GOVERNMENT
OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

+ + + + +

REGULAR PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY

SEPTEMBER 21, 2022

+ + + + +

The Regular Public Hearing of the District of Columbia Board of Zoning Adjustment convened via Videoconference, pursuant to notice at 10:16 a.m. EDT, Frederick L. Hill, Chairperson, presiding.

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

ANTHONY HOOD, Chairperson ROB MILLER, Vice Chairperson

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

CLIFFORD MOY, Secretary
TRACEY W. ROSE, Sr. Zoning Specialist
PAUL YOUNG, Zoning Data Specialist

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

STEPHEN MORDFIN

Г	\bigcirc FFT \bigcirc E	\cap F	THE	ATTORNEY	GENERAL.	PRESENT:

MARY NAGELHOUT, ESQ.

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Regular Public Hearing held on September 21, 2022.

AGENDA

<u>Item</u>	<u>Page</u>
Application No. 20764 of Sukhmohinder Mutneja	
Relief: Special Exception from the rear addition requirements of Subtitle E, Section 205.4, pursuant to Subtitle E, Section 205.5, Subtitle E, Section 5201, and Subtitle X, Section 901.2 Project: To construct a third story, and three-story rear addition with cellar, and convert to a flat, an existing, attached, two-story with cellar, principal dwelling unit in the RF-1 zone. Address: 3224 Sherman Avenue, NW, Square 2845,	
Lot 809. ANC 1A06	4

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

Τ	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	10:16 a.m.
3	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Great. Good morning.
4	Good morning, Chairman Hood. Ms. Rose, if you want to go
5	ahead and call our case, our next case.
6	MS. ROSE: The next case is a limited scope public
7	hearing, Application No. 20764 of Sukhmohinder Mutneja, for
8	a special exception from the rear addition requirements of
9	Subtitle E, Section 205.4, pursuant to Subtitle E, Section
10	205.5, Subtitle E, Section 5201, and Subtitle X, Section
11	901.2 to construct a third story, and three-story rear
12	addition with cellar, and convert to a flat an existing,
13	attached, two-story with cellar, principal dwelling unit in
14	the RF-1 zone at premises 3224 Sherman Avenue, NW, Square
15	2845, Lot 809.
16	And as a preliminary matter, the Applicant has
17	filed final compiled architectural plans that need a waiver
18	of the 24-hour rule.
19	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Mr. duPont, are you there?
20	MR. DUPONT: Yes, sir.
21	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay.
22	MR. DUPONT: Yes, I am here.
23	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Could you introduce
24	yourself for the record, please?
25	MR. DUPONT: My name is Stephen duPont. I'm the

1	architect for the project at 3224 Sherman Avenue, NW.
2	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Mr. duPont, are you
3	choosing not to use your camera?
4	MR. DUPONT: No, I'm just trying to figure it out.
5	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. We'll give you a minute.
6	MR. DUPONT: I'm in a participant. I
7	BZA CHAIR HILL: Oh, there we go. Great.
8	Perfect.
9	MR. DUPONT: You got it?
10	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yep. You're there. Thank you.
11	MR. DUPONT: All right. Thank you.
12	BZA CHAIR HILL: All right. Let's see. So, Mr.
13	duPont, you were here with us before.
14	MR. DUPONT: Yes.
15	BZA CHAIR HILL: Obviously, this is a limited
16	scope hearing on some concerns that the Board had. Could you
17	please let us know what's happened since the last time you
18	were here?
19	(Simultaneous speaking.)
20	BZA CHAIR HILL: Give me one second. Unless the
21	Board has any issues, I'd like to see those final plans. And
22	so I would like to go ahead and allow them into the record.
23	Ms. Rose, if you could ask staff to do so.
24	MS. ROSE: Yes, thank you.
25	BZA CHAIR HILL: And then that's something maybe

we can look at, everyone, while Mr. duPont is explaining to us what happened since the last time he was here. Go ahead, Mr. duPont.

DUPONT: Thank you. I reviewed the code And then I had an idea about how to make this sections. I consulted with Mr. Sullivan. And he was able to work. meet with Mr. LeGrant and show him the solution. Mr. LeGrant agreed that it met the requirements of the code. But Mr. Sullivan wrote me a note recording anything which has been submitted to you. And I also submitted a revised set, revised plan set illustrating the correction.

The correction is a sunroom, a common sunroom between the two units that both units have access to that overlooks the interior, the closed court, at the first floor level. So you have a through passageway both at the first floor level, as the occupants would desire, and also at the cellar level.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. I'm just trying to pull up plans and we have (audio interference) below. While I do so, does the Board have any questions of Mr. duPont? If so, could you please raise your hand?

BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: I have a question about the plat. And I don't know if the plat needs to be amended to show the sunroom as well. But it only shows the cellar level.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

I did not correct the plat. 1 MR. DUPONT: 2 that there even was a plat. And I will be happy to submit 3 a corrected plat. 4 BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you. 5 MR. DUPONT: Since it has not been submitted to DCRA, I hadn't, I didn't remember I had drawn a plat. 6 7 BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. I have a couple other 8 questions, but I can wait for the Chairman. 9 Yeah, no, go ahead, Ms. BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. 10 John, if you're ready. I'm just waiting for this. I'm just 11 waiting for these things to load up. 12 BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: So my question is about the And I looked at those. But I normally like to 13 sun study. see the matter of right option compared to what's proposed. 14 15 I don't know if you had any slides like that. But I didn't 16 see them. So it was --17 MR. DUPONT: I didn't do a, I didn't know you would want a matter of right option. I did do the existing 18 19 condition option. 20 BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Right. But typically in 2.1 terms of looking at whether or not there is any undue impact, 22 particularly on the neighbor to the north, I was not able to 23 understand (audio interference). 24 MR. DUPONT: The neighbor to the south is more

than ten feet past the neighbor to the north.

So a matter

would be basically the 1 same as the condition because the matter of right would not extend past 3 the neighbor to the south. And the neighbor to the south shadow would be most of the impact that's already there. 5 create most of the matter of right impact just as it is. 6 BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: So maybe you can I see. sort of walk me through at least the slide where you think 8 there is the most impact on the neighbor to the north. 9 Well, obviously, MR. DUPONT: it 10 December. And it would be in the morning hours of December. 11 So the --12 BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: What slide is that? I am going there now, sun studies. 13 MR. DUPONT: So, if you look at -- each of the slides is a screen shot. 14 And the last number in the screen shot is the easiest way to find them. So, if you look at page, a file that ends in 59, 16 17 that is at --18 BZA CHAIR HILL: I think 57V as in Victor is the 19 one I think that says December, 7:30, Ms. John. 20 MR. DUPONT: In the, that's in the afternoon, 21 yeah. 22 BZA CHAIR HILL: Oh, that's --23 MR. DUPONT: 59 is in the morning. 24 is later 24 in the morning, like 10:00. 38 is at noon. 57 is at around 4:00 in the afternoon. And 10 is at sunset.

1	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay.
2	MR. DUPONT: I would love to have been able to put
3	these into folders for the month. But I don't really have
4	any way to do that.
5	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: All right. Thank you.
6	That's it for me for now.
7	MR. DUPONT: Thank you.
8	MEMBER BLAKE: Could you clarify which slides
9	you're talking about? I wasn't I didn't follow all that.
10	Which is the slide that you
11	(Simultaneous speaking.)
12	MR. DUPONT: The slides are all screen shots. And
13	they're all time stamped. So the last number is the easiest
14	way to find a slide you're looking for. For the month of
15	December, the slides would be 59, 24, 38, 57, and 10, in that
16	order.
17	BZA CHAIR HILL: Yeah, the timestamp, I don't see
18	the timestamp that you're speaking of. Oh, I see it. Yeah,
19	yeah.
20	MR. DUPONT: That's the name of the file. The
21	file name is and I don't know how they're shown on your
22	screen. In my, on my Mac, the timestamp is the file name.
23	And those numbers are the time that I made the screen shot.
24	So the earliest screen shot was at sunrise. They
25	all say p.m., but that's because, that's the time I was

making the screen shots. So the sequence through the day is 1 59, 24, 38, 57, and 10. And each of the images has the date, 2 3 the timestamp of the day it represents. So, if you're looking at number 10, it's at 4:30 in the afternoon, 5 December. The dates are sort of hidden behind --So while you all are figuring it 6 BZA CHAIR HILL: 7 out, because those shadows had either -- let me see. Commissioner Wray here. 8 Commissioner, can you introduce 9 yourself for the record, please? 10 MR. WRAY: Sorry, there was some confusion about 11 swearing in. Michael Wray, representing ANC 1A. 12 BZA CHAIR HILL: Thanks, Commissioner. 13 Commissioner, can you give us some feedback in terms of your 14 ANC? 15 MR. WRAY: Sure. So, we, of course, reviewed this case once before, and we're in support. The Applicant was 16 17 asked to make some changes, talking about the meaningful connection between the properties. We were able to review 18 19 that change at the committee level, not at the full ANC 20 level, but at the committee. And, obviously, the small 2.1 change made on the interior of the building we do not feel 22 would change in any way what our original vote was in support 23 because it doesn't add to the shadows. 24 So, you know, the ANC remains to be in support. I do know that there are some neighbors that have now come forward with some concerns. I'm sure the Board perhaps will hear from them today. And you can consider that as well. But we have remained in support.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Let's see. Mr. duPont, if you want to mute your line just, I think it's you that has the background, thanks, until we get to you. Thank you.

Does the Board have any questions for the Commissioner? Okay, okay. Go ahead, Mr. Blake.

MEMBER BLAKE: You said there's several people who have recently expressed concerns, which I did see as well in the record recently. Have you met -- you actually have met with most of those people and chatted with them. Do you have any idea of what kind of concerns or issues that they may have? Are they consistent with ones that you initially talked about?

MR. WRAY: Sure. So, to be full, a few of the individuals that have submitted letters did come to our ANC meeting and asked some questions. At that time, they did not identify themselves as being in opposition at the time.

The issues that have been coming forward from the neighbors that we're also getting via email mostly have been about the addition going beyond the property, their own property. So, when you're looking at the neighbor to the south, we're extending I believe it's 19 feet. So their concern has been about rats. And I'm just going to say

2.1

these, because this is what they're saying. It has been about rats. It's been about parking. And it's been about alley access.

Now, the Applicant, at our own meetings, did attempt to address the question about alley access, that their property is not, their project is not impacting the alley. They're not building across the alley, that that is not a concern. You know, we, of course, know at the ANC that when we talk about rats that those are things that they'll have to deal with on the, with the DCRA. And I'm sure the Applicant will probably have an exterminator come in to address that before they start the construction project.

So that kind of leaves the question of shadows. Now, the neighbor to the north, of course, is not -- I'm sorry. No, neighbor to the south, who is in opposition, is not affected by shadow because they're on the side of the building that doesn't receive shadow. The neighbor to the north, who will have the bulk of shadowing, is in support of the project and has sent in a letter saying that they're in support of the project.

So, you know, we did consider shadows as part of the normal course of the ANC. But because the neighbor to the, the most affected neighbor is in support, we remained in support. I hope that helps.

MEMBER BLAKE: It does. Thank you very much. And

2.1

I appreciate the effort that you guys have put in to make 1 sure you understand the community's feelings. 2 Thank you. 3 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Thank you. Let's see. I guess we're having this limited scope hearing. 5 people here to testify apparently, or perhaps we do. So that being the case, I am going to, first, I'm going to actually 6 7 turn to the Office of Planning just for their summary. 8 does anybody have any further questions of the Applicant? 9 Mr. Mordfin, can you give us a summary, Okay. 10 please, or could you introduce yourself for the record first 11 also? 12 MR. MORDFIN: Chair and members of the Board, I'm Stephen Mordfin with the Office of Planning. 13 14 BZA CHAIR HILL: Mr. Mordfin, is there anything you'd like to highlight for the Board? 16 MR. MORDFIN: Well, I was just going to say at 17 this point there is nothing new in this application that would change our evaluation. The Applicant did submit all 18 19 of the shadow studies. They were submitted before. Thev were in a different format. But we still found them, we, the 20 21 Office of Planning, found them in a format that we were able 22 So, and also as the ANC Chairman did state, that to review. the applicant to the north, which is the one that is the most 23 24 affected when you look at the shadow studies.

The Office of Planning is also in support of this

application and continues to be in support of the application 1 subject to our supplemental report that was -- I don't recall 2 what agenda item it is, not agenda item. 3 4 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. Does anybody 5 have any questions of the Office of Planning? 6 BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Just one, Mr. Chairman. 7 Mr. Mordfin, the Board is required to evaluate whether the impact is undue, the shadowing is undue. 8 And it doesn't 9 matter if the neighbor to the north is in agreement. 10 is your idea of whether or not the shadowing on the neighbor 11 of the north is, creates an undue, adverse impact? 12 (Simultaneous speaking.) 13 MR. MORDFIN: I'm sorry. BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: I'm looking at the slide, 14 the December slide, that shows the shadowing from what exists 16 now and what is proposed according to the Applicant's And I wanted to know your thoughts on that. 17 representation. 18 MR. MORDFIN: Okay. That one does show a lot of 19 shadowing on that property to the north. And what the zoning 20 regulations say, it talks about light and air. It doesn't 2.1 actually say shadowing. 22 And then what is undue? And I think undue is 23 something that's personal to a lot of different people. Ιf 24 the applicant to the north I think also doesn't find that

this is an issue, whereas maybe other people might want more

sunlight, some people might not want any shadowing. So I think it's something that's also very personal, which is why we take into consideration when the applicant immediately adjacent is not opposed to an applicant's proposal.

There are, it's not -- it's only certain times in the day that it is in total shade. There are still times of the day during the course of the year when there will be sunlight in that rear yard. It's not going to be in total shadow every day of the year all day long. So that's also something else to consider when we look at it.

It's like how much, and how much shadowing is too much. It is a difficult thing, because, I think also because the zoning regulations say light and air. You're still going to get light. It's not going to be dark. You're still going to get air. The air circulation will still circulate through the interior of that square. So these are the different ways that we look at it when we try to determine is this an undue situation.

BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: So, even if there's substantial shadowing, your position is that there would still be light and air in the winter months, and that condition would not exist throughout the year. So the impact is not undue.

MR. MORDFIN: Correct.

BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. All right. Thank

2.1

1	you.
2	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you, Vice Chair John.
3	Anyone else for the Office of Planning? Okay. Mr. Young,
4	are there people here who wish to testify?
5	MR. YOUNG: They do not.
6	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. Okay. Let's
7	see then. Okay. So does anybody have any final questions
8	of the Applicant
9	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Just one question. And I
10	was trying to figure out the length of the rear yard after
11	the addition. And I calculate it's about 40-something feet.
12	Is that correct?
13	MR. DUPONT: It's around 46 or 47 as I recall.
14	The lot is 120 feet deep, including the 10 foot of the I
15	guess it's an abandoned alley at that point. But since that
16	alley also serves the two neighbors to the north, we would
17	not take that over, that abandoned part of the alley.
18	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Well, that's what I had
19	difficulty understanding, Mr. duPont, why the width of the
20	alley would be included in the rear yard because
21	MR. DUPONT: I don't understand it either, but
22	that's how it is.
23	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Is that how it is in the
24	plat, the existing plat?

I think it is, yeah.

MR. DUPONT:

I'll go take

1	a look at it.
2	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. I just wanted
3	MR. DUPONT: It's just the last three houses that
4	take over the alley. Now, in the plat, it's not. The alley
5	ends at our property line
6	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: That's
7	MR. DUPONT: according to the plat.
8	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. And that and so
9	the length of the rear yard then without the alley, is that
10	40-something feet?
11	MR. DUPONT: Without the alley, but the alley is
12	on our property. But since the other two neighbors use it,
13	we think it would be ill-advised to try to block them out.
14	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. Now I understand.
15	So there is sort of like an easement for the other two
16	properties
17	MR. DUPONT: I think it's a matter of habit. And
18	it probably would be adverse possession or something like
19	that. Who knows?
20	BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Okay. Thank you. That
21	clears it up for me.
22	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. I guess, Mr. duPont, I
23	know that some of my Board members have been having kind of
24	some questions concerning your shadow studies and everything.
25	So I guess I know that you'd come before us and will come

before us again I'm sure. It is a little bit, you know, a 1 struggle, a little bit of a struggle to kind of figure out 2 3 some of the shadow studies. 4 Maybe if there's a way you can do it in the future 5 that, what we have seen before is kind of like a red line or a dashed line that shows, you know, either existing condition 6 7 versus matter of right versus what you're proposing. 8 that that kind of thing has been helpful. And so maybe if 9 you could have those type of things ahead of time for us, it 10 might make it easier for you, just to mention. I will try to do that. I find shadow 11 MR. DUPONT: studies to be very subjective. So I will try to do what you 13 want. 14 BZA CHAIR HILL: Yeah, Mr. duPont, please don't tell me shadow studies are subjective. Like that's what we 16 actually like rely on a lot. So, you know, I don't want to 17 go into the what the program has --18 MR. DUPONT: T know. 19 BZA CHAIR HILL: -- and whether or not the program 20 is the right program. I mean, I almost treat it as a 2.1 So I hope it's more exact than you just said. science. 22 Well, I mean, it's precise. MR. DUPONT: It is There's no question. It's just, I just agree with 23 24 Mr. Mordfin. But there you go.

BZA CHAIR HILL: You understand what I was saying.

1	Like if you can make it easier for the Board in the future
2	so that it doesn't
3	MR. DUPONT: Will do.
4	BZA CHAIR HILL: As you can tell, it's probably
5	a struggle for the Board. You got like 12 exhibits that have
6	like different, you know, items on them listed in different
7	times. So, all right. Okay. Let's see. And then you will
8	submit the corrected plat, Mr. duPont?
9	MR. DUPONT: Sure, yes.
10	BZA CHAIR HILL: And how, when will you be able
11	to do that?
12	MR. DUPONT: Later today or tomorrow.
13	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Because we're not going
14	to be able to do anything until we get that. Okay?
15	MR. DUPONT: Oh, okay.
16	BZA CHAIR HILL: Meaning we're not going to issue
17	anything.
18	MR. DUPONT: I understand.
19	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay.
20	MR. DUPONT: Then it will be today, before lunch.
21	BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Great, great. All right.
22	Does anybody have anything else? All right. Commissioner
23	Wray, thanks for visiting with us
24	MR. DUPONT: Thank you, Mr. Wray.
25	BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you, everyone. Bye-bye.

I will -- the Board was curious, curious, concerned about the meaningful connection. I would agree with what has been put forward before us, that it is a meaningful connection. I would also even submit to the discussion that the Applicant had with the Zoning Administrator that's in Exhibit 58, as well as the Office of Planning's report as to -- well, now I'm thinking.

So, as to the shadow studies and everything, I am also in agreement with the testimony that's been put forward by the Applicant, as well as the testimony that we received from the ANC in terms of undue shadowing. I mean, I would agree with what Vice Chair John said, which was that, you know, whether or not the neighbor agrees or doesn't agree that it's undue to them is regardless of how the Board is supposed to look at whether or not we think it's undue.

I do believe it's undue in comparison to what is already happening with the building that is there to the south, meaning there's already a tremendous amount of shadowing that northern neighbor is getting, and then the additional shadowing is not undue, right, from what the new building is going to provide.

And now, again, what this does provide a, not a problem for, is that this is just possibly going to continue up the block, right, and as to what, you know, the next neighbor thinks is undue, whether they think it's undue or

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

not, you know, that is not what is the case here. It's what the Board thinks, right.

And so really what this comes down to for me is, you know, whether the additional information that's been put forward makes me comfortable that they are meeting the criteria with which for us to decide this application.

In this particular case, I will agree with them, the information that's put forward, as well as I would agree with the analysis that the ANC has provided. And I do thank the Commissioner for joining us today, because it takes time out of their day to join us for these hearings.

I do note that there were some people in opposition. And their opposition is noted. However, I think that, again, on the face of what the Board is supposed to look at concerning the project, I believe I'm comfortable with granting this application.

Now, we did have a request for a corrected plat to be put forward. And I don't know whether that is something that -- and we can check with also legal. I know that whether we want to wait for that or whether the Board thinks they need to wait for that to have their decision. And if not, then we can leave the record open for that, which I guess will come very soon.

But I understand that we're, the Board is kind of analyzing how to handle things in terms of like keeping the

2.1

record open for items in the future. I am going to go around the table to hear what my fellow Board members have to say.

And I'll begin with you, Mr. Smith.

MEMBER SMITH: I agree with what you stated, Chairman Hill, on the facts of this particular case. I do note the opposition of some of the residents. But most of the opposition relates to, you know, construction, from a construction management standpoint. So I will point them to DDOT's, well, not DDOT's, DCRA's construction management manual and just, you know, hold the Applicant's feet to the fire Applicant to ensure that the is meeting construction, the requirements for them to, the standards for them to, for their building permit.

So, with that, I do agree that the Applicant has met the burden of proof for us to grant the special exception under Subtitle X, 901.2 for the rear addition.

I do agree that the shadow studies were difficult to read. It would have been great, I guess -- you know, I would be open to, if we are, I would be open to keeping this open for us to, you know, digest those shadow studies a little bit more, especially in light of if we are asking for a modified plat.

I don't know if it's something, given that there are some legal questions about whether we should keep this open just for that. You know, you never know. That

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

additional plat may materially change the nature of the case.

But in looking at the sun studies, as much as I could look at the sun studies in this short period of time and digest them, it doesn't seem to be, to me, that it's a substantially undue hardship, especially in light of the applicant that would be most, I mean the apartment owner that would be most impacted did submit a letter in support.

While that is helpful, I do believe that it is incumbent upon this Board to ensure that, regardless of who lives there or who's the current owner, that the property doesn't have any undue impacts going forward. And I do agree with you, Chairman Hill, that this will probably march further down the block. So we want to ensure that we're not creating additional shadowing.

It was a concern to me that the Office of Planning pretty much said it was subjective when it's a criteria that they're using to determine whether it meets the special exception criteria. I am very concerned with that statement that was made by the Office of Planning. And I'll just go on the record and say that.

But I do think that right now based on what I see in the record and in analyzing OP staff report and all the information within the record that it wouldn't be undue. But I would entertain keeping this open for that plat and for us to decide at a later date.

2.1

2.3

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Mr. Blake.

MEMBER BLAKE: Good points made by both members on this case. I would agree that the facts of the case are supportive of approval, meeting the criteria for requested relief.

concerns The with regard to the untimely information, though, it makes it difficult to digest the information in a way that's meaningful, particularly if the standards relative to what we expect is existing and we're looking for matter of right and then the comparison to what the actual is is the format that we're used to. To receive the documents at the last minute in a confused format that difficult doesn't present that makes it to make an assessment.

In this case, the shadowing, as Board Member Smith and Chairman Hill pointed out, it's clear of how the impact is. However, digesting that information in a timely fashion that allows us to really make an assessment is not that clear.

And I would agree that it's more objective than subjective. And it's not the decision of the neighbor if he likes it or not, because that neighbor can sell the house tomorrow, in which case the next person is going to have to suffer through it without the desire to do the same project. So I have some concerns with everyone dropping the ball the

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

moment the neighbor says it's okay. That concerns me.

I, too, would agree with Board Member Smith that I was, I disagree with the Office of Planning statement on that as to the subjectivity of the measure. And I disagree with the affirmation by Mr. duPont of that comment. All that said, as I said, I do believe the case meets the standard. And I will be voting in favor of it. Thank you.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Thank you. Chairman Hood.

ZC CHAIR HOOD: I don't have much to add. But I will just opine for now on the leaving it open until you get all the necessary requirements for this application as we've already been noted by legal. So I think that keeps everything clean and clear.

But I will say that I probably to thank -- when you talk about construction, Ι know Board Member mentioned the construction issues. I do want to thank our legal counsel, Mary Nagelhout, for explaining and giving me a basic fresher. And I really appreciated the Board's request, to assess the request of zoning relief related to the requirement stated in the zoning regulation, as opposed to what the Zoning Commission does. So I wanted to put that on the record. And I don't think any of us, including the Chairman, if you've had a chance to read the position paper she's given us, which is very well done, appreciate that.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

So, other than that, I will wait for the plat. And I would agree, I don't want to get into whether something is subjective or objective. I just want to look at the regulations and govern myself, make my best decision as possible. I would agree, though, we need to wait until everything is there from what I've heard previously. So that's all I have. Thank you.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Vice Chair John.

BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So I'm in two minds about the plat. On the one hand, the Board has to have all of the information that it's going to decision on in the record before the deliberates and decides. On the other hand, the Board does decide based on the plans submitted. And in this case, the new plans show that the sunroom on the second floor is what allows the application to meet the standard for being one complete building instead of two separate buildings.

And so, on balance, I think that the Board should wait to receive the plat just to be consistent with the requirement to have the documents in the record before deciding, because sometimes even though the Board asks for information and decides and votes on the case, applicants delay submitting the information that the Board requires. So, you know, I would go along with what the rest of the Board would like to see.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

But I think if we're going to -- I don't want to say correct. I think I want to say clarify our procedure going forward, which I believe is that all of the required information must be in the record at the time the Board decides. And if that's what I'm saying, then I think the plat needs to be in the record.

Now, with respect to the shadow studies, I've heard the discussion, and I agree with it so far. I disagree that if the, I don't agree with the Applicant or with the Office of Planning that we have to look at them as purely, as shadow studies as purely subjective and having no merit in deciding whether there is any impact on light and air. And I believe imperfect as it may be, that's a tool that the Board uses. And applicants need to submit them in a format that is useful to the Board.

And I think I might ask Office of Zoning to perhaps add that to their process or whatever guidance they give to applicants, that shadow studies must be submitted in a format where it shows the existing condition and matter of right and the proposed for the time of year so that the Board can quickly review the studies to see where there is additional impact. So that's all I would add to that.

In this particular case, I was really troubled by the length of the addition. But in looking at the size of the lot, it's a narrow lot I believe 17 feet wide. And it's

also very long. And if there is 40 feet of rear yard left after the addition, I would agree that there will not be an undue impact in terms of light and air in this case. So, based on that, I would support the application. But I don't know if we can take a vote today.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. So, I mean, since this is the only case we have, we might as well talk through all this stuff with the record stuff. So my thoughts -- and, Ms. Nagelhout, I'm going to turn to you or Ms. John in a minute.

So my thoughts are -- I can't say I'm a little bit, I hate to use that word torn that Mr. May sometimes corrects me on torn. But if the Board's trying to get things that they need to see to make a decision, I think that's one thing. And then obviously, if there's things that are supposed to be in the record as per the regulations, that's another thing as well.

My concern sometimes is that unfortunately just the fact that the Board has so many cases, it tends to make other days longer, which is completely fine. I mean, now the other way that I think that we can do this, and this is where legal, is qoinq ask just to refer the to to deliberations that we had on the previous day. know, we don't have to necessarily deliberate again, right. just have to see whatever information gets submitted,

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

whether or not that changes any of the deliberations that we had and/or clarifies what we spoke about, right.

I mean, I don't think that, how imperfect as it is, I think that at least I understand the shadow studies enough to be able to compare it to the other building that's casting shadow on it currently. I will agree with everything my colleagues said in terms of how far back it goes and people's concerns, because those are kind of the concerns that we always seem to have with these type of projects.

And then I also would agree that -- and we can ask again legal. I don't know if that gets changed in the way that the Office of Zoning talks to people, that we actually do get to see -- I mean, it hasn't necessarily been, it's just something that the Board kind of has done and some applicants have started to do, wherein you see kind of the matter of right versus the proposed.

And I guess, and I'm going to also just, since we have a couple minutes, push back a little on that one, which is to say sometimes the matter of right that they show is kind of not even really accurate, because you might not actually build the matter of right, right. It might not be financially feasible, you know. It might not actually work, you know.

And so they show us a matter of right shadowing, but I guess the Board can figure that out, too. They show

2.1

us a matter of right shadowing. It's really nobody would ever really build, right. Like they would build an additional eight feet out or six feet out or whatever they're able to, right. But then they show whatever they're proposing, and anyway.

So that's the long story of saying I don't know where I am with keeping the record open all the time. But if we do, then we just -- I guess if legal can -- and we can talk about this now with Ms. Nagelhout. If we can just refer to previous, the previous deliberation. And I see Chairman Hood raising his hand. So I'll go to Chairman Hood before I go to legal, but refer back to the deliberations that we had instead of having to deliberate again. Chairman Hood.

ZC CHAIR HOOD: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, I'm going to have to be excused. Unfortunately, I don't have as much leisure time as you all do. So I'm going to have to be excused. I will follow the record. And if we're ready to vote on something germane, I will do that in this particular case. But I have to run out. So thank you all.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Thank you, Chairman Hood. Okay. Ms. Nagelhout, do you have any thoughts on any of the stuff that we just said?

MS. NAGELHOUT: First off is that you do not have to deliberate again. If you put off the vote to a later date, you know, it says if you're doing it at once, you don't

have to restate everything you've already said today. The second thing is if there's something you think you need to incorporate into your, that's going to be a part of your decision, a part of the basis for your decision, I would not take a vote until you get it.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Now, I'm going to ask the question, what if it's something we don't necessarily think we need to make a decision but we want to make sure we get it to have a complete record, and we know that, we don't know what applicants tend to do after we've made a vote, whether or not we get it or we don't get it. Do you have an opinion on that?

MS. NAGELHOUT: Even if it's just to complete the record, that is something you need. You want to have a complete record. So --

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay.

MS. NAGELHOUT: -- I would not vote until after you get it.

BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. So then this is kind of -- and this is for everybody who has to be, who possibly may be watching, that, you know, we're going to make sure we get everything we need before we -- no matter, I should say that, you know, to make the Board feel as though the record is complete, even if we are able to deliberate on what we have.

2.1

So, Ms. Rose, I guess if you could reach out to the Applicant and make sure the Applicant submits the corrected plat, and then also if the Applicant could submit some kind of a diagram I guess that shows the existing versus the matter of right versus the proposed shadow of the project.

And I guess this is where I'm not clear what the Board may need. Does the Board need a specific time? I mean, it sounds as though the shadowing is the most severe in the December morning, right. So, maybe if there was the December morning, the December afternoon, and the December evening, I don't know if that would suffice for the Board. I'm trying to see what is the clearest direction that we can give to the Applicant. And I'll, again, I don't know, Ms. John, if you have a thought on that.

BZA VICE CHAIR JOHN: I think the format that most applicants have followed is spring, summer, and winter, and so showing existing matter of right and proposed. And I am sure the Office of Zoning has some guidance that the Office of Zoning can provide in how that's done. But it's simply very difficult for me, speaking for myself, to try to look between ten different, you know, exhibits to figure what's the additional incremental shadowing.

And I think even at the Office of Planning review stage that need could be reinforced instead of accepting

something that's just so difficult to understand when you're 1 looking at nine cases. So, in this case, this week we just 2 had one hearing, but imagine if we had had nine or ten cases. 3 So that's my only comment. 5 BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. So, Ms. Rose, that's something to take back to the Office of Zoning also to see 6 if there is a way to advise applicants to make the shadow studies a little bit more concise for the Board to be able 9 to take a look at. And then, Ms. Rose, do you understand 10 what we'd like the Office of Zoning to convey 11 Applicant? 12 MS. ROSE: Yes. BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. All right. 13 Then if that's the case, then what are the submission dates and everything 14 15 that we need to adhere to, Ms. Rose? 16 The ANC, the question I had is, do you MS. ROSE: 17 want a response from the ANC, because we know that they will meet again on October 12th? 18 19 BZA CHAIR HILL: I don't think we need a response 20 per se on any of the information. I think we had to leave 21 the record open for them to respond to something. is where, again, this kind of -- it just is what it is. 22 Ι 23 mean, it pushes back things for the Board. 24 I mean, I don't know what, you know, even if we --

we could -- and this -- I think the Board is able to reset

I mean, it sounds as though, I mean, if we could get this information from the Applicant by Friday and then leave, I'm sorry, yeah, Friday, the 23rd and then leave the record open for the ANC to respond or any parties to respond by the 27th, then we could vote again on the 28th. The 28th. MS. ROSE: We can go with that. We don't know what the Applicant's capabilities are in terms of getting those shadow studies done by Friday. But he did say he would get the plat in later today. Well, BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. Ι quess the Applicant knows to get back to us. But we'll leave the record open until Friday close of business for the shadow studies and the plat. And then we'll leave the record open 13 for any parties or ANCs on the 27th. And we'll come back for 14 a decision on the 28th. So noted. Thank you. MS. ROSE: BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay, okay. Does anybody have anything else on that one? All right. That also being the 18 case, I guess we don't have anything else today. Is there anything else before the Board, Ms. Rose? No, nothing further, sir. MS. ROSE: BZA CHAIR HILL: Okay. You guys, have a good day. MS. ROSE: Thank you. 24 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 11:02 a.m.)

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

15

16

17

19

20

2.1

22

<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: Hearing

Before: BZA

Date: 09-21-22

Place: Vieoconference

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