GOVERNMENT
OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

+ + + + +

REGULAR PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY MAY 25, 2022

+ + + + +

The Regular Public Meeting of the District of Columbia Board of Zoning Adjustment convened via Video Teleconference, pursuant to notice at 9:35 a.m. EDT, Lorna John, Vice Chairperson, presiding.

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT MEMBERS PRESENT:

LORNA JOHN, Vice Chairperson CARL BLAKE, Board Member CHRISHAUN SMITH, Board Member (NCPC)

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

ANTHONY J. HOOD, Chairperson JOSEPH S. IMAMURA, Ph.D., Commissioner (AOC) PETER MAY, Commissioner (NPS)

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

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

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PRESENT:

SARAH BAJAJ, ESQ. MARY NAGELHOUT, ESQ.

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Regular Public Meeting held on May 25, 2022.

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

Application No.	20666	of	1644 North Capitol, LLC	17
Application No.	20685	of	Oladapo Kolawole	23
Application No.	20722	of	Josh and Allison Dunning	32
			Robert Bernstein	35
Application No.	20636	of	Penguin, LLC	38
Application No. Robert Thorne .			Shayleen and	41

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

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

(9:34 a.m.)

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Good morning, Ladies and Gentlemen. The Board of Zoning Adjustments May 25th, 2022 public hearing will please come to order. My name is Lorna I'm the Vice Chairperson of the District of Columbia Zoning Adjustment. Board of Joining me today are board Blake and Chrishaun Smith. members. Carl and Zoning Commissioners Peter May, Anthony Hood, and Dr. Imamura. believe Commissioner May will be joining us at some point, I think.

Today's meeting and hearing agendas are available on the Office of Zoning's website. Please be advised that this proceeding is being recorded by a Court Reporter and is also webcast live via Webex and YouTube Live. The video of the webcast will be available on the Office of Zoning's website after today's hearing. Accordingly, everyone who is listening on Webex or by telephone will be muted during the hearing. Also please be advised that we do not take any public testimony at our decision meeting session. If you experience difficulty accessing Webex or with your telephone call-in, then please call our OZ hotline number, 202-727-5471 to receive Webex login or call-in instructions.

At the conclusion of the decision meeting, I shall in consultation with the Office of Zoning determine whether

a fuller summary order may issue. A full order is required when the decision it contains is adverse to a party, including an effect to the ANC. A full order may also be needed if the Board's decision differs from the Office of Planning's recommendation. Although the Board favors the use of summary orders whenever possible, an Applicant may not request the Board to issue such an order.

hearing session, today's everyone listening on Webex or by telephone will be muted during the And the only persons who have signed up hearing. participate or testify will be unmuted at their appropriate Please state your and home address before time. name providing oral testimony presentation. or your Oral presentations should be limited to a summary of your most important points. When you are finished speaking, please mute your audio so that your microphone is no longer picking up sound or background noise.

Once again, if you experience difficulty accessing Webex or with your telephone call-in or if you forgot to sign up 24 hours prior to this hearing, then please call our OZ hotline number at 202-727-5471 to sign up to testify and to receive Webex login or call-in instructions. All persons planning to testify either in favor or in opposition should have signed up in advance. They will be called by name to testify. If this is an appeal, only parties are allowed to

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

testify. By signing up to testify, all parties completed the oath or affirmation as required by Subtitle Y, Section 408.7.

Reguests to enter evidence at the time of testimony online virtual hearing such as written or additional supporting documents other than live video, which may not be presented as part of the testimony may be allowed pursuant to Subtitle Y 103.13, provided that the person making the request to enter an exhibit explains how the proposed exhibit is relevant, the good cause that justifies record, exhibit into including allowing the the explanation of why the requestor did not file the exhibit prior to the hearing pursuant to Subtitle Y, Section 206 and how the proposed exhibit would not unreasonable prejudice any party.

The order procedure for special exceptions and variances pursuant to Subtitle Y, Section 409 will be as follows: Preliminary and procedural matters, statement of the Applicant and the Applicant's witnesses, reported recommendation from the DC Office of Planning, reports and recommendations from other public agencies, reports and recommendations from the affected Advisory Neighborhood Commission, and the ANC's witnesses if any for the area within which the property is located.

Parties in support of the application:
Individuals and organization representatives in support of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

the application. Parties in opposition to the application: Individuals and organization representatives in opposition Individuals application. and organization representatives who are undeclared with respect application. Rebuttal and closing statements the Applicant.

Pursuant to Subtitle Y, Sections 408.2 and 408.3, the following time constraints shall be maintained: The Applicant, Appellant, and all parties except an affected ANC in support including witnesses exclusive of cross examination would have a maximum of 60 minutes collectively. The Appellant persons and parties, except an affected ANC in opposition including witnesses collectively have an amount of time equal to that of the Applicant and parties support, but in no case more than 60 minutes collectively. Individuals: Maximum of three minutes. Organization Maximum of five minutes. These time representatives: constraints do not include cross examination and/or questions from the Board.

Cross examination of witnesses by the Applicant or parties, including the ANC is permitted. The ANC within which the property is located is automatically a party in a special exception or variance case. Nothing prohibits the Board from placing reasonable restrictions in cross examination, including the time limits and limitations and

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

scope of cross examination pursuant to Subtitle Y, Section 408.5.

At the conclusion of each case, an individual who wasn't able to testify because of technical issues may file a request for leave to file a written version of the planned testimony to the record within 24 hours following the conclusion of public testimony in the hearing. If additional written testimony is accepted, then parties will be allowed a reasonable time to respond as determined by the Board. Board will then make its decision at its next meeting session, but no earlier than 48 hours after the hearing. Moreover, the Board may request additional and specific information to complete the record. The Board and the staff will specify the end of the hearing exactly what is expected and the date when persons must submit the evidence to the Office of Zoning. No other information shall be accepted by the Board.

Once again, after the Board adjourns the hearing, the Office of Zoning in consultation with me will determine whether a fuller summary order may issue. A full order is required when the decision it contains is adverse to a party, including an affected ANC. A full order may also be needed if the Board's decision differs from the Office of Planning's recommendation. Although the Board favors the use of summary orders whenever possible, an Applicant may not request the

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

Board to issue such an order.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Finally, the District of Columbia Administrative Procedure Act requires that a public hearing on each case be However, pursuant to held in the open before the public. Sections 405B and 406 of that act, the Board may consistent with its rules of procedure and the act enter into a closed meeting on a case for purposes of seeking legal counsel on Code Section 2575B4 case pursuant to DC and for deliberating on a case pursuant to DC Official Code Section 257B13, but only after providing the necessary public notice and in the case of an emergency closed meeting after taking a roll call.

Mr. Secretary, do we have any preliminary matters?

If not, let's proceed.

MR. MOY: Madam Vice Chair and the Board, I do have a brief announcement regarding certain cases that were on the hearing docket. So with your indulgence, Madam Vice Chair, the following four cases have been postponed and continued to a future hearing date. The first is Application No. 20239 of 2629 MLK, LLC rescheduled to October 19, 2022. Application No. 17429A of St. Patrick's Episcopal Church and Day School continued to September 21st, 2022. Application No. 18465A of St. Patrick's Episcopal Church and Day School, rescheduled to September 21st, 2022. And Application No. 20542 of Hossein Barekatain, B-A-R-E-K-A-T-A-I-N and Fardin

Foroujan, F-O-R-O-U-J-A-N, rescheduled to September 28th, 2022.

And finally three cases have been withdrawn, Application No. 20529 of Oakwood, LLC, Application No. 20555 of Odessa Ford, and Application No. 20626 of Irvin and Kathy Shapell, S-H-A-P-E-L-L. So that takes care of that. I do have some preliminary matters, but I think it would be best, Madam Vice Chair that I bring those to the Board's attention when I call the case.

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you, Mr. Moy. And before we call the first decision case, I'd like to take a few minutes -- no more than two minutes. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 9:46 a.m. and resumed at 9:48 a.m.)

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay. Please call the first decision case, Mr. Moy.

MR. MOY: Okay. So this would be -- and we're in the Board's public decision meeting session. The first case is Application No. 20380 of Polygon Holdings, LLC. As you recall, this is as an amended self-certified application pursuant to Subtitle X, Section 901.2 for special exceptions. Under Subtitle U, Section 421 to allow a new residential development 17-unit apartment house. And Under Subtitle F, Section 5201 from the side yard requirement, Subtitle F, Section 306.2A. This property is in the RA-1 zone at 4457

2.0

through 4459 MacArthur Boulevard NW, Square 1363, Lots 57 and 961.

This application was last heard by the Board as its public hearing on May the 11th. Participating on this decision making is Zoning Commission Chair Anthony Hood, Chairman Hill, Vice Chair John, Mr. Blake, and Mr. Smith. And I believe the only other thing I have, Madam Vice Chair, which refers to -- Well, I'm not even going to mention it because the record's closed for a decision.

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay, thank you.

MR. MOY: Thank you.

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you. So are we ready to deliberate? So I'm going to start with a few comments, and please feel free to add to this. So this case was first in early 2021. before the Board the Applicant And subsequently amended the application after purchasing the adjoining property at 4459 MacArthur Boulevard. And so the Applicant now seeks relief under Subtitle U421 for a 17-unit apartment house and relief from the side yard request for two 8-foot side yards, instead of the 9.7 feet required because of the increased height of the building.

At the last hearing, the Board closed the hearing
-- the record and requested information on the Foxhall
Terrace -- from Foxhall Terrace on whether it had plans to
withdraw its status. And also requested application from the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

Applicant on the status of any agreement with the Foxhall Terrace. Both parties responded. Foxhall Terrace did not withdraw its opposition and there is no agreement.

(Audio interference) was the question of the 10-foot driveway. easement for the And the party opposition contends that -- continues to oppose the project on the basis that the 10-foot easement allowing a right of way from MacArthur Boulevard to the parking lot cannot lawfully be used for this 17-unit apartment building because of the terms of the easement. The party in opposition admits that the scope of easement is ultimately a civil matter the scope of the Board's authority, bevond but (audio interference) limitations on the application Applicant's use of the easement as described on Page 3 of Exhibit 68.

At the hearing, Foxhall Terrace also required a survey of the driveway. In my view of the -- In my view, the precise terms of the easement --of the use of the easement are beyond the scope of this Board. Both parties agree that there is an existing 10-foot easement used previously by the two buildings on the property for ingress and egress. so I do not recommend inclusion of the party in opposition (audio interference). recommended So accept the Applicant's assertions that they will be able to use the driveway to access parking at the rear. And furthermore,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

this is a self-certified application. The Applicant has not requested parking relief and the Board is not granting such relief.

Except for the easement issue. the revised application and relief sought is fairly straight forward. The Applicant now seeks a nominal 1.75 foot side yard relief because of the increased height of the (audio interference) previously noted -- as previously mentioned. There is ample separation between the adjacent buildings, so there should be no impact on light and air. And also, there are no private -- there are no potential privacy impacts due to the placement of the windows on the addition.

The Applicant has worked with the Office of Planning to improve the design by maintaining the slope of the mansard roof and retaining the location of the front steps. I agree with OP's analysis of how the Applicant satisfies the criteria of Subtitle U421 and give great weight to OP's analysis. I also give great weight to the ANC's report, which has (audio interference). And so I will be in support of the application and I will just go around the room and ask for other comments starting with Mr. Smith.

MEMBER SMITH: Sure. I'll be brief Chair John because you provided a very thorough analysis of this particular case and the reasons why they have met the standards for us to support it. I do believe that the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

Applicant has met the standards of 5201 for us to be able to grant special exception to reduce the side yard for the same reasons that you stated. You know, this application was originally for one-half of this duplex. Then the Applicant subsequently over the past year has acquired the relating two plots from the previous party in oppositions to this case. And in doing so, it has removed some privacy concerns, some structural concerns were raised that bу the party in opposition -- the previous party in opposition to the -- to the previous requests that we saw last year.

So I completely agree with you. There is ample space for the drive now. And to the right is a -- another single family dwelling that provides ample space for light and air to access the property. So I believe that they meet the special exception standards, as well as U421 standards for us to grant that special exception.

On the matter of the easement, the party in opposition is still there. I do, you know, believe that you have greatly -- I agree with your analysis on this particular case when it comes down to the party in opposition concerns about use of the easement. I think both parties agree that they have access to this easement. So the Applicant in question can access an easement for parking. Any other concern or questions that were raised by the party in opposition, I believe it should be handled as a civil matter

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

between both of these parties.

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

I believe some of the grievances raised by the parties as you stated is beyond the purview of this Board. And you know, some of those conditions that the party in opposition is attempting for us to enact, both I think, you know, beyond the purview of the Board and also it seems to that the Applicant is also \_\_\_ Ι mean the party also using for is the easement those same So it seems to be a little unfair to me. But I purposes. do believe that this is a civil matter that should be (audio interference) between the two parties. So I will support the application because they have met the burden of proof for us to grant a special exception. I said I would be brief but I wasn't.

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you, board member Smith. I always appreciate your comments. Board member Blake?

MEMBER BLAKE: I will say first of all that I will be voting in favor of the requested relief. I believe that the Applicant has met the burden of proof for both the side yard relief and the conditions of U421. With regard to the objectionable impact, I would agree with you -- and the easement -- I totally agree with the analysis that you made that this is largely a civil matter and that it is -- many of the conditions that the party in opposition proposed did

seem to have some enforceability issues, as well as not necessarily not being within the purview of the Board.

That said, I will say that this is -- it is a narrow driveway. It's steep. It's not in the best shape. And it would be nice to see the neighbors work together to manage and maintain the space. You know, the additional burden placed by having five car parking in the back is only going to make probably one additional car from what has been there historically. So that alone won't be too much burden. The delivery services could be somewhat of a burden for that trash removal and things of that sort, but that stuff could be managed and brought to the curb to alleviate some of those But it's a very steep incline, so there are a lot of issues that (audio interference) didn't work out. But again, I would agree that it's a civil issue. And again, I would be in favor of -- I will be voting in favor of the application.

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you, Mr. Blake.
Chairman Hood?

TC CHAIR HOOD: Yeah, good morning. I believe that the relief requested in Subtitle U and Subtitle F as far as I'm concerned, the (audio interference) has been met. Also the other issues, I'm sure if they want to coexist, they'll work it out. And I will be supporting this application. And it's just unfortunate they all couldn't

1

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

1	agree in this process. But I'm sure in the continuation of
2	doing whatever they're doing and coexisting and living around
3	in that area living together, they will make it work. So
4	that's all I have. Thank you.
5	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you, Chairman Hood.
6	And so I will make a motion to approve Application 20380 as
7	captioned and read by the Secretary. And ask for a second,
8	Mr. Blake?
9	MEMBER BLAKE: Second.
10	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you. Mr. Moy, would
11	you please take the roll call?
12	MR. MOY: Thank you, Madam Vice Chair. When I
13	call your name, would you please respond with a yes, no, or
14	abstain to the motion made by Vice Chair John to approve the
15	amended application for the to approve the application for
16	the amended relief requested. The motion was seconded by Mr.
17	Blake. Zoning Commission Chair Anthony Hood?
18	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Yes.
19	MR. MOY: Mr. Smith?
20	MEMBER SMITH: Yes.
21	MR. MOY: Mr. Blake?
22	MEMBER BLAKE: Yes.
23	MR. MOY: Vice Chair John?
24	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Yes.
25	MR. MOY: And we have an absentee ballot from

Chairman Hill. And his absentee vote is to approve the application. So that would give a resulting vote count of 5-0-0. And this is on the motion made by Vice Chair John to approve. The motion to approve was seconded by Mr. Blake. Also in support of the motion Zoning Commission Chair Anthony Hood, Mr. Smith, of course Mr. Blake, Vice Chair John, and Chairman Hill. The motion carries on a vote of 5-0-0.

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you, Mr. Moy. And so can you call the next case please?

MR. MOY: All right. The next case for decision is Application No. 20666 of 1644 North Capitol, LLC. This is as amended, a self-certified application for special exception under Subtitle C, Section 1501.1D, pursuant to Subtitle X, Section 901.2, which would allow an eating and drinking establishment within a penthouse habitable space.

This project is located in the MU-4 zone at 1634 North Capitol Street NW, Square 3101, Lot 118. As the Board will recall, you last heard this at your public hearing on April the 20th, 2022. Participating on this decision is Chairman Hill, Vice Chair John, Mr. Blake, Mr. Smith, and Zoning Commission Chair Anthony Hood.

The only other thing I'd like to add, Madam Vice Chair that this morning at the 12th hour, I was alerted that the SMD was going to file a document into the record. And of course as you know, the record is closed. So I only

2.0

1 mention that for your edification, Madam Vice Chair. Thank 2 you. VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: And this is 3 Thank you. 4 from the SMD. Right, Mr. Moy? 5 MR. MOY: That's correct. I believe it's 6 Commissioner Lewis. 7 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay. And there's also a response from the ANC, which is at Exhibit 29 or 30, I 9 All right, thank you. believe. Okay. 10 So are we ready to deliberate? So I'm not Yes. 11 inclined to hold the record open for additional any 12 information because we have a response from the ANC that is 13 entitled to great weight and so I'm in favor in proceeding. Does anyone have any comments? No. Okay. Does anyone with 15 And if not, I can. to start? So -- Go ahead, Mr. Okay. 16 Blake. MEMBER BLAKE: 17 Sure. 18 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Was your hand up? Yes, it will be up. 19 MEMBER BLAKE: I would first say I would be voting in favor of the application. 2.0 I believe 21 the Applicant has met the criteria to be granted relief under C1501.1D to allow for an eating and drinking establishment 22 within a penthouse habitable space pursuant to X901.2. 23 is a relatively small 632 square foot bar restaurant in a 97-24 25 room hotel that will be open to the public. The penthouse

I think I'm very happy to see that the Applicant was able to work out something with the ANC regarding the sound mitigating measures. And I also note that the Applicant has incorporated the exterior lighting addition specified by the Office of Planning.

In considering this application, I also took into consideration that the ABRA licensing process may result in further operating restrictions on noise, parking, hours of operation. Likewise, some of the concerns noted by DDOT will likely be resolved via the Public Space Committee as I'm not completely clear that a driveway is germane to the special exception for a penthouse restaurant specifically. That said, a neighborhood amenity is a plus, as is the housing fund contribution of, I think \$13,000+.

I believe the Applicant in our last hearing verbally agreed to the TDM plan conditions, although that TDM plan may or may not be relevant to our relief issue and could also be taken up, I believe in the Public Space Committee discussion. That said, I give great weight to the Office of Planning's recommendation for approval. And I do not note the support of ANC5E and the Bloomingdale Civic Association. And I would be prepared to support this application.

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you, Board Member Blake. Board Member Smith?

2.0

MEMBER SMITH: I'll add (audio interference), then I'll be quiet. I do agree with Mr. Blake's analysis of this particular case. I do believe they've met standards for us to be able to grant the special exception. As well as notating the fact that previously when we heard this, the ANC hadn't taken a position on, you know, some of the impacts that would result from the penthouse eating and drinking establishment. We now have those. Kudos to the Applicant for reaching back out to the ANC (audio interference) a set of conditions that I do believe is fairly reasonable.

You know, the only thing that I probably have to say is a very minor thing. A condition about there shall be no heavy bass. What does "heavy" mean? That may be difficult to quantify, but I'll trust that the enforcement powers of the District of Columbia will be able to decipher what that means.

Other than that, I do agree with Board Member Blake that the conditions that were requested by DDOT are not germane to the special exception that we have before us. So I will not recommend incorporating those conditions as well. So with that, I give OP's staff report great weight. Recognizing that the ANC is also in support of this. And I will be in support of the application as well.

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you, Board Member Smith. Chairman Hood.

2.0

Would agree -- I do agree with Board Member Smith about the bass. Because I don't like music without bass, but I understand this is a different issue, the boom, boom. And I'm sure they will regulate that. And I appreciate the ANC reconfirming their support. It looks like all the relief requested has been mitigated. And I would agree with the comments of both my colleagues. Thank you.

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you. So I believe we're all in agreement that the conditions at Exhibit 29 and 30 will be included in the order. There will be no DDOT conditions. And also OP proposed conditions regarding And I don't know -- I don't recall specifically lighting. if those changes were already made in the application, but I'll go ahead -- These are conditions that state that all exterior lighting on the penthouse is to be shielded and pointed downward, which would mitigate the impact of the proposal by ensuring that light is not directed towards neighboring residential properties. Decorative liahtina string lights excluded from such as is condition.

So I don't have a clear recollection that the Applicant stated that the -- that the Applicant was in agreement or that these changes were already made. And so out of an abundance -- out of an abundance of caution, I will

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

1 adopt this condition. And does anyone have any comments on 2 that? No. Okay. So I will then go ahead and make a motion to 3 approve Application No. 20666 as captioned and read by the conditions 5 Secretary with the with respect to noise 6 mitigation included at Exhibit 29 and 30. As well as OP's 7 conditions for lighting, which are stated on Page 1 of OP's that they have not the extent already been And ask for a second, Mr. Blake. included. 10 MEMBER BLAKE: Second. 11 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Mr. Moy, would you please take roll call? 12 13 When I call your name, if you would MR. MOY: please respond with a yes, no, or abstain to the motion made 15 by Vice Chair John to approve the application for the requested relief, including conditions as specified in her 16 motion regarding conditions noted in Exhibits 29 and 30, as 17 18 well as the condition in the OP report regarding exterior This motion was seconded by Mr. Blake. 19 Commission Chair Anthony Hood? 2.0 21 ZC CHAIR HOOD: Yes. 22 Mr. Smith? MR. MOY: 23 MEMBER SMITH: Yes. 24 Mr. Blake? MR. MOY: 25 MEMBER BLAKE: Yes.

1	MR. MOY: Vice Chair John?
2	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Yes.
3	MR. MOY: And before I call the vote count, we do
4	have an absentee ballot from Chairman Hill. And his vote is
5	to approve the application with such conditions as the Board
6	may impose. This would give a resulting vote of 5-0-0. And
7	this is on the motion made by Vice Chair John. The motion
8	to approve was seconded by Mr. Blake. Also in support of the
9	motion to approve Mr. Smith, of course Mr. Blake, Vice Chair
10	John, Chairman Hill, and of course Zoning Commission Chair
11	Anthony Hood. The motion carries, ma'am.
12	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you, Mr. Moy. And
13	let's move on to the next case.
14	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Well, that's it for me. You all
15	have a good day. Thank you.
16	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Oh thank you, Chairman
17	Hood. Have a great day.
18	ZC CHAIR HOOD: Take care.
19	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Now we're joined by Dr.
20	Imamura. Welcome.
21	MR. MOY: Okay. The next case for decision is
22	Application No. 20685 of Oladapo, O-L-A-D-A-P-O Kolawole, K-
23	O-L-A-W-O-L-E. This is a self-certified application for
24	special exceptions pursuant to Subtitle X, Section 901.2 from
25	the rear addition requirements of Subtitle E, Section 205.4,

which is pursuant to Subtitle E, Section 205.5 and Subtitle E, Section 5201. The rooftop and upper floor requirements under Subtitle E, Section 206.1 pursuant to Subtitle E, Section 206.4 and Subtitle E, Section 5207. The property is located in the RF-1 zone at 1933 Second Street NE, Square 3565, Lot 54.

This application was last heard by the Board at its public hearing session on May 11th. Participating on the votes is Chairman Hill, Vice Chair John, Mr. Blake, Mr. Smith, and Zoning Commissioner Dr. Imamura.

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you. So again, I'll go around the room. Would anyone like to start or should I ask for volunteers again? Mr. Smith, would you like to start?

MEMBER SMITH: Sure.

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay.

MEMBER SMITH: So this particular case we heard on May 11th -- This particular case we heard on May 11th, involved two special exceptions. One was to -- the rear addition requirements so that they can build beyond -- 10 feet beyond the real wall of the adjoining residents property because they're proposing to construct out 20 feet. And the rooftop and upper floor requirements of Subtitle E-206.1 because they're proposing to remove the existing mansard roof.

2.0

The proposal as per resultant, I do believe meets the special exception requirements for both. I do believe that -- And some of the concerns that were raised were from the adjacent property owners to the -- to the left of the -of the property in question. And their concerns more so their concerns about the views from property. They're concerned about how this 20 foot extension would affect light, air, and their views to the -- to the south. I will note that the zoning ordinance does not entitle a property owner to a view, but it does entitlement to light and air. I do not believe that this application in question given the orientation of the buildings there would affect the light and air to the apartment.

This property is on a hill, so there topographical difference between these buildings. And given that there is a topographical difference, I don't believe it will affect the light and air to the adjacent property -- all the adjacent properties to the left and right of the -- north and south of this building. So you know, I think it is reasonable for us to continue this case in order to receive additional feedback from the Applicant where it allows them to engage in additional discussion. But I think (audio interference) I think the final submission or discussion, I don't believe changes my position on the fact that I don't believe that it would have a negative impact on light and air

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

to the adjacent properties.

2.0

So I believe that it meets all the standards for us to be able to grant the special exception — the special exception criteria 901.2. I believe that it is largely in harmony with the joint purpose and intent of the zoning regulations. I do not believe it would adversely impact the adjacent properties even though the Applicant is proposing to remove the existing mansard roof. The proposed addition — that additional structural height is set back at a reasonable distance from the front property line as to not affect the character of the public (audio interference).

And I do believe that it meets the general standards and the zoning regulations. And I do not believe that there are any special conditions that we would need to impose on this (audio interference). I will note that the ANC is also recommending approval for this fabrication. And OP is in support of this application. And I will give them great weight and will also support their position on this case (audio interference).

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you, Board Member Smith. Can I go to you, Dr. Imamura?

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Madam Vice Chair. I'm going to try to show some deference here and will defer to Board Member Blake and then I'll go if that's all right.

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: That's all right. Just let me know your preference. Board Member Blake?

MEMBER BLAKE: Thank you, Doc. First of all, I'll say I will be voting in favor of the requested relief based on the record, including the supplemental filings and the testimony at the hearing. I believe that the Applicant has met the criteria for special exemption relief for rear yard addition pursuant to E5201.4 and the criteria relief from the rooftop for upper floor restrictions pursuant to E5207.

The neighbors to the north in the adjoining building expressed concerns about the loss of light and the loss of views of the city resulting from the proposed addition. I believe that the Applicant has demonstrated that the project will not substantially adversely affect the use or enjoyment of the abutting property or dwelling in regards to light, air, privacy, or visual intrusion. The shadow studies and the design and the orientation, the Applicant has demonstrated that neither the addition or the removal of the mansard would have an impact on the light and air available to the neighboring properties.

And of course as Board Member Smith pointed out and as Chairman Hood always points out, views are not protected. And I do understand -- I'm very familiar with this neighborhood. It is on a hill and there are some very, very attractive views that come out of this location. But

2.0

those views are not protected. The design and masting is consistent with the neighborhood's scale and patterns of buildings along the street.

The RF-1 zone permits row buildings of multiple dwellings and units and would allow for two additional units to be added to the building. On the north side, the addition would only extend 10 feet, which is permitted by right. And again, the Applicant's sun study showed that the neighbor's sunlight should not be significantly impacted. So having said that, I will give great weight to the Office of Planning report. Note that ANC5E is in support. They heard this and gave us the supplemental report, which said they had no significant objections during the meeting. DDOT has no objection. I'll be in favor of the Applicant -- voting in favor of the application.

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you. Thank you, Board Member Blake. So I don't really have a lot to add to what's been said so far. And I in general agree with everything that Board Member Smith and Board Member Blake have said, especially with respect to the neighbor on the north side at 1937 Second Street where the addition is only 10 feet, which is within the matter of right allowance.

So again, views are not protected even though there will be some loss of views on that side from the 10 foot addition. And I agree that there is no significant

2.0

impact on light and air. And privacy, there are no windows on the sides of the addition. And even after the addition, the rear yard would be 55 feet. So I am generally in support of the application and I associate myself with the comments that have been made so far. Dr. Imamura?

COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Madam Vice And I'm in agreement with everything that's been said I do want to acknowledge the opposition parties statement about sort of light, air, and views. As stated by Board Member Blake and Board Member Smith, the views are not protected. I think there's -- they provided a compelling document in Exhibit 52 with the exception on Page 7 that shows the height of the sun actually in view of one of the units there. I really struggled with this and I looked at the design and plans carefully. I think here an argument cannot be made against air.

And in terms of light, I think the concern here is the 10 foot expansion beyond the northern property there would put the three units for the property to the north in some shadow, but not complete shadow. So while they may have partially -- well, the direct light may be partially blocked, they will still receive indirect light for the unit. So this was a tough case, but I align myself with my fellow colleagues here. And give great weight to OP and ANC report. I'm prepared to vote in favor.

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you, Dr. Imamura.
2	I agree, it was a tough case in terms of, you know, the
3	impact of the views, but views are not protected. And there
4	is light flowing to the apartments and there's no significant
5	impact. As we all agree, there is some impact, but it's not
6	so significant that we would deny an application for a matter
7	of right extension. And while I sympathize with the persons
8	who live in those apartments, we have to comply with
9	regulations and this is a special exception relief request.
10	And it's not like a variance where the standard is really
11	extraordinarily high.
12	So having said that, I believe we're all in
13	agreement. And so I will make a motion to approve
14	Application No. 20685 as captioned and read by the Secretary.
15	And ask for a second, Mr. Blake?
16	MEMBER BLAKE: Second.
17	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Mr. Moy, would you please
18	take the roll call?
19	MR. MOY: When I call your name, if you would
20	please respond with a yes, no, or abstain to the motion made
21	by Vice Chair John to approve the application for the relief
22	that's requested. The motion to approve was seconded by Mr.
23	Blake. Mr. Smith?
24	MEMBER SMITH: Yes.
25	MR. MOY: Mr. Blake?

1	MEMBER BLAKE: Yes.
2	MR. MOY: Vice Chair John?
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Yes.
4	MR. MOY: Zoning Commissioner Dr. Imamura?
5	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.
6	MR. MOY: And before I give the vote count, Madam
7	Vice Chair, we have an absentee ballot vote from Chairman
8	Hill and his vote is to approve. So that would give a
9	resulting vote count of 5-0-0. And this is on the motion
10	made by Vice Chair John to approve. The motion to approve
11	was seconded by Mr. Blake. Also in support of the motion to
12	approve Mr. Smith, Dr. Imamura, Mr. Blake, Vice Chair John,
13	and Chairman Hill. The motion carries The motion carries
14	on a vote of 5-0-0.
15	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you.
16	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Madam Vice Chair, that does
17	it for me.
18	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay.
19	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: I will turn things over to
20	Commissioner May.
21	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you so much. Have
22	a great day.
23	COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, all.
24	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Bye. Welcome,
25	Commissioner May.

1	COMMISSIONER MAY: Thanks. I'm happy to be here.
2	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: I'm sure. So if
3	everyone's in agreement, we'll take the next two cases and
4	then maybe a five minute break. We're under a time crunch
5	today. So Mr. Moy, could you please call the next case?
6	MR. MOY: All right. To help me, Madam Vice
7	Chair, are the next two cases the party status request
8	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: The expedited review
9	MR. MOY: That's right.
10	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: I believe it's 20722 and
11	then 20727.
12	MR. MOY: Yes, great. Thank you. I just wanted
13	to double check.
14	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you.
15	MR. MOY: All right. The first of the two
16	expedited review cases. This is Application No. 20722 of
17	Josh and Allison Dunning. This is as amended self-certified
18	application for a special exception pursuant to Subtitle D,
19	Section 52201 and Subtitle X, Section 901.2 from the lot
20	occupancy requirements of Subtitle D, Section 304.1 and the
21	pervious surface requirements of Subtitle D, Section 308.1.
22	The property is located in the R-1-B zone at 6101 29th Street
23	NW, Square 2340, Lot 43. That's it for me.
24	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you. Are we ready
25	to deliberate? So I'll go ahead and start. This is a

1	special exception for lot occupancy and for relief from the
2	pervious surface requirements with 45 percent proposed, 48
3	percent existing where a minimum of 50 percent is required.
4	The Applicant is seeking to build an 85 square foot rear
5	addition. And in my view, it is a fairly straight forward
6	application. And the Office of Planning has analyzed how the
7	application meets the requirements and I will give great
8	weight to that analysis. And the Office of Planning has not
9	proposed any special conditions. The ANC is also in support,
10	but apparently there is no official letter from the
11	Applicant, so there's nothing to give great weight to. And
12	DDOT has no objection. So with that, I'm in support of the
13	application.
14	So are there any other comments from any board
15	members?
16	MEMBER BLAKE: No comments.
17	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you.
18	MEMBER SMITH: I would add one thing. The persons
19	in support There were two letters in support; one from the
20	adjacent neighbor as well. And as you said, I would also
21	give great weight to the analysis and recommendation of the
22	Office of Planning and I would be prepared to support as
23	well.
24	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you. Any other
25	comments? Okay. So I will make a motion to approve

1	Application 20722 as captioned and read by the Secretary.
2	And ask for a second, Mr. Blake?
3	MEMBER BLAKE: Second.
4	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Mr. Moy, would you please
5	take the roll call?
6	MR. MOY: When I call your name, if you would
7	please respond with a yes, no, or abstain to the motion made
8	by Vice Chair John to approve the application relief for
9	the relief requested. The motion to approve was seconded by
10	Mr. Blake. Mr. Smith?
11	MEMBER SMITH: Yes.
12	MR. MOY: Mr. Blake?
13	MEMBER BLAKE: Yes.
14	MR. MOY: Vice Chair John?
15	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Yes.
16	MR. MOY: Zoning Commissioner Peter May?
17	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
18	MR. MOY: And we have a board member not
19	participating. The staff would record the vote as 4-0-1.
20	And this is on the motion made by Vice Chair John to approve.
21	The motion to approve was seconded by Mr. Blake. Also in
22	support of the motion to approve Mr. Smith, Zoning
23	Commissioner Peter May, and of course Mr. Blake and Vice
24	Chair John. No other votes. The motion carries on a vote
25	of 4-0-1.

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you, Mr. Moy. So please go ahead and call the next case, Mr. Moy, which I believe is 20727.

MR. MOY: Thank you, yes. So case Application No. 20727 of Robert Bernstein and Bryant Hudson. This is a selfcertified application for a special exception. Pursuant to Subtitle E, Section 205.5, Subtitle E, Section 5201 and Subtitle X, Section 901.2. This is from the rear addition requirements of Subtitle Ε, Section 205.4, rear yard requirement of Subtitle E, Section 306.1. And finally, the lot occupancy requirement of Subtitle E, Section 304.1.

The property is located in the RF-1 zone at 1208 Euclid
Street NW, Square 2865, Lot 79.

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you, Mr. Moy. So this is another quite straight forward application. And I wonder if Mr. May -- Commissioner May, if you'd like to start the discussion? If not, I can go ahead.

COMMISSIONER Well, Ι MAY: the can start discussion, but don't have much to say. Yes, it's verv I think the facts in the case are clear. straight forward. And the Office of Planning's support, the ANC's support, and the adjacent property owners are all in support. pretty minor request. I mean the pergola component of this is a little bit odd because of the side sections of it. you know, that's -- I think that's secondary to the overall

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

1 case. And I don't see any problem granting relief. 2 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you. Mr. Smith? 3 MEMBER SMITH: I agree with both of you. it's a fairly straight forward request and a very reasonable 5 one as well. Just as Mr. May stated, all the adjacent property owners are in support of this particular case. 6 7 would note that many properties along Euclid or Benning Square will have a similar system over their rear yards. I do not believe it would, you know, impact the light and 9 privacy of adjacent properties, especially if they're all in 10 11 support of this particular case. And also, I would note that 12 OPM, you know, did a very thorough analysis of this case. And they are also recommending approval. 13 So I do agree with their analysis that they've met the standard and will support the application. 15 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you. Board Member 16 17 Blake? 18 MEMBER BLAKE: The statements that you guys have made up to this point give great weight to the Office of 19 Planning's analysis and recommendation for approval. 2.0 I'11 21 be voting in favor of the application. 22 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you. And Mr. Moy, 23 ahead and make a motion to I'm aoina to qo Application 20727 as captioned and read by the Secretary. 24 25 And ask for a second, Mr. Blake?

1	MEMBER BLAKE: Second.
2	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Would you take the roll
3	call please, Mr. Moy?
4	MR. MOY: Yes. Thank you, Madam Vice Chair. When
5	I call your name, if you would if you would please respond
6	with a yes, no, or abstain to the motion made by Vice Chair
7	John to approve the self-certified application for relief.
8	This motion was seconded by Mr. Blake. Mr. Smith?
9	MEMBER SMITH: Yes.
10	MR. MOY: Mr. Blake?
11	MEMBER BLAKE: Yes.
12	MR. MOY: Vice Chair John?
13	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Yes.
14	MR. MOY: Zoning Commissioner Peter May?
15	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
16	MR. MOY: And we have a board member not
17	participating today. The staff would record the vote as 4-0-
18	1. And this is on the motion made by Vice Chair John to
19	approve. The motion to approve was seconded by Mr. Blake.
20	Also in support of the motion to approve, Mr. Smith, Mr.
21	Blake, Vice Chair John, and Zoning Commissioner Peter May.
22	A member not participating. The motion carries 4-0-1.
23	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you, Mr. Moy. It
24	is now 10:37. And is everyone ready for a quick five-minute
25	break? I am. Can we take a quick five-minute break? Okay,

we'll be back at 10:45.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 10:38 a.m. and resumed at 10:50 a.m.)

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay, I believe we're all here. And the next case is 20636.

MR. MOY: Yes, thank you. The Board has returned to its session -- its meeting session actually. And the time is at or about 10:50 a.m.

The next Board action is to a request for advanced This is to Application No. 20636 of Penguin, party status. For the record, this is a self-certified application LLC. for a special exception pursuant to Subtitle C, Section 305.1 901.2. Subtitle X, Section From the subdivision requirements -- rather regulations of Subtitle C, Section 302.1, area variance pursuant to Subtitle X, Section 1002. From the vehicular ingress and egress requirements, Subtitle C, Section 305.3B. The property is located in the RA-1 zone at 4509 Foxhall Crescent NW, Square 1397, Lot 960.

Again, this is a request for advanced party status. The scheduled hearing on the merits of this case is scheduled for June 15th. Other than that, Madam Chair, with regards to preliminary, there is an Applicant's motion to deny party status request from John Fox that was submitted within the 24-hour block, as well as a corrected second request for party status, as well as a corrected Certificate

1	of Service from John Fox. And from the Applicant, I believe
2	there's a motion to deny the request for party status from
3	a John Fox. And of course, as the Board is aware, there's
4	a request for party status from Mr. Andrew Wong and a Jody
5	Westby, W-E-S-T-B-Y in Exhibit 37. So that's before you,
6	Madam Vice Chair.
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you. Mr. Young, is
8	Mr. Wong present? I see Ms. Westby.
9	MR. YOUNG: I don't see Ms. Giordano and then
10	calling out on the phone is Mr. John Fox.
11	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay. And could you let
12	Ms. Giordano in please? Ms. Giordano, can you hear me?
13	MS. GIORDANO: Good morning.
14	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay. Yes, good morning.
15	And please remind me who you're representing.
16	MS. GIORDANO: I represent the Applicant.
17	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay.
18	MS. GIORDANO: And I made a motion to allow a late
19	filing yesterday morning. It's in response to the filing of
20	Mr. Fox, which was made the previous evening around 9:30 p.m.
21	So that was the earliest opportunity that I could respond.
22	I would ask the Board to admit it.
23	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you. So under the
24	Board's procedures, we don't normally take testimony at the
25	decision meetings. However, the party requesters need to be

1	present. So I understand that Mr. Wong is present and Ms.
2	Westby is also present.
3	COMMISSIONER MAY: I don't see Mr. Wong. But I
4	see I understand from what Paul said that Mr. Fox was
5	calling in.
6	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Mr. Fox is calling in?
7	Okay. So who is missing?
8	COMMISSIONER MAY: Wong.
9	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Mr. Wong. Mr. Fox, can
10	you hear me? Mr. Fox, your microphone is muted.
11	MR. FOX: Now do you hear me, Madam Chair?
12	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Yes. Is this Mr. Fox?
L3	MR. FOX: Thank you. I was pressing the pound
L4	key, not the star key.
L5	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay. I still don't see
L6	Mr. Wong. Is he in the waiting room, Mr. Young?
L7	MR. YOUNG: Mr. Wong?
18	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay. So I will give him
L9	a couple of minutes. If he is not present, then his
20	application under the regulations is deemed abandoned or
21	withdrawn. So I will Well why don't we do this. Let's
22	take the next case to see if Mr. Wong shows up.
23	MR. FOX: I have
24	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Hello? Is someone
25	speaking?

1	COMMISSIONER MAY: That was Mr. Fox, but he's now
2	muted.
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay. Mr. Young, can we
4	move to the next case and we'll see if Mr. Wong shows up?
5	I believe
6	MR. FOX: I believe Mr. Wong will not be showing
7	up.
8	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Well, we'll take the next
9	case. So Mr. Young, please excuse the parties in this case.
10	And Mr. Moy, would you please call the next case, 20636? And
11	if Mr. Young is not present, then we will assume he's
12	withdrawn his request.
13	MR. MOY: Unless I miss something, there's also
14	the issue of the late filings that I mentioned earlier. Were
15	you allowing those into the record?
16	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: I will take that up when
17	we call the case again if that's okay.
18	MR. MOY: Sure, of course.
19	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you.
20	MR. MOY: Sorry, I didn't mean to step on your
21	toes. I just wanted to be sure you had not forgotten.
22	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Right. Thank you.
23	MR. MOY: So let's see, where are we? Okay. So
24	jumping to the next advanced party status consideration is
25	Application No. 20743 of Shayleen and Robert Thorne. This

is a self-certified application for special exception from the side yard requirement, subtitle D, Section 206.7. Pursuant to Subtitle D, Section 5201 and Subtitle X, Section 901.2. The property is located in the R-16 zone at 1630 Nicholson Street NW, Square 2723 W, Lot 33. And the merits of this application is scheduled for hearing on June 22nd. And let me double check something here. And I believe that's it for me other than the fact that the request for party status and opposition is under exhibit 18, and that's all I have, Madam Vice Chair.

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you. Ms. Ferster, would you please identify yourself for the record?

MS. FERSTER: Good morning, Madam Vice Chair and members of the Board. I'm Andrew Ferster. I am counsel for Maurice Jackson and Laurie Ginsburg who reside at 1628 Nicholson Lane. They are the abutting actual attached to the property owners.

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you. And Ms. any testimony on Board is not taking application. It's a full record and it's fairly straight forward. So if I can start. So under the regulations, the adjacent property owners are presumed to be significantly impacted -- more significantly impacted than the general In its request, the Applicant has described how it public. meets -- in detail, how it meets the specific criteria. And

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

1	I'm inclined to grant this request. Does anyone have any
2	comments? No, no one? Okay.
3	So I will make a motion to grant party status to
4	Mr. Jackson and Ms. Ginsburg. And ask for a second, Mr.
5	Blake?
6	MEMBER BLAKE: Second.
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Mr. Moy, would you please
8	take the roll call?
9	MR. MOY: When I call your name, if you would
10	please respond with a yes, no, or abstain to the motion made
11	by Vice Chair John to grant party status request.
12	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you.
13	MR. MOY: And this motion was seconded by Mr.
14	Blake. Zoning Commissioner Peter May?
15	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
16	MR. MOY: Mr. Smith?
17	MEMBER SMITH: Yes.
18	MR. MOY: Mr. Blake?
19	MEMBER BLAKE: Yes.
20	MR. MOY: Vice Chair John?
21	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Yes.
22	MR. MOY: The staff would record the vote as 4-0-1
23	and this is on the motion made by Vice Chair John to grant
24	party status request to Zachary Jackson and Laurie Ginsburg,
25	represented by Andrew Ferster. This motion to grant was

seconded by Mr. Blake. Also in support of the motion is Zoning Commissioner Peter May, Mr. Smith, and of course Mr. Blake, Vice Chair John. No other board members. The motion carries 4-0-1.

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you, Mr. Moy. When you have a minute, please re-call 20636.

MR. MOY: Okay. Returning to Case Application No. 20636 of Penguin, LLC. This is a request for advanced party status. And I'm just going to read Vice Chair that this application is located in the RA-1 zone at 4509 Foxhall Crescent NW, Square 1397, Lot 960.

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Moy. So I see Ms. Giordano is present, Ms. Westby, and Mr. Fox, I believe that's you on the phone. Would you please identify yourself for the record? Mr. Fox?

MR. FOX: This is John Fox. I live at 4504 Foxhall Crescent in the District.

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay, thank you. So as in the last case, the Board will not take testimony on the request for party status. This is a full record. We also have Mr. Moy, several late filings, which if you don't mind, I would like to admit in the record just because I would like to see them and I think the Board might also like to see them. And the first thing is the Applicant's motion to deny party status request from John Fox, which was submitted late.

2.0

1 The corrected second request for party status submitted late. The corrected Certificate of Service from Mr. Fox submitted 2 3 And the Applicant's motion to deny the second party status request for Mr. Fox, also submitted late. So I'll 5 give you a moment to get that in the record, Mr. Moy. MR. MOY: It's being processed. 6 7 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Pardon? It's being processed into the record, 8 MR. MOY: 9 so they'll be in shortly. 10 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: So while I am Okay. 11 waiting on those documents to be admitted to the record, I'll 12 go ahead and rule on the parties -- not rule -- discuss the 13 party status request for Mr. Wong. And under Y404.10, a person requesting party status must be present at the public hearing or meeting at which the request is being considered. 15 However, the attendance of the Applicant or affected ANC at 16 the public meeting is discretionary. Failure of the person 17 or the representative to appear shall be deemed to constitute 18 the withdraw of the party status request. 19 2.0 So the Board has given Mr. Wong two opportunities 21 to be present. And I wanted to hear from the Board any 22 considering his request for on party status withdrawn, which I'm inclined to do. 23 24 COMMISSIONER MAY: I think the rules are pretty

clear that if he's not present --

1	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay.
2	COMMISSIONER MAY: it will be withdrawn. But
3	(audio interference) the next day neighbor, he might have had
4	a good case. So it's unfortunate, but I think it's we
5	should be denying the application for party status.
6	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay. Anyone else? Okay,
7	thank you. This is Yeah, this is unfortunate. So I will
8	make a motion then to consider the party status request of
9	Mr. Wong withdrawn and ask for a second?
10	MEMBER BLAKE: Second.
11	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Mr. Moy, would you please
12	take the roll call? Mr. Moy?
13	MR. MOY: When I call your name, if you would
14	please respond with a yes, no, or abstain to the motion made
15	by Vice Chair John to withdraw the request for party status
16	from a Mr. Andrew Wong. This motion was seconded by Mr.
17	Blake, I believe. Zoning Commissioner Peter May?
18	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
19	MR. MOY: Mr. Smith?
20	MEMBER SMITH: Yes.
21	MR. MOY: Mr. Blake?
22	MEMBER BLAKE: Yes.
23	MR. MOY: Vice Chair John?
24	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Yes.
25	MR. MOY: We have a board member present not

present. The staff would record the vote as 4-0-1 on the motion made by Vice Chair John and seconded by Mr. Blake. Also in support of the motion, Zoning Commissioner Peter May, Mr. Smith, and of course Mr. Blake, and Vice Chair John. There are no other board members. The motion carries, Madam Vice Chair.

Thank you. VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: So the next motion for party status -- Well, before I get there. Has the Board had an opportunity to look at the recently filed documents, which are all late? But we'll just admit them for completeness. So I have reviewed all of the documents submitted by Mr. Fox. And as I read the initial request, this was a request from Mr. Fox in his own capacity, as well President of the Foxhall Crescent Homeowners Association.

So as to his request to represent the Foxhall Homeowners Association, I will note that there's information in the record from the HOA that states that Mr. Fox is no longer authorized to represent the organization as President and a new President has been elected. So unless a board member objects, I'm inclined to deny Mr. Fox's request for party status as the President of the Homeowners Association.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Vice Chair, I think that Fox -- it was a very strange application. It's usually done, something like if somebody is representing the Homeowners

1

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

1 Association, it's very clear that, that's what they're doing. 2 They have authorization to do it. Mr. Fox seemed to make the 3 case that he's doing it personally and in representation of the Homeowners Association. And I think the larger point 5 here is that he is not representing the Homeowners And furthermore, when it 6 Association. comes 7 individual concerns about the property, I do not believe he's uniquely affected and therefore doesn't qualify for party 8 status on that basis either. 9 So I'm inclined to deny the party status request for Mr. Fox. 10 11 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you. I believe he 12 was the President at the time --13 COMMISSIONER MAY: Oh, I agree. 14 (Simultaneous speaking.) 15 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Yeah. So he's no longer the President. Yes, we're in agreement on that, that he's 16 no longer the President, so he's not able to represent the 17 HOA. And I'm inclined to agree with you with respect to his 18 ability to show under the regulation that he meets 19 2.0 criteria for party status. Mr. Fox does not live within the 21 200 mile radius and --22 COMMISSIONER MAY: Feet. 23 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Pardon? 24 200 feet, not miles. COMMISSIONER MAY: 25 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Feet, thank you. Thank

1	you. So I do not believe he can meet the intent of the
2	regulation, which is really quite specific. And in his
3	response to the particular question, Mr. Fox was not able to
4	describe how he would be significantly impacted by the
5	proposed project and more impacted than any other resident
6	in the community. So I'm inclined to deny both Mr. Wong's
7	initial request for party status and his second request for
8	party status. Are there any other comments from any board
9	member as to that last point?
10	MEMBER SMITH: I'll just comment that I think you
11	probably meant Mr. Fox You had said Mr. Wong.
12	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: I'm sorry. I can't hear
13	you, Mr. Smith.
14	MEMBER SMITH: Did you mean Mr. Fox, instead of
14 15	MEMBER SMITH: Did you mean Mr. Fox, instead of Mr. Wong?
15	Mr. Wong?
15 16	Mr. Wong?  VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: No, I meant Mr. Fox.
15 16 17	Mr. Wong?  VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: No, I meant Mr. Fox.  MEMBER SMITH: Okay.
15 16 17 18	Mr. Wong?  VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: No, I meant Mr. Fox.  MEMBER SMITH: Okay.  VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Mr. Fox's request for party
15 16 17 18 19	Mr. Wong?  VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: No, I meant Mr. Fox.  MEMBER SMITH: Okay.  VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Mr. Fox's request for party status.
15 16 17 18 19 20	Mr. Wong?  VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: No, I meant Mr. Fox.  MEMBER SMITH: Okay.  VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Mr. Fox's request for party status.  MEMBER SMITH: Okay.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Mr. Wong?  VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: No, I meant Mr. Fox.  MEMBER SMITH: Okay.  VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Mr. Fox's request for party status.  MEMBER SMITH: Okay.  VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay. Mr. Blake. Okay.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Mr. Wong?  VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: No, I meant Mr. Fox.  MEMBER SMITH: Okay.  VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Mr. Fox's request for party status.  MEMBER SMITH: Okay.  VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay. Mr. Blake. Okay.  So I'm going to pardon?
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Mr. Wong?  VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: No, I meant Mr. Fox.  MEMBER SMITH: Okay.  VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Mr. Fox's request for party status.  MEMBER SMITH: Okay.  VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay. Mr. Blake. Okay.  So I'm going to pardon?  MEMBER BLAKE: No, I'm fine.

1	party status and ask for a second.
2	MEMBER BLAKE: Second.
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Mr. Moy, would you please
4	take the roll call? Mr. Moy?
5	MR. MOY: Yeah, I know. I always have a few
6	seconds lag here. So when I call your name, if you would
7	please respond with a yes, no, or abstain to the motion made
8	by Vice Chair John to deny the first and second requests for
9	party status from Mr. John Fox. This motion was seconded by
10	Mr. Blake. Zoning Commissioner Peter May?
11	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
12	MR. MOY: Mr. Smith?
13	MEMBER SMITH: Yes.
14	MR. MOY: Mr. Blake?
15	MEMBER BLAKE: Yes.
16	MR. MOY: Vice Chair John?
17	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Yes.
18	MR. MOY: (Audio interference). And there is no
19	other board member participating. Staff would record the
20	vote as 4-0-1. And this is on the motion made by Vice Chair
21	John to deny. The motion to deny was seconded by Mr. Blake.
22	Also in support of the motion to deny, Zoning Commissioner
23	Peter May, Mr. Smith, and of course, Mr. Blake and Vice Chair
24	John. No other participating. The motion carries, Madam
25	Vice Chair.

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you. And the next request is a motion -- is the Applicant's motion to deny party status request from John Fox. So Mr. Fox made his request for party status in February and the Applicant did not respond in a timely manner. And therefore, I'm inclined to deny that request, which is moot because Mr. Fox has not been granted party status, but I need to close the loop on that motion.

So the next motion is a motion for party status of the Foxhall Crescent HOA, which is filed by Ms. Westby. And so the new HOA President, Ms. Westby filed a Letter of Representation on March 29, 2022, but did not expressly request party status, which was not expressly stated until April 27th after the initial hearing date of March 2nd. although both requests are not timely, there's good cause to waive the requirement in this case. Mr. Fox submitted a timely request on behalf of the HOA and was the President of the HOA at the time. And so since that request was properly filed on behalf of the HOA, it's my view that the HOA may now substitute another authorized representative to represent it. As a new President and authorized HOA, based on the documents she submitted, I believe Ms. Westby is authorized to be the substitute representative of the HOA's interest. any board member have comments? No.

So I will make another motion to grant party

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

1	status to Ms. Westby a representative of the Foxhall Crescent
2	Homeowner's Association and ask for a second. Mr. Blake?
3	MEMBER BLAKE: Second.
4	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you. Mr. Moy, would
5	you please take the roll call?
6	MR. MOY: When I call your name, if you would
7	please respond with a whether you with a yes, no, or
8	abstain to the motion made by Vice Chair John to grant party
9	status request to Ms. Westby as the President as her role
10	as the President of the HOA. This motion was seconded by Mr.
11	Blake. Zoning Commissioner Peter May?
12	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
13	MR. MOY: Mr. Smith?
14	MEMBER SMITH: Yes.
15	MR. MOY: Mr. Blake?
16	MEMBER BLAKE: Yes.
17	MR. MOY: Vice Chair John?
18	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Yes.
19	MR. MOY: Staff would record the vote as 4-0-1 and
20	this is on the motion made by Vice Chair John to grant. The
21	motion was seconded by Mr. Blake to grant. Also in support
22	of the motion to grant, Zoning Commissioner Peter May, Mr.
23	Smith, and of course Mr. Blake and Vice Chair John. No other
24	board member participating. Motion carries 4-0-1.
25	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you. So I want to

1	say that the Board appreciates the submissions from the
2	neighbors. And would note that although Mr. Fox has not been
3	granted party status, they can all testify as witnesses
4	during the hearing and will be allowed three minutes as
5	individuals.
6	So with that, I think that concludes our decision
7	meeting decision cases, Mr. Moy?
8	MR. MOY: That's correct.
9	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay.
10	(Whereupon, the meeting in the above-entitled
11	matter was concluded at 11:17 a.m.)
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

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

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Public Meeting

Before: DC BZA

Date: 05-25-22

Place: teleconference

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

Court Reporter

near 1 aus 8