GOVERNMENT

OF

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

+ + + + +

REGULAR PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY

MAY 11, 2022

+ + + + +

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

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT MEMBERS PRESENT:

FREDERICK L. HILL, Chairperson LORNA JOHN, Vice Chairperson CARL BLAKE, Board Member CHRISHAUN SMITH, Board Member (NCPC)

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

ANTHONY HOOD, Chairman JOSEPH S. IMAMURA, Commissioner

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

CLIFFORD MOY, Secretary SARAH BAJAJ, Attorney Advisor RYAN NICHOLAS, Attorney Advisor PAUL YOUNG, Zoning Data Specialist

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

BRANDICE ELLIOTT
MATT JESICK
JONATHAN KIRSCHENBAUM

NEAL R. GROSS

STEPHEN MORDFIN CRYSTAL MYERS KAREN THOMAS

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PRESENT:

MARY NAGELHOUT, ESQ.

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Regular Public Hearing held on May 11, 2022.

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

APPLICATION NO. 2	20380 O	F POLYGON HOLDINGS, LLC	4
APPLICATION NO. 2	20648 O	F 824 TAYLOR STREET NE, LLC	39
APPLICATION NO. 2	20678 O	F TAYLOR LOFTS, LLC	50
APPLICATION NO. 2	20685 O	F OLADAPO KOLAWOLE	62
APPLICATION NO. 2	20706 0	F 4001 7TH STREET NE, LLC 1	.00
APPLICATION NO. 2		F DANIELA GROSS	1 0
AND ERIC LERAN	• • • •		.⊥∠
APPLICATION NO. 2	20711 0	F 2628 MLK, LLC 1	25
		F 2505 WISCONSIN AVE 1, LLC	40
AND 2505 WISCONS.	IIN Z, L	LC	.40
APPLICATION NO. 2	20717 0	F WESLEY HALLMAN &	
STIMANA RUBINO-H	MAM.T.TA	1	84

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

2	(9:43 a.m.)
3	MR. MOY: The Board is now in its public hearing
4	session. And this would be Case Application No. 20380,
5	Polygon Holdings, LLC. And okay. And this is an application
6	as amended, self-certified, pursuant to Subtitle X Section
7	901.2 for Special Exceptions under Subtitle U Section 421 to
8	allow a new residential development, 17 unit apartment house,
9	and under Subtitle F Section 5201 from the side yard
10	requirements of Subtitle F Section 306.2(a). This property
11	is located in the RA-1 zone at 4457 through 4459 MacArthur
12	Boulevard NW, square 1363, lots 57 and 961.
13	Mr. Chair, I'm not sure you're aware, this
14	application was at a full hearing action on July 14, 2021.
15	But, since then, there have been multiple postponements
16	arriving at today, May 11, 2022.
17	In the record, as a reminder, there are two
18	parties in opposition in the record. One is from Dawn Lea,
19	Dr. Dawn Lea. And the other one is the Foxhall Terrace, LLC.
20	And I believe that's all I have for you.
21	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Mr. Sullivan, could you
22	introduce yourself for the record, please.
23	MR. SULLIVAN: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair, members
24	of the Board. Marty Sullivan with Sullivan & Barros on
25	behalf of the applicant.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Mr. Brown, are you with us today? Can you introduce yourself for the record.

MR. BROWN: Yes, I am, Chairman Hill. Patrick Brown from Greenstein DeLorme & Luchs on behalf of the opponent, Foxhall Terrace.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Let's see. So we granted -- you guys, this was so long ago. I can't even believe. I can't believe that this is back here. That you guys stuck with this. So let's see. Mr. Brown, we gave you guys party status. Is that correct?

MR. BROWN: That's correct.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. Mr. Sullivan, I'm going to go ahead. I see everything that you have in the record, and I know what you're going to be trying to persuade the Board, in terms of why you believe your client is meeting the criteria to grant the relief requested. I see your PowerPoint. I don't know how much we need to go into the diagrams of the actual units, the architectural drawings, If you want to, primarily, just speak, again, to that is. what the Board is trying to focus on, that might be helpful. And let's go ahead and start there. And, Mr. Sullivan, you can begin whenever you'd like.

MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And, a preliminary matter, I filed a submission asking the Board to strike the party status opposition of Dr. Lea because she no

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

longer owns that property.

2.1

BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes. I see it there. Was that late, Mr. Sullivan?

MR. SULLIVAN: Well, it was, it definitely was not within 21 days. Yes, it was a recent filing. Yes.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Unless the Board, and I'm just speaking to my Board members, has any issues, I want to allow that into the record. I don't see anybody speaking up or raising their hand. And, Mr. Sullivan, I can see that that's part of what you guys had been doing for the past year. And so I understand, and I'm glad that you were able to come to some agreement with Dr. Lea. So, okay. So that's it, then, Mr. Sullivan.

MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair and members of the Board. So Mr. Young, could please load the PowerPoint presentation? And, if the Board recalls, this application was originally just 4457 MacArthur Boulevard. And it was just the right side of what is, currently, a two semidetached single-family homes surrounded on each side by much larger apartment buildings.

And the applicant was able to negotiate with Dr. Lea and purchase her property, which is something the ANC suggested to us at the beginning would be a nice solution. Therefore, now we, rather than being a 9-unit apartment building adjacent to a single-family home, it's now proposed

to be a 17-unit apartment building which is in between two larger apartment buildings. Next slide, please.

So we're requesting Special Exception approval in order to construct the new residential development under U 421. Also requesting side yard relief in order to maintain the existing eight-foot side yards. The reason why we think we needed this relief is because we were going from a singlecurrently home, which is not in nonconforming condition. So, technically, under the language in the regulations, we're not extending a nonconforming condition, which would have allowed us to do a two-foot or a three-foot side yard because we're going from a single-family. So we're asking to keep the eight-foot side yard on the side that requires a side yard, which is both sides, actually. slide, please.

We do have the support of ANC 3D now. We have the support of the Office of Planning as well as DDOT. about Dr. Lea next door. And, regarding Foxhall Associates, the applicant has been working with Mr. Brown and his client in discussing amendments, of a sort, to the existing right which the applicant enjoys, Foxhall of across Associates' property, to get to its parking spaces. We have not come to an agreement yet. We still look forward to that possibility. Next slide, please.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Sullivan, you guys added

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

that, your easement, into the record. Is that correct? 1 MR. SULLIVAN: It's been in there for quite a 2 It's in Exhibit 60. 3 while. 4 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Sixty. 5 MR. SULLIVAN: Sixty (a) through (d) as a plat showing the right of way from the location --6 7 BZA CHAIR HILL: No, that's great. I couldn't 8 remember. Thank you. 9 Yeah. It's in there. So I'll turn MR. SULLIVAN: 10 it over to Mr. Crain. 11 ADAM CRAIN: For the record, Adam Crain, the architect with 2Plys. Photos we're looking at existing conditions. 13 These are built as two single-family semi-detached structures. If we could forward to slide 14 15 number, page number 7, we should be the existing site. 16 to give an overview, kind of the areas in red are the 17 existing structures. As Marty mentioned, it was previously, I think, a 9-units, now expanded into a 17-unit to encompass 18 both buildings. Can forward one slide. 19 2.0 This is some just renderings showing the exterior 2.1 We worked pretty intensively with the Office perspective. 22 of Planning in retaining the front porch and the front facade 23 and the side facades as they wrap around to keep some of that 24 street character there. Obviously, you can see all the

additions towards the rear to provide the space for the 17

units. Forward one slide, please.

2.1

2.3

Shows the proposed site plan. Five parking spaces at the rear as well as trash. We've got pedestrian circulation on both left and right sides of the building. Move forward two slides.

Brief overview of the plans. Four levels at the cellar. Five at the first. And four each of the second and third floor for a total of 17 units. We've got the required bicycle long-term spaces there in the cellar in public space and, outside of the building, we'll have the short-term bike spaces as well as a rooftop and cellar space for roof access and maintenance. I think we can forward to slide number 18.

Just really just showing some of the elevations how we've kept as much of that existing building as possible with the proposed additions. And that was with the Office of Planning request. If we can go to slide 24, please.

This is just kind of a unit overview. You'll see that unit 11 and unit 5 are provided for for IZ. We are using the IZ bonus, and two units are required to satisfy that here. I'll turn it back over to Marty and slide 27.

MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you, Adam. So, to over the general requirements, of course, it's fairly simple. This is a RA-1 zone. This is in an apartment building, so it's compatible with the zone. And it's also compatible with the surrounding area as we're surrounded by two significantly

large apartment buildings. Next slide, please. 1 2 BZA CHAIR HILL: Hey, can in interrupt you one second, Mr. Sullivan? 3 4 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes. Of course. 5 BZA CHAIR HILL: I guess where the IZ stuff goes. You guys got the unit 5 and unit 11. Unit 11's a two bedroom 6 7 and then unit 5 is a one bedroom. And you chose those 8 because why, again? Because that was the square footage that 9 you needed to meet the requirements? 10 MR. CRAIN: Correct. We calculated 1,060 required 11 square feet for IZ. None of the units are that large. 12 basically, we have one and then we kind of provide second one to meet that minimum requirement. 13 BZA CHAIR HILL: Got it. Okay. Okay. 14 15 All right, Mr. Sullivan. Please continue. 16 MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you. Next slide, please. 17 So in the two areas of relief, the specific requirement. the side yard, we're just asking for a foot of relief. 18 That's what's required for this height of building on each 19 2.0 side. And there's a significant distance between these 21 properties and the adjacent apartment buildings as well. 22 that's a minor request that wouldn't have any impact on light 23 and air or privacy. Next slide, please. 24 And also. of course, does not affect the character, scale, and pattern of houses along the street and

It's just a continuation of the existing side 1 yard width. Next slide, please. 2 3 For the specific requirements regarding U 421, 4 these are the standard requirements that the Board goes 5 through for these cases. The application has been referred And next slide, please, the Office of to these agencies. 6 7 Planning has made a very detailed evaluation of its criteria. 8 And I'll defer to the Office of Planning report on that. 9 Next slide, please. 10 I believe that's it. Yes, that's all. Thank you. Okay. 11 BZA CHAIR HILL: Does the Board have any 12 questions of the applicant? Okay. Mr. Brown, do you have any questions of the applicant? 13 14 MR. BROWN: I do. And I don't know who to address 15 it to specifically. In the record, have you provided a 16 survey drawing showing the location of the 10-foot right of 17 way in relationship to the driveway for Foxhall Terrace at 18 4465? 19 All the easement documents MR. SULLIVAN: Yes. 20 are provided in Exhibit 60 (a) through (d), including a plat 2.1 from the recorded easement that shows the right of way. 22 But that wasn't my question. MR. BROWN: МУ question is have you provided a survey drawing showing, 23 24 2022, the easement area in relationship to the property lines

and the existing driveway at 4465?

1	MR. SULLIVAN: I would have to check the record.
2	I'm not sure if we also filed that in addition to the
3	existing easement drawing, which shows the exact location of
4	the easement in relationship to your client's property and
5	my client's property.
6	MR. BROWN: Just for the record, Mr. Chairman,
7	having reviewed the record, I'm not aware of any such
8	drawing. And I've been asking for that since my involvement
9	in this case.
10	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. That's fine,
11	Mr. Brown. You don't think it's in the record what you're,
12	at least, trying to ask for. But I do see the easement
13	documents that they have in there. Do you have another
14	question, Mr. Brown?
15	MR. BROWN: I do not.
16	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Mr. Brown, would you like
17	to give us your presentation?
18	MR. BROWN: If I could, my client, Mr. Feldman,
19	should be he was given the warning from Robert Reed. He
20	should be available.
21	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Great.
22	MR. BROWN: I'd like to let him start.
23	BZA CHAIR HILL: Sure. Mr. Feldman, can you hear
24	me? Mr. Feldman, can you hear me? Great. Could you
25	introduce yourself for the record. And have you been sworn

I think you did go through the process. 1 in do you know? 2 I did with Mr. Reed yesterday. MR. FELDMAN: 3 BZA CHAIR HILL: Could you introduce Okay. 4 yourself for the record, please. 5 MR. FELDMAN: My name is Jack Feldman. Yes. Ι οf the LLCthat owns 4465 MacArthur 6 part owner 7 Boulevard, located next to the property we're hearing about 8 today. 9 Okay. BZA CHAIR HILL: 10 MR. FELDMAN: More importantly, I'm the owner of a private driveway with a right of way to be used by the 11 12 their future residence quests, and This is not a public alley, as some documents have 13 vehicles. It's a private driveway. 14 I oppose this development until such time as the 15 parties can agree on the easement terms for the maintenance 16 17 the driveway because of increased density, the applicants -- I'm sorry, the occupants, guests, and service 18 vehicles that will be increased on the driveway. 19 This 2.0 includes but not limited to driveway maintenance, storm drain 2.1 service, snow and ice treatment. And we want to restrict the 22 unauthorized use of my parking lot for their guests and deliveries and services. 23 24 I've had several communications with the applicant but no resolution. As recently as yesterday, I go two emails

that they rejected documents that our attorneys have been 1 I desire a recordable document outlining the 2 working on. obligations of the applicant and the future owners of that 3 property in the event that it's a condominium. 5 And, lastly, the driveway is 10 feet wide. And in order for the split parking spaces behind the proposed 6 7 apartment building , they will trespass on my property on a 8 regular basis, short of me putting a wall up, I suppose. So 9 and I'd just like to have an agreement with them, in writing 10 and recordable, so that the applicant and future people can 11 exist together peacefully. 12 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Thanks, Mr. Feldman. 13 Okay. Mr. Brown, can you hear me? 14 MR. BROWN: Yes, I can. 15 CHAIR HILL: I guess, Mr. Brown, and 16 appreciate -- we -- I do recall the last hearing that we had. 17 And there was Dr. Lea was here. And the house was, again, supposedly, one house. And they got split. 18 And then there was different -- and I don't remember, Mr. Brown. 19 20 there at the beginning of this? 2.1 MR. BROWN: I've been from the very beginning. 22 All right. BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. So you 23 remember like he pictures of the walls and all that stuff. 24 As far as the easement, I don't even know if that necessarily

relates to the regulations that we're kind of taking a look

don't mind that Mr. Feldman 1 right? And so I testified to it, but we're here for the regulations that 2 3 we're supposed to look at. 4 And so I do appreciate that you all are trying to 5 work this out. I'm a little surprised. I quess you quys haven't worked this out, insofar as if it's additional cars, 7 the five cars that are going to be going back there as 8 opposed to two cars that would have gone back there. So 9 you're talking about an additional three cars, considering 10 that it was two homes at one point, right? 11 And so, anyway, I quess I'm prattling along here 12 a little bit to just say I'm going to turn this back over to you, Mr. Brown, to go ahead and give us any more of your 13 presentation that you would like to. 14 15 MR. FELDMAN: Can I add one thing, please? is Jack Feldman. 16 17 BZA CHAIR HILL: Sure. 18 The two houses had parking for four MR. FELDMAN: And a 17-unit condo or apartment building is going to 19 2.0 have a lot more activity. If there's only one person in each 21 unit, that's 17 people coming and going, as opposed to the 22 house. If they have more than one person living in an 23 apartment, having quests and visitors and deliveries. 24 BZA CHAIR HILL: I got you, Mr. Feldman. Ι

understand.

See, an awful lot of activity on 1 MR. FELDMAN: that driveway, even though they only have those five --2 3 BZA CHAIR HILL: Yeah, Mr. Feldman. I just don't 4 know if you understand what I'm trying to say, is that I 5 don't know if that falls within, necessarily, what we're looking at with the regulations. And so, but I understand 6 7 what you're trying to, your concerns. And so, Mr. Brown, do 8 you have anything else you'd like to add? 9 MR. BROWN: Sure. And I think, to your point, Mr. 10 Chairman, your role, in this instance, is to evaluate whether this project is creating objectionable conditions. 11 12 Within the regulations. 13 BZA CHAIR HILL: MR. BROWN: Pardon? 14 Within the regulations. 15 BZA CHAIR HILL: Within the regulations. I understand 16 MR. BROWN: 17 But and our view is that, within the context of the regulations, that the use of this 10-foot right of way, and, 18 remember, it's only 10 feet. 19 And the driveway that exists So and Mr. Feldman and his 2.0 now is wider than 10 feet. 21 ownership had interest in no trespassing on his property 22 without some sort of understanding, which doesn't exist now. 23 But the use of that 10-foot right of way, which, 24 and, I think, it's important to note, the applicant has not identified its location in relationship to the existing

driveway, will create objectionable conditions to Mr. Feldman's property. And we've outlined them. In the original herein, I had Exhibit 68, which I would refer to. And I don't intent to go through it.

But I'll note that I've gone through and listed, in slides 12 and 13, the objectionable conditions. If you look at the drawing that was provided by the applicant, in order to, and it's on my slide on that Exhibit 68, in order to access the rear of this property, the vehicles have to turn beyond the 10-foot and swing onto Mr. Feldman's property.

The other objectionable conditions are enhanced wear and tear on Mr. Feldman's property, illegal parking, blocking of the driveway by vehicles. At 10 feet, while it may comply with the zoning regulations, it makes two-way traffic difficult, particularly in an increased occupancy of the applicant's property, and safety hazards. It's also -- and this is a problem that Mr. Feldman fights every day, but will be made worse: people think that that parking lot behind his property is theirs to use. So there is an illegal parking problem.

What I think would be an appropriate measure for the Board to take would be to impose some reasonable conditions, certainly within the Board's jurisdiction to, and I've laid them out on slide 14. If I could go through. And

1	vehicle access limited to the vehicles who are assigned or
2	own the parking spaces behind the property. No pickup or
3	drop off at the rear. No deliveries, move-in, move-out, or
4	trash using the right of way. Bicycle storage and pedestrian
5	access not using the 10-foot right of way. This is very
б	important. No construction access using the right of way.
7	And no parking of the applicant's property's vehicles at
8	4465. That's all.
9	Those are the items that we attempted. And Mr.
10	Sullivan and I worked at it, attempted to incorporate it in
11	a written agreement. We haven't accomplished that so,
12	unfortunately, the burden falls on the Board to impose some
13	reasonable conditions that, I think, respond to the
14	objectionable conditions and, certainly, within the Board's
15	jurisdiction.
16	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Thanks. Can you guys hear
17	me?
18	MR. BROWN: I can.
19	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. I just, I don't know what
20	happened.
21	MR. BROWN: Can't see you. You were in the dark.
22	BZA CHAIR HILL: I don't know what happened to my
23	camera. All right. Let's see. Does the Board have any
24	questions of Mr. Brown? Okay. I'm going too oh. Sorry.
25	Someone has a question. Mr. Blake?

1 MEMBER BLAKE: Yeah. Mr. Brown, what, this is a 2 very interesting dilemma. It's not really within our purview 3 as a civil issue. But what is the sticking point between the negotiations, if you could give an indication of that? 5 is this something that can be managed within some reasonable time frame? 6 7 MR. BROWN: I believe so. And there's a draft 8 document that's been provided that, if the applicant has 9 specific objections to that, we're happy to discuss those but 10 not on a take it or leave it basis. Mr. Sullivan and I can 11 roll up our sleeves and work it out. 12 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Anybody else have 13 question? 14 To echo Mr. Blake's question, I ZC CHAIR HOOD: 15 was sitting here when you asked. I didn't say anything 16 because was simply trying to find a nexus between what Mr. 17 Brown was saying versus our regulations. Now, the Board isn't necessarily going to look at that. But the Commission, 18 everything's in my purview, our purview. 19 So I'm just trying 20 to figure out how to tie that in. 2.1 But I think, if the Board is willing, I hear Mr. 22 I haven't heard from Mr. Sullivan, but I think Board Brown. 2.3 Member Blake's question is very relevant. If that could 24 ease everybody's adherence and be able to work together, as

I always call, the good neighbor policy, then there may maybe

some room to hold off for a week or so or two weeks or whatever the case is. Those are just my comments, not necessarily a question. Thank you.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Does anybody actually have a question? Okay. Ms. John?

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd VICE CHAIR JOHN: hear Mr. Sullivan's response to Mr. And I'm looking at the, I believe, it's Exhibit discussion. 98 right that shows the of And, way. your understanding, Mr. Sullivan, what more is Mr. Feldman requesting, in addition to this exhibit, which shows the right of way? I'm not talking about the parking at the back. I'm just talking about the access. That's a different thing.

Well, first of all, the applicant MR. SULLIVAN: would have loved to not have a full order in this case. They're still taking a year. significant So we had а interest in reaching an agreement. I'm never comfortable discussing negotiations that happened behind the scenes when the Board for an issue that's comes to contract. But Mr. Brown has brought it up.

And so everything he said, I could say also. I could say, our offer was outright rejected. I put forward a draft which was based on an email agreement which was based on the parties themselves, without the lawyers involved, that had three simple points. One was just ensuring that the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

users of the easement would not encroach onto his property and having some sort of enforcement mechanism for that. And the other one was to share maintenance cost, which the applicant was happy to do.

So we got back an agreement that had a whole bunch more of stuff. And it became very burdensome. So if Mr. Brown would like to open up that discussion, we can talk about all that in front of the Board. I don't think it's appropriate. I would go with what Mr. Brown said in one of his initial filings where he said, although resolution of this dispute is, ultimately, a civil litigation matter and beyond the scope of the Board's authority.

We would still like to have an agreement. I think it would still be in the interest of both parties to have an agreement after this is done. So I think they're going to continue to discuss this because they're going be neighbors. And they're going to have to deal with the use of the easement. And we're certainly open to that, and my client's open to that.

Regarding the easement itself, the language of the it's almost 100 years old. rather easement, So it's ambiquous, as easements are back then. it grants a But That's basically what the language says in the drivewav. easements. And it's very clear where the location is from those documents. But some of the language is, the 10-foot

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

right of way leading to conduit road to be in favor of all of said property.

And an interesting point on this, when this easement was established, Mr. Feldman's 34-unit building was 2 single-family homes. So it was a whole different situation then. There's nothing in the easement that says the easement goes away or needs to be amended when a use is changed that's benefitted by the easement.

And now we're getting into easement law, which I'm not comfortable arguing of. And, I think, anything that an objectionable condition, which is not actually a word anywhere, I don't think, in U 421 or in the general Special Exception requirements, it's in the context of the easement. He's saying that all the things that exist, all the concerns, existed before this application. You heard Mr. Feldman say there were four cars back there before. Now we're proposing there may be five cars back there. So we're talking about one car difference.

So I just think it's a completely separate issue. But I do want to say, we're there. My client and Mr. Brown's client came to an agreement in an email and then it wasn't reflected on the document that was written. And we were working hard on it yesterday, and so here we are. I don't know if additional time would change any of that, unfortunately. And I'd love it if it would because I'd love

2.0

2.1

to not have a full order. But I don't have much faith that we're not just wasting more time. And I'd like to get to that point where, at least, we begin to wait for that full order, I guess.

VICE CHAIR JOHN: So, Mr. Sullivan, if I could follow up, in terms of the Board's concern because the easement is only of interest to us in making sure that there is access to the parking. So in terms of what's in the record, where is that 10-foot driveway shown? And because the parties can arrange for a survey among themselves because that goes towards trespassing, I think. But we're just concerned with making sure that there is access to the driveway. I'm sorry. To the parking.

And then, while you're doing that, could you also address whether or not there is sufficient turning radius? Assume that the applicant is interested in protecting his property at the rear and is not interested in having cars trespass on his property and might put up a fence, which a reasonable property owner might do, would the cars be able to turn around without hitting that fence?

MR. FELDMAN: I don't know. In answer to your question --

MR. SULLIVAN: The question was directed for me, Mr. Feldman.

VICE CHAIR JOHN: This is for Mr. Sullivan --

2.1

1 BZA CHAIR HILL: That question is for Mr. Sullivan 2 from Board Member John. 3 MR. FELDMAN: Oh, I'm sorry. I thought it was for 4 me. Sorry. 5 VICE CHAIR JOHN: It's Mr. No, for sorry. Sullivan. 6 7 MR. SULLIVAN: So, again, these are easement 8 questions that have existed for 100 years, not related to 9 this project. And if he wanted to put a wall up, he could. 10 But DDOT, in its report, has mentioned the easement several times and still is in support. So I would refer to DDOT's 11 opinion on that as far as the access and turnaround, as well 12 as the Office of Planning. 13 14 And, regarding access, again, in the end, it's a self-certified issue. We believe that we meet the parking 15 requirement. How this would play out as I've self-certified, 16 17 and I do have something in the record. Exhibit 34, I think I'm sorry. That's not it. It's Exhibit --18 it was. No. there's an exhibit in the record, I'll find the number, that 19 2.0 has a confirmation from the zoning administrator in a similar 2.1 in an identical matter, where he states that a

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1716 14TH ST., N.W. STE 200 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

private easement suffices in lieu of a public alley.

requirement for access to those parking spaces.

long as the private easement's 10-feet wide, it meets the

So and we've met with the zoning staff on this as

22

2.3

24

confirmed that's still well. And they yes, the But we didn't get that in writing yet. interpretation. But we have it in writing on another case. But I'm selfcertifying as to that. So how that would play out is if Mr. Brown's client wanted to sue in civil court and say that, hey, the easement never allowed an increase in the density of the property that was benefitted by the easement, well then that, we might lose access at that point, if the court agreed with them. And then we would have to come back to the Board. So or if the zoning administrator said, I changed my mind and the easement no longer works, I'd have to come back to the Board. So it's all, there's a path for all of that.

Regarding the easement itself, it think it's, my client understands that it's in their interest to continue to work with Mr. Feldman on that easement. It wouldn't hurt. And he's willing to share maintenance costs as well, which is not an obligation currently.

VICE CHAIR JOHN: Mr. Sullivan, all I'm trying to find out is whether or not the cars can turn around in the back without trespassing on Mr. Feldman's property. Are they doing that now? Or -- that's all I would be interested as a Board member. I'm not trying to interpret the easement. That's not what I'm trying to do.

And I'm aware of that opinion in terms of having a recorded easement where there's no rear alley access. I'm

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

not questioning that. I'm just questioning the access to the parking at the rear and whether or not there's an exhibit that shows where the easement is. And you have confirmed that there's an exhibit that shows where the easement is and that it's 10 feet. Whether or not, we don't require a survey. That's a private matter. What I'm interested in is whether or not there's room at the back for access to the parking. That would be in the Board's interest.

MR. SULLIVAN: Yes. And it would show on the site plan in the plat and then in Exhibit 60(a). It's a 10-foot easement but then it turns into the property. So as long as there's room for a car to go, you turn into the property, and then you have the whole rear of the property with which to turn around. And so the issue of whether or not they would ever encroach into non-easement property, again, that would just be a violation of the easement, which would have been — is not changing. That situation is not changing. We're going from four spaces to five spaces.

VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. Thank you.

MEMBER BLAKE: Just to follow up, Mr. Sullivan, with regard to loading, I understand that the trash will also be back there. Could that pose a problem? And I know it's not quite within the context of what we're saying. But it would seem large trucks trying to do that would be an obstruction. How do you do the loading and unloading and

2.0

2.1

also the move-in and move-out? 1 2 MR. SULLIVAN: Mr. Crain, do you have information on that? I'm not so sure the trash won't be collected at the 3 4 front. 5 MR. BROWN: I believe the trash receptacles are in the rear in the parking area. This is Mr. Brown. 6 7 SULLIVAN: Well then this would be on the applicant and the condo owners and the condo association to 8 9 then provide for that with a private pickup. So the private 10 pickup would pull up in the front, would have to walk the trash back if that truck can't get in there without violating 11 12 that easement, which is not -- that's something that private companies do all the time. They'll tailor the service to the 13 property. 14 15 BZA CHAIR HILL: Can you hear me? 16 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes. 17 MR. BROWN: Yes, Mr. Hill. 18 Thanks. Hey, I'm going to jump BZA CHAIR HILL: off for a second and try to jump back on and see if my camera 19 2.0 clicks in, okay? Just give me one moment. I'm sorry. Are 2.1 Can you all hear me? I'm you guys there? Okay. Great. It was just so distracting. 22 I couldn't wave. Ι 23 couldn't raise my hand. I can't do anything. All right. 24 Let's see. Further questions from the Board? Mr. Blake.

MEMBER BLAKE:

25

Mr. Sullivan, one last question.

With regard to the trash again, does, based on the current easement agreement, are you allowed to traverse that 10-foot space with the garbage trucks or with the trash removal? It's a little bit different. Now you've got 17 people in there. It's going to get -- there will be, 17 units, there will be more trash. And it will be a commercial delivery service or removal service. So I'm just curious to know, do you have that ability, based on your reading of the easement, not that -- to do that. Just wanted to make sure you can access the trash.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Somebody, Mr. Feldman, you might want to -- is it Feldman? You might want to mute your phone. Thank you.

MR. FELDMAN: Okay.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Go ahead, Mr. Sullivan.

MR. SULLIVAN: So, yes. Thank you. In the documents, the easement documents, it says right of way or driveway. And that's it. Now, I'm not an expert in easement. I do believe, I do understand, from discussion with others that, if it was restricted, it would have to say that. But it's a driveway for the benefit of that property.

And on the trash, I would add that my client has had conversations with Tenleytown Trash. They've said that they have vehicles that would fit and not encroach across the easement. But if it did, that would be on them. And it

2.0

2.1

would be on my client and their successor to not do that or to find a way around that under the terms of the easement.

So if they couldn't get on there, then the trash would be -- it's still just going to be one -- it's going to Ι don't know how much more couple -trash is accumulated as a result of that. I think we have six receptacles. But the short answer is, as Ι read the easement, I understand that law, and there's as no restrictions.

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

MR. KIRSCHENBAUM: Good morning, Chair Hill and members of the Board of Zoning Adjustment. I am Jonathan Kirschenbaum with the Office of Planning. We recommend approval of the revised proposal to provide a 17-unit apartment house now. And we -- so that's for the Special Exception relief for new residential development.

And then we also recommend approval for maintaining the existing side yards. Our approval is based on the revised plans that are at Exhibit 93(a) and the landscaping plan that is Exhibit 87(a) and we rest on the staff report. Please let me know if you have any further questions. Thank you.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Does the Board have any questions for the Office of Planning? All right. Does the

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

applicant have any questions for the Office of Planning? 1 2 MR. SULLIVAN: No, thank you. 3 Mr. Brown, do you have any BZA CHAIR HILL: 4 questions for the Office of Planning? Mr. Young, is there 5 anyone here wishing to speak? We do not. 6 MR. YOUNG: 7 BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Brown, would you like to add 8 anything in conclusion? 9 MR. BROWN: Yes, just briefly. One, I still think 10 that Mr. Sullivan and I can work out an agreement that would one, meet the needs of both sides, and also remove the party 11 12 in opposition status. Regardless of how we feel about what occurred, we 13 plain ran out of time before this morning. 14 So I would make 15 the suggestion two weeks. See, see if Mr. Sullivan and I, who speak the same language can work this out? 16 17 BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes, I got you, Mr. Brown. 18 MR. BROWN: The alternative is, as I've mentioned, and I think Ms. John and others have raised questions about 19 2.0 potential objectionable conditions. And the conditions that 2.1 I outlined in my presentation, absent an agreement, would address and minimize the potential objectionable conditions. 22 2.3 way that wouldn't harm the applicant's 24 project, but would in fact, respond prevent to and objectionable conditions. And with that, I'll leave it to

the Board.

2.0

2.1

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, Mr., I'll let the Board, we'll talk with the Board a little bit about what we kind of do. I have a couple of opinions and so we'll see how that goes. Mr. Sullivan, do you have anything you'd like to add conclusion?

MR. SULLIVAN: Just that in, I mean, one of the things that was interesting about this is when we went back to the to the ANC with this solution, they were so excited to have two IZ units.

And the Chair was very pointed in asking me, Mr. Sullivan, do you know how many IZ units we have in this SMD right now? And he said zero, and they all chuckled. And so they were really excited about this.

And I don't, I don't, they're not here, so I don't want to leave them out in consideration of their point of view. So I wanted to point that out. I think the application meets the requirements.

We're, well again, we do want to come to an agreement with the neighbor, we would love to avoid having a full order. We've had six weeks to work on it so far, and it hasn't really been changing. So I'm not so sure. As I'm saying this, I'm communicating with my client as well.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, give me a second,

Mr. Sullivan. If you're done, I'm going to talk to my fellow

Board members, okay?

2.1

MR. SULLIVAN: Okay.

BZA CHAIR HILL: So, I'm just looking at my fellow Board members, I don't really, my opinion are a little bit of all this is that the easement is not something that's necessarily within our purview.

If you all think, and I'm happy to give a couple of weeks to the client just so, you know, they might have an opportunity to work something out. In terms of, you know, I remember this case a year and a half ago.

And I remember Dr. Lee, who was here, and I remember that like, you know, the objections of the apartment building next door, which the applicant has pointed out, which I think is kind of what I'm taking hold of, is that when this easement was done, that was a two-bedroom house as well.

So they built their apartment building, right?

And so now they want to build an apartment building on the other side. And so I think we're kind of getting in the way of what the Board necessarily has to do.

But, you know, I'm happy to if the Board wants to wait a couple of weeks, fine. If the applicant wants to wait a couple of weeks, fine. I also am trying to run the hearing here today and whether or not this turns in, I guess it would just be a decision case.

1 So I'll go around the horn and see what people have to say before I let the applicant either go or if we 2 3 have any questions, I quess whether the applicant's client thought on wanting to wait a couple of 5 Mr. Smith, do you have a thought? 6 MR. SMITH: I do, Chairman Hill. I don't think 7 it's something that's necessarily within our purview. 8 they wouldn't be able to start construction anyway on their 9 proposal without being able to satisfy or meet the easement 10 requirements that specify about the zone administrator before they can even get a building permit. 11 12 So they, you know, I'm happy to defer this for two weeks and we could put this on for a decision meeting but 13 not, I mean, I'm on, I'm with you. 14 I'll think I'm prepared 15 to vote. 16 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, Mr. Blake? 17 MEMBER BLAKE: I would agree with your statements. I do think it would be nice to have this neatly packaged with 18 19 the agreement in place, but it seems like it may not be possible based on Mr. Sullivan's comments in a timely fashion 2.0 2.1 to make much of a difference. 22 permitting process will ultimately And 2.3 determine rather, that if they can't get the parking, then 24 they'll have to come back to parking relief, in which case

we would revisit this.

And they can work something out between now and 1 So I would be prepared to wait if 2 then it's a long road. 3 they think they can get something resolved. Otherwise, I'm 4 prepare to vote today. 5 BZA CHAIR HILL: Chairman Hood? ZC CHAIR HOOD: The issue is whether it would be 6 7 a full order or summary order because I really know and 8 pretty much can tell where the Board is going with this. So 9 it's up to whether or not, because of a summary order or a 10 full order. So I'll just leave it at that, thanks. Vice Chair John? 11 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. 12 on mute, Vice Chair John. 13 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: I'm pretty much in agreement with what's been said so far. 14 The questions I 15 asked were clearly within the Board's purview in terms of whether there's proper access 16 to the property 17 parking. 18 And looking at the Exhibit 122, the revised plot, and the copy of the easement in the record, there's a 10 foot 19 2.0 easement shown. And the rear yard is 42 feet and that's 2.1 enough to provide access to parking, I think, 22 around. 23 I mean, that's how I'm seeing it. So I'm prepared 24 to decide today or set this, continue this for two weeks for

decision if the parties want to file anything else.

1	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, then I don't even, I mean,
2	I'm fine with setting a two weeks for a decision. Two weeks
3	isn't going to make a difference one way or the other.
4	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay.
5	BZA CHAIR HILL: And so then if they can, you
6	know, and I'll let, if they can work something out or try to
7	work something out, that's fine. I mean, again, just so the
8	people that are listening, you know, the incentive on the
9	applicant side is, again, just some of the time parameters
10	in terms of what the Board has to do to issue an order.
11	And then on the other side is trying to get an
12	agreement before this may or may not get passed. So I don't
13	need to hear from Mr. Sullivan or Mr. Brown and we're going
14	to go ahead and well, I guess I'll let you all I mean,
15	Mr. Sullivan, did you get in touch with your client?
16	MR. SULLIVAN: Yes. And
17	BZA CHAIR HILL: That's okay, Mr. Sullivan.
18	MR. SULLIVAN: they're, you know, they're not
19	real, they're not real
20	BZA CHAIR HILL: That's all right. That's all
21	right.
22	MR. SULLIVAN: optimistic about it. So
23	that's
24	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, so that's fine. That's
25	fine.

-- but I defer to the Board, so. 1 MR. SULLIVAN: 2 That's fine. So we're going to BZA CHAIR HILL: go ahead and put it off for two weeks anyway because it's 3 just not going to do anything one way or the other. 5 you know, if you all can come up with something, great. And if not, you know, then there you go. 6 7 I'm going to go ahead and close the hearing of the record. 8 We don't need, I'm sorry. I'm going to leave the record open 9 for any agreement. Mr. Moy, are you there? 10 MR. MOY: I heard everything. BZA CHAIR HILL: All right. So Mr. Moy, I'm going 11 12 to leave the record open just for an agreement, okay? anything concerning the discussions that are going on with 13 14 an easement. So yes, I mean, 15 Mr. Brown, can you hear me? 16 don't want to go through like, anyway, you understand what 17 I'm saying. Like, just, if you guys can come up with an agreement, you can go ahead and submit that into the record. 18 And if you don't, you could submit something into the record 19 20 that says you didn't come up with an agreement, okay? 2.1 MR. BROWN: Very well. 22 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, all right. Then, Mr. Moy, 23 when would you leave that open? I quess if there's two 24 weeks, that means we're back here on the 25th. So can you

tell me some dates?

1	MR. MOY: I think, just give me a second. Let me
2	pull up my calendar. I have too many calendars. Okay, so
3	if this is May 11th, so this will be back to the Board for
4	decision making on Wednesday of May 25.
5	And if the, well, there are two ways we can go on
6	this, Mr. Chairman. We can just allow filings from, if
7	there's an agreement, I'm guessing, correct me if I'm wrong,
8	it would be a signed agreement.
9	So that could, I suppose, come from the applicant
10	if he makes that filing by, the decision's May 25th. Let's
11	say by, gosh, let's save Thursday May the 19th for filings
12	for that, May 19.
13	BZA CHAIR HILL: That's with no responses. Would
14	the Board care to have responses to that?
15	MR. MOY: Responses
16	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, I just wanted clarification
17	on that.
18	MR. MOY: That's
19	BZA CHAIR HILL: So that's all I have on
20	timelines.
21	MR. MOY: That's fine. And then I would assume,
22	Mr. Brown, part of this whole thing with the party status is
23	withdrawn. So that's another thing that we would leave open
24	for the record, if in fact, party status was withdrawn.
25	Okay.

And Mr. Sullivan, not that this was 1 MR. BROWN: a schedule but if all your, you're basically asking for a 2 3 yes, we have an agreement, or no, we don't and withdrawal of the party status. Would we be better suited by setting the 5 date for the Monday before the hearing? I mean, it's an on or off thing. 6 7 BZA CHAIR HILL: That's fine. I don't, I don't 8 think, I mean, I'm fine with that to the 23rd if that gives 9 you guys a little bit more time. That's fine. 10 think you might, you guys might know by the end of today 11 whether or not you're going to do anything. Mr. Sullivan, 12 it looked like you're about to say something? No, okay. No, I just wanted to confirm that 13 MR. SULLIVAN: There were a couple of different dates stated. 14 the date. 15 The decision date was two weeks? The decision date is the 25th. 16 BZA CHAIR HILL: 17 You quys can supply us whatever you want to supply us by the 23rd, which would also include a withdrawal of the party 18 status if you guys end up getting there, right? 19 20 And otherwise, we're going to make a decision on 2.1 the 25th. Okay, does any Board members have anything to say 22 before I leave? And also, just raise your hand. Okay. All 23 right, you guys, this is taking longer than I thought but 24 it's taken me years to get here anyway. So okay, thank you.

Thank you.

MR. SULLIVAN:

25

Take care, Mr. Hill.

1 BZA CHAIR HILL: Bye, bye. Closing the hearing and the record except for the items that we mentioned for the 2 3 23rd. Thank you. Okay, let's try to do one more before we take a break. Is that okay? Mr. Moy? 5 MR. MOY: One more. This would be in case application number 20648 of 824 Taylor Street Northeast for 6 7 NE, LLC. This is, as amended, a self-certified application 8 for special exceptions, presented to Subtitle F, Section 9 901.2, under Subtitle U, Section 421.1. 10 That would allow a new residential development, a new eight unit apartment house in one IZ and under Subtitle 11 F Sections 302.2 and 5206 for an increase in the floor area 12 ratio for the voluntary IZ development. 13 14 The property is located in RA-1 zone at 824 Taylor 15 Street Northeast Square 3-814 Lot 55. And I believe, Mr. 16 Chairman, there is a letter from the adjacent 5B-05 that was 17 submitted in the 24 hour block. So if the report can address that, that would be helpful. And I think that's, I think 18 19 that's all I need to say, thank you. 2.0 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, thanks, Mr. Moy. All 2.1 right, unless the Board has any issues, I want to go ahead and allow the information from the ANC into the record. 22 Ιf 23 anyone has any issues, please speak up. And I didn't realize 24 it, but I guess we lost Chairman Hood.

Chairman Hood, if you're still listening, you have

Sorry we, we only got you for one today. 1 a good day. Dr. Imamura is with us, and I still think Dr. Imamura, you're 2 3 You still seem to get a lighter day. lucky guy. 4 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: For the BCA. 5 BZA CHAIR HILL: Maybe you can come every week then if that's the case, Dr. Imamura. 6 7 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: All right. 8 BZA CHAIR HILL: All right, let's see. 9 Sullivan, if you can hear me, if you can introduce 10 yourself for the record, please? Thank you, Mr. Chair, and members 11 MR. SULLIVAN: 12 of the Board. Marty Sullivan with Sullivan and Barrows on behalf of the applicant. 13 14 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Mr. Sullivan, I'm going 15 to go ahead and let you walk us through your application and why you believe your client is meeting the criteria for us 16 17 to grant the relief requested. I know that this ties in with the other case. 18 Τf the Board has the ability, we're going to try to do both of 19 2.0 them before our break, but we'll see what happens after this 2.1 And you can begin whenever you like, Mr. Sullivan. 22 MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Young, 23 could you please load the presentation? So the story behind 24 this one, of course, is that there was an original proposal

to do an addition to the existing apartment building, which

was essentially a semidetached structure, just like the one you see to the left of the subject building here.

And initially, the applicant next door, which is also a client of ours, expressed an interest in having these buildings be more compatible. He thought it would look better and that turned out to be something that the Office of Planning thought was not a bad idea.

And also, both ANCs, the subject ANC and the ANC across the street, a lot of their residents had the same comment that these may look better as compatible buildings and then they were also anticipating the further redevelopment of the rest of this block, too.

And they thought that it would be important to start that off with something like this. So we did manage to get them on Board and my client in this application then completely revised to do a new building, added, was able to add inclusionary zoning at that point as well. So next slide, please.

This is in, as I mentioned, there's single family homes across the street, but there's apartment buildings on this side of the street. The proposal is to demolish the existing building and construct a new eight unit residential building opting into inclusionary zoning. So there'll be one inclusionary zoning unit. Next slide, please.

We'd have the support of ANC 5A. I haven't seen

2.0

2.1

the ANC 5B letter. We have worked pretty closely with Commissioner Costello on that, although the ANC did not put it on their agenda.

They decided not to put it on their agenda. And the office of planning is in support as is DDOT. With us here today is Will Teass, the architect, and the applicant, Representative Matt Scorzafava, if you have any questions for them. But I'll turn it over to Will to present the project. Thank you.

MR. TEASS: Will Teass, the principal of Teass One Architects who is architects of record for the project. If we could move, I think, to slide six for to give us, to give the Board an overview and I'll try to move through this relatively quickly.

As Mr. Sullivan indicated, we're proposing to replace an existing two-story four unit building with a new three-story plus cellar, and a small penthouse structure eight unit apartment building. It's very similar to the project to the east, which is on the right hand side of the slide that you're looking at. Next slide, please.

The view from the street here shows the massing of the new building is being very similar to the building on the east. We're proposing a brick clad structure with a bay projection.

There's an existing set of stairs that lead up

2.1

2.3

43 from the sidewalk and this is one of the notes that was made in the DDOT report, we'll come back to that in a minute. 2 3 Next slide, please. So the overall site plan shows our proposed building in green. 828 is the building to the east on the right hand side, which is what we're matching in terms of footprint massing. I think it's important to understand that we're aligning the building with the buildings to the, further to the east. There is a 15-foot building restriction line that we're building to.

We are proposing a bay projection and a window They're in conformance with DDOT standards. well. I think there was some confusion in the DDOT report. There is a set of existing, there's a grade change from the sidewalk up to the building.

And there's an existing concrete stair shared by both buildings that we intend to keep and reuse. So there may be some confusion on the DDOT part about that aspect of the project. Next slide, please.

This is the proposed cellar plan. I think there were a couple of questions in the, off the planning report. One was the location the bike storage. The bike storage here is located in the middle of the building at the cellar level.

It's accessed by a rear stairway that comes down

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

to the utility room and then into the bike storage area.

Next slide, please. The other question I think that was in the Office of Planning report had to do with the location of the inclusionary zoning unit.

This is the ground floor plan, and the inclusionary zoning unit is unit four which is at the rear of the building at the ground floor. It is a two-bedroom unit. Next slide, please.

The building repeats. It has a unit up front, a unit at the back with a stair in the middle. It's fairly straightforward. Next slide, please. Next slide, please. And then as we indicated, we have a small penthouse structure that permits the upper level units to access a private roof deck.

We are proposing a green roof, the location of our mechanical equipment, again, at the pent, the roof level. So at this point, I was, I would like to conclude my portion of the presentation and I'm happy to answer any questions that the Board members may have.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Teass, where, where's the IZ units?

MR. TEASS: If we can go back two slides it's on the ground floor. Unit Four, which is at the rear, one more back. And so the area that's highlighted in yellow in this particular slide, that's the inclusionary zoning unit.

2.1

1	BZA CHAIR HILL: Got it.
2	MR. TEASS: It's virtually identical in shape and
3	configuration to the other units on the cellar ground and
4	second floors.
5	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. I mean, it's the one in
6	the back, right? I mean, it's okay, but that's what you,
7	that's what you guys ended up doing, correct?
8	MR. TEASS: Correct.
9	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Okay, keep going,
10	Mr. Teass, or Mr. Sullivan, wherever you are.
11	MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The general
12	requirements of the buildings are very clearly in harmony
13	with the purpose and intent of zoning regulations here. Next
14	slide, please.
15	The specific requirements, it's been referred to
16	the relevant agencies, including the Office of Planning,
17	which has made its detailed findings and is in support. So
18	that's, that's our presentation if the Board has any
19	questions, thank you.
20	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. Does the Board have
21	any questions for the applicant? Any for the Office of
22	Planning?
23	MR. MORDFIN: I guess they did it me again.
24	BZA CHAIR HILL: It's the same file, Mr. Mordfin.
25	They like your profile.

MR. MORDFIN: Yes, well, there are two cameras here and I guess I just keep picking the wrong one. But in this case, the Office of Planning is in support of the application finding that it does conform to the criteria as required to build a new residential development in the RA-1.

We did have two questions. Where was the bike parking, and also which unit was the IZ unit? And the applicant did provide that information supplemented the record.

For the specific criteria to build a new residential development, in this case, there are adequate facilities that we found by looking online and finding out the usage of the public school system.

It also has access to a public street, a public alley, and behind the, I'm sorry, and also the, nearby less than a quarter of a mile, or a third of a mile, rather, is a large public park with many facilities to that the applicant, that the future residents would be able to take advantage of.

The siting of the building, we find acceptable, it's going to be similar to the one next door that is also proposed, and it will, they will continue maintaining the common walkway up from the sidewalk on Taylor Street, which helps serve to unify the project, even though they're two separate buildings.

2.0

2.1

1	It does maintain the semblance of what is already
2	on street where you have that common walkway up to two
3	buildings. So we find that the sighting of the proposed
4	building to be acceptable.
5	And the site plan and elevation plans, and
6	architectural plans were all submitted as required. So
7	therefore, the Office of Planning recommends approval of this
8	application.
9	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, does anybody have any
10	questions of the Office of Planning? Mr. Young, is there
11	anyone here wishing to speak?
12	MR. YOUNG: We do not.
13	BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Sullivan, do you have
14	anything you'd like to add at the end?
15	MR. SULLIVAN: No, thank you.
16	BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Teass, can you hear me? Is
17	it Mr. Teass? I apologize, how do you pronounce your last
18	name?
19	MR. TEASS: It's not, it's Mr. Teass.
20	BZA CHAIR HILL: Teass, yes. I thought it was
21	Teass, okay. All right, and by the way, I think it's a nice
22	design.
23	MR. TEASS: Thank you.
24	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, all right, I'm going to go
25	ahead and close the hearing on the record. Okay, I didn't

really have any issues with it. I would agree with the 1 applicant as to how to meet the criteria within the standard 2 3 for us to grant the relief requested. 4 I also think that I would agree with the ANC on 5 you know, the design of the building, how they, mentioned to Mr. Teass that I do think they're compatible. 6 7 I think it's a nice design, and also that there's going to 8 be an IZ unit there. And I did see all the notes that Ely had, and I 9 10 think the applicant addressed those as well as the concerns of the Office of Planning. I'm going to be voting in favor. 11 12 Mr. Smith, do you have anything you'd like to add? MR. I don't have anything to add. 13 SMITH: Ι appreciate the analysis on this case and I recognize that 14 both of the, the ANC, you know, ANC 5A is in support of the 15 16 application and also the ANC to the South of Taylor Street, 17 while there wasn't a formal vote on it. 18 But the single member district representative of the area does support, has spoken that her single member 19 2.0 district is in support of this particular application and, 21 you know, based on testimony we've heard today, I do believe 22 that it meets the criteria for us to support the application. 23 I will be supporting. 24 BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. Mr. Blake? 25

MEMBER BLAKE:

Well, with Board member Smith's

1	analysis and yours as well and that the applicant is in
2	conformance with the Subtitle U 421 the specific requirements
3	and also the general requirements. So would it preferable.
4	I would be willing to support this application.
5	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. Dr. Imamura?
6	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
7	I have nothing further to agree other than that I agree with
8	my colleagues and with you that it's a nice design and a good
9	example of design excellence in architecture so nothing
10	further. I'm prepared to vote in favor.
11	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. Vice Chair John?
12	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Chairman, I agree with all
13	of the comments. I believe the application meets the
14	requirement for relief, and I'll be voting in support.
15	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. All right, thank you,
16	everybody. I'm going to make a motion to approve application
17	number 20648, as captioned and read by the secretary. And
18	ask I for a second, Ms. John?
19	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Second.
20	BZA CHAIR HILL: The motion made and second,
21	Mr. Moy, can you take a roll call?
22	MR. MOY: When I call your name, if you would
23	please respond, reply with a yes no or abstain to the motion
24	made by Chairman Hill to approve the application for the
25	relief requested that the motion to approve was seconded by

1	Vice Chair John.
2	Dr. Imamura?
3	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.
4	MR. MOY: Mr. Smith? Mr. Blake?
5	MEMBER BLAKE: Yes.
6	MR. MOY: Vice Chair John? Chairman Hill?
7	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes.
8	MR. MOY: Staff would record the vote is 5, 0 to
9	0 and this is on the motion made by Chairman Hill to approve.
10	Motion to approve was seconded by Vice Chair John. Also in
11	support of the motion to approve, Dr. Imamura, Mr. Smith,
12	Mr. Blake, of course Vice Chair John and Chairman Hill.
13	Motion carries on a vote of five to zero to zero.
14	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great. Thank you, Mr. Moy.
15	If you could call our next case, Mr. Moy, and then we'll take
16	a break. Board members, if that's okay?
17	MR. MOY: So the next case before the Board is
18	application no. 20678 of Taylor Lofts, L-O-F-T-S, LLC. This
19	is a self-certified application pursuant to Subtitle X,
20	Section 901.2.
21	This is for special exceptions under Subtitle U,
22	Section 421.1 that would allow a new residential development
23	eight and eight unit apartment house. And Subtitle F,
24	Sections 302.2 and 5206 to increase the floor area ratio for
25	a voluntary IZ annulment.

1 The property is located in the RA-1 zone at 828 2 Taylor Street Northeast Square 3814 Lot 54. And let's see, and there is, I believe, Mr. Chairman, a letter from the 3 adjacent IB-05 Commissioner which attempted to file within 5 our 24 hour block. BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, unless the Board has any 6 7 issues, if you could drop that into the record, Mr. Moy? 8 MR. MOY: Thank you, sir. 9 BZA CHAIR HILL: All right, and I don't see the 10 Board mentioning anything, that's great. Ms. Wilson, if you can hear me, could you introduce yourself for the record? 11 12 MR. WILSON: Alex Wilson from Sullivan & Barros on behalf of the applicant in this case. 13 14 BZA CHAIR HILL: Great. Ms. Wilson, if you want to go ahead and walk us through your application as to why 15 you believe your applicant is meeting the criteria pressed 16 to grant the relief requested. 17 I see a lot of the design elements in here, which is great, in terms of getting an 18 19 opportunity to kind of walk through some of those. 2.0 However, if you want to talk, again, a little bit 2.1 more about the requirements for the regulations that the 22 Board can focus on why you're going through the diet, 23 sorry, the architectural drawings, that will be helpful. 24 you can begin whenever you like.

Sure, thank you.

MR. WILSON:

25

Mr. Young, could

you please pull up the presentation? So Mr. Sullivan provided a bit of background for these cases. Unlike the previous case at 824 Taylor, we were always proposing to raise the existing building and the adjacent building at 824.

Taylor modified their plans and we made some minor adjustments to make it look more cohesive. Next slide, please. So similar to the other case, we have an ANC 5A's support.

We attended SMD meetings for the ANC across the street, the ANC 5B. OP is recommending approval. We also had a couple of comments in our OP report, so we provided a landscape plan in Exhibit 22-A and the grade plan and elevations noting the grade changes are included in our plan set in Exhibit 19.

And there are detailed grade notes on those plans as requested. We do have one IZ unit, it is unit six. I know that was asked in the previous cases, so I wanted to just mention that at the outset. Next slide, please.

The project meeting the general special is exception requirements, there is made up of multifamily residential developments, the existing multifamily use is not changing, and the applicant providing more parking to make the ANC comfortable. slide, please.

In terms of the specific requirements, all D.C.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

Public students are eligible to enroll in their specific schools. There are adequate public streets, recreation, and other services available to accommodate the increase in residence.

The applicant has provided sufficient information for the Office of Planning to recommend approval and all relevant materials have been submitted. With that I'm going to turn it over to our architect, Garima Gupta, to walk through the plans very briefly. Next slide, please.

MS. GUPTA: Good morning everybody. I am Garima Gupta, and I am representing the architect, Michael Cross here. And as mentioned, we are seeking a special exception for new residential development in the RA-1 zone and for the bonus density resulting from voluntary IZ compliance. As mentioned earlier, our IZ unit is unit number six, which is on the second floor. Next slide, please.

This project is located on Taylor Street, which is very close to the intersection of Taylor and 9th Streets. The total land area of the property is about 5,800 square feet, and we are proposing about 36 percent lot occupancy, which is less than 40 percent, which is allowed.

But the remaining 64 percent are to be used as green covers, paver AOLs, parking, etc. The client is proposing to raise the existing semi-detached four unit structure and build a new construction which is fully

2.1

detached and has eight two-bedroom units. Next slide, please. This is the existing site plan which shows the building which is to be raised. Next slide.

The proposed site plan, this project requires only one parking space. However, we are proposing five parking spaces which includes one of ADA compliant parking. The project is well connected to the public transport with about half a mile to Red Line metro and about the same to the nearest bus stop.

In addition to the green cover on grade, we are proposing other green elements like green roof and on site storm water management which has a positive impact to the immediate neighborhood and to the broader environment. There is the dedicated trash space which will be screened towards the rear of the property and the trash will be collected by public, private service at intervals which is set to meet the building requirement. Next slide.

This is the typical layout on each floor. We are proposing two two-bedroom units, one in front and one in rear. Since it is proposed as a fully detached structure, it would allow for units to improve quality of life.

All units would be afforded with much increased natural light, larger, with large loft-sized windows. Every unit would also have access to other space, be it in the form of patio, balcony, rooftop, deck. Each unit is about --

2.1

1	BZA CHAIR HILL: Ms. Gupta? Ms. Gupta? Can you
2	hear me? Can you just show us which one is the IZ unit?
3	MS. GUPTA: So this all look the same if you go
4	to the next slide. This is floor, next slide, please. The
5	unit on top, as you can see unit six is the IZ unit. All of
6	the units are very identical. They all look the same and
7	they follow the same two-bedroom, two bathroom layout.
8	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, Ms. Wilson, I just have a
9	quick question because I'm just curious. How did your client
10	decide on the IZ unit? I kind of wanted to ask the previous,
11	but I was, I forgot.
12	MR. WILSON: Our client is here, Mark, but so
13	BZA CHAIR HILL: Mark can you hear me?
14	MR. WILSON: he's able to answer that question,
15	Mr. Mlakar, but they're all identical.
16	BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Mlakar, can you hear me?
17	Could you introduce yourself for the record?
18	MR. MLAKAR: Mark Mlakar, owner of Taylor Lofts,
19	LLC, the owner of the project.
20	BZA CHAIR HILL: I'm just curious, there you go,
21	Mr. Mlakar, my gosh. What, I'm just curious, how'd you
22	decide the IZ unit?
23	MR. MLAKAR: I believe there are complicated
24	formulas that go into determining the exact square footage
25	and the average of all of the units and when we apply that

1	formula, we try to figure out which area will meet those
2	requirements and
3	BZA CHAIR HILL: So it was driven by the
4	architects is what you're saying?
5	MR. MLAKAR: It's driven by the, yes, I don't, I
6	don't get to just pick
7	BZA CHAIR HILL: I was just curious. I was just
8	curious. Well, the last one, the last one was in the
9	basement in the back. So sometimes, I'm just curious how it
10	happens.
11	MR. MLAKAR: Yes, I don't believe there, they can
12	be in the basement anymore.
13	BZA CHAIR HILL: That one was in the cellar.
14	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: No.
15	BZA CHAIR HILL: Wasn't it? Vice Chair John,
16	you're saying no?
17	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: No.
18	MR. SULLIVAN: It was on the first floor.
19	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: It was on the first floor.
20	BZA CHAIR HILL: The maybe I made an error. Okay.
21	All right let's see. Okay, Ms. Gupta, let me just go ahead
22	and see where my Board members might be, okay? In terms of
23	questions. I'm going to cut to, let me just look at the
24	slide deck here a second. Yes, okay.
25	Let me go ahead and drop the slide deck, Mr.

1	Young. Okay, does my fellow Board members have any questions
2	for the applicant? Okay, I mentioned the Office of Planning.
3	Mr. Mordfin, can you hear me?
4	MR. MORDFIN: Yes, I can hear you. Sorry. So the
5	Office of Planning also recommends approval of this
6	application, which is similar to the last one. The applicant
7	did provide the two additional items, the landscaping plan
8	and grading plan.
9	As detailed in the OP Report, and similar to the
10	other application, the building is very similar. It meets
11	the same requirements as the last case in that there's
12	adequate public school facilities and it is, it does have
13	access to a pub, to a public alley, it has access to Taylor
14	Street.
15	It's about a third of a mile from Turkey Thicket
16	Recreation Center. So the Office of Planning recommends
17	approval of this application in that it does conform to the
18	requirements for a new residential development in the RA-1
19	district and I'm available for questions.
20	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Does the Board have any
21	questions for the Office of Planning? Does the applicant
22	have any questions for the Office of Planning?
23	MR. WILSON: No, thank you.
24	BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Young, is there anyone here
25	wishing to speak? Okay, Mr. Mlakar, can you hear me?

1	MR. MLAKAR: Yes.
2	BZA CHAIR HILL: It's good to see you Mr. Mlakar.
3	Last time I saw you it was, it was a, it wasn't as easy.
4	MR. MLAKAR: I agree. Let's never do that again,
5	yes.
6	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right, Mr. Mlakar.
7	Okay, Ms. Wilson, do you have anything you'd like to add at
8	the end?
9	MR. WILSON: No, thank you.
10	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, I am going to go ahead and
11	close the record on the hearing. Thank you everyone, have
12	a nice day. Mr. Smith, since you were enthusiastically
13	shaking your head and I've been talking a long time, would
14	you mind starting?
15	MR. SMITH: Sure, I didn't have any major issues
16	with this, with this particular project. I feel like it's
17	fairly straightforward. Similar to the last project, I do
18	believe that the project needs things for us to be able to
19	bring it.
20	The special exceptions from the Subtitle U,
21	Section 421.1 and Subtitle F, Section 302.2 and 5206 when
22	they're finally in the additional IZ unit, I, the, I do
23	believe that design, I do appreciate that the applicant
24	worked with the adjacent property owner.

To create a design that is they're both compatible

1	with each other given that these two, these two addition,
2	these two buildings will be the two tallest buildings, I
3	think, along that block within that area. And both of these
4	projects have the support of the ANC that they located in,
5	as well as the adjacent ANC to the south side of Taylor.
6	The single member district representative has
7	stated that the residents are for SMD are in support of the
8	application. They have had some discussions with the, with
9	the applicant. So with that, I do get a great way to open
10	the staff port and I'm in support of the application.
11	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you, Mr. Smith. Mr. Blake?
12	MEMBER BLAKE: Nothing to add to that. I agree
13	with the comments from Mr. Smith completely. I will be
14	voting in support of the application.
15	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. Dr. M. Imamura?
16	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
17	I am in agreement with Board member Smith and Board members
18	Blake. I have nothing further to add other than it's nice
19	that these two units are setting a good example in quality
20	design.
21	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. Vice Chair John?
22	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
23	I am in agreement with all of the comments so far. I believe
24	this is a straightforward application, and I'm in support.
25	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great. All right, thank

1	you. I don't have anything to add. I appreciate my
2	colleagues taking the lead on the discussion of this. I'm
3	going to go ahead and make a motion to approve application
4	number 20678 as captioned and read by the Secretary and ask
5	for a second, Ms. John?
6	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Second.
7	BZA CHAIR HILL: Motion made and seconded.
8	Mr. Moy, could you take a roll call?
9	MR. MOY: When I call your name, if you would
10	please respond with a yes/no/abstain to the motion made by
11	Chairman Hill to approve the application for the relief
12	requested. This motion to approve was seconded by Vice Chair
13	John.
14	Dr. Imamura?
15	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.
16	MR. MOY: Mr. Smith? Mr. Blake? Vice Chair John.
17	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Yes.
18	MR. MOY: Chairman Hill?
19	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes.
20	MR. MOY: Staff will record the vote as five to
21	zero to zero and this is on the motion made by Chairman Hill
22	to approve. The motion to approve was seconded by Vice Chair
23	John, also in support of the motion to approve Dr. Imamura
24	with the Zoning Commission, Mr. Smith, Mr. Blake, Vice Chair
25	John, and Chairman Hill. The motion carries on a vote five

1	to zero to zero.
2	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. Okay, everybody. You
3	want to just try and take a 10 minute break? And see if we
4	can come back in that time? Okay, thank you.
5	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the
6	record at 11:12 a.m. and resumed at 11:25 a.m.)
7	BZA CHAIR HILL: All right, Mr. Moy, could we call
8	the next case? I thought I got Mr. Moy but maybe not. Mr.
9	Moy? Mr. Moy, are you there? You all can hear me, right?
10	Okay.
11	MR. MOY: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, for being
12	tardy.
13	BZA CHAIR HILL: No, you're okay.
14	MR. MOY: I don't think we have, I got one thing
15	I do.
16	BZA CHAIR HILL: You can call our next case,
17	Mr. Moy.
18	MR. MOY: Sorry about that, sorry about that,
19	Mr. Chairman, that was my staff. They said, they said that
20	they could not hear me. Can you hear me?
21	BZA CHAIR HILL: We can hear you.
22	MR. MOY: Okay. All right, well, I don't know
0.0	
23	what they're talking about. Okay, let's see, where am I?

25 session after a quick break, and the time is at or about

11:28 in the morning.

2.3

The next case before the Board is application number 20685 of Oladapo, O-L-A-D-A-P-O, Kolawole, K-O-L-A-W-O-L-E. I apologize for my lack of skill here. So anyway, so this is a self-certified application for special exceptions, pursuant to Subtitle F, Section 901.2.

And this is from the rear edition requirements of Subtitle E Section 205.4 pursuant to Subtitle E, Section 205.5 and Subtitle E, Section 5201. And the rooftop and upper floor requirements, Subtitle E, Section 206.1 pursuant to Subtitle E, Section 206.4 and Subtitle E, Section 5207.

This property is in the RF-1 zone at 1933 Second Street Northeast Square 3565 Lot 54. Mr. Chairman, before you, also with regards to filings, or rather the lack of filings, we have three submissions that are submitted late or are blocked because of the 24-hour period.

There's a letter in support, there's emails from the ANC 5E03, submitted late. And finally, which is the bigger one, late yesterday the applicant filed a request to postpone. So if you could allow these into the record, you'll be able to read the documents.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, Yes. I mean, I think some of them are in the record. So go ahead and drop them all in the record, if you could, Mr. Moy. That's why if Board members have an issue if so, please speak up. All right,

Cross, can you hear me? If so, could you introduce 1 yourself, please? 2 3 R. Michael Cross, project architect MR. CROSS: 4 for the applicant. 5 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, Mr. Cross, do you guys want a postponement? 6 7 MR. CROSS: Yes, sir. We have been, well, while 8 we have the support of the ANC, OPE and the neighbor to the 9 originally received south, we had statement of 10 non-opposition to the neighbor of the North, but we have 11 recently received their concerns in opposition this 12 project. Since that time, we've been meeting with them 13 14 directly and as late as the ninth, just two days ago, we met 15 on site with them and the SMD Commissioner. And at that time, they expressed an interest in some additional time to 16 17 consider the concessions that we have offered. 18 As well as potentially have us consider some My client has agreed to grant them that 19 further concessions. 2.0 and work with them to see if we can an 21 agreement, agreeable resolution. 22 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Mr. Moy, can you hear me? 23 MR. MOY: Yes, sir. 24 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, Mr. Cross, I know you know this, but like, you know, where we are always amenable to try

1	to let people work things out as best they can, in this
2	particular case, I mean, we do have a lot of information in
3	the record that we could probably hear the presentation from.
4	But, you know, if this is something that, anyway,
5	I should say, though. My point was, well, I know my point.
6	Okay, so it's okay. So, it's okay, Mr. Cross, you don't have
7	to say anything, so. Okay, Mr. Moy, when could we possibly
8	get back here?
9	MR. MOY: I'm going to propose a couple of days
LO	for you, Mr. Chairman, and the Board. And of course, I have
11	no idea at this point how much time the applicant needs to
12	coordinate with the community.
13	BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Cross, how much time do you
L4	guys think you need?
15	MR. CROSS: I believe that we should be able to
16	come to some, or understand whether there is a resolution or
L7	not, pretty quickly as we have been working on this now for
18	about two weeks. So I think we probably only need another
L9	week or two to capture that and re-file if needed.
20	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Mr. Cross, would you have
21	been ready to present today?
22	MR. CROSS: I am ready to present today.
23	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right, Mr. Moy, can
24	you tell me again what, I mean, I know we're really jammed
25	lup for a while right? Or when's like another time?

MR. MOY: Okay, another time, if you want to push it, we have six cases and two expedited cases and one decision making case on May 25th. But after that, on June 15th, you have six cases as well as six cases on June 22nd. After that, it picks up by a couple more cases when we move into July with usually eight or nine cases.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Cross, what seems to be the opposition that you're getting from the neighbor to the north?

MR. CROSS: Yes, the neighbor to the north has expressed a concern about shade, shadow and views that have been created by our addition, which, to note, actually only extends 10 feet past their property. It is not the side which we're seeking relief from.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right, let me, looking at my Board members. I mean, just, and I don't know think. Like, again, you quys Ι mean, hesitating because we're just so jammed up for a while. Like, I'm kind of leaning towards go ahead and hearing the case.

And then, we could leave the record open and allow them time to work together and see what might happen before we deliberate and or if you all think you've got enough information after we have the hearing, go ahead and vote, or we can postpone. So I don't really have a big strong opinion

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

1	and I'll let you all chew on that for about 30 seconds.
2	MR. MOY: Yes, while you're chewing on 30 seconds,
3	Mr. Chairman, after the dates I gave you, we open up on July
4	27th, where we have two cases, but I'm actually working that
5	docket this week. So, of course, after that, we're looking
6	at September, okay?
7	BZA CHAIR HILL: July 27th?
8	MR. MOY: Yes.
9	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes, no, I wouldn't, I wouldn't
10	stick them that far out.
11	MR. MOY: Well, okay.
12	BZA CHAIR HILL: And if you said that, and I'm
13	sorry, I lost track of that. So what date did you
14	potentially have available for us?
15	MR. MOY: May 25th for
16	BZA CHAIR HILL: The decision that we just had?
17	MR. MOY: Yes, would you, yes, yes. Or June's,
18	June 15? I'd say June 15th or June 22nd. I have six cases
19	on each of those two dates.
20	BZA CHAIR HILL: Right. So I don't know about you
21	guys. Like, we can put, how many are on the 25th? We got
22	that decision case, two expedited reviews and then how many
23	cases?
24	MR. MOY: On the 25th?
25	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes.

1	MR. MOY: Which they, six cases, two expedited,
2	and one decision making.
3	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. I think then that, I don't
4	know, I'm kind of leaning towards going ahead and having the
5	hearing and then leaving the record open and letting them
6	kind of work. I mean, since I, since I saw a nod with Dr.
7	Imamura, I'm going to start with you, Dr. Imamura. What do
8	you think?
9	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: I agree, Mr. Chairman.
10	Let's go ahead and your case and
11	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay.
12	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: see how far we can get.
13	BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Smith, what do you think?
14	MEMBER SMITH: May or June? What was the date,
15	May or June?
16	BZA CHAIR HILL: There was, there's the 25th of
17	May, which would be six cases, two expedited reviews and a
18	decision. Like, we're kind of having a light day, maybe, you
19	know? Like, we might get out of here by three o'clock if all
20	goes well, right?
21	MEMBER SMITH: And so, I'm fine with hearing the
22	case if we're just pushing back that, you know, for two
23	weeks.
24	BZA CHAIR HILL: Right. I mean, we would, we
25	would leave the record open probably or have a continued, or

brief continued hearing about anything that may or may not 1 Mr. Blake, do you have any thoughts? 2 come up. 3 I would love to hear the case MEMBER BLAKE: 4 today. 5 BZA CHAIR HILL: Ms. John, Vice Chair John? VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: 6 Yes. 7 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, then Mr. Cross, would go ahead and walk us through your application and why 8 9 you believe your client is meeting the criteria for us to 10 grant the relief requested. 11 We're going to go ahead and hear through with 12 everybody because I know there's also members 13 community that I think they want to speak, and then we'll see 14 where we get, okay? 15 MR. CROSS: That's, I believe if Mr. Young could Exhibit 30, believe that's the most 16 pull up Ι recent 17 architectural plans and elevations. All right, if I could just get started while he's pulling that up. 18 19 We're seeking a special exception for two areas 2.0 of relief. One for the removal of an architectural rooftop 2.1 element. The second for a rear addition, which extends more than 10 feet past the adjacent neighbor. The property we are 22 23 here today --24 CHAIR HILL: Could you give me a Mr. Young, can you hear me? Mr. Cross?

1 MR. YOUNG: Yes, I can. 2 BZA CHAIR HILL: Can you that try to see 3 Exhibit 30? Because it is kind of, I mean, it is pretty 4 helpful. 5 MR. YOUNG: Yes, I have it now. 6 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Mr. Cross if you can 7 highlight the rooftop architectural elements that you're And then I can already see from the rear how, you 8 changing? 9 know, where it's kind of matching up with that building to your, I don't know whatever direction that is. 10 But go ahead 11 and please continue. 12 MR. CROSS: Yes, I will. And so let's see. Yes, the project's located at 1933 Second Street Northeast. 13 It's on the east side of the block between U Street and Todd 14 15 place. The project is otherwise matter of right expansion 16 17 of an existing apartment house. Currently it's a four unit building, and it's proposed to become a six unit building. 18 It conforms with height, lot occupancy and other setback 19 20 requirements. 2.1 We have a determination letter from the zoning 22 administrator outlining that in the record. Furthermore, the zoning administrator has granted finer flexibility, for lack 23

of a better term, for the parking in the rear. We originally

proposed to have sufficient parking for this proper project,

which would require three spaces.

2.1

2.3

As we got into the project, we found there's actually a heritage tree at the rear of the lot, which is protected, and therefore, we're only able to provide two new parking spaces.

Subsequently, the zoning administrator granted us two parking credits because there's currently no parking on this property and requires two spaces today. So we technically on paper would have four parking spaces. Next slide, please.

Existing properties today, both front and rear. I don't think you can really see it here, but that mansard roof is currently on our property directly in front of the stairs leading up where our property is designed to be very similar to the one to the North, the left on your screen, that has it removed from the balcony up front.

Next slide, please. Currently, the property is in line with the neighbor to the south. The neighbor to the north projects 10 feet past the existing property. Next slide, please.

As stated, we're proposing to do a 20 foot rear addition. That would be 20 feet past the neighbor to the south, which is on the right hand side of this diagram and only 10 feet past the neighbor to the north.

Next slide, please. Next slide. My apologies,

we're going to have to skip a few down. We don't have a 1 presentation set here posted. 2 Next slide, please. 3 slide. 4 BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes, there's lot of а 5 architectural drawings. I guess you mean just show us the, how far you're pushing back? 6 7 MR. CROSS: Yes, I'm hoping to go down to the 8 elevations. 9 BZA CHAIR HILL: Let's see what slide you're on. 10 Is it on 13, Mr. Young? MR. CROSS: This is good. So this is the existing 11 12 elevation. As you can see, it's currently a two building with a mansard roof above that second story. 13 It is a faux mansard in that it's just a flat roof beyond it. 14 15 Next slide, please. We're proposing to remove that mansard roof and 16 17 create a third story which is setback from the front and has a balcony in the location of the current mansard roof and 18 19 that condition is similar to the adjacent neighbor to the 2.0 north, 1937, as shown in the rendering on the cover slides. 2.1 I think that's about it. We do have some solar studies 22 prepared as well if the Board would be interested in covering 23 those. 24 BZA CHAIR HILL: Where are they? Where are they? 25 Yes, those are going to be in Exhibit MR. CROSS:

33.

2.1

BZA CHAIR HILL: All right, Mr. Young, if you can pull up Exhibit 33 when you get a chance.

MR. CROSS: So when they, when they show we have two different solar studies for each of the four periods of the year, the first of each is the matter of right version. That is a building which projects only 10 feet past our neighbor to the south, which would actually be in line with the neighbor to the north.

Obviously, the shadows are incurred on the neighbor to the north, as the sun will be largely coming from the south. Before we get too far into this, just staying on this slide, as I think it's generally representative of most of the matter of REITs slides that are presented here, this is showing the winter solstice.

So possibly the worst case condition of shadows and shading. But what I wanted to point out is that the property at 1937 actually is largely shaded, even in this matter of right condition where we don't actually pass them at all.

And that has to do with the fence that both there's sunken cellars in the fence that runs along the southern property line, which casts significant shadows across the lower levels and the rear yard system. Next slide, please. So what we've done here is overlaid the new

shadows of our proposed building, which is shown projecting 1 10 feet past the neighbor to the north and --2 3 BZA CHAIR HILL: And it's 1937 that has the 4 concerns, correct? 5 MR. CROSS: That is correct. Yes, sir. 6 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Cross. 7 MR. CROSS: The areas shown in red are increased shadows over and above those shadows cast by the 8 9 matter of right building. And so you can see that some of 10 those shadows are limited to rooftop. There is some shading of the balcony that 11 is 12 to our property during mid-day. And there additional shading in the rear yard, where there's currently 13 parking as well as some of the terraced patio at the far end 14 15 of the property and the cellar. 16 Mid-afternoon, towards the end of the day, all of the shading is limited to the rooftop area. 17 Next slide, We can actually skip to the next slide to show the 18 difference here. 19 20 This is the spring equinox. Again, limited 2.1 additional shading largely found at the balcony directly 22 adjacent to our property there in early morning and mid-day. 23 And then on the, on the cellar patio areas and the associated 24 stairs in the early afternoon, by the end of the day, the

entire property is already largely shaded.

1	In the matter of right condition, there's only a
2	small fragment of shadow that is added at that time. And
3	then if we can skip two slides. This is the summer solstice.
4	This is possibly the area of least impact because the sun is
5	highest in the sky.
6	No impact at the beginning or end of the day. In
7	mid-day there is some shading of a portion of the balcony
8	closest to us as well as a portion of the sunken patio
9	closest to our property.
10	Again, I'll point out that we are acknowledging
11	their shading here. We think it's limited and we would argue
12	that it is not undue shadowing because the addition that is
13	creating the shade to that property is actually the matter
14	of right 10 feet that would be allowed in other conditions.
15	I think with that I may simply close and answer any questions
16	you might have.
17	BZA CHAIR HILL: That's great, Mr. Cross.
18	MR. CROSS: And we can return back to the
19	architectural plans if those
20	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes, you can just drop it,
21	Mr. Young. Let me just see it because yes, we can pull
22	everything up on our laptops, or whatever, our desktop.
23	Madam Chair from the Office of Planning?
24	MS. MYERS: Crystal Myers with the Office of
25	Planning. The Office of Planning is recommending approval

1	of this case. The only other thing I would add is that they
2	are also getting flexibility from the zoning administrator
3	for, or minor flexibility from the zone administrator for the
4	land area.
5	There's a 900 square foot requirement for each
6	unit and they are just shy of that for the six units they're
7	doing, but they've received flexibility from the zoning
8	administrator to allow them to do it.
9	So I just wanted to bring that up as well. So we
10	reviewed this, and we thought that it was appropriate for a
11	recommendation for approval, and I will stay on the record
12	for the staff report. Thank you.
13	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, thank you. Does anybody
14	have any questions for the Office of Planning? Mr. Cross,
15	what happened to the ANC, again?
16	MR. CROSS: Yes, we met with the ANC twice as well
17	as with Eckington Civic Association. We received approval
18	from both the, or whatever you say, motion to support from
19	both the ANC as well as from Eckington Civic Association.
20	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, all right. Okay,
21	Mr. Young, is there anyone here wishing to speak?
22	MR. YOUNG: Yes, we have four witnesses signed up.
23	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, could you bring them in and
24	give me your, their names as they come in, please?
25	MR. YOUNG: Yes. Ian Wing, Mark Belak, Mark

Freeman, and Melissa Salerno.

2.1

2.3

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great. Mr. Belak, can you hear me? You're on mute, Mr. Belak. Okay, good. Now good, thank you. Could you introduce yourself for the record?

MR. BELAK: Yes. Hello, my name is Mark Belak.

I live on 1937 Second Street Northeast, and I'm the president of the Truesdell Condominium Association.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Let's see, Mr. Belak, I'm going to give you five minutes as a member of an association, or representing an association. And you'll have five minutes to speak and give your testimony and you can begin whenever you like.

MR. BELAK: Okay, very good. Thank you, Chairman Hill. Thank you, Board members for listening to our concerns today. Our primary opposition to this project as it is designed currently is the substantial amount of shading and view reduction. If I may share my screen, we've created some practical documentation that may be easier to consume than architectural drawings.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes, I don't know Mr. Belak if, well, two things. I know you can't share your screen and then I don't know how, given the COVID thing, I forget how it works in terms of like you presenting information like that. Why don't you just go ahead and tell us what you've got, and we'll see if the Board has further questions.

So frankly, I have a picture 1 MR. BELAK: Sure. from varying views in the building currently, as is today and 2 3 as would be matter of right. And I have a picture that has a mock-up of what the extension would look like that shows 5 in very clear terms a substantial reduction in the view and overall quality of life as a result of the project. 6 7 BZA CHAIR HILL: What's the address, again, that 8 you're in? 9 1937 2nd Street Northeast. MR. BELAK: 10 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, please go ahead. 11 MR. BELAK: Okay. And as a matter of fact, we've posted this information on the public Internet, so I think I can give that link to someone who can share their 13 screen, it would be pretty simple for that person to present. 14 15 BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes, it's not even so much that Belak I'm trying to remember how, or not remember, 16 17 understand how this is going work with to presenting information. Like you would have to submit this into the 18 record, I think. 19 2.0 But Ms. Nagelhout, do you know, I mean, if this 2.1 were like, again, if we were live, how would that have worked 22 versus now and can they just, I mean, can, I don't think they 23 can share the screen just because they can. 24 My question is, do you know whether or not they're

allowed to present stuff like off the cuff like this that,

1	like, the applicant didn't have a chance to look at? And I
2	know that when we were alive, we did this all the time. And
3	so I don't know Ms. Nagelhout, if you have an opinion because
4	I'm just trying to clarify for my, because I always forget.
5	MS. NAGELHOUT: Okay, what was the question?
6	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes, the question is whether or
7	not the witness can just provide us exhibits to look at.
8	MS. NAGELHOUT: Well, it's not in keeping with
9	your rules for the virtual hearings, but it happened all of
10	the time in the, when we were in person. So it's up to you
11	as chair.
12	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right, well, I don't
13	know how to get it. Mr. Young, you can't share, people can't
14	share, I don't really want you to share your screen, by the
15	way, just because I don't want to, it opens up different
16	issues maybe but I'm curious. Mr. Young, is there a way to
17	share the screen?
18	MR. YOUNG: For him to share his screen?
19	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes.
20	MR. YOUNG: He can.
21	BZA CHAIR HILL: He can?
22	MR. YOUNG: I have to give him that privilege but
23	yes, if I do that then he can.
24	MR. BELAK: Mr. Young, I'd be happy to email you
25	the web link so you may share your screen to avoid, you know,

1	the issue the chairman's posting. It's just a URL that can
2	hit it from any computer that has access to it.
3	BZA CHAIR HILL: Why don't you tell me what the,
4	what the link is?
5	MR. BELAK: It's griffinfreeman.com/1933 dash
6	extension. And I'd be happy to spell out any one of those
7	for you.
8	BZA CHAIR HILL: All right go and send, can you
9	send the, do you have Mr. Young's email address?
10	MR. BELAK: If someone were to recite it, I'd be
11	happy to send it.
12	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Mr. Moy, Mr. Belak, were
13	you able to submit something to the record before?
14	MR. BELAK: I was not, but I'd be happy to submit
15	this to the record.
16	BZA CHAIR HILL: No, that's fine. So I mean, do
17	you know who you would send something to get something into
18	the record?
19	MR. BELAK: I would ask our architect Mark Freeman
20	on how to do that and I'm sure he can advise me.
21	BZA CHAIR HILL: Got you. Okay, got it so you
22	don't know.
23	MR. BELAK: Correct.
24	BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Moy, do you know how they can
25	send something to get it into the record?

1	MR. MOY: Two ways, you can either send it
2	directly to me and then I could share with Mr. Young or if
3	the, if the chair allows it, since this is an open hearing,
4	he could send it to bzasubmissions@dc.gov.
5	BZA CHAIR HILL: Why don't you, do you mind if
6	he sends it to you real quick?
7	MR. MOY: Sure.
8	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Mr. Freeman, can you hear
9	me? Can you introduce yourself for the record? And you're
10	on mute.
11	MR. FREEMAN: Hi, I'm Mark Freeman, architect
12	working with Truesdell HOA. My office is Aggregate
13	Architecture and Design.
14	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, Mr. Freeman, can you send
15	the link to Mr. Moy? And while all of this is getting done,
16	we're going to move on to another witness and come back to
17	Mr. Belak, by the way.
18	MR. BELAK: Thank you, sir.
19	BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Belak, can you mute yourself
20	if you wouldn't mind?
21	MR. BELAK: Yes, sir.
22	BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Freeman, do you have
23	Mr. Moy's email address?
24	MR. BELAK: I do not, but I can quickly do it.
25	Mr. Moy, do you, are you able to give that out?

1	MR. MOY: Sure, it's just my, it's my office email
2	address, which Mr. Cross is very much aware of. It's
3	Clifford C-L-I-F-F-O-R-D .Moy, M-O-Y @dc.gov. Got it?
4	BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Freeman, did you get that?
5	MR. FREEMAN: I just sent it to him.
6	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, all right. So let's just
7	wait. And so Mr. Moy, wait until you get that, send it to
8	Mr. Young and I'm going to move on to another witness for
9	now. Let's see, Ms. Wing, can you hear me? Or is it
10	Ms. Wing?
11	MS. SALERNO: Ian Wing is my husband. I'm Melissa
12	Salerno. That's fine.
13	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, Ms. Salerno, could you
14	introduce yourself for the record, please?
15	MS. SALERNO: Sure. Melissa Salerno, I am the
16	Vice President of the Truesdell HOA at 1937 2nd Street, and
17	I occupy unit four.
18	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, we're doing another HOA.
19	Okay, so I'm going to, are you representing your HOA?
20	MS. SALERNO: Yes.
21	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay.
22	MS. SALERNO: Along with Mark Freeman and Mark
23	Belak.
24	BZA CHAIR HILL: You're all with the same HOA?
25	MS. SALERNO: Yes.

BZA CHAIR HILL: But Mr. Belak is the President 1 2 of the HOA? 3 Yes, correct. He's the President. MS. SALERNO: 4 BZA CHAIR HILL: I got you. So then he'll get the 5 five minutes for the HOA, and --6 MS. SALERNO: Okay. 7 BZA CHAIR HILL: -- you'll get your three minutes 8 as a member of the public. And so --9 MS. SALERNO: Okay. 10 BZA CHAIR HILL: -- the clock is right there on 11 the screen, and you can begin whenever you'd like. 12 MS. SALERNO: Sure, thank you. Well, I appreciate the opportunity to be able to, you know, get our concerns 13 As Mark had mentioned, the primary concerns 14 across today. are the shading and the lack of sunlight, especially with the 15 lower units, as well as the loss of view that would impact 16 17 all of the units. 18 Another thing is just there'd not being enough parking and adding to the stress of the neighborhood already. 19 2.0 We absolutely want this development to happen. We think it's 2.1 going to be a great thing for the neighborhood but as 22 feet back our building presented, the from ten is 23 non-starter for our HOA and not something that we'll be able 24 to support at this time.

But we are looking forward to discussing it more

1	and coming to a resolution. At present, we just haven't been
2	satisfied with anything that Michael Cross has presented us.
3	We even explored seven feet back, but as Michael showed, with
4	the shading and the drawings, or the renderings, I guess is
5	the correct term, there is essentially no difference there.
6	So we need to explore some further options.
7	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right, you guys are,
8	you guys are in 1937, right?
9	MS. SALERNO: Yes, correct.
10	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, and you're the ones that
11	are going far back now, right?
12	MS. SALERNO: Yes. So well, we aren't far, far
13	back. They would be going 10 feet beyond our building.
14	BZA CHAIR HILL: Right, all right. But, anyway,
15	okay. All right let's see. The next person is, is that it,
16	Ms. Salerno? I'm sorry.
17	MS. SALERNO: Yes, that's everything. Thank you.
18	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great. So Mr. Wing is not
19	with us. Is that correct?
20	MR. WING: I'm here. This is Ian Wing.
21	BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Wing, could you introduce
22	yourself for the record, please?
23	MR. WING: Sure. My name is Ian wing, I'm a
24	resident of 1937 2nd Street Northeast. I'm also an officer
25	in the Eckington Parks and Arts Greenways Committee and I'll

be speaking on behalf of that organization.

2.0

2.1

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, I got to tell you. Like you guys, I'm being really flexible on the time. I don't mind giving you the five minutes right now but what, the way this will work if you guys are ever with us in the future, I need a letter that says you're representing the association in order to get five minutes versus three, right? So Mr. Wing, you can go ahead and have five minutes, and you can present the response.

MR. WING: It's fine, sir.

BZA CHAIR HILL: I'm just laying it out.

MR. WING: Okay. Well, yes, we're ordinary people. We don't do this often. This is our first time attending one of these hearings. We were just motivated as a community to come out and make sure that all of the information presented to the committee is accurate and voice our concerns.

A couple matters of fact are correct. I handle a lot of the community engagement for our association, and I attended the Eckington Civic Association meeting that Michael Cross referenced earlier in the call.

The comments that I made at the time were that we are generally supportive of development of the building next door, but we needed time to review the plans and assess the impact on our property.

1	It's a sort of a large leap to accept that as
2	support from the, from the Community Association given the
3	fact that we have not had a chance to review the plans and,
4	you know, once we, once we did have a chance to go over the
5	plans with our, with our architect and amongst ourselves, it
6	was clear that the impact of the proposed development would
7	be too great and it's not something that we as neighbors
8	could support.
9	And going forward, I mean, I think that the
10	exhibits that Mr. Belak is going to show will illustrate sort
11	of our concerns pretty clearly. You know, like I said, we're
12	ordinary people. I mean, we're not investors.
13	This is everyone in the building's first home and
14	it's just hard to wrap my head around, you know, this
15	development coming in next door and, you know, adversely
16	affecting our quality of life and our property values.
17	So it's just a tough sell for us and, you know,
18	again, we're supportive of development next door, but it's
19	just got to be done in a way that, you know, is, you know,
20	positive for the community here.
21	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right, thank you, sir.
22	Mr. Bremen or Ms. Bremen, are you there?
23	MR. YOUNG: Mr. Young, was there a Mr. Bremen or

24 Ms. Bremen? It's Freeman. Never mind. Sorry, Mr. Freeman.

25 Okay, so Mr. Freeman, are you also testifying and you're

1	testifying with Mr. Belak?
2	MR. FREEMAN: I'm helping consult
3	BZA CHAIR HILL: You're in support of Mr. Belak?
4	Okay. Great, okay. So Mr. Young, do you have the item? The
5	exhibit?
6	MR. YOUNG: Yes.
7	BZA CHAIR HILL: Could you pull it up please for
8	us? Mr. Belak, can you hear me? Okay, I'm going to start
9	your five minutes now. You can go ahead whenever you like.
10	MR. BELAK: All right, thank you very much
11	Chairman Hill, thank you very much Mr. Young for sharing this
12	documentation on my behalf. What we have here is the current
13	view from the first unit in the building would share a space
14	between in the cellar and the ground floor.
15	And Mr. Young, if you could click anywhere on that
16	picture, please? So this is the proposed change. And if you
17	could click again, please. As we can see, there's a dramatic
18	difference in visibility of the skyline, most of the greenery
19	and an overall complete blockage of all of that sky. So
20	could you click again on that? Are there any questions or
21	comments from the Board before we go to the next view?
22	BZA CHAIR HILL: Now you can go to the next view.
23	I'm sorry.
24	MR. BELAK: Thank you.
25	BZA CHAIR HILL: I'm sorry, I can't see, I can't

1	see the pictures. I'm sorry, I can't see the faces of my
2	fellow Board members. Do the Board members have any
3	questions of this one?
4	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes, Mr. Chair. Is this
5	the proposed or the matter of right?
6	MR. BELAK: So if you would unclick or, just
7	simply click the link. So matter of right would look crudely
8	like this, right? And if you would click, that is the
9	proposal.
10	BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Belak, is that correct? I
11	thought that's, that's the 20 feet.
12	MR. BELAK: That's the 20 feet we're looking at.
13	BZA CHAIR HILL: Right, so they get, they get 10
14	feet by right. So half of that would exist by right.
15	MR. BELAK: That's incorrect. So ten feet would
16	put them right in line with the current building. Twenty
17	feet would put them here.
18	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, well I'll ask Mr. Cross.
19	Mr. Cross, can you hear me? It is correct?
20	MR. CROSS: It is correct. It is correct.
21	BZA CHAIR HILL: That's looks like more than ten
22	feet to me.
23	MR. CROSS: Yes, I would question the method these
24	were produced but I would agree that that the matter of right
25	solution would not pass their building as their building

already passes us ten feet, so we would only be passing them 1 the similar ten feet. So the projection that any projection 2 3 they would see would be limited to 10 feet. But I can't --4 BZA CHAIR HILL: So maybe I --5 MR. CROSS: -- see the scale of this illustration. 6 BZA CHAIR HILL: -- you're able to go, you're able 7 by right just to match their building? 8 MR. CROSS: That's right because their building 9 already goes back the ten feet that is allowed as matter of 10 right under today's code. 11 BZA CHAIR HILL: Got it, okay. Okay, continue, 12 Mr. Belak. All right, thank you very much. 13 MR. BELAK: Ιf you will please scroll down, Mr. Young? So this is the view 14 15 from actually my balcony. This is unit three, one floor above the previous view. 16 17 This was the current view. As you can see a lot of skyline, a lot of greenery, some of the neighboring 18 19 buildings. If you would please click on that picture, Mr. 20 Young. 2.1 So this is the proposed change which again, extends ten feet beyond, really that upwards gutter is where 22 2.3 the new building would be if you'd look vertically at that 24 black gutter going up the side of the building, and this

would be ten feet beyond that.

1	So again, my poor little planter which I aspire
2	to one day have plants in will unlike, be unlikely to get any
3	sun there and unlikely to grow, and of course, the
4	limitations in the skyline are pretty dramatic. If you could
5	click and unclick again for us, please, Mr. Young, so we can
6	see the difference.
7	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Mr. Belak, can you tell me
8	how deep is your balcony?
9	MR. BELAK: I would say it's roughly five feet.
10	I don't have an exact measurement, though.
11	MS. SALERNO: It's four feet. I've measured it.
12	MR. BELAK: Thank you. Thank you, Melissa.
13	BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Young, I guess if could click
14	that again is what Mr. Belak said. There you go. Okay,
15	Mr. Belak.
16	MR. BELAK: Okay, no questions?
17	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Mr. Chairman, may I ask
18	a question about this, this photograph? So where did you
19	measure from and for the projection, for the, for the
20	addition? So you mentioned
21	MR. BELAK: We measured
22	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Go ahead.
23	MR. BELAK: we measured 10 feet from the end
24	of our building, which would be 20 feet from the end of the
25	current structure.

1	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: So from the wall?
2	MR. BELAK: Correct.
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay, thank you.
4	MR. BELAK: My pleasure.
5	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: I have no other questions.
6	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, Mr. Belak?
7	MR. BELAK: Thank you ma'am. And then the last
8	one, if you'd be so kind, Mr. Young. This is actually viewed
9	from inside. So obviously, we spend most of our time inside
10	and out on the balcony.
11	And we think it's as important if not more to show
12	the difference in the amount of light and quality of light
13	inside the unit, which of course is near impossible to
14	represent on architecture drawings. If you could click on
15	that picture, please, Mr. Young.
16	So again, the view from the inside of the building
17	is dramatically reduced. The overall sunlight quality of
18	light is dramatically reduced. One more pair of clicks
19	please, Mr. Young.
20	Okay, thank you very much. So we'd be happy to
21	follow the appropriate procedure to enter this documentation
22	into the record. I apologize for not having done so already.
23	Are there any questions from the Board?
24	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Thanks, Mr. Belak.
25	Thanks, Mr. Young. You could drop that one if you don't

Okay, I got the shadow studies, that's what 1 2 looking at. The, okay --3 Ms. Myers, can you hear me? Again, when the Office of Planning was doing their analysis, I mean, this 5 happens, this has happened a lot to us, you know, just so Mr. Belak, you know. 6 I mean people are with us all of the time looking 7 8 for a special exception to go beyond the 10 feet that's 9 matter of right and then we rely on different things to see 10 whether or not they're meeting the regulations for us to 11 grant the relief, right? 12 And so Ms. Myers, I know that like, you know, 13 within the regulations, views aren't something that are protected. And so, you know, when the Office of Planning was 14 doing their analysis of this additional ten feet, how did 15 they go about that with comparison to 1937? 16 17 MS. MYERS: Well --BZA CHAIR HILL: 18 Go ahead and get started. 19 -- when it comes to going back more MS. MYERS: 2.0 than the matter of right, it's really more of an issue on the 2.1 other side. It's 20 feet from that neighbor's rear and that's the side that brings us pretty much into needing 22 23 review for that issue. 24 On this side, it is ten feet beyond this neighbor, but that is allowed. If the other side wasn't the 20-foot

issue, this, we wouldn't even see this. So, you know, when it comes to views, I mean, we do look at, I believe it's enjoyment of your property.

But again, you know, I believe there's like, there's no windows on the edition on either side. I'm trying to take a look at my report to just make sure I can verify that but I believe that was the case so that wasn't, yes. I don't think there was any significant privacy impacts so, you know, we didn't really --

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, I understand.

MS. MYERS: -- look at the level of undue impact.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, thanks. All right. Mr. Cross, can you hear me? The discussions that you were having there with Mr. Belak and his group, right. So what, I mean, you guys wanted two more weeks, or whatever, you wanted a postponement to continue to discuss what, and I'm just curious now. I'm not trying to get into negotiations here. In fact, what is it that you guys were going to discuss?

MR. CROSS: We were trying to, you know, provide a good faith effort to try to reach some sort of compromise. We had offered a reduced plan that, you know, I don't think has been outright rejected, although maybe some testimony earlier suggested that it has been but may be still being considered.

2.0

2.1

But honestly, it is, we submitted the postponement with some reservations because we are not ourselves sure if there is an area, is a solution that would receive the support of the adjacent neighbor short of alignment with their building, which would be matter of right and not require relief as the Office of Planning suggested. BZA CHAIR HILL: Right, the but then you, there was some discussion, and I'm just trying to understand. There was some discussion about you not going back as far is what I heard at one point from somebody, and then that would change your program, right? Or you would still have the same amount of units? The same amount of units. MR. CROSS: It would floor area slightly, overall 14 change our gross but our footprint as proposed would actually stay the same because we were only suggesting to inset the corner of those second and third floors, those floors which are fully above the existing fence. 18 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, and then, but then you would have a different design? MR. CROSS: There would be a slight design change. Yes, sir. BZA CHAIR HILL: All right. Okay. Okay, does the 24 Board have any questions for any of the witnesses that are

Mr. Freeman, you had a comment?

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

19

20

2.1

22

1 MR. FREEMAN: We've worked with Mr. Cross over the 2 last few weeks to further develop the shading studies and the design, and the shade studies that he's given you are 2D. 3 He's developed 3D shape studies as well as view impacts. 5 So when, if there's question about the ten-foot extension in those pictures that Mr. Belak has represented, 6 7 Mr. Cross has given us that, has given us additional drawings 8 and additional information. 9 Those drawings have not been uploaded and have not 10 been presented to you and I think those also help represent the impact that is happening on 1937 from 1933. 11 So I would 12 respectfully ask that those be uploaded and be put into the record as well. 13 14 got you because BZA CHAIR HILL: Ι 15 primitive, if my fellow Board members need anything else. I mean, we're looking at the difference between the 10 feet 16 17 and the additional, well, the additional therapy, right? 18 And so, you know, I think there's a bunch of I don't need anything else at this point. 19 shadows there. 2.0 what I'm more interested in is that if you guys 21 actually changed the design, we would have to look at the 22 design again, right? And so that's what I'm kind of, like, 23 struggling with here. 24 MR. FREEMAN: Well, and if I may, Chairman, we

also spoke with the ANC representative.

The Truesdell was

not a part of the April 19 presentation that Mr. Cross presented to them.

And as far as I understand, any support that the ANC has provided has not been put onto paper and made official. And so she also was at the meeting that we had on May 9th, and emailed all of us together and agreed that a postponement would be in the best, in the benefit of this process because I believe there may have been some, some procedures that were out of, out of place.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, I don't know, okay, that's okay. I don't have, I don't have an official report. You're correct on that. I have an email from a commissioner as to what the vote was. I'm assuming the vote is correct.

Like, I don't think the person would lie, but I don't have an official thing. So nonetheless, I'm trying to figure out what we're going to do here. So that's the, okay. So does the Board have any, and I'm going to keep the witnesses around. Like, you guys can stick around.

I'm just going to kind of let you leave the hearing room in a second. Does the Board have any questions for the witnesses? Okay, all right. Thank you guys. I'm going to, you may or may not be back but I'm going to, and it was nice to see you all. Thanks for your participation. And Mr. Young, if you can put them in the waiting room, please?

2.0

2.1

2.3

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 1 MR. BELAK: 2 Thank you. Okay, this may have BZA CHAIR HILL: been helpful. I guess it did, like we got through a majority 3 But now Dr. Imamura, you have to come back on the 5 25th, you know? And so, I think what I would suggest is we go 6 7 ahead and have a limited scope hearing on any kind of discussions that may happen with that building next door. 8 9 I don't know whether or not it affects the decision that the 10 Board might have or whether or not it, again, changes the 11 mind of where the Board may or may not be on this particular 12 case. However, if they want a little bit more time to 13 see if they can work together, then what I would suggest is 14 15 giving them a couple of weeks and then leaving the record 16 open for any changes in design, and also leaving the record 17 open for an official letter from the ANC. 18 Did I lose, I didn't mean to kick out, no, Mr. just meant to kick out the witnesses, 19 Ι 20 If you can put the applicant back in. 2.1 Mr. Cross, can you hear me? 22 Okay, so this one, I would suggest I'm looking at So we'll bring them back on the 25th for 23 my Board members.

may not take place with the adjacent neighbor.

a limited scope hearing on just the discussions that may or

1	If there is a design change, leave the record open
2	for a design change, and then also leave the record open for
3	anything that might come from the ANC. Does my fellow Board
4	members have any comments or any additional items?
5	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: So, so in term, in terms
6	of comments, I don't need any additional items, but I'm
7	looking at Exhibit 53 and looking at the relationship of 1937
8	2nd Street to 1933 2nd Street as it exists now.
9	And 1937 is towering over 1933. So there will be
10	some impact to 1937, but, you know, 10 foot is allowed, a 10
11	foot extension is allowed as a matter of right on that side.
12	So I would be interested to see if the parties can, you know,
13	make any changes that they both can accept, but just looking
14	at this photograph, a ten foot extension is allowed as a
15	matter of right on that side. So, just an observation,
16	BZA CHAIR HILL: No, thanks, Vice Chair John. So
17	you don't need anything?
18	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: I don't really need
19	anything, no.
20	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, okay. Does anybody else
21	need anything? Okay. Then Mr. Moy, let's go ahead and do
22	this. Let's bring them back for a continued hearing.
23	Continuing on 525.
24	Okay, 525 continue hearing. On just the items
25	that we spoke about, which is that the discussion with the

adjacent neighbor and any changes, Mr. Cross, do you have any 1 questions on what I just said? 2 3 No, I understand it. MR. CROSS: 4 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right, then we'll come 5 I'm sorry, Mr. Moy, you want back, Mr. Moy. Is that good? to give them a date? 6 7 MR. MOY: Yes, I was going to ask why not to give them a deadline for filings as well as whether or not you 8 9 wanted a supplemental report from the Office of Planning. 10 BZA CHAIR HILL: Т don't think we need supplemental unless the Office of Planning wants to provide 11 12 I don't, unless they see, I don't think there'll be any differences for their view. 13 14 MR. MOY: Okay, then Ι would suggest, 15 Mr. Chairman, that the filings that you're suggesting whether 16 the applicant, if the applicant were to file any design 17 changes, and as long as you're opening the record for any further documentation or a letter from the ANC. 18 19 Then those materials can be submitted into the 2.0 record. As I suppose, I mean, today's May 11th already so 21 that gives the applicant time. Maybe Friday May the 20th? Or do you want to split that over to the following Monday? 22 23 Well, I got the sample for Mr. BZA CHAIR HILL: 24 Cross quick on the 20th so that sounds like that's okay, 25 right?

1	MR. CROSS: Friday the 20th will work for us.
2	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, and so
3	MR. CROSS: Thank you.
4	BZA CHAIR HILL: we'll have submissions on
5	Friday the 20th. We don't need responses from anybody. What
6	we're leaving the record open for, what we're leaving the
7	record open for, again, is any negotiations you might have,
8	Mr. Cross, with the adjacent neighbor.
9	And I guess I'll leave the record open if the
10	adjacent neighbor wants to submit something to the record
11	again as well based upon the discussions. I mean, hopefully
12	you guys come to an agreement and, you know, there's nothing
13	for them to object to. But we'll see what happens on May
14	20th. Okay, Mr. Cross? Sorry, Vice Chair John?
15	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Mr. Chairman, would this
16	be a limited scope hearing?
17	BZA CHAIR HILL: I was going to do a limited scope
18	hearing just on that or we can just go to a decision. It's
19	up to you guys.
20	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: I defer to the rest of the
21	Board but unless there's a new design, then we could just go
22	to decision.
23	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, do you guys decide then?
24	I see Dr. Imamura nodding with decision, I guess. Okay, Mr.
25	Smith?

1	MEMBER SMITH: I agree with limited scope.
2	BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Blake? Okay, so we'll decide
3	mister, I mean, we are going to have a decision hearing on
4	525. Okay? And then hopefully we get something on the 20th.
5	All right, is that it for you guys? Okay, thanks, Mr. Cross.
6	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you.
7	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, I want to let you all know
8	I am, I am earning my lunch money today, okay? As all you,
9	as you are as well. All right, Mr. Moy, do you want to call
10	in our next one?
11	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Is this our last case
12	before lunch, Mr. Chairman? Just inquiring.
13	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes, no, that's right. I think
14	it is then.
15	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay. Thank you.
16	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, okay. You all are going
17	to have like a big donor. I mean, I'm having like, I'm
18	having like two big Dunkin Donuts before this starts and so
19	that carries me like, you know. I'm advertising. All
20	
	right, Mr. Moy.
21	right, Mr. Moy. MR. MOY: All right, I'm sorry, sir. I was, I was
21 22	
	MR. MOY: All right, I'm sorry, sir. I was, I was
22	MR. MOY: All right, I'm sorry, sir. I was, I was multi-tasking a little bit. Okay, so the case before the

pursuant to Subtitle X, Section 901.2 for a special exception under Subtitle U of Section 421. This would permit new residential development.

This is a, would be for a seven unit apartment house. The property is located in the RA-1 zone at 4001 7th Street Northeast Square 3817 Lot 11. And let's see, there are motions because there's a late filing from the applicant.

This is the 21-day dead requirement for filing supplementals into the record. And let's see, what else do we have? And the app, which includes from the applicant a untimely filing for their affidavit of posting, all right?

And finally, Mr. Chairman, late last night there was an attempted entry by the ANC 5B. It was an email correspondence that I believe was an attempt to clarify their remarked statement statements in their ANC report. So if the Board wishes to see those statements from the ANC, then you would have to allow that into the record.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right, unless the Board has any issues, I'd like to allow everything into the record. And if you have an issue, please raise your hand. All right, Mr. Moore, if you can, please ask the staff to drop those into the record and we can keep a lookout for him. Mr. Cross, if you can hear me, if you can introduce yourself for the record?

MR. CROSS: Sure. My name is Michael Cross, the

2.0

architect responsible for this projects. I'm joined here by 1 project designer agreement Garima Gupta. 2 3 BZA CHAIR HILL: Well, let's see who we Okay. 4 need to hear from, Mr. Cross. Mr. Cross, between you and 5 Mr. Sullivan, you guys have got the whole day today. Let's see, why don't you, Mr. Cross, walk us through your client's 6 7 application? And why I believe they're meeting the criteria to grant the relief requested. 8 Ι don't see 9 Is there something you want us to pull up? PowerPoint. 10 MR. CROSS: Yes, you can pull up Exhibit 26A. 11 BZA CHAIR HILL: I guess, Mr. Cross if you can 12 also speak to like the DDOT items? 13 MR. CROSS: Sure. Okay, fantastic. So, this project, this project is proposing, is a renovation of an 14 15 existing four unit structure being converted to a seven unit 16 structure with three stories, a limited third story addition 17 is being proposed. 18 We're proposing six two-bedroom units and one This is, we're seeking special relief for 19 one-bedroom unit. 2.0 this project due to the RA-1 zoning requirements that require 21 any new development or development related to the expansion 22 of an existing structure to receive special exception relief. 23 Next slide, please. 24 The project's located on the intersection of 7th and Randolph. It is a corner lot with a total land area of

roughly 4,500 square feet. And we're proposing to largely maintain the existing footprint, which is roughly 40 percent lot occupancy. The remaining 60 percent would be used as green cover pavers, window wells and parking. Next slide, please.

The project requires only one parking space. However, we are proposing to provide four parking spaces. The project as well connected to public transportation within a half mile of the red line, as well as served by nearby bus lines.

There's dedicated trash space then at the rear of the property, and the trash will be collected by a private collection service at intervals to meet the building's demand. Next slide, please.

The cellar floor shown here has two-bedroom units, one located in the front, one located in the rear. The cellar of this building is already dug out, but we will be underpinning it for additional head height. And we're proposing to keep the existing foundation walls. Next slide.

This is the first floor. In this layout we also have, well this floor is typical of both the first floor and second floor where we have two two-bedroom units. All units are afforded with increased natural light and air through windows on three sides and every unit will have access to outdoor space. The units here are proposed to 750 to 850

2.1

2.3

Next slide. Next slide. 1 square feet. 2 The third floor is a partial third story addition here being added over the existing two story building. 3 This is where the autonomous seventh unit is located. 5 has its own private roof deck. Next slide. Next slide. 6 The exterior is proposed for main, with the 7 existing brick front and side facing 7th and Randolph Street 8 with some siding on the rear towards the alley. Prior to 9 gaining to the ANC, prior to gaining the AMT, ANC support, 10 we received feedback from the SMD and revised our design 11 accordingly. 12 We are now showing that we are going to maintain the existing mansard roof, which is found on the properties. 13 We are also keeping the existing brick on the front and side 14 15 as noted before. And while our client considers, continues to 16 17 consider maintaining the front stoop and stairs and railings, we're not proposing to maintain those items at the time. 18 appreciate your time and welcome any questions that you might 19 20 have. 2.1 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, does the Board have any questions of the applicant? 22 23 Mr. Chair? COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: 24 BZA CHAIR HILL: Sure, Dr. Imamura? 25

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: So Mr. Cross, just a quick

1	question. As I kind of go through your floor plans here, the
2	patios for the cellar unit one and two that are on grade, I'm
3	looking at units four.
4	Now it looks like they have, there are two
5	windows. One in the master bedroom and one in the living
6	room kitchen that look out onto those two patios. Is that
7	right?
8	MR. CROSS: Yes, sir. They are at slightly
9	different elevations. But yes, there would be some
10	visibility from the above grade units to that side yard in
11	very much the same way as any unit would have with visibility
12	of a rear yard patio.
13	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: All right, was there any
14	thought consideration given to at least moving or relocating
15	those window units into another position?
16	MR. CROSS: Yes, it had not been considered
17	previously. Again, this situation is not all that atypical
18	for visibility within a development, but obviously it's a
19	duly noted.
20	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: What is the grade change,
21	I guess, or the elevation change from the patio to the
22	window? Because it's not so much, it's not only just the
23	unit looking out, but it's also who's on the patio looking
24	in. Just a ballpark.
25	MR. CROSS: Yes, I think it's, I think it's only

a couple of feet. 1 2 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Okay. You know, I was just 3 thinking if there's any way to kind of, we'll look at that, 4 and reposition that but that's just my question, so. 5 MR. CROSS: Okay. COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Nothing further, Mr. Chair. 6 7 BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. Mr. Blake? 8 MEMBER BLAKE: Yes, Mr. Cross, could you talk a 9 little bit about, I think that this building has building restriction lines on both 7th and Randolph. Can you talk a 10 little bit about how you are doing the patios and how that 11 12 relates to the public space or the exact encroachment on 13 public space, I quess my question is. 14 MR. CROSS: Yes, you're exactly right. As noted 15 in the DDOT report, there are building restriction lines on 16 both street facing lot lines for this project. That is one 17 of the reasons that we are largely maintaining the existing already conforms building 18 footprint as it with those restriction lines. 19 2.0 The proposed projections into public space are 2.1 limited to lead walks, stoops, window wells and in the case 22 of these two patios, some paving, and fences, I think, is so 23 what they call a fence is less than 42 inches, which are all 24 permissible elements under the public space guidelines.

MEMBER BLAKE:

Thank you.

25

Now, is that going to

1	be pervious? What was the surface going to be like in those
2	areas?
3	MR. CROSS: I don't know if it's been determined
4	at this time, but it is likely to be some sort of paver
5	system. Whether it's pervious or not, I don't know.
6	MEMBER BLAKE: Thank you, sir.
7	BZA CHAIR HILL: Anyone else? Vice Chair John?
8	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: I asked my entire
9	question. Thank you, Mr. Smith. Did you, did you see DDOT
10	comments about combining the multiple lead walks? I don't
11	know if you already addressed it in the architectural plans.
12	MR. CROSS: Not to comment but it has not been
13	addressed in the plans to date.
14	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay. All right, thank
15	you.
16	BZA CHAIR HILL: All right, anyone else? I'm
17	going to turn to the Office of Planning.
18	MS. ELLIOTT: Sorry, it was taking a minute.
19	Okay, there we go. Good afternoon. Mr. Chairman, I'm
20	Brandice Elliott representing the Office of Planning for BZA
21	Case 20706.
22	We've reviewed the application provided to us
23	which included the site plan, landscape plan, grading plan,
24	and also building elevations and found that it met the
25	special exemption criteria for a new residential development

in the RA-1 zone.

2.1

2.3

So we are recommending approval of the relief that's been requested. In terms of the public space and any DDOT issues, we would expect that the applicant would continue to work with DDOT to resolve any of those issues related to the patio or the walkways, but that that would happen with public space. So if there any questions, I'm happy to answer them.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Does anybody have questions for the Office of Planning? Does the applicant have any questions for the Office of Planning? Mr. Young, is there anyone here wishing to speak? Okay.

All right, I'm going to go ahead and close the hearing and the record unless the Board has any questions, but if so, please raise your hand. All right. All right, thank you, Mr. Cross.

Okay, after hearing the presentation, I would agree with the argument that the applicant has made as to how they're meeting the criteria to grant the relief requested under the regulations.

I like, I kind of liked the question they encountered with that. I like the design and how they kept the mansard roof and so I think that it is an interesting design.

But regardless of what I feel about the design,

I think they're meeting the criteria within the regulations. 1 2 I would also agree with the analysis that was provided by the Office of Planning and also the, and I'm trying to see here 3 4 where, I think, the latest items that came into the record. 5 One second here. And I want to thank Commissioner Costello for the clarification of the report as to the ANC's 6 7 recommendations. It took time for the commissioner read that 8 out, and I appreciate it. So I'm going to be voting in favor 9 of the application. Mr. Smith, you everything you'd like to 10 add? I don't have anything to add. 11 MEMBER SMITH: Ι 12 agree with your assessment of this cases, and I also agree with assessment for the reasons why this was especially, the 13 special section material is that grant the special exception. 14 15 So we'll be voting in support of that, thank you. 16 BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. Mr. Blake? 17 **MEMBER** voting in favor BLAKE: We the application. I do think it meets the requirements of U 21 18 19 and the general standards. I would say this, I looked at the design and think 2.0 original I do this is а significant 2.1 improvement over that with regard to the mansard roof. 22 I did know that in the SMDs comments talked a 2.3 little bit about the front, well I guess the porch or the 24 awning. Maybe that would be something that the applicant

could also consider in looking at. But otherwise, I thought

that was a good design and I think it's a nice property and 1 I'll be supporting the application. 2 3 BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. Dr. Imamura? 4 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 5 I'm in agreement, mostly with Board member Blake and Board I think the design, that it meets the special member Smith. 6 7 exception. The design, however, I don't think there's a whole 8 9 lot of expression on any of the elevations. But as Board 10 Member Blake did say, it is an improvement over the original So with that, I think I certainly understand the 11 intent of the design and the architect and I'm ready to vote 12 in favor. 13 14 BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. Vice Chair John? 15 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 16 think revised, this application Ι as we, as is 17 straightforward, and I want to commend the applicant for working with the ANC to come up with the improved design and 18 I agree with OP's analysis of how the application meets the 19 20 criteria for relief and I will be voting in support. 2.1 BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. I'd like to thank all 22 of my colleagues. I'm going to make a motion to approve 2.3 application number 20706 as captioned and read 24 secretary and ask for a second. Ms. John? 25 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN:

Second.

1	BZA CHAIR HILL: The is made and seconded, Mr. Moy
2	could you take a roll call?
3	MR. MOY: When I call your name, if you would
4	please respond with a yes, no, abstain to the motion made by
5	Chairman Hill to approve the application for the relief
6	requested. This motion was seconded by Vice Chair John.
7	Zoning Commissioner Dr. Imamura?
8	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.
9	MR. MOY: Mr. Smith? Mr. Blake?
10	MEMBER BLAKE: Yes.
11	MR. MOY: Vice Chair John?
12	MEMBER BLAKE: Yes.
13	MR. MOY: Chairman Hill? Then staff is going to
14	record the vote as five to zero to zero and this is on the
15	motion by Chairman Hill to approve. The motion was seconded
16	by Vice Chair John in support.
17	Also in support the motion to approve, Zoning
18	Commissioner Dr. Imamura, Mr. Smith, Mr. Blake, of course
19	Vice Chair John and Chairman Hill. The motion carries on a
20	vote of five to zero to zero.
21	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, thank you. Okay, do you
22	all want to do like 45 minutes? Okay, all right. So let's
23	come back at 1:30. Thank you.
24	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the
25	record at 12:45 p.m. and resumed at 1:36 p.m.)

BZA CHAIR HILL: All right, Mr. Moy. 1 You can call us back in and call our first case, when you get a chance. 2 3 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. MR. MOY: The Board has returned to the Public Hearing session after a relatively 5 quick lunch recess, and the time is at or about 1:36 p.m. The next case as before the Board is Application No. 20707 6 7 of Daniela Gross and Eric Teran, T-E-R-A-N. This is a self-8 certified application, pursuant to Subtitle X, Section 901.2, 9 for a special exception under Subtitle E, Sections 205.5, and 10 Subtitle E, Section 5201, from the rear addition requirements of Subtitle E, Section 205.4. 11 The property is in the RF-1 Zone at 1146 16th Street, Northeast, Square 4076, Lot 196, 12 and that's all they're going to have for the Board. 13 14 Great. BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Teran, can you hear 15 And if so, could you introduce yourself for the record, 16 please? 17 My name is Eric Teran, and I'm MR. TERAN: Sure. the architect, and I'm actually the homeowner this time as 18 19 well. 2.0 BZA CHAIR HILL: Well. Mr. Teran, that's 2.1 interesting. Well, welcome. Let's see, Mr. Teran, if you 22 want to --- you know the drill. If you want to go ahead and 2.3 walk us through the application and why you believe you're 24 meeting the criteria for us to grant the relief requested,

am pulling up the record right now.

And you can begin

1	whenever you like.
2	MR. TERAN: Okay. If Mr. Young could pull up
3	Exhibit I think I said it was 19, start with the plans.
4	BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Teran, can you tell us
5	I did you get an ANC letter?
6	MR. TERAN: For this? No. Well, we went last
7	night. I wasn't here in our April meeting. And so, we did
8	go last night, and we did get approved unanimously. And I
9	don't know if they had time to write the letter, though.
10	BZA CHAIR HILL: I doubt that. If you went last
11	night, they didn't have time to write the letter. But you're
12	testifying you went last night, and they approved?
	MD HEDAN Commont
13	MR. TERAN: Correct.
13 14	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. I'm sorry, Mr. Teran?
14	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. I'm sorry, Mr. Teran?
14 15	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. I'm sorry, Mr. Teran? MR. TERAN: I was going to say we finished around
14 15 16	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. I'm sorry, Mr. Teran? MR. TERAN: I was going to say we finished around 10:30 last night, so it was pretty late.
14 15 16 17	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. I'm sorry, Mr. Teran? MR. TERAN: I was going to say we finished around 10:30 last night, so it was pretty late. BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Let's see. All right.
14 15 16 17 18	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. I'm sorry, Mr. Teran? MR. TERAN: I was going to say we finished around 10:30 last night, so it was pretty late. BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Let's see. All right. Yeah. If you can just go ahead and walk us through your
14 15 16 17 18	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. I'm sorry, Mr. Teran? MR. TERAN: I was going to say we finished around 10:30 last night, so it was pretty late. BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Let's see. All right. Yeah. If you can just go ahead and walk us through your application, then.
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. I'm sorry, Mr. Teran? MR. TERAN: I was going to say we finished around 10:30 last night, so it was pretty late. BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Let's see. All right. Yeah. If you can just go ahead and walk us through your application, then. MR. TERAN: Sure. Next line, please. So this is
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. I'm sorry, Mr. Teran? MR. TERAN: I was going to say we finished around 10:30 last night, so it was pretty late. BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Let's see. All right. Yeah. If you can just go ahead and walk us through your application, then. MR. TERAN: Sure. Next line, please. So this is we're on the corner of 16th Street and Meigs Place at Lot
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. I'm sorry, Mr. Teran? MR. TERAN: I was going to say we finished around 10:30 last night, so it was pretty late. BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Let's see. All right. Yeah. If you can just go ahead and walk us through your application, then. MR. TERAN: Sure. Next line, please. So this is we're on the corner of 16th Street and Meigs Place at Lot 196. We are proposing to go past the ten feet by about four

PARTICIPANT: R19.

2.0

2.1

BZA CHAIR HILL: Got it. Okay. Great. Thank you.

MR. TERAN: And we're on the second page on the site plan. And so, we extend that four foot, eleven and a half inches past the ten feet, and then we created a dog-leg to lessen the massing. And we'll see that a little bit later in the 3-D drawings. And then, the dog-leg goes back another six feet. Here, a thing to notice is that we are the same massing as the four corner houses, Lot 254, 234, and the one right across the street, so I think it does really fit the character on this Meigs Place, right here on the corner.

Next, please. We are proposing to turn the single-family house into two units. One unit will be the first floor and the basement, which would contain four bedrooms. And I know, in this Board, this is a --- for them, it's --- they are looking for --- what is it? -- family-size housing. Next, please. And upper unit would be the second and third floor, and this would have five bedrooms, one bedroom on the third --- second floor and the other four at the top.

And you can see here, also, the --- where we're doing the dog-leg and how that helps reduce the massing.

Next slide, please. That's just the roof plan. Next, please. And elevations, I have some 3-D renderings that will

--- you can tell better, so we won't spend too much time here. Next, please. This is an elevation along Meigs, and you can see the additional feet that we're asking for. And also, we are lower than the maximum allowed by a few feet.

2.0

Next, please. And this is the residence that's to the south of us. Luckily, we are to the north, and you'll see in the sun study that we are not affecting anybody with sun or light. And here, you can also see a little bit better where we're adding the ten feet and what we're asking for the extension. I think, go to the next exhibit to the 3-D drawings. I think it's number 23. Have you go to the next page. So this is at the corner of 16th and Meigs. You can see we're doing the extra third floor, which is new.

And we're having parapet for a roof deck. We're all --- we're, as I mentioned, we're about four feet under the allowed height limit. Basically, everything that you see in white for the first two floors was what's there now, and we're proposing an addition on the back and a third floor. Next slide, please. This is on 16th Street, just different perspective. Next, please. And this is from the back. I think this is the one that really helps with a dog-leg to reduce that massing with the neighbor.

You can see there's really --- since this is on a north side, we're never casting any additional shadows to

any of the houses. And we are --- there are some trees on the lot. There's three of them, and we are going to do everything we can to protect them. We definitely don't want to get rid of them. Next, please. Just along Meigs. have one last idea. Then, Exhibit 21, please. Just to look at the sun studies quickly. So on the right is the matter of right, and the left is the proposed. I believe the first three slides are the summer solstice. This is at 9 a.m. So we're creating a little more shadow on our own yard. please.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Which exhibit are these, then,

12 Mr. Teran?

MR. TERAN: This one's number 21.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Sorry.

MR. TERAN: Same thing here, again. Summer solstice at 12. We're just creating a little bit more shadow on the sidewalk and our own property. Next, please. lastly, you can see it's the same thing, our property, a little bit on the sidewalk. Let's go to the next slide, which would be the winter solstice, where, here, we do create a little bit more shadow, but once again, it's our yard and the street. Next, please. Same situation.

And last slide, please. Same thing again. So, you see, we do comply with light, air, shading. There's no issues with any of the property itself. We believe we still

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

2.3

1	are within the character of the neighborhood. And there was
2	one more thing I wanted to say, but I forgot. But I'm happy
3	to answer any questions.
4	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Teran. Mr.
5	Blake. Mr. Blake, you're either breaking up or on mute.
6	MEMBER BLAKE: I think I'm good now. What's the
7	square footage on those units? You said they were five
8	bedrooms, just curious to know what the square footage is and
9	what the existing square footage is of the building, just to
10	get a sense of the change.
11	MR. TERAN: Yeah. The existing is about I
12	think overall it's 800 and, I want to say, 50 square feet,
13	two stories, so about 425 on each floor. We will be doing
14	a new basement, so we're doubling that. Each unit will be,
15	let's see, about 1500 square feet, so each floor will be
16	about 750, I want to say it was, off the top of my head.
17	MEMBER BLAKE: Okay. Thank you.
18	MR. TERAN: Mm-hmm.
19	BZA CHAIR HILL: Dr. Imamura.
20	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
21	Mr. Teran, you had mentioned that it looks like there are
22	three really healthy trees in the backyard. You said you're
23	going to do everything you can to retain them. Can you
24	elaborate on what everything means?

MR. TERAN:

Well, definitely, there are certain

zones that you can't build too close to the trees. They're not heritage trees yet. Hopefully, they will be one day. But we will be having no work zone or not even people could walk through. I know for better protection you could put a chain link fence up there around it. So I had --- I forgot who the gentleman --- I believe it was a gentleman from --- how's it --- someone with the DDOT forestry that we were --- we had a site meeting set up, but we haven't been able to schedule or coordinate our counters yet.

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Okay. I think I heard you say that you're going to expand the foundation, right, a bit, right, which may encroach on the critical root zones for those trees. So I would encourage you to do everything you can to protect those critical root zones.

MR. TERAN: Definitely.

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: As well as your laydown space and things like that. You know that 80 percent of those roots are within the first 3 feet of the soil, so just be real mindful of that.

MR. TERAN: Yeah. I think --- so, originally, we had --- actually, our first design, when we went to the ANC, we had actually asked for an --- it was an additional seven feet, and then we reduced it. And so, I think the closest we are now to the tree --- I want to say it's about 14 feet. So I know that definitely helped by pushing it back.

2.0

2.1

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Great. All right. Thank 1 That's all I have, Mr. Chairman. 2 you, Mr. Teran. 3 BZA CHAIR HILL: Anyone else for the applicant? 4 Good. Chairman of the Office of Planning. 5 MS. THOMAS: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, members of the Board. Karen Thomas for the Office of Planning, and 6 7 the Office of Planning is recommending approval to permit the addition greater than the ten feet. We believe the applicant 8 9 made adjustments to step the addition away from the rear wall 10 of the abutting property. So as it is a corner lot and the 11 massing was reduced, we are asking the applicant to work with 12 urban forestry to protect those trees that you referenced. 13 And with that, I will rest on the record of our report. Thank you. 14 15 BZA CHAIR HILL: All right. Does anyone have any questions for the Office of Planning? Does the applicant 16 have any questions for the Office of Planning? 17 is there anyone here wishing to speak? 18 19 MR. YOUNG: We do not. 2.0 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right, Mr. Teran. 2.1 you have anything --- Mr. Teran, can you tell me how the ANC 22 meeting went? I guess, they --- you have the same massing, 23 basically, on those four corners, so no one really had a 24 whole lot of concerns about --- I'm curious, like concerning the massing or the design. Now, that whole block is

probably going to change. Are you going to live there? Is that what you said, Mr. Teran?

MR. TERAN: So it's going to be an investment property for now. So, hopefully, we can hold it for a while, give it our kids, or maybe go live in the city one day. But the first time we went to the Zoning Committee and ANC, it was about in February. And that's when we did propose seven extra feet, and that's when nobody liked it. Or they liked the design, but it was too big. So then, that's when we reduced it. And when we went yesterday, nobody really complained at the ANC.

We did get two letters of people that were against One was one of the other buildings on the corner. it. Не just didn't like that it was going to be bigger for his view out the back. And the other one, I think, it was about three They just didn't want a bigger building, I houses down. But we did get letters of support. neighbor adjacent and, then, two across the street, immediately across the street. But there really wasn't any objection yesterday when we presented the revised plans.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Interesting. Okay. Great. All right. Does anybody have any further questions of anyone? All right. I'm going to close the hearing on the record. Mr. Young, if you could please excuse everyone.

BZA CHAIR HILL: It's funny. These ten feet

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

beyond --- the ten --- beyond the ten feet rule, I always think it's a little bit --- I don't know. It's just interesting. I know that, Vice Chair John, we've had this discussion before about how these things play out. In this particular case, I will, again, agree with the Office of Planning. I guess I always think it's interesting that that is changing the block, and, so --- there was another one that was similar to what --- this reminds me of another case that we're still deciding on.

But, in this particular case, I will agree with the Office of Planning's analysis. I would also agree that --- with the argument that the applicant is making in terms of how they're meeting the criteria for us to grant the requested relief. I thought that --- I don't know. I was just a little challenged, I guess, on that it was a departure from some --- so much of a departure of the block. But I guess that whole block is going to change that way.

And I know that maybe some of my other fellow board members have more of an understanding as to how the block is going to change than sometimes I do because it also just -- the first one is always the first one. So I'm going to be, however, voting in approval. Mr. Smith, do you have anything you'd like to add to the discussion?

MEMBER SMITH: I have nothing to add. I agree completely what you're saying. Traditionally (audio

2.0

interference) but there's (audio interference). But as you stated, the thought will change. We've seen a lot of redevelopment before us in the Trinidad neighborhood. And we believe that the design and the scale and bulk of this proposal is largely in keeping with the intent of the zoning regulations to stair step and respect some of that character for it to be a gradual change in the neighborhood and the character, so I would, then, also support the application.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. Mr. Blake.

MEMBER BLAKE: Sure. I'll be voting in favor of the application. I believe the applicant has meet the burden of proof to be granted relief for rear yard requirements. I look at some of the concerns expressed in those two letters of opposition, and I can certainly appreciate the concerns about the size of the addition. But --- we said, neighborhood's going to change a lot, and these are very small houses on very small lots. We talked a little bit earlier about this very small footprint of what it exists today, and the ability to create --- but they are in RF-1 zones, which all for flats.

And so, this conversion really is what it would take, and this much mass is what it would take, to create two reasonably sized units. Essentially, you created two homes from this one small home. And likely, something will happen, going forward on that block. And so --- but even though it's

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

a very small lot, and the extension takes about 21 feet, it's still within the lot occupancy and minimum rear yard requirements. And the massing, again, as he pointed out, is consistent with the other corner --- little corner building.

So the studies --- the shadow studies show that there's really no impact on light and air, and you have a nice 16-foot alley towards the rear. And that orientation also does support the limited impact on privacy as well. Anyway, all that said and done, I think it is a contemporary design, but it is the wave of the future. I give great weight to the Office of Planning report. DDOT has no objection. And we understand where the ANC is. And we do, again, acknowledge the letters of report from the adjacent neighbor, so I will be voting in favor of this application.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you, Mr. Blake. Dr. Imamura.

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Chairman, I'm in agreement with everything that Board Member Blake expressed. want to underscore or emphasis the letters in opposition. I certainly appreciate and understand their position. while this may not be the outcome that they had hoped for, I would say that there are similar structures within the immediate vicinity that reflect the same sort οf architectural style and design. So while this might be the first on that particular block, there are others

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2 I'm prepared to vote in favor. 3 Vice Chair John. Thank you. BZA CHAIR HILL: 4 VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 5 also in support of the application. I thought the Office of Planning did a good job in analyzing how the application 6 7 meets the criteria for relief. And Ι would note, particular, that, even with the 21-foot addition, there is 8 9 almost 29 feet of rear yard, and this is a corner lot and 10 with no windows on the rear wall next to the abutting So, in terms of light and air and privacy, I 11 properties. 12 think, even though this is an addition that's a little bit larger, I think in this case I would be able to support the 13 So I --- that's it, Mr. Chairman. 14 application. Thank you, Vice Chair John. 15 BZA CHAIR HILL: 16 also, we're going to go ahead and allow the ANC information 17 into the record. When --- Mr. Moy, if you could allow that into the record, when you get a chance. And that being said, 18 19 I'm qoing ahead and make a motion to to qo approve 20 Application No. 20707 as caption read by a secretary. And 2.1 ask for a second, Ms. John? 22 VICE CHAIR JOHN: Second. The motion being made in second. 23 BZA CHAIR HILL: 24 Mr. Moy, if you could take a roll call, please. 25 So, when I call your name, if you would MR. MOY:

neighborhood there that are similar in scale and style.

1	please respond with a yes, no, or abstain to the motion made
2	by Chairman Hill to approve the application for the relief
3	requested. The motion to approve was seconded by Vice Chair
4	John. Zoning Commissioner Dr. Imamura.
5	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.
6	MR. MOY: Mr. Smith.
7	MEMBER SMITH: Yes.
8	MR. MOY: Mr. Blake.
9	MEMBER BLAKE: Yes.
10	MR. MOY: Vice Chair John.
11	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Yes.
12	MR. MOY: Chairman Hill
13	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes.
14	MR. MOY: Staff would record the vote as 5-0-0.
15	And this is on the motion made by Chairman Hill to approve
16	the application. The motion to approve was seconded by Vice
17	Chair John, who is also in support of the motion as well as
18	Zoning Commissioner Dr. Imamura, Mr. Smith, Mr. Blake, Vice
19	Chair John, and Chairman Hill. So the motion carries on a
20	vote of five to zero to zero.
21	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you, Mr. Moy. Mr. Moy, you
22	can call our next one, when you get a chance.
23	MR. MOY: Case before the Board is Application No.
24	20711 of 2628 MLK, LLC. This is a self-certified
25	application, pursuant to Subtitle X, Section 901.2, for a

special exception, under Subtitle U, Section 421, to permit 1 new residential development. This is a 10-unit apartment This is located in the RA-1 zone at 2628 Martin 3 house. Luther King, Jr. Avenue, Southeast, Square 585 --- 5868, Lot 5 1059. And I think that's it. Thank you, sir. 6 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Great. Thank you. Ms. 7 Wilson, if you can hear me, can you introduce yourself for 8 the record? 9 MS. WILSON: Hi. Alex Wilson, from Sullivan & 10 Barros, on behalf of the applicant in this case. BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Great. Ms. Wilson, if you 11 12 want to go ahead and walk us through your application and also why you believe your client is meeting the relief 13 require --- I'm sorry --- the criteria for us to grant the 14 15 relief requested. And you can begin whenever you like. 16 MS. WILSON: Great. Thank you so much. Mr. 17 Young, could you pull up the presentation, when you have a So we are seeking relief, pursuant to U-421 -- next 18 19

MS. WILSON: Great. Thank you so much. Mr. Young, could you pull up the presentation, when you have a moment. So we are seeking relief, pursuant to U-421 -- next slide, please --- for a new development in the RA-1 zone. We are razing the existing, single-family dwelling and proposing a 10-unit apartment building. The building itself meets all development standards. The Office of Planning is recommending approval. We attended two ANC meetings. One was virtual, and one was in person.

But we did not receive a vote or a report because

2.0

21

22

23

24

there was not a quorum at either of those meetings. But I did want to note that we did present twice to the ANC in this case. DDOT has no objection. Although, they did have a number of conditions and requests. Those conditions are on the next slide, if you could please go to that. I'm not going to read all of this off, but we updated the plans so that they complied with DDOT's requests and adjusted a sidewalk, adjusted the driveway, put more details on the plans regarding the bike room.

And then, we do agree to the one condition that OP had in their report. Next slide, please. In terms of the general special exception requirements, the project meets the requirements as the applicant is proposing a new multi-family building in a multi-family zone. And there are a number of larger apartment buildings in the area, is building confirming all development proposed with standards of the RA-1 zone.

Next slide, please. With respect to the specific requirements, all DC public students are --- have a guaranteed right to enroll in their in-boundary schools, and the in-boundary schools have capacity. There are adequate public streets, recreation, and other services available to accommodate these new residents. And the applicant has provided all relevant materials and sufficient information for the Office of Planning to recommend approval.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

Next slide, please. And with that, we'll turn it over to our architect, Adam Crain, to briefly walk through the plans.

MR. CRAIN: Crain with 2Ply. I'm the project architect. Maybe we'll start off one slide forward, that would be page number 7, with some 3-D renderings overview. Just take a look at the exterior of the building. Next slide would also have some other angles. You can see on the left-hand side there we've got a just a curb cut we intend to reuse, and I think we're widening it slightly as a drive out to get to the parking that's going to be at the back and front view there on the right-hand side.

should Next slide be showing the existing conditions of the site plan. There's a house that'll be razed there, some photos on the left, you can see -- may have been attached at some point in the past, but it's a stand-Next slide will be the compost site plan. can see on the top there that curb cut and dry valve, bringing the cars to the back with seven parking places and trash towards the rear. We've got this building fully detached with walkways for pedestrians from the sidewalk in front, all the way back to the parking with several entrances noted.

Next slide would be an overview of the plans.

Cellar has three levels, first floor three levels. And those

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

three first-floor units have their bedrooms on the second floor above. And then, we've got four units that are also bi-level between the second and third floor. I would note that all of these are family-sized units of three and four bedrooms, per the client's request. We do have a bike room there at the cellar level towards the back. I think DDOT made a note of that, but we're complying with that with four bike spaces.

We can skip through some of the next slides. Those are just more detailed plans. I think we can go to the elevations, which would be slide 17. I just use this to highlight our intention to have --- we try and provide as many front doors to occupants as we can in minimized shared space with the vestibule. I think it's a little more private to have your own door access, so we try and provide those at all the cellar units and all the first-floor units as well.

2.0

2.1

2.3

I think we can go to slide number 22. And this is really just to illustrate the bedroom and --- I'm sorry -- the number of bedrooms next. We've got 1, 2, 3, 4 --- we have five four-bedrooms. The other five are three bedrooms. We are doing an IZ unit. That's number eight, which is a three bedroom. Unit 8 is at the second and third floor. That's also one of the units that'll have rooftop access. I didn't mention that, so the upper units --- all four units

of those will have private roof terraces. 1 BZA CHAIR HILL: And the IZ unit's going to have 2 3 rooftop access? 4 MR. CRAIN: It is. Unit 8. Unit 8 will have it, 5 rooftop access. BZA CHAIR HILL: 6 Great. 7 MR. CRAIN: The remainder of the slides are really 8 just materials to comply with some of the Office of Planning 9 requests, so I think I can turn it back over to Alex to 10 continue. MS. WILSON: Thank you, Adam. I have nothing more 11 to add, but we're happy to answer any questions. I mean -- while I applause ---13 BZA CHAIR HILL: 14 oh, I'm sorry. Let me let ask mine real quick. 15 again, how did you guys determine which one was going to be the IZ unit? 16 17 MR. CRAIN: Well, if you can bring back up slide number 22, but I'm also just happy to explain it. 18 19 BZA CHAIR HILL: I'm looking at it. You can just 20 explain it. 2.1 MR. CRAIN: Okay. We've got the calculations there that show that we need a minimum IZ-required space of 22 23 1,370 square feet. And so, Unit 8 is four square feet over 24 that. So --- and I thought it was pretty nice to have rooftop access in an upper unit.

1	BZA CHAIR HILL: That's great. So that's how it
2	worked. Interesting. Okay. Anybody have a question? Vice
3	Chair John? And then, I'll get to everybody else.
4	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Yes. Yes. This is for Mr.
5	Crain. Is it about 60 percent of the is the IZ unit
6	about 60 percent of the AMI? What's the
7	MR. CRAIN: No. This is actually 80 percent AMI.
8	If I believe these actually, I'll be honest. I'm not
9	sure these are going to be rental. If it's rental, it'd have
10	to be 60 percent. But, if it's ownership, it can be 80
11	percent. But there is an option with ownership units to take
12	a 20 percent reduction, if you go to 60 percent. But we're
13	not doing that. We're doing 80 percent.
14	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. And how much do you think
15	these apartments would market at?
16	MR. CRAIN: I have no idea. That's above my pay
17	grade. That's an owner question.
18	VICE CHAIR JOHN: I'm just trying to figure out
19	what 80 percent means in today's under today's
20	conditions.
21	MR. CRAIN: Yeah. Alex may be able to help.
22	MS. WILSON: Yeah. I can pull up an answer after
23	Dr. Imamura's question.
24	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay.
25	MS. WILSON: They're set by DHCD in the 2021 price

I think they're coming out with the 2022 price 1 schedule soon, but it's not based on the market-rate units 2 3 in your building. It's just based on a maximum price that's 4 set by DHCD. So it's available online. 5 VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you. Okay. 6 BZA CHAIR HILL: And then, Mr. Crain, Ι 7 didn't hear what you said about the 60 versus the 80 again for me to understand. 8 9 MR. So when --- part of our permit CRAIN: 10 submission, we've got a very thorough IZ application form that we go through several rounds of reviews with DHCD and 11 12 If it's an ownership unit --- so let me back up. If it's a rental unit, it's required to be 60 percent. 13 Ιf it's an ownership unit, typically it's 80 percent, but you 14 15 can do а 20 percent reduction on the square footage requirement towards that --- toward IZ, if you choose to go 16 17 from 80 to 60 percent, for ownership only. BZA CHAIR HILL: 18 Interesting. Okay. Great. 19 That's a 20 percent reduction to go 20 percent down. All right. 20 Dr. Imamura? 2.1 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Right. Mr. Crain, it's not 22 that I have a particular question, per se, other than just 23 two comments. One, the four square feet over, I quess, would 24 be classified as a happy accident, but I'm sure you may want

to pitch it as a intentional design decision, so good for

And I just want to applaud that it has rooftop access. 1 I'd like to think you all may set a precedent for the bar for 2 3 other projects that follow that have kind of access to 4 outdoor space for other IZ units. 5 just want to applaud that effort and that Otherwise, design decision. I don't have any further 6 7 questions. I think the design reflects good architecture, and I have nothing further to add. 8 9 Thank you, Dr. Imamura. MR. CRAIN: 10 BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Blake? Just one for the applicant, Ms. 11 MEMBER BLAKE: 12 Wilson, Mr. Crain. I was noticing that --- one thought about your community outreach. 13 We haven't --- obviously, the ANC wasn't able to chime in, but you did something kind of 14 interesting here in adding the additional parking spaces, 15 which is something we've noticed a lot of neighborhoods that 16 17 really, really appreciate it. Can you talk a little bit about, in your community outreach, some of the issues that 18 came up and some of the things you did to address those 19 20 issues? 2.1 MR. CRAIN: You want me to start, Alex, or do you 22 want to? 23 At the ANC meeting --- we had this MS. WILSON: 24 planned before did community outreach, just even we

anticipating those issues, because we have heard a lot of

feedback that the communities typically want an additional parking space or parking over, especially in areas where it's not as close to the Metro and they have street parking like this. So that was something that was done prior, but I know the first --- so I attended the first meeting with Mr. Crain.

We didn't hear any particular feedback or make any changes based on that. They seemed to like the project. And then, Mr. Crain's associate went to the second ANC meeting, and I don't think are any additional comments. So the plan has pretty much remained the same, and it seemed to be well accepted.

MR. CRAIN: I would also chime in and add, I'd say, from doing a number of these BCA cases and the interface with the ANC that's required with all of them, we've really, by default, we try and get as many cars off the street as possible. It's one of the most common concerns we hear with the ANC. And so, just --- it's sympathetic site plan design to get cars off the street. A lot of people, even though they own the street parking, it's theirs. And they feel like it's theirs because they've been doing it for a while.

So, when new developments come in, to respect that, whether it's written or codified or legal or not, we --- they're used to a certain way of living on a street, and we try and be sympathetic to that by getting as many cars on the side as we can. And, honestly, going forward, when we

2.1

get into storm water and green area ratio, that's required 1 with DOE. It's part of the permit process. It lot of that's 2 3 going to permeable pavement anyway, so it's going to be performing as if it green or not. So our goal is just to get 5 cars off the street and on-site. The last question I have was I ---6 MEMBER BLAKE: 7 I'm going to assume that, because you want to do roof access, 8 is why you decided to go against the solar panels. Is that 9 right? 10 MR. CRAIN: So I don't think we've gotten that We do have a significant area --- So I'm not sure if 11 you still got the slide, but the planned south area is a green roof area, and that green roof area right now is 13 allocated towards either actual green roof or solar panels. 14 15 I would say, in all our projects that are getting over 10,000 16 square feet, we're actually required to have solar panels now with the recent energy code --- or green code changes. 17 likely there'll be some green up there, and there'll be some 18 solar as well. 19 20 MEMBER BLAKE: Thank you. 2.1 MR. CRAIN: Sure. 22 BZA CHAIR HILL: Anyone else? All right. Going 23 to turn to the Office of Planning. 24 MR. JESICK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members

My name is Matt Jesick, and I'll be presenting

of the Board.

1	OP's testimony in this case. And the Office of Planning is
2	recommending approval of the application. We felt that the
3	application met the relevant criteria of U-421. We did have
4	one condition of approval in our report, and we agreed to
5	that condition with the applicant. The exhibits noted in the
6	condition should be updated because the applicant submitted
7	a updated set of plans.
8	So, instead of 18B, 18C, and 19A, the exhibits
9	should be 18B, 18C, and 22A, just wanted to note that for the
10	Board. But with that, I'm happy to take any questions.
11	Thank you.
12	BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Crain, Ms. Wilson, you are
13	understanding the exhibits that Mr. Jesick is citing? For
14	the record, you're both nodding your head yes.
15	MS. WILSON: Yes.
16	MR. CRAIN: Yes.
17	BZA CHAIR HILL: Let's see. Anybody have any
18	questions for the Office of Planning? Okay. Mr. Young, is
19	anyone here wishing to speak?
20	Okay. All right. Ms. Wilson, is there anything
21	you'd like to add at the end?
22	MS. WILSON: Thank you, all, for your time.
23	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Thank you. All right, Mr.
24	Young, if you could please excuse everyone. Thank you, all,
25	very much. I would agree with the argument that the

1	applicant is making as well as the analysis that the Office
2	of Planning is providing on how they're meeting the criteria
3	to us to grant the relief requested. I would also be the
4	testimony that the applicant provided that the ANC has voted
5	in favor and actually, in less, anyway. Mr. Moy, can you
6	hear me?
7	MR. MOY: Yes, sir, I can hear you.
8	BZA CHAIR HILL: If we can leave the record open
9	for the ANC report.
10	MR. MOY: Yes, sir.
11	BZA CHAIR HILL: If theyif you could reach out
12	to them, that would be helpful.
13	MR. MOY: We will do that.
14	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I believe Ms.
15	Wilson said there was no quorum at any of the meetings.
16	BZA CHAIR HILL: Oh, I'm sorry. That's right.
17	I'm sorry. Oh, then maybe I'm getting confused. I
18	apologize. Okay, Mr. Moy, so forget about what I said. So,
19	regardless of that, I also would I continue to agree with
20	the applicant's argument and also am pleased about the design
21	and that the IZ unit, even if it was a happy accident being
22	four feet over the requirement, they get roof access. So I'm
23	going to be voting in favor of the application. Mr. Smith,
24	do you have anything to add?

MEMBER SMITH: No. I don't have anything to add.

	I do appreciate the analysis and the analysis provided by OF
2	in their staff report. I commend the applicant for going
3	above and beyond the minimum parking requirement because they
4	are correct. We typically hear at these hearings from AFCs
5	or abutting neighbors' concerns about parking, so I'm happy
6	to see that the applicant has provided some additional
7	parking for, really, what sounds like may have been some
8	concerns from ANC. So, then, I'll support the application
9	with OP's recommended condition, regarding construction
10	projects.
11	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. I would also to
12	include OP's recommended condition. Thank you. And, let's
13	see, Mr. Blake?
14	MEMBER BLAKE: Yes. I would agree with the
15	comments you guys have made up to this point. I'll be voting
16	in favor of the request of relief. The project conforms with
17	provisions of U-421, and it meets the general standards as
18	well. I give great weight to the Office of Planning report,
19	and I have no objections. Again, I'll be voting in favor of
20	this relief.
21	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. Dr. Imamura?
22	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Chairman, I'm in agreement
23	with everything that's said before me. Well, I'm prepared
24	to vote in favor.

BZA CHAIR HILL:

Thank you.

Vice Chair John?

1	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm
2	also in agreement with the comments. I am really
3	appreciative of the two-level IZ unit and that the applicant
4	has added additional parking and done that consciously. So
5	I think that that helps to mitigate the potential impacts
6	from lack of parking. And it would be great if other
7	developers did the same, if possible. So I'm in support.
8	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. Thank you. All
9	right, I got to make a motion to Application No. 20711 as
10	caption read by secretary and ask for a second. Ms. John?
11	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Second.
12	BZA CHAIR HILL: Motion made and seconded. Mr.
13	Moy, take a roll call.
14	MR. MOY: Roll call, Mr. Chairman. Are you
15	including the OP condition in your motion or not?
16	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes, I am. I'm sorry. I
17	neglected to state that.
18	MR. MOY: Okay. So, when I call your name, if you
19	would please respond a yes, no, or abstain to the motion made
20	by Chairman Hill to approve the application for the relief
21	being requested along with the OP condition as he has stated.
22	The motion to approve was seconded by Vice Chair John.
23	Zoning Commissioner Dr. Imamura?
24	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.
25	MR. MOY: Mr. Smith?

1	MEMBER SMITH: Yes.
2	MR. MOY: Mr. Blake?
3	MEMBER BLAKE: Yes.
4	MR. MOY: Vice Chair John?
5	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Yes.
6	MR. MOY: Chairman Hill?
7	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes.
8	MR. MOY: Then staff would record the vote as 5-0-
9	0, and this is on the motion made by Chairman Hill. The
10	motion to approve was seconded by Vice Chair John, also in
11	support, as well as support from Zone Commissioner Dr.
12	Imamura, Mr. Smith, Mr. Blake, Vice Chair John, and Chairman
13	Hill. Motion carries on a vote 5-0-0.
14	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. Mr. Moy, you
15	can call our next, when you get a chance.
16	MR. MOY: Okay. Let's see. The case next before
17	the Board is Application No. 20712 of 2505 Wisconsin Avenue
18	1, LLC, and 2505 Wisconsin 2, LLC. This is an application
19	for that is pursuant to Subtitle X, Section 1002, for two
20	Variances. One is the Use Variance from the Use provisions
21	of Subtitle U, Section 201, that would expand a non-
22	conforming hotel use. The second is an Area Variance from
23	the penthouse height requirements of Subtitle D, Section
24	703.3 and pursuant to Subtitle X, Section 901.2 for special
25	exceptions under Subtitle C, Section 1506.1 from the

penthouse setback, requirements of Subtitle C1504.1.

The property's located in the R-12 zone at 2505 Wisconsin Avenue, Northwest, Square 1935, Lot 45. Mr. there's also a request for expert status Dominique Giordano in architecture and design. He's currently not in the witness book. Of course, Shane Dettman is already in the witness book. That's been granted status from the Board previously. And finally, because these documents were submitted late, the 21 day for supplemental filings from the applicant. It's the PowerPoint, submission, and a revised self-certification and a request to waive these deadlines. That's it.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Thanks. All right. Unless the Board has any issues and, if so, please raise your hand. I'm going to allow everything into the record. Could the applicant --- I don't know who's going to speak first --- introduce themselves, please, if you can hear me?

MS. BLOOMFIELD: Yes. Good afternoon, Chairman Hill. This is Jessica Bloomfield, with the law firm of Holland & Knight.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Great, Ms. Bloomfield. Welcome. Let's see. Okay, Ms. Bloomfield. If you --- you got a lot of stuff to talk us through actually. And so, if you could just --- well, first of all, who's the expert status again? It was Mr. Giordano?

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

MS. BLOOMFIELD: Yeah. Giordano, Nick Giordano 1 He's available to answer any questions, but we're 2 is here. 3 not presenting him as part of our direct, so we can qualify him now, if you'd like to. Or I don't know if we really need 5 to at this point. (Simultaneous speaking.) 6 7 BZA CHAIR HILL: Right. Where is which 8 exhibit, do you know, is his resume? 9 MS. BLOOMFIELD: Thirteen. 10 BZA CHAIR HILL: Thirteen. Thanks. Give me a 11 second. 12 MS. BLOOMFIELD: My understanding is that he has been accepted by the Board before, but he may not be in what 13 you're now calling your book. 14 15 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Okay. I'm just going to --- I'm just going through this, so I don't have to go 16 17 through this again is why I'm doing this. Okay. have any issues with Mr. Giordano being added to our book as 18 an expert in architecture. And if anybody does, please raise 19 2.0 their hand. Seeing none. Okay, Mr. Giordano. We're going 21 to go ahead and add you in our book. I don't know whether you're going to need to testify or not. We'll see how that 22 Ms. Bloomfield, if you want to go ahead 23 goes. 24 and walk us through your client's application and why you believe you're meeting all of the different things that

you're asking for, and, I guess, you can begin whenever you like. There's the PowerPoint, Mr. Moy, if you can drop it into the record as soon as the staff can, so that we can all look at it at the same time. And, Ms. Bloomfield, you can, again, begin whenever you like.

MS. BLOOMFIELD: Can someone please also pull up the PowerPoint, so we can --- there we go. Thank you, Mr. Young. Great. Again, for the record, my name is Jessica Bloomfield. I am here with Matt Wexler, representing the applicant, and Shane Dettman, our expert in land use and zoning. The application is for property located at 2505 Wisconsin Avenue, Northwest, which is improved with the Glover Park Hotel. And if you flip to the next slide, you can see we're located --- we are located on Wisconsin Avenue.

We in that --- we're currently in the R-12 zone. The existing hotel building was constructed in the 1960s. It is non-conforming as to use and to structure. Go to the next slide, please. Another aerial. The request --- and Mr. Moy did a good summary of it --- is to make four primary modifications to the existing building. The first is to relocate the existing outdoor, summer garden use, eating and drinking establishment from the ground floor of the property to the roof of the existing building.

The second is to expand the footprint of the building's existing mechanical penthouse. The expanded

2.0

penthouse would include storage, restrooms, and additional mechanical space only. The third renovation would be to construct a penthouse stair tower for egress on the roof. And fourth, and finally, we would be constructing a new glass guard rail the new rooftop area. The proposal is simply to relocate the summer garden. It would --- doing so would not increase the intensity of use from that currently permitted at the site, and it is in direct response to many years of community engagement.

And we're actually proud to be here today with support from the surrounding community, both affected ANCs and the Office of Planning. Before I quickly go through the drawings, I'm going to turn it over to Matt Wexler to give a brief introduction on the proposal and to go over the engagement we've had with the community.

MR. WEXLER: Okay. Thank you. Good afternoon --VICE CHAIR JOHN: Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes, Vice Chair John. Make a suggestion? Can we use the term, eating and drinking establishment, in describing what's happening? Every time I hear this term, summer garden, I'm thinking of an outdoor garden. So, please.

MS. BLOOMFIELD: Absolutely. So the term, summer garden, is actually ABRA term. It means that an eating and drinking establishment basically outside on private property.

2.0

2.1

But we will use the term, eating and drinking establishment.

VICE CHAIR JOHN: Yes. We're not before ABRA, and I have no idea what that is. And I keep thinking of this lovely garden with seats --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MS. BLOOMFIELD: Okay. Thank you.

VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you.

MR. WEXLER: Well, our objective is to create a lovely rooftop garden and eating and drinking establishment. And as Jessica said, I'm so pleased to be here this afternoon on behalf of the ownership team of the Glover Park Hotel. We began outreach and negotiations with the surrounding members of the hotel back in the summer of 2015. And here we are in early 2022, after having a very comprehensive agreement with the immediate neighbors of the Georgetown Heights Condominium Association as well as the Massachusetts Heights Citizen Association in conjunction collaboration with property owners across the alley to the immediate west of the property as well as across Davis to the immediate north of the property.

And those discussions have resulted in, as I mentioned, a very comprehensive agreement, which not only provides support for this application but also provides a real mechanism and, again, in collaboration with the immediate neighbors to have an ongoing group that will

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

continue to meet and discuss and be able to make any or perfect any changes in the future from an operational perspective so that this summer garden and rooftop eating and drinking establishment will not have adverse impacts on the community.

But that's it for me. We're very pleased to be here after all this time, and we look forward to making this happen.

MS. BLOOMFIELD: Can you go to the next slide, please? There's some images of the existing hotel building. It's been in operation for at least 50 years. And to the next slide, please. I've gone through this. These are the four physical elements that we're proposing to change to the building that results in the areas of zoning relief that we will go through in just a minute. Next slide, please. Great. Thank you.

This is a slide showing the existing site plan. And on the right of the screen, which is south, that's where the existing eating and drinking establishment is located. It's highlighted in gray. There's those two trees in front of it, along Wisconsin Avenue. Wisconsin is to the south. And if you go to the next slide, this is the proposed site plan. And the eating and drinking establishment is not there anymore. And what -- I can't tell if you can read it on the screen or not --- but, basically, in that area, the ground

2.0

level will be used to more safely manage parking, valet operations, deliveries to the hotel.

There's not sufficient space on the property for all the vehicles that are accessing the property, so that space will be redefined for better vehicular operational use. And as you can see, the landscaping and plantings adjacent to that area will be maintained and improved as part of the proposal. You can go to the next slide, please. This is a plan of the existing roof that is the --- there's a single mechanical penthouse shown in the center of the building. And so, that's what's there now.

And if you go to the next slide, that's what we're This is shows the expanded penthouse in the proposing to do. We are only adding storage, restrooms, and more mechanical space to the penthouse. What we're moving to the The eating and drinking establishment roof is all exterior. is in that area that is striped. So that's the proposal, This plan also shows the new stair tower, which I really. mentioned previously, to the right --- on the right-hand side of the page, which is to the south, southern portion of the building. You can see it on that screen.

And then if you go to the next slide, please. This is an elevation, and it's showing the new glass railing, which we are providing on the building, based on specific --- the specific request of the community. They requested this

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

railing along the entire perimeter of the new eating and drinking establishment --- the existing eating and drinking establishment that has been relocated to the roof. And it's glass, and so it's not going to have any real visional impacts, and it's going to help to reduce sound transmission as well.

And so, with that, I'm going to turn it over to Shane Dettman. He's going to go through, in detail, how we meet the standards of relief under our zoning application.

MR. DETTMAN: The next slide. Here we are. So again, good afternoon. My testimony this afternoon will summarize the manner in which the applicant satisfies the burden of proof for the three areas of zoning relief being requested for the proposed relocation of an existing eating and drinking establishment, again, which is currently located on the ground level to the roof level of the existing legally-nonconforming hotel that's on the subject property. As well as the related improvements to the rooftop that are commensurate with the proposed relocation of the eating and drinking establishment.

As Ms. Bloomfield summarized at the outset of our presentation, the existing hotel was constructed in the 1960s in accordance with at the time, our 5C zoning, which permitted a hotel as a matter of right. During construction of the hotel the site was actually down-zoned to our 1B, and

2.1

2.3

at that time the existing hotel became a legally-nonconforming structure devoted to a legally-nonconforming use. Since then the hotel has been in continuous operation since it was originally opened.

The three areas of relief that are listed on the slide before you that are being requested today include use variance from Subtitle U201.1 to allow relocation of the existing eating and drinking establishment from the ground level to the roof level of the existing hotel to allow the expansion of the existing penthouse footprint, to include upgraded mechanical space to work and restrooms, and also to а new roof level egress stair. We're requesting an area variance from the penthouse height requirement under D703.3 to accommodate upgraded elevator mechanical equipment that's needed to access the proposed roof level eating and drinking establishment. And finally, a special exception from the penthouse setback requirement under C 1504.1 to allow a new 8-foot glass guardrail.

As Ms. Bloomfield mentioned, the relief requested is in direct response to the applicant's engagement with the immediate property owners and neighbors, that occurred over a number of years to address various issues related to the existing location of the eating and drinking establishment. This includes issues relating to noise, light, parking, deliveries, overall site circulation.

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

Getting into the technical part of the relief, to prevail in a variance request, an applicant must satisfy a three-pronged test. The technical language from Subtitle X, Section 1001 is provided on this slide, but generally speaking, to obtain the requested variances in this case, the applicant must demonstrate the subject property possesses some exceptional situation or condition that would give rise to practical difficulties in the case of the area variance, or an undue hardship in the case of the use variance, upon the property owner if the zoning regulations were strictly applied. And finally, such variance relief can be granted without causing substantial detriment to the public good and without substantially repairing the intent, purpose and integrity of the zoning regulations.

Next slide. With respect to the use variance, while this type of relief is customarily sought when a property owner is seeking to establish a new use on a subject property that's not permitted or expressly prohibited in a zone, it's important to note that that's not what's occurring in this case. Instead, the use, the eating and drinking establishment, already established subject is on the exists at the ground level as a property. Ιt legallynonconforming use, and the applicant is simply proposing to relocate it to the roof in order to advance the commitments made to the neighbors as set forth in the agreements that are

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

included in the case record.

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

25

And I think that's notable in a couple respects as we approach review of the use variants. First, I think it informs consideration of the severity of the variance requested, which is one of the factors the Board may take into consideration when evaluating a variance request. The eating and drinking establishment is not new. nonconforming use, it's an existing nonconforming use that is just being relocated to a more favorable location on the property. Secondly, I think that's an important point to note because I think it informs consideration of the effect that the use variance would have on the overall zone plan, which is another factor, as you know, the Board may take into consideration, and especially when considered together with the very unique zoning history of the subject property.

With that context, I think the applicant fully satisfies the three prongs of the variance test. The property has an exceptional zoning history. The existing building was constructed in the 1960s as a matter of right under R5C zoning. The use, building height, and penthouse height were all conforming at the time of construction. And near the end of construction the property was downzoned to low density residential, and has existed and operated as a legally-nonconforming structure in use since that time.

The existing eating and drinking establishment is

also currently legally-nonconforming. And as a result of the unique zoning history that rendered the site nonconforming, the applicant is extremely hindered in its ability to address concerns expressed by the community without first having to obtain the relief that's being sought today. Should the regulations be strictly applied, the inability to relocate the eating and drinking establishment would prevent the applicant's ability to, again, implement the measures and commitments requested by the community under the agreements that are included in the record.

It would also be unable to bring the property further into conformance with what I believe the purposes of the zoning regulations and the zoning acts are intended to achieve. That includes creating conditions that are favorable to the protection of property, and also to promote safety in the general welfare. Finally, it also hinders the applicant's ability to carry out necessary building upgrades and improvements to remain competitive in the market post-COVID.

With respect to the area variance, the practical difficulties that arise is that if the regulations were strictly applied, the rooftop and the overall building cannot be reasonably used for a conforming R1B use or purpose. I think the relocation of the eating and drinking establishment from the ground level to the roof is a very appropriate use

2.0

2.1

given the long-standing use of the property as a hotel. If you look at the uses that are permitted as a matter of right under the R1B zone, certainly you can't put the roof to one of those types of uses given the existing improvements that are on the property.

Finally, the strict application of the regulations would create an inability to accommodate the upgraded elevator and other mechanical equipment that's necessary to access the proposed eating and drinking establishment on the roof. With respect to the third prong, I think the use variance and the area variance can be granted without causing substantial detriment to the public good or substantially impairing the zone plan.

It is important to note that this is merely a relocation of the existing eating and drinking establishment. There's no change in the intensity of use, the bulk of the building or the height of the building, or any kind of the property. It's change physical on responsive neighbors' interests in mitigating issues related to noise, light, trash and circulation. It is going to result improved aesthetics, parking, valet and delivery operations at the ground level as were shown in the proposed ground level site plan. The expanded penthouse footprint meets all setback requirements and is lower than the existing penthouse that is currently on the property.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

And finally, the glass wall guardrail will have no visual impact, and it will actually increase privacy by keeping occupants of the new rooftop eating and drinking establishment further away from the edge of the roof. Next slide.

Quickly turning our attention to the requested special exception, the requested special exception is subject to the general special exception criteria of Subtitle X, Chapter 9, as well as any special conditions that are required under the penthouse regulations. With respect to harmony with the general purpose and intent of the zoning regulations, this particular requirement will be met as the required relief will create conditions that are favorable to the protection of property and promote safety in the general welfare by the ability to construct the proposed 8-foot glass guardrail wall.

The extent of the setback is also de minimis; it's only two feet, and that's only because the 8-foot guardrail is actually sitting on top of the proposed new rooftop deck, which sits two feet above the roof due to structural considerations of the existing roof. The special exception will not tend to affect adversely the use of neighboring property in accordance with the zoning regulations. it's going to improve the conditions that are currently existing on the site. There will be no adverse visual

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

impacts. The proposed 8-foot wall guardrail will minimize sound transmission, and again, will increase privacy.

Next slide. Finally, with respect to the specific criteria for the special exception under Subtitle C, section 1506, as the Board knows, there's a number of items that are listed there and the applicant has to show that is consistent with one of those particular factors. The applicant's demonstration of reasonable effort has been made for the housing for mechanical equipment, stairway, elevator penthouses, will be in compliance with the required setback. Ms. Bloomfield noted, the expanded footprint of existing penthouse to accommodate the storage, the restrooms, and the additional mechanical equipment, and the standalone egress stair, all meet the required setbacks, limited to the two-foot of the glass guardrail.

In terms of the applicant's demonstration of at least one of the following factors, we believe that we fully satisfy the factor relating to that the relief requested would result in a penthouse or roof structure that is visually less intrusive. The proposed guardrail will be set back eight feet from the edge of the roof, and thus will not appear as an extension of the building wall. And finally, the visibility of the glass wall guardrail will be minimal due to the material that it is made of, the setback, and the height of the existing building.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

Chairman, that concludes 1 that, Mr. 2 And I'm happy to answer any questions. presentation. 3 MS. BLOOMFIELD: Thank you, Shane. I would close 4 that presentation by just saying a couple of things. 5 met with -- there are actually two ANCs that are considered affected ANCs in this case, ANC 3B and 3C. We have letters 6 7 from both of them in the record that support the approval of this application. 8 We also have a letter for the Office of 9 Planning report, which recommends approval of the application 10 with no conditions, and we do have a letter from DDOT that identifies no opposition to the request, which is how they 11 12 identify their support, I suppose. So based on the presentation you heard, 13 14 including Shane's very detailed explanation of how we meet the use and the area variances on the special exception, we 15 would submit that the application meets the standards of 16 17 review and that we respectfully request your support of the application this afternoon. And that concludes our direct 18 19 presentation. Thank you. 20 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, does the Board 2.1 questions of the applicant? 22 Sure, Mr. Smith. I do, I have one question. 2.3 MEMBER SMITH: 24 talked about the support and communication that you've had. looking at it from the federal standpoint, you are

located fairly close to the Naval Observatory. Do you have any conversations where representatives, the Secret Service, or --

MR. WEXLER: Yes, we have. In fact, we've toured the Secret Service through the hotel, as well as brought the Secret Service up to the rooftop, and the Secret Service did not have any formal comments that it sought to submit into the record. But from what the representative told us at the site, that there weren't any issues that were identified during that site visit, but we're going to continue to work with the Secret Service in the future if there are any issues. And the Secret Service is well aware of the hotel.

MEMBER SMITH: Okay, thank you for that. The next question I have is, Mr. Dettman, you spoke to the NAHCA agreement. Could you elaborate more on that? Is it an agreement that came about as a result of the hotel requesting or proposing to put in a summer garden? Or was this some kind of agreement or discussion prior to that with the community regarding noise or anything with activities at the hotel in general?

MR. DETTMAN: Sure. And I believe a copy of, it's called the mock-up agreement, is in the record. So that agreement is a direct result of engagement of the applicant with the community regarding the relocation of the eating and drinking establishment to the roof. And within that

2.1

2.3

agreement you will see certain commitments that have been made and agreed upon that talk about the surrounding glass wall, hours of operation, number of occupants per building code. You will actually see that per that agreement and the building code, the intensity of use will actually decrease from what currently exists at the ground level. So yes, it is a direct result of this proposal.

In terms of what all went into drafting that, I would turn it over to Mr. Wexler.

Just to add one brief comment MR. WEXLER: Sure. to that, and I'm happy to answer any further questions specifically, as well, about kind of the genesis of agreement, but we've had conversations with MAHCA, Massachusetts Avenue Heights Citizens Association, as well as other members of the community, both to the immediate Park neighborhood, south and Global and the immediate neighbors, for a number of years even predating the MAHCA agreement's starting point.

so what we began talking about in 2015 was really as a result of several years of conversations about how, not only the hotel could be further improved, but could really be a better asset and amenity to the community, as well as respond to very direct and specific concerns about the impacts of the outdoor eating and drinking establishment on the ground level. What we call the summer garden, that kind

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

1	of spill over into the immediate community at night, and
2	relocating that to the roof, as we've said and demonstrated,
3	will hopefully lessen that impact.
4	MEMBER SMITH: Thank you for that. And I think
5	I have one more question, Mr. Dettman, if you'll just return
6	to your presentation about how it meets the criteria. So
7	this question about practical difficulty. What is the
8	seating capacity of the existing ground floor restaurant?
9	MS. BLOOMFIELD: I can answer that. It's 54 seats
10	in the existing ground floor restaurant, with standing room
11	for 150 people, so that's a total of 204 occupants.
12	MEMBER SMITH: Okay, and just getting to this
13	practical difficulty because you speak to bringing the
14	property further into conformance with the purpose of the
15	zone regulations. I do admit this is zoned residential and
16	not commercial, and I do respect that the Office of Planning
17	can't seem to find a record of it being zoned commercially,
18	but I'll set that to the side.
19	What is the capacity of the rooftop summer garden?
20	The seating capacity?
21	MR. DETTMAN: Under the construction code it would
22	be 150 people total.
23	MS. BLOOMFIELD: So that's reduced from 204,
24	correct? To 150 on a regular basis on the roof.
25	MEMBER SMITH: Okay. And I had one more question

about that glass wall. For the glass enclosure that you're 1 proposing to place up there, would that repel sound in any 2 3 way, shape or form? 4 MR. WEXLER: Yes. 5 MEMBER SMITH: That's all the Okay. Okay. questions I had for now, Mr. Chairman. 6 7 BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you, Mr. Smith. Next, Chair John. 8 9 VICE CHAIR JOHN: Just one question, maybe two. 10 So could the rooftop be used as a seating area without having an eating and drinking establishment with, you know, a lovely 11 12 Isn't that one use that could be put to the rooftop? Board Member John, I think that 13 MR. DETTMAN: 14 even the establishment of a seating area that was kind of an 15 amenity space that was associated with the hotel, based upon 16 the quidance provided by the zoning administrator when we 17 were discussing the areas of relief that would be necessary, require would BZA relief. 18 that also Because it's establishing or extending a portion of the nonconforming 19 2.0 hotel use to a portion of the building that's not currently 2.1 devoted to that use, which is exactly why we have to request the use variance in this situation. 22 2.3 VICE CHAIR JOHN: So it could exist without being 24 used for any sort of occupancy, right? I mean, you don't

have to have a restaurant and you don't have to make use of

the rooftop. I mean, you're expanding a nonconforming use to an area where it didn't exist before.

Here's the difficulty I'm having. Saying that the exceptional condition is the existing nonconformity would fit all kinds of situations that the Board has seen. So that by itself is very hard to get me to where you'd like to go.

MR. DETTMAN: I think the exception condition really is not necessarily the nonconforming status. The nonconforming status is a result of the unique zoning history of the site, which the Board can look at zoning history as a factor that created uniqueness.

I don't know that I would totally agree that we're use. expanding а nonconforming We're actually just use that's already relocating a on the site to favorable use, certainly more favorable with respect to what the neighbors would prefer to see on the site. To use the roof just as a seating issue would not resolve any of the issues that are occurring at the ground level because then at the end of the day you'd have a nice seating area on the of the hotel, and you'd still have an eating drinking establishment creating those tensions, I'll call them, at the ground level in terms of noise and light and circulation.

I think here, the intensity of the use on the site is not changing at all. The gross floor area and the bulk

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

of the building is not changing at all. We really are just sort of picking up part of the nonconforming use that currently exists at the ground level and we're putting it on top of the building, and per the discussions with the zoning administrator, the zoning administrator found that to be falling within the realm of a use variance.

VICE CHAIR JOHN: Right, so we agree it would need a use variance. I am just trying to get to the exceptional condition. But I'm willing to hear from the Office of Planning before I ask anymore questions.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Anyone else? Okay, I have a comment just because I'm curious. So how did this kind of come about? I mean in 2015, I don't know if there's a new own -- I'm just curious now. I know the eating and drinking establishment, and that thing's been there forever. And so how did this -- I'm just curious. And then we can discuss whether or not you're meeting the criteria.

How did it kind of come about that you wanted to help the community and move the thing on the rooftop? I mean the view is better, but I mean, I'm just curious how it kind of came about.

MR. WEXLER: Sure. So the initial discussions with the community about potentially making modifications to the hotel and improving the hotel began back in 2013/2014, and the hotel did submit some plans to the community that

2.0

2.1

were kind of as a result of some of that, the efforts that 1 were made to look at renovations to the property. 2 3 And in 2015 we all paused those plans so that we 4 could have really a more comprehensive dialogue about not 5 only what else would happen at the hotel in terms of, from an operational perspective, not only as a result of 6 7 relocation of the existing summer garden to the rooftop, but 8 really surrounding the rest of the property, given again, its 9 uniqueness in the residential zone. 10 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, thanks Mr. Giordano. Did 11 the property change hands in 2014? 12 MR. WEXLER: The property had changed hands in 13 2012, in fact, late in 2012. Okay, it's with the same owners 14 BZA CHAIR HILL: 15 that had it in 2012? It's with a different owner today, 16 MR. WEXLER: and that was after a pause in 2020. The hotel was closed for 17 most of 2020, beginning in March, due to COVID, of course. 18 And so all of these efforts really just were put on hold 19 20 given the situation. 2.1 BZA CHAIR HILL: I got it, I was just trying to understand programmatically why it was getting moved because 22 2.3 it had been there for such a long time. And so somebody had 24 had to make the decision to try to move it onto the roof, and I find it difficult to believe that it was to try to help the

community. So I don't mind, I'm just saying that I was curious as to how this kind of came about.

MR. WEXLER: But in fact, in 2013 and 2014, when some of those conversations began, a lot of the questions that I received from community members and ANC commissioners. You know, you have this roof and it's a tall building, and in an area with single-family homes surrounding it. It would be wonderful to be able to take advantage of it and relocate what is considered kind of a noxious use at the ground level. So it really was as a result of a lot of those types of conversations.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, okay. All right, I'm entering the Office of Planning, please. Oh sorry, Mr. Smith.

MEMBER SMITH: Yeah, I've just got a follow-up to that, my question that both of you and Vice Chair John raised, because I share the same concerns that she shared about this question about a sectional situation for amenity space that has been there for years. And given that you just stated that the party that's been in ownership, that has been in continuous ownership since 2012, and just stated that you had discussions with the neighborhood about renovating this facility. Was there some discussion during that time about placing -- if the community is so concerned about noise from the summer garden on the ground floor, was there some

2.0

2.1

consideration to incorporating this interior to the existing 1 hotel space and not on the roof? 2 3 Well, there would be no room to MR. WEXLER: 4 relocate any of the existing summer garden inside of the 5 existing hotel. 6 MEMBER SMITH: Okay. Okay. 7 BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Blake? I have a question. 8 MEMBER BLAKE: What's the 9 contribution for the formal trust fund? 10 MS. BLOOMFIELD: It's about 52,000, back of the 11 envelope calculations. 12 MEMBER BLAKE: All right, thank you. BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, Ms. Myers, if you can hear 13 me, if you could introduce yourself for the record. 14 15 MS. MYERS: Myers, for the Office of Planning. The Office of Planning is in support of this application, but 16 17 in regards to the use variance we did not agree with the agree with different we did 18 applicant's argument, but arguments presented in their filings, but not in the typical 19 20 places. 2.1 So number one, Office of Planning questions the zoning history on this case. And as we said in our report, 22 2.3 we could not find information backing up some 24 information the applicant has presented. So the Office of Planning cannot say exactly what the zoning situation was,

but the hotel has been on the property for over 50 years and is permitted. So that is not something the Office of Planning really felt the need to dig too far into because the hotel exists today and there's a lot.

And we looked at the exceptional situation as being that it is a hotel that has been on the property for over 50 years, and it is in the R-12 zone. So we accepted that as an exceptional situation. And regards to resulting undue hardship to the owner, we looked at this as being more of the challenges and safety issues related to the eating and drinking establishment in its current location.

This type of eating and drinking establishment is pretty typical ancillary use for a hotel, so we understand the need for it, but in its current location, it does pose a bit of challenge when it comes to the safety in its location. That's an area that's drop-off/pick-up area, or a drop-off area, for hotel residents or hotel users, and that space is smaller than you typically would expect to see for a hotel. Also, the location does present challenges when it comes to causing queues on the street, vehicle queues or traffic buildup.

So we did look at that as being hardships on the owner when it comes to people using their hotel, as well as on the community too. So we accepted that as the argument for the undue hardship, is that the current location is a

2.1

safety concern and a significant nuisance. Because they are not expanding the intensity of the use, they are just relocating it to the roof, we looked at that as not really being increasing the use itself. And the argument about the roof has a right to be used, et cetera, we didn't really support that argument. We don't think that there's an automatic right to have a use on the roof, but to relocate the existing use that is in a poor location and relocate it to the rooftop, we thought was something we could support.

And then when it comes to the no substantial detriment to the public good, we thought that it should not cause a substantial detriment to the public good, as you are well The applicant aware. has worked a lot with the adjacent neighbors, and has community and the which includes the hours of operation, We think that does address those concerns, et cetera. concerns.

However, we do note that we believe that the applicant should provide evidence that the lighting will not have a significant impact on the naval observatory. The primary type of lighting that they are proposing is uplighting, and we would recommend that they would provide some kind of demonstration that this type of lighting would not cause light pollution spill-over and cause issues with the observatory.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

But this application was referred to NCPC and ultimately it's something that they would, I guess, make a decision. But just from our review of it, we thought that that information has not been provided so it's not clear to us whether or not there would be a lighting impact on the observatory. Otherwise, we did not have an issue. We did not make it a condition, it's just something we would note.

And then when it comes the substantial to impairment to the integrity of the zone regulations, we thought that what is being proposed meets the intent of the regulations so there would not be a substantial impairment. The proposal is for relocating the existing use on the site, and would relieve and reduce traffic impacts and vehicular safety concerns. So we thought that this would be achieving a safer environment which would contribute to meeting the intent and integrity of the regulations.

And with that, Office of Planning puts down on the record of our report for anything else, but those are the few things that were a little different than what the applicant talked about, so I thought it was important to kind of discuss that a little further with you. So here for questions.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Thanks, Ms. Myers. All right, does the Board have questions for the Office of Planning?

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Sure, thank you Mr.

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

I don't have a question, per se, but statement that I appreciate OP's report. I think you applied some sensibility to it, and I think it was very generous, and that may be the argument by the applicant. It might not have been framed in a way that addresses the issue specifically, that OP found those issues suggest or render to favorable solution. So that's my only comment, Ι appreciate the thoroughness of the report.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Blake.

MEMBER BLAKE: Just a quick question as far as also for the applicant, if necessary. Do you have an idea of when the summer garden or that establishment was started, when it began operations, and would it have gotten an authorization for its operation in the street, in its location?

MS. MYERS: The history of the summer garden/eating establishment, the applicant does.

MR. WEXLER: I don't know it's history either, but it dates back a number of decades, probably from the 1990s.

MEMBER BLAKE: Okay, so it would have been created, a nonconforming, it would have been created somehow in the context of the existing zoning regulations for 1958 then. What would be the trail to tell me how that was created? I don't suspect when they built the building they had a bar in the driveway.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

MR. DETTMAN: I think we don't know. I think and it's been touched upon a couple times here, relative to both eating and drinking establishment that currently exists, and the building itself, I think that the fact that -- and we certainly have done our due diligence and scoured OZ's records. There is simply no record here, just as the Office of Planning hasn't found either. I think that in and of itself is extremely unique.

How the heck did a 90-foot building land in an R-1B zone? But it's there, it's been there since the 1960s and we actually have the Certificate of Occupancy at Exhibit 11 that says it's zoned at 5C, but we can't find the record of the site being zoned at a 5C. Again, I think that this kind really kind of goes back to Board Member John's questions about uniqueness and the fact that there is simply no zoning record for this site being zoned R5C, but we have a C -- of OZ saying R5C, so therefore we have a legally nonconforming use that can remain in existence.

And what we're trying to do is rectify some issues that have been raised by the community by simply relocating, not establishing a brand new use that's prohibited or not permitted in the zone, but just relocating it to another portion of the existing structure.

MR. WEXLER: And to add to that briefly just from a practical consideration perspective, the history of this

2.0

1	property, there are some kind of questions and unknowns. And
2	that's really one of the primary reasons why these
3	conversations with community members had been going on for
4	a number of years, because they too wondered how this came
5	to be, and how collaboratively we can improve it for
6	everybody's benefit.
7	MEMBER BLAKE: Okay, yeah, I think I understand
8	how the hotel got there. That was very logical. What I
9	couldn't understand was how the summer garden got in the
10	parking lot. That was my question. And you did answer it.
11	Thank you.
12	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, anyone else?
13	VICE CHAIR JOHN: I have one last question for the
14	applicant. So I think I read that there is an existing
15	penthouse there, right?
16	MS. BLOOMFIELD: It's an existing mechanical.
17	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Oh, it's just mechanical.
18	MS. BLOOMFIELD: Yeah.
19	VICE CHAIR JOHN: You're expanding it for this
20	purpose. Okay, thank you.
21	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, does the applicant have any
22	questions for the Office of Planning?
23	MS. BLOOMFIELD: No. Thank you.
24	BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Young, is there anyone here
25	wishing to speak? Ms Bloomfield, do you have anything that

you'd like to add at the end?

2.1

MS. BLOOMFIELD: The only thing I would add is that we are in agreement with the Office of Planning that lighting on the roof will be downlit so that it will not shine into the residence neighborhood, and leave it at that. We appreciate that comment and we agree. It's actually, in the mock-up agreement includes a section on lighting and we've agreed with that already with the community.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, thanks. That helps me when I was going to ask, the mock-up agreement, you all have agreed to all of the terms in that agreement that is in your Exhibit 16, beginning on page 12, correct?

MR. WEXLER: Yes.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, because I don't know if we're going to include all of those. We might end up referencing that agreement if we get to a yes on this because some of it isn't necessarily within our purview, but it will be, regardless, it's been agreed to by the applicant and is in the record and will be referenced in the order, if we get to that point.

All right, so then does anybody have anything else before I close the hearing? Okay, I'll close the hearing and the record. Thank you all very much.

Okay, so that summer garden eating and drinking establishment has been there forever, and that hotel was

where all the flight attendants used to go for a long time, and like be there, whatever. Anyway, so just letting you know.

Okay, as far as the standards, I mean, I quess I'll agree with the Office of Planning. I mean, number one it sounds like there's a lot of different things going on as to how they're getting to number one. And I don't have any problems with number three, as far as the public good. And I guess I'll agree with the Office of Planning, or applicant with the practical difficulties and the undue I mean, I do think that it is a nonconformity hardships. that's in the parking lot. It's been in the parking lot forever. And Ι can understand, just on а community standpoint I totally understand why they want to move that thing out of the parking lot and put it onto the roof, right? And the roof view is going to be outstanding, it sits on the top of that hill.

But regardless, I will agree with the applicant and the Office of Planning in how they're meeting the criteria for us to grant the relief requested. I think it's a little bit of a stretch in certain places. However, I will agree with that. And I will also agree that the ANC, well, that the ANC is a support, I would again reference the mockup agreement because I think, and it's in Exhibit 16 on page 12, because I think it is pretty well-written and I don't

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

want to have to dissect it as to what parts of it are for conditions that we could actually uphold.

So that all being said, I'm looking at the applicant's PowerPoint, I will, and that deed I had no objections, I will be voting in favor. So I'm going to turn to Mr. Smith next.

MEMBER SMITH: I'll be honest with you, I'm torn on this particular case. And, you know, there's been a couple of special exception criteria, but this question about does it meet the variance criteria, I am completely torn on. The last two zones, those are things that are detrimental to the public good or substantial endangerment to the office zone plan, on one hand I can get that this is an amenity for the community and an amenity for the hotel, but an amenity is not necessary for the operation of the facility.

hand, the moving of this particular On one from ground floor could address traffic some concerns and noise concerns, but again, this property is zoned residential, and immediately abuts residential to the So it seems to me we're trading one negative impact. it's currently located is a longer street commercial area, to move an eating and drinking establishment to the rooftop in a residential zone adjacent to residential properties. So I'm not prepared to say that it would be a detriment to the public good to move it to the roof.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

I completely am not sold in any argument on the practical difficulty or an undue hardship. Again, this is an amenity. This is an amenity that's not necessary for the operation of the hotel. So it can continue to exist in its current nonconforming form on the ground floor. I'm not sold on the argument that there's an extraordinary situation for them to move a nonconforming restaurant to the rooftop of a I think this is one of property that is zoned residential. those situations where the regulations can be an enemy of the good. And in this particular situation I'm struggling with how this request before us meets the variance tests.

To me, it seems more appropriate to rezone the property. I get that's a whole different animal that has to go through the zoning commission, but to me, that's the more correct way to handle this type of problem. So right now, currently I'm not sold that it meets the variance criteria. I would love to hear more from my fellow board members on this, but right now I can't support it.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, well we'll keep going around the table here and see where we get. But again, just to make some comment again, that nonconformity is, as you said, that even commonsense would dictate, as far as the noise goes, I mean it's a pretty high up building. Right, I mean it's way up there now as far as it being less of a burden to the neighborhood. But I understand what you're

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

saying.

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

Let's see, Mr. Blake.

Sure, Chairman Hill. MEMBER BLAKE: I agree that the applicant meets the standards for the special exception, but then are set back. I also agree with the area variance. I struggle a great deal with the use variance, because as Board Member Smith pointed out, first of all, there is a question in my mind about the exceptional condition. The second issue is I did struggle with the undue hardship as And I think that the Office of Planning did a good job to piece together а rational undue hardship from the application.

But this is a very weak use variance, and as Board Member Smith pointed out, this is a very practical and logical thing to do from the perspective of the hotel. However that garden that's been there forever has gotten where it was, it shouldn't be there, and it would be more practical and prudent to have it on the rooftop like most other hotels do, and it's a very swank amenity. But it is definitely a nonconforming activity, and it's a very, very weak variance test.

So I'm going to be undecided for the moment and I'm going to wait to hear what other people have to say. But I know from a practical standpoint this makes a lot of sense. But I do struggle with the letter of the law in reading this

and the quality of the variance element.

1

2

3

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. I love it, I'm going to say something after each person just because I can. So, right, I think that the safety issue, even again, I'm going to go back through the argument here that the person has, it's in the parking lot, right? And so it's been in the parking lot for 50 years, and so they're trying to move it up to the roof. All right, but I got you, okay, I'm going to go with Dr. Imamura who maybe can make a better argument than I can.

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: All right, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yeah, this is a really interesting case. I certainly understand and appreciate Board Member Smith's comments, and Board Member Blake's comments. To me, this is really clear that the hotel is trying to tailor, right, this is a very profitable endeavor to move this eating and drinking establishment from the parking lot to a much better view on the rooftop. Fully get that.

And they're leveraging sort of the community's issues to make that argument in that case, right? your comment, Mr. Chairman, and to what Board Member Blake shared that the practicality of it, it makes sense. I think the traffic stacking vehicle issue, sort of the and circulation issues and driving safety, maybe with pedestrians, that I'm willing to buy off on.

And I would say that this is where we all know that zoning is an imperfect science or art and sometimes you have to apply sensibility and make it a judgment call. And I certainly appreciate, again, OP's report to kind of parse out and look for an argument that would justify these special exceptions. So with that I am ready and willing to vote in favor of the applicant.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. And as far as moving up the hotel and the hotel making a lot of money, like COVID killed the hotel for however long it was.

So Vice Chair John?

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. VICE CHAIR JOHN: a difficult case is for me because I appreciate completely what the applicant is trying to do. At the same time, we have had situations, I can think of one, where a new residential close MU-zoned restaurant in a area to an district create eating drinking wanted to an and establishment. And we said no, but the facts were a little different in that case.

Okay, what's different here is that this is an existing nonconformity, which by itself is not exceptional. That kind of nonconformity is a dime a dozen in this city. What's probably different about this one is that it's an eating and drinking establishment in a parking lot, and that is being very generous. So maybe that could be unique. So

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

as I read the applicant's burden of proof, and I didn't get And then I read the Office of Planning's attempt to there. piece together an exceptional condition, I thought that I could understand that argument that the Office of Planning making, which is that the eating and drinking was establishment is in a very bad location creating traffic hazards on the street and all of those adverse impacts.

so if I lump that together I kind of sort of came up, and I mean, kind of sort of, came up with an exceptional condition. And so I could get to the practical difficulty from there, and so I am leaning more towards approving the use variance even though the other two criteria, I think, can be easily met, or can be met. So I'm leaning towards approval even though this is not the strongest variance case that I've looked at.

But on balance, I am going to give great weight to the Office of Planning's analysis of how the applicant meets the criteria for a variance based on the situation with the restaurant in the parking lot.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, thank you, Vice Chair John, and also when you say great weight, like great weight to the ANC, but we're the ones that have to determine whether or not we think they're meeting the criteria. So I'll make a motion and see what happens. I need to get a second. I'll make a motion to approve the application.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

VICE CHAIR JOHN: May I, Mr. Chairman? 1 2 BZA CHAIR HILL: Sure, go on. 3 VICE CHAIR JOHN: Would we want to see if any of 4 the board members have given any additional thought? 5 put them on the stand, but --BZA CHAIR HILL: Does anybody have anything they'd 6 7 like to add before I make a motion? 8 MEMBER BLAKE: I'd like to add one quick thought. 9 BZA CHAIR HILL: Sure. 10 MEMBER BLAKE: I understand what you're saying in terms of the parking, the facility, and it's interesting that 11 12 in the long history of it being there that I didn't hear any comment about incidents that have taken place down there such 13 as someone getting hit by a car or some problem taking place, 14 15 which would have definitely supported the argument that it's 16 dangerous to have it down there. But for it to exist for so 17 long without incident, and we don't have, again, information about that, it doesn't necessarily mean to me 18 that it is as problematic as it sounds. So I understand that 19 2.0 and I appreciate that thought. That was my thought there in 2.1 response to that. 22 I was laughing, I don't want to BZA CHAIR HILL: 23 arque against myself. Like that thing is kind of tucked away 24 a little bit, and also when you walk up by it, it just seems

like another commercial thing as you're walking by.

Smith had his hand up?

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

MEMBER SMITH: Yeah, to expand that. I understand the Office of Planning's approach to raising security concerns, but there are other, you know I mean, I share Board Member Blake's opinion on that. We didn't hear that there were security concerns. This issue of queuing that was raised, but I also claim again, we don't have proof of that.

But all of these can be easily addressed at this current location. And I didn't hear that the hotel had said, of attempted to even explore some those different opportunities, given that they stated on the record that they have been engaging with the community to renovate reorient this building. This particular space can be reoriented in a way that does not lend itself to having pedestrian walk-ups through that. From that sidewalk they could tie the sidewalk board away from the pick-up and drop-I feel like they could put up some security barriers.

There's ways to address those concerns that were raised by the applicant and presented by the Office of Planning, so to me the entire argument was a fairly weak argument for variance, given that this is an amenity space. And my opinion really hasn't changed on it, so we'll see where things go.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. As we continue to deliberate, and you all can tell me if you have anything

else, my thoughts again, as even Mr. Smith was saying, is that, well, I've been in situations where I'm kind of on the fence as to how I feel the argument is going. And I think that, again, this isn't the strongest argument, but I think that it is one that has been made and that the community would like to see happen, and that the Office of Planning agrees that the analysis has taken place, and the applicant has gone through years of whatever it's gone through to get to this point.

So definitely we are charged with whatever we believe the situation to be, also taking into account the recommendations of the Office of Planning, the ANC and the deliberations that the applicant has put forward. So does anybody have anything else to say before I make a motion and see what happens? Okay.

I'm going to make a motion that we approve Application #20712 as captioned read by the Secretary, and asking for the second from somebody.

VICE CHAIR JOHN: Second.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. I got a second from Ms. John. Okay, and I got a motion, a second. Mr. Moy, want to do a roll-call?

MR. MOY: Yeah, I'm going to do a little switch-up than I normally do in my routine. When I call your name, if you would please respond with a yes, no, abstain, to the

2.1

1	motion made by Chairman Hill to approve the application for
2	the zoning relief that's being requested. And this motion
3	was second by Vice Chair John.
4	Vice Chair John?
5	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Yes.
6	MR. MOY: Chairman Hill?
7	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes.
8	MR. MOY: Zoning Commissioner Dr. Imamura?
9	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.
10	MR. MOY: Mr. Blake? Mr. Smith?
11	MEMBER SMITH: No.
12	MR. MOY: Staff would record above as 3-2-0, and
13	this is on the motion made by Chairman Hill to approve the
14	application for the roof requested. The motion to approve
15	was seconded by Vice Chair John. In support of the motion
16	to approve are Zoning Commissioner Dr. Imamura, Vice Chair
17	John and Chairman Hill. Opposed to the motion, to deny the
18	motion, would be Mr. Smith and Mr. Blake. Motions carries
19	3-2-0.
20	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Do you guys want to do the
21	last one, or do you want to take a break before you do the
22	last one?
23	VICE CHAIR JOHN: I thought that was the last one.
24	BZA CHAIR HILL: No, we've got one more.
25	MEMBER SMITH: Let's do the last one.

1	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, you all going to take one
2	more? All right, Mr. Moy, call our last one.
3	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Did I miss a case?
4	BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Moy, you're on mute. Oh,
5	sorry, Mr. Moy, I didn't see it. You're unmuted.
6	MR. MOY: It's okay because I miscounted the
7	digits on this application. You didn't get to hear that.
8	So anyway, so this is Application #20717 of Wesley Hallman
9	and Silvana Rubino-Hallman. And this is a self-certified
10	application pursuant to Subtitle F, Section 901.2. This is
11	for a special exception under Subtitle E, Section 5201 from
12	the lot occupancy requirements of Subtitle E, Section 30441
13	and the property is located in the RF-1 zone at 634 East
14	Capitol Street NE, Square 861, Lot 804.
15	There is a motion from the applicant to accept an
16	untimely filing and I think it relates to a written agreement
17	with Mr. Chairman. I can go into that if you need, but
18	that's it from me.
19	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great, thank you.
20	Is it Mr. Boyette?
21	MR. BOYETTE: Yes.
22	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, Mr. Boyette, could you
23	introduce yourself for the record, please?
24	MR. BOYETTE: My name is Joseph Boyette. I am an
25	architect at Old City Design Studio.

1	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, Mr. Boyette, what is it
2	that you're trying to get into the record?
3	MR. BOYETTE: We had a signed letter of support
4	from a neighbor who has solar panels on his roof, but the
5	Office of Planning thought it prudent for me to get an
6	agreement concerning those solar panels pursuant to Subtitle
7	E-206.3, that he would agree to any loss of power to his
8	solar panels even though my solar study showed no loss of
9	sunlight to his solar panels.
10	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, and you've already
11	submitted that?
12	MR. BOYETTE: Yes.
13	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right, Mr. Moy, unless
14	the Board has any issues, and if so, please speak up, go
15	ahead and add that into the record, Mr. Moy, and we can take
16	a look at it.
17	All right, Mr. Boyette, are you choosing not to
18	use your camera, which is fine, I just want to know.
19	MR. BOYETTE: Sorry, I am happy to use my camera.
20	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great, perfect, thank you.
21	All right, Mr. Boyette, if you want to go ahead and walk us
22	through your client's application and why you believe you're
23	meeting the criteria for us to grant the relief requested,
24	and you can begin whenever you like.
25	MR. BOYETTE: Okay, if Mr. Young could bring up

Exhibit 21, the lot occupancy diagram. And while he's doing that I will say that the project has been supported by the Historic Preservation Review Board, ANC-6C and the Capitol Hill Restoration Society. There is no impact to the property to the west. I will go into more detail on that.

The property to the east, the owners of that property have signed a letter of support and they have also signed an agreement concerning the solar panels that we just mentioned. The current lot occupancy is 66.1 percent. And we are requesting 69.6 percent. Currently that lot occupancy is taken up by a building, an existing building that's on the basement level and an existing addition that's on the first level only. This addition will be two stories.

If Mr. Young could bring up Exhibit 5, and switch to Sheet G-2.

BZA CHAIR HILL: If you can zoom, if you can make that a little bigger, Mr. Young, when you get a chance. Sorry.

MR. BOYETTE: That's great right there. The property is located on the north side of the 600 block of East Capitol Street NE. There is a through alley mid-block running north/south up and down the page, and a dead-end alley that runs behind the subject property and all those residences. Almost every home on the alley has a two-story detached garage, which forms a two-story wall at the edge of

2.0

the alley on both sides of the alley.

2.0

The exception to that is the neighbor just to the east. So if you could scroll down to the lower part of that page. The existing home is a three-story plus basement brick residence. There is an existing one-story elevated frame structure on the rear of the house that holds the kitchen and a powder room. It's not original to the home and it's in disrepair, and it will be removed along with the deck.

And then if you could switch to G-3, the addition, the proposal is a two-story plus basement addition on the back of the home that extends lot line to lot line, and is 20 foot, 5 inches deep. the building to the west, 632, is a three-story plus basement apartment building with ten units. The building extends over 47 feet beyond the existing rear wall of the subject property, the original home, and once the addition is put on, it will still project 21 feet, 1 inch beyond the proposed addition.

On the east side, there is a three-story plus cellar single-family residence that has a two-story dogleg addition off the back. And that dogleg sits about 4 feet 8 inches off the property line. That's the one with the solar panels on the roof. Once the proposed addition is built -- the proposed addition only goes 2 feet 11 inches past the existing addition, and so when the addition is put on the neighbor will still go 23 feet beyond the proposed addition.

There are no windows along the side of the addition along the neighbor's dogleg, so there's no loss of privacy there.

Mr. Young, if you can switch to the next slide we can look at a couple photographs. So the top row is the front of the residence. There's no change to that. The middle row is looking back. I'm not sure if the Board wants you to zoom in on that. It's probably worth zooming in on that middle row. So you're looking at, on that middle row, you're looking at a three-story brick wall that's to the west of the subject property. And then you're looking at the back of the existing residence, a small addition off the back, and then on the left hand side you're looking at the two-story dogleg addition of the neighbor to the east. And on the right photo you're looking back at that two-story garage on the alley.

Then if you could scroll down for me. We can see the view from the alley, so generally, on the left slide, that is the only view you have of the rear of the home. So that's the existing three-story rear home, so you can see that a two-story addition on that will be barely visible even from this one vantage point in the alley because there are these two-story garages. And while this property does not have a two-story garage, they do have, I think, a 9 foot wall there that shields the rear yard. And then on the right side you can see that whole row of two-story garages that go down

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

on that side.

2.0

I don't know that it's worth going through the plan except to show you the balconies that we are proposing off the facade. So if we could scroll through until we get to sheet A-1. That's it. So this is the first floor addition and there is a balcony that has access to the backyard down to grade that extends basically lot line to lot line. Next slide. On the second floor --

PARTICIPANT: Mr. Boyette, I'm sorry, which exhibit are you in?

MR. BOYETTE: His says Exhibit 12, but online I found it to be Exhibit 5.

PARTICIPANT: Yeah, okay, great. Thanks.

MR. BOYETTE: The second floor has a balcony that steps back three feet off each property line. I'm bringing up the balconies because of lot occupancy because that does take up a couple percentage points of the lot occupancy, and also for privacy.

And then on the next level, level three, if you could switch to the next slide, there is a roof terrace on top of the proposed addition. And we are holding that back three feet off the property line on the east side so as not to shade those solar panels, and so as not to have a privacy issue with the neighbor. And then on the next slide there is a terrace on the roof as well, and that is also going to

be set back three feet from the neighbor to the east. Okay, Mr. Boyette, let me do 2 BZA CHAIR HILL: I've got your slides pulled up. Why don't I just drop 3 this. out of there if you want to drop that, slide that, let me see 5 if my colleagues have any questions for you before we turn to the Office of Planning. 6 7 Does anybody have any questions for Mr. Boyette? 8 All right, I'm going to turn to the Office of Planning. 9 ELLIOTT: Good afternoon, members of the MS. 10 Board. I'm Brandice Elliott, representing the Office of Planning for BZA Case 20717. The applicant has requested lot 11 12 occupancy relief to go up to 69.6 percent. We did provide 13 an analysis in our report against the special exception criteria for the relief, and we are recommending approval. 14 15 I will stand on the record of our report, but I'm happy to answer any questions you have. 16 17 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, does anybody have any questions for the Office of Planning? All right, Mr. Young, 18 is there anyone here who wishes to speak? 19 20 MR. YOUNG: We do not. 2.1 BZA CHAIR Okay, Blake, HILL: Mr. is anything you would like to add at the end? I'm sorry, did 22 23 you say no, shake your head? 24 MS. ELLIOTT: Thank you for your time. 25 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great. All right, I'm

going to go ahead and close the hearing of the record. 1 2 could please Mr. Young, if you the 3 applicant. 4 Okay, I thought this was pretty straightforward. 5 That building to their left side or whatever side it is, it's basically all the way to the end of there, what they're 6 7 trying to do even. And so I didn't think there was going to be any issues on that side, obviously. 8 And the other side 9 I wasn't concerned about. And then we have CHRIS, C-H-R-I-S 10 that is, that was also in support, as well as the ANC in 11 support, as well as DDOT. 12 But I would agree with the analysis the Office of Planning has provided for us, and that also it's good that 13 the applicant did get something concerning the solar issues 14 or at least clarity on those. And I will be voting in favor. 15 16 Mr. Smith, do you have anything you'd like to add? 17 MEMBER SMITH: Nothing I would like to add. agree with your analysis and OP's analysis on this case. 18 me it seems fairly straightforward given the scope of what 19 2.0 the applicant proposes, and like you said, the two homes on 2.1 each side of this property, they go all the way back to the 22 alley so I agree with, again, OP's analysis and support the 23 application.

Okay,

great,

CHAIR HILL:

24

25

Smith.

thank you,

Mr.

1	Mr. Blake?
2	MEMBER BLAKE: Yes, I too would be in support of
3	the application. I think it meets the criteria for approval.
4	I agree with your observations and that of Mr. Smith as well.
5	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. Dr. Imamura?
6	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: I would vote in support.
7	Nothing further.
8	BZA CHAIR HILL: Vice Chair John?
9	VICE CHAIR JOHN: I'm in support, Mr. Chairman.
10	I was struck by the fact that the two adjacent properties are
11	so much longer than this property. And that's even after the
12	extension. But more importantly, there's a 64 foot real yard
13	remaining after the addition, so in terms of light and air
14	and privacy, I do not see an issue, and I will be voting in
15	support. And I also agree with OP's analysis and
16	recommendation.
17	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. All right, I'm going
18	to make a motion to approve Application #20717 as captioned
19	and read by the secretary, and ask for a second. Ms. John?
20	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Second.
21	BZA CHAIR HILL: The motion has been made and
22	seconded. Mr. Moy, why don't you take a roll-call.
23	MR. MOY: When I call your name, if you would
24	please respond with a yes, no, or abstain, to the motion made
25	by Chairman Hill to approve the application for the ruling

1	as requested. This motion was seconded by Vice Chair John.
2	Zoning Commissioner Dr. Imamura?
3	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.
4	MR. MOY: Mr. Smith? Mr. Blake?
5	MEMBER BLAKE: Yes.
6	MR. MOY: Vice Chair John? Chairman Hill?
7	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yes.
8	MR. MOY: Staff would record the vote as 5-0-0 and
9	this is on the motion made by Chairman Hill to approve. The
10	motion was seconded by Vice Chair John. Also supporting the
11	motion to be approved, Zoning Commissioner Dr. Imamura, Mr.
12	Smith, Mr. Blake, Vice Chair John, and Chairman Hill. Motion
13	carries on a vote of 5-0-0.
14	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, great. Thank you, Mr. Moy.
15	Mr. Moy, do we have anything else before the Board?
16	MR. MOY: There's nothing from the staff, sir.
17	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Do my colleagues have
18	anything they need to do?
19	VICE CHAIR JOHN: No.
20	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right, well, this is
21	so much fun, let's do this every week. All right, we'll see
22	you next week. Bye-bye.
23	VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you, thank you.
24	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the
25	record at 3:43 p.m.)

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

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Public Hearing

Before: DC BZA

Date: 05-11-22

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