GOVERNMENT
OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

+ + + + +

REGULAR PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY MAY 25, 2022

+ + + + +

The Regular Public Hearing of the District of Columbia Board of Zoning Adjustment convened via Video Teleconference, pursuant to notice at 11:17 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:

PETER MAY, Commissioner (NPS)

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

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

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

BRANDICE ELLIOTT CRYSTAL MYERS KAREN THOMAS ELISA VITALE

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PRESENT:

SARAH BAJAJ, ESQ. MARY NAGELHOUT, ESQ.

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

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

Application No. 20'	718 of 9 Ti	ree, LLC .		•	•	•	•	•	•	4
Application No. 20	721 of Phil	lip J. Cros	s.		•	•	•	•	•	8
Application No. 20 and Yunus Arslan				•	•				•	17
Application No. 20	710 of TMT	Services, 1	LLC							28

1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	(11:17 a.m.)
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: We can take one case on
4	the hearing calendar before we take a break for lunch. I
5	believe someone has to leave at noon. So let's see how this
6	goes.
7	MR. MOY: I don't know if it was noon or 2
8	o'clock, but
9	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Well, there's a noon
10	There's a noon break. Someone wants to break at noon.
11	MR. MOY: Oh, okay. Okay.
12	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay.
13	MR. MOY: All right, very well. So the Board is
14	in its public hearing session. The first case, I believe is
15	Application No. 20718 of 9 Tree LLC. This is a self-
16	certified application for special exceptions pursuant to
17	Subtitle F, Section 5220.1 and Subtitle X, Section 901.2 from
18	the court requirements, Subtitle F, Section 202.1, lot
19	occupancy requirement, Subtitle F, Section 304.1. The
20	property is located in the RA-2 zone at 1722 Swann Street NW,
21	Square 152, Lot 91.
22	Madam Vice Chair, the preliminary matter here is
23	that there is a request for party status and opposition firm
24	and Anne Carson under Exhibit 24. And I thought there was
25	also a request for a postponement under Exhibit 31, but

1	correct me if I'm if I'm in error on that point. Thank
2	you.
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you, Mr. Moy. Would
4	you let the parties in please? Is Ms. Pritchard here?
5	MR. PRITCHARD: Mr. Prichard, yes. Good morning.
6	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Mr. Pritchard. Oh, you're
7	on the phone?
8	MR. PRITCHARD: No, I'm on Webex.
9	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay. Are you choosing
10	not to use your video?
11	MR. PRITCHARD: There we go, sorry.
12	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay.
13	MR. PRITCHARD: Wrong camera. Good morning, Madam
14	Vice Chair and members of the Board.
15	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Good morning. And Ms.
16	Ferster, are you on this case?
17	MS. FERSTER: Yes. Good morning, Madam Vice
18	Chair. Andrew Ferster here for requesting party in
19	opposition, Anne Carson.
20	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay, thank you. So I'll
21	go ahead and look at the request for party status before
22	addressing the continuance. So I looked at the application.
23	Let me see if I can find my notes. I believe Ms. Carson is
24	the next door neighbor. And as I mentioned in previous
25	cases, the next door neighbor is presumed to have a
ı	·

have an interest that 1 significant to will be 2 significantly, distinctively, uniquely affected or in 3 character or kind by the opposed zoning action than that of other persons in the general public. So unless any board 5 member objects, I will grant the request for the party status for Ms. Carson. 6 7 COMMISSIONER MAY: No objection. VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay, no objection. 8 9 So now let's look at the request for continuance. Ms. Ferster, the Board will hear from you now. 10 11 MS. FERSTER: Yes, this is Andrea Ferster for Ms. The request actually was filed by the Applicant --12 Carson. 13 (Simultaneous speaking.) 14 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: My apologies. Okay. Mr. 15 MR. PRITCHARD: Pritchard. 16 17 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Pritchard. 18 MR. PRITCHARD: Yes, thank you. 19 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Please go ahead. 2.0 MR. PRITCHARD: Yes, ma'am. That was our request 21 for a postponement. We have been working extensively with 22 Ms. Ferster and her client for some time to address some issues she's raised with our request for BZA relief. 23 been having lots of discussions with her, as well as other 24

neighbors in the community.

25

I think we've made a lot of

1 progress. And our hope is, is that if we get a little more 2 time, we can -- we can satisfy her concerns and hopefully get 3 her to withdraw the party status request with a settlement and a construction management agreement. So as Ms. Ferster indicated, they're supportive 5 of the postponement. 6 And we spoke with Mr. Moy about some 7 potential dates that seem to -- that hopefully are available So we were hoping to reschedule for June -for the Board. 9 June 15th. 10 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay. Thank you, Mr. 11 Pritchard. Mr. Moy, do we have any dates? 12 MR. MOY: Madam Vice Chair, thanks for asking. For your verification, we do have decision cases for June 13 15th. We have seven -- seven cases. Well actually, I would 15 say probably six because one -- will probably be is So I would say for June 15th, we have currently 16 And then for the following week on June 22nd, the 17 six cases. Board has on the docket, six cases as well. So the Board 18 19 could either go as early as June 15th or as late as June 22nd. 2.0 21 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay, let's take June 15th. 22 23 MR. MOY: Very good. 24 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: All right. So the request

to postpone is granted and the case will be heard on June

2 MR. PRITCHARD: Thank you very much. VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you, everyone. Have 3 a great day. Okay, the next case, Mr. Moy, when you get a 5 minute. 6 MR. MOY: This would be Application No. Okay. 7 Phillip J. is a self-certified 20721 of Cross. This application pursuant to Subtitle X, Section 901.2, special exception under Subtitle E, Section 205.5 and Subtitle E, Section 5201 from the rear edition requirements of Subtitle 10 11 E, Section 205.4. The property is located in the RF-1 zone 12 at 3553 Holmead, H-O-L-M-E-A-D Place NW, Square 2828, Lot And I believe that's all I have. 13 Thank you. 14 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you, Mr. Moy. Mr. Young, would you let the parties in please? 15 I see Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Buehler. I believe that's it. 16 please introduce yourself for the record, starting with the 17 18 Applicant? Marty Sullivan with Sullivan and 19 MR. SULLIVAN? Barros on behalf of the Applicant. And with me here as well 2.0 21 is Mr. Buehler, the architect and I think Mr. Cross may be here as well. 22 23 Mr. Buehler, would VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay. you introduce yourself for the record? 25 Mr. Cross? Okay.

1

16th.

1	MR. CROSS: Yes, I'm here.
2	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay. Would you introduce
3	yourself for the record please?
4	MR. CROSS: Yes. My name is Phillip Cross and I'm
5	the Applicant.
6	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: And what is your street
7	address?
8	MR. CROSS: 3553 Holmead Place NW.
9	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay, thank you. Is the
10	ANC here? Okay. There's someone I don't recognize on the
11	screen. Is that Mr. Buehler?
12	MR. BUEHLER: I don't know if you see me.
13	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay, please introduce
14	yourself for the record.
15	MR. BUEHLER: Yes. My name is Shawn Buehler of
16	Bennett Frank McCarthy Architects.
17	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay. And could you give
18	your address as well for the record?
19	MR. BUEHLER: 1400 Spring Street in Silver Spring,
20	Maryland 20910.
21	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you. So Mr.
22	Sullivan, would you tell us a little bit about your case and
23	how it meets the criteria for approval?
24	MR. SULLIVAN: Yes. Thank you, Madam Chair. If
25	Mr. Young could load the Power Point presentation please.

This proposal is for a third-story addition and a three-story rear addition for which 10-foot rule relief is requested.

Next slide please.

The property is in the RF-1 zone. It's currently a two-story single family row building. As noted, it's a 3-story addition at the rear and a third story on top of the existing building. And the existing building extends about 16 -- almost 17 feet past the adjoining neighbor's rear wall, so the building to the south. And the request would be to go a little further than that to the distance of 23 feet past the rear wall of the adjoining neighbor to the south. So 10-foot rule relief is requested. The ANC 1A supported the application 9-0 and the Office of Planning is in support. And I'll turn it over to Mr. Buehler to take the Board through the plans. Shawn.

MR. BUEHLER: Thanks, Marty. Can you go to the next slide please? Next slide please. Here are some photographs that show the existing condition. The house is at the end of its row, so the alley runs along the side of the property. And so we only have one attached neighbor, which you can see in the picture in the top right. It's the only attached neighbor. The picture on the far left shows the back of the property. Go to the next slide please.

And again, just context, a map showing the property at the end of its row at the alley, running both to

2.0

the north and then behind it. Next slide please. This is the before and after site plans, probably the most relevant of the drawings today. The bottom image is the existing site plans showing the building extending 16 foot 10.5 beyond the neighbor to the south. We'd like to replace that smaller bay in the back of the building with a new addition. The total would be 23 feet deep relative to the neighbor to our south. I think we can go to the next slide please.

I'm going to skip existing floor plans. Next slide please. This is showing proposed floor plans with the rear addition for the cellar and first floor. It's an existing two-unit building. The proposed use will also be Next slide please. two units. This shows the top two floors. We are proposing a third floor addition as well. also the depth that we're seeking for the lower That is Next slide please. floors.

There would be a roof deck stepped in from the side along the alley and from the front and rear. Next slide. This shows existing and proposed front elevation with the third floor largely stepped back behind the existing mansard roof. Next slide. Rear elevation again with the third floor. Next slide. This is the alley elevation existing. And then the next slide will show the alley elevation proposed.

And then let's see, next slide should be sections.

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

I'm sorry. This is the side facing our neighbor. So the section cut in this slide is through the neighbor that we are attached to. And then you see our addition toward the right end of the drawing at the rear pushing behind their house. That's the existing condition. And then the next slide will show the proposed exactly. Okay, next slide.

Existing section showing the mansard roof at the And then the next slide shows the proposed with the front. third floor stepping back from that mansard. And then last for me at least, next slide. These show shadow studies. They're somewhat small. But because we are to the north of our only attached neighbor, we're generally not casting shadows on that particular neighbor at all. The drawing here shows the -- the light grey is the shadow for what would be by right, the -- what's existing -- sorry -- the dark or charcoal is showing the shadows of what would be by right. And then the red is showing the shadows that are resulting from the relief proceeding today. So you can see the shadow impact is fairly minimal. And that's, I think, it for me.

MR. SULLIVAN: You can go to the next slide please. So the application meets the general requirements of the RF-1 zone in which 10-foot rule relief is permissible. The third story respects the existing facade and the setback from the mansard roof. Next slide please. Regarding the specific criteria, there is no impact on shade -- light and

1

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

1 air to the property to the south, the adjoining building for which the 10-foot rule relief is requested. And there's no 2 3 windows also on the south facing wall, so no impact privacy. Next slide please. And the addition is set back from the front facade 5 6 and the existing mansard roof to limit its visibility. 7 There's also a number of trees along the block limiting visibility so that the application also complies and as the Office of Planning has opined with the character, scale, and pattern requirement as well. And I think that's it. If the 10 11 Board has any questions. Thank you. 12 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Ms. Elliott. 13 MEMBER BLAKE: For the --14 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Yeah. There was one question I had when I looked at the plans. I know there was 15 a building located across the alley. I just wanted to look 16 at the fenestration and see the alignment of those windows 17 relative to the windows of the building across the alley. 18 19 Could you speak to that? 2.0 MR. BLAKE: You're asking to understand the 21 windows of ours facing north to the alley and how they relate to the building on the opposite side of that alley. 22 23 right? That's correct. 24 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: I know

obviously the face of the alley in the distance.

25

But

Ι

wanted to just verify that the alignment of those windows relative to the ones on that building across the alley.

MR. BLAKE: Can we pull the presentation back up? And I think toward the beginning was the site plans. That might be a good place to start on this response. Perfect, right there. I was hoping we were going to show context across the alley. Let's go -- I'm sorry. Let's go backward one more slide as well. Yeah, that's going to be hard to see without zooming in really far.

My recollection is that the buildings on the other side of the alley shift forward from ours and are not quite as deep as ours. Because the alley to the north of us, the alley heading up to Spring Road is almost aligned with the back of our existing building. So if you go back to the -- if you'd go forward one slide, sorry, to the site plans again. The portion of our building that's proposed shaded, the addition there is roughly where the alley to the north buts into our building. And so I'd have to extend this drawing to show the building to the north of that alley. But given where their alley is positioned, almost their entire building is forward of ours and our addition. I don't know if that helps responds to that question or not.

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay, thank you.

MR. SULLIVAN: Board Member Blake too, looking on street view, I see there's two small windows on the building

2.0

1	across the alley about smack in the middle of that building.
2	So it's kind of limited on their window space on that side.
3	MEMBER BLAKE: Okay. So essentially they would
4	not line up with them at all. Okay, thank you. I don't have
5	any further questions.
6	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay, thank you. Ms.
7	Elliott, would you introduce yourself please and give us your
8	report?
9	MS. ELLIOTT: Yes. Good morning, Madam Chair and
10	members of the Board. I'm Brandice Elliott, representing the
11	Office of Planning for this BZA case, No. 20721. The Office
12	of Planning is recommending approval of the requested relief.
13	We did provide an evaluation of the relief against the
14	special exception criteria. And found that it met all of the
15	criteria. I'll stand on the record of our report, but I'm
16	happy to answer any questions you have.
17	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: So are there any questions
18	from the Board? Any questions from the Applicant?
19	MR. SULLIVAN: No, thank you.
20	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay. Because I don't see
21	the ANC here. Okay. Mr. Young, is there anyone wishing to
22	testify?
23	MR. YOUNG: We do not.
24	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay, thank you. Do you
25	have a closing statement, Mr. Sullivan? I don't believe you

have a rebuttal.

1

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

25

MR. SULLIVAN: No, nothing further. Thank you.

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay, thank you. So I'm going to close the record and the hearing and excuse the parties. Thank you.

So are we ready to deliberate? Who would like to start? Okay. This is really very straight forward. The issue is an additional six foot extension from what is there now. And so I believe the Office of Planning has done a very good job of explaining how the -- how the application meets the criteria for relief under Section X901.2 and 205.5 and Subtitle E 5201.

I believe that the Applicant has shown through the sun studies that there is no significant impact on any adjoining property from this additional six foot extension. And the Office has done a good job of explaining and analyzing the application. I believe that the response to the question of the windows suggests that there should not be an impact on privacy of the property to the north. DDOT has no objection to the application. I believe that the ANC is also in support. And so does anyone have any So then I'll make a motion additional comments? No. Okay. to approve Application 20721 as read -- as captioned and read by the Secretary and ask for a second, Mr. Blake?

MEMBER BLAKE: Second.

1 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Mr. Moy, would you please 2 take the roll call? When I say your name, if you would 3 MR. MOY: please respond with a yes, no, or abstaining to the motion 5 made by Vice Chair John to approve the application for the The motion to approve was seconded relief that's requested. 6 7 Mr. Blake? Vice Chair John? by Mr. Blake. Mr. Smith? 8 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Yes. 9 MR. MOY: Zoning Commissioner Peter May? 10 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. 11 MR. MOY: We have board member а not participating, not present. Staff would record the vote as 12 And this on the motion -- And this is on the motion 13 made by Vice Chair John to approve. The motion to approve was seconded by Mr. Blake. Also in support of the motion to 15 approve, Mr. Smith, Zoning Commissioner Peter May, and of 16 course, Mr. Blake, and Vice Chair John. The motion carries 17 on a vote of 4-0-1. 18 19 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you. I believe we 2.0 can get through one more case before we break for a guick 21 lunch. So Mr. Moy, would you call 20723? 22 MR. MOY: Okay. So before the Board is Case Application No. 20723 of Stephen Mallott and Yunus Arslan, 23 This 24 A-R-S-L-A-N. is a self-certified application for 25 special exception pursuant to Subtitle E, Section 205.5,

1	Subtitle E, Section 5201, and Subtitle X, Section 901.2. And
2	the rear addition requirements, Subtitle E, Section 205.4.
3	The property is located in the RF-1 zone at 109 11th Street
4	SE, Square 968, Lot 822. That's all I have, Madam Vice
5	Chair.
6	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Mr. Kearley, are you
7	representing the Applicant?
8	MR. KEARLEY: (Audio interference.)
9	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Good morning. Good
10	morning. Would you introduce yourself for the record please?
11	MR. KEARLEY: Sure. My name is Gregory Kearley.
12	I'm the managing principal for Inscape Studio architecture
13	firm and representing the client. I just want to point out
L4	that the client is here as well. And they will share
15	whatever other information that you might need from them
L6	during this conversation.
L7	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay, thank you. So he
18	can introduce himself if you need to call him at that time.
L9	MR. KEARLEY: Okay.
20	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay. Would you tell us
21	about your application and describe how the application meets
22	the criteria for relief?
23	MR. KEARLEY: Sure. This is an application for
24	a special exception. And it's the special exception pursuant
25	to the extending further back than 10 feet in an RF-1 zone

district. You're allowed to extend 10 feet further back from your neighbors. We're proposing to extend back 19 feet, so we're asking for a special exception for the 9 feet. And just want to note that there's an existing addition to this structure that's already 19 feet back from the neighbor's property. This is a second story addition, so we're not going back further than what is already existing as a first story addition. This is a second story addition.

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay.

MR. KEARLEY: Okay? So we believe that we meet the criteria for a special exception. The light and air available to the neighboring properties shall not be unduly affected. The additional 9 feet of building length from what is a matter of right of 10 feet will not unduly affect light and air to the neighboring structures -- to the neighbors. And we actually did a sun study, which is in the record that show that. That confirms that we're not creating adverse shadows and affecting the neighbors in a negative manner.

We do not have windows on the side, so we are not interrupting the privacy of our neighbors to the south and to the north. And additionally, together with the rear building view from the street, alley, or other public way shall not substantially visually intrude upon the character, scale, and pattern of the houses. This is not viewed from the front -- from the street. And it's landlocked, so

2.0

there's no alley. So we're not creating an adverse effect of the character from any public spaces.

approved by HPO as approved on the staff level and the consent calendar from HPRB. So Historic has already approved the addition. We have met with the ANC and they unanimously voted to be proponents of this addition. We have a number of letters in support. We have no letters in opposition and no known opposition to the project from the neighbors. Stephen and Yunus both met with the neighbors and have reached out to the neighbors. So we feel that we meet the criteria for the special exception. And we already have approval from HPO, HPRB, and the local ANC.

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Kearley. Does the Board have any questions? No. Thank you. So I'll go to the Office of Planning. Ms. Vitale.

Good morning, Madam Vice Chair and MS. VITALE: members of the Board. Elisa Vitale with the Office of I am sitting in for my colleague, Anne Fothergill. This is for BZA Case 20723. The Office of Planning is recommending approval of the requested special exception to construct an addition that would extend 19 feet beyond the adjoining property to the south. I will rest on the record the staff report, but I'm available to questions. Thank you.

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

1	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you. So Ms. Vitale
2	Ms. Vitale, I just have one quick question. And it might
3	be a typo and this is on Page 3 of the report.
4	MS. VITALE: Okay.
5	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: And I believe the
6	Applicant has not requested any relief for lot occupancy.
7	MS. VITALE: Yes, that is correct. The first
8	floor, it appears is nonconforming with respect to the
9	maximum permitted lot occupancy. Lot occupancy is generally
10	evaluated on a floor by floor basis. The Applicant is
11	proposing a second story addition. That second floor
12	addition would result in a lot occupancy of 40 percent on the
13	second floor, which would be within the 60 percent permitted
14	in the RF-1 zone. And I don't believe the Applicant is
15	requesting lot occupancy relief.
16	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay. So we'll just
17	MR. KEARLEY: And that is correct. We are not
18	requesting relief because we're under
19	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay.
20	MR. KEARLEY: the threshold of the 60 percent
21	significantly. I think we're 40 plus or minus.
22	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Right. Thank you. So
23	we'll just make a note that the report has been amended.
24	MS. VITALE: Correct. I think the recommendation
25	on the first page accurately reflects the relief
ı	I and the second se

1	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay.
2	MS. VITALE: and recommendation.
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: All right, thank you. Are
4	there any other questions from the Board? Does the Applicant
5	have an questions for the Office of Planning?
6	MR. KEARLEY: No. Thank you for your time and
7	efforts.
8	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Mr. Young, is there anyone
9	wishing to testify?
10	MR. YOUNG: Only one witness signed up and that
11	is Barbara Johnson.
12	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay. Would you let the
13	witness in please? Ms. Johnson, can you hear me? Ms.
14	Johnson? Ms. Johnson, can you hear me?
15	MS. JOHNSON: Hi. Hi.
16	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Good morning, Ms. Johnson.
17	MS. JOHNSON: Good morning.
18	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Would you state your name
19	and your address for the record please?
20	MS. JOHNSON: My name is Barbara Johnson. I live
21	at 105 11th Street. I'm a neighbor north of 109.
22	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay, thank you. And
23	you'll have three minutes to give you testimony.
24	MS. JOHNSON: I'm in support of the addition of
25	Stephen and Yunus, our good neighbors. And my concern is

noise and it may not impinge on the decision of the Board. But the noise will be significant, so I'm only requesting that the contractor is very careful about keeping the constraints on the noise, whatever that is and not weekends and just to be really aware of that because it's really difficult living next door.

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay, thank you. And Ms. Johnson, are you talking about during construction? Is that what your concern is?

MS. JOHNSON: Yes. Yes, yes, right.

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you. So I will ask the Applicant, have you discussed with Ms. Johnson how -- made a construction agreement and how you would manage construction during the process?

MR. KEARLEY: We haven't -- myself hasn't as the architect. Ms. Johnson has sent in a letter of support, so I just want to note that. So thank you, Barbara, we appreciate that.

MS. JOHNSON: Sure.

MR. KEARLEY: And I know Stephen and Yunus, they could possibly speak about that. But we will give specific direction to the contractor to first meet with Barbara so we can talk with her about the plans. We will stay within all the guidelines and regulations for DC about noise and starting. There's no plans to do any weekend work. Barbara,

2.0

I know that's a concern of yours. So we will do what is necessary to communicate with Barbara, the schedule for construction and work with her in terms of any mitigation of noise. So I can let Stephen speak more to that if you want the Owner to speak to that. But we will definitely take her concerns into consideration.

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay, thank you. That's your choice. Does the Board wish to hear from Mr. Mallott?

Mr. Mallott, did you have a comment?

MR. MALLOTT: I'm Stephen Mallott, the Owner of -co-owner of 109 11th Street Southeast in Washington DC and
Barbara's neighbor. Thank you, Barbara, for joining. And
I would like to say that we have met with each and every one
of our neighbors who adjoin our property and have full
support to move forward with our project. We've owned the
home since 2009 and have been wonderful neighbors and are
looking forward to the renovations that we can make and move
back in and be good neighbors again.

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay.

MR. MALLOTT: I'm happy to answer any questions you may have.

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay. So can the Board ask you to provide a contact number for Ms. Johnson in case there are any issues during construction? I guess you could just walk next door, but at least --

2.0

	25
1	(Simultaneous speaking.)
2	MR. MALLOTT: Absolutely. Yeah, Ms. Johnson has
3	my cell phone number. She has my partner, Yunus' cell phone
4	number. And we would be happy to provide a contact number
5	with the contractor once we finalize our agreement with him.
6	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay, thank you. So does
7	the Board have any other questions? Thank you. Mr. Young,
8	is there anyone else wishing to testify?
9	MR. YOUNG: No, that's it.
10	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay. So thank you all
11	for your testimony and the Board is going to close the record
12	in the hearing.
13	Are we ready to deliberate? Okay. So I'm going
14	to ask somebody to start. Mr. Blake, is your hand up?
15	MEMBER BLAKE: I will be voting in support of the
16	application. I believe the Applicant has met the criteria
17	for relief pursuant to E5201 and the general standards of
18	X901.2. Based on the information in the record and the
19	testimony at today's hearing, the Applicant certainly has
20	demonstrated that the proposed addition will not have a
21	substantially adverse effect on user enjoyment of the
22	abutting or adjacent properties.
23	From a light and air perspective, their shadow
24	studies demonstrated that there should be no undue impacts.

There will be no windows on the sides proposed for the second

floor addition and the balcony faces the rear yard. Therefore privacy should not be unduly compromised. The addition is not visible from 11th Street Southeast. And I would acknowledge HPO's evaluation of the project's visual continuity.

With the exception of the request for relief, the project meets the other general development standards of the zoning including lot area, lot width, lot occupancy, rear yard, and building height. I give great weight to the report of the Office of Planning and their recommendation. DDOT has no objections. We see the ANC 6B recommends approval and has stated no wishes or concerns. And I would also note the persons supporting, including Ms. Johnson. And I appreciate Applicant's willingness to work with her and to communicate the, you know, management strategies and so forth to work with her and make sure she keeps aware. limit the noise impact and also indicate the other adjacent neighborhood is supporting.

Importantly though, because this is a rear yard addition, I think it's really worth noting CH-- Capitol Hill Restoration Society's support. When I read that, it felt like a glowing support relative to anything they've said in other -- basically read with regard to rear yard expansion. So I would certainly give great -- certainly acknowledge that as well. I would be prepared to support this application.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

1	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you. Mr. Smith?
2	MEMBER SMITH: I really have nothing to add. Mr.
3	Blake profiled, you know, a very thorough analysis of this
4	case and the reasons why I also support. So I will vote
5	(audio interference).
6	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Commissioner May?
7	COMMISSIONER MAY: (Audio interference) in favor.
8	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you. I have nothing
9	to add as well and I'm in support of the application. I
10	thought Mr. Blake did a thorough job. And so I will make a
11	motion to approve Application No. 20723 as captioned and read
12	by the Secretary and ask for a second, Mr. Blake.
13	MEMBER BLAKE: Second.
14	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Mr. Moy, would you please
15	take the roll call?
16	MR. MOY: When I call your name, if you would
17	please response with a yes, no, abstain to the motion made
18	by Vice Chair John to approve the application for the relief
19	that's requested. The motion to approve was seconded by Mr.
20	Blake. Mr. Smith?
21	MEMBER SMITH: Yes.
22	MR. MOY: Mr. Blake?
23	MEMBER BLAKE: Yes.
24	MR. MOY: Vice Chair John?
25	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Yes.

1	MR. MOY: Zoning Commissioner Peter May? There's
2	no other board members participating. Staff would record the
3	vote as 4-0-1. And this is on the motion made by Vice Chair
4	John to approve. The motion to approve was seconded by Mr.
5	Blake. Also in support of the motion to approve, Mr. Smith,
6	Zoning Commissioner Peter May, and of course, Mr. Blake and
7	Vice Chair John. The motion carries on a vote of 4-0-1.
8	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay, thank you. So it
9	is 11:58 and we will break for lunch for 30 minutes. And
10	then if all goes well, we should be out of here before 2:00.
11	We have one more case. Right, Mr. Moy, after lunch?
12	MR. MOY: That's correct.
13	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay. Do I get a medal
14	for this?
15	MR. MOY: Oh, you get more than a medal.
16	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay. Let's reconvene at
17	12:30. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Moy.
18	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the
19	record at 11:59 a.m. and resumed at 12:37 p.m.)
20	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay. Mr. Moy, I think
21	we can get started.
22	MR. MOY: Thank you. I think we're all here. So
23	the Board has returned to its public hearing session after
24	a brief lunch recess. And the time is at or about 12:37 p.m.
25	The next case before the Board is Application No.

20710 of TMT Services, LLC. This application, Madam Chair, has been amended and self-certified as an application for a special exception pursuant to Subtitle X, Section 901.2 per Under Subtitle C, Section 305.1 to allow a the following: theoretical lot subdivision two buildings on a single record lot that's being proposed. Subtitle C, Section 714.3 from the screening requirements of external surface parking of Subtitle C, Section 714.2(a). Under Subtitle U, Section 421 residential development allow new and a apartment development with 21 units in two buildings.

Ι said that this is amended because the application to remove the previous request for area variance from the location requirements for bicycle parking, No. 2 added special exception relief to Subtitle C, Section 714.3 from the parking screening requirements as C-7142(a). And finally, it was added and then it was removed, a request for a variance from the 24 wide driveway requirements under Subtitle C, Section 305.3(b).

I know that's a lot, but I would ask the Applicant to confirm what I just announced. The property is in the RA-1 zone and it is at 2340 Ainger, A-I-N-G-E-R Place, Southeast Square 5740, Lot 349.

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you, Mr. Moy. I see, Ms. Wilson. Would you introduce yourself for the record please?

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

1 MS. WILSON: Hi. Alex Wilson from Sullivan and 2 Barros on behalf of the Applicant in this case. VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: 3 And do you have anyone 4 with you today? 5 MS. WILSON: Yes. Matt Lee is our architect and 6 he is here with us. 7 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay. Do you want to introduce him now, Mr. Lee? 8 9 MR. LEE: Thank you. My name is Matt Lee. I'm the architect and here on behalf of the Applicant. 10 11 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay, thank you. tell us about your application, Ms. Wilson and why you think 12 13 it requires approval? 14 MS. WILSON: Great, thank you. We do have a presentation if Mr. Young could please pull that up. 15 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: 16 Thank you. 17 Could you MS. WILSON: Thank you, Mr. Young. please go to the next page? Thank you. 18 So currently there is an existing single family dwelling on site. 19 It's one of 2.0 the only ones left in the area as the area is primarily made 21 of larger residential developments and apartment up buildings. We are proposing to raise the existing single 23 family dwelling and construct two new apartment buildings, each on their own theoretical lot, although it will remain 24 25 one record lot and the one development without rental units.

The proposed buildings meet all development standards in terms of the yards, lot occupancy, FAR height. And the buildings are well below allowable FAR for an IZ development for this zone.

There will be 21 units total, 13 in Building A, eight in Building B. The units in Building B are flats, so there will be one unit on the cellar and first floor and one unit on the second and third floor. And the units in Building A are set up as row dwellings with two stories. Three of units are IZ units, two in Building A and one in Building B. All IZunits have four bedrooms and bathrooms, as do the majority of the units in general. The non-IZ units are intended to be part of the voucher program. We are also providing 21 parking spaces as it particularly close to any metro station. And the nature of the development is that it's likely to be set up -- it's supposed to be set up like individual homes. So it makes sense in that case to provide new one to one parking ratio.

We submitted a TDM plan as requested by DDOT, as well as responses to other DDOT comments related to the screening and vent parking. That is in Exhibit 24. We were originally seeking a variance for the driveway, but BZA finally confirmed we do not need that relief. That was also submitted to the record and emailed from the Zoning Administrator.

1

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

So at this time, we are seeking only three special exceptions and no variances. The first special exception is for a new residential development in the RA-1 zone. The second is for a theoretical lot subdivision to have two buildings on a single record lot. And the third is for the screening requirements as DCRA told us we need to have internal screening between the building and parking area And I'll explain that in more detail here shortly.

In terms of agency communication, OP is recommending approval. As I mentioned, we've addressed DDOTs concerns with respect to the fencing along Ainger and bike parking on Exhibit 24. Mr. Young, if you could go to the next slide, I'll speak more about our interactions and where we are with the ANC.

our schedule of outreach. So this shows Ι typically direct our staff to reach out multiple times after we file until we get a response from the ANC. In this case, we reached out for over two months. We received a response Unfortunately we do not end up on the April The SMD asked to have a number of meetings before agenda. the full ANC. Of course, we were amenable. We talked to her And then also our architect, Matt Lee met and on the phone. picked her up in-person and walked the site with her and her They really seemed to like the project. I know from experience, this ANC prioritizes on-site past

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

That's one of the reasons we were providing you one to one parking ratio.

After the on-site meeting, she told our architect that she presented it to the ANC in their closed executive meeting in early May, I believe. And then after that, we followed up with the ANC again to ask if we could finally be And they did place us on the May placed on their agenda. something happened that's never 17th agenda. So then happened in the two years I've been doing ANC virtually. attempted to log in with the link provided to us, as well as the on-line link, but neither of the links worked. called and texted the SMD for an hour and no new link was provided. No answers were provided.

So then after the meeting the next day, we learned that the Chairperson did send staff from Sullivan and Barros a followup link at 8:30 that night, but she was not at the meeting. She does not attend the meetings, so unfortunately no one saw that link. In this case, I think it would have been really well received given the previous feedback from the community. And the fact that this is an area of apartment buildings, you know, we've of course followed up with SMD to see if she would be attending today. I'm hoping someone from ANC might be here, so at least we could have a discussion about moving forward or attending again. But we haven't heard back. We will defer to the Board on how it

1

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

would like to handle this. But again, we did present to the SMD and the ANC is well aware of the project. Next slide please.

With respect to the general special Thank you. exception requirements, this clip shows that the variance is predominantly made of up apartment buildings. The proposal will be in character with the surrounding area and conforms to all development standards. Next slide please. criteria for U-421 relief and theoretical lot relief for They're primarily directed to agencies relatively similar. to provide comments or for us to provide materials. In this case, all relevant materials have been submitted. And the project has been reviewed by the relevant agencies. either recommending approval or no objection in DDOTs case. And then the Applicant provided the detailed statement in response to DDOT comments. And the TDM plan has been submitted to the record as well. Next slide please.

I'll briefly flip through the slides for theoretical lot relief. It's pretty lengthy. They're primarily directives as to what materials we should submit and how to measure yards and height. And in this case, we meet all the side and rear yard requirements and we are meeting all the development standards. Next slide please.

We have provided the relevant information and materials required by C-305.4. Next slide please. Thank

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

you. And so finally, in terms of the theoretical lot relief, the proposed project will comply with the substantive intent and purpose of this title and will not have an adverse effect on the present character or future development of the neighborhood, which is already primarily large apartment buildings. Next slide please.

Thank you. So in terms of this screening relief, there is a bit of confusion with DDOT. So I want to make sure the record is clear on what we're asking for and why. We had a PDRM with DCRA and the reviewer said we needed to provide screening between our parking area and the sidewalk. So where the red lines are shown on this diagram. I tried to push back a bit with the reviewer as I know DCRA does not consistently enforce interior screening like this. quess if you read C-714.2(a) strictly, coupled with the definition of surface parking area, one could argue we would interior screening need based on that reading or interpretation of the zoning regulations. this So is probably not what was intended, but I know DCRA said they would enforce it this way for the project. And it's already on their radar, so we are seeking relief so that we don't have to put a fence on top of the sidewalk essentially.

We are still providing the normal screening you would expect along Ainger Place and the sidewalk line that's shown in green. And the request is so we don't have to cut

1

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

off egress from the surface parking area to the sidewalks next to the building. If you go to the next slide, it shows the 3D. Thank you. So this is a rough idea of where DCRA said the required screening would need to go on top of this sidewalk area next to or surrounding the surface parking area. And so of course the issue with this is that instead of walking to your car, you'd have to exist through gaps that are only allowed every 20 feet. That would also shrink the egress path or eliminate landscaping and it would create an unsafe condition essentially. So we are asking that we don't have to provide a fence on top of the sidewalk. Next slide please.

In terms of the criteria for relief, the Board can consider any number of the following. Reviewing the most applicable sections, a strict enforcement of the rule would mean that the driveway and parking area would have to have a fence around it, which would impede egress by increasing the distance between residents parking spaces and their respective homes. It could create a dangerous situation where residents would have to walk much further through a parking area to go around a fence through an opening and get to their respective front doors.

There will be appropriate screening along public ways, which was assuming that was the intent of the regulations. The Applicants will have a fence between the

2.0

parking area and adjacent property to the east and southeast and a fence on Ainger. And this will ensure safer traffic conditions on site and appropriate walking paths.

And with that, I'll turn it over to Matt Lee to briefly walk through the plans. And then we're happy to answer any questions.

MR. LEE: Next slide please. Thank you, Alex for going through all that. As Alex mentioned, we have two buildings, 13 units in the front, consisting of two level units exiting on grade. OP asked us to make a couple of accommodations in the design. We've got everyone exiting out through the parking lot. We've rotated that so that the two units are facing Ainger Place in the front, so that there's more of a sense of entry as you come into the site. In the rear building is three stories with the cellar. Those are two-story units, but they are stacked like Alex mentioned. Next slide please.

Let's go one more please, Mr. Moy. It's a highly repetitive view. They are bar units. But you can start to see here, we have IZ units scattered throughout in blue. The orange is the standard unit. Each building was asked to accommodate the bike parking. So the rear building, Building B that had the eight units, one of those units accommodates the bike room in the cellar level access from the exterior. And there's a small cellar level in the front 13-unit

2.0

building to provide bike parking. Next slide please.

Here's a good overview in the bottom left. You can see the diagram of Building A and Building B. Again, this is just kind of locating some site features and things in the parking level -- parking accommodations, as well as the two buildings. Next slide please. These are a Next. couple of details in here we don't really need. This shows the typical units. Each unit is, it's going to have one bedroom with the master on the main level and then three bedrooms upstairs sharing a bathroom. Next slide please. Next. Next please.

This is the cellar level. Again, very similar Master on main and then down to the bedroom and the cellar level and then up -- and then up -- in the upper You can probably skip two or three, Mr. Moy. levels. going. A lot to document on this one. Bike room detailing. Next slide please. please. Yeah, I think that's probably -- Everybody's gets it. If you have any questions, I'd be happy to answer. Mr. Moy, if you want to skip through the elevations and the color rendering, that would be great. It looks like that might be -- Yep.

We went with our contemporary look that Ms. Watson seemed to be pretty happy with. She was very excited about the parking on site. And this is -- this single family house was used as a daycare, but there's some strange construction

1

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

1	on site. So it will all be torn down and cleaned up. We're
2	adding trying to add a sense of community to this area in
3	a small, kind of pocket neighborhood. We want to put a
4	playground in-between the yards. We're trying to maximize
5	the green space as much as we can, but at the same be
6	sensitive to the parking requests for the area. She was very
7	excited about 21 parking spaces and the amount of green space
8	we were providing. Next slide please.
9	And that's the back building and an aerial shot.
10	And I'll turn it over there.
11	MS. WILSON: Great. Thank you, Matt. I believe
12	the next slide would conclude our presentation. And we're
13	happy to answer any questions. Oh, apologies. I should have
14	cut the plans down a bit, but I always think it's helpful to
15	include the full presentation in case anyone has any specific
16	questions. So I'd be happy to drop this slide. Thank you.
17	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you. Ms. Wilson,
18	how many voucher units were there?
19	MS. WILSON: So there are going to be three IZ
20	units, so the rest will be voucher units
21	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay.
22	MS. WILSON: so 18.
23	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay, thank you. Are
24	there any other questions from the Board? Okay. First I'll
25	go from left to right. Commissioner May?

1 COMMISSIONER MAY: A couple questions about the 2 bike parking situation. So the main building, Building A, It's six or seven steps down on the 3 I can understand that. cellar level below those units. Right? 5 MR. LEE: Correct. COMMISSIONER MAY: All right. But then how does 6 7 it work in Building B? Because it seems to be cutting into the space of that unit. 8 9 It does cut into the space of that unit. MR. LEE: So we've accommodated that one unit to have a three bedroom 10 11 configuration because of the bike parking. We worked with OP, with Alex and a couple other people, to try to remove 12 these requirements. They would 13 of consolidate the bike parking into Building A. They held steady about it being in the --15 I'm not asking that. 16 COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. 17 MR. LEE: Oh, I'm sorry. 18 COMMISSIONER MAY: I mean I want you to have the 19 bike parking the way it is according to regulations. 2.0 what you provided, it's not great. I mean having to drag 21 your bike downstairs to get to a cellar level to park your bike is not great, but I guess it's technically compliant. 22 My real question is just, I didn't see where that three-unit 23 was -- three bedroom unit was reflected in the plans. Am I 24

Is there a drawing somewhere that shows that

missing that?

1	in the plans other than the overall?
2	MR. LEE: There should be. I can't give you a
3	sheet number off the top of my head. I don't have the We
4	have enlarged plans that show that, but yes, it's called for
5	in the plans. We have an exterior closet for all intents and
6	purposes for the bikes.
7	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. Well if you if you
8	have a moment to take a look through your plans to see where
9	you show that plan. Because again, I don't see it any of the
10	unit plans. I only see it in the overall building plan,
11	which doesn't show the floor plans and units.
12	(Simultaneous speaking.)
13	MR. LEE: Right. We added that last minute, so
14	we might not have done a blow-up plan for that exact unit,
15	but we're happy to provide. We'll need to do it eventually
16	anyway. But we're happy to provide it if that's
17	(Simultaneous speaking.)
18	COMMISSIONER MAY: So you don't think there
19	actually is one in your set?
20	MR. LEE: There might not be. I don't have it in
21	front of me, but there not might be. But I can get that to
22	you if you'd like to see that specifically.
23	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. Well, we'll see where
24	this goes. Thank you. That's it for me.
25	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you. Board Member

Smith?

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

MEMBER SMITH: The screening requirement for (audio interference) special exception. On your discussions with the Zoning Administrator, could you have met this requirement by putting landscaping within the landscape strip between the (audio interference). Could you elaborate on that?

Yeah. MS. WILSON: So I've had а couple specific discussions about this requirement with this particular zoning reviewer on other projects too. And so he told us unequivocally we needed to have this screening right That landscaping like next to the there on the fence. I'm a little confused about the building wouldn't comply. screening requirement and DCRA's position on it, but at this point, that's where we've landed with them. And I mean, I spent two months arguing with them on another project and we ended up in the same position. So just out of an abundance of caution, we are seeking that relief.

MEMBER SMITH: This seems very odd to me, but you know, that's DCRA's interpretation (audio interference) with an abundance of caution. So that was my only question.

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Board member Blake?

MEMBER BLAKE: A little bit with regard to the theoretical subdivision. In developing this lot, you chose for what reason to use that to develop the lot, as opposed

1	to another mechanism? Just I want to get a
2	(Simultaneous speaking.)
3	MS. WILSON: Yeah. Sure. So the other option would
4	have been to do record lots. So how the theoretical lots are
5	set up now, the back one wouldn't be able to get we would
6	not be able to convert that to a record lot without relief
7	because there's no lot frontage. So I guess I mean we
8	could have You need 30 feet of lot frontage to do an
9	apartment. It just got a little too complex. I mean we did
10	do this due diligence at the earlier stages because obviously
11	it's always better if you can do it in a matter of right way.
12	But I think for permitting, this is also the easiest way to
13	go about it, rather than to create two record lots where you
14	have a parking lot in front of one and then the building in
15	the back.
16	MEMBER BLAKE: Okay, thank you.
17	MR. LEE: Real quick, Mr. Moy, A205(b) had the
18	enlarged plan on that.
19	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: It's Mr. Young.
20	MR. LEE: Sorry, Mr. Young. I thought Mr. Moy was
21	asking May was asking about the plan.
22	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Mr. Young, would you mind
23	pulling up that slide?
24	COMMISSIONER MAY: Thank you.
25	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: All right, thank you.
I	I and the second se

1 Does the Board have any other questions? So I'll go to the 2 Office of Planning. 3 MS. MYERS: Crystal Myers with the Office of Planning. We are recommending support of this case. stand on the record of the staff report. I'll just note that 5 6 the Applicant is no longer doing the area variance as they've 7 discussed, so that portion of our report, is not applicable any more. But other than that, the report -- we stand on the record of the staff report and recommend approval. And that's all I have. 10 11 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay, thank you. Does the Board have any questions? Mr. Blake, is your hand up? 12 Could you talk to me 13 MEMBER BLAKE: Yes, it is. a little bit about the intent of the screening requirement as you understand it? 15 MS. MYERS: I believe the intent is just to provide 16 safer environment. 17 kind οf а But Ι mean the actual interpretation of it is up to DCRA, so we defer to them on 18 that. The Office of Planning just responds to the relief 19 being requested. But the reading of it, that's DCRA. 2.0 21 understanding of that section is that it's really more about 22 safety. 23 CHAIRPERSON other VICE JOHN: Okav. Anv Does the Applicant have any questions for the 24 25 Office of Planning? Thank you. Mr. Young, is there anyone

1	wishing to testify?
2	MR. YOUNG: We do not.
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Ms. Wilson, do you have
4	any closing comments?
5	MS. WILSON: No, thank you.
6	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay. So I wanted to go
7	to the Board here before I close the record. So the
8	Applicant has tried to reach out to the ANC. Is the Board
9	interested in hearing from the ANC or making another
10	asking the Applicant to make another effort to present to the
11	ANC? I have no preference.
12	COMMISSIONER MAY: The Applicant has made a good
13	faith effort and there has been some discussion. And I don't
14	think it's the community or the Board, certainly not the
15	Applicant are going to be well served by extending this
16	process for the sake of getting an ANC report. It's very
17	clearly This sort of building is very clearly appropriate
18	in this context and the constraints of the property are such
19	that the relief that they're asking for is necessary. So I
20	would have no problem with preceding with the ANC report.
21	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you, Commissioner
22	May. Mr. Blake?
23	MEMBER BLAKE: I'll defer to the commissioners.
24	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Mr. Smith? Okay. And
25	likewise, I believe the Applicant has made a good faith

1 effort to reach out to the ANC and actually met with the SMD. 2 So I'm satisfied with not requiring the Applicant to make 3 another effort. So at this time, I'll excuse everyone. you have nothing more to say, Ms. Wilson, we'll just go ahead Thank you, all. Have a great day. 5 and close the record. I'll wait. 6 So are we ready to deliberate? 7 Are we ready to deliberate? Is anyone going to volunteer? Commissioner May, you have not volunteered all day. 8 9 COMMISSIONER MAY: It's been very straightforward day (audio interference). 10 11 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay. 12 COMMISSIONER MAY: It's not the most complicated 13 thing because (audio interference). I think I've pretty much made the argument for it in --15 VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Oh, okay. COMMISSIONER MAY: -- the ANC. The building, you 16 The plans make sense. 17 know, makes sense. The way they're 18 proposing to develop it, the site makes sense. The relief seems to be necessary in order to achieve this. 19 know, the project seems to be pretty well designed. 2.0 21 I don't love having such a huge parking lot, but I don't know

that there's any other way to configure the site with a more

efficient parking lot. And I don't think that that it (audio

interference). I understand that the neighborhood is such

that the folks want to have those parking lots on site and

22

23

24

we don't have a regulation that says you can't have a parking lot that big. So there are things I like about the project. Things to maybe not love about the project. But when it comes to the request for us, I don't see any reason why we should not grant the relief requested.

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you. Mr. Blake?

I agree that the -- I'll be voting MEMBER BLAKE: in favor of the application. I do think the Applicant has met the burden of proof to receive relief for what they've I do think it's important to have the parking spaces. And I think that the configuration that they've come up makes The safety issue, I do think there is pedestrian that work. And it would be nice to see safety that comes in here. something in maybe those flower boxes to kind of, you know, shifted how people came out. The randomness of people walking to the street always concerns me. But I think -- and not walking into the driveway as they try to go back and And you know, it would be nice to have some type of forth. separation there between that and the actual driveway.

But I think that, you know, it makes sense. And I appreciate the Applicant's effort to reach the ANC. I'm disappointed that they didn't get some feedback from them because I always enjoy having that information. But I do acknowledge that there's no opposition from any members of the community on record. So I'm going to be prepared to

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

support the application.

1

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you. Mr. Smith? I agree with the testimony that has MEMBER SMITH: been provided thus far. I do believe that the Applicant met (audio interference) burden of proof the special exceptions. And I think they are fairly reasonable requests, even though I have questions about that interpretation. About the landscaping requirement given the Zoning's animus position on that, I think it is reasonable to grant that

request given the narrow nature of the site.

As far as the parking, I do -- I agree with Mr. Blake. think it is important to have, you The location of the parking multimodal transit options. doesn't offend me. Where this development would be located is not -- it is not near the -- the way it profiles to the I think the closest one is probably on Naylor metro station. Road, which is still fairly far away. So I think it is reasonable expectation that many of the residents that maybe But the property is adjacent to some major would drive. metro bus lines in the area, as well as they will be divided some by apartments if any residents choose to commute via So with that, I (audio interference).

VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Okay, thank you. I was looking to see if we had anything from DDOT and we do. And I believe it is no objection. And --

1	(Simultaneous speaking.)
2	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: I'm sorry. Is someone
3	speaking?
4	COMMISSIONER MAY: I'm sorry. I just wanted to
5	say they did cite a couple of concerns, but I think the
6	Applicant has addressed those.
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Right. Okay. And that
8	was largely relating to the landscaping and the fence. Okay.
9	And I also am going to give great weight to the analysis and
10	the recommendation of the Office of Planning. Because I
11	think the Office of Planning did a good job of explaining how
12	the criteria meets how the application meets the criteria
13	for relief under Section 305.3 and 714.3 and U421.1. And so
14	I'm also in support of the application. And I will make a
15	motion to approve Application No. 20710 as captioned and read
16	by the Secretary. And ask for a second, Mr. Blake.
17	MEMBER BLAKE: Second.
18	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Mr. Moy, would you please
19	take roll call?
20	MR. MOY: When I call your name, if you would
21	please respond with a yes, no, or abstain to the motion made
22	by Vice Chair John to approve the application for the amended
23	relief requested. This motion was seconded by Mr. Blake. Mr.
24	Smith?
25	MEMBER SMITH: Yes.
ļ	

1	MR. MOY: Mr. Blake? Vice Chair John?
2	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Yes.
3	MR. MOY: Zoning Commissioner Peter May?
4	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
5	MR. MOY: We have a board member not present and
6	not participating. The staff would record the vote as 4-0-1.
7	And this is on the motion made by Vice Chair John to approve.
8	The motion to approve was seconded by Mr. Blake also in
9	support of the motion, Mr. Smith, Zoning Commissioner Peter
10	May, and of course Mr. Blake and Vice Chair John. The motion
11	carries on a vote of 4-0-1.
12	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you, Mr. Moy. Is
13	that all for us today, Mr. Moy?
14	MR. MOY: That's all there is. Nothing from the
15	staff except to award you the World Cup gold trophy.
16	VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: I accept. So thanks,
17	everyone and have a great afternoon. You have a full
18	
	afternoon left. And the person who had a 2 o'clock hard stop
19	afternoon left. And the person who had a 2 o'clock hard stop is now ahead of schedule.
19 20	
	is now ahead of schedule.
20	is now ahead of schedule. COMMISSIONER MAY: Thank you very much. I
20 21	is now ahead of schedule. COMMISSIONER MAY: Thank you very much. I appreciate it.
20 21 22	is now ahead of schedule. COMMISSIONER MAY: Thank you very much. I appreciate it. VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you so much. Have
20212223	is now ahead of schedule. COMMISSIONER MAY: Thank you very much. I appreciate it. VICE CHAIRPERSON JOHN: Thank you so much. Have a great day. Bye.

<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: 05-25-22

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