised, and the proposed construction must not intrude on the character, scale, and pattern of the houses on the street. Next slide.

And here we believe we meet those standards for

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

several reasons. First, as I've already mentioned, we will be aligning with that party wall. It's already been expanded so there will be no impacts to light, air, and privacy to the property to the west. With respect to the property -- I'm sorry -- the property to the east. The property to the west, again, is separated by a side yard so that will also help to minimize impacts of light, air, and privacy since we already have that buffer on our property separating the house from the neighboring house to the east.

And again, we'll be bringing this property into conformance and essentially restoring the matched pair that was originally contemplated for these two houses at 826 and 824 Varnum. And I should point out this developer is not the same developer that did 824 Varnum. That was a separate project, a separate developer, separate owner so that's why you're seeing these come at different points in time. Next slide.

This is the original property at 824 Varnum, and so this was the property before it was renovated, the property to the east. And now you can sort of see how it aligned originally with the property that we're talking about today. This had to come to the BZA as well in Case Number 19233 for support for that same relief that we're seeking today. BZA supported that. The ANC supported that project as well. Next slide, please.

2.0

1	As I mentioned, we've reached out to the ANC. We
2	met with the ANC. We presented at the ANC's hearing. We've
3	also held a meeting with ANC members and the community at the
4	property. The ANC supports this application and there's a
5	letter in the record to that effect. There's general I
6	would say there's general support for the project in the
7	neighborhood. There's already been a reference to a
8	comment about the roof deck but as was pointed out in OP's
9	report, that is actually not something we need relief for,
10	the roof deck. With respect to the relief we are seeking,
11	we haven't heard any opposition and it's been fully
12	supported. Next slide. I think that's my last one. Right.
13	That concludes my presentation.
14	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thanks, Mr. Williams. Does the
15	Board have any questions?
16	ZC CHAIR HOOD: I do have a question for Mr.
17	Williams very quickly. In the other case that you mentioned,
18	do you recall if the ANC had any conditions in that case as
19	well? If you don't remember, don't worry about it. I just
20	was curious.
21	MR. WILLIAMS: I'm not sure that they did and I
22	don't but I don't know for sure. I'd have to look back.
23	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Thank you.
24	BZA CHAIR HILL: All right. Now I turn to the
25	Office of Planning.

1	MR. COCHRAN: I'm Steve Cochran. I'm representing
2	the Office of Planning for this case, 20667. OP's
3	recommending that you approve both special exceptions; one,
4	with respect to the limitation on the number of dwelling
5	units. That's under Section that's Subtitle U Section
6	301; and the other one in Subtitle E Section 206 regarding
7	the requirements for the alterations to the original rooftop
8	architectural element. I'm happy to stand on the record
9	beyond that but also would be pleased to answer any questions
LO	you have.
11	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you, Mr. Cochran. Does the
12	Board have any questions for the Office of Planning? Does
L3	the applicant have any questions for the Office of Planning?
L4	MR. WILLIAMS: We do not.
15	BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Young, is there anyone here
16	wishing to speak?
L7	MR. YOUNG: Yes. We have one witness signed up.
18	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Bring that person in,
19	please. Is it Mr. Newton?
20	MR. NEWTON: Yes.
21	BZA CHAIR HILL: Could you introduce yourself for
22	the record, please?
23	MR. NEWTON: Sure. My name is Adam Newton. I
24	reside at 828 Varnum Street NW with my family.
25	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okav Mr Newton, vou'll have

three minutes to give your testimony, and you can begin whenever you like.

MR. NEWTON: Good morning, Chairman and Board. Again, my name is Adam Newton. I reside at 828 Varnum Street NW. My property is adjacent to the proposed multi-unit building with roof deck. I'm here to state that my family and my neighbors at 830 Varnum Street NW, none of them were notified by an ANC rep, value our privacy and low level of noise. And my family opposed the addition of the roof deck to the property at 826 Varnum Street NW.

The matched pair, as mentioned by Mr. Williams, at 824 does not have a roof deck, and I also notice that there was a lot of mention of it mirroring the matched pair. In this case, the roof deck would not mirror the matched pair. So to this day, we have yet to be notified by our Ward 4 ANC Commissioner, Paul Johnson, about these plans. We were made aware of the ANC's letter of support after visiting the website written on the poster displayed at 826 Varnum Street NW.

I also want to mention that the community meeting that was mentioned by Mr. Williams happened one day after we were made aware of it, so it was scheduled within one day, 24 hours after we were made aware of this community meeting that would happen during business hours out in front of the property during the week.

2.0

2.1

2.3

I'm also curious, is it true that no voices of opposition will be considered as part of this process? And I'm asking this specifically because the developer, Sam Medvene, came by yesterday to explain that none of our comments would make a difference and his plans would be approved regardless. Thank you for your time.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Let's see. Mr. Newton,

so you should have gotten -- first of all, you should -- first of all, there would have been a placard that puts forth, you know, the work, right. Then second of all, you should have gotten -- and whether or not you noticed it or whatever, you know, noticed it in the mail, you should have gotten something from the -- us letting you know that this is kind of coming through. So you would have gotten something in the mail, right. And then after that --

MR. NEWTON: We did not.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Well, I mean you had to cause otherwise, I would have gotten something back saying that you didn't. Now whether or not you noticed it or not, I don't know, because --

MR. NEWTON: You're saying I didn't notice it but I didn't get it so I'm just letting you know that. Please continue.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. I'm letting you know I don't have anything that says you didn't get it so --

2.1

I don't have anything that says that 1 MR. NEWTON: 2 you sent it so I'm sorry. 3 BZA CHAIR HILL: That's fine. I'm just telling 4 you I don't have anything that says -- so what I'm saying is 5 somebody missed it, right. 6 MR. NEWTON: Yes. 7 BZA CHAIR HILL: And our side -- on our side, it 8 says that you got it so that's what I'm just trying to tell 9 you, right. 10 MR. NEWTON: On my side, I didn't get it. BZA CHAIR HILL: 11 Okay. That's fine. So we both understand each other? 13 MR. NEWTON: Yes. BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. And so that's that. So --14 all right. The -- yeah, okay. Let's see. So Mr. -- oh, I'm Does the Board have any questions for Mr. Newton? 16 sorry. 17 Mr. Hood. 18 ZC CHAIR HOOD: Good morning, Mr. Newton. Yes. 19 Have you tried to reach out to -- I'm sure you have -- and 2.0 Mr. Chairman, I'm going somewhere else with this. 2.1 believe and I'm always troubled when I hear -- and actually, it's another line in the regulations for me when I hear 22 23 applicants say -- and I've heard this before -- oh, there's nothing you're going to do about it, we go in front of the 25 Board. I'm very troubled by that. I'm not saying they did

or didn't but when I hear that, I have problems.

Mr. Newton, let me just ask, have you reached out to the applicant? Have you all had a conversation? Maybe I missed all that?

MR. NEWTON: Yes, yesterday.

ZC CHAIR HOOD: Yesterday.

MR. NEWTON: Yes.

2.0

ZC CHAIR HOOD: So the first time you had some yesterday. Obviously, you all didn't come to some type of agreement or some -- and I understand that they are well down the line, but Mr. Chairman, I'm always believable if people have time, some of these issues can be resolved, because when I look at the ANC's, well, conditions or whatever we want to call them at the end of this, I thought they were very thoughtful. I thought they were very good, and I appreciate ANC 4C.

But then I look at Mr. Newton's situation. And Mr. Newton, I will have to say that this office is very good. You said you didn't get it and I don't need to get into that. What I want to get into is how can we find some type of resolve where you all can work this thing out, cause they meet the letter -- the standards of the -- letter of the regulations. But it's about being good neighbors because after the Board is gone, we've all gone, you all are -- will still be there. So that's what we're trying to work out.

And I'm sure Mr. Williams and all will help. I'm not sure
where the Board is going, but I think you all need some more
time, obviously, to have a conversation, because they do meet
the regulations. So that's all I have. Thank you, Mr.
Chairman.
BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Let's see. All right.
So Mr. Newton, you didn't go to the ANC meeting? You didn't
know about the ANC meeting?
MR. NEWTON: I was made aware of it 24 hours
before it happened and it happened during the day. I wasn't
able to make it.
BZA CHAIR HILL: Your ANC meetings are during the
day? ANC meeting at 4?
MR. NEWTON: Yes. The meeting in the front. That
wasn't an ANC meeting, no.
Okay. So no, I didn't I wasn't made aware of
that meeting, no.
BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay.
PARTICIPANT: We never heard from Paul
MR. NEWTON: When
PARTICIPANT: Johnson
MR. NEWTON: Right. So I think it was Paul
Johnson is our ANC for Ward 4 and we have never, not once to
this day, as I mentioned, have we heard from him about this.
BZA CHAIR HILL: Did you reach out to him?

1	MR. NEWTON: No.
2	PARTICIPANT: Yes. We emailed him and every other
3	
4	MR. NEWTON: Oh, sorry. Yes. We emailed everyone
5	on the ANC, yes, we did.
6	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay.
7	MR. NEWTON: This is why I'm here.
8	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. That's fine.
9	MR. NEWTON: Right. We went and found the
10	placard, as you mentioned, on 824 on our own because again,
11	we didn't receive anything in the mail.
12	BZA CHAIR HILL: Right.
13	MR. NELSON: We found the website and yes, and
14	that's
15	PARTICPANT: And the letters.
16	MR. NEWTON: and that's how we found the letter
17	of support. And in response to that, after finding out that,
18	getting that information, that's when we sent a letter of
19	opposition to everyone on the ANC.
20	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. In their report, I guess,
21	you know, that the ANC did not that there was objection to
22	the project. And even though the neighborhood was divided
23	on the issue, your ANC did believe that they are meeting the
24	standard with which we're supposed to grant the relief
25	requested. I'm just kind of letting you know as far as what

1	the report states. And that, right, it wasn't like the whole
2	neighborhood believed that this was something that they would
3	like to see or not. And one again, whether or not
4	unfortunately, whether or not the neighborhood things that
5	it's something they would like to see, what we're supposed
6	to do is decide whether or not the application is meeting the
7	standard for us to grant the relief requested just to let you
8	know, right.
9	MR. NEWTON: It's there, yes. But also, I think
10	that more of our neighbors would like to have had a say if
11	they had and I think they probably would have had they
12	been given notice of this meeting.
13	BZA CHAIR HILL: All right. And I guess, Mr.
14	Newton, what I'm just trying to push back against you is that
15	
16	MR. NEWTON: Okay.
17	BZA CHAIR HILL: the city makes sure that
18	everybody has the opportunity to be heard and
19	MR. NEWTON: Yes.
20	BZA CHAIR HILL: whether or not people
21	understand or know that there are ANC meetings that happen
22	every month, you know, that deal with the neighborhood
23	issues, that's something that some people don't necessarily
24	pay attention to.
25	MR. NEWTON: Right.

1	BZA CHAIR HILL: But I'm just saying that I
2	guess what I'm trying to push back on you is that we've done
3	the city has done what it can to get people notified, and
4	
	if your SMD hasn't necessarily you keep shaking your head,
5	you're disagreeing with me, but you're here right now, right?
6	MR. NEWTON: Yes. Because of my own
7	BZA CHAIR HILL: You got some kind of notice
8	MR. NEWTON: due diligence.
9	BZA CHAIR HILL: right? So well, I know,
10	but what I'm saying is that well, now you know your ANC
11	meeting meets every month, right? And so now you know when
12	it meets. So anyway, we're going to have a disagreement on
13	this one, I can see. So but what I would like to know a
14	little bit more is that you're saying you met and I don't
15	want to I'll let the applicant comment on this you're
16	saying you met with the applicant yesterday?
17	MR. NEWTON: Yes.
18	BZA CHAIR HILL: And that led to a discussion of
19	some kind
20	MR. NEWTON: Yes yes.
21	BZA CHAIR HILL: wherein you were told there's
22	nothing you could do?
23	MR. NEWTON: That's correct. Basically, I was
24	told that it's it was I was being given a favor to even
25	have the discussion with them about it, because really they

1	don't they aren't required to do anything to appease me
2	or to help me out or to, you know, or even listen to my
3	wishes about it. That may or may not be true but that's what
4	was said, and they said that my me voicing my opinion
5	today would not matter in the end, that they would that
б	it would be possible that it would delay the project, but
7	that's all that would happen and that otherwise, it would be
8	a pointless effort for me to show up today.
9	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. Well, on the
10	one hand, I can see they want you to remove a roof deck that
11	they don't want to remove, and I'm going to let Mr. Medvene
12	respond to this one. But so let's see. Okay. Does the
13	Board have any other questions of the witness before I ask
14	for a response from Mr. Medvene? Vice Chair John?
15	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: So when did you first see
16	that red sign on the property?
17	MR. NEWTON: Two, three weeks ago.
18	PARTICIPANT: Three weeks ago.
19	MR. NEWTON: About three weeks ago, taking a
20	guess, three weeks ago.
21	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay. That's fine. Thank
22	you.
23	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. Mr. Newton,
24	if you can mute your line for me? Mr. Medvene, could you
25	introduce yourself for the record?

1	MR. MEDVENE: Yes. Good morning, guys. My name
2	is Matt Medvene. I am the applicant and one of the owners
3	with my brother who is actually still in the I think the
4	attendees. Is there any way he could get promoted up,
5	please?
6	BZA CHAIR HILL: Is that because that's who
7	spoke with the applicant I mean with the
8	MR. MEDVENE: Well, he also registered to be a
9	witness as part of the application but yes, he also is the
LO	one that spoke directly with the neighbors.
11	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. What's his name again, Mr.
12	Medvene?
13	MR. MEDVENE: Sam Medvene.
L4	BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Young, could you bring in Sam
L5	Medvene, please? Mr. Medvene, can you hear me? I can't hear
L6	you, Mr. Medvene, sorry. Still can't hear you. Nope. Mr.
L7	Medvene, I don't even know how much I need to hear from you.
L8	I mean if you want to, you can call the hotline number and
L9	just call on the phone.
20	MR. MEDVENE: One second. Sorry, he's in another
21	part of the house. He's coming up.
22	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay.
23	MR. MEDVENE: I don't know what's going on with
24	his computer. As you guys know, we have extensive experience
2.5	going through this process and I'll let Sam speak to the

1	actual conversation, but as you guys have probably, I would
2	hope, recall from our past experiences, the recount of events
3	is something that we have never done before and won't be
4	doing ever in the future.
5	BZA CHAIR HILL: Say that again, the recount of
6	events?
7	MR. MEDVENE: The how the neighbor described
8	the events and the discussion.
9	MR. S. MEDVENE: How are you guys doing? Sorry
10	about that.
11	BZA CHAIR HILL: That's all right. Could you tell
12	us your name for the record, please?
13	MR. S. MEDVENE: Yes. Sam Medvene. I am the
14	owner and applicant.
15	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. And did you I hate to
16	do this now did you go ahead and register as a witness?
17	MR. S. MEDVENE: I did.
18	BZA CHAIR HILL: So, therefore, you did take the
19	oath when you registered?
20	MR. S. MEDVENE: Correct.
21	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. So Mr.
22	Medvene, I was just curious as a response to like your
23	community outreach
24	MR. S. MEDVENE: Yes.
25	BZA CHAIR HILL: both at like at the ANC level

and then what you know about everything and then also your conversation with Mr. Newton.

MR. S. MEDVENE: Yes, happy to. So Mr. Newton and Mrs. Newton are actually the first individuals I reached out to, and we've had conversations since December on this. Upon us having our first iteration, I got texts and proof of all of that as well, so actually discussing on the first write.

What we do is we actually door knock as well. And I've got dates of the doors that knocked on, responses, and so on and so forth. But -- and one of the conversations that recently came up, and the reason that we do the outreach is to be able to discuss potential design features and/or answer any questions and be proactive associated to all of that.

They actually responded on December 3rd with a photo of one of the original structures and then -- of which we discussed through seeing if we could potentially get a porch. So one day notice and so on and so forth of the project and things as a whole is a little be misrepresentative associated to everything.

But then I continued to reach out throughout that, specifically with her on February 9th. Met with them on February -- and then let's see, Friday, February 11th, 9:30, Sunday, so that would be 12th -- February 13th met with them again. And that's when I handed them plans and be able to originally discuss with them about this project. And then --

2.1

1	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Mr. Medvene, I'm going to
2	cut you off real quick cause I just I have a couple of
3	quick questions.
4	MR. S. MEDVENE: Sure.
5	BZA CHAIR HILL: The sticking point for them is
6	the roof deck, correct?
7	MR. S. MEDVENE: Right, of which we put in the
8	center, and so it's not overlooking any of their you can't
9	even see their backyard from the like from the roof top.
10	It's not maximized. It's actually central to the project
11	MR. WILLIAMS: It's pushed back.
12	MR. S. MEDVENE: which we did purposefully
13	because of the feedback.
14	MR. WILLIAMS: It's pushed back. You moved that
15	roof deck back because of the feedback, is that what you're
16	telling me?
17	MR. S. MEDVENE: Well, in general concern
18	general concern with the impacts of a roof deck of which
19	could be put in the direct back, but it's no, it's not.
20	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. Does the Board
21	have any questions of Mr. Medvene?
22	MR. S. MEDVENE: I have alsoif it's possible
23	for me to note, as far as telling them that their feedback
24	would not have any difference, I did not stated this and did
25	not the conversation went along the lines of associated

to the fact that they're and I actually ended up reaching
out to Commissioner Jonah well in our ANC, who is our regular
Johnson was non-responsive, so we had to reach out to the
Board to be able to go through to try to get this meeting set
up and proactive that they send another Commissioner, because
this one was not responding, and he was in contact, and I
sent their emails and everything for them to be able to
communication as well. And he stated that traditionally
speaking, in these cases, they are usually they have
go through in that situation. It was not and I'm sorry
if you took it that way it was not phrased as your voice
doesn't matter. That's why I went through the conversations
a dozen times, to be able to make sure that we were able to
discuss and try to their sticking point is with the
rooftop deck and not wanting development in the city or in
our neighborhood or in their street of which I said, you
know, I'm actually going to be moving into the upper unit,
and the rooftop deck, as a conversation point, would be not
this is not a reasonable request that I can potentially
do about. And we've talked about other things like gates and
other things that I can help with. And there's several other
developments that are even higher than us that are already
looking down into their property as well as balconies on the
adjoining property at 824 that already are overseeing that
as well.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Thanks, Mr. Medvene. All right. Does the Board have any -- yes, sure, Mr. -- Chairman Hood.

ZC CHAIR HOOD: Won't be but a moment. I'm just trying to walk through the sequence of events, and I want to thank the Vice Chair for asking the placard question, because the placard question tells me that, Mr. Newton, you did have notice. The placard was there and you saw the placard, then you had notice -- your notice.

I'm always concerned when Т hear those comments, but it seems like everybody took the situation under different -- understood something different. But what I will say is, as I've said previously, I think that as we move forward, as I move forward, I'm just trying to make sure that the -- everyone is on equal footing and everyone had a fair shot -- because the regulations, I believe, are met. But I don't -- Mr. Chairman, I want to withdraw my comment about holding this off or whatever's going to happen, cause I think that as the placard was there -- I think Mr. Newton -- unless you disagree with me, Mr. Newton, I think that you notice. So I will leave it at that, and I look had proper forward to seeing what others are saying as we move forward. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

BZA CHAIR HILL: All right, Chairman Hood. Okay.

Does -- Mr. Williams, you have questions of anybody?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

I do not. Thank you, Chairman 1 MR. WILLIAMS: 2 Hill. 3 BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. All right. Okay. Mr. Newton, thanks for your testimony, and we're going to 5 excuse you now from the public witness portion, and we'll see what happens next. Thank you, Mr. Newton. 6 7 All right. Mr. Cochran, can you hear me? 8 MR. COCHRAN: Yes. 9 My -- I just want to hear what BZA CHAIR HILL: 10 your thoughts are on the roof deck. I mean my whole thing about the adverse impact and it being pushed back from the 11 12 edge there, and the fact that there are other roof decks and balconies that look into everybody's yard, I mean that's kind 13 of what happens in the city. But from the Office of 14 15 Planning's perspective, what are your thoughts on the roof 16 deck and the undue impact? 17 MR. COCHRAN: Well, the only thing that OP would be concerned about with respect to the zoning regulations and 18 19 the roof deck is whether the railing on the roof deck was 2.0 appropriately set back. I don't have information on that. 2.1 Everything else -- if it were set back appropriately, then 22 the roof deck would be permitted as -- by right and wouldn't -- and discussion about it wouldn't be relevant. 23 24 My impression in looking at the plans was that the 25 deck would provide a good view of the roof of

To see anything else, you would probably 1 adjacent structure. have to crane yourself and lean out over the railing to see 2 3 anything else. I can't speak to what kind of noise might be 4 generated on the roof deck. 5 BZA CHAIR HILL: All right. Thanks, Mr. Okay. All right. Does anybody got anything for anybody? 6 7 Okay. Mr. -- oh, sorry, Ms. John -- Vice Chair John? VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: 8 Can we get clarification 9 from the architect of the railing on the roof deck? 10 MR. PETYAK: Yes. This is Ryan Petyak, The railing is set back 3'6 from the 11 architect from 3877th. roof edge as it relates to the height of the railing, it 12 13 being 3'6 for a guardrail. 14 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you very Okay. 15 much. 16 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. Mr. Williams, 17 you got anything at the end? 18 MR. WILLIAMS: No. 19 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. I'm going to close the 2.0 hearing and the record. Okay. I'll wait for you. Okav. 2.1 I mean we're here for the relief that has been requested, to conduct a third-story rear addition to a two-story semi-22 23 detached building and conversion to an apartment house. The 24 concerning all of the other standards besides the

opposition for the neighbor and the roof deck, I do believe

and would agree that the applicant has met the standard for us to grant the relief requested. I don't particularly think this is such a odd request for us, and I'm not uncomfortable approving this request.

The part that kind of did give me a little bit, you know, discomfort, is just again kind of somehow the process goes about this as to whether or not people fully know or are participating or listened to or understand what's going on in their neighborhood. I think that it sounds as through the applicant has been trying to work with the neighborhood as much as possible to get some of their issues and concerns dealt with. Mr. Moy or Mr. Young, can you bring up -- can you bring back Mr. Williams?

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Mr. Chairman, are you planning to reopen the --

BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes. I'm going to officially, thanks. I'm going to officially again reopen the record, okay, cause I have a question for Mr. Williams. I love it. If we were live, they would just come right back to the table. And I was just informed by the secretary that there is a letter in opposition that is inside of the 24-hour window, so I would go ahead and allow that letter into the record. And if that's the case, Mr. Moy, thank you so much for letting me know, but now this is just going to -- I need to see the letter first. So if you can go ahead, Mr. Moy,

2.0

2.1

and drop the letter into the record, and Mr. Williams, you can take a look also. And then, Mr. Moy, can you hear me?

MR. MOY: The letter should be there momentarily in the record.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. And I wonder for future reference how -- you know, normally, we get stuff inside the 24-hour period but oftentimes, that's for people that are involved in the hearing.

MR. MOY: I think this -- this letter came in this morning, sir.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. I'm just waiting for it to drop, but while I do weight, Mr. Williams, I just wanted to clarify your client is in agreement to the conditions that the ANC had put forward concerning a point of contact, phone numbers the neighbors can contact with any questions or concerns about development; the applicant will replace any lead water lines on the private side of their property and work with DC Water to schedule replacement on the public side; the applicant will notify neighbors at 824 and 828 Varnum in case those properties want to coordinate with DC Water to do public line replacement at the same time; and that pest abatement on the property be completed before any demolition work begins to mitigate -- to mitigate migration to nearby properties? Your client is in agreement with those conditions, correct?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

1	MR. WILLIAMS: Yes. The applicant is in agreement
2	with all of those conditions.
3	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. I do not think, from a
4	Board's perspective, that they are necessary for us to put
5	in the application as conditions, cause I don't necessarily
6	think they all apply to us. I think they're more
7	construction management. However, I'm glad that the
8	applicant has agreed to the conditions and that the applicant
9	has gone through see the letter here give me a moment.
10	(Pause.)
11	MR. MOY: While there's a pause, the letter in
12	opposition should be in the record now, Mr. Chair.
13	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes. That's what I'm reading,
14	Mr. Moy.
15	MR. MOY: Okay. Good.
16	(Pause.)
17	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Mr. Williams, how did that
18	ANC meeting go? Did you go?
19	MR. WILLIAMS: I did.
20	BZA CHAIR HILL: And so was it controversial?
21	MR. WILLIAMS: No. I don't recall any opposition.
22	There was some discussion amongst the Commissioners about the
23	fact that was alluded to already that the SMD for this
24	particular property had not coordinated and that different
25	Commissioners had to step in and handle that. But there was

no controversy with respect to this application.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. Does anybody have any -- I just wanted to confirm with Mr. Williams about the conditions. Did anybody have any questions? If so, raise your hand. All right. Once again, we're going to close the hearing and the record. Thank you, Mr. Williams.

Mr. Young, if you could excuse Mr. Williams? Thanks.

So I'll go back to my discussion. I mean I think that they're meeting the requirements to grant the relief I would agree with the analysis that the Office requested. of Planning has provided. I mean they're even -- they're providing two parking spaces to take parking off the road, you know, off the street. That roof deck is a matter-ofright roof deck. I mean it's set back appropriately to have the roof deck there and so, you know, we have the upper floor requirements that were before us that I believe they're meeting the standard and criteria for us to grant those --I also think that the conditions are something that relief. can be referred to in the order, because necessarily thing they're within our purview. I think that the fact that they're aligned with that party wall, even that roof that roof deck that's aligned with the party wall, I think that again, to the west, there's nothing that you can be seen and then to the party to the east, or at least -- and I -- if I'm getting my directions wrong, I apologize, but the party that was in opposition, there is a side yard there, and that deck has, again, as I said, been pushed back from the edge so that you can't really look into the person's yard anyway. And in addition to that, people -- I mean I'm not saying that that's not something that people have a right to be concerned about, but there are other roof decks and other balconies that look into everybody's -- I'm sorry -- that do look into people's back yards. I mean that's something that we all face by living in the city.

So, however, I can understand that the neighbors are concerned and, however, I think the as far as the Board's concerned, as far as I'm concerned and able to quantify, they're, again, meeting the standard to grant this application. So I'm going to be voting in favor. I'm going to turn to Mr. Smith next if that's all right.

MEMBER SMITH: Honestly, I don't have anything in addition to add. I agree with everything that you stated. You know, I duly understand the neighboring property owner's concern about privacy, but this is a by-right deck -- a matter-of-right deck that is placed in a manner where it should minimize any impacts to the adjacent property owners. Other than that, you know, I agree with your assessment of this. I do believe they have met the standard for us to be able to grant these special exceptions, and I will support

2.0

2.1

this application.

2.0

BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. Mr. Blake?

MEMBER BLAKE: Yes, Mr. Chair. I agree that the applicant has met the burden of proof to be granted relief. I'm in favor of the application. I do agree that the matter-of-right deck has been designed in such a way to be less impactive and again, it is matter-of-right as we established from the architectural input on the setbacks.

The other thing though is that the letter in opposition received talked a little bit about the impact on the changing character of the neighborhood and how it might impact that. I think that we've established that the — through the drawings and so forth, by replacing the trim and putting it more in line with the other property actually is more — it is more supportive of the character and pattern of houses along the street. So in that regard, I think that it is actually a design that improves and actually, it supports that.

So -- and anyway, I think that the -- I give great weight to the Office of Planning report. DDOT has no objections. And I do think that the ANC 4C was very thoughtful in creating the conditions necessary to mitigate the impact on this notwithstanding the confusion that may have taken place within that group. So I am prepared to support.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Chairman Hood?

ZC CHAIR HOOD: I was just trying to walk down a line. My question -- line of questions trying to walk down a line about notice. You know, I'm big on good neighbor policies, but I think the relief requested under Subtitle U-3202 as well as the roof top deck -- the roof deck, I believe, has been carefully designed where -- to lessen impact as my colleagues already stated.

And I think that as far as notice, there are three or four -- I know there are at least three ways of notice, in the *Register*, through the ANC, and also the placard. And I want to thank Vice Chair for helping me resolve that issue. The placard was known about for a while, so I think we were all properly noticed. Whether we did something or not is a whole different story.

But even through all of that, I would encourage Mr. Newton and Mr. -- and the applicant to continue to work together, because at the end of the day, they all have to be neighbors. So thank you, Mr. Chairman.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you, Chairman Hood. Vice Chair John?

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I really have nothing to add. Everything has been covered very well by all of the members so far -- Board Members so far, so I'm in support of the application, and I have no

2.1

1	issues concerning notice to the neighbor at 8 Mr. Nichols,
2	I believe his name was. Thank you.
3	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Thank you. All right.
4	I'm going to go ahead make a motion to approve Application
5	Number 20667 as captioned and read by the secretary and ask
6	for a second. Ms. John?
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Second.
8	BZA CHAIR HILL: The motion was made and seconded.
9	Mr. Moy, if you'd take a roll call?
10	MR. MOY: If you would please respond with a yes,
11	no, or abstain to the motion made by Chairman Hill to approve
12	the application for the relief that's requested. The motion
13	to approve was second by Vice Chair John. Zoning Commission
14	Chair Anthony Hood?
15	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Yes.
16	MR. MOY: Mr. Smith?
17	Mr. Blake?
18	Vice Chair John?
19	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Yes.
20	MR. MOY: Chairman Hill?
21	Staff would record the vote as 5-0-0 and this is
22	on the motion made by Chairman Hill to approve the motion to
23	approve, was second by Vice Chair John. Also in support of
24	the motion to approve, Zoning Commissioner Chair Anthony
25	Hood, Mr. Smith, Mr. Blake, and of course, Vice Chair John

and Chairman Hill. Motion carries on the vote of 5-0-0.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Thanks, Mr. Moy. All right, you all, you want to take a 15-minute break? We'll come back at 11:30. Okay. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 11:15 a.m. and resumed at 11:33 a.m.)

BZA CHAIR HILL: So Mr. Moy, you want to call your next one?

MR. MOY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. After a quick recess, the Board has returned to its hearing session and the time is now at or about 11:32 a.m.

The next case application before the Board for action is Application No. 20667 of DANEX, LLC. This is a self-certified application for special exceptions from the matter of right uses of Subtitle U Section 401 pursuant to Subtitle U Section 421 and Subtitle X Section 901.2 from the floor area ratio requirements Subtitle F Section 302.1, pursuant to Subtitle F Section 302.2, Subtitle F Section 5206.1, and Subtitle X Section 901.2. And finally from minimum vehicle parking requirements of Subtitle Section 701.5, pursuant to Subtitle C Section 703 and Subtitle X Section 901.2. This would construct a three-story, with cellar, eight-unit, apartment house in the RA-1 zone. The property is located at 2838 Langston Place, SE, Square 5741, Lot 137.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Sullivan, can you 1 Great. 2 introduce yourself for the record, please? 3 Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman, and MR. SULLIVAN: Board members. Marty Sullivan with Sullivan & Barros on 5 behalf of the applicant. 6 Thank you. Mr. Sullivan, if you BZA CHAIR HILL: 7 could walk us through your client's application and why you 8 believe they're meeting the standard for us to grant the 9 relief requested? And if you could also speak to why I don't 10 have an ANC report yet and then so then the public outreach on that issue, and then also anything you might want to talk 11 12 about in terms of the Office of Planning's report or DDOT's discussion. 13 I'm going to put 15 minutes on the clock there. 14 15 I see that your PowerPoint is in the record. And Mr. Young 16 if you could pull that up and Mr. Sullivan, you can begin 17 whenever you like. 18 SULLIVAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. MR. So regarding the ANC, Mr. Trantham, the Single Member District 19 2.0 Commissioner is here on the panel, I believe, and he can talk 21 about that, but we went to two full ANC meetings and hoped 22 for a vote at the second. Unfortunately, there was 23 But we've had positive feedback. 24 So next slide, please. 25 There's three areas of relief. One is for the

U421, approval of an RA1 new residential development. 1 second area of relief is for the voluntary inclusionary 2 And the third area of relief is for the relief from 3 zoning. one parking space required because it's a narrow lot, unable 5 to have a curb cut to get to it with no alley. The building is a three-story unit apartment 6 7 building. It will have a lot occupancy of 30 percent, a rear 8 yard of 60 feet, and one side yard of 10 feet. 9 Next slide, please. 10 I have the support of the Office of Planning and 11 DDOT and I will turn it over to the project architect, Mr. 12 Bostan, to take you through the project. Next slide, please. 13 Good afternoon, everybody. 14 MR. BOSTAN: said, this is an eight unit apartment building and it is located south of the Skyland neighborhood. 16 It's north of 17 Suitland Parkway. It is located on a street with similar characteristic apartment buildings as you can see on the 18 19 slide. 20 Next slide, please. 2.1 The current lot -- currently the lot is an empty The trees have been cleared from the site with the 22 lot. 23 appropriate permits in I believe in September of last year. 24 Next slide, please. 25 These are the floor plans, two units per floor.

The building is three stories and a cellar. There are two 1 2 units at every floor. Seven two bedrooms, one one bedroom. 3 Next slide, please. 4 Next slide. 5 This is the section showing the FAR calculations. Next slide. 6 7 This is the front of the building. We kept the 8 brick in the front as much as possible and the brick on the 9 next slide. 10 Next slide, please. The brick turns around the corner, the base of the 11 building and it's a cementatious material in the back and the sides. 13 Next slide, please. 14 And that's the other side. 15 16 Next slide, please. 17 I think that summarizes the overall building. can get into more details if there are any questions, but 18 19 I'll give it back to Marty. 20 MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you, Sahnur. So the project 2.1 meets the general requirements. RA1 zone provides for areas 22 predominantly developed with moderate density low to 23 development including multi-family. You can tell -- you can 24 see from the surrounding area, this is in an actual apartment 25 zone, an existing multi-family zone.

Next slide, please.

2.0

The specific requirements are that it be referred to OSSE and to other agencies regarding these particular requirements and that has been done.

Next slide, please.

And has been referred for the primary work on this to the Office of Planning which has made their findings on these, all the criteria included in 421.3 in their report.

And I would refer the Board to that.

Next slide, please.

Regarding the parking space, we do meet the special exception requirement and we're required to meet one of the requirements and it's primarily the physical constraints of the property. The lot is narrow and interior lot is only 40-feet wide, so we're not able to get a driveway in there as well and still provide the building.

One thing I would mention in the DDOT report, they have stated that they are waiving any requirement to provide a TDM plan for this and noted as well that the Zoning Commission is eliminating that requirement in this case as well, but because of the area and because of the proximity to a Metro, and other factors, they said in this case a TDM plan was not required.

Next slide, please.

And that's it. And if you have any other

1	questions, again, with the ANC, Mr. Trantham, I believe is
2	on the panel, so he can answer questions about the ANC as
3	well. Thank you.
4	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thanks. Commissioner Trantham
5	sorry, Mr. Blake, you want to go ahead, first?
6	MEMBER BLAKE: Yes, one quick question. I just
7	wanted to know could you point out the IZ unit and its
8	configuration.
9	MR. BOSTAN: Mr. Commissioner, the IZ unit, we
10	haven't decided which one yet, but it cannot be in the
11	cellar. It's going to be, I believe, one of the two
12	bedrooms, one bathroom, but by zoning regulations it cannot
13	be in the cellar.
14	We have not we need to provide that information
15	as part of the zoning permit and go with the DC Housing
16	Authority regulations, but as of now, we have not decided
17	which unit exactly.
18	MEMBER BLAKE: Thank you.
19	BZA CHAIR HILL: Chairman Hood.
20	ZC CHAIR HOOD: I know Mr. Sullivan will opine.
21	I'm not sure and I think Board Member Blake is definitely
22	right. We would also I would like to see and I know the
23	Commission we see it, but I don't know, the Board may not,
24	so that's when you flip back and forth sometimes.
25	But either way, is there a perspective to Mr.

1	Bostan. Is there a perspective of how the building is going
2	to sit there? I saw the drawings, but do you have a
3	perspective and I know a lot of times the BZA may not require
4	that as well. So is there a perspective?
5	MR. BOSTAN: Not on the record. I mean we studied
6	the lot and the footprint of the project. I mean I don't
7	have it available right now, but again, it's a three story
8	it is sitting at three stories. It's the same height as the
9	brick building right next to it.
10	ZC CHAIR HOOD: I get all that, Mr. Bostan. I
11	thank you, but I was just wondering sometimes it's better
12	to see and I realize what you're developing, but it's
13	sometimes better to see. So thank you.
14	Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
15	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you, Chairman Hood. Anyone
16	else before I turn to the Commissioner.
17	Commissioner Trantham, you're on mute,
18	Commissioner Trantham.
19	MR. TRANTHAM: Good morning, Board, Commissioners,
20	Chairs, thank you all for having this opportunity.
21	I'm kind of turn because I support this project.
22	However, I was very disappointed when I learned that the
23	neighbors are going to ask for a special exception for
24	parking. Let me go backwards. So they did come Mr. Niyi
25	Herbert and Mr. Jackson came to me. I met with them. He gave

me the plans for this building and I was impressed with what they were doing.

However, I learned later, as well as, as early as a few days ago that they only want to ask for one parking -- only going to be required for one parking spot. So I called Mr. Jackson because I just wanted to make sure I thought I heard what I heard when I met with them. And I told them that you need to go back and find me more parking spots. I didn't ask for eight. I said go back and find me, get me two more.

And I'm saying this to this Board in consideration of my tenure in this position. I would hope that when they come before you all, that you all let them know that Mr. Trantham is adamantly about parking. no sense that the Board or all these developers will come into your community, want to present a building for people to live, and they have struggles to park. It makes no sense.

For an example, if you went and bought a \$500 home, but no driveway, no garage, would you still want to live there? No.

Think of how bad -- we know parking is hard in D.C. But when you talk about right here on Langston Place, Ainger Place, where already the parking is congested public parking. Soon you all will be hearing in the news how people will be fighting over parking spots.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

It makes no sense that the Board would approve or allow them to make a special request for an exemption for parking. If you can put up a \$2 million apartment building or a \$3 million, you can afford to put parking in there to make it available for the residents and the tenants that live in there. Let's be common sense human, a little bit human about this.

Then I have another project that's going to put a handicap ramp, but you're not providing -- that's not going to go. And then I would ask the Board to also -- I listened to you, the other presentation and I said oh, that's a good idea. I would ask this Board to consider when you're asking are they being friendly to the neighborhood that they provide you with lists and names of people that they have spoken with and have consent with coming into their neighborhood building this apartment building or whatever they're building, it's a disrespect that these developers want to come in here and build these unit buildings and then don't provide parking.

I'm torn because I supported the project, and I did send Mr. Niyi Herbert a letter, and I spoke with Mr. Robert Reeve, and the reason being why it was not voted on as Mr. Sullivan did say they did come to our meeting. We did not have a quorum. We were going to vote in the Executive Board, but on that Thursday when the weather was inclement and we couldn't get a hold of all of our ANC. So I called

2.0

2.1

downtown and asked the ANC office, OANC, could I write a letter of support on my own. They said yes, but only put you -- you're not representing the entire Board. I said okay. And that's what I did.

So I sent the letter saying that I do support this project and I was only after did I learn that they were asking for a special exception and like I said before, I called Mr. Clarence Jackson who attended this meeting with me, Mr. Niyi Herbert. And when he said -- what I thought I heard what I heard, when he said one, I said no, you got to go back and get me at least two more parking spaces for this project.

Then I went around there on the street. They can provide parking. And that was a good question you raised about can you see the building and the curb cut, Mr. Hood. They can provide parking.

So I'm asking -- in a way I'm supporting it and in a way I'm discouraged because -- not discouraged, I'm disappointed that they could think they could come into this community, provide housing, but not provide parking spaces for the people to parking in. So where are they going to park in? If they can't park on the property and you're on the street, on Langston Street, and then the reason I asked for you all to have a list of people that they have talked to in the community as you stated to the other guy in the

2.0

2.1

other presentation, then you all will have a little bit more knowledge of people being more friendly and then making the community aware of what they're coming in -- and then they will see for themselves how difficult it is to park. There's no parking on Langston Place. After you got the other apartment building in Woodland, where are these people going to park at?

Then you have the audacity to talk about Metro. Do you know how far a Metro -- the closest Metro Station is right down the street by IHOP, okay. And then you've got Anacostia. You got Congress Heights, that's the closest Metro. That's like six, seven blocks away from where they're presently going to be residing. And then you've got Anacostia. You have a bus stop at the top, so now you're saying well, let's inconvenience them or force them to catch the Metro to -- the bus to a Metro Station.

So I don't understand when they come in talking about well, we got Metro access, no, you don't. Seven, eight blocks away from where the building is going to be built, you're going to force people to find a way to get to the Metro or to use the Metro? What about their car, if they have a vehicle, a motor vehicle?

So I'm asking this Board to think of ways in how you all can take out that special exception of parking.

Anybody that's coming into your development, building an

2.0

2.3

apartment building or whatever, should also make plans for parking. It's just dumbfounded that anybody could think they could come into your community and not provide you with a parking spot to where you want to live.

Thank you for listening to me. I can't hear you.

I can't hear you.

BZA CHAIR HILL: I said thank you, Commissioner. I know that other Board members might have some comments. Unfortunately, for the parking, like they're asking for one less parking space. I'm not disagreeing with you. I'm just kind of pointing out a couple of things.

They're asking for one less parking space and I don't see how they can necessarily provide the parking space in terms of they would need to get a curb cut from DDOT where DDOT wouldn't necessarily approve that, but I'm going to turn to the Office of Planning, when I get a chance, to kind of find a little bit more clarity on that one.

Do my fellow Board members have any questions or comments for the Commissioner? Chairman Hood.

ZC CHAIR HOOD: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Commissioner Trantham and thank you for your years of labor and work not just in Ward 8, but in the city. I think you are a model for what we should all pattern after. I hear about all your work, see some of your work, and I'm out there with you. So I thank you for your work.

2.1

I want to make sure I say that.

2.0

Now let me ask you, is there is a chance that the ANC, your ANC, I know you called the ANC Office and they told you to submit something. But is there a chance your ANC could vote on something like that?

MR. TRANTHAM: Yes. I can bring it up in the next ANC meeting which on April the 19th. I can do that. I mean the only thing, Commissioner, Chair, is that one, when we first had our meeting, public meeting last month, we did not have a quorum, but all three people that were on the virtual meeting agreed. We just didn't have a quorum. So then after we left there, I took it upon myself to call downtown to the OANC Office and I asked them what could I do because I did not want to hinder the project. I didn't want to stop the project.

So they told me, Mr. Trantham, is yours a Single Member District? I said yes. They said you did it before? And I said yes, I did, but I got some stuff back or feedback offered. She said you can send a letter of support which I gave Mr. Niyi Herbert. I sent it to him and I even talked to Mr. Robert Reeve who was an outstanding -- I really appreciated all the help he gave me. He gave me great help. That's the only way I'm on this page right here today.

Then that Thursday when the rain, when it was raining very badly, the chair and I was on the phone

1	together. And we were trying to see if we could have that
2	executive meeting so we could vote on this as a whole as
3	a body. But we could not get a hold of two of other ANC
4	Commissioners and then the other one, she was in a training
5	course that she couldn't be there. So it could not be done.
б	So I felt so bad because I gave my word that I
7	would do it and that's the reason why I went on and wrote a
8	letter. And I even let Mr. Reeve know that I wrote the
9	letter and I sent it to Mr. Niyi Herbert which he sent me
10	back a receipt saying that he received it.
11	If you all want to hold it off until April 19th,
12	I can get a vote.
13	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Okay, so Mr. Trantham, let me ask
14	you this and I hope you don't mind me asking you this
15	question.
16	MR. TRANTHAM: Go ahead.
17	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Aren't you licensed to preach now?
18	MR. TRANTHAM: I am a preacher, yes, sir.
19	ZC CHAIR HOOD: And the reason I said that and
20	I know I've been on you but that's we get those long
21	answer, but you're a good preacher.
22	MR. TRANTHAM: Okay. And could I say one last
23	thing to Mr. Hill and Mr. Hood and the rest of the Board?
24	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Commissioner Trantham, I have a
25	couple more questions for you right quick.

Okay, bring it on. 1 TRANTHAM: 2 So as the Chairman ZCCHAIR HOOD: already 3 mentioned, they're only asking for one space. I'm sure we 4 can think outside the box. I hear you. I believe there's 5 a church -- I can't think of the name of the church --6 MR. TRANTHAM: Emmanuel Baptist. Emmanuel 7 Baptist. 8 ZC CHAIR HOOD: Emmanuel Baptist, exactly. So I 9 am familiar with the neighborhood. It's been a while. But 10 I do know there are some parking issues, but I think if there's some more collaboration, we can work outside the box. 11 12 As the Chairman mentioned, even if it's only one space, one space for this project, one space for the next project, one 13 space for the next -- we've got to start thinking outside the 14 15 As far as I'm concerned, your points are well taken. 16 I'm going to yield to my colleagues, Commissioner 17 Trantham, and they may have some other questions, but I will 18 19 I'd like to respond back to you, MR. TRANTHAM: 2.0 You're more than right about thinking outside the 2.1 box and I even went there with them. I said you know 22 somebody is going to need to build a parking garage or 23 something and that's the reason why I'm asking you all as a 24 Board and I ain't patronizing you or anything, but sometimes

maybe I'll go look at the very area and the community at

which people asking to building property in and see the congestion. We're congested. Now will the church allow them to park on their parking lot? I doubt it if truthfully spoken. My church is directly across the street, Allen Chapel AME, okay?

There's so much congestion. You have Woodland, you have Langston Place, and eventually that's right there on that same strip where the Hope Village was at. It's not being occupied right now, but eventually somebody is going to purchase that property and wanting there to park there on that public parking because of construction and everything else.

And all I'm asking you all, you know, Ι before the gun and I own up to it. I wrote a letter of support, but if I really understood that it was only going to be one spot requested, I would not have supported this and I let Mr. Nivi Herbert know it. And I know Mr. Sullivan because me and him have spoken, so -- and all the other projects, they need to come up with parking, point blank period or my Board will not support this because it's already -- I'm having problems already now for Ainger Place. are fighting for parking space. They're territorial. You all don't hear about this. People are literally fighting for parking spots. Who wants to park three and four and five blocks away from their house where they live at?

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	Cars are being torn up, shot up. Who wants that?
2	See, this is what you all need to hear down there at the
3	Board before you all make a decision and saying I approve.
4	These people need to the same way you expect to go home
5	and be able to park in at least one or two or three blocks,
6	three parking spaces from your house or in your garage.
7	These same people have the same right to do the same thing.
8	And then they're going to be paying this apartment
9	building being for these 30 or 40 years, whether they stay
10	there that entire time or someone else, they're going to be
11	paying their rent or their mortgage or whatever.
12	And I'm asking this Board to take to heart what
13	I'm saying about this so-called special exception about
14	parking. Tell me you take that out. They need to find a way
15	to include parking in whatever building that they are
16	building and that's all I'm saying. Thank you.
17	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, thanks, Commissioner. All
18	right, I'm going to turn to the Office of Planning. I see
19	you, Mr. Blake. Just let me get to Office of Planning.
20	MR. MORDFIN: Good afternoon, no, still good
21	morning.
22	Good morning, Chair and members of the Board. I'm
23	Stephen Mordfin with the Office of Planning. And the Office

There's been a lot of discussion regarding the

of Planning is in support of this application.

24

25

parking. One parking space is required for this site and the applicant is requesting to provide none. And a lot of that has to do with the configuration of the property.

Now if one parking space were provided, a curb cut would be needed to be constructed and when you construct a curb cut, you also take away street parking and typically what happens is you're going to exchange an on-street parking space or maybe two depending on the configuration for one off-street parking space. So there's no net gain or loss. space for You trade the on-street parking one on So it doesn't -- there's no benefit from providing one parking space on the site because you've lost one on the street.

The applicant hasn't requested that only one parking space be provided for this property. That is what is required by the zoning regulations, so perhaps that is the issue that the Commissioner has is maybe with the zoning regulations and not with this application which is in conformance with the requirements of the zoning regulations for reducing the parking to -- by one because they are -- there's a list -- that's the way the zoning regulations are written. So that is why we've recommended approval and the application is in conformance with that provision.

As for the other two requests for the new residential developments, the application is in conformance

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

with those. The applicant did add additional submissions to the file, documenting the proposed and existing landscaping plan and also as he also mentioned with the TDM plan that's required to be provided that DDOT has waived in this case with us because it is only for one parking space. So that, therefore, OP is in support and I'm available for any questions.

ZC CHAIR HOOD: Okay, thanks, Mr. Mordfin. All right, does the Board have any questions for the Office of Planning?

Commissioner Hood, Chairman Hood.

ZC CHAIR HOOD: Mr. Mordfin, I noticed you kicked it back to the Zoning Commission to look at the regulations. I'm just curious. We do different things and this is where I'm starting to have some concerns about the way we do things versus the BZA. The courts have said certain things in our jurisdiction. The BZA says -- so I stopped sharing with my jurisdictions. So now, from now on everything is in my jurisdiction. The courts opposed that.

So Mr. Mordfin, I appreciate your work, but one of the concerns I have is there are always thinking outside the box. I agree with the regulations. I don't think the Zoning Commission needs to change anything.

I know sometimes we do accessory -- like there are two churches. There can be an agreement where they can park

2.0

2.1

I hear Commissioner Trantham saying There's an agreement where those -- maybe let them do that. the neighborhood can use parking at the church and be off the lot by 8 o'clock in the morning. Most churches are only open on Sunday and they do stuff in the evenings, so you can park after 10 and you have to be off the lot by 8. That may help some of those problems because what Commissioner Trantham was saying was real live in this city. People are getting shot a parking space. It just hasn't hit some of us yet. over And it's live, he's living it. I live it. Some of us on here live it, so we need to make sure -- when we're deciding on these cases, that we think about all those things.

So my question to you is is that a possibility as well, that they can continue to have a discussion? See if you can park at Emmanuel Baptist Church at night. So to me, that's thinking outside the box. So do you have any comment on that you'd rather just leave it alone?

MORDFIN: they MR. Ι mean can work interference) to the church as long as it doesn't interfere with their minimum parking requirements so that they would (audio interference) insufficient parking is required for I know there's a large parking lot there. I have no them. idea what the parking requirements are for that church. if they have surplus parking, then they could -- if could come up with an agreement with the church to let people

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

park there whenever it is that they want to allow it, then 1 they could do that if they want to have a private agreement 2 that wouldn't involve -- I don't see how that would involve 3 us, but they could have a private agreement to allow parking 5 spaces to be used whenever. ZC CHAIR HOOD: Thank you, Mr. Mordfin. 6 Some of 7 the time when we're having these special communities, and those things need to be offered, because I think your 8 9 comments to me about a wash, a curb cut versus a parking 10 space off the street, I think you're right. It's a wash. I would agree with that. But Commissioner Trantham and the 11 12 community they don't do this all the time. So sometimes we could probably make those kind of suggestions. 13 Even though it's not always the regulations 14 in our -in 15 jurisdiction, but we're also stewards of doing -- of looking 16 after the residents of the city. So that's all I have to say 17 So I appreciate your comments and I thank you. 18 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 19 MR. TRANTHAM: Mr. Hood, Mr. Hill --2.0 BZA CHAIR HILL: Commissioner Trantham, give me 2.1 I'm going to come to you. You'll have an one second. 22 opportunity, Commissioner. 23 Thank you. MR. TRANTHAM: 24 BZA CHAIR HILL: Just so we get through the Board.

MR. TRANTHAM:

Thank you, sir.

BZA CHAIR HILL: No problem, Commissioner. 1 2 Blake, you had your hand up. Are you good? 3 I'm just trying to clarify whether MEMBER BLAKE: 4 there was permit parking on that street or not. That was the 5 only question I had. I don't know, Commissioner, if 6 BZA CHAIR HILL: 7 you know that. Is it permit parking? 8 TRANTHAM: No, sir. I did not choose to do MR. 9 that and you have to understand why. I did it on Skyland 10 where I live at. I got permit parking on my specific street. I personally went around to every single apartment building 11 and got the signatures. After I got the permit parking put 12 up -- this entire -- 20 percent of this block cussed me out. 13 Threatened me and cussed me out and I had to understand that. 14 15 But explained to them when Ι qot 16 signatures for the 51 percent, I explained to them myself. 17 I knocked on the doors. I walked past. Even when I got the approval, I sent the letter -- I walked around and put the 18 letters in their doors. You don't know how many people. 19 Even the rental office challenged me. 20 The rental 2.1 office here at Skyland challenged me because they could no 22 longer park on the street. They had to go park up in their 23 They even thought they could go over me so I parking lot. 24 said I'm not going in certain areas of the city. People may

not be financially stable to afford their two-year sticker.

1	Then after 8:00 after 8:00 it's all open for everybody
2	anyway so
3	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay.
4	MR. TRANTHAM: Can I continue to speak or you want
5	me to wait?
6	BZA CHAIR HILL: Just give me one second,
7	Commissioner.
8	MR. TRANTHAM: Yes, sir. Yes, sir.
9	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Does anybody got anything?
10	Give me a second, Mr. Sullivan. I see you leaning
11	in. Let's see. Okay. Go ahead, Commissioner. Sorry,
12	Commissioner Trantham, you had a question for the Office of
13	Planning?
14	MR. TRANTHAM: Yes, sir. He said one spot, right?
15	So then who is supposed to get that one spot? The rest of
16	the seven people that live in that building, who going to get
17	that one particular spot? Who going to be fighting for that
18	one particular spot?
19	All I'm asking this Board, as Mr. Hood stated, we
20	have to be even though it may be there may be a
21	requirement and an order to get everything in place by the
22	Board. I'm asking this Board to go into a discussion and
23	have a meeting, a discussion, and talk about this.
24	BZA CHAIR HILL: Commissioner, I just want to say
25	one thing. I mean, we, the Board, definitely hear about this

1	and talk about the parking. What is before us is the one
2	parking spot, right? So that's what we kind of have to talk
3	about. What I'm trying to say is that the discussion that
4	you're speaking to is really discussions that also kind of
5	either get to the council level or also the Zoning Commission
6	level.
7	Right? And, I mean, I guess I can answer your
8	question probably for the Office of Planning which is whoever
9	was going to get that one spot is whoever probably paid for
10	that one spot, you know, from the units in the building.
11	Right?
12	Is that correct, Mr. Mordfin? Would that be your
13	answer?
14	MR. MORDFIN: We have it set up already. It was
15	just open for any of the residents of the building and it
16	would be first come, first serve. It would be restricted
17	to
18	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. I've got to catch up, Mr.
19	Mordfin, just a little bit because I've got a really long day
20	also.
21	So, let's see, okay. Do my Board Members have any
22	other questions?
23	Mr. Young, is there anyone here wishing to speak?
24	I'll get you, Vice Chair John.
25	Is there anyone here wishing to speak, Mr. Young?

1	Okay. Vice Chair John, you had your hand up?
2	You're on mute, Vice Chair John.
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: This is a quick question
4	for Mr. Sullivan.
5	Just for my information, what kind of response
6	have you had from churches about using their parking lots?
7	Have you ever tried that? What is your knowledge of the
8	existing situation?
9	MR. SULLIVAN: Churches have a relatively high
10	parking requirement and one of the requirements to satisfy
11	our parking requirement would be that the parking space that
12	we use does not already satisfy the church's parking
13	requirement.
14	Churches historically most of them don't meet
15	their parking requirement because the parking requirement is
16	rather steep. It's one for each 10 seats, or 70 square feet
17	of space if there aren't seats in the sanctuary so it's a
18	steep parking requirement. We have yet to see a church that
19	had spaces to spare.
20	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay. Thank you.
21	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. I'm going to
22	go around the table here.
23	Commissioner Trantham, do you have anything you
24	would like to add at the end?
25	MR. TRANTHAM: Thank you so much, Mr. Hill. I

appreciate you all allowing me this opportunity to speak on this. That's not correct what Mr. Sullivan said. Second of all, that's a good idea, Mr. Hood. They should go to these churches to see if they could strike up -- get a contract. In ours alone we have over 96 spots on our parking lot. Emmanuel have more than we do.

Now here comes the problem. The problem becomes Allen, nor Emmanuel, nor Independence, nor Hague Mabuyu will be able to afford to secure the vehicles that stay on that lot and then they will be forced to hire security. The city is going to have to do something much better. Yes, I already -- Mr. Hood will tell you -- when I represent, I represent.

Yes, I've already called the council member. I'm meeting with Chair Mendelson because I think it's a disgrace that they continue to allow developers to come here and then use that special exemption as a way of getting their buildings built. I am adamantly upset about that. Okay? So that's the problem with the parking lot, the churches.

On the Allen parking lot alone -- I'll just share this as a point of information -- we have seven vans. Because we did not have something to secure our lot, someone came in -- found the time to come in there and take all -- what you call those cap guns off the car -- off the vans? The cata -- what do you call that, Hood? Help me out with it. It's called the --

1	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Catalytic converter. Yeah, they
2	been taking them.
3	MR. TRANTHAM: They came and took all seven of our
4	catalytic converters off our vans just because we didn't have
5	a secure gate at the entrance. If they can do that, just
6	imagine what they would do to people's personal vehicles.
7	Unless you go in and talk to the pastor and see if they will
8	arrange some type of agreement with these developers for
9	parking, the church is not going to take on that
10	responsibility, that liability.
11	That's what happened to us and guess who had to
12	pay for all those caps to be put back on our lot alone. We
13	have seven church vans and they took every last one of them.
14	One of them was
15	BZA CHAIR HILL: Just a second, Mr. Herbert. Give
16	me a second, Mr. Herbert.
17	Look, you all, I got to kind of get through this
18	hearing. I've got a long day also.
19	MR. TRANTHAM: I know you do, sir. Thank you.
20	BZA CHAIR HILL: Commissioner, I appreciate it.
21	I'm just saying like unfortunately like a lot of the stuff
22	you're talking about, I totally agree with. It's just that
23	it's not something that we can deal with here.
24	MR. TRANTHAM: Okay. I got you.
25	BZA CHAIR HILL: And so

1	MR. TRANTHAM: Just know this, ANC-8B won't be
2	supporting nothing that's coming up in our development
3	without them getting parking spots, having parking spots.
4	I'm going to my board today. I'm going to call up every last
5	one of them and let them know that I was on the phone with
6	you all. This is going to stop over here in 8A 8B. It's
7	going to stop. As early as today it's going to stop.
8	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right, Commissioner.
9	Give me a second, Mr. Herbert. I don't even know
10	if you all need I don't know what you guys are going to
11	talk about so I don't know what the point is, right?
12	Mr. Herbert, you had your hand up. Go ahead.
13	MR. HERBERT: Thank you, sir.
14	BZA CHAIR HILL: First introduce yourself for the
15	record, Mr. Herbert. Hold on, Mr. Herbert. I'm going to
16	talk to your counsel first.
17	Mr. Sullivan, you had your hand up.
18	MR. SULLIVAN: Yeah. We should be able to respond
19	to this and I'll turn it over to Mr. Herbert in a second.
20	First time we've ever heard of an issue with parking. We've
21	been to full ANC meetings.
22	BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Sullivan, I got you. I got
23	you. Just give me a second.
24	MR. SULLIVAN: I just want to let the Board know
25	that we

1 BZA CHAIR HILL: I understand. I'll give you 2 chance --3 MR. SULLIVAN: This is news to us. It's a 180 from the ANC meeting. 4 5 BZA CHAIR HILL: I don't have anything from the ANC right now. 6 7 I understand but we get to respond MR. SULLIVAN: 8 to -- you've been listening for a long time now. 9 BZA CHAIR HILL: You'll get to respond. You'll 10 get to respond. What I'm trying --Mr. Herbert --11 MR. TRANTHAM: 12 BZA CHAIR HILL: Whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa. 13 We are not going to start yelling over a freaking electronic 14 system called Zoom, right? I don't care what you all say, So this is turning into like the whole like dias live 15 stuff again where people are yelling at each other over the 16 17 Again, what I'm trying to point out again computer system. to everybody, and this is what I'm trying to get at, I've got 18 19 a really long day and we're talking about one parking spot, 20 okay? 21 So, Mr. Herbert, what would you like to say? 22 MR. HERBERT: Thank you. Thank you very much, 23 I just want to -- I want to let you know that I 24 had a meeting with Commissioner Paul awhile ago when 25 introduced the project and he embraced the project when I

We had our first ANC meeting. introduced it. They said we 1 2 are going to have a second one and we had a second one. 3 If they had had a quorum in the second one -because they told me he was going to support the project --4 they would have automatically voted in the second meeting. Because they didn't have a quorum, that's why we had to say 7 give us a support letter towards this. 8 They are aware of it. When I called yesterday to 9 remind him of the support letter, he asked me on the phone how many parking spots are you going to provide here? 10 by requirement it is one. Then he said why are we providing 11 12 one parking spot? I said it's by requirement. But the thing about it is I go to Langston quite 13 often because of this project and I know there are some 14 offices right there during the day and I'm still able to 15 I'm able to do street parking because I'm there most 16 park. 17 In the last one week I've been in Langsdon of the time. about four times and I was able to do street parking so --18 19 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, Mr. Herbert. I got you. 20 The Board understands what we are supposed to look at. don't need to hear any more about this issue. 21 22 Mr. Sullivan, you're welcome to go ahead and give us a conclusion and speak to whatever you'd like to speak to. 23 24 Would you like to give us a conclusion?

Yes, Mr. Chair.

MR.

SULLIVAN:

25

I did want

rebuttal and conclusion. 1 2 BZA CHAIR HILL: Sure. Before you do, 3 Sullivan, Ι do clarify thing with the want to one Commissioner. 4 5 Commissioner, there's a letter that you submitted that isn't in the record yet and all I want to clarify was, 7 again, you -- it's okay. You can change your mind here. just want to understand. You were in support of this 9 It seemed as though you were in support of this project. But since they are not giving the one parking spot, 10 are you now withdrawing your support? Because, if so, I'm 11 12 not going to put the letter in the record. As I stated in the beginning 13 MR. TRANTHAM: No. 14 in my opening statement, I said I'm kind of torn but I did not -- I did tell them -- I sent Mr. Nigel Herbert, which he 15 should have told you, I sent him the letter. He has the 16 17 Mr. Reed asked me to send it and I can forward it letter. to you all. 18 19 BZA CHAIR HILL: No, I just want to make sure you 20 still --21 MR. TRANTHAM: Yeah, I'm going to support 22 simply because I gave my word. 23 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. 24 MR. TRANTHAM: That's why. The only reason is I But when I learned that they was 25

providing one spot, that's where I became a little disturbed 1 with the situation. 3 BZA CHAIR HILL: No, Commissioner, I got you. Two First of all, they are providing zero spots, okay? 4 things. They are supposed to provide one spot. This is what I'm trying to tell you. They are supposed to provide one spot 7 and what the Office of Planning is saying is that in order to get that one spot, we have to take away one spot from the 9 road. Okay? Right. Curbside. 10 MR. TRANTHAM: So I'm just trying to point that 11 BZA CHAIR HILL: What I wanted clarity one, which I think you've 12 part out. given me, is that -- I mean, again, Commissioner, the issue 13 14 that you're speaking to is a larger issue than this case and 15 what you're talking about so I just gave you clarity. do want that letter in the record and I'm putting it in the 16 17 record. Correct? Just this one. 18 MR. TRANTHAM: Correct. 19 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. 20 I've already written a MR. TRANTHAM: letter. Because I've already written a letter and sent it to Mr. 21 22 Nigel Herbert. I'm not going to go back on my promise as Mr. 23 Sullivan is talking about 180. From this day forward Mr. Sullivan and all of his clients that come with some pockets 24

won't be approved from 8B. I can assure you of that.

1	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Mr. Moy, if you can please
2	put that letter into the record. Okay? That's number one.
3	All right. Now I'm going to finish.
4	Mr. Sullivan, you can have rebuttal and a
5	conclusion and then we're going to move on with our day.
6	MR. SULLIVAN: I don't have anything further to
7	say.
8	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. Let me see
9	here. Okay. All right. Okay. I'm going to go ahead and
10	close
11	Commissioner Trantham, it's nice to meet you,
12	Commissioner.
13	MR. TRANTHAM: Thank you so much. Thank you all
14	for allowing me the opportunity to speak before this
15	Commission. I know it's been a long time and I thank you so
16	much. Be blessed.
17	BZA CHAIR HILL: You take care. You as well, sir.
18	All right. Okay. I'm closing the hearing and the
19	record.
20	Mr. Young, if you could please excuse everyone.
21	Okay. So we are here again for the special
22	exception for the eight units that are proposed for the floor
23	area ratio requirements for the IZ unit and to not provide
24	the one parking space which is of major concern to the
25	community I'm sorry, parking in general seems to be a

major concern to the community.

From the discussion -- I'm sorry. From the presentation that the Applicant has given, I do believe that they are meeting their requirements to grant the relief that's been requested due to the standards that we are supposed to look at in order to grant the relief requested.

Getting beyond that, there is the ANC which has not officially voted yet because they didn't have the quorum but according to the testimony of the Commissioner, there were three that were in favor. Whether or not it would have passed now, I don't know. We don't have anything in the record in terms of giving great weight to the ANC one way or the other.

We do have something in the record now that shows that the one Commissioner that testified here was in support of the project. I think that we, the Board, in my tenure here has seen many discussions about parking. I can think of an apartment building that came through us not too long ago when there was a big discussion about parking. There's many other people that will have something to say after I'm done, but there was a big discussion about parking and parking being provided.

Oftentimes what happens is like, you know, it's eight units, nine units, whatever, and there's one parking space that's being provided because that's what the

regulations allow. And that what seems to be happening with the regulations is maybe there's another way, and I don't know, Chairman Hood, if there's a way to be creative about this in another capacity.

I mean, it sounds as though like the churches have a minimum parking requirement. The regulations state that you can't use the parking that goes towards the minimum parking requirement of another application which makes complete sense to me, right? But if there's like a loop hole of some way to be creative at night where you could maybe do something different at night, I don't know, right?

But definitely that's outside of this little Board's, you know, purview meaning we don't change regulations. We just look at the regulations that are before us and I know the Commissioner would also understand. So I think that they meet the regulations. I think as far as the parking space, to give the parking space they have to take away the parking space.

As you all know, DDOT doesn't give curb cuts, right, that easily. It's very rare that they give a curb cut. The likelihood of getting -- they could even provide the parking if they wanted to, right? I'm going to be voting in favor of the application. However, I'm glad we had an opportunity to hear from everyone. I'm going to ask Mr. Smith if he has anything he would like to add.

MR. SMITH: I agree with what you stated, Chairman Hill. To the ANC representative, what we are tasked with here is looking at Subtitle C 703.1 and whether it's appropriate to grant this parking reduction. There are 10 or 12 different criteria that we can use to evaluate whether to grant a full or partial reduction in the number of required parking spaces.

Again, this property is only required to have one parking space so in theory it would be a full reduction. You know, many of them are fairly -- it's not a high bar for many of them to -- for us to grant this approval. For the ones that the Office of Planning particularly state are (A) due to the physical constraints of the property.

This is a fairly small lot and DDOT may be less inclined to grant a curb cut along this street and that would further reduce parking -- on-street parking on the street. It may create an additional problem that you're attempting to mitigate by pushing for them to have on-property parking, as opposed to on-street parking. The other residents along the block would lose a parking space if another curb cut is created.

The other point raised by the Office of Planning is that the property is well served by mass transit share vehicle, bicycle facilities. I understand your statement that this is far away from Metro but the standard isn't

necessarily Metro. It's if it's served by mass transit which this site is fairly well served by mass transit.

The other standard was (H), the property does not have access to an open public alley. This is getting to what Chairman Hill has stated that we commonly see issues like this on properties that do not have public allies. Again, DDOT does not support the creation of curb cuts along principal roads as opposed to accessing parking through a public alley.

They meet these three standards. Based on that, we can support the special exception to reduce the parking from that one parking space down to zero. Other than that, I do believe that they meet all the standards for us to be able to grant these series of special exceptions and I will support their application.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Thanks, Mr. Smith.

Mr. Blake.

MEMBER BLAKE: Mr. Chairman, I too would be in support of the application for all three areas of relief. They have obviously met the criteria for a U421. The parking space issue is one that I totally understand. I think that issue is complicated by a lot of other factors but based on the facts of the case, in this particular case, the Applicant has met the criteria and should be granted relief. I'll be voting in favor.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you.

Chairman Hood?

Want to support two out of three of the relief requested. I would ask that you do the motion in parts so I can vote against the 703 part, which is the parking because, as I see it, it's a domino effect. We're going to do it, we're going to have this discussion here today. Probably had it previously. We're going to have it again next week. We're going to have it the week after. At some point in time we have to stop pushing back to some degree and thinking outside the box.

Yes, Mr. Sullivan, I heard what you said. I know for a fact churches do not meet their quota. I helped a major church in this city about two years, and I'm not going to name the church, to be able to help them with their parking. I know it's not all the time, and especially in Ward 1. I know it's done there. Exactly what we talked about here is done there.

Again, I guess that's the difference in the Commission and also what the Board does. I think sometimes we have to also look at adverse impacts. What we have to look at is not creating them. I believe if we continue to move down the lines that we're discussing today, we're going to create them.

The other thing is I would ask Mr. Trantham to work with Mr. Mordfin and see if there is something that maybe we need to revisit in this particular area. I'm going to leave that up to Commissioner Trantham and also to the Office of Planning member Mr. Mordfin. Let's see if it needs to come back to the Zoning Commission and we need to revisit that. We revisit parking all the time so let's look at that. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would ask that you do the motion in part. Thank you.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Vice Chair John?

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: So I didn't know this case would create so much discussion about the parking because it's such a straightforward request. Basically there is no alley entrance so there can't be any parking from the back so it would have to be from the front and DDOT won't allow a curb cut. If you lower curb cuts, you lose parking from the street.

To me it's fairly straightforward based on what the regulations say. I think these regulations for parking relief are not very stringent because I believe the city has some policy of trying to limit the amount of people who drive cars so this is why there is, I think, generous relief from the parking requirements in my view. But I will leave that to Chairman Hood in his wisdom, as well as the Commission to look at these parking regulations again.

I think the Applicant showed on Exhibit 30, Slide 15, I believe, why in this case even if there could be a curb cut, then the Applicant could not achieve -- could not build their apartments because the lot would be so narrow. This particular project, you know, has some challenges but I appreciate the amount of two and three-bedroom units in the IZ unit. For those reasons I'm in support.

I absolutely hear what the ANC Commissioner stated about parking. I can't disagree with -- I can't disagree with the comments about the impacts of having very limited parking in your neighborhood because I live with it. At the same time, I also understand that some churches do not want to allow this relationship with the community for parking because of the security problems.

I believe that is something that could be worked around if people wanted to engage in it, but those are private agreements that have nothing to do with our regulations. To me it's a shame to see churches with these huge parking lots with, you know, big ropes and gates locking in all that great parking. That's just my soapbox about churches and parking and it's not for me to decide, or for this Board to decide. In short, I support the agreement.

Chairman Hood, I hear you.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Thanks. I guess it's funny because, you know, it brings in other issues like

1	security and what's going to happen and who's going to be
2	responsible for anything damaged. It opens a whole bunch of
3	issues, right? Okay. All right.
4	I'm going to make a motion to approve Application
5	No. 20668 which is self-certified application for special
6	exception pursuant to Subtitle X 901.2 from one. The new
7	residential development requirements under Subtitle U 421.1,
8	eight units proposed.
9	And, two, the floor area ratio requirements of
LO	Subtitle F 302.1 pursuant to Subtitle F 302.2, and Subtitle
l1	F 5206.1 from 0.9 to 1.08 with IZ permitted, 1.08 with IZ
12	proposed in terms of the FAR requirements. I would ask for
L3	a second.
L4	Ms. John.
15	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Second.
16	BZA CHAIR HILL: The motion made and seconded.
L7	Mr. Moy, if you could take a roll call, please.
18	ZC CHAIR HOOD: I have a discussion, Mr. Chairman.
L9	You did leave out I didn't hear you mention
20	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yeah, I split the parking.
21	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Okay.
22	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yeah, this is just for the two
23	other relief items.
24	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Thank you.
25	MR. MOY: your name if you would please respond

with yes, no, or abstain to the motion made by Chairman Hill 1 to approve the application for the two special exception relief as the Chairman has cited, which is Subtitle U, 3 Section 401, and the FAR requirements of Subtitle F, Section 4 This motion was seconded by Vice Chair John. 6 Mr. Smith. 7 MEMBER SMITH: Yes. 8 MR. MOY: Mr. Blake. 9 MEMBER BLAKE: Yes. Vice Chair John. 10 MR. MOY: VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: 11 Yes. 12 MR. MOY: Chairman Hill. 13 BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes. Zoning Commission Chair Anthony Hood. 14 MR. MOY: 15 Staff would record the vote as five to zero to This is on the motion made by Chairman Hill on the two 16 17 areas of relief that was cited in his motion. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair John. Also in support of this motion 18 19 Zoning Commission Chair Anthony Hood, Mr. Smith, Mr. Blake, 20 Vice Chair John, and Chairman Hill. This motion carries on a vote of five to zero to zero. 21 22 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. The next 23 motion I'm going to make is, again, for Application No. 24 That is to approve under self-certified application 25 for special exception pursuant to Subtitle X 901.2 from the

1	minimum vehicle parking requirements of Subtitle C 701.5,
2	pursuant to Subtitle C 703.2 for one space required, zero
3	proposed, and ask for a second.
4	Ms. John.
5	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Second.
6	BZA CHAIR HILL: Motion made and seconded.
7	Mr. Moy, take a roll call.
8	MR. MOY: When I call your names if you would
9	please respond with a yes, no, or abstain to the motion made
10	by Chairman Hill to was this a motion in the affirmative,
11	Mr. Chairman?
12	BZA CHAIR HILL: It's to approve the parking which
13	we're going to get a no on.
14	MR. MOY: Okay. All right. I got you. I just
15	wanted that for clarity.
16	This is on the motion made by Chairman Hill to
17	approve the special exception relief under Subtitle C,
18	Section 701.5. This motion was seconded by Vice Chair John.
19	Mr. Smith.
20	Mr. Blake.
21	MEMBER BLAKE: Yes.
22	MR. MOY: Vice Chair John.
23	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Yes.
24	MR. MOY: Chairman Hill.
25	Zoning Commission Chair Anthony Hood.

1	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Not in favor. You didn't get a
2	no, Mr. Chairman. You got a not in favor.
3	(Laughter.)
4	MR. MOY: All right. I need your assistance here,
5	Mr. Chairman. Staff would record the vote as four to zero
6	to one, or is this four to one to zero?
7	BZA CHAIR HILL: Four to zero to one. Chairman
8	Hood is using a more polite way of saying no.
9	MR. MOY: All right.
10	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Why is it four to zero to one?
11	It should be why is it four
12	BZA CHAIR HILL: I'm sorry. Four to one to zero.
13	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Yeah. Come on.
14	BZA CHAIR HILL: I always forget which the zero
15	is, whether it's abstaining or whatever, or not there. You
16	said no. You got four to one.
17	MR. MOY: That's what I thought. That's why I
18	checked. Staff would record the vote as four to one to zero
19	and this is on the motion made by Chairman Hill. The motion
20	was seconded by Vice Chair John. Also in support of this
21	motion to approve the special exception relief is Mr. Smith,
22	Mr. Blake, Vice Chair John, Chairman Hill. Opposed to the
23	motion is Zoning Commission Chair Anthony Hood. Again, the
24	motion carries on a vote of four to one to zero.
25	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Thanks, Mr. Moy.

1	Okay. We've got seven more still so I would say
2	we at least do one more. What I propose is that if you need
3	a snack, just hit the camera off button and snack away
4	because I'm trying to get out of here by 5:00. Okay? So,
5	you know, let's try to, you know, work together. Okay?
6	Mr. Moy, you want to go next with the next case?
7	MR. MOY: Yes, sir. The next case before the
8	Board is Application No. 20670 of Katherine Steel. This is
9	a self-certified application for special exceptions from the
LO	lot occupancy requirements, Subtitle E, Section 304.1,
ll	pursuant to Subtitle E, Section 5201, and Subtitle X, Section
L2	901.2.
13	And from the rear yard requirement, Subtitle E,
L4	Section 306.1 pursuant to Subtitle E, Section 5201 and
15	Subtitle X, Section 901.2. This would construct a third story
16	and rear addition to an existing, attached, two-story
L7	principal dwelling unit in the RF-1 zone. The property is
18	located at 344 14th Street SE (Square 1061, Lot 71). That's
L9	all I have, Mr. Chairman.
20	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great.
21	Mr. Ward, are you there? Or Ms. Ward? I don't
22	know.
23	MR. WARD: I'm the architect at 601 E Street, NE.
24	I'm going to pass it over to the owner, Kate Steel, to
25	present. Before I do that, we did not prepare a slide show

so hopefully you can refer to the case file --1 2 BZA CHAIR HILL: That's okay. That's okay, Mr. 3 Ward. I got you. 4 MR. WARD: Okay. BZA CHAIR HILL: 5 Ms. Steel, can you hear me? б Yes, I can. Can you hear me? MS. STEEL: 7 BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes. Just tell us about your 8 project a little bit. I think the record is pretty full and 9 we reviewed the record. Can you just tell us about your project? 10 For the record, I'm Katherine 11 MS. STEEL: Sure. 12 Steel. I'm the owner at 344 14th Street, SE. As noted, I'm seeking relief on lot coverage moving up from 60 percent 13 14 allowed to 69.5 percent, and seeking a setback exception from the required 20 feet to 18 feet and three inches. 15 That's to build a small addition on the back and then a third story. 16 17 It's keeping in line with existing properties. The adjacent property actually goes back quite a bit further 18 19 on the first floor. This will go slightly further back on 20 the second floor. There is an existing third floor addition on the house two doors down so there should be no impact on 21 22 lighting or use of backyards. 23 As well, I'm planning to keep the existing cornice 24 on the house and set back the addition from the front of the 25 house so it's not as massive, and keep the cornice on the

1	side of the property as well by insetting the third-floor
2	addition.
3	That's about it. I am happy to answer questions
4	but you did say the record is there.
5	BZA CHAIR HILL: I got you. Ms. Steel, are you
6	an attorney?
7	MS. STEEL: No, sir.
8	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right.
9	Ms. Myers, could you give us your report, please?
10	MS. MYERS: Crystal Myers for the Office of
11	Planning. We are recommending approval of this case. We can
12	stand on the record of the staff report but, of course, if
13	you want me to go further into it, I can.
14	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Ms. Myers, do you know
15	what happened what is that thing two houses down? Is that
16	something we approved or you don't know?
17	MS. MYERS: I don't know. Do you mean the
18	addition to the neighboring house?
19	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
20	MS. MYERS: I don't know. I don't know the
21	history on it, though, but it is an existing addition.
22	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yeah. Ms. Steel, do you know
23	when that was built?
24	MS. STEEL: I don't know but every house on that
25	block except for one has bumped back.

1 BZA CHAIR HILL: Right. Okay. I was just curious whether that was when I was around. 3 The addition I'm planning will MS. STEEL: No. That one shows a peaked roof which 4 be lower than that one. I think takes it over the -б BZA CHAIR HILL: I understand. I was just curious 7 as to whether that addition was done while I was on this Board so you would have that answer. 8 9 All right. Mr. Young, do we have anybody here wishing to speak? 10 We do not. 11 MR. YOUNG: BZA CHAIR HILL: Does the Board have any questions 12 of the Applicant? 13 14 All right, Ms. Steel. I'm going to let you go. 15 I've got to close the hearing and the record. Thank you, Ms. Steel. 16 17 Thank you very much. MS. STEEL: BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. I thought this was pretty 18 19 straightforward. I didn't really have any issues with it. 20 I believe they are meeting the criteria for us to grant the I would also rely on the report that was 21 relief requested. 22 submitted by the Office of Planning and their analysis, as 23 well as the ANC being in support, as well as DDOT, as well as the adjacent property owners so I'm going to be voting in 25 favor.

1	Mr. Smith, do you have anything to add?
2	MEMBER SMITH: Completely agree with your analysis
3	and I will support the application
4	BZA CHAIR HILL: Sorry about that, Mr. Smith.
5	Mr. Blake, do you have anything to add?
6	MEMBER BLAKE: Yeah, I would agree with your
7	assessment. I'm prepared to support. I would also add the
8	letter of support from the Capitol Hill Restoration.
9	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you.
10	Chairman Hood?
11	ZC CHAIR HOOD: I've heard and also moving forward
12	with this case. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
13	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you.
14	Vice Chair John.
15	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you. I'm in support
16	of the application and I agree with everything that's been
17	said so far.
18	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. I'm going to make a
19	motion to approve Application No. 20670 as captioned and read
20	by the Secretary and ask for a second.
21	Ms. John.
22	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Second.
23	BZA CHAIR HILL: Motion made and seconded.
24	Mr. Moy, could you take a roll call.
25	MR. MOY: If you would please respond with yes,

1	no, or abstain to the motion made by Chairman Hill to approve
2	the application for the relief that's been requested. The
3	motion is approve was seconded by Vice Chair John.
4	Zoning Commission Chair Anthony Hood.
5	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Yes.
6	MR. MOY: Mr. Smith.
7	Mr. Blake.
8	MEMBER BLAKE: Yes.
9	MR. MOY: Vice Chair John.
10	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Yes.
11	MR. MOY: Chairman Hill.
12	Staff would record the vote as five to zero to
13	zero. This is on the motion made by Chairman Hill to
14	approve. It was seconded by Vice Chair John to approve.
15	Also in support of the motion to approve Zoning Commission
16	Chair Anthony Hood, Mr. Smith, Mr. Blake, Vice Chair John,
17	Chairman Hill. Motion carries five to zero to zero.
18	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. I think the next case
19	should be kind of quick. Can we do one more and then take
20	lunch? Okay. I see nobody throwing up their hands yet.
21	Mr. Moy, can you go ahead and give us our next
22	case when you get a chance?
23	MR. MOY: Before the Board is Case Application No.
24	20671 of Jeremy Kern and Rebecca Fitch. This is a request
25	for a special exception relief from the lot occupancy

requirements of Subtitle D, Section 304.1, pursuant 1 2 Subtitle D, Section 5201 and Subtitle X, Section 901.2. And from the rear yard requirements of Subtitle 3 D, Section 306.2, pursuant to Subtitle D, Section 5201 and 4 Subtitle X, Section 901.2. this would construct a rear deck an existing semi-detached, two-story with addition to 7 basement, principal dwelling unit in the R-3 zone. located at 2309 38th Street, NW (Square 1301, Lot 671). 8 9 BZA CHAIR HILL: Ms. Luthra, are you there? Hi, good afternoon, everyone. 10 MS. LUTHRA: Yes. 11 BZA CHAIR HILL: Hi. Introduce yourself for the 12 record, please. 13 MS. LUTHRA: Yes. I'm Avneet Luthra representing 14 the case on behalf of Jeremy and Rebecca Fitch -- Jeremy Kern 15 and Rebecca Fitch. We are requesting to build a 13 feet by 10 feet deck off rear with stairs up the main level. 16 Sorry, 17 I forgot to mention that we don't have a presentation but the drawings and pictures and all the supporting documents should 18 19 be in the report. 20 That's okay, Ms. Luthra. BZA CHAIR HILL: 21 don't have to have a presentation. I mean, the ones that 22 come before us regularly can but it's okay. have We 23 everything that's in the record to look at so please go ahead 24 and continue.

All right.

MS.

LUTHRA:

25

So the proposed

1	occupancy will be 64.8 percent and the rear yard setback will
2	be 15 feet, six inches. We are demoing the existing steps
3	and the landing and basically redoing the same thing with a
4	deck which is 13 by 10. We also have a letter of support
5	from the ANC, the adjacent neighbor, and the neighbors on the
6	Benton Street as well.
7	We have allies at the back which is the north and
8	west side so the privacy of the deck and for other neighbors
9	will not be an issue. Additionally, most of the houses on
10	38th Street, Benton Street, and Huidekoper Street have rear
11	decks with similar dimensions and architectural scale and
12	style as well. We are not concerned about changing the alley
13	or anything on that street.
14	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, Ms. Luthra. I've got to
15	interrupt you one second.
16	May I turn to the Office of Planning, please?
17	MS. MYERS: Crystal Myers for the Office of
18	Planning. We are in support of this case and can stand on
19	the record of the staff report.
20	BZA CHAIR HILL: Great. Thank you.
21	Does the Board have any questions for the Office
22	of Planning or the Applicant?
23	Mr. Young, is there anyone here who wishes to
24	speak?
25	MR. YOUNG: We do not.

1	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. I'm going to
2	go ahead and close the hearing and the record. Mr. Young,
3	if you could please excuse everyone.
4	Ms. Luthra hold on, Mr. Young. Ms. Luthra, can
5	you hear me?
6	MS. LUTHRA: Yes.
7	BZA CHAIR HILL: I'm technically still opening the
8	record here and the hearing for one second. When you went
9	through the ANC, this is the project that you presented to
10	them. Correct?
11	MS. LUTHRA: Yes.
12	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Exactly the way it is now.
13	Correct?
14	MS. LUTHRA: Exactly the way it is.
15	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Great.
16	All right. I'm going to close the hearing and the
17	record. If you could please excuse everyone. Thank you, Mr.
18	Young.
19	Okay. I didn't really, again, have much issue
20	with this. I thought it was pretty straightforward. I think
21	it's a pretty simple application. I am happy that the Office
22	of Planning and I would agree with the support that the
23	Office of Planning has provided in their analysis. Also for
24	the ANC I was asking the question as to whether or not this
25	levactly was the project that was presented before the ANC

1	because the ANC does not reference the lot occupancy
2	requirements.
3	I assume they would have because this is what they
4	had seen so I am comfortable with moving forward concerning
5	the ANC's ability to comment about this project. DDOT has
6	also provided their input and they are comfortable with it,
7	as well as the adjacent property owners. I'm going to be
8	voting in support.
9	Mr. Smith, do you have anything to add?
10	MEMBER SMITH: No, I agree with your analysis,
11	Chairman Hill.
12	BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Blake.
13	MEMBER BLAKE: I'm voting in favor of the
14	application and agree with your analysis as well.
15	BZA CHAIR HILL: Chairman Hood.
16	ZC CHAIR HOOD: I also would agree.
17	BZA CHAIR HILL: Vice Chair John.
18	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you. I have nothing
19	else to add. I think the application meets the requirements
20	for relief.
21	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. Thank you all. I'm
22	going to make a motion to approve Application No. 20671 as
23	captioned and read by the secretary and ask for a second.
24	Ms. John.
25	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Second.

1	BZA CHAIR HILL: Motion made and seconded.
2	Mr. Moy, if you could take a roll call.
3	MR. MOY: Would you please respond with a yes, no,
4	or abstain to the motion made by Chairman Hill to approve the
5	application for the special exception relief requested. The
6	motion to grant was seconded by Vice Chair John.
7	Zoning Commission Chair Anthony Hood.
8	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Yes.
9	MR. MOY: Mr. Smith.
10	Mr. Blake.
11	Vice Chair John.
12	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Yes.
13	MR. MOY: Chairman Hill.
14	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes.
15	MR. MOY: Staff would record the vote as five to
16	zero to zero and this is on the motion made by Chairman Hill
17	to approve. The motion to approve was seconded by Vice Chair
18	John. Also in support of the motion to approve Zoning
19	Commission Chair Anthony Hood, Mr. Smith, Mr. Blake, Vice
20	Chair John, and Chairman Hill. Motion carries on a vote of
21	five to zero to zero.
22	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Thanks, you guys. We have
23	five more cases left. It's 12:50. You want to say 1:20 and
24	see what happens? Okay.
25	Chairman Hood, I know you know this is your

favorite part. We are going to try 1:20. Okay?

ZC CHAIR HOOD: 1:20 or 1:30. Now I know it's

3 | 1:20.

1

2

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

BZA CHAIR HILL: I usually say around 1:20. All right. Thank you all. Have a nice lunch.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 12:50 p.m. and resumed at 1:31 p.m.)

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right, Mr. Moy. You can call our next one when you get a chance.

MR. MOY: The Board has returned to its public hearing session after a lunch recess. And the time is at our about 1:31 p.m. The next case before the Board is Application No. 20672 of Sarah Audelo.

And this is a self-certified application for from the following: special exception relief from accessory building area requirements of Subtitle D, Section 5003.1, pursuant to Subtitle D, Section 5201 and Subtitle X, Section 901.2, the accessory apartment requirements Subtitle U, Section 253.8(e), pursuant to Subtitle U, Section 253.3, Subtitle U, Section 253.8(f) and Subtitle X, Section This would construct a new, detached, two-story accessory apartment with roof deck in the rear yard of an existing detached, two-story with basement, principal dwelling unit in the R-1-B zone. Property is located at 2210 30th Street, Southeast, Square 5652, Lot 830.

1 BZA CHAIR HILL: All right. Thanks, Mr. Moy. Is it Ms. Schinder? 2 3 Ileana Schinder, yes. MS. SCHINDER: 4 BZA CHAIR HILL: Ms. Schinder, could you introduce 5 yourself for the record, please? б MS. SCHINDER: I am Ileana Schinder. I am the 7 architect for the homeowner, the Audelo family. 8 BZA CHAIR HILL: Ms. Schinder, could you Okay. 9 tell us -- kind of just tell us about your project and why you believe that your client is meeting the criteria for us 10 11 to grant the relief requested? And you can begin whenever 12 you like. Yes, I'll be brief. 13 MS. SCHINDER: This is an 14 additional dwelling unit located in an oversized lot, in the 15 rear of an oversized lot. This project exceeds the zoning requirement of a limit of 450 square feet. 16 17 Our client is bringing their parents to live in the property, and they requested a design that exceeds the 18 19 square footage. We're still respecting all setbacks, parking 20 requirements, height, and all the other massing requirements. We believe that the project will not interfere with -- will 21 22 not negatively impact the life of the neighbors. And so I 23 think that this is a project that respects the spirit of the 24 zoning requirements.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay.

25

I'm going to turn to the

Office of Planning. 1 2 MR. JESICK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the Board. My name is Matt Jesick providing testimony for 3 the Office of Planning in this case. And the Office of 4 Planning is happy to rest on the record in support of the application. But I can take any questions. 6 7 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great. Does anybody have 8 any questions for the Office of Planning? Vice Chair John? 9 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you. Yes, I had a question about the deck/balcony. Did you have any comments 10 on that? 11 12 MS. SCHINDER: Me, as the architect? 13 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: I'm sorry. The Office of 14 Planning. 15 MR. JESICK: Well, pursuant to Section 253.8(e), a deck is not normally permitted. And the Zoning Commission 16 17 -- excuse me, the Zoning Administrator has determined that this would qualify as a rooftop deck. However, the Board can 18 19 waive that requirement. 20 is 253.10. And that pursuant The only to 21 conditions there are that the owner must reside on the 22 property -- and that is the intention here -- and that the 23 modification should not change the residential character of the neighborhood. And we found that this small change would 24

have a negative impact on the residential

alter

or

1	character of this property or surrounding properties.
2	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: So what did you consider
3	specifically with regard to the deck? Did you see impacts
4	in privacy or anything else that might impact light, air, or
5	privacy just with the deck itself?
6	MR. JESICK: No. Certainly in terms of light and
7	air, we didn't feel that adding a deck would have an impact
8	there. One could argue that a deck might change the privacy
9	characteristics of this property or adjacent properties.
10	However, this property is surrounded on two sides by alleys
11	which provides extra distance between it and the properties
L2	to the north and east. And then to the south, any visibility
13	would be primarily of the neighbor's garage and driveway.
L4	So we felt that there would be little to no impact to privacy
15	of adjacent properties.
16	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay. Thank you.
L7	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Anyone else for the
18	applicant or the Office of Planning? Mr. Young, is there
L9	anyone here wishing to speak?
20	MR. YOUNG: The ANC Commissioner, Ms. Brown.
21	BZA CHAIR HILL: Oh, hi, Ms. Brown. Can you hear
22	me? Commissioner, can you hear me?
23	MS. BROWN: Yes, I can hear you. I was able to
24	unmute.
25	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay great Commissioner Brown

1	do you want to give us your testimony?
2	MS. BROWN: I just wanted to say that the
3	Commission is in support of this project. We submitted
4	I guess it's the ANC 129 or 130, whichever form it is. And
5	I have it's also in my single-member district.
6	I've had two meetings with the community. And
7	it's fine. No one has any real issues with the building of
8	this, especially given what the exception is for.
9	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, Commissioner. Thanks, and
10	I appreciate you taking the time out of your day to come
11	speak with us because it is really helpful to always have
12	somebody from the community speak to this. And it's kind of
13	a big sized project. And so it's good that and it looks
14	like a good project, particularly for people's parents.
15	MS. BROWN: Yeah.
16	BZA CHAIR HILL: And so those of us that still
17	like our parents. But I'm glad to have you here to testify.
18	Thank you. Does anybody have any questions for the
19	Commissioner?
20	All right. Okay. And Mr. Young, you said there's
21	no one else, correct? Okay. Ms. Schinder, do you have
22	anything to add at the end?
23	MS. SCHINDER: No, no. Thank you for the
24	reviewers at Office of Planning.
25	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great. I'm going to ahead

and close the hearing on the record. Okay. This is, again, a new two-story accessory building for an accessory apartment with roof deck in the rear yard of an existing two-story detached principal dwelling. Parking pad will be found at the rear alley with the main house and the accessory apartment.

I think it's a good project. I think it's a well-designed project. I'm glad that the Office of Planning is in -- well, I shouldn't say I'm glad again. I would agree with the analysis that the Office of Planning has provided.

I am glad that the ANC is in support and that DDOT is also in support. I do think that they meet the criteria for us to grant the relief requested. And I appreciate the questions that Vice Chair John asked about concerning the roof deck. So with that being said, I will vote to approve and in agreement with the other reports and be voting to approve. Mr. Smith?

MEMBER SMITH: -- your analysis, Chairman Hill, as well as OP's analysis. So I agree with OP's analysis that they have met the burden of proof to grant special exceptions and they would be able to accessory apartment with the rooftop deck. I appreciate that the ANC did come down -- a representative for the ANC did come down and spoke on the position of the ANC that they are in support of this request. I would be voting in support.

1 BZA CHAIR HILL: Great. Thank you. Mr. Blake? 2 MEMBER BLAKE: Yes. I too will be voting in favor 3 of the requested relief. This is a very large lot and nearly 12,000 square feet and with the current lot occupancy of only 4 around 10 percent. So even though it's a larger size ADU, it won't overpower the lot. 7 The lot occupancy increases from 10 percent to 8 about 16 percent. And because there's separation between the 9 neighbor's, the primary dwelling, and ADU and because of this objectionable 10 design, it won't become to neighboring properties because of noise, traffic, parking, or any other 11 12 objectionable conditions. So as I said, I believe it meets the conditions for 5201 and also the general standards, and 13 14 I would be prepared to support the request for the relief. 15 Chairman Hood? BZA CHAIR HILL: Great. ZC CHAIR HOOD: This application warrants at least 16 17 I'm voting in support. my approval. Thanks. I approve. 18 BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you, Chairman Hood. 19 Chair John? 20 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you, Chairman. I'm in support of the application as well and note that the lot 21 22 occupancy even with the accessory building and ADU would still be only 16.4 percent on a very large lot that's more 23 24 than twice the average size. So I am in support of the

application and would vote to approve.

1	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you, Ms. John. All right.
2	I'm going to make a motion to approve Application No. 20672
3	as captioned and read by the Secretary and ask for a second.
4	Ms. John?
5	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Second.
6	BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Moy, the motion was made and
7	second. If you'll take a roll call.
8	MR. MOY: name if you would please respond with
9	a yes, no, or abstain to the motion made by Chairman Hill to
10	approve the application for the relief requested. The motion
11	to approve was second by Vice Chair John. Zoning
12	Commissioner Chair Anthony Hood?
13	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Approve, yes.
14	MR. MOY: Mr. Smith?
15	Mr. Blake?
16	MEMBER BLAKE: Yes.
17	MR. MOY: Vice Chair John?
18	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Yes.
19	MR. MOY: Chairman Hill?
20	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes.
21	MR. MOY: Staff would record the vote as 5 to 0
22	to 0. And this is on the Chairman's motion to approve. The
23	motion to approve was second by Vice Chair John. Also in
24	support of the motion to approve, Zoning Commission Chair
25	Anthony Hood, Mr. Smith, Mr. Blake, and of course Vice Chair

1	John and Chairman Hill. Motion carries on a vote of 5 to 0
2	to 0.
3	BZA CHAIR HILL: All right. Thank you, Mr. Moy.
4	Mr. Moy, what's our next case?
5	MR. MOY: 20673.
6	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. If you could
7	call that, please, when you get a chance.
8	MR. MOY: Before the Board is Application No.
9	20673 of Karl Driessen, D-R-I-E-S-S-E-N. And this is a
10	request for a special exception relief from the accessory
11	building area requirements, Subtitle D, Section 5003.1,
12	pursuant to Subtitle D, Section 5201 and Subtitle X, Section
13	901.2, and also from the accessory apartment requirements,
14	Subtitle U, Section 253.8(e), pursuant to Subtitle U, Section
15	253.3, Subtitle U, Section 253.8(f), and Subtitle X, Section
16	901.2. This would construct a new detached two-story
17	accessory apartment in the rear of an existing detached two-
18	story with basement principal dwelling unit in the R-8 zone.
19	Property located at 2840 Brandywine Street, Northwest, Square
20	2255, Lot 1.
21	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great. Thanks, Mr. Moy.
22	Ms. Schinder, can you hear me?
23	MS. SCHINDER: Yes, I can hear you.
24	BZA CHAIR HILL: Could you introduce yourself for
25	the record, please?

1 MS. SCHINDER: I am Ileana Schinder. I'm the 2 architect for the homeowner and applicant. 3 BZA CHAIR HILL: When I reviewed this, I didn't realize the connection and now I'm confused a little bit. 4 5 Is it the same design? б MS. SCHINDER: No, it's not the same design. It's 7 very, very different, in fact. 8 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right, Ms. Schinder. 9 Why don't you go ahead and walk us through your application why you believe your client is meeting the criteria for grant 10 relief requested and begin whenever you'd like. 11 12 MS. SCHINDER: Yes. This property is an oversized lot in northwest D.C. The applicant has -- the homeowner has 13 requested that we design a two-bedroom additional dwelling 14 unit that exceeds the requirement limit of 450 square feet 15 per level. So we designed a building that accommodates the 16 17 homeowner's needs. The owner is expected to occupy the building as 18 19 well. And again, this lot is oversized for the city. 20 understand that the oversized building does not affect 21 privacy or safety or space usage and the neighbors. 22 We do have plenty of parking. We are away from 23 neighboring properties. And we do have access from the rear and the front for this property. And I'm open to questions. 24

All right.

BZA CHAIR HILL:

25

I'm going to first

1	turn to the Office of Planning and then we'll come back for
2	questions of the Board. Do I see the Office of Planning?
3	MR. JESICK: Thank you again, Mr. Chair. For the
4	record, my name is Matt Jesick. And the Office of Planning
5	is happy to rest on the record in support of this
6	application.
7	I will just note that for the proposed second
8	floor balcony or deck, that deck faces to the south. And
9	this lot and all of the adjacent lots have very deep rear
10	yards in that direction. So any proposed or any possible
11	views from that deck would be mostly of the rear yards or the
12	rear alley.
13	And furthermore, the lots in this area at the rear
14	by the alley tend to have a lot of landscaping which helps
15	to shield any views onto adjacent properties. So again, OP
16	recommends approval. But I'd be happy to take any questions.
17	Thank you.
18	BZA CHAIR HILL: So OP is fine with FEMS and DC
19	Water and everybody being notified?
20	(Simultaneous speaking.)
21	MR. JESICK: OP reached out to FEMS and DC Water
22	and have not heard back.
23	BZA CHAIR HILL: Ms. Schinder, you're about to say
24	something?
25	MS. SCHINDER: Within the DCRA process, Department

1	of Environment has approved it and DC Water as well has
2	approved it.
3	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. Does anybody
4	have any questions of Office of Planning? Yeah, sure. Mr.
5	Blake?
6	MEMBER BLAKE: Yeah. Mr. Jesick, did you have an
7	issue with the east side setback east side yard setback?
8	MR. JESICK: Yes, thank you. The original plans
9	showed a side yard less than what was required which is eight
10	feet. The applicant has submitted revised plans which show
11	a compliant side yard. So we're fine with that now.
12	MEMBER BLAKE: Thank you.
13	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. Mr. Young, is
14	there anyone here wishing to speak?
15	MR. YOUNG: We do not.
16	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Does the Board have any
17	final questions. Ms. Schinder, do you have anything you'd
18	like to add at the end?
19	MS. SCHINDER: Thank OP for their support.
20	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. I'm going to
21	go ahead and close the record in the hearing and excuse
22	everyone, Mr. Young. Okay. I was confused for a second
23	there. I didn't realize the architect was the same
24	architect, and I got confused with the same request.
25	But I'm comfortable with what's being before us.

I'm comfortable with what is before us and that they are meeting the standard with which we can grant the relief requested. I would also agree with the analysis that was provided by the Office of Planning and the ANC. And I am comfortable given the size of the lot as well as the analysis the Office of Planning has pried again about that deck, voting to approve. Mr. Smith, do you have anything you'd like to add?

MEMBER SMITH: No, I don't have anything to add. I agree with your analysis and comfortable with the size of the accessory building, given the size of the lot and the landscaping to the rear of the lot. So I think this size, it wouldn't have a major impact on adjacent property owners. So I do believe that it makes sense for us to approve it. I will support the application.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. Mr. Blake?

MEMBER BLAKE: I'll be voting in support of the application. I agree that it is a very large lot and lot occupancy only increases to about 16.7 percent with the ADU which is still well below the 30 percent required. And all those issues well, as it was in the other case, mitigate a lot of the issues with regard to noise, light, air, et cetera. So I am in favor of the application.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. Chairman Hood?

ZC CHAIR HOOD: I will be supporting this

1	application.
2	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. Vice Chair John?
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: I have nothing to add.
4	I'm in support of the application, and I agree with all of
5	the comments so far.
6	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Thank you. Going to make
7	a motion to approve Application No. 20673 as captioned and
8	read by the Secretary and ask for a second. Ms. John?
9	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Second.
10	BZA CHAIR HILL: Motion made and second. Mr. Moy,
11	if you could take a roll call.
12	MR. MOY: When I call your name, if you would
13	please respond with a yes, no, or abstain to the motion made
14	by Chairman Hill to approve this application for the relief
15	requested. The motion to approve was second by Vice Chair
16	John. Zoning Commission Chair Anthony Hood?
17	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Yes.
18	MR. MOY: Mr. Smith?
19	Mr. Blake?
20	MEMBER BLAKE: Yes.
21	MR. MOY: Vice Chair John?
22	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Yes.
23	MR. MOY: Chairman Hill?
24	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes.
25	MR. MOY: Staff would record the vote as 5 to 0

1	to 0. And this is on the motion made by Chairman Hill to
2	approve. The motion to approve was second by Vice Chair
3	John. Also in support of the motion to approve Zoning
4	Commission Chair Anthony Hood, Mr. Smith, Mr. Blake, Vice
5	Chair John, Chairman Hill. Motion carries on a vote of 5 to
6	0 to 0.
7	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you, Mr. Moy. When you
8	have an opportunity, Mr. Moy, you're welcome to call our next
9	case.
10	MR. MOY: Before the Board is Case Application No.
11	20675 of Krzysztof I know I'm not pronouncing it
12	correctly, K-R-Z-Y-S-Z-T-O-F Laski, L-A-S-K-I. This is
13	a self-certified application for special exception from the
14	lot occupancy requirements, Subtitle E, Section 304.1,
15	pursuant to Subtitle E, Section 5201 and Subtitle X, Section
16	901.2. This would construct a rear deck addition to an
17	attached three-story principal dwelling unit in the RF-1
18	zone. Property located at 1307 South Carolina Avenue,
19	Southeast, Square 1040, Lot 35.
20	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you, Mr. Moy. Is it Ms.
21	Themak?
22	MS. THEMAK: Yes, that's correct.
23	BZA CHAIR HILL: Could you introduce yourself for
24	the record, please?
25	MS THEMAK: Ves Tracy Themak with Donahue

Themak, and Miller. We're here for Krzysztof Laski.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Ms. Themak, if you could walk us through your client's application and why you believe we should grant the relief requested. And you can begin whenever you like.

MS. THEMAK: Great. I think this is fairly straightforward. Actually, Claire Money, Krzys' wife, has described this as -- it's a deck. They're proposing deck and landscaping in the rear yard which is the reason for the requested increase in the lot occupancy from currently about 60 percent to just under 70 percent, 69 percent, a little over 69 percent.

This is going to allow a 29 foot by 5 foot deck or platform outside of the rear doors of the property that they can use to access the backyard. And their parking space is actually located on the neighboring condo's property along the alley. So it allows them access from the back doors to get down to the backyard and out to their parking spot there.

The ANC planning and zoning committee heard this on March 1st and recommended approval to the entire ANC who voted to support on March 8th. The Capitol Hill Restoration Society also voted to support it. And you their letter. I believe it's dated April 9th.

We have some letters in support from the neighboring property owners. And we don't think that there's

б

a negative impact either of the immediately adjoining owners. And I believe we have OP's support. So we are here mainly to answer any specific questions you all may have. But again, we're asking for that increase in 10 percent lot occupancy to 70 percent to allow for the platform deck and the landscaping.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Thank you. I'm going to just turn to the Office of Planning real quick first and get questions from my Board. You're on mute, Ms. Roberts?

MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and members of the BZA. Maxine Brown-Roberts from the Office of Planning on Case No. 20675. The proposal is for the rear deck addition which would increase the lot occupancy to 70 percent.

The proposal meets the special exception requirements of Subtitle E, 5201 for an addition to building and that the lot occupancy would not exceed 70 percent. According to the applicant, the proposed deck would not extend beyond the walls of the adjacent properties and only be five feet wide which should not cast any shadows or unduly affect the light and air to adjacent properties. The privacy of adjacent properties would not be duly affected as the deck would have no views into private areas of the adjacent properties.

And the property to the rear is a parking lot for

1

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the adjacent apartment. The property does not abut an alley and would not be visible from the street. And the house would remain a conforming use with a 70 percent lot occupancy allowed by this section.

Regarding the general special exception, the proposed deck would not interfere with the existing light and air and the building would continue to be residential use and meets the requirements of Subtitle E, 5201. Again, the increasing lot occupancy would not tend to adversely affect the use of neighboring properties. The Office of Planning therefore recommends approval of the requested special exception. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I'm available for questions.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you, Ms. Brown-Roberts.

Does the Board have any questions for the Office of Planning?

Okay. Oh, sorry. Mr. Blake?

MEMBER BLAKE: Yeah, quick question. I want to get just some clarification on the dimensions of the proposed deck. I understand it's five feet wide. But I calculated somewhere between 130 to 140 square feet.

And I would just kind of get a sense of you had requested some additional information on dimensions. I wanted to get a sense of how that fared. And also with regard to the other elements, I understand this is a self-certified application. I just noticed that there was no

information with regard to rear yard, and I was curious to 1 understand how big it was relative to that given the lot 3 occupancy issue. 4 As I said in my report, the MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: 5 dimensional requirements were not provided by the applicant that were requested. So I can't answer that question. And 7 the applicant said that the width of the deck was five feet. So that was what we went by. 8 9 MEMBER BLAKE: Mr. Chair, I'd like to ask the applicant to just clarify the dimensions for me, if possible. 10 BZA CHAIR HILL: Sure, Mr. Blake. 11 12 MS. THEMAK: You're correct. And it's about 145 13 square feet that we're adding here. The proposed deck is 5 14 feet by 29 feet in length. There's an aerial that shows -that we did submit that shows the dimensions of the deck and 15 the distance from the rear property line. And I believe that 16 17 is Exhibit --What is the distance? 18 MEMBER BLAKE: 19 MS. THEMAK: I believe it's 20 feet from the fence 20 -- the existing fence. And then there's an additional -- to the mid-center of that property line, it's between 10 and 20 21 22 additional feet. I also have Krzys Laski here who is the 23 He might be able to speak to that distance. property owner. 24 BZA CHAIR HILL: I don't -- oh, yeah. 25 can you hear me?

1 Thank you for unmuting me. MR. LASKI: Okay. let me kind of give a little bit of context and I have some We have an existing set of stairs that come up to 3 pictures. So this is a three-story building my wife and I 4 our level. live on and my family live on the second and third floor. б So we have a staircase that leads up to a door 7 which is a five foot wide platform. The deck or the exterior corridor we're proposing would extend across the back of the 9 building to a connecting set of double doors. I have a picture for you if you'd allow me to share. 10 That's okay. Let me just see if 11 BZA CHAIR HILL: 12 Mr. Blake -- Mr. Blake, does that answer your question? 13 MEMBER BLAKE: It does to a large extent. 14 question I have is about the rear yard, and it's not part of 15 the relief. But I was trying to understand it with a 20 foot 16 property. 17 You said you didn't even use the area for parking. So I was just curious to understand was it shorter than that. 18 19 It seems like there's a fair amount of space back there. 20 just want to --There is. There is. 21 MR. LASKI: So it's not a 22 perfect square. So South Carolina Ave is a diagonal, and the 23 back of my house would face C Street. So that's kind of an And so at the short end, it's -- I think the way 24

to describe is as opposed to a perfect square, you have kind

1	of a trapezoid. And so the staircase, we have kind of a lot
2	of room, more than 20 feet, from the back of building to what
3	would be the back of the yard, if that makes sense to you.
4	MEMBER BLAKE: Thank you. And it's about nine and
5	a half feet off the ground as I understand. Is that right?
6	MR. LASKI: Yeah, it's a story, right? So
7	whatever the standard story is, we have eight-foot ceilings
8	plus gap between floors kind of thing.
9	MEMBER BLAKE: Okay. Thank you.
10	BZA CHAIR HILL: Anyone else? All right. Mr.
11	Young, is there anyone here wishing to speak?
L2	MR. YOUNG: We do not.
L3	BZA CHAIR HILL: All right. Ms. Themak, do you
L4	have anything you'd like to add at the end?
15	Okay. I'm going to go ahead and close the hearing
L6	and the record. I'm going to excuse everyone. Okay. Who
L7	would like to start? Anyone like to start?
18	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay. I'll start.
L9	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thanks.
20	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: This is a fairly
21	straightforward application. I didn't have any difficulty
22	with the size of the deck because of the width. It's just
23	five feet for the deck, five feet deep. And it's a self-
24	certified application.
	1

So if the rear yard does not meet the kind of

requirement, then the applicant would need to come back to 1 the Board for relief. And so I'm going to give great weight to the Office of Planning's report and the ANC report. 3 The ANC had no issues or concerns, neither did DDOT. 4 no objections. б And so there's a caveat with the OP report that 7 the Office of Planning was unable to provide a recommendation and needed additional dimensional requirements. But based 9 on today's testimony, I am satisfied with the OP report. And I would be in support of the application. 10 Thank you, Vice Chair John. 11 BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Smith? 12 MEMBER SMITH: -- provided by Vice Chair John to 13 14 this particular application. I do give great weight to OP 15 staff report. I will be in support of the application. 16 BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. Mr. Blake? 17 I too will be voting in favor of MEMBER BLAKE: the application. I believe the burden of proof was met. 18 19 deck itself is open and uncovered and enclosed. It's only 20 about nine and a half off the ground level. It won't extend beyond the rear of either of the 21 22 adjacent properties and windows at direct eye level off the 23 deck. So there are no issues with the privacy as well. it should not have an impact on the visual landscape of the

rear as well.

1	So I feel comfortable with this. I give great
2	weight to the Office of Planning report. DDOT has no
3	objections. The ANC 6B is in support with no issues or
4	concerns. And I would also indicate you have a letter of
5	support from Capitol Hill Restoration and also letters of
6	support from most of the neighbors including one of the
7	adjacent neighbors.
8	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. Chairman Hood?
9	ZC CHAIR HOOD: For the sake of not repeating, I
10	would ditto everything Board Member Blake mentioned. Thank
11	you.
12	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you, Chairman Hood. I have
13	nothing to add. I think it's a pretty straightforward and
14	small deck. I'm going to make a motion to approve
15	Application No. 20675 as captioned and read by the Secretary
16	and ask for a second. Ms. John?
17	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Second.
18	BZA CHAIR HILL: Motion made and second, Mr. Moy.
19	If you'll take a roll call.
20	MR. MOY: When I call your name, if you would
21	please respond with a yes, no, abstain to the motion made by
22	Chairman Hill to approve the application for the relief
23	that's requested. Motion was second by Vice Chair John.
24	Zoning Commission Chair Anthony Hood?
25	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Yes.

1	MR. MOY: Mr. Smith?
2	Mr. Blake?
3	MEMBER BLAKE: Yes.
4	MR. MOY: Vice Chair John?
5	Chairman Hill?
6	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes.
7	MR. MOY: Then staff would record the vote as 5
8	to 0 to 0. And this is on the motion of Chairman Hill to
9	approve. The motion to approve was second by Vice Chair
10	John. The motion to approve was also supported by Zoning
11	Commission Chair Anthony Hood, Mr. Smith, Mr. Blake, Vice
12	Chair John, and Chairman Hill, of course. Motion carries on
13	a vote of 5 to 0 to 0.
14	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you, Mr. Moy. Mr. Moy, you
15	can call our next one when you get a chance.
16	MR. MOY: The next case before the Board is
17	Application No. 20680 of DMV Realty Investments, LLC. This
18	is a self-certified application for special exception from
19	the rear addition requirements, Subtitle E, Section 205.4,
20	pursuant to Subtitle E, Section 205.5, Subtitle E, Section
21	5201, and Subtitle X, Section 901.2. This would construct
22	a third story with roof deck and rear addition and convert
23	to a three-unit apartment house, a semidetached three-story
24	wood cellar principal dwelling unit in the RF-4 zone.
25	Property located at 801 20th Street, Northeast,

1	Square 4495, Lot 20. The preliminary matter here, very
2	quickly, Mr. Chairman, is that there was a revised surveyor's
3	plat that was submitted late, probably within that 24-hour
4	block. So that's before the Board.
5	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Unless the Board has any
6	issues, I want to see the surveyor's plat. So Mr. Moy, if
7	you could drop that into the record, please, so we can take
8	a look. Let's see. Is it Mr. Teran?
9	MR. TERAN: Good afternoon, Mr. Teran.
10	BZA CHAIR HILL: Teran? Could you introduce
11	yourself for the record, please?
12	MR. TERAN: My name is Eric Teran. I'm the
13	architect and representing the owners of the property.
14	BZA CHAIR HILL: Are you with Eustilus
15	Architecture?
16	MR. TERAN: Yes.
17	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. Okay. So then
18	you're the representative, correct?
19	MR. TERAN: Correct.
20	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. Mr. Teran, if
21	you could go ahead and walk us through your client's
22	application and why you believe they should be granted the
23	relief requested in terms of the standard with which we're
24	supposed to look at the regulations. And I'm going to put
25	15 minutes on the clock there so I know where we are, and you

1	can begin whenever you like.
2	MR. TERAN: Okay. Thank you very much for giving
3	me the time to present the case. The plat that I did submit
4	this morning is to correspond to these plans. It's basically
5	the original plat was showing three parking spaces, but
6	BZA CHAIR HILL: Are you pulling this up, Mr.
7	Teran? Or is this Mr. Young?
8	MR. TERAN: I pulled it up. Should I take it off?
9	BZA CHAIR HILL: No, that's all right. Mr. Young,
10	they can do that?
11	MR. TERAN: There's a button that said share.
12	BZA CHAIR HILL: Hold on a second, Mr. Teran.
13	Give me a second.
14	MR. TERAN: Sure.
15	MR. YOUNG: aware that they could. I thought
16	that I had to give them permission to do that.
17	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. So
18	MR. TERAN: Should I unshare?
19	BZA CHAIR HILL: No, no. Give me a second. So
20	this is now just like when we are in a hearing. You're doing
21	something interesting, Mr. Teran. Just give me a second.
22	So Ms. Nagelhout, can you hear me?
23	MS. NAGELHOUT: I can.
24	BZA CHAIR HILL: So this is just like a hearing.
25	I mean, it's so funny that it took somebody now just to push

But this is now just like a normal hearing then, 1 a button. right, if we were on the dais, meaning they're coming before 3 us with their presentation. It doesn't have to be dropped into the record before the hearing. 4 5 MS. NAGELHOUT: Could be. Yes, that's what the rules requirement, or else they ask for a waiver of the 24-7 hour deadline. 8 So it should be in the record BZA CHAIR HILL: 9 ahead of time? 10 MS. NAGELHOUT: Yes. 11 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. And I'm sorry. Just give 12 me a second, Mr. Teran. Like, I don't recall when we were 13 live on the dais, whenever somebody presented something to us, it wasn't necessarily always in the record ahead of time. 14 15 I mean, you're saying it was -- it's a -- or they ask for a waiver, correct? 16 17 That's the rule in the virtual MS. NAGELHOUT: 18 environment. When we're in person, they can just show up 19 with their presentation and people could put whatever into 20 the record until the record was closed at the end of the But there's a 24-hour rule now for the virtual 21 22 stuff. 23 BZA CHAIR HILL: I see, for the virtual stuff. 24 So it's really the virtual environment that -- I didn't

The virtual environment is causing the 24-hour

1	rule, correct? Yes. Mr. Teran, do you have something that
2	you can refer us to that's in the record? Is it just your
3	plans?
4	MR. TERAN: This is everything that's in the
5	record. I'm not showing you anything new.
6	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Are you so give me a
7	second. So if you could drop this. So unshare this, Mr.
8	Teran.
9	MR. TERAN: Sure. I got to figure out how to do
10	that. Stop sharing, there we go.
11	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. So then Mr. Young, I guess
12	if we can disable that button in the future, I don't know.
13	You can do a little research on it. And then I guess if you
14	could bring up Exhibit 21 for Mr. Teran.
15	(Pause.)
16	BZA CHAIR HILL: I'm sorry. I'm just checking if
17	you heard me.
18	MR. YOUNG: Yeah, I am pulling it up now.
19	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. No problem. All right,
20	Mr. Teran. You can just ask for Mr. Young to advance to the
21	next slide.
22	MR. TERAN: Okay. Yes, if you can, please,
23	advance to the next slide. This is the subject property, Lot
24	20. And as you can see, we're adding to the back.
25	We're asking for an extra 7 feet and 10 inches

past the 10 feet of Lot 21. That'd be for the three levels above grade. You can see Lot 65 to the left and Lot 19. It's in similar size. If you'd go next, please.

These are the floor plans. We can skim through them quickly unless one of the members has a question. It's basically we're adding to the back lot an extra 7 feet. So it's extending overall 17 feet past the existing adjacent house.

So it's three units. The first unit is the cellar, and half of it is on the first floor which is Unit A. And Unit B, half of it is on the first floor. If you go to the next slide, please. You'll see the rest of Unit B on the second floor.

And the final unit is Unit C. That would be on the third floor. Next, please. And then we have -- Unit C does have access to a roof deck through a roof hatch which you can see that there's little kind of an angle piece there above where it says, open to below. That's where they have access to the roof deck. Next please.

These are the elevations. We'll look at the 3D images as well which I think tells a better store. But quickly, I want to point out that we are asking for additional feet at the back. And because of that, we are not extending by right to what we could have done which is 40 feet to the roof plus another 4 feet with a parapet if we're

wanting to do that.

As you can see, the parapet and the gabled roof are lower which will give a massing a smaller feeling than if we did everything by right. Next, please. This is the front elevation. Same thing, just showing the front half on the corner where the roof deck is located.

It's facing the corner of the street, so there is no privacy concerns looking towards somebody's backyard. And then you can see the gable roof. So it breaks up the massing. So it's not another three-story big rectangular building.

We're hoping that by breaking it up, giving it some additional features, it'll help with the shading of the northern neighbors. And also I think given it some relief will have more interest. Next, please. So this is the adjacent neighbor's property to the north.

You can see the outline. And there, you can see where the 10 feet is allowed plus an extra 7 feet. And you can see how we are lower than what we are allowed by right to do. Next please.

Just a section, I don't think it shows too much here. Next, please. And then just the demo plans. And is it possible to bring up Exhibit 22, the three images, please? And Exhibit 14 afterwards, please, to show the sun study.

(Pause.)

MR. TERAN: So these are the 3D renderings that we have prepared. I think they'll give a better picture showing how it fits with the neighborhood. These are the angles of the six images we'll view. Next, please.

So this is the house with the house to the north and showing how the parapet walls work. And that'd be the area for the roof deck. Next, please. This is at the corner just showing the massing. Next, please.

And that's along the street. This is where the new front door will be along this side. And we're providing two parking spaces. Next, please.

Another view, as you can see, this is where I was going back to where we have parapet in the front, gabled roof in the back. We believe by doing this gabled roof, it will help lessen the sun effect on the properties to the north. And it's also smaller -- it's not as big of a mass than if we build it by right. Next, please.

And this is showing with the neighbor to the north and the additional 7 feet 10 inches that we're asking for. Once again, we're lower than what we're allowed to be. If you could bring one more. The next one, please. Sorry. And that's just a little bit further back, just kind of showing the relationship to the other building that's to the east, just similar in scale.

And if you can just bring up Exhibit 14, please,

to go over the sun study, or 17. So we have the sun study at the summer solstice and the winter solstice. This first set is at the summer solstice.

As you can see at 9:00 a.m., there is not effect on the house to the north. Next, please. Here at noon there is some. As you can see in that red highlighted area on the left side, it's pretty minimal.

Once again, if we did build it by right and went up to 44 feet, we'd be creating a much bigger shadow than what we are doing now. Next, please. And this is at 3:00 p.m. And there is no effect on the house to the north. Next, please.

This is the winter solstice. There is a little bit more of an impact, as you can see, the red on the left side cutting through the yard. Next, please. Once again, the red highlighted area would be the additional shadow. One more, please.

And this is at the very end where it would be creating a shadow. But it's at the very corner back part of the yard. So there's additional shadow effect here. But I don't think it's -- it's on the yard, not on the house.

And lastly, the roof deck as I mentioned is on the front. So we're not -- there is no privacy concern. We believe with a sun study we're showing that there isn't much effect on the light or air. And we did believe that the

1	house falls in line with the character of the neighborhood.
2	And I'm happy to take any questions.
3	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Does anybody have
4	questions of the applicant? Mr. Blake?
5	MEMBER BLAKE: With regard to the parking first,
6	could you just make sure I just want to make sure I
7	understand where the building height the building
8	restriction line is and if the parking spaces are behind that
9	line.
10	MR. TERAN: Yeah, they're not within the building
11	restriction line. I spoke to DDOT about that. That's not
12	allowed. So it is all the width of the house is basically
13	behind there and a few parking spaces. On the side plan
14	on one of the floor plans, I believe you could see it.
15	MEMBER BLAKE: Okay. How far is building
16	restriction line? Is it on it?
17	MR. TERAN: The parking? I mean
18	MEMBER BLAKE: The building at the building
19	restriction line or is it
20	MR. TERAN: Yes. The building is on the building
21	restriction line. And then the two black pieces at the
22	parapet, that extended into the building restriction line.
23	So we have to get DDOT approval for that.
24	MEMBER BLAKE: And the parking spaces, though,
25	would not. So they would line up essentially at the building

1	
2	(Simultaneous speaking.)
3	MR. TERAN: Correct, within the building
4	restriction line.
5	MEMBER BLAKE: And DDOT had mentioned something
6	about putting some type of plantings or landscaping in there
7	to kind of shield the cars. Do you do something like that,
8	or
9	(Simultaneous speaking.)
10	MR. TERAN: We're actually putting a fence because
11	we have submitted to DCRA and zoning set of fences required
12	to block parking. So we are actually going to put in a 6
13	foot fence along the building restriction line at per zoning
14	request.
15	MEMBER BLAKE: Okay. That's not on a plan,
16	though. So where the car is now, we would not see that car.
17	Is that what you're saying?
18	MR. TERAN: Correct.
19	MEMBER BLAKE: Okay. Thank you for that.
20	BZA CHAIR HILL: Anyone else oh, Mr. Smith?
21	MEMBER SMITH: I have a question and help me to
22	understand the shadow studies. You have a proposed amount
23	of light. So to understand just to make sure that the area
24	that you're striking red is the additional shadowing beyond

the matter of light shadowing that you're showing on the

1	right?
2	MR. TERAN: Correct. So that highlighted area on
3	the photos on the left would be what's additional.
4	(Simultaneous speaking.)
5	MR. TERAN: We're extending an additional 7 feet.
6	MEMBER SMITH: I'm sorry. I'm sorry. What was
7	that?
8	MR. TERAN: The highlighted area was showing where
9	the additional shadow is because we're proposing to this
10	7 foot 10 inch addition.
11	MEMBER SMITH: So is the red are you showing
12	that in the context of the existing footprint? Is that in
13	the context of what you could do a matter of right? So on
14	the right side of these images in the sun study, is that what
15	you can build as a matter of right up to the by right height?
16	MR. TERAN: We showed it as our design without the
17	additional 7 foot 10 inches.
18	MEMBER SMITH: Okay. And what's on the right?
19	MR. TERAN: That'd be what's on the right.
20	MEMBER SMITH: That's what's on the right? Okay.
21	All right. So there are some images here when you there
22	is some additional shadowing on the adjacent property. To
23	mitigate that, was there some discussion of lowering the
24	height or removing some of the bulk and mass that you
25	proposed beyond the 10 feet, not having that bulk and mass

1	to potentially reduce the impacts to the adjacent properties?
2	MR. TERAN: So that's what we were trying to
3	accomplish with the gable roof so that we wouldn't have just
4	a straight up wall right on the property line. We're tilting
5	it, and that's helping with the shadows. So that's what we
6	felt was a good compromise.
7	MEMBER SMITH: I'm still seeing even with the
8	gabled roof there is a wall there. So I don't know what you
9	can do differently from an architectural standpoint to
10	mitigate that. But it still seems to me to be a wall was
11	being created very similar to what's on the other side of the
12	alley there that (audio interference). But anyway, just was
13	a thought. I guess I'll hear from the ANC. So that's all
14	the questions that I have.
15	BZA CHAIR HILL: Anyone else for the applicant?
16	Mr. Teran, maybe I'll ask the Commissioner also, is there,
17	like, an apartment building behind the
18	MR. TERAN: The building to the east, I think it's
19	
20	BZA CHAIR HILL: On H Street?
21	MR. TERAN: condos, yeah.
22	BZA CHAIR HILL: They're condos?
23	MR. TERAN: I believe so, yeah.
24	BZA CHAIR HILL: They look familiar. I wonder if
25	we approved those. I can't remember now.

1 Commissioner Moore will be able to MR. TERAN: fill you in more on the history of this nice neighborhood. 3 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, okay. Well, these people Okay. All right. Commissioner Moore, can you 4 are smiling. Could you introduce yourself for the record, please? 6 7 Yes, I'm Commissioner Sydelle Moore. MS. MOORE: I represented 5D05, and I'm the Chairperson for ANC 5D. 8 9 BZA CHAIR HILL: All right, Commissioner. Thanks I know that you don't get paid to be here. 10 for joining us. 11 So let's see. Could you give us your testimony, please, 12 Commissioner? So I'll just give kind of a 13 MS. MOORE: Sure. 14 brief overview of the difference in how we see this project 15 as an ANC. We did vote against this particular addition for a variety of reasons. One was really kind of illustrated by 16 17 the questions about sun and light that you all just discussed and our concern that there are basically times of the year 18 19 when there's absolutely no sunshine for hours and hours 20 during the day on the adjacent property owner to the north 21 property. 22 And so that is concerning for us, and that's 23 concerning for her. The other thing that we really discussed 24 with the applicant was just the fact that this helped set a

precedent for rear setback since we're now in RF-4 zone which

is why that property across the alley does not look -- is not an appropriate point of reference to use. That is from a different zone.

If you all recall, we had a zoning case, ZC19-30. And the reason why that building may look a little bit familiar is because one of the examples that the ANC and the Office of Planning gave for inappropriate architecture in our area was exactly that building across the alley. And so this really imitates a lot of the elements from that building which was the underpinning in large part to have that zoning case approved which changed us on those blocks from an RA-2 zone to an RF-4 zone which the first mapped RF-4 zone in the city.

And so it's not that the neighbors are necessarily completely adverse to additions to properties. It's that certain types of additions lead to situations where you continue to have rear setbacks that are based on the adjacent property. So you have an addition here, then that means that the adjoining property can go back even further and the adjoining property to that one can go back even further.

So it sets a precedent that we specifically had a zoning case in 2019 in order to avoid for these blocks so that the changes in development could be more gradual. And the residents who don't want to change their properties can continue to enjoy their sun and air as other property owners

1	make different decisions for their properties. So that is
2	kind of the basic synopsis there, and I'm happy to answer any
3	questions about the gap in the previous zoning from the
4	example given versus the zoning now and why some of those
5	decisions were made.
6	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Does the Board have any
7	questions for the Commissioner? Commissioner Hood I mean,
8	Chairman Hood?
9	ZC CHAIR HOOD: That's all right. Thank you,
10	Chairman Hill. And always good to see you, Commissioner
11	Moore. I appreciate
12	MS. MOORE: It's good to see you.
13	ZC CHAIR HOOD: all that you do. I think I saw
14	you quite a bit during redistricting.
15	MS. MOORE: I think so.
16	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Job well done. I'm concerned when
17	you say ZC Case 19-30. I'm going to have to go back and
18	look. And I will be the first to admit. Sometimes I look
19	and I think I've said this at oversight hearings. Sometimes
20	I look I've been around so long. So sometimes I look at
21	stuff and I say, did we actually do that. So I need to
22	in D.C. Case 19-30, was there support from the community on
23	this? Or was it opposite?
24	MS. MOORE: Yes.
25	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Okav.

MS. MOORE: It was very heavily supported by members of the community. Most of the opposition we had save one person was actually outside of the community. And actually, most of that opposition was from Ward 3.

I thought we had a snafu here. All right. So I see in your testimony, I think -- excuse me if I don't -- correct statute. I think it was 5203.1 is what you cited. And again, kind of state to me what the -- I do see the blank wall. I guess it's on the east side. If my orientation is off, it's off.

But I'm just curious. Again, help me understand. Is there a happy medium here? Is this something that the community would like to see. I'm always trying to push the envelope even more because I do know the regulations -- which some I agree with, some I don't -- allow for some of this. What is a win-win for everybody here in your opinion?

MS. MOORE: I mean, I think we set rules very recently because 2019 is not that long ago that already allow quite a lot of flexibility over what is already there. So we are for the most party, a neighborhood where the townhouses have about 40 lot occupancy. We still bumped up to about 60 percent lot occupancy.

The height requirements are still about twice as tall as the adjoining townhomes. And we do allow for that

additional 10 feet in the rear. So it's not that -- there are some cases where neighborhoods have not looked at their zoning for quite some time, and times have changed so much in the interim that it might make a lot of sense to offer zoning adjustment like this one.

But I think in this instance, we really looked at what is available in terms of housing in the community now, what the housing patterns are in terms of things that people are building. And we really try to be fair. And so that zoning change really was the win-win and the happy medium to say that, yeah, we are going to allow for some additional growth here because the other option for us as a community is that we were being considered for historic designation which was part of the conversation during that ZC 19-30 case.

And so this was the happy medium. And so to now kind of just as soon as we get settled into that happy medium, kind of have the developer approach between to, well, let's continue to push the envelope for a new happy medium. You do reach a point where you just have a shift goal post at a certain point.

And I think that we did a really good job in conjunction with the Office of Planning, looking at what standards we wanted to set for the community. We did go with one of the very new zones in order to develop that. And it still gives quite a bit of room for growth.

б

1	Twice as tall like I said nothing to sneeze at.
2	An additional 10 feet back out of a 40 foot lot which already
3	has a 10 foot addition on the adjoining property is nothing
4	to sneeze at. So it does already offer quite a bit of
5	leeway. And we would just like to have we'd like to
6	actually enforce the guidelines we have now before changing
7	them again. I think that's really the thinking in terms of
8	being fair to all parties involved.
9	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Chairperson
10	Moore. I appreciate your comments. Stay tuned. Thank you.
11	Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
12	BZA CHAIR HILL: Chairperson, they actually say
13	that? Chairman, they don't say Chairman? Chairperson Moore?
14	I say Chairman?
15	MS. MOORE: Just don't call me late for dinner.
16	BZA CHAIR HILL: Right, that's oh, there you
17	go. So Chairperson Moore, was it a unanimous vote no?
18	MS. MOORE: Yes.
19	BZA CHAIR HILL: I can't remember. Okay. And so
20	
21	(Simultaneous speaking.)
22	MS. MOORE: And as was the zoning case vote, 19-
23	30. That was also a unanimous vote.
24	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. So if they didn't go back
25	beyond the 10 feet, then you'd be kind of okay with this just

1	because
2	(Simultaneous speaking.)
3	MS. MOORE: Yeah. I mean, we set rules that we
4	wanted the process to flow smoothly and to still be able to
5	see some growth and some development on properties, but just
6	to be fair to the adjoining neighbors. And so I do think
7	that if they were to stay within what's there as a matter of
8	right, that's not a problem for us. That's what we
9	anticipated.
10	BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Teran, can you hear me?
11	MR. TERAN: Yes.
12	BZA CHAIR HILL: What did what did the neighbor
13	to the whatever, the next door neighbor is, what did they
14	say about this project? I forget.
15	MR. TERAN: She's been very difficult to work
16	with. She opposes any type of construction. The owners gone
17	over once or twice. I've been over twice. She doesn't want
18	anything to be built. And so we've tried.
19	BZA CHAIR HILL: That's okay, Mr. Teran. It's
20	okay. She just doesn't want anything built. That's all
21	right.
22	MR. TERAN: Yes.
23	BZA CHAIR HILL: Everybody is entitled to their
24	opinion.
25	MS. MOORE: I actually have a different

1	perspective based on my conversations with that neighbor.
2	MR. TERAN: The last time two times I spoke to
3	her, that's what she told me.
4	BZA CHAIR HILL: That's fine. What is that,
5	Commissioner?
6	MS. MOORE: Well, I think her concern is more so
7	it is that additional extension and then it's things on
8	her side of the property. She there's also an expansion
9	there as you guys were discussing to the building line, the
10	building restriction line, that goes to the south of the
11	building. Not a concern for her in any way, shape, or form
12	because it doesn't impact her.
13	So I think that her opinion around the
14	construction is a bit more nuanced than that if you're really
15	just talking purely about the construction and not
16	necessarily about interactions or some of the misgivings I
17	think people have sometimes in situations like this. Not to
18	cast dispersions at all, but people are apprehensive about
19	necessarily having robust conversations sometimes with
20	developers if they think it might become adversarial.
21	BZA CHAIR HILL: Got it. Okay, Commissioner.
22	Thanks.
23	(Simultaneous speaking.)
24	BZA CHAIR HILL: Give me one second, Mr. Teran.
25	MR. TERAN: Sure.

1 Mr. Smith, you had a question? BZA CHAIR HILL: MEMBER SMITH: Yeah, and that question was to Mr. 2 Teran to your point, this dialogue that we're having now. 3 And I understand that the property owner to the north, you 4 said that she wasn't in support of any development. Did you present some other design schemes to her that may have won 7 over her support? Was there a review of the schemes you presented to her? 8 9 MR. TERAN: I couldn't even show her what we had. She didn't want to look at anything. And that's just what 10 She didn't want to see -- she didn't want to 11 she told me. 12 have any noise or any disruption which I understand. it's going to be eight, ten months of construction. 13 But I 14 couldn't get her to see anything that we had done. 15 MEMBER SMITH: Okay. Did you present some other schemes to the ANC? 16 17 MR. TERAN: No, it was this one because we believe that, yes, by right I think it's going to be much taller. 18 19 It's going to feel more -- I mean, we just did a big 20 rectangle that was an extra 10 feet and up to 44 feet. 21 going to look exactly like the building to the east that I 22 don't like and I don't think anybody in the neighborhood 23 likes. 24 So we believe a good compromise was the roof deck

in the front with the lower grove. I mean, I think we're 7

feet lower or 5 feet lower than we're allowed. And the gabled roof I think takes -- gives it a more interesting shape, gives it more relief than just a big rectangular box that you see most developers putting up because they want to try get as much square footage and area as they can. We could've easily gone -- every ceiling height could've been 10 feet because you have a 40 foot height limit. But we decided not to go that route.

MEMBER SMITH: Okay. Thank you.

MR. TERAN: And one more thing too about -- each house is about 40 percent. This what we're proposing is at 36.8 percent. Granted, the majority of it is within the building restriction area. But it's just a bigger lot. And we are still at 36.8 percent.

MEMBER SMITH: Thank you for that context.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Teran, again, the by right, can you clarify that again? If you just went 10 feet back, you could only go 10 feet back from -- and this, I can ask Office of Planning. You can only go 10 feet back from the bottom floor and then 10 feet back from the second story?

I somewhat forget that. I should know that right off the top of my head. And then the height, how would the by right project look differently? Can you tell me that again?

MR. TERAN: Yes. So you can push back 10 feet and

that can go all the way up to three floors. 1 And the height limit is 40 feet. So if you wanted to, the ceiling of the third floor could go up to 40 feet. 3 4 BZA CHAIR HILL: What are you guys proposing? 5 What are you proposing at now? 6 I think it's -- the roof deck, it's MR. TERAN: 7 35. And then at the gable, the way the gable height is measured is from the midpoint of the roof. 9 BZA CHAIR HILL: Yeah. And I think it's shown in one of the 10 MR. TERAN: elevations. And that gable point -- the midpoint is a little 11 12 bit under 40, and the point of the gable is at 44. 13 could in theory have the entire roof be at 40 feet, and then we could put a 4 foot parapet all the way around it. 14 15 is allowed by right. And I think that's going to look much more of a monster. 16 17 BZA CHAIR HILL: Yeah, I appreciate the I don't know if you can do that through the 18 discussion. 19 second story, though. But that's the part that I'm not clear 20 on. 21 MR. TERAN: I mean, you can have each story -each floor could have a 10 foot, 11 foot ceiling if you 23 wanted. BZA CHAIR HILL: No, I'm saying that I don't know 24 25 from the second floor if you can go back. You'd have to only

1	go back 10 feet from the second story of the adjacent
2	neighbor.
3	MR. TERAN: My understanding is from any floor
4	can't go past 10 feet.
5	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. Let's see.
6	Okay. Anybody else at this point? Vice Chair John?
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Mr. Teran, I just have
8	difficulty understanding what additional height would get
9	you. You wouldn't be able to add anymore units. There'd
10	just be more headroom?
11	MR. TERAN: Exactly.
12	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: So
13	MR. TERAN: My point is I don't think it's
14	necessary, and we don't need it. And so we're not building
15	as much as we're allowed to. We're building to be aware that
16	there's neighbors there, to be respectful to them.
17	So I think that's the point that I'm trying to get
18	across that even though we're allowed to build more, we're
19	not. And kind of a compromise is were' asking for those
20	additional 7 feet. But we're not building out as much as we
21	could.
22	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: I know. It sort of isn't
23	a compromise for us because you're already at 10 feet back.
24	So anything about that is within the Board's discretion. And
25	when I looked at this application. I was a bit troubled by

the 25 feet on the second floor. 1 2 So when you say that you could go up higher, 3 neither here nor there to me because that's I'm more concerned about the impact of the bump out going back 25 feet 4 on the second floor. That's not a small thing for the person living next door. I'm not saying I'm opposed to it, but I'm 6 7 just trying to explain what my difficulty is. 8 MR. TERAN: That's understood. And the way zoning 9 has it is you can go 10 feet past, whatever is the furthest extension of a house. So that's why the first floor is only 10 10 plus 7. But the second floor is more. 11 12 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: And that's why I think the gable roof helps to make that wall not a 44 foot walls all 13 14 the way up but we have a gable roof to cut that down. 15 MEMBER SMITH: I do --

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you.

MEMBER SMITH: -- disagree with that opinion that the gable roof cuts that down, because at the peak, it still reads as -- to the peak is 44 feet. And your max height is 45 feet. So given the pitch of that gable roof, to me, it still reads -- it's still going to read as a 45 foot tall building. So you saying that does not sway my opinion.

MR. TERAN: Well, I think if you stand in the adjacent back yard and you're looking up, you're not going to see the peak. You're going to see where the eave starts

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	going up. So this point here where the roof starts, I
2	believe it's at 35 feet rather if it was a straight wall up,
3	it'd be 44 feet.
4	So I think that's where lies the difference. I
5	mean, understanding 100 feet back, you'll see the gable.
6	You'll see the tip of the gable. Or if you're standing along
7	H Street, you'll see the gable. It just depends where you're
8	standing and how it affects you.
9	(Simultaneous speaking.)
10	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Oh, I'm sorry. Go ahead.
11	(Simultaneous speaking.)
12	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Had you finished, Board Member
13	Smith? I'm sorry.
14	MEMBER SMITH: Yes, I'm done.
15	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Mr. Teran, let me ask you.
15 16	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Mr. Teran, let me ask you. Are you going to be residing in this project?
16	
16 17	Are you going to be residing in this project?
16 17 18	Are you going to be residing in this project? MR. TERAN: The owner says he wants to live on the
16 17 18 19	Are you going to be residing in this project? MR. TERAN: The owner says he wants to live on the third floor with his wife.
16 17 18 19 20	Are you going to be residing in this project? MR. TERAN: The owner says he wants to live on the third floor with his wife. ZC CHAIR HOOD: Okay, so the owner. But
	Are you going to be residing in this project? MR. TERAN: The owner says he wants to live on the third floor with his wife. ZC CHAIR HOOD: Okay, so the owner. But Chairperson Moore, I went back and looked at the case. This
16 17 18 19 20 21	Are you going to be residing in this project? MR. TERAN: The owner says he wants to live on the third floor with his wife. ZC CHAIR HOOD: Okay, so the owner. But Chairperson Moore, I went back and looked at the case. This was initiated by ANC 5D, correct?
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Are you going to be residing in this project? MR. TERAN: The owner says he wants to live on the third floor with his wife. ZC CHAIR HOOD: Okay, so the owner. But Chairperson Moore, I went back and looked at the case. This was initiated by ANC 5D, correct? (Simultaneous speaking.)

not Commissioner Teran. Everybody is a Commissioner. Mr. Teran, I would just tell you that I think you should hear some of the comments I'm hearing, especially when I'm looking at what the ZC has done initiated by a community.

Even though -- I'll always say this. Even though it allows you to do certain things, sometimes it's about design that's tastefully. And also because it says you can go to a 10, you don't always have to go to a 10. That's just where I am. So thank you. And you can take head of that, and that's just I'm thinking. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. I'm going to turn to the Office of Planning.

MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: Good afternoon, Chair Hill and members of the Board of Zoning Adjustment. I am Jonathan Kirschenbaum with the Office of Planning. We did recommend approval of the rear wall extension.

should say that this was not the easiest application for us to review, and it was not the easiest decision to get to. I will say that what is proposed is probably at the sort of the upper limit of what we would find But based on the applicant's sun study, we did acceptable. find that the additional shadows that would be created beyond a matter of right condition would generally be minimal and would vary on a season and would be for not very extended of the day considering that this a built

1

3

4

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

rowhouse, neighborhood.

And so there would be some additional shadowing as we indicated in the OP report properties to the north. There would not be any shadowing properties to the south as it's the southernmost building on the square. We did not find that privacy or enjoyment of neighboring properties would be unduly compromised as there would be no windows proposed on the subject property facing the property to the north and that generally the proposed scale of the building overall in terms of height, in terms of front setback, in terms of side setbacks would conform to the zone. Please let me know if you have any further questions. Thank you.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Yeah. Okay, Mr. Smith. Give me one second because I just want to ask Mr. Kirschenbaum. So Mr. Kirschenbaum, again, I -- and I'm not clear on the answer for this from me. From the second store, is it 10 feet back from the second story?

MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: So zoning does not prescribe this rule. This is an interpretive rule by the zoning administrator. I have always understood it that it's based on the location of the furthest rear wall on the neighboring property.

So it doesn't matter what floor it is. It's where the furthest rear wall is. In the case of the property to the north, that would be the first floor. The first floor,

extends further out. So you base the 10 foot measurement on that floor. But I will say that that is an interpretation, and I am happy to get that in writing from the zoning administrator if the Board would like me to do so.

BZA CHAIR HILL: No, that makes sense. I mean, I don't know when the Zoning Commission put this forward again whether they had thought about the second floor or the third floor. Or I don't know.

I remember the wedding cake conversation from way back in the day that has been discussed in terms of the floor setting back. Okay. That was the one question I had. And then you say that the Office of Planning had some hesitancy about the application, I guess.

I was just curious as to what were you guys just hesitant about, like, again, like, the light and air or that massing? I mean, I think the design is a nice design. I mean, I'll be honest.

I mean, the design is a nice design. I think the parking being in the rear with the door in the rear, I mean, I think the architect did a good job. I mean, I'm not trying to get -- I'm just curious as to why the Office of Planning, you say you guys were kind of hesitant. Was it the massing?

MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: It was a bit of the massing. I mean, I think a little bit of the struggle here is just the fact that the existing built out houses to the north are

significantly built under what the maps on zoning would allow. And so generally speaking, this subject property is, more or less, conforming most to the prescribed zoning requirements except for the rear setback.

And that is what made this case a little bit difficult to review. It's significantly under law. You can see it conforms to the height. It conforms to the number of stories.

It's providing the required 20 foot rear yard setback. It's just it's distance past of houses to the north. And again, as I said, when looking at the shadow study and also this piece in the context to how we generally review these rear wall extensions, we did find that sort of on balance that this would be acceptable.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. And so to the Commissioners, I mean, we've seen these before in that it does domino the block. And you'll get people that will then be able -- I mean, it's just the way progress also does happen and change. Do you -- does the Office of Planning, do they think about how -- I mean, they couldn't go -- another person couldn't go back another 10 feet from this because they'd be then into the rear yard, correct?

MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: That would -- yes. So if someone wanted to go beyond this proposed rear wall, then that property owner would have to also request rear yard

setback relief.

б

(Simultaneous speaking.)

BZA CHAIR HILL: Right, right. They'd be back before us for that --

MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: They would.

BZA CHAIR HILL: -- if that were something that they were trying to do. Okay. Mr. Smith, you had questions?

MEMBER SMITH: Mr. Kirschenbaum, it relates to criteria under 5201.4(c) as it relates to -- my question is -- I don't know how to say this -- that the criteria that I'm referencing is the proposed addition, dot, dot, dot, shall not substantially visually intrude upon the character, scale, or pattern of houses along the street or alley frontage. And you stated in your -- the reasons why we need support is that the proposed height, scale, and design as viewed from the street are in keeping with the intent of the zoning -- and my question pertains with -- and the prevailing residential character of the block fronts. So could you expand on that?

What did OP look at along the block fronts to arrive at this building if they're going to keep it? Did you look at across H Street and the heights of those buildings or up 20th Street and look at heights of those buildings? Could you expand on how you arrived at this?

MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: Sure. So I mean, this criteria is not just about height. It's more about design, and it's

a bit of a subjective criteria because it is about design. 1 Generally speaking, the proposal is designed look residential in nature. And the prevailing development on the 3 surrounding 4 subject square and the squares also residential in nature. б The applicant is not proposing a 40-foot cinder 7 block square building with one window, right? If that was proposed, we would probably say that is not the -- that 9 doesn't not match the prevailing residential nature or character of the subject square. But because of the way it's 10 designed, we did feel that it does generally match the 11 12 residential appearance of the neighborhood. 13 MEMBER SMITH: Okay, okay. That was the only 14 question I had. 15 I mean, the follow up of that, BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Kirschenbaum, again, from the front, I don't know if I 16 It doesn't really look 17 would necessarily agree with that. like the rest of that row. Is that what the Office of -- the 18 19 Office of Planning did have some discussion about that? 20 KIRSCHENBAUM: We did not have too much MR. 21 discussion about that. I mean, again, the criteria is --22 it's not historic preservation. It's not supposed to make 23 the proposal look exactly like what currently exists.

Okay, okay.

BZA CHAIR HILL:

MR. KIRSCHENBAUM:

24

25

And again, I would also say

1	that this is particularly without criteria, it is not a
2	straightforward, either yes or no, black and white answer.
3	And the Board has the ability to recommend changes to the
4	design that they feel is so appropriate to ensure that
5	there's more compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood.
6	So I would definitely recommend to the Board that if they do
7	feel that their needs to be additional design changes, to do
8	so.
9	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. And I'll let I mean,
10	Mr. Teran, I mean, this is turning into be more than I had
11	anticipated I guess a little bit. I mean, I don't know even
12	what I think of that front. I mean, I think the like I
13	said, I think the design is nice.
14	I just don't know what I think in the front of
15	that building in regard to the row. But and when I say,
16	front, like, your address is still the address is still
17	going to be 801 20th Street, correct?
18	MR. TERAN: Most likely will change to H Street
19	because usually they have where the front door is facing
20	BZA CHAIR HILL: Right.
21	MR. TERAN: that's where the address is. So
22	most likely, it'll be an address change.
23	BZA CHAIR HILL: Got it.
24	MS. MOORE: That did not occur for the building
2 5	lagrang the allow that that building is still listed as 900

1	21st Street, Northeast which creates a lot of confusion for
2	the neighbors in terms of RPP.
3	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. Anybody else
4	got some more questions? Yeah, Ms. John.
5	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you. Did the
6	Commissioner have something to say?
7	MS. MOORE: I just had one quick question because
8	I found the conversation about the rear wall interesting.
9	Does that include porches? Because if we're measuring from
10	the farthest rear wall, does that include a partially
11	enclosed porch?
12	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you.
13	MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: And again
14	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Well, I was about to help
15	you with that because that was my question. I'm going to ask
16	Mr. Young to put up Exhibit 35 which is the plat. And we can
17	talk about where the 10 foot measurement should begin because
18	on the first floor, there's a small addition on one floor.
19	BZA CHAIR HILL: Ms. Vice Chair John?
20	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Exhibit 35, that's the
21	revised building plat.
22	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. And all my exhibits
23	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Exhibit 35.
24	BZA CHAIR HILL: 35?
25	ZC CHAIR HOOD: I don't know.

1	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: No? Okay. What if I have
2	the wrong case?
3	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Or maybe it's mine. I don't know.
4	Sometimes I don't have all the files.
5	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Well, let's see.
6	BZA CHAIR HILL: This one's 28.
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Oh, no, 28. Okay. Mine
8	at the top it says 35, so 28.
9	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yeah, yeah, 28.
10	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Sorry about that. So
11	maybe the Office of Planning could kind of walk us through
12	or maybe the architect, where the 10 feet is measured from.
13	I think it's measured from the rear wall and not from that
14	small proposed addition that small addition.
15	MR. TERAN: If you zoom in, it is measured from
16	the furthest rear portion of the building. And that is on
17	the first floor, and that's where you start your 10 feet.
18	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: You start the 10 feet at
19	the end of that small addition?
20	MR. TERAN: Yes, where it says adjacent house,
21	first floor.
22	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Mm-hmm.
23	MR. TERAN: And that's where you start your 10
24	feet.
25	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay. And then you would

1	go in addition to that another almost 17 feet?
2	MR. TERAN: No, no, 7 foot, 10 inches.
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: So the total distance
4	would be 16.84 from the rear wall addition?
5	MR. TERAN: Correct.
6	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay. And then on the
7	second floor, it would be 25 feet.
8	MR. TERAN: Correct.
9	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: So this is starting from
10	the rear wall where you see that arrow adjacent, the second
11	floor.
12	MR. TERAN: Correct.
13	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Yeah. So that's a
14	difficulty for me. Okay. Thank you.
15	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Chairman?
16	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yeah? All right. Go on. Sorry,
17	Chairman Hood. I was looking at the exhibit.
18	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Mr. Kirschenbaum, let's go back
19	to Office of Planning's decision making. The way I heard
20	from your testimony, it could've went either way. Your
21	support could've went either way.
22	MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: It could've gone either way.
23	But it was something that we really had to really analyze.
24	This wasn't just a quick one to make a decision about. It
25	was we did struggle somewhat with reaching our decision. But

I continue to recommend approval. I don't -- recommendations made, we're not going to change at this point.

I appreciate you standing with your recommendation. But that's just the way it came across to me, and I look at everything that's being said. I look at the record, and I also look at the Zoning Commission 19-30 which I need to come back to speed on because to me that's very important in this process. Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Kirschenbaum.

ZC CHAIR HOOD: Vice Chair John?

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Mr. Kirschenbaum, one more quick clarification. When you say rear wall, are we talking about the original building or the small addition on the first floor?

MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: Yes, thank you for asking that clarifying question. this the And goes back to question Commissioner's too. again, this is So prescribed in zoning. This is interpreted from the Zoning Administrator. The furthest rear wall in this case based on the applicant's self-certified application would be at the very, very end of what you saw, that little sort of addition at the end.

And in order for that to be the furthest rear wall, it has to be enclosed space and it has to be conditioned space, so heating, air conditioning. That is

1

3

4

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

what -- furthest application that the applicant has self-certified. That is where he can measure to because it's conditioned space and it's enclosed. It cannot just be, like, an open air porch.

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Right, right. We're clear about the porches. What I wasn't sure about was the small addition which doesn't take up the full width of the rear wall as I recall. But anyway, that's -- thank you. I think that clears it up. Thank you.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Commissioner, you had a question?

MS. MOORE: A comment. That rear porch is not conditioned space. I personally been in that porch, and it actually is a porch that you couldn't sit there in the wintertime. And the top part of the space does -- I can see how someone would say this is an enclosure. But it's those metal screens that were popular, I would say, in the late '60s, early '70s that are -- that kind of work like -- I forget what those windows are called but basically tilting windows. But it's just a series of metal screens with mesh in the middle.

BZA CHAIR HILL: So this is a Zoning Administrator question, Mr. Kirschenbaum.

MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: Two options, you can approve this based on what the applicant has self-certified. And he

can go to permitting, and the Zoning Administrator could say, 1 hey, this is not really enclosed conditioned space as I've interpreted it to be. Or the Board can ask the Office of 3 4 Planning. We're happy to reach out to the Zoning Administrator to further discuss this and get some sort of interpretation in writing. It's up to the Board. 6 7 Let's see where we get BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. with this. 8 All right. Mr. Young, is there anyone here 9 wishing to speak? MR. YOUNG: We do not. 10 Okay. All right. 11 BZA CHAIR HILL: So I don't know where I am. So that is my first statement. I really Like, I'm looking to my fellow Board 13 don't know where I am. 14 Like, I don't know. members. 15 Like, as I said, I don't -- well, hold on second. Let me shut this door. I don't know. I'm not 16 17 closing the hearing because I want something to happen. just don't know what it is or if anybody else has anything 18 19 that they want to happen. I mean, I'm confused in terms of whether or not 20 21 that first floor -- I'm sorry. Yeah, the first floor, 22 whether it's in enclosed conditioned space and therefore they 23 can go 10 feet back from that. That's one question I'm 24 I'm looking at my Board members by the way.

Then the other is that that second wall, they're

going basically -- I mean, 6, 7 feet back from the 10 feet. That's something that we've approved before. I mean, I know it's all in context on different cases and everything. But that's not -- like, we've approved 25 feet past the 10 feet. I mean, it all depends on what each individual case is different, right?

And so this -- the struggle that I'm having with is kind of that row and the way that row is. However, the building -- the zoning allows for larger buildings on that row. So that whole row is eventually going to go in some capacity or another I would think, right, because of the way that the zoning is, right?

And so what is allowed now kind of -- I'm just not really sure. In other words, I don't know whether I want to see -- I don't know. I don't know whether I put this off for a week, we come back, we reopen it. Whatever you all -- maybe you guys are somewhere else and I'm not.

I've got a little bit of a problem with the front of the building. I think the building -- again, the architect, I think it's a good design. I think the rear looks nice. I think it all looks nice. I'm just having trouble with again some of the light and air issues and how it could be changing that block. But that's just me.

And I'm going to kind of go around the table and see where we are and see if anybody has a suggestion about

anything. Or maybe you all are ready. I don't know. And I'm going to go in the same order that I've been going all day long. So unfortunately, Mr. Smith, that's you next.

MEMBER SMITH: Well, Chairman Hill, I've shared some of the same concerns that you have. I'm not a yes on this because -- and probably even further from a yes than it sounds like you are with this because I am concerned about light and air to the adjacent property owners and this issue of E-5201.4(c) that I think is raised by the ANC and the adjacent property owners. I do believe as designed, this building would visually true upon character, scale with the houses along the street and the alley frontage based on the mass of the building.

I can appreciate -- to the architect, to Mr. Teran, I can appreciate you looking to that building to the east and making a decision that you don't want to design the building that looks like that, just a block. So I think you've done a great job of breaking up the facade along H Street. But to me, it still reads as a large mass.

And I can fully respect the fact that given the zoning, these existing rowhomes from this area are substantially smaller than the maximum allowed -- maximum bulk and size allowed within the zone as a matter of right. But you're here asking for a special exception. And so I do believe that we can attempt to break up the facade a little

bit more (audio interference) a little bit or reducing that (audio interference) a little bit so that this building can be more in keeping with I think the character of the neighborhood and speak to what this Commission of the Board is saying on gradual stair step increase of buildings in this neighborhood.

I mean, I welcome -- if you want to give it a week or additional time, I welcome some additional designs that kind of speak to what I'm referencing. But that's where I'm at. So I'll just leave it at that and I'll listen to the rest of my Board members.

BZA CHAIR HILL: And before I move on to the next one, Mr. Teran, we're going to come back to you and everything. And I appreciate everybody being kind of calm as we kind of go through this which, Mr. Teran, you don't own the property. So you're able to be a little bit more calm.

And so the -- I'm just trying to think as you kind of hear what people are talking about. Like, I'm still kind of curious as to whether or not even that you might not even be able to do what you think you're able to do once you get to permitting whether or not that enclosed space is considered something you can go 10 feet past, right? So I'm just kind of discussing that as we kind of go through this. Mr. Blake, do you have comments or do you know where you are?

MEMBER BLAKE:

I think

Well, I'm in the middle.

that the design is somewhat interesting. But I'm very sympathetic to what Commissioner Moore has pointed out and the issue of visual intrusion on the alley. And I go back to that building, the measuring wall.

It does seem that based on the definition that wall would be the other wall which would address some of these issues in terms of what could actually be built there. So I would love to have clarification on that point even though I know it's a self-certified application and they can revisit it later. I think it'd be less efficient to do that.

I think it would be more efficient to kind of make that determination about that particular thing. It's one thing to not be in the spot and make the assumption based on what may be the case in the subject building. But it is what it is.

I mean, the rules kind of are what they are. I think that we've had instances before with this measuring wall. And it makes a difference in terms of what could be accomplished.

So from that perspective, that's a very important part for me. And I definitely agree with Board Member Smith's assessment about visual intrusion. And to your point again about the front end design, it does look a little boxy. But it's not unreasonable.

And so I'm on the fence. But in fact, I'm not on

the fence. I need to have clarification on the back wall 1 because that's important to me with regard to the size of the property and if it meets the criteria. So I'd love to have 3 clarification on that. 4 5 BZA CHAIR HILL: All right. So Mr. Kirschenbaum, can you hear me? 6 7 MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: Yes, I --8 BZA CHAIR HILL: We can ask Mr. Moy also. But I 9 quess we want clarification from the Zoning Administrator as to what's 10 feet past, right? Is it 10 feet past that --10 what I'm looking at is the possible second story. 11 Or is it 12 10 feet past that enclosed space, right? 13 So that's one question. And this is where I 14 always get confused, how long it takes. Like, when do you 15 get answers back from the Zoning Administrator? 16 KIRSCHENBAUM: There's not a prescribed MR. 17 But I would say that this should not be a schedule We'll need a couple of weeks to ensure we 18 for next week. 19 hear back from the Zoning Administrator. 20 BZA CHAIR HILL: No, that's fine. Anyway, so but You'll think about this. You think about 21 still -- right. 22 it for a second as to how long you think you might be able 23 to get something back from the Zoning Administrator as I continue to go through this process. Chairman Hood, where

are you, may I ask?

1	ZC CHAIR HOOD: I want to give you a little bad
2	news. I was going to be back next week because some kind of
3	way, the Zoning Commission, we scheduled things different.
4	So I will be back with you all next week. And Mr.
5	Kirschenbaum just X'ed that out of the whole conversation.
6	One of the things I would ask Commissioner Moore
7	to do or Chairperson more to do for me is to help members
8	on the Commission Case No. 19-30 since it's looks like we're
9	going to be putting this off. I can't remember all what we
10	did. But it was a self-initiated map amendment from the
11	community.
12	And I want to make sure we and I really
13	appreciate her comments and I agree with that. And I will
14	tell you this. I mean, if we open it up, Mr. Chairman, I
15	would like to get that from Commissioner Moore.
16	The other thing is and it doesn't have to be
17	a long dissertation. It could just be, like, a paragraph to
18	help refresh my memory and the others as well. Also, I'm not
19	sure who put the site photos in the file, but that didn't do
20	me any good.
21	That didn't help me. That just I had
22	flashbacks. But that was something the city required the
23	Zoning Commission to do when we started building pop-ups,
24	pop-backs.

So I would say that we still have to craft it.

And I think Commissioner Moore's comments about tastefully moving forward I think exactly is what the community wants.

And they're the ones who's going to have to endure it.

You're going to develop, others develop and they go home and we have to endure it. And no disrespect to you. So I still think that conversation can still be had because it looks like we're not going to be deciding this today because if we were deciding it today, I would have to vote it down. So that's where I am, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Vice Chair John, may I ask your suggestions?

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: So I agree that we can decide this two weeks from today to get clarification on the measurement of the 10 foot extension, whether it's from that back wall or from the back of the addition. So that's one thing.

And I guess what I like about the project is that it's still at 36 percent lot occupancy even with the addition. And it has the -- still has a conforming rear yard and two parking spaces. But I am a bit troubled by that 25 foot extension on the second floor.

I might be willing to go to 16 feet from the back wall. And even if we have gone more than that in prior cases, I think this particular block that is sort of sandwiching that neighbor to the north. I mean, 25 feet is

really long.

б

So if the applicant could go back to the drawing board and see what's possible. And for me, whether or not you have 8 or 11 foot ceilings doesn't solve the problem of the 25 feet back. So those are just my thoughts.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right, Mr. Teran. I'll give you a chance also. So I'm trying to make this at least step process for me. Mr. Kirschenbaum is going to get back to us as to the Zoning Administrator, right, as to whether or not it's 10 feet back from that brick wall or 10 feet back from the enclosed porch. Okay? So that's the first question, right?

The other, I guess, Mr. Teran, I don't know whether you got the votes yet or not. So that's why I'm trying to figure this out, right? Like, your height is basically almost the height. I mean, I appreciate the gable roof, right?

And what I've told other applicants before is that even if you could possibly build something within the matter of right, you might not do it because it's not financially feasible, right? It just doesn't make any sense to necessarily fill the envelope just because you can. And so I think that if were the -- and if you got the -- if you were able to somehow get the buy in from the ANC, then at least -- and I know this isn't necessarily supposed to be a helpful

thing or not.

But then you might get a summary order rather than a full order which means maybe you'll get to your project a little bit sooner which might be helpful to your client, right? And I think that knowing my fellow Board members a little bit that what Vice Chair John is saying is that the 16 or 17 feet that you're -- you're trying to get 7 more feet from the 10 feet on that first floor, right? So you getting the -- what Ms. John seems to be saying and I'm just kind of spit balling this here a little bit -- I don't know what that term means -- is that 17 feet from the second floor seems like everybody is kind of that might not be as -- it might be something that's palatable -- I don't know.

You might want to try to show us that, right? And whether or not that works within your program, I don't know, because by right you'd only be able to probably go ten feet from that second story I think. I don't know. We'll wait and see what the Zoning Administrator says, right?

And even if you were able to go 10 feet from that first story, I still think it's a big wall to just kind of be there. Like, it's just so odd to me to kind of like -- I just can't -- I can't get my head around it that far back, right? Even at 10 feet from the first story, and I mean, if that's what you're allowed to do by right, then I guess that's what you're allowed to do by right, right?

And then the last thing just to throw all this into confusion is that this whole changing character of the alley stuff that has been brought up, I mean, I still wonder, have you thought about putting the front -- the door on the front again and having parking in the back? I mean, I think the design is very nice. I mean, that's the problem. I like the design.

I think it's an interesting design. It's a quarter unit. It makes sense. It looks nice. I think it'd be a nice thing for the neighborhood. But did you think of putting it on the front, the entrance? And how did that look, or what did it look -- how did you get to this design?

MR. TERAN: Are you done?

BZA CHAIR HILL: Yeah, I'm done.

MR. TERAN: Well, we definitely did look at the front door. I mean, one thing was parking, if somebody was parked in the alley and they have to walk all the way around to get to the front door. And since the owners do plan on living there, they were more comfortable with parking and being closer to that front door. That was one aspect.

Another one was how it laid out with the floor plans. The stairs do start to take up a lot of space. It is a big lot. But since most of it is within the building restriction line, the width isn't that big and the stairs start to take up a lot of space.

And I mean, those are the two main reasons why we shifted the door over to H Street. As far as the wall goes, I agree with you as well. I think all of these are houses that are in RF-1 and now this RF-4 that go 35-40 feet. I think they're tall, especially if you have a two-story house right next to it.

But zoning has allowed it. I don't understand why this -- they change the zoning here recently why they didn't drop it down to 35 feet and why they kept it at 40. I find that interesting because that 5 feet is a lot. So I agree with you.

But zoning allows it by right which I worked with the owner to try to lower it as much as we could and still have it acceptable for him where he can live comfortably and he can have some money renting out the lower units where they can be big enough, the units, that it makes sense for him. As far as the 10 feet, I'm about 99 percent certain that you take it from the furthest structure in the rear yard. I've had multiple projects where we have done this before where it's only the first floor, sometimes the second floor where it's cantilevering over the first floor.

And the zoning reviewers I've always dealt with have allowed me to go 10 feet up to three stories, mainly the RF-1 zone that these happen in. But it has happened multiple times. And I have not had an issue with it.

1	BZA CHAIR HILL: For those kind of, like,
2	additions for that type, they're not really, like they're
3	kind of a sun porch thing, right? You're saying that
4	MR. TERAN: They're considered that as an
5	enclosure and as part of the house. And as long as it's kind
6	of like a screen porch, from my experience, that they count
7	because it counts toward lot occupancy. It was only a deck,
8	then you can't do it. But that's been my experience.
9	BZA CHAIR HILL: Right. So then
10	MR. TERAN: I'm happy to have zoning respond and
11	have it in writing and
12	BZA CHAIR HILL: I mean, I
13	MR. TERAN: it could take a day or maybe two
14	weeks.
15	BZA CHAIR HILL: I'm just trying to get us to a
16	yes or no faster also. Like, then that means that your by
17	right is the 10 feet and I'm looking at whatever slide
18	that you got up here, Slide No. 6 I don't know what
19	exhibit I'm in that has your red line, right?
20	MR. TERAN: Yes.
21	BZA CHAIR HILL: So you guys would go to that 10
22	foot red line.
23	MR. TERAN: Yes, and that's it's been my
24	experience that is what we will be allowed by right.
25	BZA CHAIR HILL: Right. So then is this is

1	where I don't know what to do with my fellow Board members.
2	Maybe we just need a week and we'll figure it out. Like, I
3	mean, you're basically talking about the difference in
4	shadowing now. And this is why the Office of Planning
5	probably was always also. The difference in shadowing
6	between that 10 feet and the additional 7.84, correct?
7	MR. TERAN: Yes.
8	BZA CHAIR HILL: That's the additional shadowing
9	which is additional shadowing. But does your program work
10	within the by right?
11	MR. TERAN: It would get it would kill a
12	bedroom on each floor. It gets
13	(Simultaneous speaking.)
14	BZA CHAIR HILL: You've got three bedrooms now on
15	each floor?
16	MR. TERAN: I believe we squeezed four. So it
17	would be three bedrooms and now everybody needs a home
18	office. So we're building for what people are looking for
19	in homes now. So I mean, the living room, dining, kitchen
20	area is very small. It's an open concept for that area. I
21	mean, it's definitely not
22	BZA CHAIR HILL: All right. Okay. That's all
23	right, Mr. Teran. I don't know where we are here with this.
24	So I mean, I think that it's still kind of something to
25	discuss with my Board members. So I'm going to do this.

1 I say let's just wait. I think we might reopen this because I don't know what to do, right? So let's just wait and see what the Zoning Administrator says which I think 3 probably Mr. Teran is correct because he does this, right? 4 5 And since that thing -- he says it counts toward lot occupancy, then probably he's correct. It's going to be 6 7 10 feet back from that enclosed space, right? So that'll take two weeks, Mr. Kirschenbaum, perhaps? 9 MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: I would like to -- this is a short week (audio interference) on Friday. 10 Ι realistically and for just sort of the Board's ability to not 11 12 have things postponed, three to four weeks would be more preferable or I think it would. 13 BZA CHAIR HILL: But what I want to do is also --14 and I apologize. I shouldn't say I apologize. I just don't 15 know where we are. And I'm not really sure how to make this 16 17 thing move forward at this point. Like, I don't know what my fellow Board members 18 19 may or may not do. And I guess actually to quite honest with 20 you, we can just vote on it and not have to worry about it. Like, it'll just get denied. And so the -- but if we went 21 22 ahead and said the 4th, right? We come back here. 23 Whether or not I got a -- whether or not I have an opinion from the Zoning Administrator or not by the 4th, 24

we can at least come back and see if Mr. Teran had any other

1	different opinions after hearing from the Board. Or if you
2	and your client wanted to stick with what you got and then
3	we kind of come back here and figure out what the because
4	I think we just need a little bit of time just to think about
5	it ourselves, right, individually. Mr. Moy, what does the
6	4th look like?
7	MR. MOY: It's for the next two or three, four
8	hearings. They're all equally the same. But I know that May
9	4th would accommodate Chairman Hood really well.
10	BZA CHAIR HILL: Oh, it'll accommodate Chairman
11	Hood May 4th?
12	MR. MOY: Yes, sir.
13	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. I guess he
14	knows something you don't, Chairman Hood.
15	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Must not because I thought it was
16	next week. And May 4th? Okay.
17	MR. MOY: Yeah, once it was changed, Chairman
18	Hood. I'll double back with you.
19	ZC CHAIR HOOD: I think you're right. You got it.
20	BZA CHAIR HILL: So let's do this. Mr. Teran,
21	I'll leave the record open and we're going to have a
22	continued hearing on the 4th. Okay? And if we do get
23	something from the Zoning Administrator, by then, that will
24	be wonderful, Mr. Kirschenbaum, okay, just so we can know
25	that. And then, Mr. Teran, I'll leave it up to you as to if

you want to submit anything or not, right?

MR. TERAN: Okay.

BZA CHAIR HILL: We'll come back here on the 4th. I mean, I guess you need to have a discussion with your client. And you can figure out where you think the Board may or may not be and whether or not you want to stick with your original plan right now or whether you want to change anything.

I mean, it may work out for you this way. I'm not really sure is what I'm trying to say. Even if the Zoning Administrator -- and I'm just speaking for me here. Even if the Zoning Administrator comes back and says, yes, it's from that first floor, then it's the shadowing in my opinion that goes on between the by right and the additional 7 feet, but that's just me, right?

And still I don't -- and still I'm a little bit off on that whole rear entrance thing because I think it makes the front look a whole lot different for that row, right? So if you wanted to submit something, you're welcome to in terms of a change. Or we could possibly be back here on the 4th, and then the Board would have an opportunity to have thought about this and we can have a discussion.

And then you might be doing a change, right? I'm just trying to let you know how this timeline might work out for the discussion with you and your client. Okay. I'm

going to go around the horn.

I'm going to start with the Commissioner just because, and then I'm going to go around the horn and see if anybody has any more advice for Mr. Teran. Otherwise, I'm going to close the hearing. Commissioner, do you have anything you'd like to add at the end?

MS. MOORE: Yes, please contact me. And I think the other thing I would add -- would really be two things is to have the Board take a look at ZC 19-30 and not just the outcome of the case but the rationale that the Board gave regarding why we chose to make the decisions that we've made. I think that voting yes in this instance really kind of undermines the vote on that case which was a really huge case for the community.

It was a large scale map amendment that had an impact around the city, first map RF-4 zone in the history of the city as it's a newer zone. And the whole purpose of going that route was so that, yes, there will be a transition period here. But that transition period was intended to be more gradual than I think what supporting this case would set a precedent for in this very new zone, the RF-4 zone.

And so I think that should be considered that we don't want to put communities in a situation where neighborhoods are very reasonable about raising concerns but also providing leeway for development. And then we basically

in a way punish those communities for being reasonable and not coming up with draconian standards for future development, by then immediately undermining those standards the first opportunity that presents itself. So I do think that's something to consider just in terms of the Board respecting its own precedents and its own decision making, especially when there was so much more that went into that case than has gone into -- and rightfully so, this individual case, and not to allow this individual case to undermine that for the community as a whole.

And I think the other question that was raised here that I can answer is why the decision was made not to make further changes to the height because there were some height changes enacted just because of how the various zones actually work in reality, RF versus RA. And that's because we were aware of the building restriction lines. We were aware of the other limiting factors, the height ratios, and the other considerations that take place in zoning.

And it's not that you kind of take a cafeteria approach to selecting which rule you want to follow on a given property and which not. It's that all the regulations work together in tandem and with the building codes. And so with that awareness, we did make that decision.

And I think that's evidenced by that if you take a look back at ZC 19-30, you'll see that there's a property

1

3

4

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	at the corner of 19th and H which was excluded from the
2	change to the RF-4 zone for exactly that reason, that
3	thinking was a part of the decision at the time. And so this
4	really does put us in a position where this is the first BZA
5	case in that new zone. And we're immediately undermining the
6	changes that we made just a few years back.
7	So I do think that is something worth considering
8	because all of these cases are quite specific. And they're
9	specific to the zone. And with us being the first RF-4 zone,
10	I do think that there needs to be some consideration of
11	maintaining the integrity of that zone.
12	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner.
13	That was well said. Are you an attorney?
13 14	That was well said. Are you an attorney? MS. MOORE: No.
14	MS. MOORE: No.
14 15 16	MS. MOORE: No. BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. Let's see.
14 15 16	MS. MOORE: No. BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. Let's see. Oh, if our attorneys can please write up that case that the
14 15 16 17	MS. MOORE: No. BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. Let's see. Oh, if our attorneys can please write up that case that the Commissioner is speaking of to let us know so we can look at
14 15 16 17	MS. MOORE: No. BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. Let's see. Oh, if our attorneys can please write up that case that the Commissioner is speaking of to let us know so we can look at it or give us a little bit of analysis on that case. And
14 15 16 17 18	MS. MOORE: No. BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. Let's see. Oh, if our attorneys can please write up that case that the Commissioner is speaking of to let us know so we can look at it or give us a little bit of analysis on that case. And let's see.
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS. MOORE: No. BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. Let's see. Oh, if our attorneys can please write up that case that the Commissioner is speaking of to let us know so we can look at it or give us a little bit of analysis on that case. And let's see. Okay. So now I'm going to go around the table.
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. MOORE: No. BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. Let's see. Oh, if our attorneys can please write up that case that the Commissioner is speaking of to let us know so we can look at it or give us a little bit of analysis on that case. And let's see. Okay. So now I'm going to go around the table. So the plan is at this point we're going to wait for the

And then it's going to come down I think to what

we think about even what the Commissioner says. And like, right away, people are going farther past what was allowed by right which is the 10 feet, whether or not it's something that we've done or not. And to the Commissioner I'm kind of speaking now, for me, it's that additional 7 feet of shadowing, right?

But to your point, right away, people are going farther than they were originally allowed to go, right? So I'm talking myself in a circle which is for Mr. Teran just to do what you want with it, right? And so now, Mr. Smith -- and then we're going to come back on the 4th and have an open hearing again -- supplemental hearing to see where we are with everything, where we might have the exact same design before us. And then we'll see what happens or whatever. Mr. Smith, do you need anything more to the plan?

MEMBER SMITH: More than what I've already stated. Just as Commission Board stated, I would say reconsider the design a little bit to bring it more into character and scale of the neighborhood. I guess you'll think about that after get the definitive answer from the Zoning Commissioner.

BZA CHAIR HILL: I love it. Mr. Teran, I hope you're watching this and go back and watch it. So you've got enough. All right. So then Mr. Blake, where are you? Do you need anything?

MEMBER BLAKE: I need nothing else other than the

Zoning Administrator's input. 1 2 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. So you got whatever you 3 got there with that, Mr. Teran. Mr. Hood, where are you? Do you need anything else? 4 5 ZC CHAIR HOOD: Yes, as I've asked Commissioner Moore to just give me a paragraph on 19-30. 6 I'm actually 7 going to review 19-30 myself because that's what the Zoning Commission put in place. And I think we need to stand to it 9 even though as you've already mentioned to Mr. Teran, I would still implore you to go back and work with the neighborhood 10 who took the initiative to send something forward. So that's 11 12 where I am. I haven't even got to the setback yet because 13 I can't get past 19-30. So thank you, Mr. Chairman. 14 Okay. So Mr. Teran, you can do BZA CHAIR HILL: 15 what you want to do. I think if they have a lot of times on their hands, your applicant -- your client, you might be back 16 17 here on the 4th with the exact same design and you'll be sent back to the drawing board with whatever is going on or not. 18 19 I don't know. Okay? 20 So I'm going to close the hearing -- yeah. No, 21 I'm going to close the hearing. I'm going to leave the --22 oh, sorry. Ms. John, did I miss you? I'm sorry, Ms. John. 23 I'm sorry.

So the only thing I wanted to say about 19-30, the

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN:

right.

24

25

That's all

That's okay.

text amendment, it didn't -- I mean, it didn't reduce the 1 height that's allowed. The height is still whatever it is, Let me just take a look, 40 feet max, three stories. 3 4 So that's reasonable. That's what's And the 10 foot limitation is still there. regulation. I don't understand the discussion of what happened with the 7 change in zoning because the height -- the thing that's the issue for this case is the height and the 10 foot rule. 9 There's no change in that, at least for me in this case. And so I would really want to hear from the ZA on 10 I believe it is from where that 10 foot is measured from. 11 I think I agree with the Office of Planning's 12 the wall. We've had this come up a few times, but I could 13 analysis. 14 be wrong. 15 So other than that, I don't -- I do need one more thing, the size of the apartment. So if these are three and 16 17 four bedroom units plus den, those are fairly large. smaller units support the client's objective so that we're 18 19 not looking at a 25 foot wall? So this is some of my 20 questions. Thank you. 21 So you might get kicked back to BZA CHAIR HILL: 22 the drawing board on that one, Mr. Teran, as well. 23 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: I didn't say -- I'm just 24 saying I had questions. 25 MR. TERAN: I appreciate all these questions and feedback. It's very helpful.

1

2

3

4

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

BZA CHAIR HILL: I'm saying for me he might also be sent back to the drawing board. I'm saying that the 4th, I don't know what's -- if we get nothing from Mr. Teran is what I'm saying, Mr. Teran might be sent back to the drawing board on the 4th. So he can do with what this information he has.

All right. Anybody else? If so, raise your hand. Okay. I'm going to close the hearing on the record except for leaving the record open for anything that Mr. Teran might want to submit. And then I guess the ANC would have an opportunity as always to comment on that submission. And then Mr. Moy, you could let them know if something gets puts into the record, correct? One second, Commissioner.

MR. MOY: Yes, sir. I'm following the conversation and discussions, although I'm nitpicking. So this actually a Actually, this is an open hearing. limited scope hearing based on the additional supplemental information the Board is requesting from the applicant, if anything at all, from OP and their coordination, with the ZA and additional information on the rationale or explanation from Commissioner οf ZC19-30 Moore and from our ΟZ Yes, no? attorneys.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Yeah, yeah. That's all correct.

Commissioner, you had your hand up?

1	MS. MOORE: answered my question. I just
2	wanted to make sure that you all wanted a report from me in
3	writing regarding the ZC 19-30 conversation.
4	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Yes, if nobody else wants it,
5	Commissioner, I want it.
6	MS. MOORE: Okay. Understood.
7	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. Commissioner,
8	thank you so much for your time. You've been extremely
9	helpful and thank you for waiting around this long.
10	MS. MOORE: Sure. Not a problem.
11	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. I'm letting everybody go.
12	Bye-bye. All right. So we have one more case. Let's take
13	a break. Is that cool I mean, good? And then let's just
14	take a quick break, like, five, ten minutes? Ten minutes?
15	Ten minutes? Ten minutes. Ten minutes. Ten minutes.
16	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the
17	record at 3:36 p.m. and resumed at 3:47 p.m.)
18	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, Mr. Moy, you can call our
19	next case when you can I think I saw Mr. Blake. Yep,
20	okay, go ahead, Mr. Moy.
21	MR. MOY: All right. The Board has returned to
22	its public hearing session after a quick break, and the time
23	is at or about 3:48 p.m
24	The next and last case application before the
25	Board is Application Number 20665 of Howard Road Community

Partners, LLC, this application is as amended and self-certified for request for special exceptions and area variances.

As to the area variances, relief is being asked from the subdivision regulations of Subtitle C section 302.1, pursuant to Subtitle C section 305.1, and Subtitle X section 901.2, and from the Matter of Right uses of Subtitle U section 401, pursuant to Subtitle U section 421, and Subtitle X section 901.2.

The area variances are from the maximum floor area ratio requirements, Subtitle F section 302.3, pursuant to Subtitle X section 1002. And from the lot occupancy requirements of Subtitle F section 304.1, pursuant to Subtitle X section 1002. This would construct 20 new, three-story, row dwellings in the RA-1 zone.

Property is located at Howard Road -- let me see, yes, Howard Road Southeast, Square 5860, Lots 839, 897, 906, 908, 948, 952, Lot number 1034 and 1035.

Two quick preliminary matters, Mr. Chairman, there's an authorization statement for the revised project from DMPED, so that's late, and so that's teed up for you to review or allow into the record.

And finally the Applicant is asking for expert witness status for their architect, and I believe it's under Exhibit 11.

1	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Mr. Freeman, can you hear
2	me, and if so, could you introduce yourself for the record?
3	MR. FREEMAN: Good afternoon, yes, my name's Kyrus
4	Freeman, I'm a partner at the law firm of Holland and Knight,
5	here on behalf of the Applicant in this case.
6	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Unless the Board has any
7	issues I want to see whatever it is from DMPED, so Mr. Moy,
8	if you could drop that into the record, and then, I guess,
9	Mr. Freeman, your architect is not in our book yet, is that
10	correct?
11	MR. FREEMAN: Fernando, have you testified at the
12	Board of Zoning Adjustment before?
13	MR. BONILLA: I'm not sure. I've done the Zoning
14	Hearing Examiner, by the way. I'm not sure that I've done
15	anything at the BZA.
16	(Simultaneous speaking.)
17	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, which I'm just looking,
18	it's number 11, Mr. Moy, that his resume is in?
19	MR. MOY: Yes, sir. Exhibit 11, it's there.
20	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, I see it.
21	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Examiner or the Zoning
22	Commissioner?
23	MR. FREEMAN: The Zoning Commissioner.
24	BZA CHAIR HILL: He said, Zoning Examiner.
25	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Oh, I was trying to figure out who

That's a better name for it, Zoning Examiner, 1 the -- okay. I like that. 3 So you spoke, sir, Mr. Bonilla, BZA CHAIR HILL: before the Zoning Commission? 4 5 MR. BONILLA: Yes, I did. б BZA CHAIR HILL: So I'm looking at your resume and 7 since I'm not an architect, you're not going to get grilled by me, I don't have an issue with your being an expert in 8 9 architecture. Does anybody on the Board have an issue with 10 11 Bonilla being accepted as an expert in architecture and if 12 so raise your hand? Seeing no one raising their hand, Mr. 13 Moy, if you would please add Mr. Bonilla to our book. 14 Mr. Freeman, I'm pulling up your slide deck here. 15 MR. FREEMAN: Sure. 16 If you want to go ahead and BZA CHAIR HILL: 17 explain to us, there are a lot of things that you're kind of going through here with us, but if you could go ahead and 18 19 explain to us, why you believe your client is meeting all of 20 the standards for us to grant all of these different reliefs requested, and I'm going to put 15 minutes on the clock just 21 22 so I know where we are, and you can begin whenever you like. 23 MR. FREEMAN: Just for a quick introduction as 24 well, Shane Dettman is our proffered expert in zoning and 25 land use, he's already in your book, if you will, but just

wanted to make sure that the record identified him as an expert as well.

Our PowerPoint, maybe, Mr. Young, if you could pull up Exhibit 37 that would be great. And just a quick introduction of our team, I'm on, Fernando's our architect, Shane's our planner, our clients Chris Miller and Tessa Edison are also on the line and available to answer any questions about the project.

As you may know, this site is being developed pursuant to an RFP issued by DMPED, so we're excited to be here. It's not a whole lot of relief, it's four areas of relief, it's two special exceptions. One is a standard for a multiple dwelling in the RA-1 zone.

The second special exception is for a theoretical lot subdivision which is somewhat a normal special exception, I know the Board has seen a number of times before. And then there are two variances, one from lot occupancy, and one from FAR.

So I will summarize, but if we could go to, next page. So here's our (audio interference) it's zoned RA-1, it's approximately 27,000 square feet, it's vacant. Next slide, please.

This is an existing image of our sites. Next slide, please. Some existing photos of the surrounding area.

Next slide, please. Another image that shows the irregular

shape of our property, the slope and topography.

Two important things is that this site is impacted by a WMATA right of way/subsurface easement which minimizes our ability to do any below-grade construction, so everything here is slab-on-grade. We're also impacted by a Washington Gas easement, then again there is some DMPED RFT goals that this project is designed to meet. Next page, please.

So, Mr. Chairman, I'll say two chairmans, Hill and Hood, again it's special exception to have a multiple dwelling, which is a normal special exception. I think a month or two ago you approved the same thing for another project.

We have 20 units, they're all three-bedroom units, three and a half bath, with integral garage parking. Importantly, three of the units are at 50 percent MFI, three are at 80 percent MFI, and the remaining 14 are at essentially 120 percent MFI, which is generally referred to as workforce housing.

FAR, our overall FAR is 1.38, calculated across the entire site, and that's primarily driven by a number of factors, again, things that would normally be in the cellar area are at grade, and there are other design impacts that we can go through in a second.

And our lot occupancy, again, measured across the entire site is at 50 percent, whereas 40 percent is

permitted. We comply with height, rear yard, side yard.

Next slide, please.

This is just a site plan, showing the layout.

Next slide, please. A rendering from Howard Road. Next slide, please. A render -- well an elevation of front and

back of the units. Next slide, please.

So these are the floor plans and I think, why don't I have our architect, Fernando, just run quickly through the floor plans. It's only two floor plan sheets.

MR. BONILLA: Yeah, absolutely. Again, this is Fernando Bonilla and I'm the principle and owner of Soto Architecture here in Washington D.C.. As you can see we have, we're proposing these row home dwelling located in three floors, they are about 16 feet by 38-foot-10 in footprint, 1,863 square feet in GFA area, and that does not include the area of the decks or the base.

The row homes are well-designed with an interesting layout, as you can see we have on the left side our grand floor with a bedroom, or could be used as an office, the garage has access from the back, each town home has its own individual parking space, covered and protected. There's also a bathroom on that level.

As you go to the second floor it's an open floor layout with a half-bathroom, open kitchen, dining room and living room, and a deck towards the back. And then on the

third floor we have two bedrooms, two bathrooms, then that's where the laundry closet will be located. We can go to the next slide.

MR. FREEMAN: So the next slide is, Mr. Dettman,

I wonder if you could run -- I shouldn't say run through, if

you could walk us through the next couple slides to address

the different standards for relief?

MR. DETTMAN: Sure, and good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, members of the Board. Just listed here on this slide are the four areas of relief being requested, two special exceptions, as Mr. Freeman already summarized.

Both special exceptions, generally standard in terms of special exception for new residential development in a RA-1 zone, because we're proposing a residential development that's not comprised entirely of detached and semi-detached dwellings.

And then also in order to provide the two proposed buildings on a single record lot we need to do theoretical lot subdivision. And then two area variances, one from the FAR, and the other from lot occupancy requirements of the RA-1 zone. Next slide, please.

This is showing a diagram that's in the record, showing the configuration of the theoretical lots that are proposed, again we have a total of 20 dwelling units but for purposes of zoning those 20 dwelling units are configured in

two sticks of, kind of arranged in a town home arrangement, but for purposes of the zoning those are considered to be a single building. So two buildings, each on their own individual theoretical lot. Next slide.

So the special exceptions, both of them are subject to the general special exception criteria under X, chapter 9, being in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the zoning regulations, and then will not tend to affect adversely the use of neighboring properties in accordance with the zoning regulations.

In terms of harmony with the general purpose and intent of the regs, the RA-1 zone is described as being a moderate density residential zone, we're proposing a low-rise, multiple dwelling unit development which is entirely consistent with what is contemplated in the RA-1 zone.

We're contemplating new housing in close proximity to transit which is consistent with the expressed purpose and intent of the zoning regulations, and as Mr. Freeman described, the 20 dwelling units will be comprised of affordable housing at the 50 and 80 percent MFI levels, and workforce housing at 120 percent MFI.

In terms of impacts on neighboring properties, it's surrounded on three sides by rights of way and open space, there's only an existing apartment home approximately 25 feet to the northeast of the proposed development. And

the proposed scale, height, density of the proposed development is consistent with the surrounding development pattern. Next slide.

In terms of specific criteria that are applicable to the requested special exception, as set forth on this slide, the proposal measured according to the two theoretical lots, both buildings meet the applicable side and rear yard requirements of the RA-1 zone. The private drive that connects to Shannon Place meets and actually exceeds the required 24 foot width requirement.

And then the heights of both buildings, as measured from Shannon Place, are measured in accordance with the regs and they're consistent with the maximum height that's permitted in the RA-1 zone. Next Slide.

This is just finishing out the special exception standards, they're adequately, or thoroughly addressed in our pleadings as well as the OP Report, relating to public safety, the environment, public education, I won't go through these in any amount of detail, they're here for your consideration, and again, it's in our pleadings. Next slide.

Again, for recreation, parking and loading, we're meeting the parking requirement, there's no loading required, and as DDOT's report sets forth, there's a nominal increase in vehicle trips that are contemplated, nothing that's going to overwhelm the surrounding transportation network.

And as I've mentioned in terms of urban design, the height and scale of the development is compatible with the surrounding context, and the project will result in a number of improvements to the pedestrian realm along both, Howard Road and Shannon Place. Next slide.

This is just the last slide on the special exception standards noting considerations for site planning, it's an efficient use of the buildable area on the land given the constraints that are on the property. Again, meets all side and rear yard requirements, and then for traffic it satisfies the minimum parking requirement, modest number of trips as I've already mentioned, and there's no objection from DDOT. Next slide.

And next slide. So just very quickly, at the variance, we're talking about two area variances and so in order to grant the two area variances, the Board must find that there's an exceptional condition that's specific to the property that gives rise to practical difficulties if the regulations were strictly applied, and that the relief can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good, impairing substantially the intent, purpose, and integrity of the zone plan. Next slide.

So we'll just go through those three prongs for the lot occupancy and the FAR variances that are being requested, as stated in our pleadings the subject properties

1

3

4

б

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

are irregularly shaped, it has a sloping topography up on the north side of the site that actually makes a decent amount of the site unbuildable with respect to being able to place buildings there, in terms of the topography.

There's also WMATA right of way and a subsurface easement that goes through the property, there's a 10 foot Washington Gas easement along the north side which limits our ability to place buildings on the site closer to Shannon Place, down in that southeastern corner.

And as Mr. Freeman mentioned, there's also requirements that are set forth in the DMPED RFP in terms of maximization density and maximizing affordable housing on this site that have to be met. I think collectively those result in an extraordinary exception situation specific to the property. Next slide.

And those conditions do give rise to practical difficulties if the lot occupancy and FAR requirements were strictly applied, as Mr. Freeman mentioned there's an inability to utilize any cellar space because of the subsurface constraints of the site.

So that whole first floor of the parking, and that bedroom number three and the full bath there, especially with respect to the parking and the utility areas, stuff that would normally be able to go underground and not count towards FAR has to be lifted out of the ground, adding an

entire third story to each building.

And so, if you do the math, actually having to have that third story on each of the 20 dwelling units adds about .4 FAR to the project, we're about .3 FAR over the allowable .08 that's permitted in the RA-1. So if not for the subsurface constraints on the site we'd be able to come within compliance with the RA-1 FAR requirement.

There's also the inability to provide surface parking due to the steep slopes on the northwestern portion of the site, as well as the Washington Gas easement that prevents any kind of construction there. If we could provide surface parking we could actually drop the buildings down to a two-story and again come into compliance with the FAR requirements.

In terms of lot occupancy, the only way to comply with the lot occupancy requirement would be to shrink the footprint of each of the 20 dwelling units, and that's what this diagram is showing here. First, we'd have to eliminate all of the outdoor decks, so completely eliminating any kind of private outdoor space and we know that there's a premium put on outdoor space currently.

We'd also have to shrink the footprint, either shrink the depth of each of the dwelling units, that's shown in the yellow area on this diagram. And so if you get rid of the yellow are on each of the dwelling units you can the

impact that has, not only on the living space on the second and third floor, but in order to retain that parking within the footprint of the thing, you're going to lose that third bedroom on the first floor.

You also shrink, instead of shrinking the depth you could shrink the width of the each of the dwelling units, but if you do that, that's shown in that blue-hatched area along the right-hand side of each of the footprints here.

You can see that if you were to shrink it by that much it's really taking it down to, you know, a 12 foot width which is not feasible for any kind of residential layout given the width that's required for the stair, and then the hallway requirements, you're really just kind of whittling it down to something.

So if that happens then you have to actually reduce the number of dwelling units that's proposed on the site which is now coming into conflict with the DMPED RFP requirements. Next slide.

So finally, because of the unique situation on the site that gives rise to the practical difficulty we turn to the question of whether or not the two areas of relief can be granted, or two areas of variance can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good.

We think the proposal is responsive to the DMPED RFP requirements and encourages maximization of permitted

density and the maximum amount of affordable housing on the site. Without this relief we'd be either, having to shrink the footprints and make unreasonable residential floor plates, but more likely have to shrink the number of units that are proposed on this site.

The project will also activate a vacant, underutilized site with a mixed income community of 20 larger size dwelling units that's in close proximity to transit. Next slide.

Lastly, I believe that the two variances can be granted without substantial detriment, or impairment to the zone plan. The intent of the RA-1 zone is to promote stable residential areas while (audio interference) a variety of types of residential, urban residential neighborhoods and that's exactly what this proposal is proposing.

There's adequate light and air provided to the two buildings that are proposed and then around the site, so no anticipated impacts to light and air on the adjacent residential apartment buildings to the northeast.

We're not proposing any kind of undue concentration of population or overcrowding of the site, and again consistent with the stated purposes of the zoning regulations, to provide distribution of population and use of land that will tend to create conditions that are favorable to transportation, protection of property,

б

recreational education opportunities, this is a development that fits really comfortably within the surrounding context on the site, given the constraints that exist.

And so I believe that the three prongs on the variance test have been met for the two areas of relief that are being requested. With that, Kyrus, I'll hand it off to you.

MR. FREEMAN: Thank you. If I could just add one more point, our Exhibit Number 26 includes a little more detail on the variance analysis, I'll just make two quick points, as detailed in that analysis, the BZA and the Court of Appeals have recognized that the layout and feasibility of a unit is proper for the Board to consider as part of the variance analysis and that, kind of the program of a site, or a use, or a building, are appropriate considerations for the Board as well.

Mr. Dettman and our architect just walked through the layout of the units in the program there, I just want to reiterate, I don't know if we said this, all of these units are actually home ownership units, they're not rental, and they're all, I think I said, all have a income limitation.

All of the units have the same -- and this is a DMPED expectation -- have the same interior layout and features, right, so all of them are three-bedroom units, all have in-unit washer and dryers, all have integral garages,

so you can't have some things in some units and not in others because the goal is for them to be consistent.

There's a question, well why not just reduce the number of units, you could always do that and avoid the need for relief, a reduction in the number of units not only, kind of is contradictory to the district goals of maximizing housing, but a reduction in units would proportionately reduce the amount of affordable housing as well. Because the affordable housing is proportionate to the total number of units delivered.

So that hopefully summarizes our PowerPoint, our supplemental submission, and our pre-hearing submission. Last thing I'd point out, which I'm sure you have seen, we're happy to have the support of, the record includes at least eight individual and organizational letters of support. Those are Exhibit 28, 29, 30, 34, 35, 36, 38, and 39.

I see the ANC Commissioner is on, we're happy to have the ANC's support which is Exhibit 27, and as you'll likely see in here, we have DDOT support at Exhibit 25, DPW support at Exhibit 31, and the Office of Planning's support at Exhibit 33. So we believe the application in the record clearly demonstrates that we meet all of the applicable standards for approval. So that concludes our presentation, we're happy to answer any questions.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, I'm going to move to

Commissioner White at some point but first, does the Board 1 have any questions for the Applicant? 3 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Not at this time. Okay, thanks, Vice Chair John. 4 BZA CHAIR HILL: 5 Commissioner White, can you hear me? б MS. WHITE: How are you all this afternoon? 7 Good, thank you, BZA CHAIR HILL: 8 introduce yourself for the record? 9 MS. WHITE: Yes, I'm Commissioner Jamila White, I'm the ANC Commissioner for 8A05, and the Chair of ANC-8A. 10 BZA CHAIR HILL: All right, well there's a lot of 11 12 chairmans here today -- chairpersons. Chairperson White, can 13 you give us your testimony, please? 14 MS. WHITE: Yes, my testimony's going to be really 15 Sorry, guys, I have to teach very soon so I can only be on for a few more minutes. But we are really happy to 16 17 support this development coming to our community, we've been working with the developer for several years now, several 18 19 different ANCs from when they first responded to the RFP to 20 bring this development to our community. 21 are very happy that more home ownership 22 opportunities are coming for working class families, but also 23 that this developer included four units for families earning 24 to 52 percent AMI, which the vast majority of our 25 community falls within, as average AMI for Ward 8 is below

\$40,000. So we were very happy that the developer met that request to include units in this new development that the community here could be able to purchase.

Our only -- our major concern with this development was to ensure that, two things, one, there be some type of parking on site for the homeowners, just looking at that area and that street, there's very limited parking.

That area that they're going to be developing on is currently cul-de-sac where -- well more than just a cul-de-sac but a big part of it is a cul-de-sac where, at any given time cars are all jammed up, parked up, picking up their kids from school or just parking because there's very, very limited street parking on Shannon Place, and of course no parking on Howard because of the main thoroughbred 4:13:56 street.

But many of the residents in that community don't have driveways so they rely on street parking, and so for this development we understand that the developer is looking to put a car park or garage for each unit and that's something that we really hope can stick to be able make sure that the residents over there and then the new residents that'd be coming will have places to park that have more tension than is already there

And then our other major concern was with the removal of that cul-de-sac in a earlier development plans

1	DDOT was asking for Shannon Place to be connected to Howard
2	Road, but with the ANC's support and the community's support
3	we were able to have a conversation with the developer and
4	DDOT explaining why that is not a optimal solution to open
5	up Shannon Place to Howard Road, citing several reasons with
6	transportation and safety being the biggest one.
7	So we are very happy to see that the plan has been
8	updated to keep that street blocked off, it's a one-way
9	street pretty much, so that it doesn't lead straight on to
10	Howard.
11	And we're hoping that the development is approved
12	and they get the reliefs that they are looking for, you know,
13	contingent that the two agreements they made with the
14	community stays.
15	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thanks, Commissioner.
16	Commissioner, are you telling me that DDOT listened to you?
17	MS. WHITE: I think they did, from what I
18	understand from Tessa and the development, they listened to
19	the community.
20	We had a conversation, I think about 30 folks
21	joined the town hall that DDOT participated with us in over
22	this development when they were requiring that the cul-de-sac
23	is opened for this development to come to fruition, which

Okay.

would be disastrous for the community.

BZA CHAIR HILL:

25

Okay, does

All right.

anybody have any questions for the Commissioner, Chairperson? 1 2 No? Okay, I'm going to turn to the Office of Planning, please? 3 4 Good afternoon, Chairman Hill, MS. FOTHERGILL: members of the Board, I'm Anne Fothergill for the Office of Planning, for BZA Case 20665. 6 7 And as you saw in the record the Office of 8 Planning initially didn't file a report as we waited while 9 the plans were changing in response to community concerns, the DMPED RFP, and DDOT's concerns. 10 And so our report was filed a little late but it does recommend approval based on 11 12 the revised final application, which is in Exhibit 26 of the 13 record. 14 application changed and some relief The 15 removed based on the change to two theoretical lots, so there is less relief needed now than in the original application. 16 17 And it is, as was mention, two special exceptions a new residential development in the RA-1 zone and 18 19 theoretical lot subdivision, and we found that it met the 20 criteria for both of those special exceptions. And then in order to do the development variance 21 22 relief as needed and for lot occupancy, and FAR, and we also 23 found that the Applicant made a case for those variances, and we have recommended approval of all four areas of relief.

I will rest on the record and I'm happy to take

1	questions.
2	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, thank you. Does the Board
3	have any questions for the Office of Planning?
4	Does the Applicant have any questions for the
5	Office of Planning?
6	I assume that's a no, Mr. Freeman. Sorry I didn't
7	you're shaking your head no, that's okay. Mr. Young, is
8	there anyone here wishing to speak?
9	MR. YOUNG: We do not.
10	BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Freeman, is there anything
11	you'd like to add at the end?
12	MR. FREEMAN: Thank you for your time. We look
13	forward to your hopeful approval of our application.
14	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great. Thank you, Mr.
15	Freeman. All right, I'm going to close the hearing and the
16	record and let everyone go, thank you all, have a nice day.
17	Thank you, bye-bye, Commissioner.
18	Okay, I would agree with the Applicant and their,
19	that they're meeting the burden of proof in order for us to
20	grant the relief requested. There was a lot of different
21	hoops that I think they had to jump through, but I do believe
22	that they've met all of the standards for which I feel
23	comfortable approving, or granting approval of this
24	application.

I mean, the thing that I think makes the land

really unique, again, is the WMATA, the Washington Gas, the DMPED requirements, all are things that kind of go towards making a project that I'm sure they jumped through, again, a lot of community hoops in order to get to a place which, I mean, you know, three units at 50 percent MFI, three at 80 percent, and 14 at 120, I mean obviously it's a program that is something that is well needed in the city and helps with what the Mayor's goals are.

But I do believe, again, that this application is meeting the criteria for us to grant the relief requested, I would also rely on the analysis that the Office of Planning has provided in their report, as well as the support of the ANC and DDOT. Give me one second.

So there was a lot of issues that DDOT had brought up and I believe that the Applicant has addressed those, they are issues that I think overall are not necessarily within the purview of the Board but I would ask the legal division, when they're writing the report and order, if this actually does move forward, to reference the items that DDOT had spoken to, that the Applicant is going to adhere to.

With that, I'm going to go around the table, Mr. Smith, do you have anything to add?

MEMBER SMITH: I don't have anything to add, I agree with your (audio interference) on this particular case and I would support the application (audio interference)

Applicant for implementing some additional affordable units 1 within this building (audio interference) increase affordable interference) 3 housing (audio Ι would support so the Applicant. 4 5 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okav. Mr. Blake? б MEMBER BLAKE: I too would be in support of the 7 application, the Applicant has met the burden of proof to be granted relief and I would be in support. 9 BZA CHAIR HILL: Chairman Hood? I would also agree, 10 ZC CHAIR HOOD: I really appreciate the way this whole Howard Road project has come 11 12 into play. This is just another small piece of it, I really appreciate the unit mix of the, as you mentioned, the three 13 units of 50 percent, three units of 80 percent, and the 14 14 units of 120 percent. 15 16 I think we've heard from the residents don't 17 always just push us to zero to 30, which I have personally been doing but I'm hearing now from other residents that we 18 19 want a mixture and I see here this is taking that course. 20 Also I appreciate the government DPW, I've never want to thank Deputy Director Carter 21 and I 22 submitted something in the report along with the other 23 agencies. That's all I have, Mr. Chairman. 24 BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you, Chairman Hood. 25 Chair John?

1	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Have anything to add and
2	I believe you addressed how to address DDOT's comments,
3	particularly the one that says, prior to the issuance of a
4	Certificate of Occupancy Applicant will fund and install
5	pedestrian improvements to facilitate safe crossing from
6	future Shannon Place Plaza, across Howard Street to the
7	Anacostia Metro Rail Station, subject to DDOT approval.
8	So I am not I don't believe that condition
9	should be included and that's something that Applicant can
10	work with DDOT on, because it's not a zoning requirement.
11	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, thank you, Vice Chair John.
12	All right, I'm going to go ahead and make a motion then to
13	approve Application Number 20665 as captioned and read by the
14	secretary, and ask for a second. Ms. John?
15	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Second.
16	BZA CHAIR HILL: The motion has been made and
17	seconded, Mr. Moy, can you take the roll call?
18	MR. MOY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. When I call
19	your name, if you would please respond with a yes, no, or
20	abstain to the motion made by Chairman Hill to approve the
21	application for the relief that's requested.
22	The motion to approve was second by Vice Chair
23	John, Zoning Commission Chair Anthony Hood?
24	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Yes.
25	MR. MOY: Mr. Smith?

1	Mr. Blake?
2	MEMBER BLAKE: Yes.
3	MR. MOY: Vice Chair John?
4	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Yes.
5	MR. MOY: Chairman Hill?
6	Staff would record the vote as five-to-zero-to-
7	zero, and this is on the motion made by Chairman Hill to
8	approve, the motion to approve second by Vice Chair John.
9	Also in support of the motion to approve, Zoning Commission
10	Chair Anthony Hood, Mr. Smith, Mr. Blake, and of course Vice
11	Chair John and Chairman Hill. Motion carries on a vote of
12	Five-to-zero-to-zero.
13	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Everybody, thank you so
14	much for all of your help today and I look forward to seeing
15	everyone again next week. And does anybody have anything
16	they'd like to add, otherwise we'll adjourn?
17	Okay. All right, then we're adjourned, Mr. Moy.
18	Thank you all, bye-bye.
19	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the
20	record at 4:24 p.m.)
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

<u>CERTIFICATE</u>

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Public Hearing

Before: DC BZA

Date: 04-13-22

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 aus 9